## Ash Shifaa

## Volume Two Qaadhi Iyaadh Andalusi α

English Translation Edited By:
Mufti Afzal Hoosen Elias
(May Allaah protect him)
Khalifa of Haji Abdul Mannan Abdur Razack





#### جميع حقوق الطبع محفوظة All Rights Reserved

No Part of this book may be reproduced in any form without written permission from Mustafah Publishers

#### First Authorized Edition 2015

Title : Ash Shifaa (Vol Two)

By : MAULANA MUHAMMAD ILYAAS GHAMAN

Translated By : Qaadhi Iyaadh Andalusi

First Published: June 2015

### **Published By:**

#### Mustafah Publishers

Book Mall Urdu Bazar Karachi-Pakistan.

Cell: 0335-1222460 Phone: 021-32711964

E-mail: mustafahpublishers@gamil.com

### **Visit Our Website**

www.mustafahpublishers.com

#### Books Also Available in :

United Kingdom

#### **AL-FAROOQ-INTERNATIONAL**

68 Asfordby Street, Leicester, LEG 3QG,

#### AZHAR ACADEMY LTD.

London E12 5QA

#### ISLAMIC BOOK CENTER

Bolton Bl1 3NE

#### U.S.A

#### DARUL HIKMAH

182, Sobieski Street Buffalo, NY 14212 Tel: (716)894-5715, E-mail:bookstore@darul-hikmah.org

#### South Africa

#### AL-HUDA PUBLICATIONS

Johannesburg

#### I.G.HOOSEN

Durban

*: : :	Ash Shifaa (Volume Two)	<del>\\\\</del>
--------	-------------------------	-----------------

Contents	
Volume Two	12
The Muslim Ummah and the Rights of Rasulullaah $\varepsilon$ .	12
It is Obligatory to Believe in Rasulullaah ε an	nd it is
Compulsory to Obey him and Follow his Sunnah	12
The Command of Jihaad with those who Refuse the G	Oneness
of Allaah j and the Risaalat	14
The Purport of Imaan According to the Author α	14
Who is a Hypocrite?	16
Section 1	19
The Compulsion of Obedience to Rasulullaah ε	19
The Essence of the Above-mentioned Verses	
The Explanation of the Mufassireen and Imams Re	garding
This	
Call to the Disbelievers on the Day of Resurrection	
Section 2	
Following Rasulullaah ε	
The Meaning of the Example of Rasulullaah ε	
Rasulullaah ε said, "If you Love Allaah, then Follow	
That which is not Beloved in the Qur'aan, the Qu	
Displeased with	
Types of Knowledge	
Section 3	
The Statements of the Pious Predecessors and	
regarding following the Sunnah of Rasulullaah ε	
Seerah	
Section 4	
Opposing or Changing the Sunnah of Rasulullar	
Deviation and Innovation	
Chapter Two	
The Necessity of Loving Rasulullaah ε	
Section 1	
Love for Rasulullaah s and its Virtue	44

★!分     Ash Shifaa (Volume Two)
Love for the Household is from the Love for
Rasulullaah ε44
Section 247
Love for Rasulullaah $\varepsilon$ and the Statements of the Pious47
Even the Threat of Death could Make the Person say
Nothing but Love for Rasulullaah ε50
Section 3
The Signs of Love for Rasulullaah ε51
Love for Hadhrat Hasan τ and Hadhrat Husayn τ54
Love for the Ummaah and Poverty
Section 4
The Meaning of Love for Rasulullaah ε and its Reality61 The Reality of Love
Section 5
It is Compulsory to Practice on the Advice of Rasulullaah ε66
Well-Wishing for the Qur'aan67
Well-Wishing for Rasulullaah ε
Adopting Well-Wishing for the Leaders of the Muslims and
the Muslims70
Chapter 371
The Compulsion of Honour for Rasulullaah ε, Veneration of
Him and Service for Him71
The Reason Behind the Revelation of this Verse75
Immediate Glad Tidings for those who Adopt Taqwa76
The Sahabah ψ Teach the Reverts Etiquette for
Rasulullaah ε77
Section 179
The Special Adoption of Honour and Veneration by the
Sahabah $\psi$ for Rasulullaah $\epsilon$ 79
Section 2
Honour for Rasulullaah $\epsilon$ after his Demise, Honour for the
Household, and Honour for the Sahabah ψ83
Section 3 89

*:計算 Ash Shifaa (Volume Two) (計画
Narration of Ahadith and the Caution of the Pious
Predecessors and Respect for Hadith89
The Importance of Narrating Ahadith according to Imam
Maalik α91
Section 493
Honouring the Household and the Progeny of Rasulullaah ε
is Honouring Rasulullaah ε93
Section 5101
Honouring and Following the Sahabah ψ is Honour and
Well-Wishing for Rasulullaah ε101
Section 6
Honour for the Blessed items Associated with Rasulullaah ε108
Chapter 4113
The Command to Send Salaah and Salaam, its Obligatory
Status, its Obligation and Virtue113
Section 1
The Command to Send Durud upon Rasulullaah ε115
Section 2
In which Place is it Preferable to Recite Durud and
Salaam?119
Section 3
The Way in which Durud and Salaam Should be
Presented
Section 4
The Virtue of Sending Durud upon Rasulullaah ε
Section 5
Admonishment for not Reciting Durud upon
Rasulullaah ε
Section 6
The one who Recites Durud and Rasulullaah ε
Section 7
Difference of Opinion Regarding Sending Durud upon non-
Ambiyaa'

Ash Shifaa (Volume Two)	
Virtue of Visiting the Raudah of Rasulullaah ε a	
Presenting oneself There	
Section 91	
The Etiquette of Entering Masjid an Nabawi ε1	
Chapter 31	
Those Matters that are Compulsory for Rasulullaah $\epsilon$ 1	67
Summary	70
Religious Matters and the Innocence of the Ambiyaa' $\iota$ 1	70
Section 11	72
The Promise of the Heart by Rasulullaah $\epsilon$	72
The Statement of Hadhrat Ibraaheem 11	72
No Doubt Should be Allowed to Come About Regard	ing
Rasulullaah $\epsilon$	75
The Ambiyaa' ı can Never have any Doubt about	out
Tauheed1	81
That Which is Against the Grandeur of the Scholars of	can
never apply to the Ambiyaa' ı1	82
Even before Revelation, Rasulullaah $\epsilon$ was Shown thin	ngs
Beyond the Human Mind	
We Do Not Know of any Doubt of Rasulullaah $\epsilon$ from	an
Authentic Hadith1	
Upon the Counsel given by Waraqah bin Naufal, Hadh	ırat
Khadijah $\rho$ Tests the Arrival of Hadhrat Jibreel $\upsilon$	86
The Polytheists Gather to call Rasulullaah $\epsilon$ using a Speci	
Title	
'Ghayn' refers to Something that Completely covers	the
Heart1	
The Divine Command to adopt Patience given to Rasululla	
$\epsilon$ when the Nation belied Him1	
The Ambiyaa' ι are Innocent from Error/Sin	
Section 2	
The Innocence of the Ambiyaa' ı Before Nubuwwah2	
The Miracle of Splitting the Chest2	209
Section 3	223

→ Shifaa (Volume Two)	
The Innocence of the Ambiyaa' ı and the Matters of	the
World	223
Section 4	228
The Innocence of Rasulullaah ε, Protection from Shayt	aan
and the Consensus of the Ummah	228
Section 5	237
The Authenticity and Truthfulness of the Statements	
Rasulullaah $\epsilon$	237
Rasulullaah & never Spoke Something Contrary to Real	lity,
Wilfully or by Mistake	•
Section 6	
A silencing Reply to the Objectors	241
This Narration can be Criticized in Two Ways	
Section 7	260
The Innocence of the Nabi in terms of Worldly Matters	260
Rasulullaah ε Never Spoke Something Contrary	to
Reality	261
Section 8	264
The Reality and Status of Error (Sahwa)	264
The Three Statements of Hadhrat Ibrahim $\boldsymbol{\upsilon}$	267
A few Ahadith Regarding Intercession	269
The Statement of Hadhrat Musa v	270
Section 9	274
The Innocence of the Ambiyaa' t in terms of Limbs	274
Section 10	280

Ash Shifaa (Volume Two)	<b>k</b>
The Story of Hadhrat Adam v	307
The Story of Hadhrat Yunus v	311
The Story of Hadhrat Dawud υ	313
The Story of Hadhrat Yusuf v	315
The Story of Hadhrat Musa v	318
The Story of Hadhrat Sulaymaan v	320
The Story of Hadhrat Nuh v	322
The Nabi and the Ant	323
Section 14	
and the 'وَعَصَى آدَهُ رَبَّهُ فَعَوَى' and the Meaning of the Verse,	Reality
of Attesting to the Slip of the Ambiyaa i' in the Qur' Hadith	325
Section 15	
The Rights Dealing with the Innocence of the Am and its Importance	332
Section 16	
The Views Narrated Regarding the Innocence	
Angels	
Chapter 2  The Specialty of the Ambiyaa ı' in Worldly Matters	
Explanation of such Human Aspects that are linked to	
Section 1	
Reply to the Criticism levelled against Rasulullaah	
Reference from the Hadith of Sihr	
Section 2	
The Condition of the Worldly Matters of Rasulullaah	
Section 3	
Being Human and related Laws	
Section 4	
The Statements of Rasulullaah ε Dealing w	
World	
A Doubt	356
Section 5	363

→ Shifaa (Volume Two)	
Hadith e Qirtaas	363
Section 6	
The Statement of Rasulullaah ε while Angry	368
Section 7	
The Worldly Actions of Rasulullaah ε	374
Section 8	
The Divine Wisdom in Testing the Ambiyaa t'	382
Part Four	
Regarding the person who disparages or speaks	evil of
Rasulullaah v	392
Chapter 1	
The one disparages the Being, Lineage, Deen, or H	labit of
Rasulullaah ε and Explanation of the one who	swears
Rasulullaah ε	397
Section 1	405
The Proofs that Show that a Person who Swears Rasu	ılullaah
ε or Disparages Him ε Should be Killed	405
Section 2	415
The Forgiveness of Rasulullaah ε upon the Opp	osition
Harming Him ε	415
Section 3	425
Insolence towards Rasulullaah ε Unintentionally	425
Section 4	428
Explanation of Those who Belie Rasulullaah ε	428
Section 5	
The Ruling about the one who Speaks in a Confusing	ıg Way
about Rasulullaah ε	
Section 6	
The Ruling of Making a Similitude of Someon	
Rasulullaah ε	
Section 7	
Narrating Words of Kufr	
Section 8	448

*: <del> : ;}</del>	Ash Shifaa (Volume Two)	
---------------------	-------------------------	--

The Matters of Rasulullaah $\varepsilon$ about which there is Difference
of Opinion448
Section 9454
Be cautious when Mentioning the Secrat of
Rasulullaah ε454
Chapter 2457
Section 1457
The Punishment for the ones who speak ill of, swears,
disparages, and harms Rasulullaah ε457
Section 2463
Repentance for a Murtad463
Section 3467
The Ruling of Shahaadat or non-Shahaadat467
Section 4470
The Punishment for the Insolence of the Dhimmi470
Section 5477
The Inheritance, Ghusl, and Janaazah Salaah of the person
who is killed for swearing Rasulullaah ε477
Chapter 3
Explanation regarding the person who speaks ill of Allaah j,
the Angels, the Ambiyaa' (1), or the Family, Spouses, or
Sahabah ψ of Rasulullaah ε481
Section 1
Attributing such things to Allaah j that is against His
Grandeur484
Section 2
Research of the View of those who view and Classify others
as Disbelievers488
Section 3
Explanation of the Blasphemous Articles496
Refutation of Sects like the Rawaafidh496
Takfeer of Opposing Consensus506
In Summary, disbelief can Based on One of Three
Things:

*: Ash Shifaa (Volume Two) - 기계	
Section 451	3
The Ruling of the Words of Kufr by a Dhimmi51	3
Section 551	5
Attributing lies to Allaah, claiming Divinity, claiming	g
Risaalat51	5
Section 651	8
About the person who mocks at Belief and the Shari'ah51	8
Section 752	2
Being Insolent towards the Ambiyaa' (1) and the Angels.52	2
Section 852	6
The Ruling Regarding the person who mocks the Qur'aan o	r
the copy of the Qur'aan (Mushaf)52	6
Section 953	0
It is Haraam to be insolent towards the Household, Spouses	3,
and Sahabah ψ of Rasulullaah ε53	0
Conclusion53	8

#### Volume Two

## The Muslim Ummah and the Rights of Rasulullaah $\varepsilon$

Qaadhi Abul Fadhl  $\alpha$  explains, "In the first volume, I explained that I have divided volume two into four parts.

We shall mention the following in this volume:

- 1. Verification of Rasulullaah ε,
- 2. Following the Sunnah of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ ,
- 3. Obedience to Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  and love for him,
- 4. Well-wishing for Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ ,
- 5. Accepting piety,
- 6. The compulsion of sending Durood upon Rasulullaah ε,
- 7. And the method of visiting the grave of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$

# It is Obligatory to Believe in Rasulullaah ε and it is Compulsory to Obey him and Follow his Sunnah

Previously, we discussed Nubuwwah and Risaalat at length. We have also discussed its authenticity. We shall now shed light, with proof, on the obligation to believe in Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and the compulsion to verify the guidance that he  $\epsilon$  was sent with. Without this, Imaan and Islaam are not complete.

Allaah says:

So believe in Allaah, in His Rasool  $\epsilon$  and in the light (the Qur'aan) that He revealed. Allaah is Informed of what you do.

(Surah Taghaabun (The Great Loss), 8)

And Allaah j says:

Verily We have sent you (O Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ ) as a witness (to testify to the actions of people on the Day of Qiyaamah), a carrier of good news, (to the Mu'mineen) and a warner (to the Kuffaar).

(We have sent Rasulullaah ε) So that you (O people) believe in Allaah, believe in His Rasool, assist Him (His Deen), revere Him, and glorify Him morning and evening (in Salaat and Tasbeeh).

(Surah Fatah (Victory), 8-9)

And Allaah j says:

...So believe in Allaah and His Rasool (who is) the untutored Nabi who believes in Allaah and His words (the Qur'aan). Follow him so that you may be rightly guided (because there is no salvation without Imaan and belief in the Risaalat of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ )."

(Surah A'raaf (The High Wall), 158)

It is obligatory to believe in Allaah j. Moreover, without believing in Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , a person's Imaan in Allaah j will be incomplete and his Islaam cannot be correct.

## Verifying Rasulullaah $\epsilon$ together with Believing in the Oneness of Allaah j

(Surah Fatah (Victory), 13)

## The Command of Jihaad with those who Refuse the Oneness of Allaah j and the Risaalat

1129. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "Allaah j has commanded me to wage Jihaad against the people until they testify to the Oneness of Allaah j and, together with my Risaalat, those things that Allaah j taught me. If they accept, then they have protected their lives and wealth from me, except that their reckoning is with Allaah." (Bukhari)

## The Purport of Imaan According to the Author α

1130. Qaadhi Abul Fadhl  $\alpha$  says, "Verification must be done of his Nubuwwah and Risaalat and verification of all that he brought. Together with verifying from the heart, testimony must be given; 'Indeed, he is the Rasul of Allaah'. When a person verifies from the heart and testifies with his tongue, then his Imaan and verification will be complete, as is narrated in the Hadith of Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Umar  $\tau$  (from Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ): 'I have been commanded to fight

people until they testify that there is none worthy of worship but Allaah and Muhammad is the Rasul of Allaah. This is clarified even further in Hadith e Jibreel.

1131. It states (in Hadith e Jibreel) that he (Jibreel  $\upsilon$ ) came to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and questions and answers between them ensued. Jibreel  $\upsilon$  asked, "Tell me about Islaam?" Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Islaam is to testify to the Oneness of Allaah and my Risaalat." He then mentioned the other fundamentals of Islaam. Hadhrat Jibreel  $\upsilon$  then asked about Imaan and Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Imaan is to believe in Allaah, the angels, the books revealed by Allaah, and His Rasuls."

It is proven from this that, for Imaan, it is necessary to have conviction in the heart. For Islaam, verbal testimony will suffice. If the tongue and heart both verify these things, then Imaan will be complete and this is a good and complete condition. In Islaam, the worst condition of a person is that a person gives testimony verbally but he does not verify with the heart. This is called *Nifaaq* (Hypocrisy).

Allaah j says:

When the Munaafiqeen come to you (O Rasulullaah ε) they say, "We testify that you are certainly Allaah's Rasool." Allaah knows well that you are His Rasool and Allaah testifies that the Munaafiqeen are liars.

(Although their statement is true, they are lying about the fact that they believe it.)

(Surah Munaafiqoon (The Hypocrites), 1)

## Who is a Hypocrite?

They were liars in their claim because their claim contradicted their belief; they did not have the belief that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is the Rasul of Allaah. When their hearts did not verify what their tongues say, there will be no benefit for them in their verbal testimony alone, nor will they get anything from it. On account of this hypocrisy, they are out of the fold of Imaan and they are with the disbelievers. In fact, they are worse than them in terms of their stage in Jahannam (Hell).

The law of Islaam will apply to them so when they openly testified to Tauheed and Risaalat. Based on this, all the laws of the Muslims will be applied to them because the Muslim ruler will enforce law upon the apparent condition (those who possess the apparent signs of Islaam) for there is no means that a person has through which he can find out about the condition of the people's hearts. People were not commanded to search for Imaan in other people's hearts. In fact, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  severely prohibited calling someone a hypocrite.

1132. "Did you tear his heart open and see?" (Bukhari, Muslim)

In the explanation of Imaan and Islaam given in the light of *Hadith e Jibreel* above, the clear difference between verbal testimony and verification with the heart was mentioned. There are another two conditions besides verification and testimony, which are linked to them.

1133. A person verifies regarding Islaam and Imaan in his heart but he does not get the chance to verbally testify.

During this time he passes away. There are two views regarding such a person:

He did not verbally testify to Islaam or announce it. Therefore, there was no benefit in verifying with the heart because verification in the heart and verbal testimony are necessary for Imaan.

1. Some scholars have said that such a person is worthy of Jannah and they present the following Hadith of Rasulullaah ε as proof, "The person who had even an atom of Imaan in his heart will be taken out of Jahannam (Hell)." (Tirmidhi)

It is clearly proven in this Hadith that this person had nothing else in his heart. He clearly shows that this person had Imaan in his heart, he was not sinful, nor is he blameworthy for not being able to verbally testify.

Some think that such Imaan is totally correct and worthy of acceptance. This is the correct view.

However, in the case where there is such a person who had abundant time to make his Islaam apparent and many occasions arose where he could have made his Islaam apparent but he did not make his Islaam apparent and he also did not give verbal testimony, the scholars have two views regarding such a person:

1. One group is of the view that such a person is in the fold of Islaam because he verifies the laws of Islaam in his heart and his deeds give verbal testimony. Such a person will be sinful for not giving verbal testimony but he will not be deserving of the punishment of eternal Jahannam because of his deeds.

2. Another group is of the view that the verbal testimony and the verification of the heart of this person is not in harmony. As proof, they say that verbal testimony is a clear sign that the person has accepted with the heart. This testimony is its explanation. Based on other reasons, verbal testimony and verification with the tongue were not in harmony. Therefore, the ruling can never be given that such a person is part of the fold of Islaam and the scholars have said that this is correct.

This was a short discussion on Islaam and Imaan and about its increase and decrease. It must be remembered that this is a very broad subject. Is distribution impossible based only on verification? In short, this is not correct because it turns more to deeds, or, it will be evident in different qualities; where was his conviction? How firm was his belief? What form was there of this being firm? Was it less or more? If we discuss all this, then we shall definitely veer far from the original subject matter. Therefore, we have purposely mentioned whatever is sufficient on this chapter.

### Section 1

### The Compulsion of Obedience to Rasulullaah ε

When it is compulsory on us to believe in Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and to verify that all this is from Allaah j, then it becomes obligatory upon us to obey and submit to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Allaah j says:

O you who have Imaan! Obey Allaah and His Rasool and do not turn away from him (do not oppose him by listening to evil ones) while you are listening (to the Qur'aan and other advices).

(Surah Anfaal (The Spoils of War), 20)

Say, "Obey Allaah and the Rasool (Muhammad ε by practising the Sunnah)." If they turn away, then (bear in mind that) surely Allaah does not like the Kaafiroon.
(Surah Aal-Imraan (Aal-Imraan), 32)

Obey Allaah and the Rasool ε so that mercy (salvation) is shown to you. (To obey Rasulullaah ε is to obey Allaah because Allaah commands that Rasulullaah ε be obeyed.)

(Surah Aal-Imraan (Aal-Imraan), 132)

...If you obey, you will be rightly guided. The Rasool  $\epsilon$  is responsible only for clear propagation.

(Surah Noor (The Celestial Light), 54)

Whoever obeys the Rasool  $\varepsilon$  (Muhammad  $\varepsilon$ ) obeys Allaah (because Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  conveys the message of Allaah) and whoever turns away, (refusing to accept the message, then O Muhammad  $\varepsilon$ , you should not upset yourself because) We have not sent you as a watcher (guard) over them (you will not be questioned for their denial because your responsibility is merely to convey the message to the best of your ability).

(Surah Nisaa (The Women), 80)

...Hold fast to what (commands) the Rasool  $\epsilon$  gives you and refrain from what (actions) He prevents you (because whatever he instructs you is from Allaah). Fear (disobeying) Allaah, for Allaah punishes very severely.

(Surah Hashar (The Exile), 7)

وَ مَنْ يُطِعِ اللهُ وَ الرَّسُوْلَ فَأُولَٰلِكَ مَعَ الَّذِيْنَ اَنْعَمَ اللهُ عَلَيْهِمْ مِّنَ النَّبِيِّنَ وَ الصِّدِّيْقِيْنَ وَ الشُّهَدَآءِ وَ الصَّلِحِيْنَ ۚ ١ وَ حَسُنَ اُولَٰلِكَ رَفِيْقًا ۖ ٢٩٠٠٠

Those who obey Allaah and the Rasool  $\varepsilon$  will be (in the Aakhirah) with those Ambiyaa (those who received divine revelation), "Siddiqeen", martyrs (those prepared to die for Allaah and for Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ ) and righteous ones (those who purify their bodies and souls) on whom Allaah has

bestowed His bounties. These are indeed the best of companions. (Although all these people may not share the same stages of Jannah, they will be able to meet each other frequently.)

(Surah Nisaa (The Women), 69)

وَ مَا اَرْسَلْنَا مِنْ رَّسُوْلِ اِلَّا لِيُطَاعَ بِاِذْنِ اللهِ اللهِ اَوْ اَنَّهُمْ اِذْ ظَّلَمُوْا اَنْهُمْ جَآءُوْكَ فَاسْتَغْفَرُ وَا اللهِ وَ اسْتَغْفَرَ لَهُمُ الرَّسُوْلُ لَوَجَدُوا اللهِ اللهِ اللهِ مَا ١٠٤٠.

We have sent every Rasool so that he should be obeyed by the order of Allaah. If only it were that when they (the hypocrites) oppress (wrong) their souls (by referring their disputes to others), they should come to you (O Muhammad  $\varepsilon$ ) seeking Allaah's forgiveness and then the Rasool (Muhammad  $\varepsilon$ ) seeks forgiveness on their behalf, they will then surely find that Allaah is Most Forgiving, Most Merciful (Allaah will forgive the if they obey Him and realise that the judgement of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  is absolute). (Surah Nisaa (The Women), 64)

#### The Essence of the Above-mentioned Verses

From the above-mentioned verses we learn that Allaah j said that obedience to Him is obedience to His Rasul  $\epsilon$  and the obedience of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was joined to His obedience. He promised great virtue for this obedience. There were also warnings announced for disobedience to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and they were reminded of the punishment from Allaah for this. We also learn that it is obligatory upon every Muslim to obey every command of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and to stay away from everything he forbade.

## The Explanation of the Mufassireen and Imams Regarding This

The Imams and Mufassireen explain that the meaning of 'the obedience to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ' is 'following his Sunnah completely and accepting that which he brought'.

The scholars have explained that whichever Rasul Allaah j sent to a nation, He made it obligatory on that nation to obey the Nabi or Rasul.

It has been proven that he who follows Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  in *Masnun (acts done by the Nabi)* matters will definitely follow Allaah j in the obligatory matters.

Sahl bin Abdullaah was asked about the Islaamic Shari'ah. He explained that this decision was made by the verse of the Qur'aan. (Surah Hashr, 7)

Samarqandi  $\alpha$  explained that the 'obedience of Allaah' means fulfilling the obligatory duties, and 'obedience to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ' means following the *Sunan*.

Some scholars have explained that 'obedience' means that the law of Allaah should be followed in that which is forbidden and 'obedience to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ' means that whatever command Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  gave should be practised upon. One view regarding 'obedience' is that 'obedience to Allaah' means that we should testify to the Oneness of Allaah and 'obedience to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ' means that we should testify to the Risaalat of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .

1134. Hadhrat Abu Hurayrah  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "He who obeyed me is as though he has obeyed Allaah. He who has disobeyed me is as though he has

disobeyed Allaah. He who obeys the ruler appointed by me is as though he has obeyed me, and he who disobeys the leader appointed by me is as though he has disobeyed me." (Bukhari, Muslim)

From this Hadith we learn that obedience to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is obedience to Allaah j because Allaah j commanded us to obey Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Therefore, we are obligated to obey Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .

## Call to the Disbelievers on the Day of Resurrection

When the disbelievers are punished in the lowest level of Jahannam, they will call out. Allaah j mentions this in the following words:

(Instead of asking when Qiyaamah will take place, the Kuffaar should bear in mind that it will be) The day when their faces will be overturned in the Fire as they say (in remorse), "O dear! If only we had obeyed Allaah and obeyed the Rasool &!"

(Surah Ahzaab (The Armies), 66)

At the time, the punishment of Jahannam that they were warned of will be set upon them and they will be given the punishment of the lowest level of Jahannam. They will show regret upon their disobedience but, regrettably, such talk will be of no benefit at that time.

1135. Rasulullaah & said, "When I command you to stay away from something, then stay away from it. But when I command you to do something, then do it according to your ability." (Bukhari, Muslim)

1136. Hadhrat Abu Hurayrah  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "All the individuals of my Ummah will enter Jannah except the one that rejected." The Sahabah  $\psi$  asked, "What do you mean by 'the one that rejected'?" Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "He who obeyed me will enter Jannah and he who disobeyed me has rejected me." (Bukhari)

1137. Another authentic Hadith states that Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "My example and the example of that which Allaah has sent me with is like that person that came to a nation and said, 'O nation, I saw an army and I am clearly warning you. Therefore, make arrangements to save yourselves.' Hearing this, a group accepted and they left quickly and were saved. Among them was also a group that belied him and they remained in their homes until morning. The army attacked them in the morning and destroyed them. This is the example of the one that obeyed me and of the one that denied the truth that I brought." (Bukhari, Muslim)

1138. The same subject matter is narrated in another Hadith in which Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "My example is like that of a person that built a house and he prepared good food there to host guests and he sent a caller out. He who accepted the invitation entered the home, and he who refused the invitation did not either enter the home and nor did he not accept the invitation, nor did he enjoy anything. (Bukhari, Muslim)

Listen! Home is Jannah. Allaah has made it and the announcement (of it) was made by Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Whoever responded to the call of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  obeyed Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and he undoubtedly obeyed Allaah j. He who refused the invitation of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  has disobeyed Allaah j. The being of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is one that makes apparent the pious and the evil among people.

### **Section 2**

### Following Rasulullaah &

Allaah j says the about following Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ , practising upon his Sunnah and following his example:

Say (O Muhammad ε), "If you love Allaah then follow me (Muhammad ε), Allaah will then love you (He will reward you and grant you numerous material and spiritual blessings) and forgive your sins. Allaah is Most Forgiving, Most Merciful."

(Surah Aal-Imraan (Aal-Imraan), 31)

And Allaah j says:

...So believe in Allaah and His Rasool (who is) the untutored Nabi who believes in Allaah and His words (the Qur'aan). Follow him so that you may be rightly guided (because there is no salvation without Imaan and belief in the Risaalat of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ )."

(Surah A'raaf (The High Wall), 158)

Allaah j says in another place:

Never! By the oath of your Rabb, they cannot have Imaan until they make you (O Muhammad  $\varepsilon$ ) judge their disputes and (until) they do not find any dissatisfaction in

that which you decide and (until) they accept (your decision) with complete submission (with happiness).

(Surah Nisaa (The Women), 65)

Everybody should adhere to the command of Rasulullaah ɛ. The words (وَيُسَلِّمُواْ تَسْلِيمًا) are used to show obedience in Arabic.

Allaah j says:

There is definitely an excellent example in Allaah's Rasool ε (in the manner in which he stood his ground and faced the enemy with determination) for the one who fears Allaah and the Last Day, and who remembers Allaah abundantly.

(Surah Ahzaab (The Armies), 21)

### The Meaning of the Example of Rasulullaah ε

Muhammad bin Ali Tirmidhi explains that the meaning of the example of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  (Uswa) is to follow him, to practice upon his Sunnah, and to abandon opposing Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  in word and deed. Most of the Mufassireen have explained this meaning. Some Mufassireen say that this is only admonishment for those people that remain behind in following the Sunnah.

In the explanation of the verse, 'the path of those whom You have favoured...' (Surah Fatihah, 7), Hadhrat Sahl mentions that this means following Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . In this verse, Allaah j has commanded people to follow Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and has promised them that whoever follows and adopts

the Sunnah of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , will take the path of guidance by means of following the Sunnah. This is because Allaah j sent Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  with the true Deen and guidance, that he  $\epsilon$  may purify the hearts of people, teach them the book and wisdom, and guide them to the straight path.

In another verse, Allaah j has made His love for the Muslims conditional; stating that they will be forgiven if they follow Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . It has also been clarified that following Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  should be given preference over one's desires and following Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  should be beloved. The reason for explaining this is that following should not be out of force or greed for bounties, but the enthusiasm of obedience should be hidden in it.

There is no doubt that the faith of the Muslim Ummah revolves around following Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Through this, a person will acquire the pleasure of Allah j. We must also remember that our success lies in remaining pleased with the command of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and abandoning objections regarding it.

## Rasulullaah ε said, "If you Love Allaah, then Follow Me."

1139. Hadhrat Hasan Basri  $\alpha$  narrates that a few groups said to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , "O Rasul of Allaah, we love Allaah." Allaah j then revealed the verse:

Say (O Muhammad  $\varepsilon$ ), "If you love Allaah then follow me (Muhammad  $\varepsilon$ ), Allaah will then love you (He will reward

# you and grant you numerous material and spiritual blessings) and forgive your sins. Allaah is Most Forgiving, Most Merciful."

(Surah Aal-Imraan (Aal-Imraan), 31)

One narration states that this verse was revealed regarding Ka'b bin Ashraf and others for they said, "We are the sons and the friends of Allaah and we have great love for Allaah."

In the Tafseer of this verse, Zujaaj states: "It means that if you love Allaah, i.e. if you intend to accept what Allaah says, then do that which Allaah j has commanded you with because the clear purport of a person loving Allaah and His Rasul  $\epsilon$  is that the servant obeys them and remains pleased with their command. The meaning of Allaah j loving a servant is that Allaah j forgives their sins and sends His mercy upon them."

Some have explained the purport of the love of Allaah for the servant to be that He saves the person from sin and grants him the divine ability to worship, and the love of the servants is that they obey Him.

### As a poet says:

"You disobey your Rabb and with it you claim to love Him. By my age, this is astonishing for if you were truthful in your love, then you would have obeyed Him. A lover is obedient to the beloved."

It is said that the love of a servant for Allaah is that he honours and fears Allaah. The love of Allaah for a servant is that He is Beneficent towards him and has good intentions for him. Sometimes, the meaning is also that Allaah j praises him.

Qushayri  $\alpha$  says that when the meaning of love is mercy, pious intentions, and praising, then these are part of the divine qualities. A detailed explanation about the love of the servant will soon follow by the divine ability of Allaah.

- 1140. Hadhrat Irbaadh bin Saariyah  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Hold firmly to my Sunnah and the Sunnah of my rightly guided Khulafa'; hold firmly onto them using your teeth. Stay away from new things because every new thing is innovation and every innovation is deviation." (Abu Dawud, Tirmidhi, Ibn Maajah)
- 1141. The Hadith of Hadhrat Jaabir  $\tau$  has the addition: "Every deviation will take a person to the fire." (Muslim, Nasaai)
- 1142. It is narrated in the Hadith of Hadhrat Abu Raafi  $\tau$  that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "It should not be that you are sitting, (or) resting on your horse and any of my commands come to you; something which I commanded or something that I forbade, and you immediately say, 'I do not know; I shall practice upon that which I find in the book of Allaah'." (Abu Dawud, Tirmidhi, Ibn Maajah, Ahmad)
- 1143. The Hadith of Hadhrat Ayesha  $\rho$  states: "Once Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  did something and the people also sought permission to do it. However, the people stayed away from doing it. When Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  came to know this, he praised Allaah and then said, 'What has happened to the people that they stay away from something that I do? By Allaah, I recognize Allaah the most and I fear Allaah the most'." (Bukhari, Muslim)

## That which is not Beloved in the Qur'aan, the Qur'aan is Displeased with

1144. Rasulullaah ε said, "He who does not keep the Qur'aan as beloved and is troubled regarding it, then the Qur'aan will also be harsh upon him, whereas the Qur'aan is the judge in all matters. **He who takes proof from my Hadith and understands it and practices upon it will be in the shade of the Qur'aan on the day of Qiyaamah.** However, he who was lazy regarding the Qur'aan and Hadith and mocked it will definitely be disgraced in the world and in the Aakhirat because Allaah j said, '...Hold fast to what the Rasul gives you and refrain from what He prevents you...' (Surah Hashar, 7)."

1145. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "He who followed me is from me and he who turned away from my Sunnah is not from me."

1146. Hadhrat Abu Hurayrah  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "The best book is the book of Allaah and the best guidance is my guidance and evil it is to innovate in Deen." (Muslim, Ibn Maajah)

## Types of Knowledge

1147. Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Amr bin Aas  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Knowledge is three, besides this, all extra:

- 1. The resolute verses (The Qur'aan),
- 2. The established Sunnah (the authentic Ahadith),
- 3. And the just obligations (the system of distributing wealth in which the right of every person is given. It is also called welfare today)." (Abu Dawud, Ibn Maajah)



- 1148. Hadhrat Hasan bin Abil Hasan  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "A few deeds **in accordance to the Sunnah** is better than the great deeds which are done through innovation."
- 1149. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "Allaah will enter a person into Jannah on the basis of his following the Sunnah."
- 1150. Hadhrat Abu Hurayrah  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "He who **practises upon my Sunnah** will be given the reward of a hundred martyrs."
- 1151. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "The Banu Israa'eel split into seventy-two sects and my Ummah<sup>I</sup> will be split into seventy-three sects. Seventy-two of them will be dwellers of Jahannam and only one sect will enter Jannah." The Sahabah  $\psi$  asked, "Who are those people?" Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "The saved group will be that one who takes this path; **the one upon which I and my Sahabah**  $\psi$  **are upon."** (Tirmidhi)
- 1152. Hadhrat Anas  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "He who **enlivens my Sunnah**, it is as though he has enlivened me, and the one who enlivens me will be with me in Jannah."

¹ The purport of this statement of Rasulullaah ☐ is clear: 'My Ummah will be more divided than the Banu Israa'eel.' However, some ignorant ones have taken the meaning that it is not something bad for the Ummah to be split into different sects. Can this meaning be taken from the statement of Rasulullaah ☐ when Rasulullaah ☐ has commanded that you should definitely split into so many sects? Never! In fact, it mentions a shortcoming of the Ummah and today we are practising this exactly as said. May Allaah grant the Muslim Ummah the ability to display unity, otherwise there will be no decrease in the way the non-Muslims treat us, only increase. (Translator)

1153. Hadhrat Amr bin Auf Muzani  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said to Hadhrat Bilaal bin Haarith  $\tau$ , "He who **enlivens a Sunnah** of mine that has died after my demise will get the reward equal to all those that practised on it, without the reward of those practising on it decreasing. He who innovates an action that displeases Allaah and His Rasul  $\epsilon$  will get the punishment of all those people that practised on it and there will be no decrease in the sin of those that practised it." (Tirmidhi, Ibn Maajah)

#### Section 3

## The Statements of the Pious Predecessors and Imams regarding following the Sunnah of Rasulullaah & and the Seerah

#### The Advice of Hadhrat Ibn Umar τ

1154. Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Umar  $\tau$  narrates that a person asked him, "Salaat ul Khauf (salaat of fear) and Salaat of the resident is found in the Qur'aan but nothing is mentioned in the Qur'aan regarding the method of performing Salaah on journey." Hadhrat Ibn Umar  $\tau$  heard this and said, "Nephew, Allaah sent Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  to us while we knew nothing. We only practice on that which we saw Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  doing." (Ibn Maajah, Nasaai)

## The Statement of Hadhrat Umar bin Abdul Aziz $\alpha$

1155. Hadhrat Umar bin Abdul Aziz  $\alpha$  said: "Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  has appointed a road for us and he granted us the treasure of his deeds and sayings. In the light of these, the Khulafa  $\psi$  had practiced and created great ease for the coming generations. Practising on it is verifying the book of Allaah and is synonymous with obeying Allaah and giving strength to His Deen. No one has the right to change anything whatsoever in it, nor is there a need to practice on a view that opposes it."

Remember, he who follows the Sunnah is guided and whoever wants help from it, or helps it, is taking a liked path. However, if there is a person who opposes those who practice on the Sunnah and adopts a path opposite to that of

the believers, Allaah will overpower him by means of his deeds and throw him into Jahannam which is an evil abode.

#### The Statement of Hadhrat Hasan bin Abi Hasan

1156. Hadhrat Hasan bin Abi Hasan said: "A little practice on the Sunnah is better than many deeds that are based on innovation."

## The Explanation of Ibn Shihaab $\alpha$

1157. Hadhrat Ibn Shihaab  $\alpha$  says, "It is narrated from the scholars **that practising upon the Sunnah** is the only means of success and salvation."

#### The Statement of Hadhrat Umar bin Khattaab τ

- 1158, 1159. Amir ul Mu'mineen Hadhrat Umar Farooq  $\tau$  once wrote a letter to his governors stating that **they should learn the Sunnah**, the obligations and language. "People will take the verses of the Qur'aan and argue with you. At that time, catch them by means of the Sunnah because **the one who knows the Sunnah will know the book of Allaah in the best way."**
- 1160. When **Hadhrat Umar Farooq**  $\tau$  performed 2 Rakaat in Dhul Hulayfah (the place of tying the Ihraam), he said, "I only do that which I saw Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  doing." (Muslim)

### The Statements of Hadhrat Ali τ

1161. It is narrated about **Hadhrat Ali**  $\tau$  that when he performed Qiraan (a single Ihraam for Hajj and Umrah), then Hadhrat Uthmaan Ghani  $\tau$  said to him, "Do you not know that I stop people from Qiraan and you are doing Qiraan?"

Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$  replied, "I am not from among those people that abandon the Sunnah of Nabi  $\epsilon$  upon the saying of someone." (Bukhari, Muslim)

1162. **Hadhrat Ali** τ states: "I am not a Nabi and revelation does not come upon me. However, as far as possible, I strive to practice upon the book and the Sunnah of Nabi ε."

#### The Statement of Hadhrat Ibn Mas'ood T

1163. Hadhrat Ibn Mas'ood  $\tau$  says, "**Pondering over the Sunnah** is much better than striving in innovation."

#### The Statement of Hadhrat Ibn Umar $\tau$

1164. Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Umar  $\tau$  narrates: "He who performs four Rakaats instead of two on a journey and has opposed the Sunnah, has done an action of disbelief."

### The Explanation of Hadhrat Ubayy bin Ka'b $\tau$

1165. Hadhrat Ubayy bin Ka'b  $\tau$  narrates: "Hold firmly onto the Sunnah because there is no person on earth who is firm on the Sunnah, remembers Allaah in his heart, and tears flow from his eyes out of the fear of Allaah, that Allaah will punish. And no one (such a person ) lives on earth that is firm on the Sunnah, remembers Allaah at heart, and his movements shake with the fear of Allaah. His example is like that of a tree whose leaves became dry and a strong wind blew its leaves off. In the same way, by practising upon the Sunnah of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  the sins of the person fall off him and he is counted among the pious. Undoubtedly, practising upon the Qur'aan and Sunnah is not only better than practising upon that which opposes the Sunnah, but also

it is necessary to hold onto it and an absolutely necessary command. Always remember that whether your deeds are done with moderation or with great effort, it should be done in the way shown by the Ambiyaa' i."

## Can the Rulers go Contrary to the Qur'anic Laws, Looking at the Expediency of the Time?

1166. During the Khilaafat of Hadhrat Umar bin Abdul Aziz  $\alpha$ , some of his governors wrote to him, informing him of an increase in theft in some of their areas. "In order to punish the thief, there is a need to establish proof according to the Shari'ah. Looking at the expediency of the time, do you permit us to catch them (the doubtful), based only on thought?"

When Hadhrat Umar bin Abdul Aziz  $\alpha$  came to know of this, he wrote a letter stating, "Remember, no person should ever be punished only through accusation. This is until he does not fulfil his Shar'i responsibility in the complete way; do not execute such laws on anyone. **Execute only the law of the Shari'ah that is in accordance to the Sunnah of Nabi \epsilon** upon such people. Remember, if they cannot be reformed through the truth, then do not strive to reform them."

## Ataa bin Abi Rabaah $\alpha$ 's Explanation Regarding a Verse

1167. Hadhrat Ataa  $\alpha$  was asked about the verse, (فان تنازعتم في شيئ فردوه الى الله والرسول), he was asked what the word (دوه) means. Hadhrat Ataa  $\alpha$  said, "If you have doubt regarding a matter, then return that matter to the Qur'aan and the Sunnah of Nabi  $\epsilon$ ."

### The Explanation of Imam Shafi'i $\alpha$

- 1168. Imam Shafi'i  $\alpha$  says, "There is no other way but to practice upon the Sunnah of Nabi  $\epsilon$ ."
- 1169. On one occasion, Hadhrat Umar Farooq  $\tau$  went to the Ka'bah. When his gaze fell on the Black Stone, he addressed it and said, "You are like other stones, that cannot benefit and cannot harm. If I did not see Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  kissing you, I would not have kissed you." After saying this, he kissed the Black Stone. (Bukhari, Muslim)
- 1170. During a journey, Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Umar  $\tau$  made **a round with his camel.** When his companions saw him, they asked the reason. He said, "I do not know anything regarding this. **I only know that I saw Rasulullaah \epsilon doing this at this place.** Therefore, I did the same in following him." (Ahmad)
- 1171. Hadhrat Abu Uthmaan Hayri narrates: "He who makes the Sunnah a ruler over him in terms of words and deeds will begin to speak with knowledge and wisdom. However, he who takes his desires over him will only utter innovation."
- 1172. Hadhrat Sahl Tastari  $\alpha$  says: "There are three principles in our Deen; to follow Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  in character and deeds, to earn in following Nabi  $\epsilon$  and to strive to acquire Halaal sustenance, to have a sincere intention in all deeds and actions."
- 1173. It is narrated that the verse, 'Allaah elevates good deeds' means 'to follow Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ .'

1174. Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal α says, "I was once with a group. During this time some people took off their clothes to bath and they entered the water. However, I remembered the Hadith of Rasulullaah ε in which he ε said. 'He who believes in Allaah and His Rasul should not enter the bathroom naked, but he should tie the loincloth'. (Tirmidhi, Nasaai) I practised upon this Hadith. When I fell asleep at night I saw in a dream that a person is calling me, saying, 'Allaah has forgiven you upon the basis of following the Sunnah of Nabi  $\varepsilon$  and He has made you a leader that is 'Who followed. asked. vou?' I are he said, 'Jibreel',"

#### **Section 4**

# Opposing or Changing the Sunnah of Rasulullaah ε is Deviation and Innovation

It is deviation and innovation to oppose the commands of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and to change his Sunnah. Allaah j announces severe warnings for this:

...Those who oppose the Rasool's commands (which come from Allaah) should beware that some calamity or a grievous punishment should afflict them.

(Surah Noor (Celestial Light), 63)

In another place, Allaah j says:

Whoever opposes the Rasool after the guidance (the truth of Islaam) has become manifest (clear) to him and follows a path other than that of the Mu'mineen, We shall allow him to do that which he is doing and then enter him into Jahannam. It is the worst of abodes. (This verse makes it clear that those who oppose the Ijma (consensus) of the Ummah are heading for Jahannam.)

(Surah Nisaa (The Women), 115)

1175. Hadhrat Abu Hurayrah  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  once went to the graveyard who mentioned a Hadith in praise of the Muslim Ummah. He  $\epsilon$  said, "Some people will be moved away from my pond exactly how camels are

herded. However, I shall call them, 'Come here, come here.' Upon my repeated calling, it will be said to me, 'These are the people that turned away from your Sunnah in the world and adopted their own separate way.' Upon finding this out I shall say to them, 'Go far away, go far away, and go far away'." (Bukhari, Muslim)

- 1176. Hadhrat Anas bin Maalik  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "He who turns away from my Sunnah is not from me." (Bukhari, Muslim)
- 1177. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "He who enters into our Deen something that was not part of it before, that thing is worthy of being rejected." (Bukhari, Muslim)
- 1178. Hadhrat Ibn Abi Raafi narrates a Hadith of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  from his father: "I should not find any of you sitting on his soft bed and one of my commands reaches him, or the prohibition of something that I prohibited reaches him, and he says, 'I do not know anything; I shall only follow that which I find in the book of Allaah'."
- 1179. Hadhrat Miqdaad  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Listen well, just as Allaah has made a number of things forbidden in His book, a number of things has also been forbidden by Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ." (Tirmidhi, Ibn Maajah)
- 1180. On one occasion, something written on a bone was presented to Rasulullaah \(\varepsilon\). Looking at it, Rasulullaah \(\varepsilon\) said, "It is sufficient for the foolishness of a nation", or he said, "The deviation of a nation, that they turn away from that which was brought by their Nabi and they turn to the one who is not a Nabi. Alternatively, they leave their book and turn to other books. The following blessed verse was revealed regarding this:

اَوَ لَمْ يَكْفِهِمْ اَنَّا اَنْزَلْنَا عَلَيْكَ الْكِتٰبَ يُتْلَى عَلَيْهِمْ ١٠ اِنَّ فِيْ ذَٰلِكَ لَرَحْمَةً وَ ذِكْرِي لِقَوْمِ يُؤْمِنُونَ ١٠٥٠٠

Is it (the miracle) not sufficient for them (the Kuffaar) that we have revealed a Book (the Qur'aan) to you, which is recited to them? (In addition to the Qur'aan being timeless miracle on its own which proves the prophethood of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ ,) There is certainly mercy and a reminder in it for those who have Imaan.

(Surah Ankaboot (The Spider), 51)"

- 1181. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "Those who exaggerate in carrying out the commands have been destroyed. (i.e. those who criticize, boast and brag)." (Muslim)
- 1182. Hadhrat Abu Bakr  $\tau$  narrates: "I shall never leave whatever Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  used to do because I have this fear that if I abandon any statement or deed of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  I shall definitely go astray." (Bukhari, Muslim)

### **Chapter Two**

## The Necessity of Loving Rasulullaah ε

Allaah j says:

قُلْ إِنْ كَانَ اٰبَآؤُكُمْ وَ اَبْنَآؤُكُمْ وَ اِخْوَانُكُمْ وَ اَزْوَاجُكُمْ وَ عَشِيْرَ تُكُمْ وَ اَمْوَالُ اقْتَرَ فْتُمُوْ هَا وَ تِجَارَةٌ تَخْشَوْنَ كَسَادَهَا وَ مَسْكِنُ تَرْضَوْنَهَا اَمُوَالُ اقْتَرَبَّصُوْا حَتَّى يَاْتِيَ اَكْتُ الْيُكُمْ مِّنَ اللهِ وَ رَسُوْلِهِ وَ جِهَادٍ فِيْ سَبِيْلِهِ فَتَرَبَّصُوْا حَتَّى يَاْتِيَ اَحَبَّ اللهُ اللهُ عَلَيْ الْقَوْمَ الْفُسِقِيْنَ ١٠٠٠٠

Say, "If your fathers, your sons, your brothers, your spouses, your families, your wealth that you have earned, your businesses in which you fear a loss, and your home that you love so dearly are more beloved to you than Allaah, His Rasool  $\varepsilon$  and exerting yourselves (striving) in His path; then wait for Allaah's order (punishment) to come. Allaah does not guide the sinful ones." (If these things prevent you from obeying Allaah and Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  and from exerting yourselves for Deen when it is obligatory, then Allaah's punishment is imminent.)

(Surah Taubah (Repentance), 24)

The above-mentioned verse suffices to show the compulsory nature of loving Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and to show its importance. We also learn that the one deserving of this love is Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and Allaah j has admonished those people whose wealth, children, and fathers are more beloved to them. In the last words of the verse, Allaah admonished them and warned them that such people are sinners and deviated and that they are from those that are not guided in the court of Allaah.

- 1183-1185. Hadhrat Anas  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "He in whom three things are found will find the sweetness of Imaan:
- 1. He for whom Allaah and Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  are more beloved than the entire creation,
- 2. If he loves someone, then it is for the pleasure of Allaah,
- 3. And he dislikes returning to disbelief even more than he dislikes being thrown into a punishment of fire." (Bukhari, Muslim). The same is narrated by Hadhrat Abu Hurayrah τ in Bukhari.
- 1186. Hadhrat Umar bin Khattaab  $\tau$  narrates that he one-day said to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , "You are more beloved to me than everything except my own self." Hearing this, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "None of you can be a believer until I do not become more beloved to him than his own life." Hearing this, Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$  said, "If this is the case, then by the Being that has sent you with the truth and the book of guidance, today you are even more beloved to me than my own life." Hearing this, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "O Umar, now your Imaan has been completed." (Bukhari)
- 1187. Hadhrat Sahl narrates: "He who does not find the complete control of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  over himself in all conditions, and he takes himself to be the owner of his life, will never get the taste of the Sunnah because Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, 'A person can never be a true believer until I do not become more beloved to him than his own life'."

### Section 1

### Love for Rasulullaah $\epsilon$ and its Virtue

1188. Hadhrat Anas bin Maalik τ narrates that a person came to Rasulullaah ε and said, "O Rasulullaah, when will Qiyaamah occur?" Rasulullaah ε said, "You have great concern about Qiyaamah, but what preparations have you made for it?" He said, "I do not have any special preparations for it, nor do I have a treasure of Salaah, nor of fasting, nor do I have great amounts of other good deeds. However, despite not having all this, I have something which I feel very important (for my forgiveness). It is that Allaah and His Rasul are more beloved to me than the world and what it contains." Hearing this, Rasulullaah ε said, "You will be with whomever you love." (Bukhari, Muslim)

1189. Hadhrat Safwaan bin Qudaamah narrates: "After migration, I came to Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  and said, 'O Rasul of Allaah, put your hand forward so that I can pledge allegiance.' I said at the time, 'O Rasul of Allaah, I have love for you.' Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, 'You will be with whomever you love'"

1190-1193. The same Hadith is narrated by Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Mas'ood  $\tau$ , Hadhrat Abu Musa  $\tau$  and Hadhrat Anas  $\tau$ . However, the narration from Hadhrat Abu Dhar  $\tau$  has different wording, but the purport is the same.

### Love for the Household is from the Love for Rasulullaah £

1194. Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  took the hands of Hadhrat Hasan  $\tau$  and Hadhrat Husayn  $\tau$  and said, "He who loves me, these two sons of mine, and their parents,

will be with me on the day of Qiyaamah and he will be in the same level of Jannah as I." (Tirmidhi, Ahmad)

1195. A person came to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and said, "O Rasul of Allaah, you are more beloved to me than the world and whatever it contains. I do not have love for wealth, nor for my associates. Whenever I remember you, I have no peace and contentment until I do not see you. When I think about my death and your demise, then I think that you will enter Jannah and you will be living with the Ambiyaa  $\iota$  and if I enter Jannah I will not be able to see you (because of a great difference in rank)." The following verse was revealed:

وَ مَنْ يُطِعِ اللهِ وَ الرَّسُوْلَ فَأُولَٰلِكَ مَعَ الَّذِيْنَ اَنْعَمَ اللهِ عَلَيْهِمْ مِّنَ النَّبِينَ وَ السَّلْحِيْنَ وَ الصَّلْحِيْنَ اللهِ وَ حَسُنَ اُولَٰلِكَ رَفِيْقًا ﴿ ٢٠٠٥ كَانُهُ مِّنَ اللهِ اللهِ اللهِ اللهِ اللهِ اللهِ اللهِ اللهِ اللهُ اللهِ اللهُ اللهِ اللهُ اللهِ اللهُ اللهِ اللهِ اللهُ ال

1196. Another Hadith states that a person came to Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  and began to look at him  $\varepsilon$  without even blinking his eyes. He did not turn his attention in any direction. When Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  saw him in this condition, he asked, "Why are you doing this?" The person replied, "May my parents be sacrificed upon you. I look at you to acquire benefit. However, the thought comes to my heart that tomorrow, on the day of Qiyaamah, you will be in the

*: : :	Ash Shifaa	(Volume Two)		<del>\</del>
--------	------------	--------------	--	--------------

highest stages. What will be my condition at the time?" The above quoted verse was then revealed.

1197. Hadhrat Anas  $\tau$  narrates a Hadith in which the following words of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  are mentioned: "He who has love for me will be with me in Jannah."

#### Section 2

# Love for Rasulullaah ε and the Statements of the Pious

1198. Hadhrat Abu Hurayrah  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "The one the loves me the most from my Ummah will be the one that has the firm desire to sell his family, relatives and possessions and come to visit me." (Muslim)

1199. The same is narrated from Hadhrat Abu Dhar  $\tau$ .

1200. The Hadith of Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$  in which it was said that he loves Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  more than his own life. The enthusiasm of the other Sahabah  $\psi$  has been written in the previous pages.

- 1201. Hadhrat Amr bin Aas  $\tau$  narrates that there was none more beloved to him than Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . (Muslim)
- 1202. Abdah bint Khaalid bin Ma'daan narrates that it was the daily habit of his father to take the names of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , the Sahabah  $\psi$ , the Muhaajireen and Ansaar with great enthusiasm whenever he lied down. He would state his belief in them and his heartfelt devotion to them. He would say, "These people are my honour and lineage and my heart inclines towards them. All my love and belief is linked to them. My enthusiasm increases for them. O my Rabb, grant me death quickly so that I can meet them." He would say this until he fell asleep.

1203. Hadhrat Abu Bakr  $\tau$  said, "By Allaah Who sent you with the truth, it was more liked to me that Abu Taalib accepts Islaam, as compared to my father so that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  could be happier." He only said this because

he knew that the eyes of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would be cooled if Abu Taalib accepts Islaam.

1204. Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$  said to Hadhrat Abbaas bin Abdul Muttalib  $\tau$ , "The joy I experience by you accepting Islaam, probably I would not have if your father accepts Islaam because Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would be pleased by you accepting Islaam."

1205. The father, three brothers, and husband of an Ansaari woman passed away in a battle. When this woman received news of their martyrdom (one after the other), she asked every time, "Tell me about Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ." She was told that, through the grace of Allaah, he was well and safe. "He is, as you want him to be." She was still not satisfied and finally she was taken to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . When her gaze fell on Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , she immediately exclaimed, "Every calamity is nothing for me in your presence."

1206. Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$  was asked, "How did you love Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ?" He said, "Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was more beloved to me than my life, wealth, parents and children. You can understand it in this way: the way a person is quenched through cold water when uneasy on account of severe thirst, my love for Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is more than this."

1207. Hadhrat Zayd bin Aslam narrates: "One night, Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$  went out at night to enquire about the condition of the people, as per habit. There was a woman sitting at home with a lamp and she was knitting wool. While doing this, she was reciting the following lines,

على محمد صلاة الابرار صلى عليه الطيبون الأخيار Ash Shifaa (Volume Two)

قد كنت قواما بكا بالأسحار

يا ليت شعري والمنايا اطوار

هل تجمعني و حبيبي الدار ؟

"The Durud and Salaam of the pious reach Rasulullaah ε,

The most pious send Durud upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .

Indeed, Rasulullaah ε would stand at night in worship and he would plead and cry until dawn. If only I could know how desires and hopes are fulfilled. If only Allaah I could be joined to my beloved."

Hearing these lines that were filled with the love of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  caused Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$  to sit down and cry..." The incident after this is very lengthy. It has been left out for brevity.

1208. It is explained that the feet of Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Umar  $\tau$  used to swell. Someone told him to take the name of the person that is most beloved to him in the world. He immediately said, "O Muhammad." The difficulty immediately went away. (Bukhari)

1209. During the final illness of Hadhrat Bilal  $\tau$ , his wife said in grief, "Regret." Hadhrat Bilal  $\tau$  immediately said, "What a joyous, tomorrow I shall meet Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and his friends."

1210. It is narrated that a woman once came to Hadhrat Ayesha  $\rho$  and requested that the veil be moved so that she could visit the grave of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . When the veil was moved, she cried and passed away there crying.

# Even the Threat of Death could Make the Person say Nothing but Love for Rasulullaah ε

- 1211. Before the conquest of Makkah, the incident of Rajee' took place where the disbelievers of Makkah took Hadhrat Zayd bin Dathinah τ to the outskirts of Makkah to him. Abu Sufyaan τ asked Hadhrat Zayd bin Dathinah τ, "If Muhammad was in your place and he was killed and you were freed so that you could go to your family and children and remain in comfort, what would your opinion be?" Hearing this, Hadhrat Zayd bin Dathinah τ said, "Listen, you seek such a thing. Know well, I will not tolerate that even a small thorn pricks Rasulullaah & while I sit here in comfort." Abu Sufyaan τ said, "We have seen like the die die hearts hearts for Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  before. They love Muhammad  $\varepsilon$  so much that nothing could be compared to it."
- 1212. Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$  narrates that when a woman would come to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , he would make them take an oath that they have not come there in the displeasure of their husband, nor have they come there out of the desire to leave their land and settle down in another land, but they bid farewell to their land solely out of the love of Allaah and His Rasul  $\epsilon$ .
- 1213. When Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Zubayr  $\tau$  was martyred, Hadhrat Ibn Umar  $\tau$  went to his body and make du'aa' of forgiveness for him and then said, "By Allaah, according to my knowledge, you would fast in abundance, remain awake at night and you were a person that had great love for Allaah j and His Rasul  $\epsilon$ ."

#### **Section 3**

## The Signs of Love for Rasulullaah ε

# Whoever a Person has True Love for, he tries to make himself like him

There is no scope for doubt in that if a person has love for someone, then he will make it binding upon himself to follow that person and to obey his command. If he does not do this, then know that he is not true in his claim of love, but he is false. The love for Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  that is backed by a sign that shows this will be accepted as true.

### The First Sign of Love for Rasulullaah ε

The first sign is that a person follows Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and he adopts his Sunnah. He follows Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  in word and deed, he carries out his command, and whatever Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  forbade, he stays away from it. Not only in luxury or joy or worry, but he strives to take the advice of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  in every condition. The following verse points out to this:

Say (O Muhammad ε), "If you love Allaah then follow me (Muhammad ε), Allaah will then love you (He will reward you and grant you numerous material and spiritual blessings) and forgive your sins. Allaah is Most Forgiving, Most Merciful."

(Surah Aal-Imraan (Aal-Imraan), 31)

### The Second Sign of Love for Rasulullaah ε

The second sign to recognize whether a person has love for Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is that whatever Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  forbade from, a person does not give preference to his carnal desires. Whatever command Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  gave, he enthusiastically obeys it. As Allaah j says:

(Part of this booty is also for) Those (the Ansaar) who adopted the place (Madinah) as their home before them (before the Muhaajireen) and (had adopted) Imaan. They (the Ansaar) love those who migrate to them (the Muhaajireen) and find no want (jealousy or envy) in their hearts for what they (the Muhaajireen) are given. They (the Ansaar) prefer (others) above themselves (they prefer to give others) even though they are themselves in need (of the things they give). (Like the Ansaar,) Those who are saved from the miserliness (and greed) of the soul are really the successful ones (whom will attain salvation). (Surah Hashar (The Exile), 9)

### The Third Sign of Love for Rasulullaah ε

The third sign to recognize the love for Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is that a person does not care the least about what people say for the sake of the pleasure of Allaah and Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .

1214. Hadhrat Anas  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "O son, if you can, spend the morning and evening in such a way that there is no malice in your heart for anyone." The

narrator says that Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  then said, "He who enlivens my Sunnah has loved me and the one who loves me will enter Jannah with me." (Tirmidhi)

Therefore, whoever has this quality, it will be accepted that he is truthful in his claim of love for Allaah and Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . However, if a person cannot practice upon certain things, then know that his love is incomplete and whatever shortcoming there is in his deeds, the same shortcoming will increase in his love. However, he will not be removed from the list of the lovers.

1215. The proof for this is the statement of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  that the punishment for drinking was executed on someone (Abdullaah Al Himaar  $\tau$ ). The people cursed him for this. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  stopped them from cursing him and said, "Do not curse him. He loves Allaah and His Rasul  $\varepsilon$ ." (Bukhari)

Another sign of love is that a person mentions Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  in abundance. Whatever a person loves, he speaks about it in abundance. Besides this, a person has a desire to meet his beloved and this moves in his heart. This is because the desire of every lover is that he wants to cool his eyes with the sight of the beloved.

1216. When the Ash'aris came to Madinah Munawwarah to meet Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ , they were reciting this poem,

"Tomorrow we shall meet our friends, i.e. Hadhrat Muhammad  $\epsilon$  and his companions."

1217-1219. The enthusiasm of Hadhrat Bilal  $\tau$  was mentioned above. The enthusiasm of Hadhrat Ammar bin Yaasir  $\tau$  was also mentioned. The same exists for the story of Hadhrat Ma'daan  $\tau$ .

# Abundantly Mentioning Rasulullaah $\epsilon$ is A Sign of Love for Him $\epsilon$

One of the signs of love is that whenever Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is mentioned, he is mentioned in abundance, and he is honoured greatly. Whenever his name is taken, a person humbles himself.

Ibn Ishaq Tuhbeeni explains that after the demise of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , the Sahabah  $\psi$  would mention Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  with great belief, love, and humility. Their hair would stand when Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was mentioned and tears would flow from their eyes. The same was the condition of the Taabi'een. The condition of some of them was based on love and desire and some were affected by awe and power.

# The Sign of Love is that Whatever the Beloved Loves, the Lover also Loves

One of the signs of love is that whatever or whoever Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  loved or liked, whether it was based on lineage or family (e.g. the household), the Sahabah  $\psi$ , etc., the lover also feels the same way. And whatever or whoever Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  disliked and turned away from, or Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  did not speak well of, the lover also dislikes and turns away from it. The reality is that a person will love everything that his beloved likes.

## Love for Hadhrat Hasan τ and Hadhrat Husayn τ

1220. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said regarding Hadhrat Hasan  $\tau$  and Hadhrat Husayn  $\tau$ , "O Allaah, I love them both; You also love them." (Tirmidhi)

- 1221. In one narration, Hadhrat Hasan  $\tau$  says that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "I love those who love them." (Bukhari, Muslim)
- 1222. One narration explains that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "I love them both (Hadhrat Hasan  $\tau$  and Hadhrat Husayn  $\tau$ ). Whoever loves them has loved me, and whoever shows love for me, Allaah loves him. Whoever shows hatred for them has shown hatred for me, and whoever shows hatred for me, we seek the protection of Allaah, he has shown hatred for Allaah." (Tirmidhi, Ahmad)

# The Necessary Result of Love for Rasulullaah $\epsilon$ is Love for the Sahabah $\psi$

1223. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "Fear Allaah when speaking about my companions. Do not make them a target of criticism after me. Love for my companions is on account of my love and hatred for them is on account of me. Therefore, whoever harmed them has harmed me and whoever has harmed me has harmed Allaah and Allaah will definitely punish him for this." (Tirmidhi, Ahmad)

# **Love for Sayyidah Faatimah** ρ, **Beloved of Rasulullaah** ε

1224. Regarding Hadhrat Faatimah  $\rho$ , Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Faatimah  $\rho$  is a piece of my liver. Whatever Faatimah is displeased with, I am displeased with it." (Bukhari, Muslim)

### Love for Hadhrat Usaamah bin Zayd τ

1225. Hadhrat Ayesha  $\rho$  narrates: "Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  commanded me to love Usamah bin Zayd because he  $\epsilon$  loves him." (Tirmidhi)

#### Love for the Ansaar

1226. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "Love for the Ansaar is a sign of Imaan and hatred for the Ansaar is a sign of hypocrisy." (Bukhari, Muslim)

#### Love for the Arabs

1227. Hadhrat Ibn Umar  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "He who loves the Arabs, it is only on account of me. However, whoever hates them, it is on account of enmity towards me."

It is also reality that whoever loves someone, then the lover will love everything that the beloved loves. This has remained the practice of the pious predecessors. They would honour everything that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  loved, to the extent that they would consider it even when regarding permissible things as well as their carnal desires.

### **Loving what the Beloved Loves**

- 1228. Hadhrat Anas bin Maalik  $\tau$  narrates: "I love gourd only for this reason: I once saw Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  looking for a piece of it in the plate. From that day, I have included eating it as part of habit." (Bukhari, Muslim)
- 1229. Hadhrat Hasan  $\tau$ , Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$  and Hadhrat Ibn Ja'far  $\tau$  (the freed slave of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ) went

to the house of Umm Salama and requested her to feed them the food that was beloved to Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ .

1230. Hadhrat Ibn Umar  $\tau$  narrates that he would wear Sibti shoes and colour his clothes yellow because he said, "I saw Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  doing the same." (Bukhari, Muslim)

One of these signs is that a person has enmity for the one for whom Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  had enmity. A person stays away from those that oppose the Sunnah of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and he tries his best to stay away from such people who innovate things in religion. He also stays away from that which contradicts the Shari'ah of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Allaah j says:

لَا تَجِدُ قَوْمًا يُّؤْمِنُوْنَ بِاللَّهِ وَ الْيَوْمِ الْأَخِرِ يُوَآدُّوْنَ مَنْ حَآدً اللَّهَ وَ

رَ سُوْ لَهُ وَ لَوْ كَانُوْا الْبَاءَهُمْ أَوْ اَبْنَاءًهُمْ أَوْ اَخْوَانَهُمْ أَوْ عَشَيْرَتَا ٱولَّٰبِكَ كَتَبَ فِيْ قُلُوْبِهِمُ الْإِيْمَانَ وَ آيَدَهُمْ بِرُوْحٍ مِّنْهُ ۖ ٥ وَ يُذَخِّلُهُمْ جَنَّٰكَ تَجْرِيْ مِنْ تَحْتِهَا الْأَنْهُرُ خَلِدِيْنَ فِيْهَا ۖ ١ رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ وَ رَضُوْ ا عَنْهُ ۚ ١ أُولِيكَ حِزْ بُ اللَّهِ ١ ۖ اللَّهِ ١ أَلَا انَّ حِزْ بَ اللَّهِ هُمُ الْمُفْلِحُوْنَ أَ٢٢٠٠٠ You will not find people who believe in Allaah and the Last Day befriending those who oppose Allaah and His Rasool & even though they (those who oppose Allaah and Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ ) are their fathers, their sons, their brothers or their families. These (Mu'mineen who disassociate from their relatives who oppose Allaah and Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ ) are the people in whose hearts Allaah has written (entrenched) Imaan and whom Allaah assists with His mercy. Allaah shall enter them into Januar beneath which rivers flow where they shall live forever. Allaah is pleased with them and they are pleased with Him. They are the group of Allaah. Behold! The group of Allaah shall be the only successful ones. (This verse refers specifically to the Sahabah w and then to all other Mu'mineen.)

(Surah Mujaadalah (The Lady Who Debated), 22)

The Sahabah  $\psi$  showed such a love for Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , the likes of which were neither found before, nor will such an example ever be found. These pure luminaries fought their parents, children, and friends for the sake of acquiring the pleasure of Allaah. Some made the sacrifice of their parents and their children too. <sup>1</sup>

1231. Abdullaah bin Ubayy (when he uttered nonsense that the noble will remove the disgraced from Madinah, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was very uneasy. Realising this) Abdullaah, the son of Abdullaah bin Ubayy said, "At the slightest indication you ( $\epsilon$ ) make, I shall chop the head of my father and bring it to you."

### Loving the Qur'aan

1232. One of these signs is that a person has love for the Qur'aan. This is because Rasulullaah taught this book of guidance  $\epsilon$  and he found guidance from it too. He practiced upon it so perfectly that Hadhrat Ayesha  $\rho$  said (in reply to a question about his character), "Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was a walking Qur'aan."

The meaning of love for the Qur'aan is that a person recites it regularly and he practices on it. He ponders over it

 $<sup>^1</sup>$  Once, Hadhrat Abdur Rahman  $\tau$ , the son of Hadhrat Abu Bakr  $\tau$  said to him, "During a battle, you came under my sword. If I struck, I would have chopped your neck, but my love for you stood as a barrier." Hadhrat Abu Bakr  $\tau$  immediately said, "If you had to come under my sword, I would not have waited a moment." This is the difference between fighting for the sake of Islaam and for the sake of disbelief. (Translator)

and he honours it in every way. He never oversteps the limits that the Qur'aan lays down.

Hadhrat Sahl bin Abdullaah narrates that when it is the divine demand that a person loves the Qur'aan and love for the Qur'aan is that he loves Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  and the sign of love for Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  is that he follows the Sunnah and the first sign of following the Sunnah is that he remembers the Aakhirat and loves it. This yardstick of pondering over the Aakhirat is that he hates the world and does not like it. The sign to recognize this is that he suffices upon the necessary or whatever will aid him in the journey of the Aakhirat.

1233. Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Mas'ood  $\tau$  narrates: "Besides the Qur'aan, never ask anyone else regarding anything. He who befriends the Qur'aan will definitely befriend Allaah and His Rasul  $\epsilon$ ."

### Love for the Ummaah and Poverty

One yardstick of the love of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is that a person deals affectionately and mercifully with the Muslim Ummah and he remembers them with good words. He desires good for them and he makes every possible effort to benefit them. He makes every possible effort that hatred must not be created (among them). He desires that affection, love, and following the Sunnah should be in the Muslim Ummah because Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  also used to be very affectionate and merciful to the Ummah.

One sign from among the signs of the love of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  that has special standing is that a person who claims love does not attach his heart to the world. He is accustomed to poverty and he has the qualities of the poor.

- 1234. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said to Hadhrat Abu Sa'eed Khudri  $\tau$ , "He who has love for me, poverty will come to him faster than water comes down the slope of a mountain." (Ahmad)
- 1235. Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Mughaffal  $\tau$  narrates that a person came to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and said, "I love you abundantly." Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Ponder over what you are saying." He repeated his statement, a third time as well. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "If you love me, then become ready for poverty." (Tirmidhi)

He then said the same thing that was quoted in the Hadith of Hadhrat Abu Saeed Khudri  $\tau$  above.

#### **Section 4**

# The Meaning of Love for Rasulullaah ε and its Reality

There is a difference of opinion among the scholars regarding the meaning of love for Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , its reality, the meaning of love for Allaah j and Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and its explanation. The reality is that this difference is not a difference in wording, but a difference in condition.

Hadhrat Sufyaan Thauri  $\alpha$  explains that love for Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is following him. It is as though he said this while keeping the following verse before him:

Say (O Muhammad ε), "If you love Allaah then follow me (Muhammad ε), Allaah will then love you (He will reward you and grant you numerous material and spiritual blessings) and forgive your sins. Allaah is Most Forgiving, Most Merciful."

(Surah Aal-Imraan (Aal-Imraan), 31)

Some scholars say that 'love for Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ' means that 'one has the belief of helping him'. The Sunnah of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  should be followed and a person should always be fearful of opposing Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  in anything.

Some scholars have explained that 'love for Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ ' means that 'one remembers him all the time'. Other scholars say that 'love' means that one 'gives preference to every aspect of the beloved'. According to some, 'love' means 'desire for the beloved'. Some scholars

said that 'love' means 'to make one's heart in accordance to the pleasure of Allaah j and to keep as beloved that which Allaah j loves and to turn away from that which Allaah j dislikes'. Some have said that 'love' means to 'turn one's heart to that which the beloved likes'.

### The Reality of Love

The texts quoted above show the essence of love. However, the reality of love is not clarified through them. The reality of love is that the heart inclines towards that which is in harmony with the nature of man. This harmony is not free of either two conditions: either because the heart finds enjoyment when finding it; for example, looking at a beautiful form, listening to a beautiful voice, or eating tasty food. These aspects please the heart because every sound nature will definitely incline towards it in some way.

Or, because this harmony is from the sense of the intelligence and heart, such meanings are found; for example, the love of the pious, the scholars, love of their sayings, and having the enthusiasm to practice on them. This is because on account of love for them, the nature of a person will find his heart automatically incline towards these. Sometimes, it happens such that because of loving one class, the opportunity to hate another class arises and the support of one class reaches the stage where in one's love for them, one will leave one's locality and a person will not refrain from reviling seniors and destroying lives.

Sometimes, the reason for love is reward and favour, because it is the nature of man that he loves the one who does a favour to him. When this has been clarified to you and when you think about all these causes regarding Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , you will realize that all three causes that create love are

**found in Rasulullaah \varepsilon.** Much has been explained in the first part of the book about:

- 1. The apparent beauty of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and his inner character and perfection. There is no need to repeat it here,
- 2. The favour of Rasulullaah ε upon the Ummah has been explained,
- 3. And Allaah j mentioned the mercy of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ , his affection, his guiding and efforts to save people from the fire, and his softness towards the believers.

Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  is a mercy for the universe, one who gives glad tidings, one who warns of the punishment of Allaah and one who calls to Allaah by the command of Allaah i. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  used to recite the verses of Allaah to the people, he used to purify their hearts, he used to teach them the book and wisdom and guide them to the straight path. What greater bounty can there be of a person upon the believers? What bounty can be more beneficial than this upon the Muslims? This is because Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was the means of guidance for them. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  removed them from the darkness of ignorance. Rasulullaah ε called them towards success. Rasulullaah & remained the means between the servants and Allaah j. He will intercede on the day of reckoning, his request will reach the court of Allaah, and he will testify against the wrongdoers, and he will be a means of eternal success and acquisition of eternal bounties of the fortunate ones.

Together with holding the position of speaking to Allaah, he witnessed the existence of Allaah j. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  was

granted eternal existence and eternal bounty and the Ummah was granted this honour through Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .

From these realities, it is clear that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is the being that is deserving of love in the Shari'ah. We have proven this from the Ahadith as well. **Similarly, Rasulullaah \epsilon is also worthy of love by way of natural habit and nature.** We have mentioned the details of this before. This is because the bounties of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  are the greatest and it includes the good ways of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .

The general principle of the world is that if a person does a favour to someone once or twice, then he becomes like a slave that was bought with gold. Or, if a person saves someone from destruction, then the saving of the person is taken as a bounty, whereas this destruction was temporary. However, the being whose favour never ends. Similarly, the destruction that Rasulullaah & saved the Ummah from is the punishment of Jahannam and other related destructive things. These will remain. Therefore, without any doubt, that being is blessed and deserving of love that saves humanity from all difficulty and calamity and gives them peace contentment. That being is the benefactor of humanity, Rasulullaah ɛ. We witness in our daily lives that when man is in difficulty, he turns to the ruler who has good character, is a benefactor, and has the enthusiasm to serve for work. He continues to praise him and mention his qualities. Similarly, the knowledge and piety of the justice-loving judge will become famous all over the lands. He will become naturally beloved to people. So the being that encompassed all these perfections and honours, will he not be worthy of more love?

1236. Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$  said regarding Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , "Whoever saw Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  once would immediately

*: Ash Shifaa (Volume Two)	*: : ;}	Ash Shifaa	(Volume Two)		<del>    </del>
----------------------------	---------	------------	--------------	--	-----------------

become awed, and whoever came close to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would begin to love him."

1237. We have mentioned regarding a number of Sahabah  $\psi$  who, on account of the love of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , would not like to turn their gaze away from Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and they would continuously look at him.

#### Section 5

# It is Compulsory to Practice on the Advice of Rasulullaah ε

Allaah j says:

وَ لَا عَلَى الَّذِيْنَ لَا يَجِدُوْنَ مَا يُنْفِقُوْنَ حَرَجٌ إِذَا نَصَحُوْا اللهِ وَ اللهُ عَفُورٌ رَّحِيْمٌ ١٠٩١. رَسُوْلِه ١٠٩ مَا عَلَى الْمُحْسِنِيْنَ مِنْ سَبِيْلٍ ١٩٥ وَ اللهُ عَفُورٌ رَّحِيْمٌ ١٩٥٠...and those who do not find the means to spend, if they wish Allaah and His Rasool ε well (if they are sincere and true in their loyalty to Allaah and to Rasulullaah ε). There is no blame on those who do good (such as these people because their situations are beyond their control). Allaah is Most Forgiving, Most Merciful.

(Surah Taubah (Repentance), 91)

The scholars of Tafseer write: 'well-wishing for Allaah j and Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ' means that he is a believer apparently and inwardly.

1238. Tamim Daari  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Indeed, Deen is well-wishing. Indeed, Deen is well-wishing." The Sahabah  $\psi$  asked, "For whom?" Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "For Allaah j, His Rasul  $\epsilon$ , the leaders of the Muslims and all the people." (Abu Dawud, Muslim)

The Imams  $\alpha$  say that it is compulsory to adopt well wishing for Allaah j, His Rasul  $\epsilon$ , the Muslim rulers, and the general Muslims.

## The Definition of 'Advice' according to Imam Abu Sulaymaan Busti α

Imam Abu Sulaymaan Busti  $\alpha$  said that *Naseehat* (advice) is a comprehensive word. All good matters are meant for the one being advised and good intentions are made for him. The purport of 'naseehat' in one word – that encompasses all benefit and shows harm is not possible.

### The Lexical Definition of Advice (Naseehat)

The meaning of *Naseehat* is 'sincerity/purity' in the lexicon. The Arabs say, (نصحت العسل) 'I have made the honey pure, when the wax is separated from it.'

Abu Bakr bin Ishaaq Khaffaaf narrates that it is that deed through which affiliation and harmony is created. It is derived from *Nussaah*. *Nussaah* refers to 'the thread which is used to sew'. A word that has similar meaning is *Zujaaj*. 'Well-wishing for Allaah j' is that a person has the correct belief about Him; he believes Him to be One, he praises the Being of Allaah j and takes Him to be pure from all that which is against His grandeur. He has love for those who love Allaah and he stays away from those deeds that can become a means of the anger of Allaah j. There is no ostentation in his worship. This is well-wishing and *naseehat*.

## Well-Wishing for the Qur'aan

'Well-wishing for the Qur'aan' means that a person believes it to be the Divine Word and he practices upon the laws therein. He recites is slowly. He bears the etiquette of recitation in mind and he adopts concentration and devotion during recitation. He tries to understand the meaning and he tries his best to remove the objections made on the Our'aan by the extreme rejecters and heretics.

### Well-Wishing for Rasulullaah ε

The meaning of 'well-wishing for Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ ' is that, besides testifying to his Nubuwwah and Risaalat, a person practices upon his  $\varepsilon$  commands and stays away from whatever Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  forbade.

Hadhrat Abu Bakr  $\tau$  said, "During the life of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  should be supported. After his demise, every Sunnah of his must be searched for, Those who object to him must be answered, a person should adopt the beneficent character of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , and he should strive to adopt his perfect character."

Hadhrat Abu Ibrahim Tujaybini explains that the meaning of 'well-wishing for Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ' is that whatever Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  brought, should be verified. A person should remain firm on his Sunnah and encourage others to practice on it. He should call others towards Allaah j, His book and His Rasul  $\epsilon$ .

Hadhrat Ahmad bin Muhammad explains that 'well-wishing for Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ' is from among the duties of the heart.

Abu Bakr Aajurri said that 'well-wishing for Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ' demands two things: One is during the life of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and the second is after the demise of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . During his life, to help his companions and to aid them in every way, to desire good for them, to defend them from the enemies of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , to listen to his

commands and to practice upon them, to spend on him with one's life and wealth, as Allaah j says:

...there are men who are true to the pledge they vow to Allaah (that they will fight in Jihaad until they die). Of them is he who has fulfilled his pledge (and has been martyred), and he who is waiting (to be martyred). They have not changed (their resolve) in the least (unlike the Munaafiqeen).

(Surah Ahzaab (The Armies), 23)

And Allaah j says:

...assist Allaah and His Rasool ε. These are the ones who are true (in their claim to Imaan).

(Surah Hashar (The Exile), 8)

After the demise of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , well wishing for him is that he  $\epsilon$  is honoured and he is held as more beloved than all people. Also, a person should remain engaged in learning and teaching the Sunnah and he should strive to practice on it and acquire deep understanding of it. He should keep the companions of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and the household beloved in the depths of his heart and he should love every person that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  loved. He should take as evil every such person that turns away from the Sunnah of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . He should be affectionate to the Ummah of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , his noble character should be recognized, his life should be adopted, and effort should be made to remain steadfast one it.

The result of the above-mentioned research is that advice is the fruit of love and its sign.

1239. Imam Abul Qaasim Qushayri  $\alpha$  narrated an incident that someone saw Amr bin Layth – the king of Khurasaan, known by the title of Saffaar – in a dream. He asked, "How did Allaah j deal with you?" He replied, "Allaah forgave me." When he was asked, "On what account did he forgive you?" He said, "Once I saw the large number of the army from the mountain and my heart was overjoyed. At that time, I hoped that if I could be present before Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , then I would have helped Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  with this army. This desire of mine was so beloved to Allaah that He forgave me for only thinking this."

# Adopting Well-Wishing for the Leaders of the Muslims and the Muslims

Well-wishing for the Muslims means that they should be helped and aided through pure and good means. Those among them who are negligent should be notified. Whatever difficulties the Muslims are unaware of, they should be informed. A person should refrain from rebelling against them. People should not be excited against them, nor should people be made to think badly about them for no reason.

Well-wishing for the general Muslims is that their attention should be turned towards goodness. They should be helped in religious and worldly affairs and they should be helped in word and deed. The negligent among them should be made aware, the ignorant among them should be guided, the needy among them should be helped, the faults of those with faults should be hidden, harm should be removed from them and effort must be made to give them every possible benefit.

## The Compulsion of Honour for Rasulullaah ε, Veneration of Him and Service for Him

Allaah j says; يٰأَيُّهَا النَّبِيُّ إِنَّا اَرْسَلْنٰكَ شَاهِدًا وَّ مُبَشِّرًا وَّ نَذِيْرً ٰلَا مَ مُنَافِدًا وَ مُبَشِّرًا وَ نَذِيْرً ٰلَا مَ مُنَافِدًا وَ مُبَشِّرًا وَ نَذِيْرً ٰلَا اللَّبِيُّ إِنَّا اَرْسَلْنٰكَ شَاهِدًا وَ مُبَشِّرًا وَ نَذِيْرً ٰلَا اللّٰمِيْ إِنَّا اللّٰمِيْنِ الللّٰمِيْنِ الللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ الللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ الللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ الللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ الللّٰمِيْنِ الللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ الللّٰمِيْنِ الللّٰمِيْنِ الللّٰمِيْنِ الللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ الللّٰمِيْنِ الللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ الللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ الللّٰمِيْنِ الللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ الللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ الللّٰمِيْنِ الللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ الللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ الللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ الللّٰمِيْنِ الللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ اللللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ الللللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِيِلْمِيْنِ اللّٰمِيْنِ الللّٰمِيْنِ الللّٰمِيْنِ اللّٰمِي

O Nabi ε! We have certainly sent you as a witness (who will bear testimony against the Kuffaar of all nations on the Day of Qiyaamah – refer to verse 143 of Surah 2), a carrier of good news (to the Mu'mineen that they will enjoy Jannah), a warner (to the Kuffaar that they will suffer the punishment of Jahannam if they do not accept Imaan)... (Surah Ahzaab (The Armies), 45)

النَّوْمِنُوْا بِاللهِ وَ رَسُوْلِهِ وَ ثُعَزِّرُوْهُ وَ ثُوَقِّرُوْهُ وَ لَكُوَّدُوهُ اللهِ كَا كُوهُ اللهِ كَا كُوهُ اللهِ So that you (O people) believe in Allaah, believe in His Rasool, assist Him (His Deen), revere Him (Surah Fatah (Victory), 9)

Allaah j says: يٰأَيُّهَا الَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا لَا تُقَدِّمُوْا بَيْنَ يَدَي اللهِ وَ رَسُوْلِهِ

O you who have Imaan! Never proceed ahead of Allaah and His Rasool  $\varepsilon$  (never do anything or comment on anything until Allaah and Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  have issued directives concerning the matter). Fear Allaah, for verily Allaah is All Hearing, All Knowing.

(Surah Hujuraat (Rooms), 1)

يَٰايُّهَا الَّذِيْنَ الْمَنُوْا لَا تَرْفَعُوْا اَصْواتَكُمْ فَوْقَ صَوْتِ النَّبِيِّ وَ لَا تَجْهَرُوْا لَهُ بِالْقَوْلِ كَجَهْرِ بَعْضِكُمْ لِبَعْضِ اَنْ تَحْبَطَ اَعْمَالُكُمْ وَ اَنْتُمْ لَا تَجْهَرُوْا لَهُ بِالْقَوْلِ كَجَهْرِ بَعْضِكُمْ لِبَعْضِ اَنْ تَحْبَطَ اَعْمَالُكُمْ وَ اَنْتُمْ لَا تَجْهَرُوْنَ ٢٠٠٢.

O you who have Imaan! Never raise your voices above the voice of the Rasool  $\varepsilon$  (literally and figuratively) and do not speak to him loudly as you speak loudly with each other, lest your deeds be laid to waste without your realising it.

(Surah Hujuraat (Rooms), 2)

Do not make the calling of the Rasool  $\varepsilon$  among yourselves like your calling to each other (when Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  calls any of you, you are obliged to respond and do not have the choice of ignoring the call as you have when anyone else calls).

(Surah Noor (Celesstial Lights), 63)

These verses is clear proof that Allaah j has made it necessary to honour and revere Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .

Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$  said that the meaning of 'tu'azziruhu' in verse 9 of Surah Fatah means 'to honour', i.e. honour Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Mubarrad said that its meaning is that 'a person should exaggerate in honouring and revering Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .' Akhfash said that it means 'a person should help Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .' Tabari  $\alpha$  said that the purport of it is that 'Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  should be helped in every way.'

Some scholars explain that tu'azziruhu can be read as 'tu'azzizuhu', i.e. with two zaa', taken from 'respect', meaning 'one should honour Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ '.

# '...Never proceed ahead of Allaah and His Rasool E...'

Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$  and other scholars of language like Tha'lab etc. have explained that the prohibition of going ahead of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  ('O you who have Imaan! Never

proceed ahead of Allaah and His Rasool  $\epsilon$ ...' (Surah Hujuraat, 1)) means that no one should speak before Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , nor should they go ahead of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  in speech and show disrespect.

Hadhrat Sahl explained this meaning: 'You should not speak before Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  speaks and when Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  begins speaking, then listen attentively and listen silently. The Muslims have also been forbidden from hurriedly deciding something before Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  decides. They have also been forbidden from opposing Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  in the matters of war or in religious matters, or that they should try to go ahead of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  in opposing Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .' This is the view of Hadhrat Hasan  $\alpha$ , Mujaahid  $\alpha$ , Dahhaak  $\alpha$ , Suddi  $\alpha$ , and Sufyaan Thauri  $\alpha$ .

### '...Fear Allaah, for verily Allaah is All Hearing, All Knowing.'

When Allaah j explained this, He further emphasized, '...Fear Allaah, for verily Allaah is All Hearing, All Knowing.' (Surah Hujuraat, 1)

Maawardi said that 'fear' means, 'stay away from going ahead of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .' Sulami  $\alpha$  said that 'fear' means 'do not be negligent in fulfilling the rights of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and stay away from whatever aspect there is a shortcoming in honouring Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Remember, Allaah j is watching your deeds.'

# '...Never raise you voices above the voice of the Rasool s...'

Allaah j then forbade the Muslims from calling Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  in a loud voice, or He forbade the other companions from calling Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  using a loud tone or voice.

### Adopt the Greatest of Etiquette When Calling Rasulullaah &

Some scholars have explained that this means that you should not call Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  in the same way in which you call on each other, i.e. by name.

Abu Muhammad Makki has explained regarding the verse that 'during conversation, do not try to go ahead of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Do not speak in a loud tone to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and do not call Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  using such a name as you call each other. Honour Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  to the highest extent, and call Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  with the greatest of honour. For example, O Rasul of Allaah, O Nabi of Allaah. This has been clarified in the following verse:

Do not make the calling of the Rasool  $\varepsilon$  among yourselves like your calling to each other (when Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  calls any of you, you are obliged to respond and do not have the choice of ignoring the call as you have when anyone else calls).

(Surah Noor (Celesstial Lights), 63)'

Other scholars have explained it as 'do not address Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  in order to understand something small'.

After this, Allaah j warned that if people do not desist from this, Allaah will destroy their good deeds.

### The Reason Behind the Revelation of this Verse

1240. Some have explained that this verse was revealed regarding the Banu Tamim or a delegation of another tribe. They came to Rasulullaah ε and began calling out to him, 'O Muhammad, O Muhammad!". They said, "Come outside." Upon this ignorance of theirs, Allaah j admonished them severely and He said regarding them,

"Indeed most of those who call for you (O Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ) from outside the rooms (of your wives) have no understanding (of etiquette, because of which they did not respect your privacy)." (Surah Hujuraat, 4)

- 1241. Some scholars have explained that this verse was revealed regarding the argument that took place in the presence of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  between Hadhrat Abu Bakr  $\tau$  and Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$ . Their voices were raised higher than that of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  comparatively.
- 1242. Some scholars think that this verse was revealed regarding **Thaabit bin Qays bin Shammaas, the Khateeb of Rasulullaah \epsilon.** He had a loud voice and therefore, when speaking to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , he was relatively loud. When this verse was revealed and he came to know about it, he adopted solitude. However, when he realized that deeds could be destroyed, he went to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and said, "O Rasul of Allaah, after the revelation of this verse, I have fear that my deeds will be destroyed because I speak loudly in front of you, as the Qur'aan prohibits." Hearing this, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$

said, "O Thaabit, are you not pleased that you live a good life in this world and that you will be resurrected with the martyrs on the day of Qiyaamah and that you will be entered into Jannah?" (Bukhari, Muslim) Thaabit  $\tau$  was martyred during the battle of Yamaamah.

# Immediate Glad Tidings for those who Adopt Taqwa

1243. When this verse was revealed, Hadhrat Abu Bakr  $\tau$  said, "O Rasul of Allaah, by Allaah, after today, I shall speak to you like how someone whispers."

1244-1245. After this verse was revealed, Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$  began to speak to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  like how someone whispers. Even this was done with so much fear and respect, that sometimes Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  had to ask twice and thrice for a repetition. The following verse was then revealed:

Verily, those who lower their voices with Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  are the ones whose hearts Allaah has (examined and) purified for Taqwa. They shall have forgiveness and a tremendous reward.

(Surah Hujuraat (Rooms), 3)

Some scholars say that the following verse was revealed regarding Banu Tameem:

(Referring to some people who shouted for Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  from outside his quarters, Allaah says,) *Indeed most of those who call* for you (O Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ ) from outside the rooms (of your wives)

have no understanding (of etiquette, because of which they did not respect your privacy).

(Surah Hujuraat (Rooms), 4)

### The Sahabah ψ Teach the Reverts Etiquette for Rasulullaah ε

1246. Safwaan bin Assaal narrates: "During a journey, I was with Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . A Bedouin called out to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  loudly, "O Muhammad" thrice. We told him that Allaah j has taught the etiquette that must be shown to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and he should be addressed softly and Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  should not be called by his name. Such words that show disrespect are forbidden to use for Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . (Tirmidhi)

Regarding this, Allaah j commands:

O you who have Imaan! Do not say, "Raa'inaa," (to Rasulullaah ε. Whereas this word means "Consider us" in Arabic, it was an insult in the language of the Jews. The Jews therefore used this word as an insult when speaking to Rasulullaah ε. The Mu'mineen were therefore commanded not to use this word)...

(Surah Al-Baqara (The Bull), 104)

Some Mufassirreen have said that in the dialect of the Ansaar, this word was used with the meaning of, 'O Rasul of Allaah, consider us; we shall consider you.' Allaah j disliked this because there is a bad connotation of this speech, i.e. 'if you do not consider us, then in lieu of this, we shall also not consider you'. This is totally wrong because the right of the Rasul is that he is obeyed in all conditions, not only on the condition of 'if you consider us'.

Another bad connotation that comes from here is that this is against the grandeur of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  to do something that goes against the demand of justice.

Another negative aspect of this is that the unfortunate Jews used these words to mock Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and they would use these boastful meaning for themselves.

Thus, the Muslims were forbidden from it, i.e. they should never address Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  using such words that have a bad connotation. The Jews used to take advantage of the similarity in pronunciation and used to take the meaning that they wanted. Besides this, the scholars have explained other meanings as well.

#### Section 1

# The Special Adoption of Honour and Veneration by the Sahabah $\psi$ for Rasulullaah $\epsilon$

It was the habit of the Sahabah  $\psi$  to honour Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  to the greatest level.

- 1247. This is a part of a long Hadith. Amr bin Aas  $\tau$  narrates, "In my sight, there was none more liked in the world than Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , nor was there anyone more pious or lofty in rank. The condition of awe, magnificence, and glory of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was such that throughout my life I never had the courage to look directly at Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Whenever I tried to, I could not understand how to explain the features of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . The reason for this is probably that no one could look directly at Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ." (Muslim)
- 1248. Imam Tirmidhi  $\alpha$  narrates from Hadhrat Anas  $\tau$ : "When Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  left his home, the gaze of the onlookers would be lowered. There were two people in the gathering of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  that looked up at Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would smile at them in response, i.e. Hadhrat Abu Bakr  $\tau$  and Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$ ." (Tirmidhi, Ahmad)
- 1249. Hadhrat Usamah bin Shareek narrates: "When I came to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , I saw that the Sahabah  $\psi$  were sitting there, without moving, as though birds were sitting atop their heads and if they had to move their heads, the birds would have flown away." (Abu Dawud)

1250. It is narrated in one Hadith that when Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  began speaking, the Sahabah  $\psi$  would immediately lower their heads out of respect, as though birds were sitting on their heads.

1251 Hadhrat Urwah bin Mas'ood τ narrates he was sent as a messenger to Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  on behalf of the disbelievers on the occasion of the treaty of Hudaybiyyah. He was greatly affected by the great enthusiasm of the Sahabah w. "I saw that they would respect, honour and revere Rasulullaah ε in such a way that I had never seen or heard. I saw that his companions would compete with each other for the water he used for wudhoo. They would remain ready to acquire it. When Rasulullaah ε would spit, the Sahabah ψ would quickly take it onto their hands and rub it onto their faces and bodies. If a hair broke and fell from the body of Rasulullaah E, they would quickly take it and look after it. If he commanded anything, they would immediately carry out the command. When they began speaking to Rasulullaah E, they would lower their voices out of respect that it was difficult to hear them. Out of honour, they would not look directly Rasulullaah E." After seeing all this, Urwah returned to the Quraysh and said, "O Quraysh, I went to Kisra, I saw the country of Qaysar and I have travelled to the country of Najashi, but, by Allaah, I have never found a king so respected, honoured and revered by his nation as the companions of Rasulullaah ε love, honour and like him. His companions love him so much and honour him so much that I have conviction that the nation that gathers around Muhammad will never turn their backs on him." (Bukhari)

- 1252. Hadhrat Anas  $\tau$  narrates: "Once Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was clipping his hair and the Sahabah  $\psi$  formed a circle around him and they were catching the hair before it could fall to the ground and protecting it." (Muslim)
- 1253. On the occasion of the treaty of Hudaybiyyah, Hadhrat Uthmaan bin Affaan  $\tau$  was appointed as the messenger of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  to the Quraysh of Makkah to negotiate. Based on former relations, the Quraysh permitted him to make Tawaaf of the Ka'bah. However, they did not permit Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and the other companions. **Hadhrat Uthmaan**  $\tau$  **did not tolerate that he should perform Tawaaf alone. He said, "How can it be possible for me to perform Tawaaf before Rasulullaah \epsilon?** Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  will perform Tawaaf first, and then I shall perform Tawaaf."
- 1254. Hadhrat Talha bin Ubaidullaahτ states that the companions of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  sometimes did not have the courage to directly ask something of Rasulullaah ε so they would take the support of a Bedouin. Once, they asked a Bedouin to ask Rasulullaah & "Which Sahabi is there that fulfilled his obligation (i.e. of having been martyred)?"<sup>1</sup> When the Bedouin asked this, he (E) turned his face away. During this time. he saw the narrator 3 (Abu Talha), so Rasulullaah ε said to the Bedouin, "He is

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The question pertained to the verse: "Among the Mu'mineen there are men who are true to the pledge they vow to Allaah (that they will fight in Jihaad until they die). Of them is he who has fulfilled his pledge (and has been martyred), and he who is waiting (to be martyred). They have not changed (Their resolve to fight) in the least (unlike the Munaafiqeen). (Surah Ahzaab, 23)

\*: Ash Shifaa (Volume Two)

from among those that have fulfilled their obligation (of being martyred)." (Tirmidhi)

- 1255. Qayla says, "When I saw Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  for the first time, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was sitting on the floor with his knees raised before him. I began to shake out of awe and fear."
- 1256. Hadhrat Mughirah  $\tau$  narrates that it was the practice of the Sahabah  $\psi$  that they would come to the house of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  in order to see him. Instead of knocking at the door using their fingers, they would only softly knock using their fingernails.
- 1257. Hadhrat Bara bin Aazib  $\tau$  narrates that there were a few times that he wanted to ask Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  something but he would wait for the ideal opportunity and searching for this opportunity would take up a significant amount of time.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Hadhrat Talha □ was later martyred during the Battle of the Camel.

#### Section 2

# Honour for Rasulullaah $\epsilon$ after his Demise, Honour for the Household, and Honour for the Sahabah $\psi$

Just as it was necessary to honour and revere Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  during his life, it is necessary to honour and revere him in exactly the same way after his demise. This honour is after the hearing the name of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , his Hadith, the mention of Seerah, the Ahle Bayt, and at the time of the mention of the Sahabah  $\psi$ . This is necessary to be done out of respect.

Abu Ibrahim narrated that Ishaq Tujibi said, "When Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is mentioned, it is necessary upon every Muslim to show utmost humility and humbleness, to appease his movement (be quiet and calm), to dignify and honour Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  just as he would do in the life of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , and to observe the manners Allaah j has ordained"

Qaadhi Iyaadh  $\alpha$  explains that this was the practice of the pious predecessors and Imams and that they used to express this enthusiasm at every occasion.

### The Narrations of Imam Maalik $\alpha$

1258. It is narrated from Ibn Humayd: "Once Abu Ja'far (Mansur) debated with Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  in the Masjid an Nabawi about some issue, so Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  said, 'Do not raise your voice in Masjid an Nabawi because Allaah j taught the nation etiquette and said,

يَايَهَا الدِينَ امَنُوا لَا تَرْفَعُوا اصْوَاتَكُمْ فَوْقَ صَوْتِ النَّبِيِّ وَ لَا تَجْهَرُوا لَهُ بِالْقَوْلِ كَجَهْرِ بَعْضِكُمْ لِبَعْضِ أَنْ تَحْبَطَ أَعْمَالُكُمْ وَ أَنْتُمْ لَا تَجْهَرُونَ ٢٠٠٠

O you who have Imaan! Never raise your voices above the voice of the Rasool  $\varepsilon$  (literally and figuratively) and do not speak to him loudly as you speak loudly with each other, lest your deeds be laid to waste without your realising it.

(Surah Hujuraat (Rooms), 2)

On one occasion, Allaah j praised this group in the following way,

Verily those who lower their voices with Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  are the ones whose hearts Allaah has (examined and) purified for Taqwa. They shall have forgiveness and a tremendous reward.

(Surah Hujuraat (Rooms), 3)

Allaah j admonished one group in the following way,

(Referring to some people who shouted for Rasulullaah ε from outside his quarters, Allaah says,) *Indeed most of those who call for you* (O Rasulullaah ε) *from outside the rooms* (of your wives) *have no understanding* (of etiquette, because of which they did not respect your privacy).

(Surah Hujuraat (Rooms), 4)'

When Abu Ja'far heard this he adopted silence and asked Imam Maalik  $\alpha$ , 'O Abu Abdullaah, should I turn to the Qiblah and make du'aa' or should I remain facing Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ?' Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  said, 'Why do you turn your face away from Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ? He is a means for you and

your father Adam  $\upsilon$  from Allaah on the day of Qiyaamah. **Therefore, remain facing him and remain desirous of his intercession.** Allaah will accept the intercession of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  because Allaah j says,

...If only it were that when they (the hypocrites) oppress (wrong) their souls (by referring their disputes to others), they should come to you (O Muhammad  $\varepsilon$ ) seeking Allaah's forgiveness and then the Rasool (Muhammad  $\varepsilon$ ) seeks forgiveness on their behalf, they will then surely find that Allaah is Most Forgiving, Most Merciful (Allaah will forgive the if they obey Him and realise that the judgement of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  is absolute).

(Surah Nisaa (The Women), 64)'."

Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  was asked about Ayyub Sakhtiyaani  $\alpha$ . He said, "Ayyub Sakhtiyaani is the most virtuous from all those that I narrate Ahadith to; he performed Hajj twice and one special thing is that whenever I heard someone speaking about Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  to him, he would cry so much that I would have mercy on his condition." Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  explains that when he saw him honouring Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  so much, he began to write narrations from him.

Mus'ab bin Abdullaah narrates: "Whenever Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  would mention or hear about Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , his colour would change and he would stand up respectfully. This condition of his was difficult for some of his companions so one day they asked Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  the reason for it; 'Why do you do this?' Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  said, 'You are not shown it. If you had the eyes, then whatever

I see after hearing the name of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , you would see and you would not have the courage to raise objections upon this condition'."

Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  said, "Whenever I saw Muhammad bin Munkadir (taken as the leader Qaari of his time) and any of us asked him about the Ahadith of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , he would cry so much that we would have mercy on him."

It is narrated about Imam Ja'far Saadig α that he was very jovial and happy person. However, when a Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  was mentioned in a gathering, he would turn pale. Imam Maalik a explains that he never saw Imam Ja'far Saadig α ever narrated a Hadith without wudhoo. "I staved with him for a long time but I never saw a change in his habitual practices. I saw three habitual practices. I did not see him engaged in any other action besides these. He was either engaged in Salaah or in the recitation of the Our'aan and if he was not engaged in these, I saw him silent (making Dhikr in the heart). He would never engage in useless talk. I have conviction that he is among those personalities that had great fear of Allaah in their hearts."

When Hadhrat Abdur Rahman bin Qaasim mentioned Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ , his condition would become such that all the blood would drain from his face, i.e. the colour of his face would change and his face would become dry and his tongue would shake out of awe.

Hadhrat Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  says, "I would go to Aamir bin Abdullaah bin Zubayr. His condition was such that when Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would be mentioned in front of him, he would cry until he had no tears left."

"I saw Zuhri; he had a very soft nature and he would console others. However, when Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was mentioned before him, he would become such that it was as though he did not see anyone and no one saw him, i.e. such a condition overcame him that he had no idea of the world and his surroundings."

"I would go to Hadhrat Safwaan bin Saleem. When Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was mentioned before him, he would cry so much that the onlooker would get worried and would leave him in that condition."

It is narrated from Hadhrat Qataadah  $\alpha$  that when he would hear Ahadith, he would cry and become very restless.

When a (large) number of students had come to the gathering of Imam Maalik  $\alpha$ , people said to him, "You should appoint someone to call out in a loud voice (what you say so that everyone may hear)." Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  replied:

"O you who have Imaan! Never raise your voices above the voice of the Rasool & (literally and figuratively) and do not speak to him loudly as you speak loudly with each other, lest your deeds be laid to waste without your realising it.

(Surah Hujuraat (Rooms), 2)

Because of this verse, I shall not let the voice of any person be raised in the Masjid of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ."

Imam Ibn Seereen  $\alpha$  would smile and speak happily. However, the moment Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was mentioned before him, he immediately showed helplessness and humility.

\*\*\* Ash Shifaa (Volume Two)

When Abdur Rahman bin Mahdi read Ahadith, he would tell those present to adopt silence, saying, "Allaah j said,

O you who have Imaan! Never raise your voices above the voice of the Rasool  $\varepsilon$  (literally and figuratively) and do not speak to him loudly as you speak loudly with each other, lest your deeds be laid to waste without your realising it.

(Surah Hujuraat (Rooms), 2)"

He said that it was necessary to adopt the condition as though speaking directly to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  when narrating the Ahadith of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .

#### Section 3

## Narration of Ahadith and the Caution of the Pious Predecessors and Respect for Hadith

### The Caution of Taken in Narrating Ahadith

1259. Hadhrat Amr bin Maymoon narrates that he remained for approximately a year in the company of Hadhrat Ibn Mas'ood  $\tau$ . However, he never heard him narrating a Hadith any day. One day, in order to narrate a Hadith, he said, "Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said..." and a strange condition overcame him. His face began to sweat. After narrating the Hadith he said, "Insha Allaah it is such, or it is definitely something like this."

According to one narration, whenever Ibn Mas'ood  $\tau$  narrated Ahadith, the veins on his neck would swell, his eyes would dry and the colour of his face would change.

Ibrahim bin Abdullaah bin Quraym Ansaari, the judge of Madinah, said, "Once, Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  was passing by the front of the home of Hadhrat Abu Haazim while he was delivering a lesson of Hadith. However, he continued forward without stopping. When the people asked, 'Contrary to your habit, you passed his house and you did not meet him?' He replied, 'He (Hadhrat Abu Haazim) was engaged in teaching Hadith. There was no place to sit in his house and I do not like to hear the Ahadith of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  standing in this way'."

Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  narrates: "A person came to Sa'eed bin Musayyib  $\alpha$  and enquired about a Hadith. At the time, Ibn Musayyib was leaning and resting. He immediately got up and began narrating the words of the Hadith. The person

said, 'I excuse myself that I have given difficulty to you; you could have narrated while lying down.' Ibn Musayyib said, 'It was very difficult for me to begin narrating the Ahadith while lying down'."

Muhammad bin Seereen was of a happy constitution most of the time. However, whenever a Hadith was mentioned in his gathering, his condition would change and he would become a picture of complete humility and helplessness.

Abu Mus'ab narrates that it was the habitual practice of Imam Maalik α to perform wudhoo before narrating Ahadith. His companions wrote that he would not only perform wudhoo, but he would wear good clothing, sit respectfully, and narrate Ahadith. When the reason behind this etiquette was queried, he said, "We should respect and honour the Ahadith of Rasulullaah ε even more than this."

It was the habit of Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  that when people would come to him, the slave girl would ask the people, "Have you come to listen to Ahadith or to enquire rulings?" If they came to enquire rulings, he would immediately come out. However, if they came to listen to Ahadith, he would first perform Ghusl, wear good clothing, wear perfume, tie a turban, wear a shawl (over his shoulders) and he would then come to the gathering. His condition at the time would become as though he was an embodiment of humility and helplessness. As long as he narrated Ahadith, Ood would be burning near him. Some have written that he would sit on a stage when narrating Ahadith.

Ibn Abi Idrees narrates that when Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  was asked the reason for his practice, he said, "I like that these

precautions are taken when narrating Ahadith and I adhere to them strictly:

- 1. The honour and respect for Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  should be kept up,
- 2. Wudhoo should be performed before narrating the Ahadith,
- 3. I severely dislike to narrate Ahadith while standing, and to narrate it quickly while walking in the street. (In a condition of carelessness),
- 4. The Hadith should be explained easily and with caution so that people can easily understand the purport."

Diraar bin Murrah narrates: "According to the Muhadditheen, it is Makruh to narrate it (Ahadith) without wudhoo." The same is narrated from Qatadah.

When narrating Ahadith, it was the practice of A'mash, if he could not perform wudhoo, to perform Tayamum. However, the habit of Qatadah was that if he did not have wudhoo, he would not narrate Ahadith.

# The Importance of Narrating Ahadith according to Imam Maalik α

Abdullaah bin Mubaarak  $\alpha$  narrates: "Once when Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  was conducting a lesson of Hadith, a scorpion bit him about sixteen times, however, he carried on the lesson. Despite his colour changing because of the scorpion bites, he carried on his narration. When he completed the lesson, I asked, 'Hadhrat, I have never seen your condition during a lesson as I saw today.' Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  explained what happened during the lesson, saying, 'The importance and honour of the Ahadith pushed me on to adopt patience

and to tolerate the difficulty; I could not stop explaining the Ahadith'."

Ibn Mahdi  $\alpha$  narrates: "One day, Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  was on his way to Aqeeq. On the way, someone asked him about a Hadith. He scolded the person (although he was generally soft), saying, 'You have a higher rank than doing the deed of a general person, yet you ask me about a Hadith of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  in the condition that you are walking on the road'."

Once, Jarir bin Abdul Hameed Qaadhi asked Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  about Hadith while Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  was standing. Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  immediately got him jailed. The people said, "Hadhrat, he is the Qaadhi." Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  said, "It is more necessary to teach the Qaadhi etiquette." (As compared to others)

Hishaam bin Ghaazi once asked Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  about a Hadith when Imam Saheb  $\alpha$  was standing. Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  immediately had him lashed twenty times. When he saw the true enthusiasm of the person he had mercy on him and narrated twenty Ahadith to him. Hishaam said, "If only you lashed me more so that I could get the chance to hear more Ahadith."

(Subhaanallaah, may we be sacrificed for such luminaries that for the sake of listening to Ahadith, they would tolerate lashing. Translator)

It was the practice of Layth and Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  that they would not write Hadith without wudhoo and Qatadah  $\alpha$  would not write Ahadith without wudhoo, he would not read or explain it. If he was not in the condition of wudhoo, then A'mash would immediately make Tayamum in order to parrate Ahadith.

### **Section 4**

# Honouring the Household and the Progeny of Rasulullaah $\epsilon$ is Honouring Rasulullaah $\epsilon$

Honouring the household and the progeny of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is honouring Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  encouraged this and it was also the practice of the pious predecessors. Allaah j says:

...O members of the household (of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ ), and to purify you thoroughly (from all evil).

(Surah Ahzaab (The Armies), 33)

...and his wives are their mothers ... (Surah Ahzaab (The Armies), 6)

1260. Zayd bin Arqam  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "I take an oath in the name of Allaah regarding my household; deal well with the household (Wives etc. included)." Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said this thrice. We asked Zayd  $\tau$  who the household are? He said, "The family of Ali, the family of Ja'far, the family of Aqeel and the family of Abbaas  $\tau$ ." (Muslim)

1261. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said: "I leave the book of Allaah and my household amongst you. As long as you remain linked to them, you will never go astray. Now ponder over how you will deal with these two things after me." (Muslim, Tirmidhi)

1262. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Recognizing the honour for the household of Nubuwwah is salvation from the punishment of Jahannam and love for the family of the Nabi will help in crossing the Siraat (the bridge over Jahannam) easily, and helping the household is a means of protection from the punishment of Allaah."

Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Recognizing the rank of the family of the Nabi is on account of recognizing Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and his greatness. Now, if a person acquires this link that is between the household and Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , then it can be said with certainty that this love is on account of the love for Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .

1263. Hadhrat Umar bin Abi Salamah  $\tau$  narrates that when the verse,

(Allaah only wishes to rid you of filth) O members of the household (of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ ), and to purify you thoroughly (from all evil).

(Surah Ahzaab (The Armies) -33

was revealed, Hadhrat Umm Salamah  $\rho$  was in the house of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  called Hadhrat Faatimah  $\rho$ , Hasan  $\tau$ , and Husayn  $\tau$  and wrapped them in a blanket. He called Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$  and kept him behind him and covered him too, saying, "O Allaah, this is my household. Remove filth from them and purify them well." (Tirmidhi)

- 1264. Hadhrat Sa'd bin Abi Waqqaas  $\tau$  narrates that when the verse of  $Mubaahalah^I$  was revealed, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  took Hadhrat Hasan  $\tau$ , Hadhrat Husayn  $\tau$ , and Hadhrat Faatimah  $\rho$  and said, "O Allaah, these people are of my household." (Muslim)
- 1265. Regarding Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$ , Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Whoever I am the leader of, Ali is also his leader. O Allaah, whoever befriends Ali, You also befriend him and whoever has hatred for Ali, You also have hatred for him."
- 1266. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  also said regarding Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$ , "A believer will love you and a hypocrite will hate you." (Muslim)
- 1267. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said to Hadhrat Abbaas  $\tau$ , "By the Being in Whose control is the life of Muhammad, the light of Imaan can never shine in a person until Allaah and His Rasul do not love him. He who harms my uncle has harmed me and the status of an uncle is like that of the father." (Tirmidhi)
- 1268. One day, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said to Hadhrat Abbaas  $\tau$ , "Come to me tomorrow with your children." Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  gathered them under his shawl and said, "This is my uncle, holding the rank of a father, and this is my household. O Allaah, save them from the fire just as I gather them now (under the shawl of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ )." When

¹ The verse is: "Whoever disputes with you (O Muhammad ε) concerning this (concerning the birth and death of Hadhrat Isa □) after the knowledge (revelation) has come to you, then say to them, 'Come! We shall call your sons and our sons, your wives and our wives, yourselves and ourselves. Then we shall (collectively) pray sincerely (to Allaah) and place Allaah's curse on the liars." (Surah Aal-Imraan, 61)

Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  made this du'a', then the sound of Aameen could be heard form the walls of the house.

- 1269. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  would hold the hands of Hadhrat Usamah  $\tau$  and Hadhrat Hasan  $\tau$  and say, "O Allaah, I hold them dearly, You also love them." (Bukhari)
- 1270 1272. Hadhrat Abu Bakr  $\tau$  said: "Just as Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is honoured, you should honour the household in exactly the same way. You should honour them because of being relatives of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ." He  $\tau$  further said, "By the being in Whose control is my life, I shall keep up ties with the relatives of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  more than compared to my own family." (Bukhari, Muslim, Tirmidhi, Ibn Maajah)
- 1273. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "He who loves Hasan  $\tau$  and Husayn  $\tau$ , Allaah will Befriend him and he who befriends their parents (Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$  and Hadhrat Faatimah  $\tau$ ) will have the rank with me on the day of Qiyaamah."
- 1274. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "He who disgraces the Quraysh, Allaah will disgrace him." (Ahmad)
- 1275. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "Put the Quraysh ahead in your affairs. Do not go ahead of them."
- 1276. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said to Hadhrat Umm Salamah  $\rho$ , "Do not cause harm to me regarding Ayesha  $\rho$ ." (Bukhari, Muslim)
- 1277. Hadhrat Uqbah bin Haarith  $\tau$  narrates that one day he saw Hadhrat Abu Bakr  $\tau$  with Hadhrat Hasan  $\tau$  mounted on his neck and he was saying, 'May my father be sacrificed for you. His similarity is much more to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  than

his father Ali,' and Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$  was standing close by and smiling." (Bukhari)<sup>1</sup>

1278. Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Hasan bin Husayn narrates that he went for some work to Hadhrat Umar bin Abdul Aziz  $\alpha$  who said to him, "When you have any need then send a messenger or write a note and inform me. Indeed I feel ashamed to see you at my door."

1279. Sha'bi  $\alpha$  narrates: "Once Hadhrat Zayd bin Thaabit  $\tau$  was performing the Janaazah Salaah of his mother. A mule was then brought close so that he could mount it. In this time, Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$  came and took the reins (to help Hadhrat Zayd  $\tau$ ). Hadhrat Zayd  $\tau$  said, 'O uncle of Rasulullaah, leave the reins.' Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$  replied, "We should honour the scholars in this way." Hadhrat Zayd  $\tau$  kissed the hands of Hadhrat Abbaas  $\tau$  and said, "We have been given the same command for the household (family) of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ."

1280. One day, Hadhrat Ibn Umar  $\tau$  saw Muhammad bin Usamah bin Zayd  $\tau$  and said, "If only this was my attendant." He was told, "This is Muhammad bin Usamah."

¹ Subhaanallaah, based on the trickery of the (ignorant) Muslims today, our condition is such that the narrations that show the love, happiness, mutual relations, playing with each others childen, marriages, consultation, between the Sahabah □ like Hadhrat Ali τ, Hadhrat Abu Bakr τ, Hadhrat Umar τ and Hadhrat Uthmaan τ etc. we pass over them as though it is not authentic, even if it has been narrated in the Sahihayn. If a narration discussing a difference of opinion is heard, then we do not even bother about finding the reference for it. By Allaah, research a little about them, what love their was between them. Know with certainty that this will be opened up to you in just a few days. The condition is that you study with an open heart. Translator

Hadhrat Ibn Umar  $\tau$  lowered his head, rubbed his hands on the ground, and said, "If Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  saw him, he would have shown great love to him." (Bukhari)

- 1281. Auza'i said: "One day, the daughter of Usamah bin Zayd  $\tau$  came with her attendant to Hadhrat Umar bin Abdul Aziz  $\alpha$ . The daughter was holding the hand of the lad. He  $\alpha$  came to the child and wrapped the child in a shawl (so that people can gauge the special honour due), he took the hand of the child and seated the child on his place and sat in front. He fulfilled whatever need the child had."
- 1282. Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$  stipulated the stipend of his son Abdullaah  $\tau$  at 3000 during his era of Khilafat and the stipend of Usamah  $\tau$  at 3500. Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Umar  $\tau$  said to his father, "In which battle did Usamah precede me? If he did not, then what is the reason for his stipend being more?" Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$  said, "The position that his father enjoyed before Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was higher than that of your father and he was more beloved to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  than your father. Similarly, Usamah was also more beloved to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  than you. Now, understand that I give preference to the beloved of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  over my own beloved." (Tirmidhi)
- 1283. Hadhrat Mu'awiyah  $\tau$  came to know that Kaabis bin Rabi'ah was very similar to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . One day, Kaabis came to Hadhrat Mu'awiyah  $\tau$ . Hadhrat Mu'awiyah  $\tau$  stood up, went forward, and welcomed him. He gave him a place on his throne and kissed him between the eyes. He also gave him the land of Marghaab because he looked similar to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .

1284. Ja'far bin Sulayman (the governor of Madinah) was angered at something and had Imam Maalik α whipped, to the extent that he became unconscious. The people picked and took him home. When he consciousness, he said, "I make you witness and say that I have forgiven the one who hit me." The people asked, "Why did you do this?" Imam Maalik α said, "I had fear that a person from the family of Rasulullaah ε will go to Jahannam on account of me and I will have to meet Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  in condition had great regret upon this."

1285. It is said that upon this action of Ja'far, the Khalifah Mansur wanted Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  to take Qisaas. Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  said, "I seek the protection of Allaah, as he was lifting the whip to hit me, at that very moment I forgave him on account of being the relative of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ."

1286. Ayyaash  $\rho$  said, "If Hadhrat Abu Bakr  $\tau$ , Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$  and Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$  had to come to me for some need, then before the two, I would have begun with the need of Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$  because he was a relative of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . If I was given some beloved from the sky to the earth, then too I shall not place Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$  above them.

1287. Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$  was informed regarding the demise of one of the pure spouses. He immediately went into prostration. The people asked him as to why he prostrated at that time. He said, "Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, 'When you see a sign, then prostrate' and what greater sign can there be than the passing away of the wife of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ ?" (Abu Dawud, Tirmidhi)

1288. Hadhrat Abu Bakr  $\tau$  and Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$  used to go to Umm Ayman  $\rho$ . They said that the reason for them going was that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  used to go to meet Umm Ayman  $\rho$ . (Muslim)

1289. When Hadhrat Halimah Sa'diyyah  $\rho$  came to meet Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  he immediately laid out his shawl. After the demise of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , whenever she went to Hadhrat Abu Bakr  $\tau$  and Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$ , they used to do the same and they used to fulfil her needs.

### Section 5

\*:13

# Honouring and Following the Sahabah $\psi$ is Honour and Well-Wishing for Rasulullaah $\epsilon$

part of honouring and well-wishing for Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  that a person loves to honour and wish well for the Sahabah w and adopt well-wishing for them as well. Their right should be recognized, they should be praised, forgiveness should be sought for them, and one should side with them in issues wherein there is a difference of opinion. One should have enmity for their enemies. One should not pay attention at all to the historians, ignorant narrators, deviated sects. innovators. those who criticize Sahabah w. and those who narrate only those aspects wherein they differed. It is better to form a good interpretation of these things; the best path should be sought for them because they are worthy of not being remembered in a bad way. Their faults should not be picked out, in fact, their piety and good habits should be remembered and silence should be adopted on other matters.

1290. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "When ill is spoken about my Sahabah  $\psi$ , then stop your tongues from evil." Allaah j says:

Muhammad & is Allaah's Rasool and those with him (the Sahabah \( \psi \)) are stern against the Kuffaar and (yet) compassionate among themselves. You will see them sometimes bowing (in Ruku), sometimes prostrating (in Sajdah, always) seeking Allaah's bounty and His pleasure. (Surah Fatah (Victory), 29)

Allaah j says:

# وَ السَّبِقُوْنَ الْأَوَّلُوْنَ مِنَ الْمُهْجِرِيْنَ وَ الْأَنْصَارِ Allaah is pleased with the first to lead the way from the Muhaajireen, the Ansaar

(Surah Taubah (Repentance), 100)

Allaah j says: لَقَدْ رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنِ الْمُؤْمِنِيْنَ اِذْ يُبَايِعُوْنَكَ تَحْتَ الشَّجَرَةِ

Allaah was well pleased with the Mu'mineen (the Sahabah  $\psi$ ) when they pledged their allegiance to you (O Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ ) beneath the tree (at Hudaybiyyah). (Surah Fatah (Victory), 18)

In another place, Allaah j said about them fulfilling their promise:

Among the Mu'mineen there are men who are true to the pledge they vow to Allaah (that they will fight in Jihaad until they die). Of them is he who has fulfilled his pledge (and has been martyred), and he who is waiting (to be martyred). They have not changed (their resolve) in the least (unlike the Munaafiqeen).

(Surah Ahzaab (The Armies), 23)

# Rasulullaah $\epsilon$ Commands that Hadhrat Abu Bakr $\tau$ and Hadhrat Umar $\tau$ be Followed after his Demise

1291. Hadhrat Hudhayfah bin Yamaan  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Follow Abu Bakr and Umar after me." (Tirmidhi, Ibn Maajah, Ahmad)

- 1292. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "My Sahabah are like stars. Whomever among them you follow, you will be guided."
- 1293. Hadhrat Anas  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "The example of my Sahabah  $\psi$  is like that of salt in food. The food will never be correct and complete without salt."
- 1294. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Fear Allaah regarding my Sahabah and do not make them a target of criticism after me. Whoever loves my Sahabah, he loved them on account of my love and whoever hates them, he has hated them on account of enmity for me. Whoever harms the Sahabah, he has harmed me and he who has given me trouble has harmed (dis-pleased) Allaah. Those who harm will soon be caught."
- 1295. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Do not be insolent regarding my Sahabah and do not rebuke them. Even if any of you spends gold equal to Mount Uhud in the path of Allaah, you will not get the reward equal my Sahabi spending a Ritl (a measure), or even half of it in the path of Allaah." (Bukhari, Muslim)
- 1296. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "He who swears my Sahabah, the curses of Allaah, the angels and all the people will come upon him and the obligatory and optional worship of such a wretched person is not accepted in the court of Allaah."
- 1297. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Whenever the Sahabah are mentioned, then listen attentively."
- 1298. Hadhrat Jaabir  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "My companions enjoy a rank above that of all people except the Ambiyaa  $\iota$  and the Rasuls. Four from them are loved only on account of me; i.e. Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthmaan and Ali, my other companions are not any less in goodness."

1299. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "He who loves Umar, he has loved me and he who has hatred for Umar, it is as though he has rebelled against me."

1300. Hadhrat Maalik bin Anas and others said, "He who has hatred for the Sahabah and swore them, such a person has no share in the booty of the Muslims. The proof of this is taken from the verse:

Those who come after them (after the Muhaajireen and Ansaar ought to) say, "O our Rabb! Forgive us and our brothers (the Sahabah \(\psi\)) who passed before us with Imaan. And do not place any impurity (ill-feelings) in our hearts against those who have Imaan. O our Rabb! Indeed You are the Most Forgiving, Most Merciful." (Surah Hashar (The Exile), 10)"

1301. Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  said, "He who angers the Sahabah leaves the fold of Islaam"

1302. Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Mubaarak  $\alpha$  explains: "He who has two characteristics will be saved: One is truthfulness and the other is love for the companions of Muhammad  $\epsilon$ ."

1303. Ayyub Sakhtiyaani  $\alpha$  explains: "It can be said regarding the one who has love for Hadhrat Abu Bakr  $\tau$  that he has undoubtedly kept Deen established. The path of truth will be clarified upon the one who has love for Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$ . The one who loves Hadhrat Uthmaan  $\tau$  becomes one that acquires light from the light of Allaah j. He who loves Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$  has caught a firm handhold. He who praises

the Sahabah of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  has become pure of hypocrisy. (As for) he who mentions any of their faults, becomes an innovator, and opposes the Sunnah and the pious predecessors, I fear that none of his good deeds may reach the heavens until he does not create friendship from the heart with all the Sahabah  $\psi$  and his heart is not made clean and safe."

1304. Hadhrat Khaalid bin Sa'eed  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "O people, know well that I am pleased with Abu Bakr. O people, I am pleased with Umar, Uthmaan, Ali, Talha, Zubayr, Sa'd, Abdur Rahman bin Auf, Abu Ubaydah; you must recognize them too. O people, Allaah has forgiven the companions of Badr and the companions of Hudaybiyyah. O people, on account of me, honour my Sahabah  $\psi$ , my family, and son in-laws. It should not be that any of these pure personalities should seek recompense on the day of reckoning for oppression you committed against them because this is such oppression that will not be forgiven on the day of reckoning."

1305. One person said to Mu'aafa bin Imraan, "What is the difference in virtue between Umar bin Abdul Aziz and Mu'awiyah  $\tau$ ?" Hearing this, Mu'aafa became angry and said, "Do not ever compare the Sahabah  $\psi$  to those that came after them. The virtue that Hadhrat Mu'awiyah  $\tau$  has, others do not. Hadhrat Mu'awiyah  $\tau$  was a Sahabi, brother-in-law of Nabi  $\epsilon$ , scribe of revelation and protector of revelation."

1306. A funeral was brought to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  refused to perform the Janaazah Salaah because that person had hatred for Hadhrat Uthmaan  $\tau$ .

Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "Allaah is displeased with him on account of his enmity and hatred for Uthmaan." (Tirmidhi)

- 1307. In order to show the virtue of the Ansaar, Rasulullaah ε said, "Overlook their errors and shortcomings and accept their good." (Bukhari, Muslim)
- 1308. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Practice upon my advice regarding my companions and my in-laws. Protect my statement. He who remembers my talk regarding them will be protected and safe in this world, but he who does not practice upon my advice, remember, he is out of the protection of Allaah and he who comes out of the protection of Allaah will be caught by Him very quickly."
- 1309. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "He who honours the Sahabah  $\psi$ , according to my advice, he will be in my protection on the day of Qiyaamah."
- 1310. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  also said, "He who does not honour and respect them (the Sahabah  $\psi$ ) will not be able to come to me at the pond on the day of Qiyaamah. Not only this, but he will be so far from me that he will not even be able to see me."
- 1311. Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  narrates: "Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was the teacher of character. It is through Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  that Allaah blessed us with guidance. He made Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  a mercy to the worlds. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would go to Jannatul Baqee' when half the night would pass and he would make du'aa' of forgiveness for the people of Baqee' as though he was bidding farewell to them. Allaah had commanded him with this and he  $\epsilon$  was commanded to love those who love them and to be enemies of those who are their enemies.

- 1312. Hadhrat Ka'b  $\tau$  narrated that the companions of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  will have the good fortune of intercession on the day of Qiyaamah.
- 1313. Hadhrat Ka'b  $\tau$  requested Mughirah bin Naufal  $\tau$  to intercede for him on the day of Qiyaamah.
- 1314. Hadhrat Sahl bin Abdullaah Tustari narrates that he who does not have love for the Sahabah  $\psi$  and does not honour the laws of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , he does not have Imaan in the Rasul and he is not a complete believer.

#### Section 6

# Honour for the Blessed items Associated with Rasulullaah ε

It is also part of the honour of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  that he honours everything associated to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . For example, the gatherings of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , the home of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , Makkah Mukarramah, Madinah Munawwarah and all other places where Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  placed his hands or whatever was famously linked to him.

- 1315. Safiyyah bint Najd narrates that Abu Mahdhurah's hair was so long that if he sat down and he opened it, it would touch the ground. Someone said to him, "Why do you not cut it?" He replied, "How can I cut it, Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  had touched it on one occasion."
- 1316. There was a few hairs of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  in the hat of Hadhrat Khaalid bin Waleed  $\tau$ . Coincidentally, this hat fell down during a battle. Hadhrat Khaalid  $\tau$  made great effort to find it. During this struggle, a number of companions were martyred. When the Sahabah  $\psi$  objected, because of these deaths, and asked, he said "That hat has no importance on its own, but the hair of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  was in it. I did not undertake all this difficulty for the hat, but for the sake of this hair, that it should not fall into the hands of someone and I will be deprived of its blessings."
- 1317. Hadhrat Ibn Umar  $\tau$ 's habit was to go to the pulpit and touch the place where Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  used to deliver the Khutbah from and then rub his hands over his face.

- 1318. Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  would not mount his conveyance in Madinah Munawwarah, saying, "I am ashamed of trampling that ground upon which Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is resting with my conveyance."
- 1319. It is explained that he gifted many horses to Imam Shafi'i  $\alpha$ . Imam Shafi'i  $\alpha$  said, "Keep a horse for yourself." He gave the same reply.
- 1320. Abu Abdur Rahman narrates from Ahmad bin Fadlawiyyah (a famous archer of his time) that he never touched the bow that was with Rasulullaah & without wudhoo.
- 1321. A person spoke ill of the land of Madinah Munawwarah in front of **Imam Maalik**  $\alpha$ . Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  commanded that he be lashed thirty times and that he should be imprisoned despite being a noble of his nation. He said, "Actually, the neck of this person should be chopped because he calls the land in which Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is buried as impure."
- 1322. It is narrated in an authentic Hadith that Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "He who innovates something in Madinah Munawwarah, or he gives protection to an innovator, the curse of Allaah and His angels and all the people are upon him. Allaah will not accept his obligatory or optional worship." (Bukhari, Muslim)
- 1323. Jahjah Ghifaari took the staff of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  from Hadhrat Uthmaan  $\tau$  and he wanted to break it by hitting it on his knee but the other people made a noise and stopped him. However, only on account of trying to do something like this, he got such a punishment that on that place of his knee,

a sore erupted and it became bigger and an ulcer developed. On account of this, his leg had to be cut and was sent to hell.

- 1324. Rasulullaah ε said, "He who stood in the shade of my pulpit and spoke a lie, he should make (know) his abode (is) in hell." (Abu Dawud, Ibn Maajah)
- 1325. When Abul Fadl Jauhari neared the homes of the city of Madinah Munawwarah on his journey there, he came down from his conveyance and recited the following lines while going forward:

لما رأينا رسم من لم يدع لنا فؤادا لعرفان الرسوم و لا لبا نزلنا عن الاكواز نمشي كرامة لمن باع عنه ان نلم به ركبا "When we saw the signs of this noble personality, he who did not leave the recognition of the signs to our intelligence, therefore, for the sake of the honour of this beloved, we cannot tolerate sitting on our conveyances in this city and we walk."

1326. It is said that when some students reached Madinah Munawwarah, they recited the following lines:

رفع الحجاب لنا فلاح لناظر فمر تقطع دونه الاوهام وإذا المطى بنا بلغن محمدا فظهور هن على الرجال حرام قربننا من خير من وطئ الثرى ولها علينا حرمة وذمام

"The veil has been lifted for us, then the moon shone so much in front that all doubts were removed from those who saw that. When our conveyances reached close to

Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , then his back was forbidden for the palanquin and conveyance. These conveyances brought us close to that personality that is more virtuous than the entire creation.

Therefore, it is necessary for us to honour these conveyances as well."

It is narrated about some Mashayikh that they went for Hajj on foot. When they were asked about it, they said, "Can a hungry slave come mounted to the house of his master? If I had to come walking on my head (I would have, but) I would not have taken a step mounted."

Qaadhi Iyaadh α narrates that the place that was inhabited by revelation. The place where Hadhrat Jibreel v and Hadhrat Mikaa'eel v came down, the place from where Ruh al Amin and other angels went up, the place whose land echos with the sounds of Tasbeeh and glorification, the place where the guide of the Ambiyaa ı spent most of his life, the place from where the Sunnah and Islaam was spread and propagated, the place where those Masaajid and homes where the Oneness of Allaah and Islaam was taught and all the items of this area bear witness, the place where Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  lived, the places from where the munificence of Nubuwwah spread and the light of Risaalat removed the darkness, The place that had the good fortune of being the burial place of Rasulullaah ε, the place where Rasulullaah ε is buried today, this place is indeed worthy of honour and respect.

یا دار خیر المرسلین ومن به هدی الانام وخص بالآیات عندی لاجلك لوعة وصبابة وتشوق متوقد الجمرات وعلی عهد ان ملات محاجری من تكلم الجدران والعرصات لاعفرن مصون شیبی بینها من كثرة التقبیل والرشفات لولا العوادی والاعادی زرتها ابدا ولو سحبا علی الوجنات لكن ساهدی من حفیل تجیتی لقیطین تلك الدار والحجرات اركی من المسك المفتق نفحة تغشاه بالأصال والبكرات و تخصه بز و اكی الصلوات و نوامی التسلیم و البر كات

"O the home of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and those things associated to him, from which people acquired guidance and the miracles that occurred on them. I have great love and such enthusiasm whose coals are enlightened. By Allaah, my enthusiasm is that I should fill my eyes all the time with these fields and

walls, I should kiss these places so much that my black beard should become dusty. If the places continue to come and there is no difficulty in the path, then I shall visit these places continuously even if my cheeks were to become dusty. However, soon I shall send Salaat and Salaam as a gift, which is wrapped in musk and which is covered morning and evening. It is distinguished with its blessings from those that recite Durud and Salaam.

### Chapter 4

# The Command to Send Salaah and Salaam, its Obligatory Status, its Obligation and Virtue

Verily Allaah and His angels send Salaah on the Nabi ε (meaning that Allaah showers special mercies on him and the angels pray for him). O you who have Imaan! Send salaah and Salaam to him (pray to Allaah to shower special mercies and peace on him by reciting the various forms of "Salaah and Salaam" reported in the Ahadeeth). (Surah Ahzaab (The Armies), 56)

Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$  narrates that this means that Allaah j and the angels send blessings upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Some are of the view that it means that Allaah j sends mercy upon him.

Mubarrid said that the lexical meaning of 'Salaah' is 'to have mercy'. Therefore, the purport of the verse will be that Allaah j has mercy and the angels request Allaah j to show mercy.

- 1327. The meaning of 'Salaah' as explained in the Hadith is 'he who sits in the Masjid waiting for Salaah, the angels make du'aa' for him so, "O Allaah, have mercy on him and forgive him".' (Bukhari, Muslim)
- 1328. Qushayri said that 'Salaah from Allaah' means 'increase in the honour and respect of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ '.
- 1329. Abul Aaliyah said, "The meaning of this will be that, in the gathering of the angels, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is praised and the angels send Durud and make du'aa' for him."

- 1330. Qaadi Abul Fadhl  $\alpha$  explains that in the Hadith regarding Durud upon his being, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  has explained the clear difference between 'Salaah' and 'blessings'. This is clear proof that the words of both are different.
- 1331. The research of Qaadhi Abu Bakr bin Bukayr regarding the recitation of Durud and Salaam from the servants shows that the objective of the revelation of this verse was to command the Sahabah  $\psi$  to send Durud and Salaam upon the being of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Similarly, after the era of the Sahabah  $\psi$ , the people are commanded to recite Durud and Salaam upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  when presenting themselves at the Raudah. There are three forms of reciting Durud and Salaam explained:
- 1. 'May there be peace upon him ε and his ε companions', 'Salaam' is a root word. E.g. *ladhaadh* and *ladhaadha*
- 2. The second form is 'May peace be upon those who protect him  $\varepsilon$ , those who are ahead in every aspect regarding Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ , those who are his friends'. At this point, 'Salaam' will be the name of Allaah.
- 3. The third form is that 'Salaam' has the meaning of 'obedience' and 'acceptance'. The following verse denotes this:

فَلَا وَ رَبِّكَ لَا يُؤْمِنُوْنَ حَتَّى يُحَكِّمُوْكَ فِيْمَا شَجَرَ بَيْنَهُمْ ثُمَّ لَا يَجِدُوْا فِيْ اَنْفُسِهِمْ حَرَجًا مِّمَّا قَضَيْتَ وَ يُسلِّمُوْا تَسْلِيْمًا 6 ° ° °

Never! By the oath of your Rabb, they cannot have Imaan until they make you (O Muhammad  $\varepsilon$ ) judge their disputes and (until) they do not find any dissatisfaction in that which you decide and (until) they accept (your decision) with complete submission (with happiness.)

(Surah Nisaa (The Women), 65)

### The Command to Send Durud upon Rasulullaah ε

Remember, on the whole, it is obligatory to send Durud upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . This is not confined to a specific time because Allaah j gave the command to recite Durud and the Imams and scholars have interpreted this to be compulsory. They are unanimous upon this.

According to Abu Ja'far Muhammad bin Jarir Tabari  $\alpha$ , practising on the verse will be preferred. He narrated the unanimity of the scholars regarding this. He said this regarding the recitation of it more than once. The Waajib regarding which the difficult condition falls away and through which sin is necessitated if left out, falls away by reciting it once. For example, it is compulsory to testify to Nubuwwah once, beyond this will be preferable and liked. It should be known as a sign of Islaam and of the Muslims.

Qaadhi Abul Hasan bin Qassaar  $\alpha$  explains: "It is famous among our companions that it is compulsory upon man to recite Durud. If a person recites Durud once during his lifetime, the obligation will fall off."

Imam Shafi'  $\alpha$  and his companions are of the view that the command to recite Durud that Allaah j and His Rasul  $\epsilon$  has given is only obligatory during Salaah. They explained that Durud is not compulsory on other occasions (besides this).

Imam Abu Ja'far Tabari  $\alpha$  and Imam Tahawi  $\alpha$  have narrated the consensus of all the scholars that it is

not compulsory to recite Durud upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  during Salaah.

Imam Shafi'  $\alpha$  has a different view on this issue. He says that he who does not recite Durud after Tashahhud and before making Salaam, then his Salaah will be nullified. Furthermore, it is not permissible to recite Durud upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  before Tashahhud.

This is the personal view of Imam Shafi'  $\alpha$ . No luminary said this before him. Due to this, a group of scholars have contested his view, stating that it is contrary to the view of the early day scholars. Muhammad bin Jarir Tabari  $\alpha$  and Tahawi  $\alpha$  etc. are among those that contest the view of Imam Shafi'  $\alpha$ .

Abu Bakr bin Mundhir  $\alpha$  explains that it is preferable for whoever performing Salaah to recite Durud upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . If someone left Durud out, the Salaah will be done according to Imam Maalik  $\alpha$ , Sufyaan Thauri  $\alpha$ , other scholars of Madinah, and the people of Kufa. This is the view of all the people of knowledge.

There is a narration from Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  and Sufyaan Thauri  $\alpha$  that it is preferable to recite Durud at the end of Tashahhud, and that the person who leaves it out in Tashahhud will be a sinner. Imam Shafi'  $\alpha$  is alone in the view that the person who leaves out Durud Sharif in Tashahhud must repeat the Salaah. Ishaaq said that the person who intentionally leaves out Durud Sharif should repeat the Salaah. However, if a person forgetfully leaves it out, he will not have to repeat the Salaah.

Abu Muhammad bin Abi Zayd narrated a view from Muhammad bin Mawaaz that it is obligatory to send Durud

upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . However, Abu Muhammad explains this view is not a separate obligation. It is not a part of Salaah. This is supported by the view of Muhammad bin Abdul Hakeem. However, Ibn Qassaar and Abdul Wahhaab say that Muhammad bin Mawaaz was of the view that it is obligatory to recite Durud Sharif in Salaah and this is the view of Imam Shafi'  $\alpha$ .

Abu Ya'la Abdi Maaliki has narrated three views from Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  about the recitation of Durud. Compulsory, Sunnah, and Preferable. However, Khattaabi  $\alpha$  and Imam Shafi'  $\alpha$  have taken him to task for this. Khattaabi  $\alpha$  says that it is not compulsory in Salaah and all the scholars besides Imam Shafi'  $\alpha$  are unanimous upon this. He said that he does not know of any narration to this effect from Imam Shafi'  $\alpha$ . The proof is that this is not from among the obligatory duties of Salaah. It is the practice of the pious that came before Imam Shafi'  $\alpha$  and they are unanimous upon it.

Imam Shafi'  $\alpha$  was criticized for this ruling. Whatever Imam Shafi'  $\alpha$  said regarding the recitation of Tashahhud, it was regarding the narration of Abdullaah bin Mas'ood  $\tau$ .

1332. This is the Tashahhud of Hadhrat Ibn Mas'ood  $\tau$ . (Bukhari, Muslim)

Regarding this, he (Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Mas'ood  $\tau$ ) says that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  taught him the Tashahhud. However, in the narration of Ibn Mas'ood  $\tau$ , there is no clear mention of reciting it during Salaah.

1333-1339. The different wording that is narrated of Durud Sharif that comes from other narrators, e.g. Abu Hurayrah  $\tau$ , Abu Musa Ash'ari  $\tau$ , Abdullaah bin

Zubayr  $\tau$ , it is clear from the narrations of these companions that it is compulsory to recite it during Salaah.

- 1340, 1341. Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$ , Hadhrat Abu Sa'eed Khudri  $\tau$  and Hadhrat Jaabir  $\tau$  said: "Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  taught us Tashahhud just as he would teach a verse of the Qur'aan". (Muslim)
  - 1342. Hadhrat Abu Sa'eed said the same.
- 1343, 1344. Hadhrat Ibn Umar  $\tau$  narrates: After placing us on the pulpit of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , Hadhrat Abu Bakr  $\tau$  and Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$  taught us the Tashahhud like the lesson of a book is taught."
- 1345. Another Hadith states that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "He who does not recite Durud upon me during Salaah, there is no Salaah for him." (Ibn Maajah)

Regarding this, Ibn Qassaar says that it means: 'The Salaah of the person who did not recite Durud upon me is incomplete', alternatively, 'there is no Salaah for the one who did not recite Durud upon me once during his life'. The scholars of Hadith have classified this narration as weak.

- 1346. Abu Ja'far has explained the narration of Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Mas'ood  $\tau$  like this: Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "He who performed Salaah and he did not recite Durud upon me and my household, his Salaah will not be accepted."
- 1347. Ad Daar Qutni explains that the authentic view is that which Abu Ja'far bin Muhammad bin Ali bin Husayn narrated; "If I perform such a Salaah in which there is no Durud upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and his household then, according to me, this Salaah is not done."

# In which Place is it Preferable to Recite Durud and Salaam?

There is encouragement given to recite Durud and Salaam in the Tashahhud of Salaah, as we explained that Durud Sharif is recite after Tashahhud in Salaah.

1348. Fudaalah Ibn Ubayd explains that Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  heard a person making du'aa' in Salaah but he did not send Durud upon Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ . Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "He was in a hurry." Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  then explained to him and others, "When you perform Salaah, first praise Allaah, then send Durud upon Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ . After this, ask Allaah for whatever you want." (Tirmidhi, Abu Dawud, Nasa'i)

One narration states: "Together with mentioning the greatness of Allaah, begin du'aa'". This is more authentic.

1349. Hadhrat Umar bin Khattaab  $\tau$  narrates that the du'aa' of man and his Salaah remains suspended between the earth and the sky and it is not accepted in the court of Allaah until Durud and Salaam is recited upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . (Tirmidhi)

1350-1352. Another Hadith of similar purport is narrated from Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$ . Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$  said: "Recite Durud upon the household of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , together with Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ."

The Hadith of Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$  comes from other narrators as well. Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Mas'ood  $\tau$  narrates: "When you ask Allaah for something, then praise Him in such a way that is in accordance to His Grandeur. Then recite Durud upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Then ask whatever you

want. This method is very effective in the acceptance of Du'aa"

1353. Hadhrat Jaabir  $\tau$  narrates that he heard from Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , "Do not make me like the travel utensil which is first filled with water, then it is kept aside and a person gets involved in looking after his goods and provisions. Then when he needs water, he drinks water from it, he performs wudhoo, and the water will be wasted otherwise. When you make du'aa', then recite Durud upon me in the beginning, recite Durud in the middle and do not be lazy. The last words you say should also be Durud."

1354-1357. Regarding the etiquettes of du'aa', Ibn Ataa mentioned that du'aa' has fundamentals, wings, causes, and a time. Therefore, if the du'aa' is in accordance to the fundamentals, then it will be accepted in the court of Allaah. If it is in accordance to the wings, it will be found to be powerful; if it is made at the appropriate time, it will be successful; if the means are seen to, it will reach completion. **The fundamentals of du'aa' are that a person's heart is present, soft, tranquil, humble, devoted and he makes du'aa' in this way.** The heart turns to Allaah. Truthfulness, and happiness work as veils. The morning time is very effective in the acceptance of du'aa'. A very successful means for the acceptance of du'aa' is to recite Durud upon Rasulullaah ε.

Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "The du'aa' made between two Duruds is never rejected."

Another Hadith states: "Before going to the heavens, every du'aa' is suspended by a veil and when the person making du'aa' recites Durud, the du'aa' begins to go up."

Hadhrat Khanash  $\alpha$  narrated the method of du'aa' of Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$ : "Whenever Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$  made du'aa', at the end of the du'aa', he said, 'O Allaah, accept my du'aa'. Then, 'O Allaah, I ask You to send Durud upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . He is Your Rasul and Servant, and Your Nabi. Send the best Durud from all the Duruds that You have sent upon a person until now. Ameen'."

From among the places wherein Durud should be sent upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , is when the name of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is taken, heard, or written. Durud should be recited upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  whenever his name is taken.

1358. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "May his nose be covered in dust, the one before whom I am mentioned and he does not send Durud upon me." (Tirmidhi)

Ibn Habib  $\alpha$  said that it is disliked (Makruh) to send Durud upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  when slaughtering. Suhnun  $\alpha$  said that it is disliked to recite Durud on an occasion of surprise. They say that it is permissible to recite Durud only with the intention of acquiring reward.

Asbagh narrated from Ibn Qaasim that there are two occasions where nothing but the remembrance of Allaah should be made. One is at the time of slaughter and the second is at the time of sneezing. On these occasions, after the remembrance of Allaah, not even Muhammad Rasulullaah ( $\epsilon$ ) should be said. If a person said this, it will be not be counted as Durud, together with the Dhikr of Allaah.

Ash hab said that it is not appropriate that Durud be regarded as Sunnah at the time of slaughter and at the time of sneezing.

1359. Nasa'i has narrated through Aus bin Aus that Rasulullaah ε said, "Recite Durud upon me in abundance on the day of Jumu'ah." (Nasa'i, Abu Dawud, Ibn Maajah)

One of the occasions for reciting Durud is upon entering the Masjid.

1360. Ibn Ishaaq bin Sha'baan narrates that when a person enters the Masjid he should first recite Durud upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and his household. He should request Allaah to send mercy and blessings upon the household of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and he should send Salaam to the family members of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . He should then recite,

اللهم اغفر لي ذنوبي و افتح لي أبواب رحمتك O Allaah, open for me the doors of Your Mercy

When leaving the Masjid, a person should do the same because the Masjid has been classified a place of His mercy and grace.

1361. Amr bin Dinaar explained that the verse: فاذا دخلتم بيوتا فسلموا على انفسكم النور

...When you enter any homes, then greet yourselves with a prayer (Salaam) that has been ordained by Allaah... (Surah Noor, 61)

Means: 'When you enter your homes, greet the people of the home. However, if the house is empty and no one lives there, then say:

السلام على النبي ورحمة الله وبركاته السلام علينا وعلى عباد الله الصالحين السلام على أهل البيت ورحمة الله وبركاته

Peace be upon the Nabi and Allaah's Mercy and Blessings. Peace be upon us and upon the righteous servants of Allaah.

### Peace be upon the househould (of Rasulullaah ε) and Allaah's Mercy and Blessings'

1362. Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$  says that here 'home' means 'Masaajid'.

1363. Nakha'i says that when there is no one in the Masjid say:

السلام على رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم Peace be upon Rasulullaah ε

And when there is no one at home say:

السلام علينا و على عباد الله الصالحين Peace be upon us and upon the righteous servants of Allaah.

1364. Alqamah explains: "When I enter the Masjid I say:

السلام عليك ايها النبي ورحمة الله وبركاته صلى الله وملائكته على محمد

Peace be upon you, O Nabi  $\epsilon$ , and Allaah's Mercy and Blessings. May Allaah and His angels send prayers for Muhammad  $\epsilon$ "

- 1365. It is narrated from Hadhrat Ka'b: "Recite upon entering and leaving the Masjid", but no Durud is mentioned.
- 1366. The proof of Ibn Sha'baan's statement that was mentioned regarding entering the Masjid is the narration of Hadhrat Faatimah  $\rho$ . She explains that reciting these Adhkaar was the habit of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . (Tirmidhi, Ibn Maajah, Ahmad)
- 1367. It is narrated from Abu Bakr bin Amr bin Hazm but he added the words, 'Salaam' and 'Rahmah'. The

difference of wording of this Hadith will be mentioned elsewhere.

1368. A Janaazah is also one of the occasions for reciting Durud. Abu Umamah  $\tau$  explains that it is Sunnah to recite Durud in the Janaazah Salaah. (Nasa'i)

From those places upon which Durud should be recited where it is narrated with Mutawaatir chains and no one opposed the recitation of Durud upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and his family, is in letters where Durud is written after Tasmiyah. In reality, this Durud was not present in the early times, but after the Banu Hashim became kings, it was made apparent for the first time. Then, this was brought into use in all the Islamic countries. Some also write the Durud at the end of the letter.

1369. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "He who writes Durud upon me in a book, then as long as my name is in that book, the angels with continue seeking forviness for that person."

One of the occasions where Durud should be recited is Salaah.

1370. Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Mas'ood  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "When any of you performs Salaah, then in Tashahhud (position) he should recite:

By reciting this, the mercy of Allaah and peace of Allaah will reach every servant." (Bukhari, Muslim)

It is also said regarding the occasion for reciting Durud is before Tashahhud.

- 1371. Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  narrates from Hadhrat Ibn Umar  $\tau$  that he used to say this when completing Tashahhud and he intended to make Salaam. In Mabssot, Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  classified it as preferable and he said, "It is my daily practice to recite Durud before Salaam."
- 1372. Hadhrat Ayesha  $\rho$  narrates that the following should be recited before Salaam:

The scholars explain that it is Mustahab to, when making Salaam during Salaah, make intention of (greeting) every pious person that is in the heavens and the earth, whether it is the angels, the human beings or the jinn.

Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  has explained in his book Al Majmu'a: "When the Imam says Salaam, I take it to be Mustahab for the Muqtadi to say,

السلام على النبي ورحمة الله وبركاته السلام علينا وعلى عباد الله الصالحين

## The Way in which Durud and Salaam Should be Presented

1373. Abu Humayd Saa'idi  $\tau$  narrates that the Sahabah  $\psi$  asked Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , "O Rasul of Allaah, how should we recite Durud upon you?" Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Recite it in this way:

اللهم صل على محمد وازواجه وذريته كما صليت على آل ابراهيم وبارك على محمد وازواجه وذريته كما باركت على آل ابراهيم انك حميد مجيد (Bukhari, Muslim)

1374. It is narrated from Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  that Abu Mas'ood Ansaari  $\tau$  said: "Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  taught us the following words to recite Durud,

اللهم صل على محمد وعلى آله كما صليت على آل ابر اهيم وبارك على محمد وعلى آله كما باركت على آل ابر اهيم في العالمين انك حميد مجيد

The words of Salaam are the same as narrated above. (Muslim)

1375. Hadhrat Ka'b bin Ujrah τ narrates that the words are:

اللهم صل على محمد وآل محمد كما صليت على ابر اهيم وبارك على محمد وآل محمد كما باركت على ابر اهيم انك حميد مجيد (Abu Dawud, Muslim)

1376. Uqbah bin Amr  $\tau$  narrated the following words: اللهم صل على محمد النبى الامى و على آل محمد . ابو داؤد ، مسلم

1377. Hadhrat Abu Sa'eed Khudri τ narrates, اللهم صل على محمد عبدك ورسولك (Bukhari)

1378. Hadhrat Ali bin Abi Taalib  $\tau$  narrates: "Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  taught me these words. He  $\epsilon$  said, 'Hadhrat Jibreel  $\upsilon$  taught them to me'. He  $\upsilon$  said, 'These words were revealed by Allaah:

اللهم صل على محمد و على آل محمد كما صليت على ابراهيم و على آل ابراهيم انك حميد مجيد اللهم بارك على محمد و على آل محمد كما باركت على ابراهيم و على آل ابراهيم انك حميد مجيد اللهم و ترحم على محمد و على آل محمد كما ترحمت على ابراهيم انك حميد مجيد اللهم و تحنن على محمد و على آل ابراهيم انك حميد مجيد اللهم و تحنن على محمد و على آل محمد كما تحننت على ابراهيم و على آل ابراهيم انك حميد مجيد اللهم و سلم على محمد و على آل محمد كما سلمت على ابراهيم انك حميد مجيد اللهم و على آل ابراهيم انك حميد مجيد اللهم و على آل ابراهيم انك حميد مجيد"

1379. Hadhrat Abu Hurayrah  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "He who desires that on the day of Qiyaamah he is given the reward of his good deeds in full, then he should recite this Durud upon me and my family whenever he recites Durud:

اللهم صل على محمد النبي وازواجه امهات المؤمنين وذريته واهل بيته كما صليت على ابراهيم انك حميد مجيد (Abu Dawud)

1380. Hadhrat Zayd bin Khaarijah Ansaari  $\tau$  narrates that he asked Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , "How should I recite Durud upon you?" Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "First perform Salaah. Then make du'aa' to Allaah with great humility and effort. Then recite Durud in the following words:

اللهم بارك على محمد و على آل محمد كما باركت على ابر اهيم انك حميد مجيد . النسائ ، احمد

1381. Salamah Kindi narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  taught Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$  to recite Durud in the following way:

اللهم داحى المدحوات وباري المسموكات اجعل شرائف صلواتك ونوامي بركاتك ورافة تحننك على محمد عبدك ورسواك الفاتح لما اغلق والخاتم لما سبق والمعلن الحق بالحق والدامغ لجيشات الاباطيل كما حمل فاضطلع بامرك لطاعتك مستوفزا في مرضاتك واعيا لوحيك حافظا لعهدك ماضيا على نفاذ امرك حتى اورى قبسا لقابس آلاء الله تصل باهله اسبابه به هديت القلوب بعد خوضات الفتن والإثم واتهج موضحات الاعلام ونائرات الاحكام ومنيرات الاسلام فهو امينك المامون وخازن علمك المخزون وشهيدك يوم الدين وبعيثك نعمة ورسولك بالحق رحمة اللهم افسح له في عدنك واجزه مضاعفات الخير من فضلك مهنئات له غير مكدرات من فوز ثوابك المحلول وجزيل عطائك المعلول اللهم اعلى على بناء الناس بناه واكرم مثواه لديك ونزله واتم له نوره واجزه من انبعاثك له مقبول الشهادة ومرضي المقالة ذا منطق عدل وخطة فصل وبرهان عظيم

1382. The following Durud is narrated from Hadhrat Ali τ:

ان الله وملائكته يصلون على النبي يايها الذين آمنوا صلوا عليه وسلموا تسليما لبيك اللهم ربي سعديك صلوات الله البر الرحيم والملائكة المقربين والنبيين والصديقين والشهداء والصالحين وما سبح لك من شيئ يا رب العالمين على محمد بن عبد الله خاتم النبيين وسيد المرسلين وامام المتقين ورسول رب العالمين الشاهد البشير الداعي اليك باذنك والسراج المنير وعليه السلام

1383. This Durud is narrated from Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Mas'ood  $\tau$ :

اللهم اجعل صلواتك وبركاتك ورحمتك على سيد المرسلين وامام المتقين وخاتم النبيين محمد عبدك ورسولك امام الخير ورسوله الرحمة اللهم ابعثه مقاما محمودا يغبطه فيه الاولون والآخرون اللهم صل على محمد و على آل محمد كما صليت على ابراهيم وآل ابراهيم انك حميد مجيد وبارك على محمد و على آل محمد كما باركت على ابراهيم و على آل ابراهيم انك حميد مجيد

1384. Hadhrat Hasan Basri  $\alpha$  explained: "Whoever desires to drink from the pond of Kauthar at the hands of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  should recite the following Durud:

اللهم صل على محمد و على آله و أصحابه واو لاده و از و اجه و ذريته و اهل بيته و اصهاره و انصاره و اشياعه و محبيه و امته و علينا معهم اجمعين يا ارحم الراحمين

1385. Ta'oos  $\alpha$  narrates that Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$  used to recite Durud in the following way:

اللهم تقبل شفاعة محمد الكبرى وارفع درجته العليا وآته سؤله في الآخرة واللهم تقبل شفاعة محمد الكبرى ما آتيت ابراهيم وموسى

1386. Hadhrat Wuhayb bin al Ward narrates that he used to recite the following Durud in his du'aa':

اللهم اعط محمدا افضل ما سألك لنفسه واعط محمدا افضل ما سالك له احد من خلقك واعط محمدا افضل ما انت مسؤول له الى يوم القيمة

1387. Hadhrat Ibn Mas'ood narrates, "Do you not know which Durud should be recited upon Rasulullaah?" he then recited the following Durud:

اللهم اجعل صلواتك ورحمتك وبركاتك على سيد المرسلين وامام المتقين وخاتم النبيين محمد عبدك ورسولك امام الخير وقائد الخير ورسول الرحمة اللهم ابعثه مقاما محمودا يغبطه فيه الاولون والآخرون اللهم صل على محمد وعلى آل محمد كما صليت على ابراهيم وآل ابراهيم انك حميد مجيد اللهم بارك على محمد وعلى آل محمد كما باركت على ابراهيم وعلى آل ابراهيم انك حميد مجيد

The famous Durud mentioned from the household has many narrators.

1388. Rasulullaah ε said, "Salaam is that which you have been taught." This Salaam is the one recited in Tashahhud:

السلام عليك ايها النبي ورحمة الله وبركاته السلام علينا وعلى عباد الله الصالحين 1389. The Tashahhud narrated from Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$  is as follows:

السلام على نبي الله السلام على انبياء الل ورسله السلام على رسول الله السلام على محمد بن عبد الله السلام علينا و على المؤمنين والمؤمنات من غاب منهم ومن شهد

ومن شهد اللهم اغفر لمحمد وتقبل شفاعته واغفر لاهل بيته واغفر لي ولوالدي وما ولدا وارحمهما

السلام علينا و على عباد الله الصالحين السلام عليك ابها النبي ورحمة الله ويركاته

In the narration of Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$ , du'aa' of forgiveness for Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was also made. The narration before, from Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$ , has du'aa' of mercy in it. However, besides the Marfoo' hadith of Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$ , no other narration mentions these words. In fact, Abu Umar bin Abdul Barr said that a person should not make du'aa' of mercy for Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , but he should request Salaah and blessings for Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and this is the specialty of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . However, du'aa' of mercy and forgiveness should be made for others.

1390. Abu Muhammad bin Abi Zayd narrates in the Hadith of Durud:

These words are not established from an authentic Hadith, but he presented the following words with proof from Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ :

السلام عليك ابها النبي ورحمة الله وبركاته

### The Virtue of Sending Durud upon Rasulullaah ε

- 1391. Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Umar  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "When you hear the Azaan from the Muezzin, then say as he says and then send Durud upon me because he who sends Durud upon me once, Allaah sends ten mercies upon him. Then make the du'aa' of Waseelah for me." Some scholars have explained that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Make du'aa' of Waseelah for me" because (Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said) "This is a part in Jannah that is not appropriate except for one person and I have hope that I shall be that person. Therefore, he who makes du'aa' of Waseelah for me, my intercession will be compulsory for him." (Bukhari, Muslim)
- 1392. Hadhrat Anas bin Maalik  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "He who recites Durud once upon me, Allaah sends ten Durud upon him, ten sins of his are wiped out and his rank is raised by ten." (Nasa'i)
- 1393. Another narration states that ten good deeds are recorded for him. (Ahmad, Tirmidhi)
- 1394. Hahdrat Anas  $\tau$  narrates that he heard Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  say, "Jibreel  $\upsilon$  called me and said that he who recites Durud once upon you, Allaah sends Durud upon him ten times and raises his rank by ten."
- 1395. Hadhrat Abdur Rahman bin Auf  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Jibreel  $\upsilon$  said that Allaah j said, 'He who sent Salaam to my Nabi, I (Allaah) shall send peace to him

and he who sends Durud upon My Nabi, similar quantity of mercy will come upon him'." (Ahmad)

- 1396. Hadhrat Abu Hurayrah  $\tau$  narrates the same. (Muslim)
- 1397. The same is narrated from Hadhrat Maalik bin Aus bin Hadathaan.
- 1398. The same is narrated from Hadhrat Ubaydullaah bin Abi Talha. (Nasa'i)
- 1399. Hadhrat Zayd bin al Habab narrates that Rasulullaah ε said, "Whoever recites this Durud:

اللهم صل على محمد وانزله المنزل المقرب عندك يوم القيمة My intercession will become compulsory for him." (Ahmad)

- 1400. Hadhrat Ibn Mas'ood  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "On the day of Qiyaamah, the person closest to me will be the one that sent the most Durud upon me." (Tirmidhi)
- 1401. Hadhrat Abu Hurayrah  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "In whichever book Durud is written upon me, as long as my name will remain in that book, the angels will continue making du'aa' of forgiveness for him."
- 1402. Hadhrat Aamir bin Rabi'ah narrates that Rasulullaah ε said, "As long as a person recites Durud upon me, the angels will continue making du'aa' of forgiveness for him. Now, the reciter can recite for long or, if he wants, he can complete (it) quickly." (Ibn Maajah, Ahmad)
- 1403. Hadhrat Ubayy bin Ka'b  $\tau$  narrates that after quarter of the night passed, it was the habit of

Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  to say, "O people, the time of trials and corruption has come. The signs of Qiyaamah will then begin. Death, with all its difficulty is waiting for you. Remember Allaah."

Ubayy bin Ka'b  $\tau$  says that he once said to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , "I recite Durud upon you in abundance but how much time should I stipulate for it?" Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "As much as you want." He asked, "A quarter of my time of worship?" Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "As much as you want, but if you recite for longer, it will be better for you." He said, "Half my time?" Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "As much as you want but if you increase it will be better for you." Ubayy bin Ka'b  $\square$  said, "Three quarter?" Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "As much as you want but if you increase it will be better for you." He said, "O Rasul of Allaah, shall I stipulate all my time for the recitation of Durud?" Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "This will suffice you, now your sins will be forgiven." (Tirmidhi)

1404. Abu Talha  $\tau$  narrates that once he went to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and he saw that the face of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was beaming with joy, he never saw Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  in such a way before. He asked Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  about this. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Who can stop me from being happy? Jibreel came to me now from Allaah with the glad tidings that if a person of the Ummah recites Durud once, Allaah and His angels will send Durud upon him ten times."

1405. Hadhrat Jaabir  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "He who says the following words after Azaan:

اللهم رب هذه الدعوة التامة والصلاة القائمة آت محمدا الوسيلة والفضيلة والفضيلة وعدته

My intercession will be compulsory for him on the day of Qiyaamah." (Bukhari)

1406. Hadhrat Sa'd bin Abi Waqqaas  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "He who says the following words after Azaan:

اشهد ان لا اله الا الله وحده لا شريك له وان محمدا عبده ورسوله رضيت بالله ربا و بالاسلام دينا

His sins will be forgiven." (Muslim)

- 1407. Ibn Wahb narrates from Rasulullaah ε: "He who recites Durud ten times upon me will get the reward equal to freeing a slave."
- 1408. From some narrations we learn that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Some people will be presented to me (and) I shall recognize them because of their abundant recitation of Durud upon me."
- 1409. Another narration states: "On the day of Qiyaamah, the one that will be saved from the difficulties will be the one that sent Durud abundantly upon me."
- 1410. Hadhrat Abu Bakr  $\tau$  narrates that recitation of Durud upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  removes sins just as cold water satiates a thirsty person, or water extinguishes fire and sending Salaam to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  earns the reward more than that of freeing a slave.

## Admonishment for not Reciting Durud upon Rasulullaah ε

- 1411. Hadhrat Abu Hurayrah  $\tau$  said, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said regarding a few people, "May their noses be covered in dust, those before whom Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is mentioned and they do not send Durud. May the nose of that person be covered in dust, the one upon whom Ramadhaan passes and he could not get forgiveness. May the nose of that person be covered in dust, the one who could not acquire Jannah despite the presence of his weak parents." The narrator says that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  also said, "One of them (the parents) has reached old age." (Tirmidhi)
- 1412. Another narration states that one day, Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  ascended one step of the pulpit and said, "Aameen." He ascended the second step and said, "Aameen." He ascended the third step and said, "Aameen." Hadhrat Mu'aadh  $\tau$  asked Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  about it and he replied, "Jibreel  $\upsilon$  came to me and said, 'O Muhammad, whoever does not recite Durud upon you when your name is taken, and then dies, will go to hell. Allaah will remove His mercy from him." Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "Aameen."
- 1413. Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "The worst miser is he before whom my name is taken and he does not send Durud upon me."
- 1414. Ja'far bin Muhammad narrates from his father that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Whoever does not send Durud upon me when my name is taken will be made to forget the path to Jannah." (Ibn Maajah)

- 1415. Hadhrat Ali bin Abi Taalib  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "The one who does not send Durud upon me when my name is taken is counted as a great miser."
- 1416. Hadhrat Abu Hurayrah  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "If people gather at a place and they separate without taking the name of Allaah and His Rasul  $\epsilon$ , then it is up to the pleasure of Allaah to punish them or to forgive them for this negligence." (Tirmidhi, Ahmad)
- 1417. Hadhrat Abu Hurayrah  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "He who forgets to recite Durud upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  will also be made to forget the path of Jannah."
- 1418. Hadhrat Qataadah  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "It is great oppression that a person does not recite Durud upon me when I am mentioned before him."
- 1419. Hadhrat Jaabir  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Those who gather and then disperse without reciting Durud and Salaam, they separate as though they have a stench of a corpse upon them."
- 1420. Hadhrat Abu Sa'eed Khudri  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Those who gather and did not recite Durud upon me, even though they enter Jannah, they will regret. The deprivation of not reciting Durud that they will experience there, they will continue to express." (Tirmidhi, Nasa'i)
- 1421. Abu Isa Tirmidhi has narrated from some scholars that if a person recites Durud in a gathering once, it will suffice him, no matter how long he stays there.

#### The one who Recites Durud and Rasulullaah ε

- 1422. Hadhrat Abu Hurayrah  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Whenever any person recites Durud upon me, Allaah returns my soul. Then I reply to his Salaam." (Abu Dawud, Ahmad)
- 1423. Hadhrat Abu Hurayrah  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "He who sends Durud upon me from in front of my grave, I hear it; and he who sends it from afar, it is brought to me"
- 1424. Hadhrat Ibn Mas'ood  $\tau$  narrates that the angels of Allaah search the earth for the one who recites Durud upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Then the angels take the Durud and Salaam and present it to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . (Nasa'i)
- 1425. The same is narrated from Hadhrat Abu Hurayrah τ. (Abu Dawud, Ahmad)
- 1426. Hadhrat Ibn Umar  $\tau$  narrates that he heard Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  saying: "Send Salaam in abundance upon me on the day of Jumu'ah because the Salaam is presented to me on the day of Jumu'ah."
- 1427.One-narration states: "When the person reciting Durud upon me completes sending Durud, then it is presented to me immediately. (Ibn Maajah)
- 1428-1434. Hadhrat Hasan bin Ali  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Send Durud upon me from wherever you are because your Durud is conveyed to me." Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$  narrates that whichever person of the Immah sends Durud upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , it is conveyed to him  $\epsilon$ . Some

Sahabah  $\psi$  narrate that when a person recites Durud, the name of the person is taken and it is conveyed to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .

Hadhrat Hasan bin Ali  $\tau$  narrates, "When you enter the Masjid, then send Durud upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  because **Rasulullaah**  $\epsilon$  said, 'Do not make my house a place of celebrating Eid, nor should you make your houses into graveyards. The Durud you recite upon me is conveyed to me from wherever you are'."

Hadhrat Sulaymaan bin Saheem narrates that one night he saw Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  in a dream and asked him, "O Rasul of Allaah, people come to you and recite Durud upon you. Do you know if the Durud is sent to you?" Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "Yes, in fact, I also reply to the Salaam."

Ibn Shihaab  $\alpha$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Recite Durud upon me during the enlightened day and enlightened night (Friday) because the Durud of this time is immediately brought to me. **The earth does not consume the bodies of the Ambiyaa 1."** Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Whichever Muslim sends Durud upon me, an angel brings it to me with the name of the person who recited it and he says that a particular person says such is for you  $\epsilon$ ."

# Difference of Opinion Regarding Sending Durud upon non-Ambiyaa'

Qaadhi  $\alpha$  explains that the general scholars are unanimous that it is permissible to send Durud upon the other Ambiyaa'  $\iota$  besides Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .

1435 - 1441. Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$  narrates that it is not permissible to send Durud upon a Nabi other than Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . How, then, is it possible to send Durud upon someone who is not a Nabi?

Hadhrat Sufyaan said that it is Makruh to send Durud upon one who is not a Nabi.

I saw this ruling in a letter of some pious people that the research of Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  on this issue is that besides Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , it is not permissible to send Durud upon the other Ambiyaa  $\iota$ . However, this view of his is not famous, but contrary to this, the letter of Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  is written in Mabsut Yahya bin Ishaaq, "I take it to be Makruh to send Durud upon those that are not Ambiyaa  $\iota$  and it is not permissible for us to turn away from that which we have been commanded"

Yahya bin Yahya says that he does not agree with this view of Imaam Maalik  $\alpha$ , but he says that Durud can be recited upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and the other Ambiyaa'  $\iota$ . In fact, it can be read upon others too. He draws proof for his ruling from the Hadith of Hadhrat Ibn Umar  $\tau$  in which, besides Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , encouragement is given to recite Durud upon the family of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and the pure spouses as well.

Abu Imraan al Faasi's narration from Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$  states that it is Makruh to recite Durud upon someone that is not a Nabi. The people before also practised this.

Abdur Razzaaq narrates from Hadhrat Abu Hurayrah  $\tau$  that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Send Durud upon the Ambiyaa  $\iota$  and the Rasuls because Allaah deputed and sent them as He did with me."

The scholars say that all the narrations of Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$  on this issue have a weak chain of narration.

Salaah: In Arabic, this word is used in the meaning of 'mercy' and 'du'aa'. In terms of the consensus of the Ummah and the authentic Ahadith it is correct. Therefore, as long as it is not proven, there will be no prohibitive command to use this word.

Allaah j says in the Qur'aan:

It is He Who showers mercy on you, and so do His Angels (pray for your forgiveness), so that He may remove you from a multitude of darkness (kufr, Shirk, sin and bring you) into light (Imaan and Islaam). He is always Most Merciful towards the Mu'mineen.

(Surah Ahzaab (The Armies), 43)

خُذْ مِنْ اَمْوَ الهِمْ صَدَقَةً تُطَهِّرُهُمْ وَ تُزَكِّيْهِمْ بِهَا وَصَلِّ عَلَيْهِمْ ١٠ إِنَّ صَلَا عَلَيْهِمْ ١٠ إِنَّ صَلَوتَكَ سَكَنُ لَّهُمْ ١٠ وَ الله سَمِيْعٌ عَلِيْمٌ ١٠١٠٠

103. (O Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ ) Take charity from their wealth by which you may purify and cleanse them, and pray for them. Indeed your prayer for them is a source of comfort for them (because they know that your du'aa is accepted).

Allaah is All Hearing, All Knowing.

(Surah Taubah (Repentance), 103)

157. These (people who are patient in difficulties and who abstain from ingratitude) are the ones on whom the combined and special mercies (bounties) of Allaah descend and who are rightly guided.

(Surah Baqarah (The Bull), 157)

1442. Rasulullaah ε said:

"O Allaah, send mercy upon Abu Aufa and his family and children"

Whenever people brought Zakaat to Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ , he would make du'aa', "O Allaah, have mercy upon the family of (he would mention their names)." (Bukhari, Muslim)

1443 - 1446. The words of another Hadith state:

O Allaah, bless Muhammad, his wives, and his offspring The following words are narrated in another Hadith:

Bless the family of Muhammad

Some scholars state that 'family' means 'those who follow Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ '. However, some have also said that the 'Ummah' is meant and some feel that it is the 'household of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ '. Some say that 'family' means 'followers, group, and tribe'. Some scholars say that the 'progeny of a person' refers to the 'family of his male offspring'. Some said that the 'people of the nation of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ ' are meant and the 'family of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ ' refers to 'those people for whom it is forbidden to take Zakaat'.

Hadhrat Anas  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was asked, "Who are the family of Muhammad?" Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Every abstinent person."

Hadhrat Hasan Basri  $\alpha$  says that the 'family of Muhammad  $\epsilon$ ' means 'the being of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  himself' because Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  says in a Durud himself:

اللهم اجعل صلواتك وبركاتك على آل محمد "O Allaah, have blessings and favours on the family of Muhammad"

Saying this, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  meant his own being because it cannot be thought regarding Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  that he would leave an obligation and start doing something optional. This is because it is obligatory to recite Durud upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and this is proven from the statement of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , as he said:

1447. "O Allaah, grant him a beautiful voice like one of the beautiful voices of the family of Dawud." (Bukhari, Muslim) 1448-1451. Hadhrat Abu Humayd Saa'idi  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  used to recite the following Durud:

اللهم صل على محمد وازواجه وذريته  $^{\circ}$ O Allaah, send mercy upon the Muhammad  $\varepsilon$ , his spouses, and progeny.  $^{\circ}$ 

The narration of Hadhrat Ibn Umar  $\tau$  narrates that he used to send Durud upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , Hadhrat Abu Bakr  $\tau$  and Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$ . Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  narrates this in his book Mu'atta. This is narrated by Yahya Andalusi. Other narrations also state, "Hadhrat Ibn Umar  $\tau$  used to make du'aa' for Hadhrat Abu Bakr  $\tau$  and Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$ ."

Ibn Wahb  $\tau$  narrates from Hadhrat Anas bin Maalik  $\tau$ : "We used to make du'aa' for our brothers during their absence and we used to say, "O Allaah, send Salaam from Your side upon those servants of Yours that wake up at night and fast in the day for You."

Qaadhi Iyaadh  $\alpha$  explains: "These are the statements that are narrated from the research scholars. However, my inclination is towards Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  and Sufyaan Thauri  $\alpha$ . Their views can be concluded to be from the narrations of Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$ . Most of the jurists and the scholars of belief have supported it; Durud should not be sent to those that are not Ambiyaa  $\iota$ . This is specific with the Ambiyaa  $\iota$ . This is in order to increase their honour. Just as when Allaah is glorified and His praises are mentioned when He is remembered, those other than Allaah are never included in it. In the same way, Salaah and Salaam is specific with Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , not with the other Ambiyaa  $\iota$ . No one can be a partner to him in this. Allaah j said:

...Send Salaah and Salaam to him (pray to Allaah to shower special mercies and peace on him by reciting the various forms of "Salaah and Salaam" reported in the Ahadeeth).

(Surah Ahzaab (The Armies), 56)

Besides the Ambiyaa ı, forgiveness, and joy is mentioned with the other Imams.

Allaah j says:

"... O our Rabb! Forgive us and our brothers (the Sahabah ψ) who passed before us with Imaan. And do not place any impurity (ill-feelings) in our hearts against those who have Imaan. O our Rabb! Indeed You are the Most Forgiving, Most Merciful."

(Surah Hashar (The Exile), 10)

And Allaah j says:

Allaah is pleased with the first to lead the way from the Muhaajireen, the Ansaar, and those who followed them with sincerity and they are pleased with Him. He has prepared for them such Jannaat beneath which rivers flow, in which they shall live forever. This is the ultimate success. (This verse clearly illustrates the great status of the Sahabah  $\psi$  and it will therefore be wrong to revile them.) (Surah Taubah (Repentance), 100)

At this point, it must be remembered that it was not common among the people of before, as Abu Imraan explained, that they invented this for some of the Imams of the Rafidi and Shi'a. They included the Ambiyaa  $\upsilon$  in Durud and they placed their Imams on the same level as Rasulullaah  $\epsilon.$ 

Besides this, emulation of the innovators is also found in it. The shari'ah has opposed this and it has made it compulsory upon us to oppose them especially because they have held firmly onto it.

As far as reciting Durud upon the family of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  and his spouses is concerned, it can be said to follow the Durud upon Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  and can be attributed to him  $\varepsilon$ , not specifying it with any particular person.

The scholars explain that the Durud that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  sent upon certain people stands in place of Du'aa'. It turns our attention to the fact that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  turns to these people with full mercy. In this Durud, the honour for the Ambiyaa  $\iota$  – which is their specialty – is not meant and proof can be drawn from the following verse:

Do not make the calling of the Rasool  $\varepsilon$  among yourselves like your calling to each other (when Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  calls any of you, you are obliged to respond and do not have the choice of ignoring the call as you have when anyone else calls).

(Surah Noor (Celestial Light), 63)

Similarly, the du'aa' that is made for Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  should not be like the du'aa' made for others. This is correct.

*: : : :	- Ash Shifaa	(Volume Two)		<del>\ \ \\</del>
----------	--------------	--------------	--	-------------------

Imam Abu Muzaffar Safarini  $\alpha$  has mentioned this and Hadhrat Ibn Abdul Barr  $\alpha$  has the same view.

### **Section 8**

# Virtue of Visiting the Raudah of Rasulullaah ε and Presenting oneself There

## Visiting the Raudah is the Sunnah of Rasulullaah E.

Everyone is unanimous upon this and they all state its virtue. The Muslims have been encouraged towards this as well.

1452-1455. Hadhrat Ibn Umar  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "My intercession will be compulsory for he who visited my grave." Hadhrat Anas bin Maalik  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "He who presents himself in Madinah Munawwarah to visit me, with the intention of acquiring reward, has come into my protection and his rank has been raised and I shall intercede for him on the day of Qiyaamah."

It is explained in another Hadith that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Whoever visits me after my demise is as though he visited me during my life."

If anyone said to Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  that he visited the grave of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , he would say it is Makruh. However, there is a difference of opinion about what he meant by this.

1456. Some scholars have explained that he (Imam Maalik) disliked the wording 'visiting'. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "Allaah sends curses upon those who visit the graves." (Ahmad, Tirmidhi, Ibn Maajah)

- 1457. However, Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  had abrogated his previous instruction by saying, "I used to stop you from visiting the graves, but now there is no prohibition." (Muslim)
- 1458. The following words are also narrated from Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ , "He who visits my grave." The words 'visiting' are narrated from Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  himself.
- 1459. Abu Imraan α narrates that the apparent reason for the fatwa of Makruh by Imam Maalik a could be that the Tawaaf and visiting are similar words for Rasulullaah ε. By using such words, equality with Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  can be assumed. Therefore, he said that it is Makruh to use them. According to him, it should be simply said, 'We recited Salaam upon Rasulullaah ε'. He says that, besides this, visiting is permissible for people and it is compulsory to mount the conveyance and go towards the grave of Rasulullaah ε. Imam Maalik α means 'preferable' and 'encouragement' by using the words 'compulsory'. He does not mean obligatory.
- 1460 1469. According to Imam Maalik  $\alpha$ , not using the word 'visiting' and calling (the use of) it Makruh is because of the link to the grave of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Therefore, if anyone says, 'We visited the grave of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ', then Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  would not feel it Makruh because **Rasulullaah \epsilon** said, "The anger of Allaah will come upon those nations that made the graves of the Ambiyaa  $\iota$  into places of prostration and they prostrated towards them."

In order to stop fitnah, it will be a great thing to adopt a similar way to that of Imam Maalik  $\alpha$ , that let alone imitating in deed, he would stay away from imitating in words. It is because of this that he stopped the Ummah from using such words.

Ishaaq bin Ibraaheem Faqeeh narrates that it was part of the Ummah to go for a visit (to Madinah) when they complete the Hajj of the Baytullaah. People perform Salaah in Masjid an Nabawi, they visit the grave of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , his blessed pulpit, his pure place of gathering, wherever the hands of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  touched and where he stepped, the pillar upon which he rested, and the places where revelation came upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . They take blessings from these (places). These things give strength to the heart and they respect and honour these places.

Ibn Abi Fudayk  $\alpha$  narrates that he heard the following from some scholars, "He who stands close to the grave of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and recites the verse:

Verily Allaah and His angels send Salaah on the Nabi α (meaning that Allaah showers special mercies on him and the angels pray for him). O you who have Imaan! Send Salaah and Salaam to him (pray to Allaah to shower special mercies and peace on him by reciting the various forms of "Salaah and Salaam" reported in the Ahadeeth). (Surah Ahzaab (The Armies), 56)

And he says, (صلى الله عليك يا محمد) 70 times then an angel will call out to him saying, 'O person, Allaah will send His mercy upon you.' The needs of such a person will be fulfilled and none of his needs will go in vain."

Yazeed bin Abu Sa'eed Mahri narrates that he went to Hadhrat Umar bin Abdul Aziz  $\alpha$  and when he was leaving he asked, "If there is any service I could do, tell me." Umar bin Abdul Aziz  $\alpha$  said, "When you go to Madinah, then try at the

first opportunity to present yourself at the grave of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and to present my Salaam."

It is also explained that he (Hadhrat Umar bin Abdul Aziz  $\alpha$ ) used to send a messenger from Shaam to go to the grave of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and present Salaam to him.

It is narrated from some scholars that they saw Hadhrat Anas  $\tau$  at the grave of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . He would wait a while there. An onlooker would assume that he had begun Salaah but then he would convey Salaam and return.

It is narrated from Ibn Wahb  $\alpha$  that Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  explained: "When you present Salaam to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , then make Du'aa' and you should be facing the direction of his face. You should not face the Qiblah. You should go close to the grave and make Du'aa' but you should not touch the grave.<sup>1</sup>

Imam Malik has written in Mabsut: "I cannot tolerate that a person stands at the Raudah of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and he does not make Du'aa'. He only makes Salaam and returns."

Ibn Abi Mulaykah  $\alpha$  narrates that the one standing at the grave should stand directly under the candle that is above the grave.

Hadhrat Naafi narrates: "Hadhrat Ibn Umar  $\tau$  would recite Salaam at the grave. Not a hundred times, but I saw him saying Salaam more than this. It was his habit to go to the grave and say,

السلام على النبي السلام على ابو بكر السلام على أبي ثم ينصرف

He would then return."

It was also seen that Hadhrat Ibn Umar  $\tau$  would stand at that place where Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would go, he would place his hands there and then pass them over his face.

Ibn Qusayt and Utbah narrate that when the Sahabah  $\psi$  would go close to the grave of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , then they would hold that which was similar to a pomegranate tree with the right hand, then they would face the Qiblah and engage in Du'aa'.

In Mu'atta, Yahya bin Yahya Laythi narrates that Hadhrat Ibn Umar  $\tau$  would stand in front of the grave of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Then he would send Durud and Salaam upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , Hadhrat Abu Bakr  $\tau$ , and Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$ . However, Ibn al Qaasim and Qa'nabi state that he would make Du'aa' for Hadhrat Abu Bakr  $\tau$  and Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$ .

The narration of Ibn Wahb states that Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  explained that the one saying Salaam should say:

Mabsut says that he would send Salaam to Hadhrat Abu Bakr  $\tau$  and Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$ .

Qaadhi Abul Walid explains: "According to me, the words 'Salaah' should be used to make Du'aa' for Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and, in this way, Du'aa' should also be made for Hadhrat Abu Bakr  $\tau$  and Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$ ."

Ibn Habib narrates that when entering Masjid an Nabawi, a person should say:

السلام علينا من ربنا وصلى الله وملائكته على محمد اللهم اغفرلي ذنوبي وافتح لي ابواب رحمتك وجنتك واحفظي من الشيطان الرجيم

In Riyaadh ul Jannah it then says, "This is the place that is found between the pulpit and the Raudah. Perform 2 Rak'at here before presenting yourself at the Raudah. Praise Allaah and whatever hope you have left home with, make Du'aa' to Allaah for it and seek the help of Allaah. If these 2 Rak'ats are read in any place other than the Riyaadh ul Jannah, then too there is no problem. However, it is best that these 2 Rak'ats are performed in the Riyaadh ul Jannah.

1470. Rasulullaah ε said, "Between my room and pulpit is a garden from the gardens of Jannah and my pulpit is a hill from among the hills of Jannah." (Ahmad)

After completing these 2 Rak'ats, a person should go with complete humility and great respect to the grave and, in appropriate words, he should present the Salaam and Durud to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . He should make du'aa' for Hadhrat Abu Bakr  $\tau$  and Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$  and he should also stand at their graves and make Du'aa'. While staying in Masjid an Nabawi, a person should recite Durud and, whenever he gets the chance, he should visit Masjid Quba and the graves of the martyrs.

Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  narrates in Mu'atta: when entering Madinah, a person should present the gift of Durud and Salaam to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . When going to Madinah Munawwarah, a person should present himself at the Raudah, send the Durud and Salaam and, even if the residents of Madinah come out, they should include this as part of their practice.

\*\*\* Ash Shifaa (Volume Two)

Hadhrat Faatimah  $\rho$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "When you enter Masjid an Nabawi, then send Durud upon me, then recite the following Du'aa':

O Allaah, forgive my sins and open the doors of Mercy for me.

When you leave the Masjid, send Durud upon Rasulullaah and recite:

O Allaah, forgive my sins and open the doors of Your grace for me."

1471. Another narration states: "When entering Masjid an Nabawi and when leaving, send Salaam upon Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  and recite the above mentioned du'aa'. When leaving the Masjid, recite this du'aa':

O Allaah, I seek from You Your grace."
(Abu Dawud, Muslim)

1472. Another narration states: read the following Du'aa',

O Allaah, protect me from the plotting of Shaytaan. (Ibn Maajah)

Muhammad bin Sireen  $\alpha$  narrates that it was the practice of the people of Madinah, when they entered Masjid an Nabawi, to recite:

صلى الله وملائكته على محمد السلام عليك ايها النبي ورحمة الله وبركاته باسم الله دخلنا وباسم الله خرجنا وعلى الله توكلنا

And they would say the same when they left.

1473.Hadhrat Faatimah  $\rho$  narrates the same; when Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would enter the Masjid, he would say:

1474 - 1478. One narration also states that he should praise Allaah j. Taking the name of Allaah and sending Durud upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is mentioned in it. One narration states that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would recite:

Another narrator says that Rasulullaah ε would say:

Hadhrat Abu Hurayrah  $\tau$  narrates: "When any of you enters the Masjid, he should recite Durud upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and say:

Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  has written in Mabsut that it is not necessary for the people of Madinah, on the occasion of visiting the Raudah and upon returning, to present themselves at the grave. This command is for those who come as travellers to Madinah. Furthermore there is no problem if someone goes out of Madinah and upon returning comes to the Raudah of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and presents Salaam to Hadhrat Abu Bakr  $\tau$  and Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$ .

On one occasion, Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  was asked regarding the practice of the people of Madinah: they would come to

Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  upon leaving Madinah and upon returning to Madinah and they mostly came to the Raudah of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  on a Friday. They should present themselves at the Raudah of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  after four days. They recite Durud and Salaam and spend a moment in duaa. When Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  heard this, he said, "I have not heard a narration from any of the local scholars regarding this, nor is (this) practice anything good according to me, **as long as the condition of the first people is not corrected, how can the condition of the latter ones be corrected?** However, if someone leaves with the intention of undertaking a journey or he returns, then it will be permissible for him, otherwise he should not do this separately."

Ibn al Qaasim narrates that he saw the people of Madinah go to the Raudah of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and present Salaam when they leave Madinah or when they enter the boundaries of Madinah. He said that a view stating this has come from one of the Imams.

Baaji  $\alpha$  narrates that Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  has differentiated between the people of Madinah and the travellers because the traveller comes to the Raudah of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  with the intention of presenting himself there. The residents of Madinah do not come to visit the Raudah; they are returning home and Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "O Allaah, do not let my grave be made into an idol, that it is worshipped. Allaah sends great anger upon such a nation that made the graves of their Ambiyaa  $\iota$  into places of prostration."

1479. **Rasulullaah ε said,** "Do not make my grave a place of celebration." (Abu Dawud, Ahmad)

Ahmad bin Sa'eed Hindi  $\alpha$  has written in his book that it is necessary for those visiting Madinah to stand at the

Raudah of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  with respect, such that they should not touch the gates, nor should they hold onto the walls, nor should they stand there for a long time for these things are counted as bad manners.

In Utaybah, Qaadhi Iyaadh  $\alpha$  has written that before presenting oneself to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , a person should perform 2 Rak'ats of Tahiyyatul Masjid. He should then recite Durud and Salaam upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . The best and most virtuous place for optional Salaah is the Musalla of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and the pillar that is fragrant.

When performing the obligatory Salaah, it is best that the Salaah is performed in the front rows and it is best for those coming from outside to perform the optional Salaah in Masjid an Nabawi.

## **Section 9**

## The Etiquette of Entering Masjid an Nabawi ε

In this section, visiting Masjid an Nabawi, Haram an Nabawi, the Raudah of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ , visiting the grave, and the honour with which the people of Makkah Mukarramah and Madinah Munawwarah were blessed with will be briefly mentioned.

Allaah j says in the Qur'aan:

...Surely the Masjid that was established on Taqwa from the first day is worthier for you to stand in...

(Surah Taubah (Repentance), 108)

1480. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  was asked, "Which Masjid is this?" Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "My Masjid."

This is also narrated from Ibn Musayyib  $\alpha$ , Zayd bin Thaabit  $\tau$ , Ibn Umar  $\tau$  and Maalik bin Anas  $\tau$ .

- 1481. Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$  narrates that the verse refers to Masjid Quba.
- 1482. Hisham bin Ahmad narrates through various narrators from Hadhrat Abu Hurayrah  $\tau$  that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Do not undertake a journey to any Masjid but three: Masjid an Nabawi, Masjid Haraam and Masjid Aqsa." (Abu Dawud, Bukhari, Muslim)

We have already mentioned whatever is narrated from the Sahabah  $\psi$  regarding the recitation of Durud at the time of entering the Masjid.

1483. Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Amr bin Aas  $\tau$  narrates that when Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  entered the Masjid, he would say:

اعوذ بالله العظيم وبوجهه الكريم وسلطانه القديم من الشيطان الرجيم ابو داؤد

1484. Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  narrates that once Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$  saw a person who was speaking very loudly in masjid an Nabawi. He called him and said, "From which tribe do you come?" He said, "Banu Thaqif." He said, "If you were a resident of one of these two cities, **I would have punished you by lashing because voices are not raised in our Masaajid."** (Bukhari)

Muhammad bin Maslamah narrates that no one has the right to raise his voice in the Masjid, to bring something with him that people dislike, or to bring something that will cause difficulty to people.

Qaadhi Ismaa'eel has written on this subject under the chapter of the virtue of Masjid an Nabawi in Mabsut. All the scholars have agreed that this ruling is not specific with Masjid an Nabawi but it is the ruling for all the Masaajid.

Qaadhi Ismaa'eel explains that Muhammad bin Maslamah said: "Speaking in Masjid an Nabawi with a loud voice or calling out to someone is Makruh because there is fear of disturbance in the Salaah of the people. This ruling is not specific with any particular Masjid, but it is for all the Masaajid. However, there are two Masaajid in the world that are exempted from this; Masjid Haraam and Masjid

## Mina. The people recite the Talbiyah aloud in these Masjids, therefore they have been excluded."

1485. Hadhrat Abu Hurayrah  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "The reward for performing Salaah in my Masjid is a thousand times more than that of performing Salaah in other Masaajid, except for Masjid al Haraam." (Bukhari, Muslim)

Qaadhi Abul Fadhl  $\alpha$  narrates that there are differing views of the scholars regarding whether it is more virtuous to perform Salaah in Makkah or Madinah. There is a statement of Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  narrated from Ash hab, "Many Sahabah  $\psi$  have explained the following meaning: the reward of Salaah in Masjid an Nabawi is more (1000 times) than that of other Masaajid except for Masjid Haraam. This is because performing Salaah in Masjid an Nabawi is less virtuous than performing Salaah in Masjid Haraam. The proof is the following narration:

1486. Hadhrat Umar bin Khattaab  $\tau$  narrates that performing Salaah in Masjid Haraam as compared to other Masaajid is higher by 100 stages. In terms of this, performing Salaah in Masjid an Nabawi will be 900 stages more virtuous and it will be equal to 1000 Salaah as compared to other Masaajid.

Based on this narration, Madinah is more virtuous than Makkah, as we have explained above. This view is narrated from Hadhrat Umar bin Khattaab  $\tau$ , Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  and most of the people of Madinah.

The people of Kufa and the people of Makkah state that Makkah is more virtuous. This is the view of Ataa', Ibn Wahb and Ibn Habeeb  $\alpha$ . They are from among the students of Imam Maalik  $\alpha$ . Baaji  $\alpha$  narrates the same from

Imam Shafi'  $\alpha$ . The above quoted Hadith will be taken in the light of its apparent meaning; that it is most virtuous to perform Salaah in Masjid Haraam.

1487. They take proof from the Hadith of Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Zubayr  $\tau$  in which he says that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Performing Salaah in Masjid Haraam as compared to my Masjid is a hundred times better." (Ahmad)

Hadhrat Qatadah  $\alpha$  narrates similar. However, most of the scholars have written that performing Salaah in the Haram of Makkah equals the reward of a hundred thousand Salaah.

No one can have any difference of opinion regarding this and everyone is unanimous that the resting place of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is the most virtuous place on earth.

Qaadhi Abul Waleed Baaji  $\alpha$  explains "We learn from the demand of the Hadith that Masjid Haraam is different from all other Masaajid and we do not learn that ruling from it which deals with Masjid an Nabawi."

Imam Tahawi  $\alpha$  Narrates that the Virtue of Masjid Haraam is only for the Obligatory Salaah.

Mutarrif says that that the virtue is not only for the obligatory Salaah, but for the optional Salaah as well. He says that performing Jumu'ah there (Masjid Haraam) and spending Ramadhaan there (Masjid Haraam) is much more virtuous than in other places.

- 1488. A Hadith is narrated from Abdur Razzaaq in which the virtue of spending Ramadhaan and other forms of worship in Madinah Munawwarah is learnt.
- 1489. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "The part between my house and pulpit is a garden from the gardens of Jannah." (Bukhari, Muslim)
- 1490. Hadhrat Abu Hurayrah τ narrates the same with the extra words: "My pulpit is on my pond." (Bukhari, Muslim)
- 1491. A Hadith explains: "My pulpit is one of the stages of Januah"

Tabari explains that this has two meanings:

- 1492. One is that 'house' means 'the place where Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  lives', although one narration states 'room' and 'pulpit'. (Ahmad)
- 1493. The second meaning explained is that 'house' refers to the blessed grave of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ . This is the view of Zayd bin Aslam. This is because his narration has the words 'room' and 'pulpit'. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  also said that 'The area between my grave and my pulpit is a garden from the gardens of Jannah.' Tabari says that when his  $\varepsilon$  grave is in his house, then all the narrations will be in harmony and there will be no difference. This is because the grave is in the room that is his house.

According to some, his  $\varepsilon$  statement that 'my pulpit is on my pond' could possibility be the same pulpit that was in the world. This is clearer. Secondly, this will another pulpit there. Thirdly, presenting oneself at the pulpit to do good

deeds there will come to the pond and will definitely let the person drink water.

Baaji  $\alpha$  said that 'Garden from the gardens of Jannah' have two possible meanings:

One is that it will be a means of entry into Jannah. Secondly, performing Salaah on this piece of land and making du'aa' to Allaah on it will become a means of acquiring Jannah. This is like the following:

1494. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "Jannah is beneath the shade of the swords." (Bukhari, Muslim)

Dawudi says: "Some have said that this part of land will be lifted and placed in Jannah."

- 1495. Hadhrat Ibn Umar  $\tau$  and a group of Sahabah  $\psi$  said that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "He who is patient upon the difficulties and problems that come upon Madinah Munawwarah, I shall testify for him and intercede for him on the day of Qiyaamah." (Muslim)
- 1496. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "If only he who cannot exercise patience over the difficulties of Madinah Munawwarah and he flees knew that Madinah was better for him." (Bukhari, Muslim)
- 1497. Rasulullaah ɛ said, "Madinah is like a furnace. Just as the furnace removes the dirt from metal, Madinah is the same." (Bukhari, Muslim)
- 1498. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "No one should leave Madinah happily. Despite this, if someone did do so, then Allaah will grant Madinah a better replacement." (Muslim)

- 1499. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "On the day of Qiyaamah, Allaah will resurrect he who passed away during Hajj and Umrah in the condition wherein he will have no reckoning and there will not be any punishment for him."
- 1500. Another narration states: "He will be among those who have acquired safety on the day of Qiyaamah."
- 1501. Hadhrat Ibn Umar  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Whoever can, should try to pass away in Madinah. He should desire to pass away in Madinah because I shall intercede for such a person." (Tirmidhi, Ibn Maajah)

Allaah j said:

اِنَّ اَوَّلَ بَيْتٍ وُّضِعَ لِلنَّاسِ لَلَّذِيْ بِبَكَّةَ مُبْرَكًا وَّ هُدًى لَلْعُلَمِيْنَ ﴿ Indeed the first house designated (appointed and set up) for man (as a direction to worship Allaah) was the one at Bakkah (Makkah) which is blessed and a guidance for the (people of the) universe.

(Surah Aal Imraan (Aal – Imraan), 96)

Some scholars of Tafseer say that it will remain safe from the fire of hell.

Some said that during the era of ignorance, if someone commited a crime and then came to the Haram, he would come into safety. The following verse means the same:

(Remember also the time) When We made the House (the Kabah) a gathering place for people (throughout the world) and a place of safety...

(Surah Al-Baqara (The Bull), 125)

It is said that some people came to Sa'doon Khaulani and said: "Some people of the Kinanah tribe have killed someone and burnt his body and his body burnt the entire night but there was no effect of the fire on him; the person is lying there in the same way." Khaulani heard this and said, "Did he perform Hajj three times?" the people replied, "Yes. He has definitely performed Hajj three times." Khaulani said, "I heard that he who performs three Hajj has the following specialties:

- 1. He completed his obligation with the first Hajj,
- 2. He gave a loan to Allaah with the second Hajj,
- 3. And he has protected his body from the fire with the third Hajj for Allaah has forbidden the fire for the body that performed Hajj three times."
- 1502. When the gaze of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  fell on the Ka'bah, he said, "Welcome, O Ka'bah, you have acquired honour because of being linked to Allaah. You have acquired great honour." (Tirmidhi)
- 1503. One Hadith states that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "He who stands close to the Hijr al Aswad and makes Du'aa' to Allaah, his Du'aa' will definitely be accepted. Similarly, if a person stands beneath the Mizaab (the water out-let of the Ka'bah) and makes Du'aa', it will be accepted."
- 1504. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "He who stands at the Maqaam Ibraaheem and performs two Rak'ats, all his past and future sins will be forgiven and he will be raised with those who are safe on the day of Qiyaamah."

1505. Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Whoever makes Du'aa' at the Multazam, it will definitely be accepted."

Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$  narrates that after hearing this advice of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , whatever Du'aa' he made close to the Multazam was accepted.

Amr bin Dinaar narrates that he heard this narration from Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$  and he tested it as well. He says, "Whatever Du'aa' I made close to the Multazam, it was definitely accepted."

Humaydi explains that ever since he heard that the Du'aa' made close to the Multazam is definitely accepted from Hadhrat Sufyaan, he made it his practice to make every Du'aa' close to the Multazam. His experience has proven that the Du'aa' made there will definitely be accepted.

Muhammad bin Idrees narrates the same; ever since he heard this Hadith from Humaydi, his Du'aa' was accepted at this place.

Ever since Abul Hasan Muhammad bin al Hasan heard this Hadith from Muhammad bin Idrees, and he did the same, he found out the same.

Abu Usamah says, "I do not remember from Hasan bin Rashiq anything regarding this before. However, it was most probably upon hearing from him that whenever a person makes Du'aa' for some worldly need near the Multazam, it will definitely be accepted. Therefore, I have hope that whatever Du'aa' I made for the Aakhirat while near the Multazam will definitely be accepted."

Udhri explains: "Ever since I heard from Abu Usamah regarding this, then whatever Du'aa' I made near the Multazam was definitely accepted."

Abu Ali explains that he made many Du'aa's near the Multazam and most of them were accepted. He says that whatever remains (for the Aakhirat) will also be accepted.

Qaadhi Abi Fadhl  $\alpha$  says that whatever points he mentioned in this section are only a few, although they were not related to the subject matter. However, they can be linked to it in some way or the other. They were mentioned only for the benefit of the readers. May Allaah grant us the Divine ability in the matters of truth.

## Chapter 3

## Those Matters that are Compulsory for Rasulullaah ε

This chapter will explain the qualities of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  that are compulsory for his being and those impossible things that are not permissible for Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Or, those things that are possible to link to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  in terms of being a human being.

Allaah j says:

وَ مَا مُحَمَّدٌ إِلَّا رَسُوْلُ ۚ آ قَدْ خَلَتْ مِنْ قَبْلِهِ الرُّسُلُ ۗ ا اَفَآسِ مَّاتَ اَوْ قُتِلَ انْقَلَبْتُمْ عَلَى عَقِبَيْهِ فَلَنَّ يَّضُرَّ اللهَ قُتِلَ انْقَلَبْتُمْ عَلَى عَقِبَيْهِ فَلَنَّ يَّضُرَّ اللهَ قُتِلَ انْقَلَبْتُ عَلَى عَقِبَيْهِ فَلَنَّ يَّضُرَّ اللهَ قُلْلُ الشَّكِرِيْنَ ١٤٢٤ . • شَيْئًا ۖ اللهِ اللهِ اللهُ الشَّكِرِيْنَ ١٢٢ . •

Muhammad  $\epsilon$  is but a Rasool (of Allaah). Indeed many Rusul have passed before him. If he passes away or is martyred, would you (Muslims) then turn back on your

heels (and forsake Islaam)...? (Surah Aal-Imraan (Aal-Imraan), 144)

مَا الْمَسِيْحُ ابْنُ مَرْيَمَ اِلَّا رَسُوْلٌ ۚ ا قَدْ خَلَتْ مِنْ قَبْلِهِ الرُّسُلُ ۖ ا Maseeh the son of Maryam is but a Rasool. Many Rusul have passed before him ...

(Surah Maa'idah (The Set Table), 75)

وَ مَا اَرْسَلْنَا قَبْلُكَ مِنَ الْمُرْسَلِيْنَ إِلَّا إِنَّهُمْ لَيَاكُلُوْنَ الطَّعَامَ وَ يَمْشُوْنَ فِي الْأَسْوَاقِ ١٠ وَ جَعَلْنَا بَعْضَكُمْ لِبَعْضِ فِتْنَةً ١٠ اَتَصْبِرُوْنَ ١٠ وَ كَانَ رَبُّكَ بَصِيْرً أَ ٠٠٠٠ رَبُّكَ بَصِيْرً أَ ٠٠٠٠٠

All the Ambiyaa ı that We sent before you (O Muhammad &) used to eat food and walk in the marketplaces (because they too were humans, which is

perfectly in order). (Therefore, do not worry about the persistent taunts of the Kuffaar because) We have made some of you as trials (tests) for others (to see whether you will exercise patience or not). Will you then exercise patience (to pass this test)? Your Rabb is Ever Watchful (so beware of what you do and know that He will reward every good that you do).

(Surah Furqaan (The Decider), 20)

## قُلْ إِنَّمَا آنَا بَشَرٌ مِّثْلُكُمْ

Say (to the people,), "I am but a human being (a mortal) like yourselves (neither an angel nor Divine light)...
(Surah Kahaf (The Cave), 110)

## وَ لَوْ جَعَلْنَهُ مَلَكًا لَّجَعَلْنَهُ رَجُلًا وَّ لَلْبَسْنَا عَلَيْهِمْ مَّا يَلْبِسُوْنَ ٩٠٠ .

If We were to make him (the prophet) an angel (as the Kuffaar request when they say that the prophets are nothing more than human beings like themselves and should rather have been angels), We would surely make him (the angel in the form of) a man (because humans cannot see an angel in his true form) and then cast the same doubt on them in which they find themselves (they would then again say that the prophet is merely a human being like themselves).

(Surah An'aam (Livestock), 9)

قُلْ لَّوْ كَانَ فِي الْأَرْضِ مَلْبِكَةٌ يَّمْشُوْنَ مُطْمَنِنِّيْنَ لَنَزَّلْنَا عَلَيْهِمْ مِّنَ السَّمَاءِ مَلَكًا رَّسُوْلًا ٩٥٠٠

Say (in reply to them), "If there were angels walking peacefully on earth, We would have sent to them an angel from the skies as a Rasool (However, since there are humans on earth, We have sent a human because he can best relate to them)."

(Surah Bani Israa'eel (Bani Israa'eel), 95)

When Allaah j sends a guide to a nation, it is His continuous Way that the guide He sends is from among that nation and that he possesses the specialties that Allaah selected for Risaalat. He grants him the ability to intermingle with the nation completely. The Ambiyaa t are a means between Allaah j and man. They convey Allaah's Laws, Promises, and Admonitions to the creation. All of which man did not know before, (i.e. Allaah's Law, the Grandeur of Allaah, the Overpowering Standing of Allaah, His Honour, and His Respect.)

The outward of the Ambiyaa 1, that is, their bodies and their make up, is that of the human qualities. Those temporary aspects that come upon man, like death, sickness, etc., also come upon them. However, their internal condition – their souls – are filled with the highest quality of human characteristics. It is linked to the *Mala' ul A'la*. The helplessness and human weaknesses found in general people cannot come into them because, if their inner condition was in accordance to the outward human conditions, then it would not have been possible for them to meet the angels and speak to them and convey the laws of Allaah to us through them.

In summary, it can be said that in terms of their bodies and outward conditions, the Ambiyaa 1 are like other human beings but in terms of their inward conditions, they are similar to the angels.

1506-1508. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said: "If I were to take a close friend from the Ummah, then indeed I would have taken Abu Bakr  $\tau$  as a close friend. However, I have Islaamic brotherhood with Abu Bakr  $\tau$  and your companion  $\epsilon$  is the friend of Allaah."

Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "While sleeping, my eyes appear asleep but my heart is awake."

Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "I am not like you; my condition is such that I pass the day in such a way that my Rabb feeds me and He gives me to drink."

## **Summary**

If the summary of these verses and statements of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  were to be presented, then it would be proven that the Ambiyaa  $\iota$  were pure from internal calamities and defects. This is such a subject matter that every person cannot easily understand. In fact, some scholars go to great lengths in order to explain this.

With the Divine ability given by Allaah, we shall try to explain this subject matter in some detail in the next two chapters. Allaah is the greatest support and the best representative.

## Religious Matters and the Innocence of the Ambiyaa' 1

Qaadhi Abul Fadhl  $\alpha$  explains: "Know well; whatever difficulties come upon human beings without his intention come upon his body and senses, like sicknesses. Alternatively, they come with his intention and will. In reality, these are all lofty deeds. However, it was the practice of the senior scholars that they mentioned the detail of this in three ways:

- 1. Promise of the heart,
- 2. Verbal utterance,
- 3. And Practice of the body.

Either these conditions that come upon the human body have no intention behind them (like sickness or any other calamity), or, upon examining these conditions when they come, then the will and deeds of a person clearly have some part in it.

However, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was not like the general people and Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was pure from many things that occurred intentionally or unintentionally. This has been established with proof and there is consensus regarding it. We shall soon explain and mention its detail.

### Section 1

## The Promise of the Heart by Rasulullaah ε

May Allaah grant you and I pious ability. Know well that the heart of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  possessed knowledge of Tauheed, knowledge of the qualities of Allaah, complete awareness of Divine revelation, His recognition, clear knowledge, and complete conviction. There was nothing hidden, nor was there any doubt. Besides this, in this recognition and conviction, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was purified from every type of opposition and he was made innocent of everything contrary to practising on this recognition and conviction. This is such a thing upon which all the Muslims are united and it has been clarified with proofs. There is nothing else in the beliefs of the Ambiyaa  $\iota$ .

#### The Statement of Hadhrat Ibraaheem 1

The statement of Hadhrat Ibraaheem  $\upsilon$  cannot be objected to, based on the beliefs we explained. Hadhrat Ibraaheem  $\upsilon$  said:

...He (Ibraheem v) replied, "I certainly do, but (I am asking) to satisfy my heart (so that I may have first-hand knowledge, so that my Imaan can be strengthened further and so that there remains no room for doubt in my heart)."...

(Surah Al-Baqara (The Bull), 260)

Ibraaheem  $\upsilon$  did not have any doubt that Allaah j can resurrect the dead. However, in order to further content his heart, Ibraaheem  $\upsilon$  wanted to see and witness. Therefore, the argument is brought to an end. If someone does argue, he can be given the following explanation:

#### First Reason

In reality, Ibraaheem  $\upsilon$  had knowledge of the resurrection of the dead from before. He only made his desire apparent, that, besides this, he wanted to acquire knowledge on how it was done and by witnessing it.

#### Second Reason

The second reason is that **Hadhrat Ibraaheem**  $\upsilon$  **desired to know what his rank was in the Sight of Allaah j.** He wanted to know what (level of) acceptance his question will have in the court of Allaah.

Therefore, Allaah j asked, "(O Ibraaheem) **Do you not believe?**" (Surah Al-Baqara, 260). The meaning of this statement of Allaah j is, 'O Ibraaheem, do you not have complete conviction in your position of Nubuwwah that We granted you and the honour that you have in Our court?'

### Third Reason

The third reason is that Hadhrat Ibraaheem  $\upsilon$  posed the question in order to strengthen his contentment and increase his conviction. He did not have doubt from before, but he also knew that knowledge acquired by witnessing makes the necessary knowledge of a person strong. Although it is impossible for doubts to arise in the necessary knowledge a person has, then too, Hadhrat Ibraaheem  $\upsilon$  intended to go from knowledge to witnessing and from knowledge (Ilm ul Yaqeen) to eye witnessing (Ayn ul Yaqeen). This is because receiving news is not like witnessing. Based on this, Hadhrat Sahl bin Abdullaah said, "Hadhrat Ibraaheem  $\upsilon$  made Du'aa' in the court of Allaah for this reason: 'May Allaah remove the veils in front of my

eyes so that together with the light of conviction, I can acquire more conviction upon my present condition'."

#### Fourth Reason

The question posed by Hadhrat Ibraaheem  $\upsilon$  was also so that proof could be clearly established that Allaah gives death in this way and He gives life a second time in this way.

### Fifth Reason

Some scholars say that this question of Hadhrat Ibraaheem  $\upsilon$  was out of respect, i.e. Hadhrat Ibraaheem  $\upsilon$  wanted to witness the ability of resurrecting the dead so that his heart could be further contented.

#### Sixth Reason

Hadhrat Ibraaheem  $\upsilon$  made it seem that he had doubt, but in reality, there was no doubt. In fact, this 'doubt' further opened the doors of closeness.

## **More Reasons**

1502. Rasulullaah ε said, "We are more worthy of doubting in this matter than Ibraaheem v." By this statement of Rasulullaah ε, the doubt of Hadhrat Ibraaheem υ is negated and weak thoughts are removed from the heart so that no one can utter anything regarding Hadhrat Ibraaheem v, saying, 'We have such thoughts regarding him', and no one should feel that Hadhrat Ibraaheem v had doubt. This (Hadith) means: 'We have complete conviction in resurrection if Hadhrat SO Ibraaheem v had doubt, then it is all the more reason for us to have doubt?

There is also the possibility that the statement of Hadhrat Ibraaheem  $\upsilon$  was out of respect. It deserves attention that the word 'we' means 'the individuals of the Ummah' for whom it is possible to make a staetement of doubt. One interpretation can also be made that his statement was out of humility or out of affection. However, all this can be in the case where the request of Hadhrat Ibraaheem  $\upsilon$  is taken to be for the sake of increase in conviction and a test of his condition.

Now you will ask, what does the following verse mean?

فَانْ كُنْتَ فِيْ شَلَكً مِّمَّا اَنْزَلْنَا النَّكَ فَسْئِلِ الَّذِيْنَ يَقْرَءُوْنَ الْكِتٰبَ مِنْ قَبْلِكَ اللَّهِ اللَّذِيْنَ مِنَ الْمُمْتَرِيْنَ مِنَ الْمُمْتَرِيْنَ مِنَ الْمُمْتَرِيْنَ ١٩٠٠ وَ قَبْلِكَ اللَّهِ فَتَكُوْنَ مِنَ الْمُمْتَرِيْنَ ٩٥٠٠ وَ لَا تَكُوْنَنَ مِنَ الْخُسِرِيْنَ ٩٥٠٠ وَ لَا تَكُوْنَ مِنَ الْخُسِرِيْنَ ٩٥٠٠

If you are in (any) doubt about what We have revealed (about the truth of the incidents mentioned in the Qur'aan), then ask those who were reciting the Book (the Torah) before you (they will confirm that these incidents are true because they had been told the same). Undoubtedly the truth has come to you from your Rabb, so never be of the doubtful ones.

And never be of those who deny Allaah's Aayaat, for then you will be of the losers (who will lose the rewards of both worlds).

(Surah Yunus (Yunus), 94-95)

## No Doubt Should be Allowed to Come About Regarding Rasulullaah ε

At this point, we should not let any doubt come close to our hearts. May Allaah keep your hearts firm. May He not let us go close to slipping. While mentioning the narration of Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$ , some Mufassireen have said that

Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  had doubt about revelation because, after all, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was a human being.

- 1503. However, Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$  himself said, "Doubt was not created in the heart of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  regarding something that was revealed, nor did Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  ask anyone about it."
- 1504. There is a narration from Qataadah that Rasulullaah ε said, "I do not doubt, nor do I ask anyone." Most of the Mufassireen support the view of Qataadah.

Yes, there are various interpretations given by the Mufassireen. Subsequently, some interpret this verse as, "O Muhammad, say to those who doubt: 'If you are in doubt, then ask those who study the Divine scriptures'."

Say, "O people! If you are in doubt about my Deen, then (I would like to make it clear that) I do not worship what (idols and gods) you worship besides Allaah. However, I worship that Allaah Who shall take your lives. I have been commanded to be (to remain) one of the Mu'mineen...

(Surah Yunus (Yunus), 104)

Regarding this verse, the Mufassireen explain that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is not addressed in this verse but the Arabs are addressed.

As in the following verse:

... "If you commit Shirk, your (good) deeds will certainly be wasted (because you will receive no rewards for them in the Aakhirah), and you will definitely become of the losers."

(Surah Zumar (The Groups), 65)

Although Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  is addressed in the above mentioned verse, the original addressees are others. Another verse is an example of this:

So do not be in doubt about what (idols and false gods) these people worship (worshipping their gods will certainly earn them Allaah's punishment). They merely worship as their forefathers worshipped before (and will therefore suffer the same fate as their forefathers). Verily We shall grant them their full share (of punishment) without deduction (reprieve).

(Surah Hood (Hood), 109)

There are many more examples of this in the Qur'aan.

Bakr bin Alaa says, "Did you not read in the Qur'aan?-

And never be of those who deny Allaah's Aayaat, for then you will be of the losers (who will lose the rewards of both worlds)."

(Surah Yunus (Yunus), 95)

If you see the reality, it is the true religion that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  calls to that the people continuously deny and belie. How is it possible that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  supports those

who belie? This is proof of our claim that although Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is addressed in the verse, the original ones who are addressed are others.

If you ponder over the following verse, the reality will become clearer:

...He is the Most Merciful, so enquire about Him from one who is knowledgeable (find out about Allaah from those who have recognised Him so that you may also recognise Him).

(Surah Furqaan (The Decider), 59)

Although Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is addressed in this verse, others are actually addressed. They are being told to ask Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  about Allaah because Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  has knowledge of Allaah. Those who question do not have the knowledge of Allaah.

Some scholars have explained that, except Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ , those who doubted were commanded to enquire about the people of the past (i.e. news of the previous nations) and not that to which they are called towards, i.e. Tauheed and the Shari'ah. As Allaah j says:

Inquire from those Rusul of Ours whom We have sent before you (by referring to their teachings. Ask them,) Have We introduced other Aaliha who can be worshipped Besides Rahmaan? (The teachings of every Nabi emphasised that Only Allaah must be worshipped.)

(Surah Zukhruf (Gold), 45)

Even though it seems that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is being addressed, this verse is addressed the polytheists; 'Ask the people'. This is explained by Atabi.

Some scholars are of the view that the verse means: 'Ask Us regarding the Ambiyaa  $\iota$  that We sent before Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ '. The *Harf Jar* at this place has been hidden and the speech is completed. The sentence then commences, "Have We introduced other Aaliha who can be worshipped Besides Rahmaan?" A negative sentence is narrated in the Qira'ah of Makki (of this verse). Some narrations state that on the night of Me'raaj, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was commanded to ask the other Ambiyaa  $\iota$  but Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  had such conviction in Allaah being the Rabb and in His Tauheed that he did not feel the need to ask.

1505. Some narrations state that Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "I shall not ask anyone; my conviction will suffice me." This is the statement of Ibn Zayd.

# Abstention from Polytheism was Emphasized upon every Nation

Some scholars say that the verse commands Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  to enquire from the nations that passed about whether their Nabis were sent to them with anything other than Tauheed. This is the view of Mujaahid, Suddi, Dahhaak, and Qatadah. The objective of this was only that it is clarified that the Ambiyaa  $\iota$  that passed before Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  were flag bearers of the belief of Tauheed, which Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is; Allaah never ever permitted polytheism. Through this, Allaah refutes the polytheists who say 'We worship the idols only so that they may give us closeness to Allaah'.

### Allaah says:

(O Muhammad ε, say to the Ahlul Kitaab, why) Should I seek another judge besides Allaah (to judge between me and yourselves) when He has revealed the Book (the Qur'aan) to you in detail (distinctly making it clear that I am His Nabi because no man can ever compile such a masterpiece)? Those to whom We have given the Book (the Jews and the Christians) know that it (the Qur'aan) is revealed with truth from their Rabb, so do not ever become of the doubtful ones.

(Surah An'aam (Livestock), 114)

From this verse it is apparent that these people would doubt the Risaalat of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  but they did not find the strength to verbally say it (Other book says 'these people did **not** doubt the Risaalat...'). The doubt of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  can never be drawn from this verse and it has been mentioned in the previous verses as well.

What requires thought at this point is that the purport of this verse should be understood in the same way that we have explained the purport of the previous verses; Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is addressed, but Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is told to inform the people, 'O those who doubt, do not doubt.' The proof is the beginning of the above mentioned verse:

"(O Muhammad & say to the Ahlul Kitaab, why) Should I seek another judge besides Allaah (to judge between me and yourselves) when He has revealed the Book (the Qur'aan) to you in detail..." Some scholars say that this is an explanation. It is supported by other Qur'aanic verses in which Hadhrat Isa v was informed:

...Did you say to the people, 'Take myself and my mother both as Ilaah instead of Allaah?' He (Isa v) will reply, "I express Your purity (You have no need for partners)! It does not befit me to say what I have no right to say! If I had said so, You would certainly have knowledge of it (You therefore know that I did not say anything like it). You know what is in my heart and I do not know what is in Your knowledge. Most assuredly, You are the Knower of the unseen."

(Surah Maa'idah (The Set Table), 116)

Allaah knows well that Hadhrat Isa  $\upsilon$  did not say this to his nation.

### The Ambiyaa' i can Never have any Doubt about Tauheed

Some scholars explain that the above-mentioned verse that explains doubt, linked to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , the meaning is only that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  never had any doubt. However, for the sake of increase in contentment of heart and knowledge and conviction, ask me about those who were sent as Rasuls before.

Some say that the verse means: 'I have given the honour due to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . If Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  has doubt about this honour, then you  $\epsilon$  should ask about the virtues of the previous nations that I have revealed in the previous scriptures.'

Abu Ubaydah says that the meaning is: 'If you have doubt of others that We have revealed'

# That which is Against the Grandeur of the Scholars can never apply to the Ambiyaa' 1

At this point, the question arises that, in the light of these views, what will the meaning be of the following verse?

(When they are not punished immediately, the Kuffaar should not think that they have escaped punishment because Allaah allows them periods of grace. The same happened to the Kuffaar of the past. In fact, the punishment was delayed)

Until the time came when (even) the Rusul grew despondent and thought that they had erred in their understanding (that they had completely miscalculated the time that Allaah's punishment would come to the Kuffaar). Then (at this desperate point) Our assistance came to them (and the Kuffaar were destroyed) and We rescued whom We willed (the Mu'mineen). Our punishment is never turned away from the criminal (wrong doing) nation. (Surah Yusuf (Yusuf), 110)

### The Hypocrites would Promise the Rasul and Turn away from their Word

In order to understand this, the statement of Hadhrat Ayesha  $\rho$  suffices. She said, "We seek the protection of Allaah; can the Rasul of Allaah think something like this regarding Allaah?" This means that when Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  lost hope, he began to think that those believers who promised to help him had made a false promise. Most of the Mufassireen agree to this.

One meaning has also been explained that the pronoun refers to the Ummatis. The Ambiyaa'  $\iota$  did not have this thought, but their believers and Ummatis had it. This is the view of Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$ , Nakha'I, Ibn Jubayr and a group of scholars.

This is the reason why Mujaahid read the word 'Kadhabu' with a fatha. Therefore, the Tafseers of the unknown scholars should not be referred to, but a study should be made of the famous Tafseers. How is this possible when that which is not understood to be worthy for the scholars is linked to the Ambiyaa 1?

The following Hadith is narrated in the Seerah books: When revelation began, **Rasulullaah**  $\varepsilon$  said to **Hadhrat Khadijah**  $\rho$ , "I fear for my life." (Bukhari, Muslim)

This does not mean that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  had doubt after seeing the angels, but instead this means that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  had the fear that possibly he would not be able to remain around the angels or bear the weight of revelation and that his heart will stop or he will lose his life.

## Even before Revelation, Rasulullaah $\epsilon$ was Shown things Beyond the Human Mind

explained authentic Hadith in an that said this after meeting the angels. Rasulullaah Alternatively, he explained this before meeting the angels and it was at the time when Allaah j opened up that he  $\varepsilon$  will be blessed with Nubuwwah. Things beyond the human mind were shown to him. The stones and trees would greet him, Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  would see good and strange dreams and receive glad tidings as is explained in some narrations that, in the beginning, Rasulullaah ε would see a dream and upon awakening, the exact same that he  $\epsilon$  dreamt would happen in reality. This happened in order to familiarise Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  so that when the reality would be shown to him, no worry that is the demand of human nature would come over Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .

1506. Hadhrat Ayesha  $\rho$  narrates in an authentic Hadith: "In the beginning, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would see true dreams; whatever he saw at night would happen in the morning. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  then loved solitude, to the extent that the truth came to him at that time (when) he was in the cave of Hira." (Bukhari, Muslim)

### Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas τ Explains the Condition of Rasulullaah ε before Revelation

1507. Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  stayed in Makkah for fifteen years in such a way that for the first seven years he heard a voice and he saw a light but after this he did not see anything. The next eight years passed in such a way that revelation continued coming to him. (Muslim, Ahmad)

1508. Ibn Ishaaq  $\alpha$  narrates from some Sahabah  $\psi$  that, when speaking about his stay in Hira, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said "One day I was sleeping when he (Hadhrat Jibra'eel  $\upsilon$ ) said to me, 'Read.' I replied, 'I am not literate.' After my reply, the angel covered me and said, 'Read in the name of your Rabb'."

Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  explains, "After this incident, the thought came into my heart that what effect will it have on the listeners when I mention this to the people? They will think me to be a poet and mad. Nothing was worse for me than these two things. If the people did say such things (as I was

thinking), then there was no way out but to throw myself from the mountain top. I was thinking this in my heart when an unseen voice came, 'O Muhammad, you are the Rasul of Allaah and I am Jibra'eel.' Addressing Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . The moment I heard this, I looked towards the sky and I saw that Hadhrat Jibra'eel  $\nu$  was in the form of a man."

It is clear from this narration that this intention of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was when Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  had not met Hadhrat Jibra'eel  $\upsilon$  and, until then, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was not informed that he had been blessed with the great rank of Nubuwwah.

- 1509. Amr bin Shurahbeel narrates a similar Hadith that Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said to Hadhrat Khadijah  $\rho$ , "When I am alone, I hear a voice. By Allaah, I have fear that it should not be of this matter."
- 1510. Hammaad bin Salamah narrates that Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said to Hadhrat Khadijah  $\rho$ , "I see a light when in solitude and I hear voices. I have fear that this should be something that makes a person mad." (Ahmad)

#### We Do Not Know of any Doubt of Rasulullaah ε from an Authentic Hadith

1511-1515. In the Hadith quoted above, it is clarified that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  had doubt and fear of madness. If this is accepted to be correct, then it will be interpreted to mean that this happened before meeting the angel and it was before he had knowledge of being appointed as a Nabi from Allaah j. The situation is that the above-mentioned Ahadith are weak from a few chains of narration. However, when Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was informed by Allaah that he is a Rasul and the angels met him, then Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  had no doubt, nor did

he have any reservations about the revelation that came to him.

Ibn Ishaaq narrates from his teachers that before Nubuwwah, when Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was living in Makkah, the evil eye would affect him and a person would be called who would remove it. However, when the revelation of the Qur'aan began and he was affected by the evil eye, then Hadhrat Khadijah  $\rho$  asked, "Shall I call someone to read and blow?" Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Now there remains no need for it."

# **Upon the Counsel given by Waraqah bin Naufal, Hadhrat Khadijah** ρ **Tests the Arrival of Hadhrat Jibreel** υ

A narration about the coming of Jibreel  $\upsilon$  is also narrated by Hadhrat Khadijah  $\rho$ . In this narration she uncovered her hair and tested the arrival of Jibreel  $\upsilon$ . The scholars say that this is part of the specialties of Hadhrat Khadijah  $\rho$ ; she verified whether it was Jibreel  $\upsilon$  that came to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , or whether it was something else. Through this, the Nubuwwah of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was also verified and doubts were removed. It is said that Hadhrat Khadijah  $\rho$  did all this upon the instruction of Waraqah bin Naufal.

Qaadhi Iyaadh  $\alpha$  says that Hadhrat Khadijah  $\rho$  verifying was not because she had some doubt about announcing the Nubuwwah of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , but because **she wanted to increase her conviction. That is why she did research about the coming of Jibreel \upsilon.** 

In explaining the narration of Hadhrat Khadijah  $\rho$ , Abdullaah bin Muhammad says that Waraqah bin Naufal

gave counsel to Hadhrat Khadijah  $\rho$  that she can test the coming of Jibreel  $\upsilon$  in this way.

Ismaa'eel bin Abi Hakeem's narration has similar words: Hadhrat Khadijah  $\rho$  requested Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , "O my cousin, is it possible that when the *Naamoos Akbar* comes to you, can I see him?" Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Indeed." Subsequently, when Jibreel  $\nu$  came to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , he said to her, "Sit next to me..." The narration continues and concludes with Hadhrat Khadijah  $\rho$  verifying that "Hadhrat Jibra'eel  $\nu$  is the angel and there is no effect of the devil. I give you the counsel that you should become firmer in your claim of Nubuwwah and I congratulate you on the coming of the angel." Hadhrat Khadijah  $\rho$  believed in him (Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ).

From this incident we learn that whatever Hadhrat Khadijah  $\rho$  did was for the contentment of her heart and for the firmness of her Imaan, not for the consolation of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .

## The Polytheists Gather to call Rasulullaah ε using a Specific Title

1516. Ma'mar explains: "When there was a break in revelation, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was greatly grieved. His grief reached the extent that on a number of occasions Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  wanted to fall from the mountain." (Bukhari)

This does not affect our explanation because the chain of narration of Ma'mar that has reached us does not reach Rasulullaah ε. Moreover, Ma'mar does not mention the narrators, nor is the name of the person that narrates from Ma'mar mentioned. Ma'mar does not explain that it is a Hadith. Such narrations that are narrated from

\*: Ash Shifaa (Volume Two)

Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  should be understood to be during the initial stages of Nubuwwah, or it should be said that Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  made such an intention because the people had straitened him. Allaah j says:

It should not be that you (O Muhammad  $\epsilon$ ) destroy yourself in grief after them (after their rejection) because they do not believe in this communication (Qur'aan). (It is not in your hands to ensure that they believe.)

(Surah Kahaf (The Cave), 6)

1517. More support for this is in the narration of Hadhrat Jaabir bin Abdullaah  $\tau$ : "When the polytheists called their meeting in Dar un Nadwah to discuss Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , all of them were unanimous that they should make Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  famous as a magician. When Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  came to know of this, this hurt him in abundance and he  $\epsilon$  wrapped himself in his shawl. Hadhrt Jibra'eel  $\upsilon$  came to him with these words from Allaah: "O you wrapped in a cloth (shawl)!" (Surah Muzzamil, 1)

The meaning of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  being wrapped in a shawl could also be that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  thought that revelation had stopped because of a deed he committed; Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  worried that it should not be punishment from Allaah. However, after this intention, because Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was stopped because of a Divine command, no objection can be levelled against Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .

The leaving of Yunus v was exactly the same; on account of his nation belying him, he was greatly grieved.

He left because he had promised his nation that the punishment of Allaah will come, as Allaah says:

وَ ذَا النُّوْنِ اِذْ ذَّهَبَ مُغَاضِبًا فَظِنَّ اَنْ لَّنْ نَقْدِرَ عَلَيْهِ فَنَادِي فِي الظُّلُمِيْنَ الْكُلُمِيْنَ الطُّلُمِيْنَ الطُّلُمِيْنَ الطُّلُمِيْنَ الطُّلُمِيْنَ الطُّلُمِيْنَ الطُّلُمِيْنَ الطُّلُمِيْنَ الطُّلُمِيْنَ الطُّلُمِيْنَ الطَّلُمِيْنَ الطَلْمِيْنَ الطَّلُمِيْنَ الطَّلُمِيْنَ الطَلْمِيْنَ الطَلْمُ اللَّهِ اللَّهُ اللَّلِيْنَ اللَّهُ اللِّهُ اللِّهُ اللَّهُ اللَّهُ اللَّهُ اللَّهُ اللَّهُ اللَّهُ اللَّهُ اللَّهُ اللِّهُ اللَّهُ اللِّهُ اللِّهُ اللِّهُ اللَّهُ اللَّهُ اللَّهُ اللَّهُ اللَّهُ اللْمُ اللَّهُ اللْمُولِيْلُولِي اللْمُولِيْلُولِي اللْمُولِي اللْمُولِي اللْمُولِي اللْلِمُ اللَّهُ اللَّهُ اللْمُولِي الللْمُولِي اللْمُولِي اللللْمُ الللِّلْمُ اللْمُلْمُ اللْمُولِي اللْمُولِي اللْمُولِي الللْمُلْمِ اللْمُلْمُ الللْمُولِي اللْمُلْمُ اللْمُلْمُ اللْمُلْمُ اللْمُلِمُ اللْمُلْمُ اللْمُلْمُ اللْمُلْمُ اللْمُلْمُ اللْمُلِمُ اللْمُلِمُ اللْمُلْمُ اللَّهُ اللَّهُ اللْمُلْمُ اللْمُلْمُ اللْمُلِ

And (do not forget) the person of the fish (Yunus v) when he left (the town) in anger (without requesting permission from Us) and thought that We would not straiten things for him. (However, when a large fish swallowed him,) He prayed in the darkness (of its belly) saying, "There is no laah but You (O Allaah).

You are Pure. I have certainly been from among the wrongdoers (so please forgive me and remove me from this fish)."

(Surah Ambiyaa (The Ambiyaa), 87)

This verse states that Hadhrat Yunus  $\upsilon$  thought 'We shall not be harsh upon his nation'. Makki says that Yunus  $\upsilon$  thought, 'I shall not live in this harshness, nor will my nation belie. Similarly, my nation will be protected from Divine punishment.'

However, some scholars say that this was the good thought of Yunus bin Matta  $\upsilon$  (that Allaah will not punish them).

Some have recited the word 'nugaddir' with a Tashdeed.

In this way, the meaning of the verse will be that Yunus  $\upsilon$  thought 'We shall not send a punishment upon his nation'.

Some Mufassireen have explained this meaning: 'We shall take Yunus v to task'.

Ibn Zayd explained this verse as: 'We shall not take control of him'

However, this view is not correct in any way because it is not possible that a Nabi remains unaware of the Qualities of Allaah.

The correct purport of the verse is that Hadhrat Yunus  $\upsilon$  left his nation upon being displeased with their disbelief. This is the view of Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$ , Dahhaak and other Mufassireen. This means that he was displeased with the actions of his nation and he went away. The meaning can never be taken that he was displeased with his Rabb and he left Ninawa. This is because being displeased with Allaah is synonymous with rebellion against Him and it is a means of disbelief. It is not a sign of Imaan to think such a thing regarding the Ambiyaa  $\iota$ .

According to some views, the reason why Hadhrat Yunus  $\upsilon$  left that place was because a Nabi informed a king of the command of Allaah but the king disobeyed it. Hadhrat Yunus  $\upsilon$  felt very bad at this king turning away from the command of Allaah. Furthermore, the king began treating Yunus  $\upsilon$  in a harsh way, saying that Hadhrat Yunus  $\upsilon$  should take an oath that 'Besides my king, no person is more worthy than I (the king) that he should command me to follow someone'. Yunus  $\upsilon$  was angered at this and went away in this condition.

Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$  narrates that Yunus  $\upsilon$  recieved Nubuwwah when he came out of the belly of the fish and he brings the following verse as proof:

(However, We rescued him from the fish and) We cast him on a barren shore, and he was ill (after spending a long time in the fish's belly).

We then caused a creeper to grow over him (to shade him as he regained his strength).

Then We sent him (to preach) to a nation of a hundred thousand or more.

(Surah Saaffaat (Those who stand in rows), 145-147)

More verses used as proof are:

So (O Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ ) be patient with the decision of your Rabb (to postpone the punishment) and do not be (hasty for the punishment to come immediately) like the person of the fish (Yunus  $\upsilon$ ) who called (to Allaah for help) as he was suppressing his grief (while in the stomach of the fish). (Surah Qalam (The Pen), 48)

فَاجْتَلِنهُ رَبُّهُ فَجَعَلَهُ مِنَ الصَّلِحِيْنَ ٥٠٥٠

His Rabb selected him and made him among the righteous.

(Surah Qalam (The Pen), 50)

From these verses it is proven that Yunus v was granted Nubuwwah after the incident of the fish.

### 'Ghayn' refers to something that Completely covers the Heart

1518. If someone levels an objection at this point that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "There is a veil on my heart. Subsequently, I seek forgiveness from Allaah a hundred times a day." (Muslim)

1519. Another narration states: "I seek forgiveness from Allaah more than seventy times a day." (Bukhari)

Before giving the answer to this, it is necessary to inform those who object so that no one thinks that the word 'ghayn' used in the Hadith means 'doubt' or whispering. Ghayn means 'that which covers the heart'. Abu Ubayd gives the explanation of Ghayn to be an example like that of a cloud that covers the sky.

Some scholars have explained it in this way: *ghayn* refers to a condition that covers the heart like the clouds cover the sky. However, it does not stop the rays of the sun. Therefore, it is said that it cannot be understood from using the word *ghayn* that daily, seventy to a hundred times, this condition comes over his heart.

Another matter that deserves pondering over is that the above mentioned word does not have the possibility which was mentioned. Most of the narrations state it. This aspect deserves thinking about that no number is mentioned, but it is an explanation of Istighfaar.

The meaning of the Hadith that we have given and the meaning explained by others is better and more famous and most of the scholars have adopted it. However, those people go around these high meanings and reach the delicate depths. For those who take benefit, I have explained the clear

meaning and this meaning is based on the principle that besides propagation and explanation of rulings, it is possible for error, negligence and laziness.

#### Explanation of the Error of the Mashayikh

The Mashaayikh feel that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was free of all this and to say regarding Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  that laziness overcame him or there was error is something blameworthy. They say that the purport of the Hadith is that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would be worried about the matters of the Ummah. These conditions would make him worried because Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was very merciful upon the Ummah. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would therefore seek forgiveness for the Ummah, not for himself.

Some scholars say that 'ghayn' means 'contentment of the heart that would always cover Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ', because Allaah j says:

إِلَّا تَنْصُرُوْهُ فَقَدْ نَصَرَهُ اللهُ إِذْ اَخْرَجَهُ الَّذِيْنَ كَفَرُوْا ثَانِيَ اثْنَيْنِ إِذْ هُمَا فِي الْغَارِ إِذْ يَقُوْلُ لِصَاحِبِهِ لَا تَحْزَنْ إِنَّ اللهَّ مَعَنَا ۚ ا فَاَنْزَلَ اللهُ سَكِيْنَتَهُ عَلَيْهِ وَ اَيَّذَهُ بِجُنُوْدٍ لَمْ تَرَوْهَا وَ جَعَلَ كَلِمَةَ الَّذِيْنَ كَفَرُوا السُّفْلَى أَلَ وَعَلَيْهِ وَ اَيَّذَهُ بِجُنُودٍ لَمْ تَرَوْهَا وَ جَعَلَ كَلِمَةَ الَّذِيْنَ كَفَرُوا السُّفْلَى أَلَا وَ عَلَيْهُ عَزِيْزٌ حَكِيْمٌ ١٠٠٠ كَلِمَةُ اللهِ هِيَ الْعُلْيَا اللهُ عَزِيْزٌ حَكِيْمٌ ١٠٠٠

If you do not assist him (Rasulullaah ε), then indeed Allaah had assisted him when the Kuffaar drove him out him (of Makkah). He was the second of the two (the other being his bosom friend Abu Bakr τ) when they were (hiding from the Kuffaar) in the cave (outside Makkah) and he (Rasulullaah ε) told his companion (Abu Bakr τ) (when the Kuffaar were on the verge of capturing them), "Do not grieve (do not fear for my safety). Verily Allaah is with us (and He will protect us from the Kuffaar)." So Allaah caused His tranquillity (serenity, mercy and peace) to

descend on him, assisted him (on various occasions) with an army (of angels and other creation) that you had not seen. And (Allaah) placed the word of the Kuffaar (the call to Shirk) at the very bottom while the word of Allaah (the Kalimah) is right at the top. Allaah is Mighty, The Wise. (Therefore, if any person refuses to assist Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  and Islaam, his assistance is not needed because Allaah shall assist them as He did before.)

(Surah Taubah (Repentance), 40)

When tranquillity descends, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  resorted to Istighfaar in order to show his servitude and need.

Ibn Ataa says that the objective of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  seeking forgiveness was to teach the Ummah that they should do the same

Other scholars are of the view that he used to seek forgiveness so that it could be known that despite being such a great Rasul, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would fear Allaah j and he would remain in the effort of staying away from sin. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  never became fearless and he did not understand that we (the Ummah of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ) are safe.

It is also possible that such a condition of fear and honour is meant, which would always be in the heart of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , and Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would show his servitude and he would seek forgiveness out of gratitude to Allaah Proof for this is in the statement of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ :

- 1520. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said in display of his servitude, "Shall I not be a grateful servant of Allaah?"
- 1521. Based on these reasons, this statement of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  can also be studied, "A condition comes over

my heart more than seventy times a day. At that time I seek forgiveness from Allaah."

Now, if someone levels an objection regarding the meaning of the following verse:

(O Muhammad ε) If their turning away (from Islaam) is difficult for you (because of your concern for them) then, if you are able to do so, search for a tunnel into the earth or a ladder to the sky and bring forth a miracle for them (since you cannot do this, you will have to exercise patience until Allaah deals with them). If Allaah willed, He would have gathered them all upon guidance (however, He did not desire to do so). So do not be of the uninformed ones (and do not worry about them).

(Surah An'aam (Livestock), 35)

Addressing Nuh v, Allaah j says:

قَالَ يُنُوْحُ إِنَّهُ لَيْسَ مِنْ اَهْلِكَ ۚ النَّهُ عَمَلٌ غَيْرُ صَالِح ۗ فَلَا تَسْئَلْنِ مَا لَيْسُ لَكَ بِهِ عِلْمُ ۖ النِّيْ اَعِظُكَ اَنْ تَكُوْنَ مِنَ الْجَهِلِيْنَ ٢٠٢٠ لَيْسَ لَكَ بِهِ عِلْمُ ۖ ١٠٤٤ لِنِّيْ اَعِظُكَ اَنْ تَكُوْنَ مِنَ الْجَهِلِيْنَ ٢٠٤٠٠

Allaah said, "O Nooh! Indeed he was not from your family (he was not destined to be a Mu'min like the others and therefore could not be saved). His actions were certainly incorrect (he committed kufr and rejected Imaan), so do not ask Me about that which you have no

knowledge (do not ask me to save him when you have no knowledge about his inner condition). I advise you not to be of the ignorant (those who address subjects that they do not have knowledge about)."

(Surah Hood (Hood), 46)

Do not turn attention to this which is said about Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  in the verse that do not be from those who are ignorant because if Allaah wants, He can gather all of them upon guidance and what Allaah j says about Hadhrat Nuh  $\upsilon$  (mentioned above).

A person should not turn his attention to the apparent meaning of these verses because attributing these qualities to the Ambiyaa ι is ignorance and it is not appropriate for these things to come from the Ambiyaa ι. At this point, the objective is the advice that a person should not do anything in accordance to the way of the ignorant and they should not do anything similar to the ignorant. In one place Allaah said, "I advise you." As it has also been explained above, the conclusion can never be reached that something was found in these two Ambiyaa ι that Allaah forbade them (from). This is proven because before this Allaah j says, "...so do not ask Me about that which you have no knowledge..." (Surah Hood (Hood), 46)

In all these cases, it is shown to be best that the end part of the verse is studied in the light of the first part. Therefore, in this case, it is necessary to take permission and it is permissible to ask in the beginning. However, at the time when Hadhrat Nuh  $\upsilon$  asked about something which Allaah wanted to keep hidden, Allaah forbade (it). This is because his son was (meant to be) destroyed and Allaah j informed Hadhrat Nuh  $\upsilon$  of this.

قَالَ يَنُوْحُ إِنَّهُ لَيْسَ مِنْ اَهْلِكَ ۚ ١ إِنَّهُ عَمَلٌ غَيْرُ صَالِح ۖ فَكَ تَسْئَلْنِ مَا لَيْسُ لَكَ بِهِ عِلْمُ ۖ ١ إِنِّيْ اَعِظُكَ اَنْ تَكُوْنَ مِنَ الْجَهِلِيْنَ ٢٠٠٠ لَيْسَ لَكَ بِهِ عِلْمُ ۖ ١ إِنِّيْ اَعِظُكَ اَنْ تَكُوْنَ مِنَ الْجَهِلِيْنَ ٢٠٠٢ مِنْ الْجَهِلِيْنَ ٢٠٠٠

Allaah said, "O Nooh! Indeed he was not from your family (he was not destined to be a Mu'min like the others and therefore could not be saved). His actions were

certainly incorrect (he committed kufr and rejected Imaan), so do not ask Me about that which you have no knowledge (do not ask me to save him when you have no knowledge about his inner condition). I advise you not to be of the ignorant (those who address subjects that they do not have knowledge about)."

(Surah Hood (Hood), 46)

Allamah Makki  $\alpha$  has explained this meaning 'I have completed My favour upon Nuh  $\upsilon$ .'

### The Divine Command to adopt Patience given to Rasulullaah ε when the Nation belied Him

Similarly, Ibn Faurak has explained this meaning: Rasulullaah was commanded to adopt patience when his nation belies him and Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was told that he shold not turn his gaze away because if he does, then his condition will become like that of an ignorant person because of severe regret.

Some scholars explain that the addressees of the verse "...do not be of the uninformed ones." (Surah An'aam, 35) is the Ummah of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ . Abu Muhammad Makki has explained this meaning and said that there are countless more examples in the Our'aan besides this.

#### The Ambiyaa' 1 are Innocent from Error/Sin

After all this clarification, the virtues of the Ambiyaa  $\iota$  has been proven. The Ambiyaa  $\iota$  are innocent from sin upon Nubuwwah.

If you object to the proof that the Ambiyaa ı are innocent from sin and nothing disliked can come from them by saying

why did Allaah warn Rasulullaah ε? Why was he advised: 'If you do not do this, or if you do not remain protected, then the following will happen:

Indeed We have sent revelation to you (O Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ ) and to those ( $Ambiyaa\ \iota$ ) before you (stating), "If you commit Shirk, your (good) deeds will certainly be wasted (because you will receive no rewards for them in the Aakhirah), and you will definitely become of the losers." (Surah Zumar (The Groups), 65)

And:

...and, besides Allaah, do not call on (do not worship) any being who cannot benefit nor harm you (do not worship or pray to them because they cannot harm or benefit you). If you do so, then you will surely be of the oppressors (wrong-doers).""

(Surah Yunus (Yunus), 106)

Another verse says,

وَ لَوْ لَا اَنْ تَبَتْنَكَ لَقَدْ كِدْتَّ تَرْكَنُ اِلَيْهِمْ شَيْئًا قَلِيْلًا اللهِ مَ الْأَدْقَنَكَ 
مَا الْمَاتِ ثُمَّ لَا تَجِدُ لَكَ عَلَيْنَا نَصِيْرًا ١٠٠٧٥ فَ الْمَمَاتِ ثُمَّ لَا تَجِدُ لَكَ عَلَيْنَا نَصِيْرًا ١٠٠٧٥ الله 
If We had not kept you firm (by saving you from wrongdoing), you could have (possibly) inclined slightly towards them (because of their persistence and convincing manners).

In that case (had you acceded to their requests,) We would have let you taste double punishment in this life and after

### death. Then you would not have found any assistant for you (to help you) against Us.

(Surah Bani-Israa'eel (Bani Israa'eel), 74-75)

And Allaah says:

Indeed we would have caught his right hand. (Surah Haagga (The Inevitable), 45)

Allaah j also says:

If you follow the majority on earth (the Kuffaar) they will deviate you from Allaah's path (from Islaam). All they follow are their guesses (their own ideas and concepts) and lies (their beliefs have no substance).

(Surah An'aam (Livestock), 116)

And Allaah j says:

Or do they (the Mushrikeen) say that he (Rasulullaah ε) has forged a lie against Allaah (by claiming that Allaah made him a Rasool and gave him the Qur'aan)? (O Rasulullaah ε! Do they not realise that if you are inventing lies about Allaah, then) If Allaah desires (to prevent you from lying about Him), He could seal your heart (rendering you incapable of saying or doing anything?). Allaah eradicates falsehood and establishes the truth with His words (Therefore, no false prophet can ever hope to

### succeed). Undoubtedly He has thorough knowledge of the secrets of the heart.

(Surah Shura (Consultation), 24)

Allaah j says:

يَٰآيُّهَا الرَّسُوْلُ بَلِّعْ مَا أُنْزِلَ اِلَيْكَ مِنْ رَّبِّكَ ١٠ وَ اِنْ لَّمْ تَفْعَلْ فَمَا بَلَّعْتَ رِسَالَتَهُ ١٠ وَ اللهُ يَعْصِمُكَ مِنَ النَّاسِ ١٠ اِنَّ اللهَ لَا يَهْدِي الْقَوْمَ الْكَفِرِيْنَ ١٠٠٠ الْكُفِرِيْنَ ١٠٠٠٠

O Rasool ε! Propagate what (everything that) has been revealed to you from your Rabb (and do not fear the reaction of the Kuffaar). If you do not do so (if you hide something), then you have not conveyed Allaah's message (because hiding some is as bad as hiding all). Allaah shall protect you from the people (and they will be unable to kill you). Surely Allaah does not guide the nation of Kaafiroon. (Rasulullaah ε therefore conveyed the complete message of Islaam.)

(Surah Maa'idah (The Set Table), 67)

And:

يَانَيُهَا النَّبِيُّ اتَّقِ اللهَ وَ لَا تُطِعِ الْكُفِرِيْنَ وَ الْمُنْفِقِيْنَ ١٠ اِنَّ اللهَ كَانَ عَلِيْمًا حَكِيْمًا النَّبِيُّ اتَّقِ اللهَ كَانَ عَلِيْمًا حَكَيْمًا ١٠٠٠

O Nabi & Fear Allaah (at all times) and do not follow (the instructions of) the Kuffaar and the Munaafiqeen.
Undoubtedly Allaah is ever the All Knowing, the Wise.
(Surah Ahzaab (The Armies), 1)

#### The Reply to the Doubt

May Allaah j grant us and you the Divine ability not to have any shortcoming in the propagation of Deen. We should not be lazy in carrying out the command of Allaah. After reading these verses, it is necessary to remember that there is no possibility of polytheism with the being of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . It is not possible for Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  to disobey Allaah's Ordinance, cease conveying His message (of Tauheed), associate partners with Him, say anything regarding Allaah j that is not appropriate for Him, attribute something false to Allaah, or lead people astray. If he had followed the disbelievers, Allaah would have placed a seal on his heart.

It is clearly known from these verses that, through explanation, Allaah j created an easy way of propagation for Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Allaah informed Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  to adopt the same method of propagation which he was taught and using any other way would be as though he  $\epsilon$  has not propagated.

Allaah also strengthened and consoled the heart of Rasulullaah a with the verse:

...Allaah shall protect you from the people (and they will be unable to kill you)...
(Surah Maa'idah (The Set Table), 67)

The words of consolation are the same that were given to Musa v and Haroon v:

Allaah said, "Have no fear, for verily I am with you, hearing and seeing (I am with you to protect you wherever you are)."

(Surah TaaHaa (TaaHaa), 46)

i.e. 'When both of you go to Fir'awn for the sake of propagation, do not be awed by him and do not fear any oppression; your hearts should be firm and you should have no fear of the enemy when propagating Deen'.

Allaah j says:

If he (Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ ) has (falsely) attributed some words to Us (ascribed to Allaah words that Allaah had not revealed) ...

...We (shall not allow him to go unpunished and We) shall grab (seize) him by the his right hand.
We shall then severe, (cut) his jugular vein ...
(Surah Haagga (The Inevitable), 44-46)

And Allaah j says:

In that case (had you acceded to their requests,) We would have let you taste double punishment in this life and after death. Then you would not have found any assistant for you (to help you) against Us.

(Surah Bani Israa'eel (Bani Israa'eel), 75)

The meaning of these verses is: 'Whoever does this; we shall do the same, and if you do the same, then the same will happen to you'.

Similarly, another verse states:

If you follow the majority on earth (the Kuffaar) they will deviate you from Allaah's path (from Islaam). All they

follow are their guesses (their own ideas and concepts) and lies (their beliefs have no substance).

(Surah An'aam (Livestock), 116)

Others are meant, although the apparent addressee is Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .

Allaah j says:

O you who have Imaan! If you obey the Kuffaar (take their advice), they will turn you back on your heels (turn you away from Islaam), causing you to return as losers (in both worlds).

(Surah Aal-Imraan (Aal-Imaan), 149)

And Allaah j says:

Or do they (the Mushrikeen) say that he (Rasulullaah ε) has forged a lie against Allaah (by claiming that Allaah made him a Rasool and gave him the Qur'aan)? (O Rasulullaah ε! Do they not realise that if you are inventing lies about Allaah, then) If Allaah desires (to prevent you from lying about Him), He could seal your heart (rendering you incapable of saying or doing anything?). Allaah eradicates falsehood and establishes the truth with His words (Therefore, no false prophet can ever hope to succeed). Undoubtedly He has thorough knowledge of the secrets of the heart.

(Surah Shura (Consultation), 24)

And:

Ash Shifaa (Volume Two)
 كَانَاكُ وَ اللَّهِ اللَّذِيْنَ مِنْ قَبْلِكَ اللَّهِ اللَّهِ اللَّهِ عَمَلُكَ
 وَ لَقَدْ أُوْحِيَ اللَّيْكَ وَ اللَّهِ اللَّهِ اللَّهِ اللَّهِ اللَّهُ ا

Indeed We have sent revelation to you (O Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ ) and to those ( $Ambiyaa\ \iota$ ) before you (stating), "If you commit Shirk, your (good) deeds will certainly be wasted (because you will receive no rewards for them in the Aakhirah), and you will definitely become of the losers." (Surah Zumar (The Groups), 65)

Can a doubt arise that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  will (May Allaah protect us) engage in polytheism? Other people are also meant by it.

And the verse:

O Nabi ε! Fear Allaah (at all times) and do not follow (the instructions of) the Kuffaar and the Munaafiqeen.
Undoubtedly Allaah is ever the All Knowing, the Wise.
(Surah Ahzaab (The Armies), 1)

This verse does not mean that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  ever obeyed the disbelievers. It is the right of Allaah to admonish in this way. He can stop Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  from whatever He wishes, like in the verse:

Do not drive away those  $(poor\ Sahabah\ \psi)$  who call (worship) their Rabb morning and evening, seeking His pleasure. You are not accountable (responsible) at all for

them (for their inner condition), nor are they (just as they are not) at all accountable (responsible) for you, (there is therefore no reason) that (permits) you (to) drive them away and become of the wrong-doers (by doing this). (Since you have no knowledge of the inner conditions of their hearts, you have no reason to drive them out of your gatherings.)

(Surah An'aam (Livestock), 52)

This was the case despite the fact that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  did not push anyone away, nor can we find anything in the characteristics of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  that he pushed someone away without reason.

#### Section 2

#### The Innocence of the Ambiyaa' i Before Nubuwwah

Before being deputed, did the Ambiyaa' unever have any doubt regarding the Being and Qualities of Allaah, and were they innocent from error before Nubuwwah or not? Regarding this issue, there is a difference of opinion.

All the incidents, conditions, and words of the Ambiyaa' t show that they were innocent and clear from every form of shortcoming from birth. They not only remained in the shade of Tauheed and were nurtured in faith in Allaah, but they were brought up in the rains of recognition and light. We informed about this in the First Part, Chapter 2 about this.

Until today, no scholar of Hadith has narrated that a disbeliever or a polytheist was given the rank of Nubuwwah. Some scholars have presented the logical proof that the hearts of people would begin to hate the person whom disbelief and polytheism was proven from. How is it then possible for disbelief and polytheism to come from the Ambiyaa' 1?

Qaadhi Iyaadh  $\alpha$  says that the Quraysh also directed every type of accusation towards Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and they lied about him. They attributed to him whatever they could think of and they attributed to him without hesitation. The disbelievers in the nations of the previous Ambiyaa'  $\iota$  did the same to them. However, we have never ever heard it said: 'He (the Nabi) placed the command of Allaah behind his back (i.e. abandoned it)'. A Nabi was never ever criticized so: 'You left that which you were upon' or 'You joined us'.

If this had actually happened, the disbelievers would have not given up the opportunity to say it. As for the idols, proof could be taken from the way the Ambiyaa' ı dealt with them. If they did this (if the disbelievers accused the Ambiyaa' ı of this), then possibly their talk would have been more effective. Contrary to this, they instead said to their Nabi, "You have turned the people against the deities that our forefathers used to worship, the deities that people were worshipping for a long time already."

They did not accuse their Nabi himself of turning away from their idolatry because they did not find him worshipping their idols before he proclaimed Nabuwwah in the first place. If they had accused him of this, then their objection would have definitely been narrated and silence would not have been adopted.

The example can be given like that of the Qiblah change, they said:

Soon the foolish people will say: "What has caused them (the Muslims) to turn away from the Qiblah towards which they were facing?" Say (O Muhammad  $\varepsilon$ ), "To Allaah belongs the East and the West (Allaah therefore has the right to fix the Qiblah to any direction He pleases and none has the right to object). He guides whoever He wills to the straight path."

(Surah Al-Bagara (The Bull), 142)

Qaadhi Qushayri has taken proof from the following verses of the Qur'aan regarding the innocence of the Ambiyaa' t and he has explained that these verses are clear

proof that the Ambiyaa'  $\iota$  are protected (from the defect of ascribing partners to Allaah):

وَ اِذْ اَخَذْنَا مِنَ النَّبِيِّنَ مِيْتَاقَهُمْ وَ مِنْكَ وَ مِنْ نُّوْحٍ وَّ اِبْرْهِيْمَ وَ مُوْسلي وَ عِيْسَى ابْنِ مَرْيَمَ إِ وَ اَخَذْنَا مِنْهُمْ مِّيْثَاقًا غَلِيْظًأَلَا • •

When We took the pledge from the Ambiyaa' 1; from you (O Muhammad  $\epsilon$ ), Nooh  $\upsilon$ , Ibraheem  $\upsilon$ , Moosa  $\upsilon$  and Isa  $\upsilon$  the son of Maryam (all the Ambiyaa' 1 pledged to worship only Allaah and to pass Allaah's message on to the people).

We took a solemn pledge from them all... (Surah Ahzaab (The Armies), 7)

Allaah j says:

وَ إِذْ اَخَذَ اللهُ مِيْثَاقَ النَّبِيِّنَ لَمَا الْتَيْتُكُمْ مِّنْ كِتٰبٍ وَّ حِكْمَةٍ ثُمَّ جَاءَكُمْ رَسُوْلٌ مُّصَدِّقٌ لِّمَا مَعَكُمْ لَتُؤْمِنُنَّ بِهِ وَ لَتَنْصُرُنَّهُ ۖ اَ قَالَ ءَاقْرَرْتُمْ وَ اَخَذْتُمْ عَلَى ذَلِكُمْ اِصْرِيْ ۖ 1 قَالُوْا اَقْرَرْنَا ۖ 1 قَالَ فَاشْهَدُوْا وَ اَنَا مَعَكُمْ اَخَذْتُمْ عَلَى ذَلِكُمْ اِصْرِيْ ۖ 1 قَالُوْا اَقْرَرْنَا ۖ 1 قَالَ فَاشْهَدُوْا وَ اَنَا مَعَكُمْ الشَّهِدِيْنَ ١٠٨١.

(Remember the time) When Allaah took the pledge with (all) the Ambiyaa' ι (saying) "(Take hold of) Whatever I give you of the Book (divine scriptures) and wisdom, and then when there comes to you a Rasool (Muhammad ε) confirming what is with you, you must believe in him and you must assist him." He (Allaah) said, "Do you agree and accept My pledge?" They replied, "We agree!" He said, "Then bear witness and I will be a Witness with you." (The Ambiyaa' ι then also took the same pledge from their followers.)

(Surah Aal-Imraan (Aal-Imraan), 81)

Allaah j purified Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  the day that he took the oath. It is not in line with justice that a promise be taken

from him  $\epsilon$  before his birth, or that a promise was taken a long time ago from the Ambiyaa'  $\iota$  to believe in him and to help him, and then, later, polytheism and sin comes from him  $\epsilon$ . These are things that none but an irreligious person will take to be permissible. This is the meaning of the text.

#### The Miracle of Splitting the Chest

1522. When Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was young, Hadhrat Jibra'eel  $\upsilon$  came to him and split his chest open, took out a black clot of blood and said to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , "This was the devilish part that was in you." Hadhrat Jibra'eel  $\upsilon$  then washed the heart of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  in Zamzam water and filled it with Imaan and wisdom.

At this point, if someone brings the story of when Hadhrat Ibrahim saw the stars, sun, and moon and said: "Can this be my Rabb?" (Surah An'aam, 76-78) v as proof, then the response is this as follows:

Some scholars have explained that this was during the childhood of Hadhrat Ibrahim  $\upsilon$  and therefore the initial stage of understanding. However, those of wisdom and foresight say that Hadhrat Ibrahim  $\upsilon$  was actually questioning his nation in order to establish proof against them and to silence them.

Some scholars say that this question was in the meaning of 'Inkaari' and the objective of it was: "Tell me, can this be my Rabb?" i.e. the phrase is interrogative and signifies denial

Zujaaj said that Hadhrat Ibrahim v saying, "Can this be my Rabb?" was in accordance to the statement made by

his nation. The proof of this is that Hadhrat Ibrahim  $\upsilon$  did not worship it for even a moment, nor was he ever engaged in polytheism for even a moment. Furthermore, Allaah mentions the words he (Hadhrat Ibrahim  $\upsilon$ ) used to address his father and nation:

(Tell them about the time) When he said to his people and to his father, "What do you worship?"

(Surah Shu'araa (The Poets), 70)

And Allaah said:

He said, "Do you (not) see what you worship..."
"...you and your forefathers (Have you not considered your position carefully)?"

"They (your idols) are all my enemies (whose worship causes harm instead of good), except the Rabb of the universe (Allaah, Whose worship brings only good and no harm)."

(Surah Shu'araa (The Poets), 75-77)

And Allaah said:

(Remember the time) When he (Ibraheem v) came to his Rabb with a sound (pure) heart (that was free from Shirk and sin)

(Surah Saaffaat (Those who stand in rows), 84)

i.e. his heart was pure from polytheism. Allaah j says:

Ash Shifaa (Volume Two)

 Ash Shifaa (Volume Two)

وَ إِذْ قَالَ اِبْرُ هِيْمُ رَبِّ اجْعَلْ هَٰذَا الْبَلَدَ أُمِنًا وَّ اجْنُبْنِيْ وَ بَنِيَّ اَنْ نَّعْبُدَ

الْأَصْنَامَ ٢٥٠٠٠

(Remember the time) When Ibraheem v said (when he left his wife Haajira and son Isma'eel in Makkah), "O my Rabb! Make this city peaceful and safeguard my children and myself from worshipping idols." (Allaah accepted his du'aa by declaring Makkah a sacred place where no person should be killed.)

(Surah Ibraheem (Ibraheem), 35)

If someone raises objection regarding the statement of Hadhrat Ibrahim v:

...But when it set, he said (to the people), "If my Rabb does not guide me I shall surely become of those who have gone astray." (By saying this, he indicated to the people that they were astray and in need of guidance) (Surah An'aam (Livestock), 77)

Then (the response is that) the meaning of this is clear: 'If the help of Allaah was not with me (Hadhrat Ibrahim  $\upsilon$ ) then I would have been astray like you and I would have been worshipping idols'. Hadhrat Ibrahim  $\upsilon$  said this out of well-wishing for his nation and out of the fear of Allaah, otherwise he was protected from deviation from the very beginning.

Now, those who object will question the purport of this verse:

وَ قَالَ الَّذِیْنَ كَفَرُوْ الرِسُلُهِمْ لَنُخْرِجَنَّكُمْ مِّنْ اَرْضِنَا اَوْ لَتَعُوْدُنَّ فِيْ مِلْتَنَا ال الْلَمِيْنُ ١٠٠٣ مَلَّتِنَا الْأَلْمِیْنُ ١٠٠٣ مَلَّتِنَا الْأَلْمِیْنُ ١٠٠٣ مَلَّتِنَا الْأَلْمِیْنُ ١٠٠٣ مَلْتِنَا الْأَلْمِیْنُ ١٠٠٣ مَلْتِنَا الْعَلْمِیْنُ ١٠٠٣ مَلْتِنَا الْعَلْمِیْنُ ١٠٠٣ مَلْتِنَا الْعَلْمِیْنُ ١٠٠٣ مَلْتَنَا الْعَلْمِیْنُ ١٠٠٣ مِلْتَنَا الْعَلْمِیْنُ ١٠٠٨ مِلْتَنَا الْعَلْمِیْنَ الْعَلْمِیْنُ ١٠٠٨ مِلْتَنَا الْعَلْمِیْنَ الْعَلْمِیْنُ ١٠٠٨ مِلْتَنَا الْعَلْمِیْنَ الْعَلْمِیْنُ ١٠٠٨ مِلْتَنَا الْعَلْمِیْنَ الْعَلْمِیْنُ ١٠٠ مِلْتَنَا الْعَلْمِیْنَ الْعَلْمِیْنُ ١٠٠ مِنْ الْعَلْمِیْنَ الْعَلْمِیْنُ ١٠٠ مِلْتَنَا الْعَلْمِیْنُ الْعَلْمُ الْمُنْتَعُوْدُ مِیْنَ الْعَلْمِیْنَ الْعَلْمِیْنَ الْعَلْمِیْنَ الْعَلْمِیْنَ الْعَلْمِیْنَ الْعَلْمِیْنَ الْعَلْمِیْنَ الْعَلْمِیْنَ الْعَلْمِیْنَ الْعِلْمِیْنَ الْعِلْمِیْنَ الْعَلْمِیْنَ الْعَلْمِیْنَ الْعَلْمِیْنَ الْعِلْمِیْنَ الْعِلْمِیْنَ الْعِلْمِیْنَ الْعِلْمِیْنَ الْعِلْمِیْنَ الْعِلْمِیْنَ الْعِلْمِیْنَ الْعِلْمِیْنَ الْعِلْمِیْنِ الْعِلْمِیْنَ الْعِلْمِیْنِ الْعِلْمِیْنَ الْعِلْمِیْنَ الْعِلْمِیْنُ الْعِلْمِیْنِ الْعِلْمِیْنِ الْعِلْمِیْنِ الْعِلْمِیْنِ الْعِلْمِیْنِ الْعِلْمِیْنِ الْعِلْمِیْنِ الْعِلْمِیْنِ الْعِیْمِیْنِ الْعِیْمِیْنِ الْعِلْمِیْنِ الْعِیْمِیْنِ الْعِیْمِیْنِ الْعِیْمِیْنِ الْعِیْمِیْنِ الْعِیْمِیْنِ الْعِیْمِیْنِ الْعِیْمِیْنِ الْعِیْمِیْنِ الْعِیْمِیْنِ الْعِیْمِیْنَ الْعِیْمِیْمِیْ الْعِیْ

(After years of trying to convince the people,) The Kuffaar (finally) said to their Rusul, "We shall certainly drive you out of our land, unless you return to our religion (because we are not prepared to follow your religion)." (At that stage) Their Rabb sent revelation to them (to the Rusul, saying), "We shall surely destroy the oppressors (the Kuffaar)..." (Surah Ibraheem (Ibraheem), 13)

Then, the statement of the Ambiyaa' i is mentioned:

قَدِ افْتَرَيْنَا عَلَى اللهِ كَذِبًا إِنْ عُدْنَا فِيْ مِلَّتِكُمْ بَعْدَ إِذْ نَجِّىنَا اللهُ مِنْهَا 1 وَ مَا يَكُوْنُ لَنَا أَنْ نَعُوْدَ فِيْهَا إِلَّا أَنْ يَشَاءَ اللهُ رَبُّنَا ا وَسِعَ رَبُّنَا كُلَّ مَا يَكُوْنُ لَنَا أَنْ تَعُوْدَ فِيْهَا إِلَّا أَنْ يَشَاءَ اللهُ رَبُّنَا وَ بَيْنَ قَوْمِنَا بِالْحَقِّ وَ شَيْءٍ عِلْمًا 1 عَلَى اللهِ تَوَكَّلْنَا 1 رَبَّنَا افْتَحْ بَيْنَنَا وَ بَيْنَ قَوْمِنَا بِالْحَقِّ وَ اللهِ عَلَى اللهِ تَوَكَّلْنَا 1 رَبَّنَا افْتَحْ بَيْنَنَا وَ بَيْنَ قَوْمِنَا بِالْحَقِّ وَ اللهُ عَلَى اللهِ تَوَكِيْنَ ١٩٨٠٠

"We would surely be forging a lie against Allaah if we were to return to your religion after Allaah had rescued us from it (because this would mean that Allaah prefers us to follow your false religion). It is not (proper) for us that we return (to your religion), except if our Rabb Allaah wills (It is a different matter if Allaah had predestined that we should return to your religion for reasons He knows best.). The knowledge of our Rabb surrounds (covers) everything and in Him alone do we trust (we trust that Allaah will keep us steadfast on His true Deen and not cause us to deviate). (However, when Shu'ayb v realised that his people would not listen to him, he prayed) O our Rabb! Decide between us and our people with the truth, for You are the best of deciders (let it be known who is on the right and who is not)."

(Surah A'raaf (The High Wall), 89)

Here, no one should be mistaken by the word 'return' because it only appeared as though the Ambiyaa' t were first part of the creed that their nations were a part of. It is not appropriate to think that they actually were a part of it. This is because, according to the Arabic law, the word 'aud' is also used on such occasions where there is no beginning. Such occurrences are described with the word 'sayrurah', i.e. 'going from one condition to another'. This is supported by the statement in the Hadith:

1523. (عادواحما), "They (the people of Jahannam) will return to coals." (Bukhari, Muslim) Here, the word 'aud' does not mean 'return' because they were not coals before. Similarly, the words of the poet:

'Your character is not such a utensil of milk in which water was mixed and then it became urine.'

In this poem, the word 'aada' was used, i.e. the milk was not urine before.

If one asks about the meaning of the verse:

Did He not find you uninformed (about the Shari'ah of Islaam) and show you the way (by informing you about its details)?

(Surah Duha (The Light of Day), 7)

Then if the lexical meaning is taken of the word 'dhaalan', it will be clear disbelief because if (Allaah save us) Nabi  $\varepsilon$  was deviated, then who will guide to the straight path? The view of Tabari is that it **means that the straight** 

path was not showing itself to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and Allaah j opened it and showed it.

Suddi and other scholars have explained the meaning as: 'O Nabi, We saw Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  among the deviated, so for the sake of the protection of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ , We showed Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  the path of Imaan and guidance.'

Some scholars said that this means that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was found in such a condition that he was uninformed of the Shari'ah so Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ 's attention was turned in the direction of the Shari'ah

What Qushayri said at this point is excellent. He says that the meaning of 'dhaalan' here is 'astonishment' and 'surprise' and that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was in this condition. Therefore, in the search of truth, he went to the cave of Hira so that he could acquire closeness and the Shari'ah. The mercy of Allaah turned to him and he was blessed with the rank of Nubuwwah.

Ali bin Isa says that the meaning is that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  did not recognize (the way to worship Allaah), so Allaah j guided him in its direction, as Allaah j says:

وَ لَوْ لَا فَضْلُ اللهِ عَلَيْكَ وَ رَحْمَتُهُ لَهَمَّتْ طَّآبِفَةٌ مِّنْهُمْ اَنْ يُضِلُوْكَ ١٠ وَ اَنْزَلَ اللهُ وَ مَا يُضُرُّوْنَكَ مِنْ شَيْءٍ ١٠ وَ اَنْزَلَ اللهُ عَلَيْكَ الْكِتَبَ وَ الْحِكْمَةَ وَ عَلَّمَكَ مَا لَمْ تَكُنْ تَعْلَمُ ١٠ وَ كَانَ فَضْلُ اللهِ عَلَيْكَ الْكِتَبَ وَ الْحِكْمَةَ وَ عَلَّمَكَ مَا لَمْ تَكُنْ تَعْلَمُ ١٠ وَ كَانَ فَضْلُ اللهِ عَلَيْكَ الْكِينَ وَ الْحِكْمَةَ وَ عَلَمْكُ مَا لَمْ تَكُنْ تَعْلَمُ ١٠ وَ كَانَ فَضْلُ اللهِ

If it were not for the grace (favour) of Allaah upon you (O Muhammad ε) and His mercy, a party of them (the thief and his clan) would have surely resolved to mislead you (by lying about what had happened). They mislead none but themselves (because they are leading themselves to

Jahannam) and they cannot harm you in the least (because Allaah shall protect you from all wrong). Allaah has revealed to you the Book (the Qur'aan) and wisdom (the Sunnah) and taught you what you knew not. The grace (favours) of Allaah upon you has been tremendous indeed.

(Surah Nisaa (The Women), 113)

Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$  explains that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was never affected by deviation and sin.

In explanation of the word 'guidance', some scholars have said that Allaah j clarified the matters of Nubuwwah by means of proof.

There is another view that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was undecided whether to make his home Madinah or Makkah, so Allaah j guided him to Madinah.

Some scholars have said that the meaning of the verse is that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was found and then others were guided by means of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .

Ja'far bin Muhammad says that the meaning of the verse is that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  could not recognize the love that is granted by Allaah j right in the beginning, so Allaah j then granted this recognition to him later.

#### The Difference Between 'Dhaala' and 'Dhaal'

Hasan bin Ali recited *Dhaali* instead of *Dhaalaan*, 'A straying one found you (O Muhammad  $\epsilon$ ) and was then guided by you)

Ibn Ataa explains that it's meaning can be taken to be love. Besides this, it could also be used in the meaning of friend. We find that the Qur'aan also testifies to this meaning:

This verse can never be taken to be in the meaning of deviation because he was not involved in some deviation related to Deen. This is because if such a thing is said regarding a Nabi (that he was involved in the deviation of disbelief) then the person saying this will become a disbeliever. Similar to this is the verse: "...she is certainly in manifest error." (Surah Yusuf, 30);

Similarly, the verse:

Junayd Baghdadi  $\alpha$  said that he understood the meaning of this verse to be 'Allaah j informed you (Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ) of laws by means of revelation'. He explained the guidance and support for this is with the verse:

(We sent these messengers) With clear proofs (to prove Towheed and their prophethood) and with (divine) books. We have revealed the Reminder (the Qur'aan) to you (O

Muhammad  $\epsilon$ ) so that you may explain to the people what (injunctions of the Shari'ah) has been revealed to them, and so that they may reflect (carefully).

(Surah Nahl (The Bee), 44)

Some scholars say that the verse means 'Allaah j found you (Rasulullaah ɛ) in the condition where you did not recognize your Nubuwwah, Allaah j then made it apparent (to you) and, by means of you, the fortunate were guided.'

I have not seen the view of any Mufassir until now in which the meaning of *Dhaalan* has been explained.

Similar is found in the story of Hadhrat Musa υ:

Moosa v said, "I did it (unintentionally killed the man) at a time when I was from the mistaken ones (I killed him by mistake)."

(Surah Shu'araa (The Poets), 20)

In this verse, *Dhaalleen* is taken in the meaning of 'mistaken'. Someone mistaken is one from whom a mistake or error occurs, without intention. Ibn Arfah says that Azhari said that the meaning of it is 'one who forgets'. He says the same thing regarding the verse:

Did He not find you uninformed (about the Shari'ah of Islaam) and show you the way (by informing you about its details)? i.e. you were uninformed and Allaah j reminded you.

(Surah Duha (The Light of Day), 7)

Dhaal is also used in the meaning of 'forget', as in the verse:

\*:注: Ash Shifaa (Volume Two) - (日本)

وْ ا أَنْ تَكْتُنُوْ هُ صَغِيْرًا أَقْهَ مُ لِلشُّهَادَة وَ أَدْنَى وَ يُعَلِّمُكُمُ اللَّهُ ١ وَ اللَّهُ بِكُلِّ شَيْءٍ عَلِيْمٌ ٢٨٢ O you who have Imaan! When you contract a debt for a fixed period (of time) then write it down. Let a scribe (someone who can write) write down the transaction between you with fairness. No scribe should refuse to write (when he is asked to do so). As Allaah has taught him (to write), so should he write. Let him on whom the **debt is** (binding, i.e. the debtor) **dictate** (the terms of the contract). He should fear Allaah his Rabb and should not reduce anything of it (he should not understate the amount he owes). If the one on whom the debt is (binding) is low in understanding, or weak (too young, too old or ill) or **unable to dictate** (because of a handicap or inability to speak the language), then his guardian should dictate (the contract) with fairness (with justice). Call to witness (the contract) two persons from your men. If there are not two men, then (it will suffice to use) one man and two women from those whom you approve as witnesses (people who *are honest and trustworthy)* **so that if the one** (*woman*) should err (forget), the other may remind her. The witnesses should not refuse (to state what they witnessed)

<del>- |:|:|:\*</del>

when called (to do so). Do not be reluctant in record debts, be they small or large with (record of) their fixed terms (the date when the debt is due should be recorded).

This (recording of debts) is more just in the sight of Allaah, stronger as evidence and the best way to avoid doubt between you; (it is therefore best to record all transaction) unless it is a cash transaction (the goods of) which you transfer amongst yourselves (on the spot). In that case (when the transaction is cash) there is no sin on you if you do not record it. Have witnesses when you sell to each other (this and the command to record transaction are not obligatory but preferable). Let no harm (difficulty) come to the scribe or to the witness. If you do (harm them), then it is indeed a grave sin on you. (Similarly, the scribe and the witness should also not cause harm to the creditor or to the debtor). Fear Allaah (by fulfilling His commands), Allaah shall teach you (what is good for you in all matters). Allaah is the Knower of all things.

(Surah Al-Baqara (The Bull), 282)

Allaah j says:
وَ كَذٰلِكَ اَوْحَيْنَا اِلَيْكَ رُوْحًا مِّنْ اَمْرِنَا ١٠ مَا كُنْتَ تَدْرِيْ مَا الْكِتٰبُ وَ
لَا الْإِيْمَانُ وَ لَكِنْ جَعَلْنٰهُ نُوْرًا نَهْدِيْ بِهِ مَنْ نَشَآءُ مِنْ عِبَادِنَا ١٠ وَ إِنَّكَ
لَا الْإِيْمَانُ وَ لَكِنْ جَعَلْنٰهُ نُوْرًا نَهْدِيْ بِهِ مَنْ نَشَآءُ مِنْ عِبَادِنَا ١٠ وَ إِنَّكَ
لَتَهْدِيْ اِلَى صِرَاطٍ مُسْتَقِيْمٌ ٢٥٠٠٠

In this manner (by these methods of communication) did

We send to you (O Rasulullaah &) revelation of Our
command. (Before We sent revelation to you,) You did not
know what was the Book (the Qur'aan) or what was (the
requisites and etiquette of perfect) Imaan, but We made it
 (the Qur'aan) a light with which We guide those
bondsmen of Ours whom We will. Without doubt (using
the Qur'aan and the revelation We sent to you), you (O
Rasulullaah &) guide (others) towards the
straight path...

Samarqandi says that the verse means: 'Before being deputed, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  had no knowledge of the Qur'aan, nor was he affiliated to the method of teaching.'

Qaadhi Abu Bakr mentioned similar: 'Before being deputed, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  had knowledge of the Oneness of Allaah but the obligations and laws were not revealed as yet, so he therefore did not have knowledge of it'. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was also not compelled at that time. When the divine laws were revealed, then Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was obligated with Imaan and the obligatory duties. We find this interpretation to be the best.

If the meaning is asked of the following verse:

...Before this you were of the unwary (those who did not know about this story).

(Surah Yusuf, 3)

Then the answer is that it deals with acknowledging. It does not have the meaning of the verse:

Abu Abdullaah Harawi said that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was not aware of the incident of Yusuf  $\upsilon$  and Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was informed by means of revelation of it.

1524. Similarly, the Hadith that is narrated by Uthmaan bin Abi Shaybah from the chain of Jaabir  $\tau$  that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  participated in the gathering of the polytheists.

During this time, he  $\epsilon$  heard two angels speaking behind him. One said to the other, "Go ahead and stand behind him." The other said, "How can I stand behind him." They were going towards the idols. Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal  $\alpha$  has refuted this Hadith and he said that it is fabricated. If it is not fabricated, then it definitely is similar to fabricated. Ad Daar Qutni explains that there is confusion in the chain of Uthmaan and the chain of transmission of it is not correct. Therefore, it is best that we do not pay attention to this narration. Instead, there are famous narrations from Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  contrary to this.

1525. For example, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said: (بغضت الى الاصنام) "I have hatred for the polytheism naturally."

1526. Another narration from Umm Ayman  $\rho$  states that when Abu Taalib and his sons asked Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  to come to them for 'feast of theirs', he turned away and he showed his dislike. Abu Taalib took an oath that he must participate. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was forced to go with them but he returned quickly, fearful. He said:

كلما دنوت منها من صنم تمنثل الى شخص ابيض طويل يصيح بي وزاؤك لا تمسه

"When I neared an idol, a tall white person came and says, 'O, move back, you should never touch it'." After this, Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  never participated in a festival of the polytheists. This was the first and last and it was an incident during his childhood.

1527. Similarly, there is the incident of Bahira the monk. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  went with his uncle Abu Taalib on a journey to Shaam and they met Bahira the monk on they way. He saw the sign of a shining, enlightened face and he gauged the

\*: Shifaa (Volume Two)

signs of Nubuwwah according to his knowledge. He took an oath upon Laat and Uzza and wanted to pose a few questions but Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said,

"Do not take an oath upon them because they are the most hated to me; by Allaah, I have no greater enemy than them." Bahira then said to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , "I give you the oath of Allaah and make you witness." Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  replied, "Come, ask what you wish."

It is also well known that before Nubuwwah, whenever Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  went for Hajj, he was against Wuquf in Muzdalifah, as the polytheists used to do. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  stayed in Arafaat at that time because Hadhrat Ibrahim  $\upsilon$  also used to stay in Arafaat.

### Section 3

### The Innocence of the Ambiyaa' 1 and the Matters of the World

Qaadhi Abul Fadhl \alpha says that whatever he explained before proves that the Ambiyaa' ı were filled with knowledge conviction and of Tauheed. Imaan. regarding knowledge, revelation. was nothing There conviction, or religious and worldly matters that they were unaware of. Whoever studied the Ahadith deeply will have definitely found this, especially in the Ahadith that I mentioned. We have explained this in section one of the fourth chapter of the first volume. Yes, it can be said that the condition of the Ambiyaa' t differs regarding this knowledge and recognition.

We shall mention those things that are related to the religious affairs of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ . It is also necessary to clarify that it is not correct to believe that the Ambiyaa'  $\iota$  lived a life totally away from the world and it is not correct to believe that their knowledge had some defect. Their attention was always towards the Aakhirat and the matters of the Shari'ah; these have nothing to do with the world. Contrary to this, people wrongly understand worldly matters to be everything and they remain totally negligent of the Aakhirat. Allaah j says about these worldly people:

بَعْلَمُوْنَ ظَاهِرًا مِّنَ الْحَلِوةِ الدُّنْيَا ۗ وَ هُمْ عَنِ الْأَخِرَةِ هُمْ غَفِلُوْنَ ٢٠٠٧. They (the Kuffaar) have superficial (shallow) knowledge of (matters related to) the life of this world whereas they are negligent of (matters related to) the Aakhirah (as a result, they will be unsuccessful in the Aakhirah).

(Surah Room (Rome), 7)

More detail regarding this will be mentioned in the next chapter, Insha Allaah.

At this point, it must also be remembered that it is not correct to say that the Ambiyaa' ı were totally unaware of the worldly affairs. This is because such a thought will lead to negligence and ignorance about them, while they were totally pure of this. They were sent to the people of the world. They were appointed leaders over them, to guide them in worldly and religious affairs and to reform them. Can a person who is ignorant of the world do this? From the lives of the Ambiyaa' t we learn that they were well known for having knowledge in this regard. If their belief is regarding Deen, then it is proven that Rasulullaah ε knew. It is not permissible to say that Rasulullaah ε was ignorant because this demands that Allaah i sends revelation upon him. It is not permissible to have doubt about him. We have explained this before. What type of ignorance then? Remember, Rasulullaah ε possessed real knowledge. These are such deeds regarding which there was no revelation, but they were Ijtihaadi. The view of the research scholars is that it is permissible for Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  to make *Ijtihaad*.

1528. This agrees with the narration of Hadhrat Umm Salamah  $\rho$  that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Regarding whatever no revelation has come to me, I decide based on my opinion." (Bukhari, Muslim, Abu Dawud)

An example of this is on the occasion of the Badr, when Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  gave the command according to the opinion of some **regarding the prisoners and those remaining behind**. This was also part of his Ijtihaad. This is correct and this was the right, such that whoever takes the opposing view and says that error in Ijtihaad is permissible. Nor can we go the route of the person who says that the

Muitahideen were correct, which is totally correct according to us, nor upon the view of others that the truth went one way. This is because it is proven that an error in Ijtihaad can come from Rasulullaah ε in Shar'i matters. The foresight and Iitihaad of Rasulullaah ε was in those matters in which no revelation came upon him and he was thinking about it, it was not prescribed. However, those matters of the Shari'ah upon which his heart was not settled, he definitely did not have knowledge of it except that which Allaah i informed him of. The knowledge of Rasulullaah ε regarding all this was proven, either through revelation or divine command that he  $\varepsilon$  should begin something. It was these matters that Allaah i showed and Rasulullaah & remained waiting for revelation for them. Rasulullaah ε did not leave the world until he acquired knowledge in all these affairs and knowledge of the laws of the Shari'ah were proven for him, there was no doubt, and ignorance was removed.

The summary of this is that the call that Rasulullaah ε made of explaining the Shari'ah, which he was commanded to do, it is not correct to state that he was unaware because it will not be correct for Rasulullaah ε to call to something which he is not aware of. However, the matters that were related to the belief of Rasulullaah ε, i.e. the kingdom of the skies and the earth, the creation of Allaah, the names of Allaah, specification of the great signs, the signs of Qiyaamah, the condition of the good and the evil whose end has been decided and those that will be decided in future, knowledge of all this was granted to Rasulullaah ε by means of revelation. We have explained before that in accordance to the innocence ofRasulullaah Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  had no doubt about whatever knowledge he was granted. In fact, Rasulullaah ε had complete conviction regarding it.

1529. There is no condition stated that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  must be given (all) the details of all this. Nevertheless, other people were not given the amount of knowledge Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was given.

Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "I do not know except that which Allaah has taught me."

1530. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "And it has not passed the hearts of any human being."

No soul knows what pleasures are hidden for him (in Jannah) as a reward for the deeds he carries out.

(Surah Sajdah (The Prostration), 17)

Musa υ said to Khadir υ:

... "May I follow you on condition (with the understanding) that you teach me some of the special knowledge that has been taught (specially) to you?"

(Surah Kahaf (The Cave), 66)

- 1531. **Rasulullaah ε said,** "O Allaah, I ask You by means of Your good names, those which I know and those which I do not know."
- 1532. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "I ask You by means of every name of Yours that You have kept for Yourself or You have given preference to it in the unseen which is by You."

— Ash Shifaa (Volume Two)

Allaah i says:

وَ فَوْقَ كُلِّ ذِيْ عِلْمٍ عَلِيْمٌ ٢٠٠٧،

... Above every knowledgeable person is one who is more knowledgeable. (No human can claim to be the most knowledgeable. Even the knowledge of the most knowledgeable person is negligible compared to Allaah's knowledge.)

(Surah Yusuf, 76)

Zayd bin Aslam and others say that until that knowledge reaches Allaah. This is such a matter which is not hidden because no one can encompass the knowledge of Allaah, nor does it have an end point. This is a matter dealing with belief in Tauheed, Shari'ah, and the matters of Deen.

### **Section 4**

# The Innocence of Rasulullaah ε, Protection from Shaytaan and the Consensus of the Ummah

The Ummah are unanimous that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was protected from Shaytaan and he was innocent from sin. Allaah sufficed him from different forms of harm coming upon his body and whisperings overpowering his heart.

1533. Indeed we were informed by Qaadhi Abu Bakr Baaqillaani and others that Abul Hasan Daar Qutni said, "Ismaa'eel Saffaar narrates, Abbaa Tarfuqi narrated, Muhammad bin Yusuf narrated, Sufyaan narrated, Mansoor narrated that Saalim bin Abi Janadah narrated, he from Masrooq, and he from Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Mas'ood  $\tau$  that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, 'There is none of you except that a Jinn companion has been appointed for him and an angel companion.' The Sahabah  $\psi$  said, 'With you, O Rasul of Allaah?' Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  replied, 'Even with me, but Allaah has helped me regarding this; he (the Jinn) has become a Muslim."

Besides this, the following is narrated from Mansoor, "He does not command me except good." (Muslim)

1534. The meaning of this has been explained by Hadhrat Ayesha ρ, "*I have been saved*." (Muslim)

Some scholars have said that this narration is Saheeh and they have given preference to it. It has been narrated that 'He accepted Islaam, i.e. in staying with me, his condition returned from disbelief to Islaam. He does not command anything but good, just as the angel does.' This is the apparent meaning of the Hadith.

1535. Some have narrated: "He has become obedient."

Qaadhi Abul Fadhl  $\alpha$  said that now that the Shaytaan that was with him and it normally overpowers man, this is the command, what will be the condition of the one that stays far away from him and the one that does not accompany him, nor does it have the ability to come close to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .

Indeed there are countless Ahadith narrated regarding the Shaytaan; they tried to extinguish the light of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and tried to destroy him, he went after Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  but he became despondent of trying to deceive him  $\epsilon$ . During Salaah he faced Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  but Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  caught him and imprisoned him so he returned an unsuccessful failure.

1536. It is narrated in the authentic books that Hadhrat Abu Hurayrah  $\tau$  narrated that Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "Shaytaan was presented to me." Abdur Razzaaq said that it was in the form of a cat. "It then attacked me such that it broke my Salaah. Allaah gave me power over it but I left him. Before this, I made the intention that I shall tie him to a pillar so that you will be able to see him in the morning but then I remembered the speech of my brother Sulaymaan  $\upsilon$ :

He (Sulaymaan v) said, 'O my Rabb! Forgive me and grant me a kingdom that cannot be had by any other after me. Undoubtedly, You are the Great Giver'.

(Surah Saad, 35)"

1537. Hadhrat Abu Darda  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Indeed the enemy of Allaah, Iblees, came to me with a coal of fire so that he can place it in my

mouth while I was in Salaah." Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  then recited Ta'awwudh and cursed him. "I then intended to catch him and (as before), keep him tied until morning. Through this, the children of Madinah would have played with him."

- 1538. A similar incident is mentioned in the narration of Me'raaj; a Jinn came with a coal to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Hadhrat Jibra'eel  $\upsilon$  then taught Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  the words by means of which he  $\epsilon$  sought protection. This is mentioned in Mu'atta.
- 1539. When Shaytaan himself was not able to attain power over Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , the enemies of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  were made a means, just as the Quraysh consulted regarding killing Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and he (Shaytaan) came (to them) in the form of a Najdi Shaykh.
- 1540. As well as during the battle of Badr, where he came in the form of Suraaqah bin Maalik. This incident corresponds with the verse: "When Shaytaan (Iblees in the disguise of a leader of an Arab tribe) beautified their actions for them (the Mushrikeen of Makkah) and told them (encouraged them to fight the Muslims), 'None from man can overpower you today when I am by your side.'…" (Surah Anfaal, 48)
- 1541. Once, at the pledge of Aqabah, Shaytaan appeared to incite the Quraysh against Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .

In all these incidents, Allaah sufficed for Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and He protected Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  from harm and difficulty.

### 1542. Rasulullaah ε said:

"Isa  $\upsilon$  was saved from his touch, he (Shaytaan) came in order to touch him by the side when he was born but he touched the veil (instead)."

1543. When Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  fell ill and when medication was placed into his mouth, Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  was told, "We fear that you should not have *Dhaat al Janb* ( 'pleurisy')." Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  replied:

"This was from Shaytaan and Allaah has not given that accursed one power over me."

Now it can be said, "What is the meaning of the verse:

Should Shaytaan provoke (incite) you (to do evil), then seek protection from Allaah. Verily He is the All Hearing, the All Knowing.

(Surah A'raaf (The High Wall), 200)

In reply, the scholars of Tafsir explain that this refers to the verse:

...(shun) **the ignorant ones** (because it is futile to argue with them).

(Surah A'raaf (The High Wall), 199)

Then Allaah j says:

### Should Shaytaan provoke (incite) you (to do evil), (Surah A'raaf (The High Wall), 200)

You should not be very angry with those who encourage you to leave out shunning him. Seek protection with Allaah.

Some say that the meaning of the verse relates to corruption, as in the verse, "... 'after Shaytaan had caused trouble between my brothers and me...'." (Surah Yusuf, 100)

Some say that **'provoke you'** refers to a lower stage of whispering. Allaah j commanded Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  to seek protection when anger moves him against the enemy or when Shaytaan intends to provoke him. This is a lower level of whispering and there is no way out of this except that he  $\epsilon$  seeks protection, he will then be sufficed and this will be the means of the innocence of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  because he cannot overpower Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  in troubling him. He (Shaytaan) was not given more power than this over him  $\epsilon$ .

Other scholars have given other explanations of this verse and it is not totally correct that Shaytaan came to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  in the form of an angel and placed doubt into him, not in the beginning of Risaalat and not after. In fact, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  had no doubt regarding the nature of what came to him. He was the Rasul. In reality, (he had) either definite knowledge that Allaah j created for him, or with proof which He made apparent so that the word of Allaah could be completed with truthfulness and justice. There can never be a change in the word of Allaah j.

Now you will ask that what is the meaning of the verse:

وَ مَاْ اَرْسَلْنَا مِنْ قَبْلِكَ مِنْ رَّسُوْلٍ وَّ لَا نَبِيٍّ إِلَّا اِذَا تَمَنِّى اَلْقَى الشَّيْطِ فِيْ اُمْنِيَّتِهِ ۚ اَ فَيَنْسَخُ اللهُ مَا يُلْقِي الشَّيْطِنُ ثُمَّ يُحْكِمُ اللهُ اللِّهُ اللهِ ١٠ وَ اللهُ عَلِيْمٌ حَكِيْمٌ ١٥٠٠

It occurred to every Rasool and Nabi whom we sent before you (Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ ), that whenever he recited (the divine scripture), Shaytaan cast doubts (and objections) in (the hearts of listeners with regard to) his recitation. (The Shayaateen and their allies from the human race never accept Islaam, nor do they wish others to do so. They therefore continue to sow the seeds of doubt in the hearts of others.) However, Allaah eradicates the doubts that Shavtaan casts (mixes into peoples' hearts) and then **consolidates** (confirms) **His verses** (by making people understand them clearly). Allaah is All Knowing, The Wise.

(Surah Haji, 52)

Know well that there are many views narrated regarding the meaning of this verse. Some of them are light, and some are harsh. Some are huge and some are thin. The best among them is the view which majority of the Mufassireen have agree upon, and that is the word 'tamanna' is in meaning of recitation. The casting of Shaytaan is that he causes worry to Rasulullaah ε and for the reciter, he reminds him of worldly talk, to the extent that he (the teacher) forgets his teaching, or for the listeners, he puts them into intricate interpretations that Allaah j has abrogated. However, Allaah clears away the confusion and establishes His verses. Discussion will ensue regarding the verse, Allaah-willing.

Samarqandi α has refuted the view that states, 'Shaytaan overpowered the kingdom of Sulaymaan v'; it is not authentic. We have explained the story of Sulaymaan  $\upsilon$  in the best way after this. In this explanation it is stated that 'body' means the 'son that was born from him'.

Regarding the story of Ayyub v and his statement, "... 'Verily, Shaytaan has afflicted me with pain and difficulty." (Surah Saad, 41) Abu Muhammad Makki said, "It is not permissible at all for anyone to make the interpretation that Shaytaan had made him ill and entered evil into his body. This cannot be done by anyone but Allaah, so that He can test him."

Makki says that some scholars say, "The difficulty that Shaytaan gave him was the whispering of his wife in which he (Shaytaan) tried to mislead her."

Now a person will ask regarding the meaning of the verse wherein Hadhrat Yusha v said, "...It was certainly Shaytaan that made me forget..." (Surah Kahaf, 63) and the verse: "...However, Shaytaan caused him to forget mentioning..." (Surah Yusuf, 42)

1544. And the statement of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  on the day wherein he slept in the valley (and the sun rose and he missed Salaah): "This is the valley where Shaytaan is."

And when Hadhrat Musa v struck the Copt, he said, "... 'This is from the works of Shaytaan...'" (Surah Qasas, 15)

Know well that, among the Arabas, when something evil occurs, they always say that it is from Shaytaan and it is his work, as Allaah j says: "Its (the Zaqqoom tree in Jahannam) fruit resembles the heads of hideous snakes (heads of Shayateen)." (Surah Saaffaat, 65)

And Rasulullaah & said:

"Kill (fight) him (the one who passes in front of someone engaged in Salaah) because he is a devil."

Similarly, one answer is also that it is not necessary to give an answer to the statement of Hadhrat Yusha v because until that time his Nubuwwah with Hadhrat Musa v was not proven. Allaah j says, "When Musa v said to the youngster..." (Al Kahf, 60). Some scholars say he became a Nabi after the demise of Musa v, others have said just before the demise of Musa v. It is also explained that Hadhrat Musa v said this before his Nubuwwah

There are two views narrated of the Mufassireen regarding "...However, Shaytaan caused him to forget mentioning..." (Surah Yusuf, 42):

- 1. One is that the person who forgot was one of the two in prison and his master was the king, i.e. Shaytaan made him forget that he should mention the condition of Yusuf υ to the king.
- 2. It is also said that such types of deeds of Shaytaan was not the overpowering of Yusuf v and Yusha v by whisperings but the objective was only to engage their hearts in other matters. He reminded them of other things so that they forget forget what they were told.
- 1545. (Regarding the place Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  stayed on a journey) Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "This is a jungle of Shaytaan."

This statement does not mention that Shaytaan overpowered or whispered to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ; if this is taken according to the apparent meaning, then Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  made the action of Shaytaan apparent.

1546. Shaytaan came to Bilaal  $\tau$  and made him sleep just as a child is put to sleep, until he slept. So the overpowering of Shaytaan in the jungle was only over Bilaal  $\tau$ , who was appointed to wake everybody up for Fajr.

Another interpretation can be made when the statement 'This is the jungle of Shaytaan' is taken to be a means of oversleeping the Salaah. But if it is taken to be a means of warning for departure and the underlying cause for not performing Salaah there, then this proof is found in the Hadith of Zayd bin Aslam. There can be no objection upon this because it is apparent and the doubt has been removed.

### Section 5

## The Authenticity and Truthfulness of the Statements of Rasulullaah ε

All the statements of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  are true and there are clear proofs to show this. The truthfulness of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is also proven through miracles. The Ummah is unanimous upon the method of propagation of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ : he was innocent and anything he conveyed was never proven wrong later on, whether he said it intentionally or unintentionally.

# Rasulullaah ε never Spoke Something Contrary to Reality, Wilfully or by Mistake

It is totally wrong to say that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said something wrong intentionally because a miracle has been established. Allaah j said: 'Whatever my Rasul spoke is all true'. The Ummah is unanimous upon this.

Now the question arises that whatever Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said my mistake, if the contrary occurs, then just as it is not possible for it to occur intentionally, it is not possible for it to occur by mistake. This is the view of Abu Ishaaq Isfaraa'ini. The Ummah is unanimous upon the intentional part, therefore it can be assumed regarding the mistaken part.

## The Difference of Opinion of Allamah Baaqillaani $\alpha$ and Allaamah Isfara'ini $\alpha$ regarding This

Qaadhi Abu Bakr Baaqillaani  $\alpha$  states that this contradicts the Shari'ah, the verses, and the authentic Ahadith. The difference of opinion is regarding 'becoming proof' and it does not deal with explaining intricate rulings

in its place and making it long, because of this, I will go far from my original subject matter. Therefore, we should also agree with that upon which the Muslims agree.

#### The View of the Author

The reality is that Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  never spoke anything contrary to reality in conveying the Shari'ah to the Ummah. Similarly, Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  never said anything contrary to the information and revelation conveyed from Allaah j to him  $\varepsilon$ , regardless of his condition, whether in joy or in sadness, health or sickness. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "I speak the truth in all conditions."

1547. Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Amr  $\tau$  narrates that he asked Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , "O Rasul of Allaah, shall I write that which I hear from you?" Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  replied, "Yes." I said, "Whether you said something in anger or in joy?" **Rasulullaah \epsilon said,** "Yes, because I speak the truth in all conditions." (Abu Dawud, Ahmad)

It is our desire to mention the detail of what we explained before regarding the proof of miracles (by way of indication). Subsequently, we say that when a miracle of the truthfulness of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  has been established and it has been proven that Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  does not speak anything but the truth and Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  only propagates the truth from Allaah j, then it is as though it has been proven that the speech of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  is true. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  also said, "I am the Rasul of Allaah sent to you so that I may convey that which Allaah sent me with and I may explain whatever He revealed to me clearly."

Allaah j says in the Qur'aan:

وَ مَا يَنْطِقُ عَنِ الْهَوٰى ٣٠٠٠ اِنْ هُوَ اِلَّا وَحْيٌ يُّوْحَى He does not speak of his own desires.

(Rather) Whatever he says is revelation (which Allaah has)
revealed to him (through the agency of Jibra'eel v).

(Surah Najm (The Stars), 3,4)

In testimony of the truthfulness of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , Allaah j says in another place:

يَٰآيُّهَا النَّاسُ قَدْ جَاْعَكُمُ الرَّسُوْلُ بِالْحَقِّ مِنْ رَّبِّكُمْ فَاٰمِنُوْا خَيْرًا لَّكُمْ ١٠ وَ اِنْ تَكْفُرُوْا فَاِنَّ لِللهِ مَا فِي السَّمُوٰتِ وَ الْأَرْضِ ١٠ وَ كَانَ اللهُ عَلِيْمًا حَكَيْمًا ١٠٠٠٠

O Mankind! Indeed the Rasool has come to you with the truth (Islaam) from your Rabb. So bring Imaan, it will be better for you. If you disbelieve, then (you will not be harming Allaah in the least because) verily to Allaah belongs whatever is in the heavens and earth. Allaah is ever All Knowing (about your conditions and actions), The Wise (knows what is best for His creation).

(Surah Nisaa (The Women), 170)

In commanding us to follow Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ , Allaah j says:

مَا اَفَآءَ اللهُ عَلَى رَسُوْلِهِ مِنْ اَهْلِ الْقُرٰى فَلِلّٰهِ وَ لِلرَّسُوْلِ وَ لِذِي الْقُرْبِي وَ الْيَتْمٰى وَ الْمَسْكِيْنِ وَ ابْنِ السَّبِيْلِ\١ كَيْ لَا يَكُوْنَ دُوْلَةً بَيْنَ الْاعْنِيَآءِ مِنْكُمْ ١ وَ مَا اَتَكُمُ الرَّسُوْلُ فَخُذُوْهُ ٥ وَ مَا نَهْكُمْ عَنْهُ فَانْتَهُوْ ١٩ وَ اتَّقُوا الله ١ إِنَّ الله تَسْدِيْدُ الْعِقَابِ٧٠٠

The booty that Allaah granted His Rasool  $\epsilon$  (without a battle being fought) from the people of the villages is for Allaah (to be distributed as Allaah pleases), for the (needs of the) Rasool  $\epsilon$ , for the relatives (of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ), for the orphans, for the poor and for the travellers so that this

wealth may not remain as amassed riches with the wealthy among you (by distributing it in this manner, the wealth is circulated among people so that all may benefit). Hold fast to what (commands) the Rasool  $\epsilon$  gives you and refrain from what (actions) He prevents you (because whatever he instructs you is from Allaah). Fear (disobeying) Allaah, for Allaah punishes

very severely.

(Surah Hashar (The Exile), 7)

In the light of these verses, it will be great disrespect to say that Rasulullaah ε said something that is contrary to reality, no matter what condition it might be. Now if we say that it is permissible that an error can come from Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  or that he can be mistaken, then there will be no distinguishing factor between him ε and others. Truth and falsehood will be mixed.

Therefore, we must accept that all the speech of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  entails it being miraculous and it verifies the truthfulness of his speech. As Abu Ishaaq Isfaraa'ini has explained, it is proven through consensus and proof that the speech of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is free from every form of error or mistake.

### Section 6

### A silencing Reply to the Objectors

1548-1553. In this section we shall provide the replies to the objectors who raise objections regarding the speech of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  from time to time. One of them is that when Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  recited the verse:

Have you seen Laat and Uzza (the names of two idols that the Mushrikeen of Makkah worshipped)...

... and the third one Manaat (another idol of theirs)? (Surah Najm (The Stars), 19, 20)

He  $\varepsilon$  said, "This is a great bird and hope can be held for its intercession." One narration states the words, 'liked'. One narration states:

Another narration states,

When he completed the Surah after this, the Muslims prostrated with him and when the disbelievers heard that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  praised their idols, then they also prostrated. Some narrations state (May Allaah save us), that Shaytaan said these words on the tongue of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . It was because Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  desired that a verse be revealed that will establish close relations between him and his nation. Another narration states that the desire was in the heart of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  that in future such a verse should not be revealed due to which his nation will hate him more. This incident is mentioned in the narrations that Hadhrat

Jibra'eel vcame to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  recited this verse before him. When Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  reached the above-mentioned verses, Hadhrat Jibra'eel  $\nu$  said, "I did not bring these two sentences." Hearing this, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  became sad. The following verse of the Qur'aan was then revealed:

It occurred to every Rasool and Nabi whom we sent before you (Rasulullaah &), that whenever he recited (the divine scripture), Shaytaan cast doubts (and objections) in (the hearts of listeners with regard to) his recitation. (The Shayaateen and their allies from the human race never accept Islaam, nor do they wish others to do so. They therefore continue to sow the seeds of doubt in the hearts of others.) However, Allaah eradicates the doubts that Shaytaan casts (mixes into peoples' hearts) and then consolidates (confirms) His verses (by making people understand them clearly). Allaah is All Knowing, The Wise.

Then, this verse was revealed:

(Surah Haji, 52)

(Referring to the request of the Mushrikeen that Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  should remove some poor Sahabah  $\psi$  from his company before they could associate with him, Allaah says,) **They** 

had almost come close to turning you

(O Rasulullaah ε) away from that which We have revealed to you (not to drive the sincere Muslims away from your

company) so that you may attribute something different to Us. (Had you done what they requested and driven the poor Muslims away,) They (the Mushrikeen) would then have taken you as a friend.

(Surah Bani Israa'eel, 73)

### This Narration can be Criticized in Two Ways

Understand that there are two ways of discussing this narration. The first is that this narration is weak in principle. Secondly, if this narration is accepted, then it is sufficient to classify it baseless by stating that none of the *Sihaah Sittah Muhadditheen* have narrated it, nor has any reliable narrator narrated it with an unbroken chain of narration. So this is a narration from those Mufassireen who love all strange things, those who take every authentic and weak narration. Qaadhi Bakr bin Ala Maaliki very aptly said, "On account of some of the Mufassireen who follow their desires, many people have been affected."

Despite the weakness and confusion in these narrations, as well as their broken chains and variance in wording, the irreligious have held onto it. Someone says that this occurred during Salaah. Another group says that that it occurred when Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  went to a gathering of his people and the verse (Surah Najm) was revealed at this time. Some say that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said this when he  $\epsilon$  was overcome by drowsiness. One group says that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was saying this from his heart and he said it forgetfully. A fifth group says that Shaytaan said these words on his  $\epsilon$  tongue and when Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  mentioned these words to Hadhrat Jibra'eel  $\upsilon$ , Hadhrat Jibra'eel  $\upsilon$  said that he had not taught those words to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Another group says that Shaytaan taught these words to the disbelievers and when Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  came to know, he said, "By Allaah, this verse

was not revealed in this way." What is astonishing to note is that whichever Tabi'een or Mufassireen narrated this, none of them mentioned the chain of narration for it. Moreover, it does not reach any Sahabi. In fact, whatever chains there are for it, are all vague and mixed up.

From these chains, there is a Marfu' narration of Shu'ba. The narrator is Abu Bishr, he narrates from Sa'eed bin Jubayr from Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$ . Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$  states, "I think." It is as though Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$  himself has doubt that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was in Makkah at the time. After this, the narrator mentions the incident.

Abu Bakr Bazzaar states that there is no narration like this from Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . He also informed that this narration is weak. This is because a doubt has been created and we have mentioned the reasons why this narration is not considered. Regarding the narration of Kalbi, it is sufficient to state regarding it that it is not correct to narrate it, nor are his narrations even considered to be narrated because he is very weak, beyond limit. Lies are also proven from Kalbi. Hadhrat Bazzaar has also indicated towards this.

Regarding this Hadith, what is mentioned in the authentic narrations is that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  recited Surah Najm. At this time, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was in Makkah. During this time (of recital), he prostrated and the Muslims, polytheists, Jinn, and man all prostrated with him. From this, the weakness of the previous narration is established. This weakness was made apparent in terms of narration. In terms of logic, it is also proven weak when compared to the previous narration because proof has been established and the Ummah is unanimous that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is innocent. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was free of such types of deeds. Regarding that there was a desire

in the heart of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  that a verse should be revealed in which the idols of the polytheists are praised, a desire of such a type is clear disbelief. All of the following aspects are impossible for Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , Shaytaan overpowered him which caused the Qur'aan to become confusing for him, to the extent that he added something from his own side into the Qur'aan. Then he  $\epsilon$  understood it to be the Qur'aan until Hadhrat Jibra'eel  $\upsilon$  had informed him.

If it is said that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  added something from his own side into the Qur'aan, then it is also disbelief. If it is said that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  did this forgetfully, then it should be clear that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was protected and innocent from this as well.

By means of strong proofs and the consensus of the Ummah we have proven in the previous pages that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is innocent. No disbelief could come into the heart of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , nor could it come onto his tongue, whether intentionally or by mistake. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was also innocent from Shaytaan telling him something or from Shaytaan getting a chance to overpower him or to join his speech to the speech of Allaah, whether intentionally or by mistake. Shaytaan never had the power to do this. Allaah j said:

وَ لَوْ تَقَوَّلَ عَلَيْنَا بَعْضَ الْأَقَاوِيْلْ ٢٠٠٤ لَآخَذْنَا مِنْهُ بِالْيَمِيْنِ ٤٠٠٤٥

If he (Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ ) has (falsely) attributed some words to Us (ascribed to Allaah words that Allaah had not spoken)...

...We (shall not allow him to go unpunished and We) shall grab him by his right hand.

(Surah Haaqqa (The Inevitable), 44,45)

In that case (had you acceded to their requests,) We would have let you taste double punishment in this life and after death. Then you would not have found any assistant for you (to help you) against Us.

(Surah Bani Israeel, 75)

#### **Second Reason**

It is apparent from narration and logic that the above-mentioned narration is impossible. It is in this way as explained. If it is the case, then a type of contradiction is created. Together with praise, rebuke is found and the sequence of the speech will be disrupted. Definitely, this would not have been hidden from Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , the Muslims, and the polytheists. When this is the case with the masses, then how can it be hidden from Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , who possessed a high level of intelligence and he possessed great knowledge of eloquence?

### **Third Reason**

It was the habit of the hypocrites, the enemies, polytheists, and the weak hearted Muslims to show their hatred by fuelling corruption; they would join ten things to the talk of the enemy, they would find fault with the Muslims and they would show continuous joy upon the difficulties of the Muslims. The people of weak faith whose hearts were ill would show their faith but would become renegade upon the slightest doubt.

However, no one related anything about that issue save that narration of weak authenticity. If the case had been otherwise, the Quraysh would have overpowered the Muslims based on it, and the Jews would establish proof against them just as they did during the incident of Me'raaj and some people of weak faith had turned renegade. Similarly, on the occasion of the treaty of Hudaybiyyah, some Muslims had shown their displeasure. If such an incident took place, then what could be a greater trial than that? On such occasions, the enemy makes a big noise but the enemy did not say a single word, nor did any Muslim say anything.

From all this it is apparent the incident under scrutiny is a lie and fabricated. It is uprooted by our explanation. There is no doubt the devil of some men and jinn had placed this incident in the hearts of some foolish scholars so that they may explain this incident to the weak Muslims and create doubt in them.

#### **Fourth Reason**

The narrators have mentioned this incident to be the underlying reason for the revelation of the following verse:

(Referring to the request of the Mushrikeen that Rasulullaah ɛ should remove some poor Sahabah ☐ from his company before they could associate with him, Allaah says,) They had almost come close to turning you (O Rasulullaah ɛ) away from that which We have revealed to you (not to drive the sincere Muslims away from your company) so that you may attribute something different to Us. (Had you done what they requested and driven the poor Muslims away,) They (the Mushrikeen) would then have taken you as a friend.

If We had not kept you firm (by saving you from wrongdoing), you could have (possibly) inclined slightly

towards them (because of their persistence and convincing manners).

(Surah Bani Israa'eel, 73, 74)

Ponder over these two verses; they refute that which the people narrate because Allaah i has clearly explained that these people placed Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  into trials so that he  $\varepsilon$  may fabricate things against Allaah, and if Allaah j did not keep Rasulullaah ε firm he ε would have inclined to them. Now it has been clarified that Allaah i protected Rasulullaah ε from this and Allaah j kept Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  so firm that he  $\varepsilon$  did not incline towards them in the least. So now there is no question of inclining in abundance. Those who relate this fabrication say that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  inclined to them so much that he forged a lie and he praised their deities, and they say that Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said that he forged a lie against Allaah by saying that which He did not say. This is totally contrary to the purport of the verse. Because of this, this Hadith is weak, these things are similar to the explanation of the following verse:

وَ لَوْ لَا فَضْلُ اللهِ عَلَيْكَ وَ رَحْمَتُهُ لَهَمَّتْ طَّابِفَةٌ مِّنْهُمْ اَنْ يُّضِلُونَكَ ١٠ وَ مَا يُضِلُّوْنَ اِلَّا اَنْفُسَهُمْ وَ مَا يَضُرُّوْنَكَ مِنْ شَيْءٍ ١٠

If it were not for the grace (favour) of Allaah upon you (O Muhammad ε) and His mercy, a party of them (the thief and his clan) would have surely resolved to mislead you (by lying about what had happened). They mislead none but themselves (because they are leading themselves to Jahannam) and they cannot harm you in the least (because Allaah shall protect you from all wrong)... (Surah Nisaa (The Women), 113)

The view of Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$  is that wherever the word 'kaada' comes in the Qur'aan, it means that 'it will not

occur'. Allaah j said: "...The flash of His lightning (is so bright that it) can almost snatch away eyesight (however, Allaah protects the peoples' eyesight)." (Surah Noor, 43) Another verse states: "...I shall conceal it..." (Surah TaaHaa, 15). Whereas Allaah did not conceal it.

Qaadhi Qushayri  $\alpha$  says that when Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  passed by the idols of the Quraysh and the Thaqeef, then they pleaded to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  that if he  $\epsilon$  faces them they will believe. However, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  did not do this and he never did it at any cost.

Anbaari says that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  did not go close to them, nor did he incline towards them. There are many other Tafsirs which explain the above-mentioned verse, i.e. Allaah explained the innocence of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  in a unique way. Through this, these baseless narrations are refuted. Nothing is left for discussion regarding this verse except that Allaah showed His favour upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  by keeping him firm upon the straight path, whereas the disbelievers tried their best to lead Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  astray from the straight path. Whatever has been said is the first objective of the verse.

Even if it is accepted that this narration is correct to a certain degree, then the scholars of the Ummah have given many answers. Some are weak and some are very strong.

One of them is that the narrator is Qataadah and Muqaatil. They said that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was drowsy when he was reciting this Surah. Then, when overpowered by sleep, this talk of the praise of the idols left his tongue. This answer is not correct because it is not in accordance to the status of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Whether in sleep or while awake, nothing wrong left the tongue of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , nor did Shaytaan ever

### overpower him. This is because Allaah j protected Rasulullaah & from every intended or mistaken talk.

Kalbi said that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said this in his heart and Shaytaan said these statements on the tongue of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . In the narration of Ibn Shihaab, narrated from Abu Bakr bin Abdur Rahman, it is said that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  erred and when he was informed, he  $\epsilon$  said, "This is from Shaytaan." This is also not correct because Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was also protected by Allaah from saying something like this, whether intentionally or by mistake, or that Shaytaan takes out some mixed up talk from his tongue.

Some say that it is possible that during his speech, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  could have admonished the disbelievers and rebuked them upon their error, just as Hadhrat Ibrahim  $\upsilon$  said, "This is my Rabb." This statement means "Can this be my Rabb?" Or, when Hadhrat Ibrahim  $\upsilon$  broke the idols and the people asked (who had broken it), he  $\upsilon$  said, "Their bigger one has done this." It is possible that after reciting the first part of the verse, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  remained silent in order to create a break, and then in order to notify them of their error, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  spoke, then he returned to his recitation. This type of break is possible during speech.

The circumstances also show that such type of blasphemous talk cannot be part of the verses that are recited. Qaadhi Abu Bakr said this. Based on this, an objection cannot be raised on the narration, "Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  recited this during Salaah" because during the initial stages of Islaam, it is proven that speaking during Salaah was in vogue.

In the case where the above-mentioned narration is accepted, the interpretation that the research scholars give

preference to, it is that it was the habit of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  to recite the verses of the Our'aan slowly. Subsequently, in his recitation, he would recite every verse separately. This is narrated from reliable narrators. It is possible that Shaytaan was lying in ambush and between two verses, the silence that he adopted, the disbelievers who were sitting close to Rasulullaah E, they heard it and understood it to be the statement of Rasulullaah ε and spread it to all. At the time, the Muslims who were present did not think it objectionable because they knew these Surahs by heart and they knew well that Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  would always speak ill of the idols. Subjects like this are also discussed by Musa bin Ugbah in his Maghaazi and he said that the Muslims who were present did not hear this, but Shaytaan put this in the ears and hearts of the polytheists. The narration states that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was grieved at this. The reason for this was because baseless things were spread and people were put into doubt. This is because talk like this is a means of trials. Allaah i said that He did not send a Rasul or Nabi before Rasulullaah ε, at this point, 'tamanna' means recitation. In this case, the meaning of the verse will be: 'Our Rasul and Nabi knows nothing but to recite Our verses.'

The verse, "...Allaah eradicates (blots out) the doubts that Shaytaan casts and then consolidates (confirms) His verses..." (Surah Hajj, 52) means that Allaah j wiped out whatever talk Shaytaan had placed, removed every doubt, and established His verses.

Some say that the verse means that in the recitation of the verses, Allaah jinformed Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  of the mistakes that he  $\epsilon$  had made and Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  retracted from his error.

This view is from Kalbi. Kalbi translated the word 'tamanna' as 'Hadith un Nafs'.

Abu Bakr bin Abdur Rahman also explains a meaning like this. He says that such errors could come from Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  in recitation that, no change comes about in the meaning or in the words, and there is no increase in the wording of the Qur'aan, but sometimes it so happens that a verse is left out or a word is left out. However, this error does not remain because Allaah j notifies him immediately. We shall, Insha Allaah, explain the detail of this in the coming chapters where we state what types of errors are possible and what errors are not possible.

It is necessary to interpret this verse that Mujaahid has mentioned this incident, so if we accept that Rasulullaah & said, 'Al Gharaaranaka al Ula', then too there will be no 'Al Gharaaranaka al Ula' whose problem because intercession is hoped for is not an idol, but Gharaaranaka al Ula' means the angels, and the intercession of the angels is hoped for. Based on this view, Kalbi has written in the Tafseer of 'Al Gharaaranaka al Ula' that the angels are meant. Therefore, it was the belief of the disbelievers that the angels are the daughters of Allaah. Allaah i mentions this in the Our'aan and refutes this belief; in Surah Najm it is stated, "Are males (sons reserved exclusively) for you (because you like having them) and (you attribute) females for Him (saying that the angels are the daughters of Allaah)? (Surah Najm, 21)

Allaah refuted this baseless belief. However, it is correct to hope for intercession from the angels. When the polytheists made this interpretation that it means their idol,

Shaytaan put them into doubt and embedded it into their hearts, so Allaah abrogated this verse that Shaytaan had placed into them. In this way, He made His verses firm. Reciting those verses through which Shaytaan got a path, they were abrogated because of the confusion, just as Allaah had abrogated a number of verses.

There was wisdom of Allaah in the revelation of these verses and there was also wisdom in abrogating it. It is that whoever Allaah wants to deviate by means of them, He can make them astray and whoever He wants to guide, He can guide. However, those who are sinners will go astray.

In another verse, Allaah j says:

لِّيَجْعَلَ مَا يُلْقِي الشَّيْطِنُ فِتْنَةً لِّلَّذِيْنَ فِيْ قُلُوْ بِهِمْ مَّرَضٌ وَّ الْقَاسِيَةِ قُلُوْ بُهُمْ ١٠ وَ إِنَّ الظِّلِمِيْنَ لَفِيْ شِقَاقِ بَعِيْدِ ٥٠٠٠ وَّ لِيَعْلَمَ الَّذِيْنَ أُونُوا الْعِلْمَ اَنَّهُ الْحَقُّ مِنْ رَّبِّكَ فَيُؤْمِنُوا لِّهِ فَتُخْبِتَ لَهُ قُلُوْ بُهُمْ ١٠ وَ إِنَّ اللهَ لَهَادِ الَّذِيْنَ الْمَنُوا اللّٰي صِرَاطٍ مُسْتَقِيْمٍ ٥٠٠٠

(These doubts that are cast into peoples' hearts have different effects on different people. Allaah says that Shaytaan casts these doubts) So that Allaah makes the doubts cast by Shaytaan a test (to see whether they accept or reject) for those in whose hearts is a disease (of hypocrisy or doubtfulness) and for those whose hearts are hard (the Kuffaar). Indeed, the oppressors (those who succumb to these doubts) are in a far removed disagreement (they will argue at all costs. In this regard, Allaah says in verse 121 of Surah 6, "The Shayaateen surely whisper evil (doubts) into the hearts of their friends so that they dispute with you".)

And (these doubts are also cast) so that those granted knowledge (understanding of the Qur'aan and Deen) should know (be convinced) that it (the revelation that the Nabi recites) is the truth from your Rabb and they believe in it,

causing their hearts to bow (to become soft and submit to Allaah). Allaah shall definitely guide those who have Imaan to the straight path (Islaam).

(Surah Hajj, 53, 54)

Some people say that when Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  recited this Surah and he reached the mention of Laat, Uzza and Manaat, then the disbelievers feared that Rasulullaah ε would say something through which their idols would be disgraced. So by saying 'Al Gharanakatal Ula' (themselves) they wanted his ε recitation of the verses and this mixed up in between so that it could be blown up and evil could be spoken of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , as per their habit: "Those who commit kufr say (to each other), 'Do not listen to this Our'aan, and (if it is still recited then) make a noise (to disturb its recitation) so that you may be victorious (in putting an end to its recitation.)" (Surah HaaMeem Sajdah, 26) This action was linked to Shaytaan so that he can encourage them to do deeds like this and this is what he spread also. He said that Rasulullaah & praised the idols and he forged a lie against Rasulullaah ε. Due to this, Rasulullaah ε was grieved so Allaah j consoled him, "It occurred to every Rasool and Nabi whom we sent before you (Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ ) that whenever he recited (the divine scripture), Shavtaan cast doubts (and objections) in (the hearts of listeners about) his recitation. However, Allaah eradicates the doubts that Shaytaan casts (mixes into peoples' hearts) and then consolidates (confirms) His verses (by making people understand them clearly). Allaah is All Knowing, The Wise. (Surah Haji, 52) Subsequently, Allaah separated truth from falsehood and protected the Our'aan. He established His verses and removed the doubts that the enemies created. He took up the responsibility of protecting the Qur'aan.

He said:

Without doubt only We have revealed the Reminder (the Qur'aan) and (by various means) We shall certainly be its protectors (ensuring that it remains unchanged throughout time).

(Surah Hijr, 9)

Regarding this subject, the story of Hadhrat Yunus  $\upsilon$  is mentioned. He warned his nation of a punishment from Allaah but his nation repented and the punishment was averted. At that time, Hadhrat Yunus  $\upsilon$  said, "Now I have been belied. Therefore, he did not want to return to his nation." Saying this, Yunus  $\upsilon$  went away in anger.

Understand that in whatever narrations there regarding this, none of them state that Hadhrat Yunus v said to his nation "Allaah will destroy you". In fact, all these narrations state that he made a du'aa' of misfortune for his nation and it is apparent that a du'aa' of misfortune is not news that a request is being made regarding his truthfulness. However, he said to his nation that a punishment will come upon you at a specific time. The punishment did arrive at the time he stipulated. Then, Allaah removed the punishment because of their repentance and He showed mercy to them. Allaah i says, "There has been no nation who accepted Imaan where their Imaan profited them, except the nation of Yunus v. When they accepted Imaan, We turned away from them a punishment of disgrace in this worldly life and We granted them enjoyment for a while (for as long as they lived afterwards)." (Surah Yunus, 98)

Ibn Mas'ood  $\tau$  said that they saw the signs of punishment. Sa'eed bin Jubayr  $\tau$  said that the punishment covered them in this way like a grave is covered using a cloth.

If an objection is raised regarding the meaning of the narration of Abdullaah bin Abi Sarh who was the scribe of Rasulullaah ε but then became a polytheist and renegade. He went to the Quraysh and said: (May Allaah protect us) "I turn Muhammad in whichever direction I wish. He says to me, 'Noble, write a command.' I say, 'Shall the knowledgeable not write a command?' he says, 'Well, both are correct'."

Another narration states that he said, "Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  says to me, 'Write like this.' I say, 'Shall I not write like this?' he says, 'Write as you wish'."

In an authentic Hadith, Hadhrat Anas  $\tau$  narrates that a Christian became a Muslim and he became the scribe of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . He then turned renegade and said, "Whatever I write, that is what Muhammad knows". (May Allaah save us).

May Allaah keep you and me on the straight path and may He not give Shaytaan the chance to mix the truth and falsehood and place us into deviation. In reply, firstly, this statement cannot place any doubt into the heart of a Muslim because it is the talk of a renegade; he rejected Allaah. Our condition is such that we do not accept the narration of a Muslim that is accused in any way, so how can the talk of accepting the 'narration' of disbeliever, who forged a lie against Allaah and His Rasul? It would be astonishing for a person with a sound mind to turn his attention to talk like this because it has come from such a person that is an enemy, disbeliever, hater of Deen, and one who falsely accuses Allaah i and His Rasul ε. No Muslim or Sahabi narrated this, whereas they witnessed everything. In reality, this disbeliever has slandered Rasulullaah ε and this type of slander will come from those that do not believe.

They are liars, as Allaah said: "Those who do not believe in Allaah's Aayaat merely invent lies. These are the true liars." (Surah Nahl, 105)

Concerning the incident mentioned in the narration of Hadhrat Anas  $\tau$  - it does not show that Hadhrat Anas  $\tau$  was a witness, but rather that he narrated the incident. Moreover, Bazzaar had termed the narration of Hadhrat Anas  $\tau$  as weak and Thaabit narrated from Hadhrat Anas  $\tau$ . It is not narrated through any other chain. The narration of Humayd from Hadhrat Anas  $\tau$  was narrated after Thaabit. And Allaah knows best.

Oaadhi Abul Fadhl says that it is because of this that the compilers of the Saheeh works have not transmitted a narration from Thaabit and Humayd and the authentic narration that has come from Hadhrat Anas τ from Abdullaah bin Azeez bin Rafee' which the Muhadditheen of the Saheeh narrations have transmitted, we have mentioned it. In this narration, Hadhrat Anas τ did not say anything from his own side, but he only repeated the fabrication of a renegade Christian. If this was a Hadith, then too there would be no problem because there can be no thought of confusion regarding the revelation that would come to Rasulullaah E. There can also be no doubt regarding any error or change in it. Moreover, there has been no criticism regarding the arrangement of the Qur'aan or that it was revealed by Allaah j. Regarding this aspect that the scribe wrote 'The Knowledgeable, The Wise', and Rasulullaah ε said that it is such. The reason for this is that the pen of the writer went towards those (correct) words, and before Rasulullaah ε could say them, he said or wrote (it).

It is not something strange because when Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  dictated the verse, then the words of the verse

demanded this. From this it is understood that the scribe was knowledgeable and he understood the arrangement of the speech. Recognition of speech and intelligence like this is similarly found when a person is listening to a poem and his mind goes to a rhyme, or a person hears some good speech and his mind goes to such types of good sentences. However, this rhythm is not found throughout the speech, neither is this rhythm in the entire verse or in an entire Surah.

If the statement of Rasulullaah ε "All this is correct" is taken as authentic, then sometimes there are two Qira'ahs for of and both them revealed verse were Rasulullaah ε. Rasulullaah ε made the scribe write one and based on the intelligence of the scribe, his mind went to the other Oira'ah and he mentioned this to Rasulullaah ɛ. Then Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said that it is correct. Then, Allaah made whatever He wanted as established and He abrogated whatever He wanted. This difference in Qira'ah is found at the end of a number of verses, for example:

"If You punish them, then verily they are Your slaves (and You are at liberty to treat them as You please), and if You forgive them, then surely You are the Mighty, the Wise (and Your reason for doing so is filled with wisdom)." (Surah Maa'idah (The Set Table), 118)

This is the Qira'ah of the majority. However, some recite 'Verily, You are the Forgiver, the Merciful, but this is not in the Mushaf Uthmani.

Similarly, there are words that are not at the end of the verse, but in the middle of the verse. They are of two types and the majority have recited them in both ways:

These differences do not cause doubt, nor can a person think that there was some error from Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .

Some say that the Christian was not a scribe of the Qur'aan, but he used to write the letters of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . While writing, he used to write the praise of Allaah and he wrote whatever he wished. Because there are many ways of praising Allaah, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  did not object to his writing.

### Section 7

# The Innocence of the Nabi in terms of Worldly Matters

1554-1558. The subject matter discussed in the previous pages dealt with the innocence of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and propagation.

However, regarding that which does not deal with propagation, is just information with no laws being proven from it, and does not deal with any information of the Aakhirat, but is linked to the matters of the world and the condition of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ , it is necessary to understand that Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  never said anything contrary to reality, not wilfully and not by mistake. We must have this belief that Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  was innocent from error in all conditions; joy, anger, serious matters, joking, in health and sickness. The proof of this is that the pious predecessors are unanimous upon this.

We know the Deen and Imaan of the Sahabah  $\psi$  very well. The Sahabah  $\psi$  would verify everything that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said and they had full reliance on whatever he said, no matter what is was related to. They did not hesitate at all in accepting, they did not doubt, they never sought proof from Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , and they never asked if he had probably erred.

When Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$  had removed Ibn Abi al Haqeeq from Khaybar, he contested Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$ 's decision by saying: "Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  told me to live in Khaybar". However, Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$  corrected him and replied that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  actually said, "What will be your condition when you will be taken out of Khaybar?" The Jew then said,

"Abul Qaasim  $\varepsilon$  said this to me in jest". Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$  said, "O enemy of Allaah, you are lying."

# Rasulullaah ε Never Spoke Something Contrary to Reality

The life and biography of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  has been narrated with great detail and importance; in it there is no mention that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  ever corrected an error concerning his statement, neither did he  $\epsilon$  attest that there was an error in whatever information he conveyed. Had this happened, it would have definitely been narrated in the Ahadith, **just as was the case with the planting of the date palms;** Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  gave his view regarding it to the Ansaar, and then he retracted. Prohibiting the pollination was a view that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  gave; it was not a Hadith or Revelation

Besides this, there are many aspects that are not included, for example: Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "By Allaah, if I take an oath on something and then I see something better, then whatever I took an oath not to do, I shall do and I shall pay the recompense of breaking my oath."

Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "You people bring your cases to me...<sup>1</sup>" And he said, "O Zubayr, irrigate your farm so much that it reaches the wall." We shall mention difficult incidents of this nature in future as well, Insha Allaah.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Umm Salamah narrated that Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said: "You (people) bring your disputes to me and perhaps some of you are more eloquent in their plea than others, in which case I will give a judgement based on what I heard from him. Therefore, whatever I rule for anyone, which by right (actually) belongs to his brother, I am only giving him a portion of Hell." (Agreed upon by Al-Bukhari and Muslim)

We must also bear in mind that if some false talk is proven to be contrary to reality, people have doubt about the speech of that person; no consideration will be given to his talk and it will not affect the hearts of people. That is why the scholars and Muhadditheen have said that the narrations of such a person will not be considered and that their narrations are doubtful. Similar is applied to the narrations in which the narrator is negligent or he makes many errors due to weak memory, even if he is considered reliable in terms of something else.

Secondly, it is a sin to wilfully lie in worldly matters. Moreover, it is a major sin to speak lies frequently and it causes the standing of a person to fall.

## The position of Nubuwwah is Pure from Every Form of Filth

The position of Nubuwwah is pure from all these evils. Even if he speaks a lie once, the liar will be blameworthy and the talk of such a person is defective, even if we do not refer to it as a minor sin. Therefore, the correct view is that Nubuwwah was pure from lies, whether little or a lot, whether wilfully or by mistake. This is because the work of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  was to explain and propagate, and it is our faith that whatever Rasulullaah ε brought is correct and true. Contrarily, attribute things like this to Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  is blameworthy and creates doubt. This link also negates miracles. Therefore, we have firm belief that whatever the Ambiyaa' t said can never be contrary to reality, not wilfully and not by mistake. Those who say out of negligence that the Ambiyaa' t said something contrary to reality by error, we do not think the same because this makes them blameworthy and doubtful and hatred for them is

created in the hearts of people and people will not verify them.

What thoughts did the Quraysh have regarding Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ? When other nations asked the Quraysh about the truthfulness of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , they immediately said that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  always speaks the truth and they would attest to his honesty. In summary, all the narrations are unanimous that before being deputed and after being deputed, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was pure from all sins. The second chapter of the beginning of the book mentions these narrations. They show the authenticity of that which we have stated in this chapter.

### **Section 8**

## The Reality and Status of Error (Sahwa)

1559-1571. If you ask about the meaning of the Hadith of Sahwa, narrated by Hadhrat Abu Hurayrah  $\tau$ , in which Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  once led the Asr Salaah and made Salaam after two Rak'ats, resulting in Dhun Nurayn  $\tau$  standing up and asking, "O Rasul of Allaah, has the Salaah been decreased or have you forgotten?" Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  replied, "None of these happened." Another narration states that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Salaah was not decreased and I have not forgotten." (Bukhari)

In this way, Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  negated both things whereas one of them did occur, as Dhun Nurayn said. The scholars have given the reply in various ways. Some of them replied with justice and some of them were unjust. Those who say that Sahwa is permissible for Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  and the view of those that I have already refuted, there is no need to reply to it.

Regarding these Ahadith, those who believe that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  cannot err think that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  made a mistake on purpose so that they can learn the Sunnah. Therefore, when Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said that he did not forget, he was truthful because, in reality, he  $\epsilon$  did not forget, nor was the Salaah decreased. However, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  made an error on purpose so that the Sunnah during Sahwa can be known if a case of Sahwa ever has to occur.

If it is said that it was not possible for Sahwa to occur from Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  and it was permissible in deed, as we shall soon mention, then the reply can be given in various ways as well:

One is that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  informed in accordance to his belief and heart. Refuting the decrease in Salaah was correct, both outwardly and inwardly. Regarding forgetfulness, it can be said that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  informed in accordance to his thought and he did not forget according to his understanding. It is as though the information that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  gave, it was in accordance to his thought and his intention. It is as though Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  did not mention his thought and it is correct.

Secondly, his statement "I did not forget" deals with Salaam, i.e. 'The Salaam that I made was on purpose'. However, he forgot the number of Rak'ats, i.e. 'I did not forget the Salaam itself'. This answer is confused and is a bit far-fetched.

The third answer is the most far-fetched, some scholars have mentioned it. They say that his  $\epsilon$  statement "None of the two occurred" means that both did not occur simultaneously, i.e. there was no decrease in Salaah and the forgetfulness did not occur together, but one thing happened. However, the purport from the words of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is opposite because the narration states that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "There was no decrease in Salaah, nor did I forget."

I have found these interpretations in the teachings of our scholars and the statement of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  also has the possibility (of variant interpretations). This is despite the fact that some are far- fetched and some are unjust.

Qaadhi Abul Fadhl says, "Whatever I say is closest to all these answers. It is that the Hadith of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ , 'I did not forget' is to negate any forgetfulness. Sometimes Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  also showed his displeasure at his Ummah saying, 'It is a bad thing for you to say, 'I forgot a certain verse'; you should say, 'I was made to forget'.' According to

another narration, Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, 'I do not forget but I am made to forget.' Therefore, when the questioner asked, "Has the Salaah been decreased?" Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  rejected it as this was correct because the Salaah was not decreased. When the questioner attributed forgetfulness to him, he said, 'We are made to forget by Allaah.' Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  also refuted this. Therefore, it is established that he was made to forget so that it can become the Masnun way. Therefore, the statement, 'I do not forget and the Salaah was not decreased' is true because in reality, the Salaah was not decreased, nor did Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  forget, but rather Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  was made to forget.

Another explanation that I have drawn from the views of the scholars is that Rasulullaah ε would err (sahwa), but he would never forget. Because he did not forget, he refuted forgetfulness occurring from himself. This is because forgetfulness occurs because of negligence and it is a type of calamity. However, sahwa is a type of engagement of the heart. Subsequently, there would be sahwa in the Salaah of Rasulullaah ε, but he ε would not be negligent of Salaah. Rasulullaah ε would be so engaged that he would complete the postures of Salaah temporarily and he would have no concern. Therefore, if this view is correct, then the statement, 'There was no decrease in Salaah, and I did not forget' has contradiction. T think that no Rasulullaah ε said entails leaving the meaning forgetfulness. This is also a form of forgetfulness. And Allaah knows best. This means: 'The Salaam I made after two Rak'ats was not that I left out the perfect Salaah but I forgot. However, this forgetfulness was not from me'. The proof is the statement of Rasulullaah ε mentioned in a Sahih Hadith: 'I do not forget but I am made to forget, so that I can show the Sunnah to you.'

### The Three Statements of Hadhrat Ibrahim v

Regarding Hadhrat Ibrahim  $\upsilon$ , it is said that he said three things contrary to reality. Two of them are mentioned in the Our'aan:

One was when he said: "...'I feel unwell.' (Surah Saaffaat, 89)

The second time was:

They asked, "Is it you who did this to our gods, O Ibraheem?"

He replied, "But (it seesms as if) this large one has done it. Ask them (who it was) if they (idols) have the ability to talk." (Surah Ambiyaa' 1, 62,63)

 $<sup>^{1}</sup>$  One hadith states that Hadhrat Ibraaheem  $\upsilon$  spoke three 'lies'. This was one of them; Hadhrat Abu Hurayrah  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\square$ said, "Ibraaheem  $\upsilon$  migrated with his wife Saarah. He took her and reached a town where an oppressive king was the ruler. He sent a message to Hadhrat Ibraaheem  $\upsilon$  that he should send Saarah to him. Subsequently, when Hadhrat Ibraaheem  $\upsilon$  sent her, he lifted his hands to do evil but Saarah got up and went away. She performed wudhoo and Salaah and made Du'aa', 'O Allaah, I believe in You and Your Rasul. Do not let this oppressor overpower me.' The king became unconscious and fell down and he rubbed his legs on the ground. He did this thrice and every time the same thing happened. Finally, he left Hadhrat Saarah. On this occasion, Hadhrat Ibraaheem  $\upsilon$  referred to Hadhrat Saarah as his sister. This was 'tauriyah'; He meant a sister in religion. Similarly, on another two occasions, he used tauriyah. One was when he said that he was ill and the other time was when he broke the idols and the people asked him, and he replied, 'The big idol did it, so ask him'." (Bukhari) This

And the third was when he told the king regarding his wife, Hadhrat Saarah, "This is my sister." Know well that all this is not lies but such indications in which there is scope for it not to be lies.

#### "I feel unwell"

Regarding the statement "I feel unwell", Hasan Basri \alpha and others say that it means 'I shall soon fall ill' i.e. every creation is ill. Therefore, in order to excuse himself from participating in the Eid occasion, Hadhrat Ibrahim υ said this, meaning 'My death is predestined'. Some say that it means 'Looking at your disbelief, my heart is ill'. Some say that when a certain star came out, Hadhrat Ibraaheem v would get a fever. When he looked at it, he knew that he would get a fever because it would occur habitually. Therefore, it was not a lie but it was true information that he gave. Some say that Hadhrat Ibraaheem v said this by way of Ta'reedh because he felt that the logical proofs he gave for the stars not being the Rabb that he established were not complete. This is because he did not explain Tauheed fully at the time, nor did he negate polytheism fully. Therefore, the weakness of his proof was termed as ill, although Hadhrat Ibraaheem v did not have any doubt about his own belief in Tauheed, nor was his Imaan weak. However, it can be said that his method of conclusion was weak and the method of debate was weak. Such sentences are used, for example, it is said that his proof

three statements were kinaayah or tauriyah. In appearance, they seemed lies. In reality, they were not lies but the good deed of the extremely pious is like a bad deed of the close ones. According to this law, it was dealt with. In the same way, the slip of Hadhrat Aadam  $\upsilon$  was termed 'Asaa'. Therefore, there is no need to reply to the objection as the contemporaries try to do.

is ill (not complete). So the viewpoint of Hadhrat Ibraaheem  $\upsilon$  was weak, this was until Allaah opened up to him the correct method of drawing a conclusion and by means of the stars and the sun, he showed them. This is mentioned in the Qur'aan and we have mentioned this before.

"But this large one had done it"

They asked, "Is it you who did this to our gods, O Ibraheem?"

He replied, "But (it seems as if) this large one has done it.

Ask them (who it was) if they (idols) have the ability
to talk."

(Surah Ambiyaa' 1, 62,63)

The reply to this is that Hadhrat Ibraaheem  $\upsilon$  linked his news to the big idol, as he said, "If it can speak." Hadhrat Ibraaheem  $\upsilon$  said this to inform his nation (of their deviated worship) and this is also true because he did not say anything contrary to reality.

### "This is my sister"

Regarding the time when he called his wife his sister, the reply is mentioned in the Hadith: Hadhrat Ibraaheem  $\upsilon$  said to his wife, "You are my sister in Islaam." And this is correct because Allaah j said in the Qur'aan, "The Mu'mineen are all brothers..." (Surah Hujuraat, 10)

### A few Ahadith Regarding Intercession

If you object by saying that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  used the word 'lies' for Hadhrat Ibraaheem  $\upsilon$  and said, "Hadhrat

Ibraaheem  $\upsilon$  did not speak a lie except on three occasions..." and, in the Hadith of Intercession, Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "He (Hadhrat Ibrahim  $\upsilon$ ) will remember his lie (and refuse to intercede)." The answer to this is that, throughout his life, Hadhrat Ibraaheem  $\upsilon$  did not say anything that was even similar to a lie. However, on these three occasions, although what he spoke was true, the external appeared untrue. It is for this reason that Hadhrat Ibraaheem  $\upsilon$  will fear retribution.

Regarding the objection on the Hadith that when Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  intended to go to war, he would say that he is going somewhere else as *tauriyah*. This statement of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  was not contrary to reality because he would hide his objective so that the enemy did not prepare. In order to hide his destination, Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  would mention another place by way of question and he would enquire about the conditions there. In this way, he would make *tauriyah* regarding the destination. It never happened that he told them to prepare for a certain battle or that he wanted to go to a certain place and it turned out not to be the intended destination of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ . In the first instance, that which is contrary to reality did not happen.

### The Statement of Hadhrat Musa v

If you ask about the meaning of the statement of Hadhrat Musa υ when he was asked, "Who is the most knowledgeable at this time?" and he replied, "I am the most knowledgeable." Allaah j admonished him because he did not attribute knowledge to Allaah and Allaah j said: "There is a servant of Mine where the seas meet who is more knowledgeable than you." This was something that Allaah clarified to Hadhrat Musa υ and informed him that what he was thinking was not correct.

Know well that this narration is also narrated from Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$ . It states: "You do not know such a person that is more knowledgeable than you?" Hadhrat Musa  $\upsilon$  replied that he does not know of such a person. He answered according to his knowledge and this was correct according to him. Hadhrat Musa  $\upsilon$  did not say something contrary to reality, nor was he wrong. If the first narration is considered and an objection is raised, then the answer is that in accordance to his thought and belief, Hadhrat Musa  $\upsilon$  gave the reply because he was the Rasul and the Nabi. This was the demand of Risaalat. Therefore, if Musa  $\upsilon$  spoke in accordance to his belief and thought, then he spoke correctly and it cannot be said that he spoke wrong.

The second reply is that when Hadhrat Musa  $\upsilon$  said, "I am the greatest scholar in the world", he referred to the sciences of the obligations, Tauheed, the Shari'ah and the politics of the Ummah. In terms of other branches of knowledge, Hadhrat Khadir  $\upsilon$  had greater knowledge. These are the sciences that no one can know, except if Allaah informs, as is apparent from the incidents that occurred between the two of them. In summary, Hadhrat Musa  $\upsilon$  possessed more knowledge in those sciences which we explained and Hadhrat Khadir  $\upsilon$  had more knowledge of those sciences related to the unseen and that knowledge that Allaah gives in special conditions. Proof of this is in the verse, "...to whom We had given Our special knowledge" (Surah Kahaf, 64).

The question remains, why did Allaah j admonish Musa v? According to some scholars, the reply is that because Musa v did not refer his knowledge to Allaah j as the angels did by saying, "...We possess only the knowledge that You have taught us..." (Surah Al-Bagara, 32). That is

why he was admonished. In terms of the Shari'ah, Allaah j was not pleased with his statement. And Allaah knows best. The expediency in it was that in the Ummah of Musa v, there was no perfect individual that reached that level and his carnal self was not purified. It should not be that one follows him in this matter, praises him, and is destroyed. It should not be that one praises him and pride is created, begins to make big claims, although the Ambiyaa' t are pure from this evil character. Because others would follow, that is why they would fall into darkness. However, whoever Allaah wants to save, will be saved. Therefore, he was notified so that he can save himself from this and the people should rather follow him in this.

Therefore, as a means of protecting the past, on account of his knowledge, Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "I am the chief of the progeny of Adam." Together with this, he said, "I do not say this out of pride."

Those who say that Hadhrat Khadir  $\upsilon$  was a Nabi, this Hadith is their proof, because in this Hadith, the statement of Hadhrat Khadir  $\upsilon$  is mentioned; "I know more than Hadhrat Musa  $\upsilon$ ." It is an accepted matter that a pious person can never have more knowledge than a Nabi. However, in terms of knowledge, some Ambiyaa'  $\iota$  have more virtue than others. Therefore, Hadhrat Khadir  $\upsilon$  said, "...I did not carry out these actions of my own accord..." (Surah Kahaf, 82) From this it is proven that revelation would come to him.

Those who are of the view that Hadhrat Khadir  $\upsilon$  was not a Nabi say that the statement of Hadhrat Khadir  $\upsilon$ , "...I did not carry out these actions of my own accord..." (Surah Kahaf, 82) could mean that another Nabi told him to do it, but this is weak because, in our knowledge, there was no

other Nabi in the time of Musa  $\upsilon$  other than Hadhrat Harun  $\upsilon$ . The scholars of Hadith have not narrated another Nabi besides him.

We have not taken the statement of Allaah "He is more knowledgeable than you" to be general. In fact, this is specific with certain matters which cannot be used as proof for the Nubuwwah of Hadhrat Khadir v. Therefore, some Mashayikh said that in terms of the knowledge that Hadhrat Musa v got from Allaah, Hadhrat Musa v had greater knowledge than Hadhrat Khadir v. In terms of the knowledge that was transferred to Hadhrat Khadir v, Hadhrat Khadir v knew more.

Some scholars have said that Allaah told Hadhrat Musa  $\upsilon$  to go to Hadhrat Khadir  $\upsilon$  in order to learn (finer) etiquette, not knowledge.

### **Section 9**

## The Innocence of the Ambiyaa' i in terms of Limbs

1572-1577. The actions of the Ambiyaa' t that are linked to the limbs, which include the words they spoke, and besides Tauheed, the actions of the heart are also included, the Muslims are unanimous that the Ambiyaa' t were innocent and protected from lewd deeds and major sins that destroy. This is the view of majority of the scholars and the Muslims are unanimous upon this too. This is the view of Qaadhi Abu Bakr as well.

## The Ambiyaa' 1 were Innocent from Sin, from the Side of Allaah

Besides consensus, it is illogical to think that lewd, major sins would occur from the Ambiyaa' \(\tau\). All the scholars have said this. Abu Ishaaq has chosen this as well. Similarly, everyone is unanimous that the Ambiyaa' \(\tau\) were protected from hiding their Risaalat and from shortcomings in conveying the commands of Allaah j. This is because this is the demand of the innocence of the Ambiyaa' \(\tau\). The entire Ummah is unanimous upon the innocence of the Ambiyaa' \(\tau\). Besides Husayn Najjaar, majority of the scholars are of the view that the Ambiyaa' \(\tau\) were protected by Allaah j from sins and they remained in the circumference of their innocence. Husayn Najjaar says that the Ambiyaa' \(\tau\) did not have the ability to sin.

However, there are some scholars among the pious predecessors like Abu Ja'far Tabari and other jurists, Muhadditheen and some of the Mutakallimeen that said that it is possible for minor sins to come from the Ambiyaa' t. We shall mention their proofs soon. Another group adopts silence regarding this issue. They say that in terms of logic, it is not impossible to come from them and the Shari'ah has not made a decisive decision regarding whether it is possible or impossible.

## The Ambiyaa' 1 were Pure from both Major and Minor sins

The view of the research scholars among the jurists and the Mutakallimeen is that the Ambiyaa'  $\iota$  are innocent from minor sins just as they are innocent from major sins. They say that in this matter there is difference of opinion regarding which sin is major and which one is minor. Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$  and others say that every action that entails the disobedience of Allaah is a major sin. However, there are some sins in which a person disobeys less as compared to others. In terms of this, they are called minor. Opposing the command of Allaah, no matter what deed it is part of, it will be a major sin.

Qaadhi Abu Muhammad Abdul Wahhaab said that it is impossible to call the disobedience of Allaah a minor sin. However, it can be called minor in the sense that on account of being saved from a major sin, it will be forgiven. Contrarily, as long as a person does not repent for a major sin, he will not be forgiven. There is no deed by means of which major sins will be automatically forgiven. However, he will be forgiven if Allaah wishes. Qaadhi Abu Bakr from the Ash'ari Imams and countless Imams of Fiqh has narrated this view.

Some of our scholars have said that despite this difference of opinion, the Ambiyaa' t were innocent from minor sins.

According to the view of some, there is no difference of opinion regarding repetition of a minor sin. This is because if a minor sin is repeated, then it gets the level of a major sin. In the same way, a minor sin will remove the standing of a person and he falls from his position and becomes lowly. All the scholars of the Ummah are unanimous upon this that the Ambiyaa' t were innocent from such sin because these things make the Ambiyaa' t blameworthy and it creates hatred in the hearts of people for them. It is apparent that the Ambiyaa' t were pure from this filth. In fact, their status was so high that they would stay away from permissible things that may lead to Haraam at some stage.

Some scholars say that the Ambiyaa'  $\iota$  would never do anything disliked (Makruh) on purpose. Those who say that the Ambiyaa'  $\iota$  were also innocent from minor sins, their proof is that the Ambiyaa'  $\iota$  were followed. The people would practice upon their commands without question.

The majority of the jurists, Imam Maalik  $\alpha$ 's companions, Imam Abu Hanifah  $\alpha$  and Imam Shafi'i  $\alpha$  also have the view that a person should blindly follow the Ambiyaa'  $\iota$ . There is a no need to think regarding which action is correct and which is not. **Ibn Juwayz Mundhaar and Abul Farj narrate from Imam Maalik \alpha that it is compulsory to follow the Ambiyaa' \iota. This is the view of Abhuri, <b>Ibn al Qassaar and most of the Maaliki scholars.** However, most of the scholars of Iraq, Ibn Sareeh Istakhri, Ibn Khayraan and most of the Shafi'i scholars say that it is Mustahab. One group of scholars say that it is permissible.

Some say that it is necessary to follow the Ambiyaa'  $\iota$  in religious matters, and this should be the case if a person wishes to attain closeness. The scholars that say that it is permissible, they did not place any condition. They said, "If

we accept that minor sins can come from the Ambiyaa' 1, then how can it be permissible to follow them?" This is because in the actions of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ , for example, there is no firm standard by which we can know that following which action of Rasulullaah & will be a means of closeness and worship. Which action of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  is permissible, which is forbidden, and which is a sin. It is not correct that someone is told to follow all the actions of Rasulullaah & because it could be that the command is a sin, especially, based on the view of the master scholars that give preference to deed over word when there is a contradiction. We expand the circumference of this proof and say that whoever has this that whenever Rasulullaah ε would see impermissible deed, he would admonish, and when he would see an action and he remained silent, it meant that the action was permissible. So when the way of Rasulullaah ε was to admonish regarding a 'minor' deed, then how can it be possible that he  $\varepsilon$  does the action himself? Based on this, it must be accepted that Rasulullaah ε was innocent from every type of disliked deed. Moreover, if something impermissible came from him, then definitely people would have followed him. In this case, how can it be that Rasulullaah & encouraged people to do impermissible actions?

We know from the actions of the Sahabah  $\psi$  that they would blindly follow Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Just as they would follow his commands, they would follow his actions, without question. When Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  took out his gold ring and threw it, then all the Sahabah  $\psi$  took out their golden rings and threw it. When Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  took out his shoes, then the Sahabah  $\psi$  did the same.

It is narrated that Hadhrat Ibn Umar  $\tau$  was one day facing Bayt ul Muqaddas in relieving himself and he gave the proof

that he once saw Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  facing Bayt ul Muqaddas and relieving himself. Furthermore, many Sahabah w would follow Hadhrat Ibn Umar τ in matters of habit and worship and it was the statement of Hadhrat Ibn Umar  $\tau$ , "We saw Rasulullaah ε doing this." He said, "You did not tell this woman that I kissed while fasting?" then he mentioned the Hadith of Hadhrat Ayesha ρ as proof: "Rasulullaah ε and I used to do this." When a Sahabi τ was informed of this, he said that the matter Rasulullaah ε is different because Allaah i makes permissible for him what He wishes, but it is not correct for us. When Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  came to know of this, he became angry and said, "People, I fear Allaah more than you and I am more aware of the boundaries of the law of Allaah."

There are so many narrations regarding this that it will be difficult to mention them all. After pondering over these narrations, it is understood with certainty that following the actions of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is general, i.e. we should follow all the actions of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . If the Sahabah  $\psi$  understood it permissible to oppose the actions of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , then this would have not been the case, and it would have definitely been narrated from a Sahabi. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would have definitely admonished a person for his wrong, as we mentioned before.

However, permissible matters can come from the Ambiyaa' t because there is no problem with it, nor can any objection be raised. In fact, just as permissible things are permitted for others, they are allowed for the Ambiyaa' t. There is this much that because the ranks of the Ambiyaa' t are high and Allaah has opened their chests and He filled their bosoms with the light of recognition and in terms of recognition of Allaah, they are outstanding, their attention

was towards the Aakhirat, and that is why they would take the items of the world according to necessity. This is so that by means of it they could arrange the goodness of their religion and they could acquire strength to tread their path. The one uses the world in this way, his usage will be worship and a means of closeness to Allaah, just as in the beginning of the book we mentioned as part of the habits of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . From our previous discussions the virtue of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and the Ambiyaa'  $\iota$  has become clear; Allaah j has made their deeds and actions worthy of following and worship. This is so that their deeds can stay far away from opposition to the commands of Allaah and from sin.

### Section 10

# The Innocence of the Ambiyaa' i before being Deputed

There is difference of opinion regarding whether the Ambiyaa'  $\iota$  were innocent from sin before Nubuwwah or not. Some say that it was impossible for sins to come from them even before Nubuwwah. Some say that it is possible. The correct view is that they are pure from every fault and undoubtedly they are also pure from those sins that cause doubt. Why should this not be the case? It is impossible to think regarding them that sins could come from them before Nubuwwah. This is because sin and prohibition can be thought of after the Shari'ah comes.

revelation came, which Shari'ah Before would Rasulullaah ε follow? There is difference of opinion regarding this. One group says that Rasulullaah & would not follow any Shari'ah. This is the view of majority of the scholars. If this view is taken as correct, then it has become clear that there was no sin in existence. Therefore, the word 'sin' cannot be used for Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ . This is because the Shar'i laws, permissible and forbidden can only be established after the Shari'ah comes. Those who have this view have different proofs. Sayf us Sunnah and the leader of all the groups, Qaadhi Abu Bakr, says that the only means of knowing regarding this is narration. If this was the case, then it would have definitely been narrated. It is generally impossible to hide something like this. This is because it was an important part of the life of Rasulullaah ε and those who follow the Shari'ah pride over it and bring proof by means of it. However, nothing like this has been narrated.

One group says that in terms of logic, it is impossible because regarding whichever person it becomes famous that he is a follower, then his being followed is far from analogy. They based their proof on good and bad. However, the way of drawing conclusion by this group is not correct because this matter is based on narration. Therefore, the method of drawing conclusions by Qaadhi Abu Bakr is correct and clearer as well.

One group adopted silence regarding Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and they did not give a decisive ruling because in terms of logic both are impossible. They feel that both things are not proven in the light of narration. This is the stance of Abul Ma'ali

The third group says that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was practising upon the last Shari'ah. Then they have a difference of opinion regarding whether there was a specific Shari'ah or not. Some have adopted silence regarding specifying the Shari'ah and some have quickly specified it. Then, there is difference of opinion among those that specified which Shari'ah he  $\epsilon$  followed. Some say that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  followed Nuh  $\upsilon$  and some say that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  followed the religion of Ibraaheem  $\upsilon$ .

This is the summary of the views of the people. The clearest is the stance of Qaadhi Abu Bakr. Those that have specified a religion, their stance is far from analogy because if there was something like this, it would have been narrated, as we explained before. Then, it is not hidden from anyone as well. Therefore, there is no proof for anyone that Hadhrat Isa  $\upsilon$  was the last Nabi. Therefore, whichever people came after him, they followed him because the call of Hadhrat Isa  $\upsilon$  was not general, but the correct view is that besides Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , no Nabi made a general call. If someone holds

onto the verse, "Then We sent revelation to you (O Muhammad  $\varepsilon$ , instructing you to): 'Follow the religion of Ibraheem v..." (Surah Nahl, 123) it will not be correct. It is also not correct to take the verse "Allaah ordained for you the same Deen that He ordained for Nooh v..." (Surah Shura, 13) as proof.

These verses came regarding the Tauheed of the Ambiyaa' i. For example, Allaah j says, "These are the people whom Allaah has guided, so follow their guidance..." (Surah An'aam, 90)

In these verses, Allaah j mentioned such Ambiyaa' ı that were not sent with a specific Shari'ah, for example, Hadhrat Yusuf bin Ya'qub v. This is in accordance to the view of the one who says that he was not a Rasul.

Besides this, in these verses, Allaah j has taken the names of those groups whose Shari'ah was different and it was not possible to gather it. Allaah j commanded that it be followed. So, it is proven that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was not commanded to follow every Shari'ah but the command was that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  follows that which all the individuals of the group of Ambiyaa'  $\iota$  were unanimous upon, i.e. Tauheed. The one that has the view that Allaah should not be followed in worship, he has the opinion that besides Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , this is compulsory upon all the Ambiyaa'  $\iota$ .

He who has the view that this is impossible in terms of logic that one Nabi follows the Shari'ah of another Nabi, he has this view regarding all the Ambiyaa'  $\iota$ , without doubt. He who accepts, only on the basis of narration says that it is not proven from any narration that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  followed another Shari'ah.

Those who adopt silence regarding this issue, the basis of their stance is that they know with certainty that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  followed another Shari'ah, not that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  did not follow.

Those who prove from the verse that it is necessary to follow the previous Ambiyaa'  $\iota$ , they exclude Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and they take it as necessary for other Ambiyaa'  $\iota$ .

### Section 11

### The Ruling Regarding Error and Forgetfulness

In the sections before, what we mentioned was related to wilfully doing those things that oppose the Shari'ah. This is called 'sin'. Allaah j has obligated man to try and stay away from this. However, the work that is done without intention; for example, an error occurs while fulfilling an obligation of the Shari'ah or a person forgets something that the Shari'ah has stipulated, then the person will not be taken to task. In this matter, just as the people of the Ummah are not taken to task, the same will apply for the Ambiyaa' \(\tau\). There are two forms of this error (sahwa):

- 1. One is that sahwa occurs in those actions that are propagated; they are related to the laws of the Shari'ah, teaching the Ummah, following Rasulullaah ε, and being taken to task for not following him.
- 2. The second form relates to the being of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ .

### The First Form

According to a group of scholars, the first form is in the ruling of a verbal error and we have explained that it is impossible for something like this to occur with Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .

Similarly, there can be no sahwa that occurs with Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  in terms of deed and Allaah j has kept him protected from this. This is because the action of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is also a type of propagation. Therefore, if there was some error in the word and deed of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , then there would be doubt and the enemy would accuse.

Regarding whether there would sometimes be sahwa in the actions of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  we shall explain them after explaining the Ahadith.

Abu Ishaaq has this view. However, most of the jurists and Mutakallimeen are of the view that there can be sahwa in his  $\varepsilon$ 's actions that are propagated and the laws of the Shari'ah without intention. Many Ahadith prove that sahwa occurred during Salaah. However, they say that there can never be a sahwa in the statements of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  that are propagated. This is because a miracle has been established upon them that all the words that come from the tongue of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  are true. So if it is said that there was error in the speech of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ , then this will be against the miracle.

However, it is not contrary to being miraculous if a sahwa occurred in his deed, neither does it go against the grain of Nubuwwah. This is because it is part of human nature to forget or for the heart to be temporarily negligent, just as Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "Indeed I am a human, and I also forget just as you forget. Therefore, if I forget, then remind me." Not only this, but the forgetting of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  or a sahwa coming from him was for the benefit of people and it was to explain the Shari'ah. Therefore, Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "I forget or I am made (other one says: 'I do not forget but I am made to forget') to forget so that I may establish the Sunnah."

We learn that the sahwa and error of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was also propagation and because Allaah j completed His bounties upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , they were not a means of shortcomings, nor are they worthy of criticism. This is the reason why those that say that sahwa can occur from Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  in deed make it conditional that the Rasuls do

not remain upon the sahwa, but they are immediately informed. According to some scholars, the moment the sahwa occurs, they are informed of the law. This is most correct. Some say that before their demise, they are informed of the law but the first view is more reliable.

#### The Second Form

The second form of sahwa is related to the personal actions of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ . Meaning: that which is specific with him, the objective was not propagation, nor to explain laws. For example, the specific religious matters of Rasulullaah ε or the dhikr of the heart of Rasulullaah ε 'He did not do in front of the people so as to be followed). Most of the scholars feel that sahwa can occur in them and sometimes uneasiness can come about, or the blessed heart can be negligent (for a few moments) due to the various responsibilities of Rasulullaah ε to remove the difficulties of the creation, to run the affairs of the Ummah, to look after his family, and to remain aware of the plots of the enemy. However, this did not occur repeatedly, but rarely. Rasulullaah & said, "Sometimes my heart is veiled so I immediately seek forgiveness." This is not something that will cause his rank to be lowered or negate his miracles.

One group does not accept sahwa, forgetfulness, negligence, and uneasiness for Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . This is the thinking of the Sufiya and the group of scholars that are masters of spirituality, those that are aware of the conditions of the heart. Whatever they said regarding the Ahadith, we shall mention in the next section, Insha Allaah.

### Section 12

# **Explanation of the Above Hadith Regarding Error**

1578-1601. Whatever we have written in the previous sections about the deeds and words in which it is permissible or impermissible to attribute sahwa to Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ , we have first said that it is impossible for sahwa to come from Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  in the narrations that deal with religion. However, in religious matters, based on the expediency that we mentioned, it is possible for sahwa to occur in certain cases. We shall now mention these in detail:

- 1. Firstly, the narration of Dhun Nurayn  $\tau$  in which Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  made Salaam after two Rak'ats.
- 2. Secondly, the narration of Ibn Bahinah  $\tau$  in which Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  stood up after two Rak'ats, instead of sitting.
- 3. Thirdly, the narration of Ibn Mas'ood  $\tau$  where Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  performed five Rak'ats of Zuhr. All these three sahwa are based on the sahwa in deed.

The wisdom hidden in them is that the Sunnah is established from Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ . This is because the propagation of deed is clearer than propagation of word and it is convincing in terms of explaining to people. The condition is that the sahwa does not remain. In fact, Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  would immediately realize if sahwa occurred in his deed. It does not contradict the miracle of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  and it does not negate verifying him. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "I am a human; just as you forget, I also sometimes forget. Therefore, when I forget, remind me."

Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "May Allaah have mercy on such and such person for they reminded me of a particular verse that left out (by mistake)." One narration states, "I have been made to forget the verses."

Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "I forget and I am made to forget so that I can teach the Sunnah." Some say that this is doubt from the narrator. The authentic narration is that Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "I do not forget, but I am made to forget so that the Sunnah can be made." Ibn Dinaar is of the view that this is not the doubt of the narrator but the purport of it is Taqseem, i.e. 'Sometimes I forget and sometimes Allaah makes me forget'.

Abul Waleed Baaji says that the statement of both of them (Ibn Naafi and Isa bin Dinaar) could also mean 'I forget in wakefulness and I also forget in sleep'. The meaning could also be 'I forget as part of human nature', i.e. 'I am negligent of something or sometimes I turn with full attention to something (and despite this, I forget, or the forgetfulness is in the wisdom of Allaah j)'.

In this way, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  attributed one type of forgetfulness to his own self. In terms of being human, the cause is found in Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and the second forgetfulness he negated from himself because he  $\epsilon$  has no choice in that forgetfulness.

In commentary of this Hadith, the masters of the science of *Kalaam* say that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would definitely err in Salaah but he would not forget. Forgetfulness occurs out of negligence and it is a type of calamity from which Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is pure off. However, sahwa is a type of engagement and Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would make sahwa in Salaah. It would happen like this: he would be so engrossed in his

**internal condition of Salaah that he would not pay attention to the apparent movements.** It was not on account of negligence. These people bring the Hadith "I do not forget" as proof.

One group is of the view that no sahwa can come from Rasulullaah E. The sahwa that came from him, he did it on purpose so that he could establish the Sunnah. However, their view is not liked and it is contradictory for how can it be possible that Rasulullaah ε knows something and he forgets something at one time? It is not correct to say that Rasulullaah ε was commanded to make a sahwa on purpose so that the Sunnah could be established. It is not correct because Rasulullaah & said, "I forget and I am made to forget." In this statement, Rasulullaah ε has proven one of two conditions and he has removed the state of contradiction in this way by saying, "I am also a human like you, just as you forget, I also forget." Great scholars and researchers have accepted this. Those who are among our Imams. One of them is Abul Muzaffar Isfaraa'ini. However, besides him, no other scholar has liked this and I also do not prefer it. It is not correct for both groups to use the Hadith, "I do not forget but I am made to forget" as proof. This is because in this narration, forgetting has not been negated in general, but only the word is negated and there is a show of dislike by using the word 'forget'. For Rasulullaah & said, "It is wrong for you to say I have forgotten a certain verse', you should rather say 'I have been made to forget'." Alternatively, it negates Rasulullaah ε being negligent or the heart of Rasulullaah ε not paying the necessary attention in Salaah. However, it used to happen that in a certain condition in Salaah, due to complete absorption, he would forget an apparent movement of Salaah. This was the case in the battle of the trench where

Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  left out Salaah until the time had passed because he  $\varepsilon$  was engaged in guarding from the enemy. It is as though because of being engaged in one form of obedience and worship (guarding from the enemy), Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  had left out another form of worship (Salaah).

The narrations state that on the occasion of the battle of the trench, four Salaah were made Qadaa: Zuhr, Asr, Maghrib, and Esha. Those that are of the view that it is permissible to delay the Salaah on account of fear for the enemy take this as proof, on condition that they do not get the chance to fulfil the obligation. This is the view of the Shaami scholars. However, the correct view is that the command of Salaat ul Khauf was revealed after this and this ruling abrogated the previous ruling.

If you object to Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  sleeping on one journey in the jungle because **Rasulullaah**  $\varepsilon$  said, "My eyes sleep but my heart does not sleep." The scholars have given the reply in a number of ways:

One of the answers is that this refers to the majority of the time. It could have happened to the contrary, but this was rare. Just as when sometimes he  $\varepsilon$  did something contrary to habit. The statement of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ : "Allaah j has taken control of our souls" and the statement of Hadhrat Bilaal  $\tau$ , "I hade such deep sleep" verifies this interpretation. As per the demand of wisdom, through this incident Allaah j wanted to prove His command and establish His Sunnah. He wanted the law of the Shari'ah to be shown, as the Hadith states, "If Allaah wanted, He could have awoken us but He wanted that a pattern be established for those that come later."

Secondly, the heart of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would not be so engaged during sleep that he experienced  $\mathit{Hadath}$ . This is because the narrations state that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was protected from this (wudhu breaking) and he would be heard snoring and then he would wake up and perform Salaah without performing a fresh wudhoo. The narration of Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$  that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would sleep by his wife and he would wake up and perform wudhoo cannot be used as proof. This is because it could have been that he performed wudhoo because of touching his wife or because of another cause of  $\mathit{Hadath}$ . The end of this Hadith states that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  slept until he was heard snoring. The Takbeer was then called out and he got up and led the Salaah without performing a fresh wudhoo.

Some say that in the condition of sleep, the heart of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would remain awake because revelation would sometimes come to him while he was asleep. The incident of sleeping in the jungle only explains that the eyes of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  fell asleep and he did not see the sun. This was not the action of the heart. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said: "Allaah has taken out our souls and, if He wished, He would restore them to us during a period of time other than that."

At this point, it may be said, "If it was not the habit of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  to sleep deeply, then Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would not have said to Hadhrat Bilal  $\tau$ , 'Check the morning for us."

The reply to this is that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would perform Fajr in the dark and because consideration of the first time is not for that person whose eyes sleep, because that is an apparent condition which the apparent body will realize. Therefore, he  $\epsilon$  appointed Hadhrat Bilal  $\tau$  to check the first time and inform Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . If Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was involved in

something else, then he could have appointed someone to inform him of the first time of Fajr.

If it is asked as to why Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  forbid (the words) "I forgot" regarding himself, but he  $\epsilon$  also said, "I forget just as you forget. If I forget, then remind me", or "A certain person reminded me of a certain verse and I had forgot."

The reply is that there is no contradiction between these two statements; Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  forbade us from saying, "I forgot". The reason behind this was that the verses that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  had left out were not because he  $\epsilon$  forgot out of negligence, but Allaah j had abrogated them. Then, Allaah j took away from the heart of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  whatever He wanted and He kept whatever He wanted. When Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said that he forgets, he  $\epsilon$  was referring to those verses that were left out of the recitation of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  by error (sahwa), and he was reminded.

Some say that when he said that he was made to forget, then out of prefer ability (Istiihbaab), he attributed his forgetting to the Creator and when he  $\epsilon$  said that it is permissible for him to forget, then the link of forgetting he made to himself because the action of the person has a role in it.

After Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  propagated and conveyed the laws to people, leaving out a verse and forgetting and the Ummah reminding him, or Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  could have remembered on his own, was permissible for him. However, those verses which Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  did not remember, or he did not like that someone reminds him, were the verses that Allaah j abrogated and removed from the hearts. This is because Allaah made the decision that these verses should not be recited.

It is possible that whichever verses Allaah intended to abrogate, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  forgot them. It is also possible that before certain verses were conveyed to the Ummah, Allaah had abrogated them and there was no problem in the arrangement of the Qur'aan by abrogating them. Allaah j then reminded him and created such a form that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would now never forget. This is because Allaah protects His book in every way and He gave the responsibility of conveying His verses to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . It can never be that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  permanently forgot verses that were not abrogated.

#### Section 13

# It is not Correct to Attribute any Minor sin to the Ambiyaa' ı

1603-1615. In section 13 we have refuted those people who opine that the Ambiyaa' ι can do minor sins and we scrutinized their proofs. The jurists, Muhadditheen and Mutakallimeen that think that it is possible for minor sins to come from the Ambiyaa' ι have drawn proof from many verses of the Qur'aan and Ahadith. If these verses and Ahadith are taken in the literal meaning, then minor sins will remain separate and the discussion will reach major sins and breaking the consensus of the Ummah. No Muslim will ever have this view, and how can this be? Those who have this view and whichever verses they draw proof from, the Mufassireen have differences of opinion regarding their purport. They have mentioned many doubts. Whatever the pious predecessors have said regarding it's meaning, it contradicts the meaning specified by them.

The Ummah is not unanimous upon the viewpoint of these people and whatever proofs they produce, there always have been difference of opinion about it in the Ummah. Proof has also been established that their view is wrong and the other view is correct. In such a case, it will be compulsory to leave out their view and it will be necessary to take the view that is correct. We shall now discuss their proofs:

Their proof is the verse wherein Allaah j said to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ :

(Allaah granted this victory to Rasulullaah ( $\varepsilon$ ) so that he may be rewarded greatly for the many people entering the fold of Islaam and in addition) So that Allaah may forgive you (O Rasulullaah ( $\varepsilon$ )) for your past shortcomings and those that may occur in the future; ...

(Surah Fatah (Victory), 2)

And the verse:

...And seek forgiveness for your shortcomings and for the Mu'mineen men and women...

(Surah Muhammed, 19)

And the verse:

And did We not relieve you of your burden.

... that was breaking your back? (Because of his extraordinary piety, Rasulullaah (ɛ) regarded the human mistakes that he sometimes made as serious violations. This was naturally very burdensome for him. By granting him total forgiveness for every single past and future slips,

Allaah removed from Rasulullaah ( $\varepsilon$ ) this burden conscience)

(Surah Inshiraah (The Expanding), 2, 3)

And the verse:

Allaah has forgiven you (O Rasulullaah ( $\varepsilon$ ) for excusing some permanently from marching into battle). Why did you excuse them...

(Surah Taubah, 43)

And the verse:

If it were not for an order that Allaah had already been preordained (that some of the prisoners were to become Muslims), a great punishment would have afflicted you on account of what (ransom) you took (in exchange for the freedom of the prisoners).

(Surah Anfaal (The Spoils of War), 68)

And the verse:

He (Rasulullaah  $(\varepsilon)$ ) frowned and turned away ... ...because a blind man came to him (interrupting him). (Surah Abas, 1, 2)

There are verses beside this in which Allaah j mentions: the story of other Ambiyaa' ı, for example:

...Adam v (mistakenly) broke the command of His Rabb and deviated (from the way shown to him). (Surah TaaHaa, 121)

And Allaah j said:

(However,) When He granted them a healthy child, they both attributed partners to Allaah in that (child) which He had granted them (by saying that a certain saint, idol, treatment, etc. had granted them the child). Allaah is Exalted above all (gods) that they ascribe to Him. (Surah A'raaf (The High Wall), 190)

The statement of Hadhrat Aadam υ:

... "O our Rabb! We have oppressed our souls (done a wrong)...

(Surah A'raaf, 23)

Or the statement of Hadhrat Yunus v:

... "There is no Ilaah but You (O Allaah). You are pure, I have certainly been from among the wrongdoers (so please forgive me and remove me from this fish)."

(Surah Ambiyaa' 1, 87)

...It occurred to Dawood v that We had tested him (by presenting to him a case that appeared to be straight forward and which came from people who displayed great disrespect, causing him to neglect listening to both sides), so he sought forgiveness from his Rabb, fell prostrate, and turned to Him in repentance.

(Surah Saad, 24)

Subsequently, he sought forgiveness and bowed.

He said in the story of Hadhrat Yusuf υ:

She was determined to achieve her objectives from him, and he also would have intended the same...

(Surah Yusuf, 24)

Or the verse regarding Hadhrat Musa  $\upsilon$ :

... Moosa v punched him (used his fist to push the Copt) and (because of his tremendous strength, Moosa v) concluded his affair (killed the Copt although he did not intend to do so). (Regretting the act,) He said, "This (killing) is from the works of Shaytaan (something Shaytaan loves)...

(Surah Oasas, 15)

And Rasulullaah ε made du'aa', "O Allaah, forgive me, what is to come and what has passed and what I have hidden and what I have done openly."

Similarly, in the Hadith of intercession the Ambiyaa' t remember their errors.

There are similar words in the du'aa' of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ . As well as when Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "A veil comes over my heart (and) I seek forgiveness at the time." The narration of Hadhrat Abu Hurayrah  $\tau$  states that Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "I seek forgiveness from my Rabb more than 70 times a day."

In the story of Hadhrat Nuh v, he said, "...If You do not forgive me and have mercy on me, I will be of the losers." (Surah Hood, 47)

(Hadhrat Nuh v said this because of) Allaah j's statement: "...Do not address me regarding the oppressors (do not intercede on behalf of any of the Mushrikeen). They shall certainly be drowned (in the flood that is to come)." (Surah Hood, 37)

And the statement of Hadhrat Ibraaheem v, "...Who I hope will forgive my shortcomings on the Day of Qiyaamah." (Surah Shu'araa, 82)

And the statement of Hadhrat Musau, "... 'I declare Your purity! I repent...'." (Surah A'raaf, 143)

Or the verse regarding Hadhrat Sulayman υ, "Verily, We tested (tried) Sulaymaan υ..." (Surah Saad, 34)

There are many verses from which the people have drawn proof from the apparent words. For example, regarding the verse: "...Allah may forgive you (O Rasulullaah ( $\varepsilon$ )) for your past shortcomings and those that may occur in the future..." (Surah Fatah, 2) There is difference of opinion among the Mufassireen regarding it:

Some say that it refers to those errors that could have come from Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  before Nubuwwah or afterwards.

Some say that it means if sins occurred from Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  in the past, Allaah j wants to show Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  that he has been forgiven.

Some say that in this verse, Allaah j wants to show his  $\varepsilon$  innocence.

Ahmad bin Nadhr has explained the meaning that it refers to the sins of the Ummah of Muhammad  $\epsilon$ .

Some say that it refers to the errors that occurred by mistake from Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Qushayri has liked this interpretation.

Some say that the first sin means the error of Hadhrat Adam  $\upsilon$  and past sins means the sins of the Ummah of Muhammad  $\epsilon$ . Samarqandi and Sulami have narrated this

from Ibn Ata, for this Tafseer and the previously explained Tafseers.

As for the verse: "...And seek forgiveness for your shortcomings and for the Mu'mineen men and women..." (Surah Muhammed, 19) Makki said that although Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is addressed in this verse, the Ummah of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  are actually being addressed.

Some say that when Allaah told Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  to say: "...I have no idea about what will happen to me and you people..." (Surah Ahqaaf, 9) The disbelievers heard it and were pleased. Allaah j then revealed the verse, "...Allaah may forgive you (O Rasulullaah ( $\epsilon$ )) for your past shortcomings and those that may occur in the future..." (Surah Fatah, 2). In a following verse the end of the believers is mentioned. Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$  mentioned this meaning. The purport of the verse is that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was forgiven and Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  will not be taken to task if a sin came from him  $\epsilon$ . Some say that forgiveness here means that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is pure from all sin.

Regarding the verse, "And did We not relieve you of your burden...that was breaking your back?" (Surah Inshiraah, 2, 3) it refers to the errors that came from Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  before Nubuwwah. This is the view of Ibn Zayd, Hasan Basri, and Qatadah.

Some say that the meaning is that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was protected from error before Nubuwwah and if this was not the case then the back of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would have been heavy today. Samarqandi has mentioned this meaning.

Some say that it refers to the weight of Nubuwwah which Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  propagated. Mawardi and Sulami have mentioned this meaning.

Some say that the meaning is 'We have removed the burden of the days of ignorance from you'. Makki has mentioned this meaning.

Some say that the meaning is the spiritual secret and the burden of astonishment because Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  wanted one Shari'ah upon which to practise, so Allaah granted Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  one Shari'ah and lightened his burden. Qushayri mentioned this meaning.

Some scholars say that the meaning is 'We have made the burden which was placed upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  lighter. This is because We protect that which he was made responsible to protect' and the meaning of 'the back of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  being burdened' is 'the back of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was close to becoming burdened'. According to those who take this verse in the light of the time before Nubuwwah, it refers to those matters which Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  remained engaged with before Nubuwwah and after Nubuwwah, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was stopped from them. Then Allaah j referred to it as a burden. The meaning is that He saved Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and that He is sufficient to keep him protected from sin. If these matters had to remain, then after Nubuwwah, a double burden would be upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .

Or it is said that it was the burden of Risaalat. Alternatively, the meaning is that looking at the matters of ignorance, the heart of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was burdened. The heart of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was lightened and it refers to the responsibility of protecting revelation. Allaah took up the responsibility and made it light for Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .

As for the verse: "Allaah has forgiven you (O Rasulullaah ( $\varepsilon$ ) for excusing some permanently from marching into battle). Why did you excuse them... (Surah Taubah, 43) the question: Why did Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  permit them? This was the thing from which Allaah j stopped Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ ; after doing it, sin would not come from Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ , nor did Allaah j count it as sin or disobedience. In fact, the scholars have not taken this verse as admonishment and whoever took it as admonishment has erred.

Naftu said that Allaah j had freed Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ . Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  was given a choice between two things and the scholars say that he  $\varepsilon$  would have a choice regarding whatever matter there was no revelation for. Why should this not be the case? **Allaah j said:** "...Permit those of them whom you please..." (Surah Noor, 62)

When Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  permitted them, Allaah j informed Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  of the intentions they had at heart that Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  was not aware of; namely, even if Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  did not permit them, they would still have remained. Therefore, there is no problem in whatever Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  did. In this verse, the word 'afa' is not in the meaning of 'forgiveness', but as Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said in a Hadith, "Allaah has forgiven you from the Zakaat of horses, and slaves", whereas Zakaat was never compulsory on them. Therefore, the meaning of 'forgiveness' here is that 'it was not compulsory' on Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ .

Qushayri also mentioned a Tafseer like this. 'Forgiveness can only be from a sin' can only be said by the person that is not aware of the language of the Arabs. 'Allaah did not deem

that to be a fault perpetrated by you'. That because of this action of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , there was no sin on Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ 

Dawudi says that the narrations state that this verse mentions the honour of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Makki says that 'Allaah has forgiven you' is the beginning of a conversation. Just as it is said, "May Allaah reform you or may Allaah honour you." Samarqandi says that the meaning is 'May Allaah grant you safety.'

Allaah j said to Rasulullaah ε regarding the prisoners of Badr, "It is not for a Nabi that he takes prisoners..." (Surah Anfaal, 67)

From this, no sin comes upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  but rather the special virtue which Allaah j gave to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and not the other Ambiyaa'  $\iota$  is mentioned. It is said that it was not appropriate for any Nabi besides Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Similarly, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Booty has been permitted for me whereas it was not permitted for any Nabi before me."

If the meaning is asked of the following verse, "...You desire the things of this world while Allaah desires the Aakhirah (for you)..." (Surah Anfaal 67) Then the reply is that it was said to the people that desired the wealth of the world and their objective of participating in battle was to acquire worldly benefit and to increase their wealth. This verse does not refer to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  or his great Sahabah  $\psi$ .

Dahhaak narrates that this verse was revealed when the polytheists were defeated at Badr and some people temporarily stopped fighting and were engaged in acquiring booty. This was to such an extent that Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$  feared that the polytheists would return. Allaah j then revealed the verse:

If it were not for an order that Allaah had already been preordained (that some of the prisoners were to become Muslims), a great punishment would have afflicted you on account of what (ransom) you took (in exchange for the freedom of the prisoners).

(Surah Anfaal (The Spoils of War), 68)

There is a difference of opinion regarding this verse. Some say that the meaning of it is 'If it was not from Me to not punish (a deed) unless I prohibited (it) first, I would (have) punished you'. In the light of this Tafseer, the way in which Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  dealt with the prisoners cannot be termed sin.

Some say that the meaning is 'If you do not believe in the Qur'aan and it is the first book that has made forgiveness compulsory for you, so you will be taken to task for taking booty. From this Tafseer it is clear that the meaning of the verse is 'If you do not believe in the Qur'aan and you are not part of those people for whom booty has been permitted, then you will be taken to task just as the oppressors were taken to task.'

Some say that the meaning of the verse is 'If it was not written in the protected tablet from before that booty is permitted for you, you would be taken to task.'

From all these Tafseers it is proven that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was not responsible for any sin because if a person does something permissible, it will not be sinful.

Allaah j says, "So partake of the spoils you have received (received) lawful and pure (for you)..." (Surah Anfaal, 69)

Some say that Rasulullaah ε was given a choice in this matter from Allaah j. Hadhrat Ali τ narrates that on the day of the battle of Badr. Hadhrat Jibra'eel v came to Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  and said that he has been given a choice regarding the prisoners; if he wants, he can kill them and if he wants, he can take recompense. The condition for taking recompense is that the same number of people will be killed the following year. From this it is proven that whatever was said regarding giving a choice is correct and the Sahabah w did that which they were commanded. However, the Sahabah w inclined towards that which was weaker, whereas the better option was the other choice, that they should be killed. On account of taking the weaker option, they were admonished and it was clarified to them that what they chose was the weaker option. This does not mean that the Sahabah w were disobedient or sinners.

Tabari has indicated towards this. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "If punishment had to come from the sky, then none would have been saved besides Umar." The objective of this was to indicate towards the correct opinion of Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$  (i.e. to kill the prisoners) and it was support of those who held this view. This is because the awe of this Deen would have been created, the word of Islaam would have been raised, and the enemies would have been destroyed.

Why did Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  say, "If there was punishment, then Umar would have been saved"? What was the reason for specifically mentioning Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$ ? The cause behind this was that Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$  gave the counsel

that they should be killed. However, Allaah j did not predestine punishment for them and the Sahabah  $\psi$  were given a choice.

Dawudi said: "Firstly, this narration is not completely proven. Even if we accept it as correct, it cannot be thought that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  gave such a command regarding which there was no clear text or it is not proven through the indication of the text. It is not correct to attribute this to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  because Allaah j protected Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  from this type of shortcomings."

Qaadhi Abu Bakr bin Ala said, "In this verse, Allaah j informed his Nabi  $\varepsilon$  that he chose to accept compensation and leave them. This was because booty was made permissible for the Muslims. So, why was it not permissible to take the booty? Before the battle of Badr, the Muslims had taken booty from the polytheists on one occasion. This was when in the army of Abdullaah bin Jahsh, Ibn al Hadrami was killed by Hakam bin Kaysaan and his companions. On this occasion, Allaah i did not admonish the Muslims. This incident took place about a year before the battle of Badr, in fact, even before that. All this shows that in the matter of the prisoners, the practice of Rasulullaah ε was based on interpretation and complete insight. As explained before, Allaah j did not object to this because the compensation was accepted. However, because of the abundant prisoners in Badr, Allaah i gave due importance to this matter and Allaah mentioned His bounties and He emphasized His favours. Therefore, He wrote the praise of the Sahabah in the protected tablet that booty is permissible. When this was the case, then where was there scope for admonishment and how can sin occur?" This is the summary of the statement of Qaadhi.

#### One view of Abu Tamaam Regarding Surah Abas

He ( $Rasulullaah(\varepsilon)$ ) frowned and turned away ...

...because a blind man came to him (interrupting him). (Surah Abas, 1, 2) There is no sin upon Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  in these verses. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  was only informed that, even though he wanted to purify, if he knew the reality he  $\varepsilon$  would have known that turning to the blind person would have been better. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ 's action of not turning to the blind person and turning to the disbeliever instead was because of obeying Allaah, propagating the laws, and in order to incline the person (towards the straight path). Allaah j had commanded Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  to do all this so this was not a sin

In these verses, the objective of the indication of Allaah j was to inform of the condition of the two individuals and to disgrace the disbeliever, 'as well as to indicate to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  to turn away from the disbeliever (because the disbeliever would not become pure from disbelief)')

Some say that 'He frowned and turned away' refers to the disbeliever that was with Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  at the time. This was said by Abu Tamaam.

#### The Story of Hadhrat Adam v

Now, ponder over the incident of Hadhrat Adam υ in which Allaah j said, "So they both (Hadhrat Aadam υ and Hadhrat Hawa (ρ)) ate from there..." (Surah TaaHaa, 121) and Allaah j said, "...'Do not approach this tree, for then you will be of the wrong-doers.'" (Surah A'raaf, 19) And Allaah j said, "...'Did I not forbid you from that tree?'..." Allaah j then clearly said:

... Adam v (mistakenly) broke the command of His Rabb and deviated (from the way shown to him).

(Surah TaaHaa, 121)

Some have said that Hadhrat Adamo made a mistake.

Then Allaah j informed Hadhrat Adamu:

We Certainly commanded Adam v (not to eat from a particular tree) before, but he forgot and We did not find him to be determined (to remember what We had told him).

(Surah TaaHaa, 115)

Ibn Zayd said that Hadhrat Adam v forgot the enmity of Iblees, which he had for his Rabb. This is because Allaah j told Hadhrat Adamv from before that: "We said, 'O Aadam! Indeed he (Iblees) is an (open) enemy to you and your wife so he should never remove the two of you from Jannah (by causing you to err)..." (Surah TaaHaa, 117)

Some say that when Shaytaan deceived Hadhrat Adamu then he forgot the previous enmity. Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$  said that man is called 'man' because a promise was taken from him and he forgot the promise.

Some say that Hadhrat Adam  $\upsilon$  did not intentionally oppose the command of Allaah nor did he take the tree to be permissible, but Iblees deceived him by taking an oath; Iblees said, "...'I swear that I am definitely one (sincere

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> 'Insaan' which means 'Mankind' literally means 'the forgetting one' in Arabic.

friend) who is giving you good advice!" (Surah A'raaf, 21) Hadhrat Adam  $\upsilon$  and Hadhrat Hawwa  $\rho$  then thought, "Can he take a false oath? (i.e. they did not think it possible to take a false oath)" Some narrations include many excuses of this type on behalf of Hadhrat Adam  $\upsilon$ .

Ibn Jubayr says, "Iblees took an oath in the name of Allaah in front of Hadhrat Adam  $\upsilon$  and deceived him, and a believer is deceived by an oath."

Some say that Adam  $\upsilon$  did not oppose the command of Allaah intentionally but he forgot. Therefore, Allaah j said, "...We did not find him to be determined (to remember what We had told him)." i.e. 'He did not intentionally oppose My command'. Most of the Mufassireen say that the word 'azm' in the verse is in the meaning of 'caution and patience', i.e. 'Adam  $\upsilon$  was not cautious'.

Some say that when Hadhrat Adam  $\upsilon$  ate from the fruit of the tree, he was not sober. However, this is weak because Allaah j has explained that the wine of Jannah does not intoxicate. However, if it is accepted that Hadhrat Adam  $\upsilon$  forgot, then it is apparent that forgetting is not a sin. Similarly, if it is said that Hadhrat Adam  $\upsilon$  made an error, then also it is clear. This is because everyone is unanimous that forgetting is not something worthy of being punished.

Shaykh Abu Bakr Ibn Faurak and other scholars say that this incident took place before Adam  $\upsilon$  became a Nabi and the proof is:

Adam v (mistakenly) broke the command of His Rabb and deviated (from the way shown to him).

Thereafter his Rabb chose him (drew him close with special favour), accepted his repentance, and made him steadfast on guidance.

(Surah TaaHaa, 121, 122)

We learn that the selection of Hadhrat Adam  $\upsilon$  was for Nubuwwah and guidance came about after this 'disobedience'.

Some say that Hadhrat Adam  $\upsilon$  ate the fruit by way of Ta weel because he did not know that it is that very tree, the fruit of which he was forbidden from eating. Adam  $\upsilon$  thought that the fruit of the specific tree that Allaah j stopped Adam  $\upsilon$  from going to could be eaten from another tree. Therefore, it is said that Hadhrat Adam  $\upsilon$  did not repent for disobedience, but he repented for not being cautious.

Some say that Hadhrat Adam  $\upsilon$  thought that the fruit from which he was forbidden was not because it was Haraam. Subsequently, he ate of it.

At this point, the following verse may be raised as an objection to the given explanations:

...Adam v (mistakenly) broke the command of his Rabb and deviated (from the way shown to him). (Surah TaaHaa, 121)

And Allaah j said: ثُمَّ اجْتَبْهُ رَبُّهُ فَتَابَ عَلَيْهِ وَ هَدٰى ١٠٢٢ ٠ • ثُمُّ اجْتَبْهُ رَبُّهُ فَتَابَ عَلَيْهِ وَ هَدٰى

Thereafter his Rabb chose him (drew him close with special favour), accepted his repentance, and made him steadfast on guidance.

(Surah TaaHaa, 122)

I shall provide the answers to the following objections at the end of the section: Hadhrat Adam  $\upsilon$  'disobeyed' his Rabb and went off, then he repented and Allaah j accepted his repentance and granted him guidance, the Hadith of intercession states that the people will ask Hadhrat Adam  $\upsilon$  to intercede in the plain of reckoning but he will remember his sin of eating from the tree that he was prohibited from.

#### The Story of Hadhrat Yunus v

Now take the story of Hadhrat Yunus  $\upsilon$ . There are a number of points of discussion in it. Secondly, it is not proven from the clear text that a sin came from Hadhrat Yunus  $\upsilon$ . The clear text only states this much that he moved out and went away in anger. We shall discuss this.

Some say that Allaah j admonished Hadhrat Yunus  $\upsilon$  on why he warned his nation of punishment and then left them.

Some say that Hadhrat Yunus  $\upsilon$  warned his nation of a punishment but his nation sought forgiveness and Allaah j forgave them (and relieved them of punishment). Then Hadhrat Yunus  $\upsilon$  said "I shall not take the face of a liar back to my nation."

Some say that the people of his nation would kill the one who lied. Hadhrat Yunus  $\upsilon$  thought, "I have now been

belied. So if I return, my nation will kill me." He feared and did not go.

Some say that there was no clear text regarding the sin of Hadhrat Yunus  $\upsilon$ . The most that can be said is that Allaah did not like the step that Hadhrat Yunus  $\upsilon$  took and the verse, 'Hadhrat Yunus  $\upsilon$  moved to a full ship.' The question remains regarding the verse, "…'I have certainly been from among the wrongdoers."

(Surah Ambiyaa' 1, 87)

## 'Oppression' refers to 'not Putting Something on its Place'

Some say that Hadhrat Yunus  $\upsilon$  attested to his sin but it was not a sin. Hadhrat Yunus  $\upsilon$  left his city without the permission of Allaah and it seemed that he was helpless in carrying the responsibility of Nubuwwah. By saying this, he did not attest to his sin, but to his helplessness that he felt that making a du'aa' of misfortune for his nation was a sin. However, Hadhrat Nuh  $\upsilon$  also made du'aa' of misfortune for his nation but he was not taken to task for it.

Waasiti says that the meaning of this is that Hadhrat Yunus  $\upsilon$  said, "...You are pure..." By saying this, he classified Allaah as pure from oppression and he attributed the oppression to himself and understood that he deserves admonition. Similar to this is when Hadhrat Adam  $\upsilon$  said, "...'O our Rabb! We have oppressed our souls (done a wrong)'..." (Surah A'raaf, 23). This is because they were at a place where they would not like to have been and they were taken out from Jannah. They said that the cause of being taken out from Jannah was that they were oppressors.

## The Story of Hadhrat Dawud v

Some of the Mufassireen have narrated from the Ahle al Kitab; those that change the divine scriptures according to their whims. There is no need to repeat from them because Allaah j has not mentioned anything clearly in the Qur'aan, nor is there anything stated in the Ahadith regarding it. This deals with the verse:

قَالَ لَقَدْ ظَلَمَكَ بِسُوَالِ نَعْجَتِكَ اللَّي نِعَاجِه ١ وَ إِنَّ كَثِيْرًا مِّنَ الْخُلَطَآءِ لَيَبْغِيْ بَعْضُهُمْ عَلَى بَعْض إِلَّا الَّذِيْنَ الْمَنُواْ وَ عَمِلُوا الصَّلِحٰتِ وَ قَلِيْلٌ مَّا هُمْ ١ وَ ظَنَّ دَاوُدُ أَنَّمَا فَتَنَّهُ فَاسْتَغْفَرَ رَبَّهُ وَ خَرَّ رَاكِعًا وَّ مَا هُمْ ١٠٠٠ فَغَفَرْ نَا لَهُ ذَٰلِكَ ١٠ وَ إِنَّ لَهُ عِنْدَنَا لَزُلْفَى وَ حُسْنَ اَنَابً ٢٠٠٠ فَغَفَرْ نَا لَهُ ذَٰلِكَ ١٠ وَ إِنَّ لَهُ عِنْدَنَا لَزُلْفَى وَ حُسْنَ مَا اللهَ عَنْدَنَا لَزُلْفَى وَ حُسْنَ مَا اللهَ اللهَ اللهَ اللهَ اللهَ اللهَ اللهَ اللهَ اللهَ اللهُ اللهَ اللهُ اللهَ اللهُ اللهُولِ اللهُ اللهُ

He (Dawood v) said, "He has wronged you by asking for your ewe to add to his ewes. Indeed, there are many partners who transgress against each other, except for those who have Imaan and who do righteous deeds. (Unfortunately) These are but a few." (When reviewing the case,) It occurred to Dawood v that We had tested him (by presenting to him a case that appeared to be straight forward and which came from people who displayed great disrespect, causing him to neglect listening to both sides), so he sought forgiveness from his Rabb, fell prostrate, and turned to Him in repentance.

So We forgave him for that (action). Undoubtedly, he has a close position to Us, and (shall have) a favourable return (in the Aakhirah).

(Surah Saad, 24, 25)

Allaah j said that he was a person that relented in abundance. Therefore, the words mean: 'We tested him' and, according to the view of Qataadah, the meaning of *Awwaab* is 'obedient'. This Tafseer is better.

Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$  and Hadhrat Ibn Mas'ood  $\tau$  said that Hadhrat Dawud  $\upsilon$  did not say more than 'For my sake, separate from your spouse and make me responsible' to the person. Upon him saying this, Allaah admonished him and, in informing him, He refuted that he (Dawood) will be involved in the world in this way.

Some say that a person sent a marriage proposal to this woman and, despite this, Hadhrat Dawud  $\upsilon$  sent a marriage proposal to her as well. Some say that there was a desire in the heart of Dawud  $\upsilon$  that her husband be martyred.

Contrarily, Samarqandi said that the sin Hadhrat Dawud  $\upsilon$  sought forgiveness for was regarding two people who came with their case to him; one accused the other and, upon hearing this, Hadhrat Dawud  $\upsilon$  said that the opposing group were oppressors.

Some say that Hadhrat Dawud  $\upsilon$  was given a great kingdom by Allaah j and spread the bounties of the world for him. Looking at this, Hadhrat Dawud  $\upsilon$  had the fear that he should not be tested and he repented.

The shameless story that is attributed to Hadhrat Dawud  $\upsilon$  has been refuted by the research scholars like Ahmad Nasr and Abu Tamaam. Dawudi said that the incident of Hadhrat Dawud  $\upsilon$  and the woman is not proven in any authentic Hadith. It cannot be thought regarding a Nabi that he liked that a Muslim be killed. Some say that the verse deals with the argument of the two people over a goat.

## The Story of Hadhrat Yusuf v

#### The Actions of the Brothers of Hadhrat Yusuf v

In the story of the Yusuf v and his brothers, no objection can be levelled against Hadhrat Yusuf v. However, there was no Nubuwwah proven for his brothers so they were not innocent and objections can be levelled against them. Regarding the words inn the Qur'aan where the Ambiyaa' i have been mentioned and their children have been mentioned, the Mufassireen have said that *Asbaat* does not mean that all the children of the Ambiyaa' i were Nabis, it means that a son from among them became a Nabi. Therefore, *Asbaat* means 'those children that were Nabis'.

Some say that Hadhrat Yusuf v's brothers were very young at the time (when Hadhrat Yusuf v was separated from them). Therefore, when they saw him a second time in Egypt, they could not recognize him. Secondly, they said to Hadhrat Ya'qub v: "Send him with us tomorrow so that he may eat and play with us..." (Surah Yusuf, 12) From this it is proven that if (any of them) got Nubuwwah, they got it after this incident. And Allaah knows best.

#### **The Intention of Hadhrat Yusuf** v

Allaah j says:

وَ لَقَدْ هَمَّتْ بِهِ ١ وَ هَمَّ بِهَا لَوْ لَا أَنْ رَّا لَبُرْ هَانَ رَبِّهِ ١٠

She was determined to achieve her objectives from him, and he also would have intended the same had he not seen the proof of his Rabb (had he not been a Nabi) ... (Surah Yusuf, 24)

Most of the jurists and Muhadditheen say that there is no retribution for the intention of a person. A Hadith Qudsi states, "When My servant intends to sin and he does not do it, then a good deed is recorded for him instead of a sin." So even if Yusuf  $\upsilon$  made a slip intentionally, there is no sin because the research jurists and Muhadditheen are of the view that when the carnal self of a person intends something evil and this intention is completed, only then will the intention be sinful. The thoughts that come into the minds of people and pass, whether they are evil or not, are forgiven. This is the correct view and Insha Allaah, the intention of Hadhrat Yusuf  $\upsilon$  was of this type.

When Hadhrat Yusuf  $\upsilon$  said, "I do not absolve myself (of all fault)..." (Surah Yusuf, 53) it means: those thoughts that would pass through the heart of Hadhrat Yusuf  $\upsilon$ , or he said this out of humility. In reality, this is attesting that the (human) self was inclined to that which he became free and pure from.

Abu Haatim narrates from Abu Ubaydah that Hadhrat Yusuf  $\upsilon$  did not have any evil intention but what should have been mentioned before was mentioned later and the other way round.

She was determined to achieve her objectives from him, and he also would have intended the same had he not seen the proof of his Rabb (had he not been a Nabi).

(Surah Yusuf, 24)

And Allaah said regarding the woman:

قَالَتْ فَذَٰلِكُنَّ الَّذِيْ لُمْتُنَّنِيْ فِيْهِ ١٠ وَ لَقَدْ رَاوَدْتُهُ عَنْ نَّفْسِهِ فَاسْتَعْصَمَ ١٠ وَ لَقَدْ رَاوَدْتُهُ عَنْ نَفْسِهِ فَاسْتَعْصَمَ ١٠ وَ لَيَكُوْنَا مِّنَ الصَّغِرِيْنَ ٣٢٠٠٠ وَ لَيَكُوْنَا مِّنَ الصَّغِرِيْنَ ٣٢٠٠٠

She (Zulaykha) said, "This is what you were criticising me for. Indeed I attempted to seduce him against his will, but he escaped.

(Surah Yusuf, 32)

And Allaah said:

... In this manner (Our fate had decreed the matter) so that We averted evil and immorality from him. Indeed he was from Our sincere bondsmen (the Ambiyaa' t).

(Surah Yusuf, 24)

... She locked the doors (of the room) and said, "Come to me." He said, "I seek refuge with Allaah! Indeed my caretaker (referring to her husband or referring to Allaah) has treated me honourably (how can I ever betray him by doing what you ask of me). Oppressors (adulterers) will definitely not succeed."

(Surah Yusuf, 23)

Some say that in this verse, the word "Caretaker" means 'Allaah' and some say that it refers to the king of Egypt. Some said that the intention of Yusuf  $\upsilon$  was not that which was explained before and the actual intention of Hadhrat Yusuf  $\upsilon$  was to push Zulaykha away and advise her. Some say that the meaning is that Hadhrat Yusuf  $\upsilon$  saw the evil intentions of the woman and was grieved. Some say that intention means that he saw Zulaykha. Some say that he intended to hit Zulaykha. Some say that this incident took place before Nubuwwah. Some say that women would always be behind Hadhrat Yusuf  $\upsilon$  with wrong intentions. Subsequently, Allaah informed him and placed the awe of Nubuwwah on her face. The condition then became such that because of awe, no one could look at his beauty.

## The Story of Hadhrat Musa v

#### When Hadhrat Musa v Struck a Person

**Hadhrat Musa**  $\upsilon$  struck a person and killed him. It has been proved through a text of the Qur'aan that it was his enemy. Some narrations state that it was a Copt and a follower of the religion of Fir'awn and from the entire Surah it is proven that this took place before the Nubuwwah of Hadhrat Musa  $\upsilon$ .

Qataadah said that Hadhrat Musa  $\upsilon$  hit him using a stick without the intention of killing him. Therefore, this was no sin.

Regarding the verses: "**He** (*Hadhrat Musa v*) **said, 'This** (*killing*) **is from the works of Shaytaan** (*something Shaytaan loves*)'..." (Surah Qasas, 15) and "... 'O my **Rabb! I have oppressed** (*wronged*) myself, so forgive me." (Surah Qasas, 16) Ibn Jurayj said that this was because it is not appropriate for a Nabi to kill someone without the command of Allaah.

Naqqaash said that Musa  $\upsilon$  did not intentionally kill. He tried to stop oppression and in doing so he struck the person and it so happened that the person died. Some say that this was before Nubuwwah and the context of the verse shows this.

#### "We tried you with many trials"

Allaah j said, "...(We) tried you with many trials..." (Surah TaaHaa, 40) i.e. 'We tested you sequentially.' Some say that this verse deals with the incidents that took place between Musa v and Fir'awn. Some say that it deals with the

incident of placing the box in the river. Some say that the meaning is 'We have made you completely sincere and purified you from all incorrect desires'. Jubayr and Mujaahid said this; they say that the Arabs say 'we placed silver in fire and purified it'. The meaning of *fitnah* is 'a test' and 'to show the inside of something'. However, in the terminology of the Shari'ah, it refers to 'a test one is put into which one dislikes.'

Similarly, an authentic narration states that when the angel of death came to Musa v to take his soul, he struck the angel of death such a blow that his eye fell out. However, there is nothing mentioned based upon which the ruling of oppression or exceeding the limits has been passed. This is because it is apparent that this action of Musa v was not impermissible. Musa v was defending himself from the person trying to take his life for the angel of death came in the form of a human and it was not possible that Musa v would have known who it was. Subsequently, he dealt with him in such a way that his eye fell out. Coming in the form of a human was a test from Allaah j. When the angel of death came a second time to him, Allaah clarified to Musa v that the angel is His messenger, and then Hadhrat Musa v accepted. The early and latter day scholars have given a answer to this narration, but the above answer is the most resolute.

Our Shaykh Abu Abdullaah Al Maazri has given this answer. Before him, Ibn Ayesha and other scholars have also given interpretations for the incident of Hadhrat Musa v. They say that giving a slap was giving proof and the eye of the angel coming out was the failure of the proof of the angel. This type of speech is used in Arabic.

## The Story of Hadhrat Sulaymaan v

#### The Incident of 'InshaAllaah'

With respect to the story of Hadhrat Sulaymaan  $\upsilon$  and the incidents mentioned by the scholars of Tafseere which they regard as part of the 'sin' Hadhrat Sulaymaan  $\upsilon$ , Allaah j said, "Verily, We tested (tried) Sulaymaan  $\upsilon$ ..." (Surah Saad, 34). The meaning of fitnah here is also 'test'.

It is narrated from Rasulullaah ε: "One day, Hadhrat Sulaymaan v said, 'Tonight I shall have relations with a hundred and ninety nine spouses so that from each one a Mujaahid in the way of Allaah can be born.' When the companion of Hadhrat Sulaymaan v heard this, he said, 'Say Insha Allaah.' However, Sulaymaan v did not say it. The result was that none of the woman conceived, except one. Moreover, an unformed child was born from this woman." Rasulullaah ε said, "By the Being that controls my life, if Hadhrat Sulaymaan v said 'Insha Allaah', then fighters in wav ofAllaah would have definitely been born "

The scholars of Ma'aani say that 'shaqq' means the body that was placed on his throne. This was his test. Some say that the baby was a fully formed child but the moment it was born, it died. Hadhrat Sualymaan v had placed this child on the throne.

Some say that in his extreme desire and hope, Sulaymaan  $\upsilon$  forgot to say Insha Allaah. Some say that the error of Hadhrat Sulaymaan  $\upsilon$  was that he did not like from the heart that he should decide a matter in favour of his

spouses' family. Some say that on account of the sin of his spouse, Hadhrat Sulaymaan v was taken to task.

The narrations that state that Shaytaan took the form of Hadhrat Sulaymaan  $\upsilon$  and took control of his kingdom and oppressed his nation are incorrect. This is because the Shayateen cannot overpower the Ambiyaa'  $\iota$  in this way for the Ambiyaa'  $\iota$  have been protected from this.

Regarding the objection as to why Hadhrat Sulaymaan v did not say 'Insha Allaah', the replies to this are a few:

One of them is that which is narrated in an authentic narration that Hadhrat Sulaymaan  $\upsilon$  forgot to say 'Insha Allaah'. This was so that the decision of Allaah could come to pass.

The second reply is that at the time when his companion reminded him, Hadhrat Sulaymaan  $\upsilon$  became so engaged in the matters of his kingdom that he did not hear what his companion said.

## "A kingdom that cannot be had"

Regarding the du'aa' that Hadhrat Sulaymaan  $\upsilon$  made; "...'O my Rabb! Forgive me and grant me a kingdom that cannot be had by any other after me...'." (Surah Saad, 35) Hadhrat Sulaymaan  $\upsilon$  did not pose this question because he desired worldly fame and honour or he loved the world, but, as the Mufassireen mentioned, the objective of his du'aa' was that no one should be given power. This is just like the view of those who take the narration that, during the time of the test, Shaytaan was given power over his kingdom, as correct.

Some say that the desire of Hadhrat Sulaymaan  $\upsilon$  was that he should also have virtue and specialty like the other Ambiyaa'  $\iota$  and this virtue would be a proof of his Nubuwwah just as iron was made soft for his father Hadhrat Dawud  $\upsilon$  as a miracle, Hadhrat Isa  $\upsilon$  was given the miracle of raising the dead, and Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was given the virtue of intercession.

#### The Story of Hadhrat Nuh v

The objection raised regarding the incident of Hadhrat Nuh  $\upsilon$  is about the promise of Allaah  $\epsilon$ , which Hadhrat Nuh  $\upsilon$  took literally:

## إِنَّا مُنَجُّونِكَ وَ اَهْلَكَ

...We will surely rescue (save) you and your family... (Surah Ankaboot (The Spider), 33)

He took the literal meaning of this and asked Allaah i for salvation for his son. He had the desire that Allaah informed him of this decision, which He had kept hidden from Hadhrat Nuh v. It was not that Hadhrat Nuh v had doubt in the promise of Allaah. Allaah i then clarified to Hadhrat Nuh v that his son was not part of his family, those to whom salvation was promised. This is because he was a disbeliever that did evil deeds and Allaah i explained that he will be drowned like the other oppressors. Therefore, Hadhrat Nuh  $\upsilon$ was warned not to intercede for those people because, Hadhrat Nuh v had included his son in the verse that Allaah j had revealed out of affection. Allaah i admonished him and Hadhrat Nuh v became fearful because of asking a question that was prohibited before Allaah j without permission. In his state of fear he explained his excuse, "... 'O my Rabb! Surely my son is from my family...'." (Surah Hood, 45)

Naqqaash explains in his Tafseer that Hadhrat Nuh  $\upsilon$  did not know that his son was a disbeliever. That is why he interceded for him. Many other things are mentioned in the interpretation of this verse. However, no Tafseer states that Hadhrat Nuh  $\upsilon$  was guilty of sin, except for interceding for his son that without permission. However, Hadhrat Nuh  $\upsilon$  was not prohibited from interceding before this, that is why his record is clear and he cannot be accused of anything.

#### The Nabi and the Ant

Mentioned in the authentic Hadith is the narration of an an ant biting a Nabi. The Nabi then burnt the entire dwelling of the ants and Allaah j sent revelation to the Nabi, "One ant bit you and you burnt an entire nation that Allaah created? That nation (of ants) was engaged in the glorification of Allaah." The Hadith does not state or imply that the action of the Nabi was a sin; rather the Nabi did what he felt was best in putting an end to the harmful creatures, thus benefiting the human race which Allaah made permissible. The Nabi did what was according to expediency; such harmful creatures should be destroyed.

The tree that Allaah created for benefit, when the Nabi sat down under it and the ant harmed him, then he went away from there out of fear that the ant should harm him again. There is nothing in revelation that states that he sinned, but Allaah encouraged him to be patient, to tolerate, and to abandon revenge. As the Qur'aan says: "...But if you exercise patience (without taking revenge) then this is definitely best for the patient ones." (Surah Nahl, 126)

Therefore, his apparent deed was that he took revenge because the ant harmed him specifically. However, his real intention was that if the ants remained there, there was a possibility that they would do the same to others. So he burnt the dwelling. In the entire incident, there was no command from Allaah and the Nabi was not commanded to seek forgiveness. And Allaah knows best.

If the meaning of the following statement of the Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  is asked: "There is no person who did not sin except Yahya bin Zakariyya  $\upsilon$ ." The reply has passed that the slip that occurs from the Nabi is unintentional and it occurs out of negligence.

#### Section 14

# The Meaning of the Verse, 'وَعَصَى آدَمُ رَبَّهُ فَغَوَى' and the Reality of Attesting to the Slip of the Ambiyaa 1' in the Qur'aan and Hadith

1616-1619. Now, if someone makes the objection that it has been proven that the Ambiyaa ı are innocent from the statements of the Mufassireen and the interpretations of the research scholars, then what will the meaning of the following verse be:

...Aadam v (mistakenly) broke the command of His Rabb and deviated (from the way shown to him).

(Surah TaaHaa, 121)

Besides this, many verses and Ahadith repeatedly state that the Ambiyaa t attested to their errors, they sought forgiveness and they cried upon their past deeds. So can it be possible that a person is fearful without any error, or his repentance is accepted, or he is forgiven?

The reply to this is that the rank of the Ambiyaa  $\iota$  is very high. They were individuals that recognized Allaah j and they knew the Sunnah of Allaah regarding His servants, they knew the honour of the rule of Allaah and they were aware of the severity of the hold of Allaah j. Therefore, the fear of Allaah j overpowered them, they feared the recompense from Allaah because they feared that recompense will not be taken from them like the general people. It never happened that they were commanded to do something, or they were forbidden from something, and when they did it, then retribution was taken from them and they were admonished.

It was through their interpretation, or through error, or through understanding something to be permissible, that they did something and they continued to fear that, in terms of their status, these matters would be classified as sin.

Alternatively, in terms of their complete obedience, it is not a sin. Whatever they did was not a sin like the sins of others. This is because sin is something lowly and evil. In Arabic, the word 'Dhanb' refers to the last point of everything. So naturally, the last point is in the general people and not in the Ambiyaa t'.

The most that can be said regarding the Ambiyaa ı is that their deeds that are of the lower level are taken to be 'bad' because they were pure and clean people. Their outside and inside was filled with good deeds, pure words, and it was beautified with soft and loud Dhikr. They feared Allaah outside and inside and they attested to the grandeur of Allaah j. The slip of the Ambiyaa t has the status of being a good deed when compared to others, as it is said, 'the good deeds of the extremely pious (abraar) are bad deeds of the extremely close (mugarrabeen)'. What this means is that because the Ambiyaa ı and mugarrabeen enjoy a very high rank, those good deeds become 'bad' for them. Subsequently, if they leave a good action, then it is remembered with the word 'sin'. In any case, whether they slip, or they do something based on their interpretation, it is remembered as 'sin' or 'opposition'.

The word 'ghawa' in the verse means that Hadhrat Aadam  $\upsilon$  did not know that he was forbidden from eating the fruit of that particular tree.

Some say that 'ghawa' means that a slip came from Hadhrat Aadam v because he understood that he will live in Jannah forever by eating the fruit. However, this wish of his never materialized

Similarly, when Hadhrat Yusuf  $\upsilon$  said to one of his companions in jail:

..."Mention me to your master (tell the king about me being imprisoned for something I did not do)." However, Shaytaan caused him to forget mentioning him (Yusuf  $\upsilon$ ) to his master, and he (Yusuf  $\upsilon$ ) remained in prison for a few years.

(Surah Yusuf, 42)

Some say that the meaning of the verse is that Yusuf  $\upsilon$  forgot to mention the Dhikr of Allaah. Some say that the companion of the jail was made to forget and he did not mention Yusuf  $\upsilon$  to his master.

Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "If Yusuf  $\upsilon$  did not say this, he would not have stayed in prison longer."

Ibn Dinaar said that when Yusuf  $\upsilon$  said this to his companion then Allaah j said to him, "You left Me and took support from someone else. Therefore, I shall lengthen your stay in prison." Yusuf  $\upsilon$  said, "O my Rabb, abundance of difficulties has made me forget and I did not think. However, Your Will has received me."

Some say that even if a minute slip has to come from the Ambiyaa  $\iota$ ', they will be taken to task because their rank is

very high according to Allaah j. Even if other people commit twice the amount of a slip, they will be overlooked because others do not have so much importance and therefore no consideration is given to them.

The following objection is raised against our view of the Ambiyaa t being taken to task for error and mistakes due to their very high rank: from this it is proven that – may Allaah save us – in comparison to others, they face more difficult conditions

The answer to this objection is that our saying that they will be taken to task does not mean that they will be taken to task because of their high rank but rather that they are tested because their rank and their rank is raised by means of the test; as it is mentioned about Hadhrat Aadam v:

'Thereafter his Rabb chose him (drew him close with special favour), accepted his repentance and made him steadfast on guidance (of goodness of a high level).

(Surah Taahaa, 122)

Allaah j said about Hadhrat Dawud v: 'So we forgave him for that (action)...' (Surah Saad, 25)

And when Musa v said that I repent, then it was said, '...I have selected you from your people (of your time) ...' (Surah A'raaf, 144)

After mentioning the incident of the test of Hadhrat Sulaymaan v, Allaah j said: 'So (in response to his du'aa) We placed (subjected) the wind at his service...' (Surah Saad, 36)

Some scholars have said that that the slip of the Ambiyaa t is seen but in reality, this is a means of their

honour and gaining closeness, as we have explained before. In addition, besides the Ambiyaa  $\iota$ , the same exists for those people that have a high rank (the pious). They are notified that they should listen to the condition of the Ambiyaa  $\iota$  and remain alert. When the Ambiyaa  $\iota$  can be taken to task for something apparently small, then what about others?

That is why other people should be fearful all the time and they should remember that they could be taken to task. They must be grateful for the bounties of Allaah and be patient over their difficulties, realizing that despite the Ambiyaa t having such a high status, difficulties came upon them.

If this is the condition of the Ambiyaa ı, what is the condition of the other people?

Saalih Marri said that the incident of Hadhrat Dawud  $\upsilon$  is a means of consolation for those repenting.

Ibn Ataa  $\alpha$  said, Allaah j mentioned the story of Hadhrat Yusuf  $\upsilon$  in the Qur'aan. No shortcoming of his is shown. The objective is that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  increases in patience.

Those who say that it is possible for minor sins to come from the Ambiyaa ı are addressed thus by the author: You are of the view that the minor sins of those that stay away from major sins are forgiven without repentance. You also accept that the Ambiyaa ı are innocent from major sins. So, according to your view, the minor sins of the Ambiyaa ı are forgiven automatically. Then, tell me, according to your view, why were they taken to task? Why did the Ambiyaa ı repent and why did they fear Allaah j? This was the case whereas the sins that they were taken to task for were already

forgiven. The answer that you give, we will give the same answer to the objection of 'sahwa' and interpretation.

Some have said that Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  used to make Istighfaar in abundance and the other Ambiyaa  $\iota$  used to repent repeatedly. They used to do this out of humility, concentration and in order to show their servitude. When they saw the great bounties of Allaah and they felt that they could not show gratitude for them as is the right of them, in order to show their helplessness they would seek forgiveness. Therefore, Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ , the one whose past and future sins had been forgiven, said, "Shall I not be a grateful servant of Allaah?" Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "I fear Allaah the most from among you." 'Because I recognize Allaah the most, therefore I know best what I should be fearful of.'

Haarith Ibn Asad said, "The angels and Ambiyaa  $\iota$  fearing Allaah, fearing His Majesty are worshipping Him because they were safe from punishment."

Some say that the Ambiyaa  $\iota$  feared and sought forgiveness so that people may follow them, as Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "Follow that which I know." Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "If you knew what I know, you would laugh less and cry more." Another delicate meaning of repentance and seeking forgiveness towards which some scholars have indicated is that it is a form of seeking the love of Allaah j because Allaah j said in the Qur'aan, '…Verily Allaah loves those who repent excessively (even for sins committed unintentionally such as engaging in sexual intercourse without knowing that the wife is still menstruating) and those who stay pure (by abstaining from sin). (Surah Al-Baqarah, 222)

Subsequently, the repentance and seeking forgiveness of the Ambiyaa  $\iota$  and their turning to Allaah in reality was seeking the love of Allaah j. **Seeking forgiveness has the same meaning as repenting.** Therefore, after Allaah j said: 'We have forgiven all the past and future sins of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ', He said, 'Allaah has certainly turned in mercy towards the Nabi ( $\epsilon$ ) and towards the Muhaajireen and the Ansaar...' (Surah Taubah, 117)

In another verse, Allaah j says, '...then glorify the praises of your Rabb (in gratitude for this great favour) and seek forgiveness from Him (for shortcomings in your effort). Without doubt, He is the Greatest Acceptor of repentance.' (Surah Nasr, 3)

#### Section 15

# The Rights Dealing with the Innocence of the Ambiyaa 1' and its Importance

It has become clear to you from whatever has been mentioned before that in the light of intelligence and the Shari'ah, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was innocent from being unaware of the Being and Qualities of Allaah j, or that he had shortcomings in conveying the laws that were revealed to him. He was also pure from saying something contrary to reality, whether it was intentionally or by mistake, when Allaah j made him a Nabi and deputed him as His Rasul. There is consensus upon this. It is also proven that he  $\epsilon$  is pure from error, negligence, and forgetting in the matters of the Shari'ah. In all conditions, whether happiness or anger, whether intentionally or unintentionally, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was innocent. It is now necessary upon you to accept these realities with complete conviction.

Appreciate them and benefit from the sections that dealt with this. This is because whoever is unaware of these things that are necessary to believe in regarding Rasulullaah ε, or he does not know that they are impossible to come from Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ , then there is fear that he will have some belief regarding Rasulullaah ε that is contrary to reality, or he will something Rasulullaah which attribute to 8 is permissible. In this way, the person will be destroyed while he is not aware and he will be placed in the lowest level of hell. This is because to think something baseless regarding Rasulullaah ε or to have a belief regarding him that is not correct will bring destruction to a person.

This is the reason why when Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was making I'tikaaf in the Masjid and his wife Hadhrat Safiyyah  $\rho$  was with him and two Ansaaris passed by him, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  called them and said, "This is Safiyyah my wife." In surprise they said, "Subhaanallaah." Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  replied, "Shaytaan flows in the son of Aadam like the flowing of blood. Therefore, I am apprehensive that he should not place evil thoughts into your hearts by means of which you are destroyed." This is from among the beneficial points which I discussed in the previous sections. It is possible that there is someone who does not have understanding, who will hear all this and say that these are useless aspects and it is better to remain silent. However, this is not the reality, but there is great benefit in mentioning these things and discussing them.

One of these benefits is that they will be needed in the discussion of the principles of Fiqh. This is because from them, rulings will be drawn. Although they are not counted as part of Fiqhi rulings, by knowing them, the jurists are saved from a lot of commotion.

In summary, this is the ruling pertaining to the statements and actions of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and it is something important. In fact, it will not be wrong if it is said that it is the basis of the principles of Figh.

Therefore, to have this belief that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was truthful in giving information and in conveying the laws and he j did not err, he  $\epsilon$  did not deliberately oppose Allaah j in his deeds, he  $\epsilon$  was innocent in these types of deeds is Imaan. There is difference of opinion whether minor sins occurred from him or not. According to their viewpoint, there is also difference of opinion in following the actions of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . This ruling is mentioned in detail in the

books. If we mention it here, the discussion will become unnecessarily long.

The third benefit of mentioning these subjects is that it is necessary for the ruler and the Mufti to know those things that are linked to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . This is because if someone does not know which qualities he should believe for Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , which are impermissible, or which qualities are there upon which the Ummah has established consensus and regarding which qualities there is a difference of opinion, how can they pass a resolute fatwa? How can it be understood whether what a certain person said is in praise of him  $\epsilon$  or it is speaking ill of him? It will be possible for him to pass the ruling that the blood of someone be shed or someone be punished for disrespecting Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . If he does not do this, then it will necessitate that the honour of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is let to be destroyed.

Similarly, there is a difference of opinion among the Imams and jurists regarding the innocence of the angels.

#### Section 16

# The Views Narrated Regarding the Innocence of the Angels

The Muslims are unanimous upon this that the angels are believers and they are most virtuous. All the Imams of the Muslims are unanimous upon this. The angels that are deputed are innocent just like the Ambiyaa t. We have already discussed the innocence of the Ambiyaa ı in the previous pages. The angels that are deputed and their rights are like the Ambiyaa t that propagate amongst their Ummahs. There is a difference of opinion regarding the innocence of the angels that convey messages. Some people take all the angels as innocent, in terms of their being messengers. The proof of this is the verse, '...who never disobey what Allaah commands them and who carry out exactly what they are instructed (to do). (The people of Jahannum therefore have no way of convincing these angels lessen their punishment.) (Surah Tahreem (The Prohibition), 6)

Allaah j says:

The position of each of us (angels in the heavens) is known. (It is in these fixed positions that the angels engage in Ibaadah all the time).

Indeed, we are standing in rows (worshipping Allaah). Indeed, we are glorifying Allaah (worshipping Allaah). (Surah Saaffaat (Those who stand in rows), 164-166)

And:

"...Those (the angels) who are with Him are not ashamed (idle) to worship Him, nor do they tire (of worshipping Him).

They glorify Him night and day without being lax (without growing weary).

(Surah Ambiyaa 1, 19 -20)

And Allaah j says:

'Verily those who are present by your Rabb (the angles) are not too proud to worship Him...' (Surah A'raaf (The High Wall), 206)

Allaah j said regarding the Ambiyaa ι':

"...who are honourable and righteous..."
(Surah Abas (He Frowned), 16)

And:

'Only the pure ones (the angels, who are pure from sin)
may touch it (the Lowhul Mahfoodh). (The Shaytaan and all
evil forces have absolutely no access to it.)
(Surah Waaqiah (The Happening), 79)

It is also proven from other proofs that the angels are innocent. One group says that these verses are especially regarding the angels that bring messages and they are among the close angels. They draw proof from those narrations that the historians and Mufassireen have mentioned. We shall mention this soon Insha Allaah. However, the correct thing is that all the angels are innocent and they are pure from all evil, pure from that which contradicts their status and pure from that which lowers their status. I have also seen the indication of some Mashayikh that there is no need for any scholar to debate the innocence of the Angels. Contrarily, I say that discussing their innocence has the same benefit as is discussing the innocence of the Ambiyaa \(\text{\text{t}}\). However, it is necessary that the standing of the statements and actions of the Ambiyaa \(\text{\text{t}}\) are separate. We do not wish to discuss this at this point.

Those who have the view that all the angels are not innocent present the story of Harut and Marut as proof lalong with what Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$  and Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$  have mentioned and what they spoke about their test. However, note that there is no authentic or weak narration regarding this from Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and these narrations cannot be accepted simply on the basis of analogy. There is difference of opinion among the Mufassireen regarding the verses relating to them. We shall soon explain that most of the Mufassireen among the pious predecessors have refuted this proof.

This story about Harut and Marut that is explained is adapted from the books of the Jews. They have lied against the angels. Similar to how they have lied about Hadhrat

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Allaah mentions Harut and Marut in the Qur'aan: '...They also taught them that which was revealed to the two angels Harut and Marut in Babylon. The two never taught anyone without first advising them...' (Surah Al-Bagara, 102)

Sulaymaan  $\upsilon$ ; (May Allaah save us) they call him a disbeliever. Allaah j has explained their lies in His Book<sup>1</sup>. Insha Allaah, we shall soon mention the shortcomings in this incident and remove the misgivings.

Firstly, there is difference of opinion regarding whether Harut and Marut were angels or human beings. Does the word 'Malakayn' used in the Qur'aan refer to them or to other angels? Also, is the word 'Malakayn' (two angels) or 'Malikayn' (two kings)? Or is the word 'Maa' in the verse, naafiyah or mujibah?

Most Mufassireen say that by means of these two angels, man was tested because they taught magic and magic is disbelief. Therefore, whoever learnt magic became a disbeliever and whoever did not learn magic remained a believer. The Qur'aan states, '...We are merely a test (for you)...' (Sural Al-Bagara (The Bull), 102)

The teachings that they gave were such that it made them fear Allaah. The form was that whoever came to them to learn magic, they would say, "Do not do this. Because this knowledge separates a husband and wife, do not ever think about learning it because this is magic; a person will become a disbeliever by learning it." Subsequently, based on this Tafseer, the work of the two angels was to obey Allaah; whatever they were commanded, they completed it, and that was no sin. However, it was a test for others.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> 'They (the Jews) go by what the Shayateen advertised during the reign of Sulaymaan □ (that Hadhrat Sulaymaan □ practised black magic and was therefore a Kaafir). Sulaymaan never committed kufr, but the Shayaateen were Kuffaar by teaching black magic to the people...' (Surah Al-Baqara, 102)

In a narration regarding Khaalid bin Abi Imraan, it was mentioned before him that Harut and Marut would teach magic to the people. He said, "We take them to be pure from this." In response, some recited the verse: '...that which was revealed to the two angels Harut and Marut in Babylon...' So Khalid said, "It was not revealed upon both of them." Khalid was a great, knowledgeable, and pious scholar, and he says that they are pure from teaching black magic.

Other Mufassireen say that they were commanded to do teach black-magic so (do what?) on condition that they told the people that black magic is disbelief. This was a test for people. So will they not be classified as pure from major sins and disbelief? The statement that Khalid made: 'It was not revealed upon both of them', he takes the meaning that 'maa' in the verse is 'maa naafiya' (negation). This is the version of Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$ .

Makki says that the verse means that Sulaymaan  $\upsilon$  did not disbelieve, i.e. the lies that the devils attributed to Sulaymaan  $\upsilon$ , that he would do black magic and the Jews would do the same, has been refuted that 'black magic was not revealed to the angels'. Makki said that the two angels were Hadhrat Jibreel  $\upsilon$  and Hadhrat Mikaa'eel  $\upsilon$ . The Jews accused them of bringing black magic and teaching it to the people. They accused these angels just as they accused Hadhrat Sulaymaan  $\upsilon$ . Allaah j refuted their claim, saying that it was Shaytaan that taught black magic to Harut and Marut in Babylon.

Some said that Harut and Marut were two people to whom the devils taught black magic.

Hasan Basri  $\alpha$  said, "Harut and Marut were severe disbelievers." Instead of 'Malakayn', he recited in the meaning of 'Milkayn'. Abdur Rahman bin Abza's Qira'ah states this. However, he said that two kings mean Dawud  $\upsilon$  and Sulaymaan  $\upsilon$  and the 'maa' is 'naafiya'.

Some say that there were two kings among the Bani Israa'eel. Allaah j disfigured them for teaching magic. Samarqandi said this and he mentioned that the Qira'ah of Milkayn is narrated by very few. Therefore, according to the view of Abu Muhammad Makki, the purport of the verse is correct, from which it is proven that the angels are pure. Allaah j has cleared them of filth. He purified them and said, '...who are honourable and righteous...' (Surah Abas (He Frowned), 16) and '...who never disobey what Allaah commands them and who carry out exactly what they are instructed (to do). (The people of Jahannum therefore have no way of convincing these angels to lessen their punishment.)' (Surah Tahreem (The Prohibition), 6)

Those who object with reference to the story of Iblees that he was among the angels. His leader was the doorkeeper and guard of Jannah. As proof they say that Allaah j excluded Iblees from the angels, '...they all prostrated, except Iblees (Shaytaan, whose name was Azazil and who lived among the angels)...' (Surah Al-Baqara (The Bull), 34)

The reply to this doubt is that the scholars are not unanimous upon this and that most of the scholars refute this. They say that just as Aadam  $\upsilon$  is the leader of humanity, in the same way, Iblees is the leader of the Jinn. This is the view of Hasan Basri, Qataadah, and Ibn Zayd.

Shahr bin Haushab said that when the Jinnaat corrupted the skies the angels chased them to land. Regarding this aspect that Allaah j excluded Iblees from the angels, the reply is that in Arabic, exclusion is made from something that is not part of the species of the excluded thing. Allaah j says, '...The only knowledge they possess (about Isa (v)) is guesswork (they have no accurate knowledge about his whereabouts)...' (Surah Nisaa (The Women), 157)

The narrations stating that a group of angels disobeyed Allaah and they refused to prostrate and they were burnt. Then they were commanded again. They refused to prostrate to Hadhrat Aadam  $\upsilon$  a second time, and they were burnt a second time. Then all the angels prostrated. However, Iblees refused this time as well and he was burnt again. Then all the angels prostrated. However, Iblees refused again. This is what the incident is about that Allaah told the angels to prostrate but Iblees refused. These narrations are fabricated and baseless. The authentic Ahadith refute them. Therefore it is not appropriate to mention them.

### Chapter 2

## The Specialty of the Ambiyaa 1' in Worldly Matters and the Explanation of such Human Aspects that are linked to Them

Before this we have explained that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and all the Ambiyaa  $\iota$  were human beings. The body and apparent part of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was human and just as difficulty comes upon the body of a human, changes come about in his nature, he experiences grief and finally death comes upon him, these things happened to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . This is not a defect or something blameworthy. This is because a defect or shortcoming is that where something more perfect is present. The form that Allaah has decided for people of the world is that they will live, die, and be resurrected from the same earth. He created people that go through changes. Subsequently, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would sometimes fall ill, the seasons would affect him, he would get hungry and thirsty, he would become angry, grieve, and weakness would also overcome him.

#### Rasulullaah ε is Injured

On one occasion Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  fell from horseback. Due to this, the blessed side of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was injured. The disbelievers also injured Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . The tooth of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was broken. He  $\epsilon$  was poisoned, affected by black magic, he  $\epsilon$  resorted to treatment, he was cupped, he read and blew on himself. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  lived his life properly and passed away. He went on to meet Allaah j. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was affected by this world of tests. All these are signs of being human, from which there is no escape. Besides Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , the other Ambiyaa  $\iota$  faced even more

severe difficulties; they were killed, thrown into fire, sawed, etc. Allaah saved some of them and Allaah protected others. When Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  went to call the people of Taa'if to Islaam, Allaah j placed a veil over the eyes of the enemy and they could not martyr him. On the occasion of migration when Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  came out of his home and went to the cave of Thaur, Allaah temporarily removed the light from the eyes of the disbelievers and they could not see Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .

Similarly, the sword of Ghaurith, the stones of Abu Jahl and the horse of Suraqah were stopped. That was Allaah j. He was the one that protected Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  from the black magic of A'sam. The roasted meat that was poisoned and given to him, Allaah j saved him. In this way, all the Ambiyaa  $\iota$  were affected and they were saved. The wisdom of Allaah j hidden in this was that He wanted to show the high status of the Ambiyaa  $\iota$  and He wanted to fulfil His promise regarding the Ambiyaa  $\iota$  so that their being human can be clarified. Those of simple minds are put into doubt; the Christians saw the miracles of Hadhrat Isa  $\upsilon$  and went astray. Like them, the masses can go astray.

#### Why are Difficulties sent upon the Ambiyaa 1'?

Difficulties come upon the Ambiyaa  $\iota$ ' so that they could be an example for their nations. There was an increase in the reward of the Ambiyaa  $\iota$  when difficulties came upon them and their rank in the sight of Allaah j rose.

Some research scholars said that this type of temporary occurrences happen only upon the apparent bodies of the Ambiyaa t'. The objective of this is only to make apparent that they were humans, i.e. just as human beings go through

difficulty, they also go through difficulty. However, their internal condition remains the same.

They are linked to the higher angels all the time because they acquire revelation from them.

- 1620. Therefore, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "My eyes sleep, but my heart does not sleep."
- 1621. He  $\epsilon$  also said, "I am not like you, I stay by my Rabb, He feeds me and He gives me to drink."
- 1622. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "I do not forget, but I am made to forget so that I can establish the Sunnah."

It is as though Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said that his  $\epsilon$  inner side, his hidden side, and his soul were not like that of his  $\epsilon$  body and his apparent side. Subsequently, temporary things like weakness, hunger, sleep, etc. would come over him. It would only affect the apparent body of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  but it would not pass into the inside. This is contrary to other people. When it comes to other people, sleep overpowers them and their bodies and hearts are affected. However, just as the heart of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would be present while awake, it was the same way while he was asleep.

1623-1624. In some Ahadith, it is mentioned that despite Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  falling asleep, he would be awake. We have explained this before. Similarly, when other people are hungry, their bodies become weak and their strength diminishes. If this condition perpetuates, they die in a few days. However, Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said that these things do not happen to him and the opposite happens to him instead. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "I am not like you people, I stay by my Rabb, my Rabb feeds me and gives me to drink." I (the

writer) say that the same is the case with pain, sickness, black magic, and anger. All these conditions would overcome Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , only on his apparent body, but there was no affect on the inside.

Alternatively, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would never say anything that would negatively affect his grandeur or he would not do anything that would negatively affect his status as is the case with normal human beings. We shall explain this in detail in the forthcoming chapters.

#### Section 1

### Reply to the Criticism levelled against Rasulullaah ε, with Reference from the Hadith of Sihr

1625-1631. If you object that it is mentioned in the authentic Ahadith that black magic was done on Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , quoting the narration of Hadhrat Ayesha  $\rho$  that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was affected by black magic, and that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would think that he had done something but he had not done it. As well as another narration stating that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would not come to his spouses but he would think that he came to them. It is apparent that this is the condition of the person upon whom black magic was affected. However, how could this be the condition of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ? He was innocent and protected.

# Criticising Rasulullaah $\epsilon$ Based on this is Foolishness and Incomplete Understanding

The answer to this objection is that irreligious people have made this a basis for accusation. This accusation is based on their minute intelligence. They want to place doubt in the matters of Shari'ah whereas Allaah j has kept the Shari'ah and Rasulullaah ε above every type of doubt and misgiving. However, it can be said that black magic is a type of sickness, and like other sicknesses, this could affect Rasulullaah ε. There is no refutation of this. However, no shortcoming will be created in the Nubuwwah of Rasulullaah ε.

The narration that state that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would think that he did something whereas he did not do it is not

something to object about because this would not affect the propagation of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , nor did it affect his truthfulness for the honour of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  has been proven. Whatever conditions have been mentioned, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was sent for them. Like other people, worldly difficulties would come upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and it is not something blameworthy that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would think about something that had no Deeni results. Furthermore, the reality would soon be clarified to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .

Another narration clarifies that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would think that he went to his spouse whereas he did not go.

Sufyaan said that severe black magic was effected upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and whatever narrations regarding black magic upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  have been narrated are a few. There is nothing to the contrary, i.e. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would think that he did some work whereas he did not do it. These were simply his thoughts.

# Rasulullaah $\epsilon$ only had this Thought; He Did Not Take it to be Correct

Some say that the meaning of the Hadith is that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would only think that he did a certain task whereas he did not do it. **This was only a thought**. He  $\epsilon$  did not take it to be correct. Subsequently, all the beliefs and statements of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  were correct. This is what our Imams have said regarding this Hadith. I have clarified it here and have added to it.

#### The most correct view According to the Author

All of these interpretations are sufficient. However, according to me, there is another interpretation that is clearer and is above the objections of the deviated. It can be understood if one pays attention. It is that Urwah bin Zubayr  $\tau$  narrated that the Jews of Banu Zurayq affected black magic upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and hid it in a well. The effect of this was that despite looking at something, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would refute it. Allaah j then informed him of their deed and it was removed from the well.

Similarly, there is a narration of this nature from Waaqidi, narrated by Abdur Rahman bin Ka'b and Umar bin Hakam. Ataa Khurasaani narrated from Yahya bin Ya'mur that for about a year, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was stopped from Hadhrat Ayesha. During this time, one day when Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was sleeping two angels came and one sat at his head side. Abdur Razzaaq said that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was especially stopped from Hadhrat Ayesha  $\rho$  for a year and his eyesight became weak. Muhammad bin Sa'd narrates from Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$  that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  fell ill and he was stopped from food and his spouses. Two angels then came. He then narrated the entire incident.

From all these narrations, it has become clear to you that the effect of black magic was on the apparent limbs of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , not on his heart, beliefs, and intelligence. His eyesight was affected and he was stopped from his spouses and food. His body was weakened. The narration states that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would not go to his spouses but he would feel as though he went to them. The meaning of this is that he had his normal energy but he would not go close to them. Possibly, pointing towards this, Sufyaan has said,

\*\*\*\* Ash Shifaa (Volume Two) \*\*\*\*

"Severe black magic was affected upon him."

In another narration, Hadhrat Ayesha  $\rho$  said that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would not do something but he would think that he did it. **This was because on account of black magic, the sight of Rasulullaah \epsilon was affected.** Subsequently, he began to think that he saw a certain spouse or he saw a certain action, whereas he did not see it. This was the weakness in the sight of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . There was no shortcoming in the intelligence of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . In reality, the only thing that happened was that which was mentioned in the narrations. The Nubuwwah of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was not affected, nor did anyone get the chance to object.

#### Section 2

# The Condition of the Worldly Matters of Rasulullaah ε

1632-1638. This was the condition of the body of Rasulullaah ε. Regarding worldly matters, in accordance to our old way, we shall discuss beliefs, statements, and deeds.

In worldly matters, the view of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was that he would consider worldly matters in one way and sometimes he would go contrary. Alternatively, he would doubt or think contrary to the mundane event. However, this never happened in the matters of the Shari'ah.

### **Stopping the Pairing of the Dates**

It is narrated from Hadhrat Rafi bin Khadeej  $\tau$  that when Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  came to Madinah Munawwarah, the people would pair the dates. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  asked, "What are you doing?" They said, "We always do this." Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "If you do not do this, it will be better." They stopped it. However, the fruit was less that year. The Sahabah  $\psi$  mentioned this to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "I am a human. Therefore, do whatever I command you in religion. Whatever I say from my opinion (bear in mind that) I am a human."

In the narration of Hadhrat Anas  $\tau$ , Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "You know your worldly matters better."

Another Hadith states, "I said this from my own thought. Therefore, you should not take me to task for a thought."

It is said about Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$ 's Hadith regarding gauging the dates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "I am a human being. Therefore, whatever I tell you from Allaah, it is the truth and whatever I say from my side, you know that I am a human. I sometimes err and I am correct at times. Whatever I have said, it was with regards to worldly matters."

Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  gave his personal opinion regarding these affairs, not that what he explained was the Shari'ah or from his ijtihaad, or that he did not establish any Sunnah.

### Rasulullaah $\epsilon$ Consults with the Sahabah $\psi$

Ibn Ishaaq explained that when Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  encamped far from the well at Badr, then Hadhrat Habbaab bin Mundhir  $\tau$  asked, "O Rasul of Allaah, did you camp here because of the command of Allaah?" Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "No, this is my opinion and I did it in terms of battle plan." Hadhrat Habbaab bin Mundhir  $\tau$  replied, "O Rasul of Allaah, it is not appropriate to camp here. We should move ahead and camp near the water and we should make a barrier in front of the other water supplies so that we can get water but the disbelievers will not get." Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "You have given the correct opinion." Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  did that which Habbaab bin Mundhir  $\tau$  suggested.

Allaah j commanded Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , '...And consult with them in matters...' (Surah Aal-Imraan, 159)

Once, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  intended to make peace with the enemies of Islaam in exchange of a third of the dates of Madinah Muanwarah. He consulted with the Ansaar. When they presented their views, he  $\epsilon$  retracted from his view. This was in actual fact worldly matters. The

knowledge of religion has no part in this; not in terms of belief, not in terms of teaching. Therefore, in matters like this, the opposite of the thought of Rasulullaah ε can come about, as I have just explained. There is no problem with this. These matters are such that they are related to practising matters of habit. Subsequently, those who have experience and they use their intellectual abilities in understanding, they will acquire knowledge. The condition of Rasulullaah & was such that his heart was filled with divine recognition, his bosom had the knowledge of Shari'ah and his heart would consider the expediency and needs of the Ummah in terms of worldly needs and religious needs. However, it must be borne in mind that there would hardly be negligence from Rasulullaah ε in worldly matters. Those matters that are linked to the protection of the world and the delicacies of the worldly benefits. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  would never be negligent of religious affairs. There are some narrations from which it is proven that he recognized worldly affairs and their delicate points and he would consider their expediencies. Also, in terms of controlling the different groups in the world, Rasulullaah ε had such a high status that it can be termed miraculous. We have discussed this in the section of miracles

#### Section 3

### **Being Human and related Laws**

1639-1641. The human laws and the decisions of the cases that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  passed, or Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  differentiating between truth and falsehood, differentiating between benefit and harm has the same ruling. This is because Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Indeed I am a human, you bring your cases for decision to me. It is possible that some of you speak better than others and I decide as I have heard. Therefore, if I decide in favour of someone, he should not take the possession of his brother because by this, I am making him catch hold of fire."

Hadhrat Umm Salamah ρ narrates that Rasulullaah ε said, "It is possible that one group is more eloquent than another and I take them to be truthful and decide in their favour." The meaning of these Ahadith Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  would execute commands upon the apparent situation, i.e. by the testimony of witnesses or by the oaths of those who take them. Rasulullaah & would consider the truth and he would pass the ruling according to the apparent signs. This was the demand of divine wisdom because if Allaah wanted. He could have informed Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  of that which is in the hearts of people and the thoughts of people. There is no doubt that if this was the case, then Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  would have passed the ruling of conviction and there would be no need for the testimony of a group, or an oath, or doubt. However, the condition is that Allaah commanded the Ummah i to Rasulullaah ε. If Allaah j granted Rasulullaah ε special knowledge and gave preference to him in terms of this, then there would have been no reprieve for the Ummah. In terms

of the Shari'ah, the decision of Rasulullaah ε would not have been used as proof because we would not know what ruling Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  passed in what specific case. It would be apparent that a specific hidden knowledge Allaah j placed in his heart (decided his ruling) which his Ummah would never know of. That is why Allaah i commanded Rasulullaah ε to pass decisions on apparent conditions (thus making him similar to human beings, so that his Ummah could imitate his way of judging cases, passing rulings, and fulfilling that out of having knowledge and conviction of his Sunnah). This is because actions are clearer than words; there are no variables in the interpretation of the actions of Rasulullaah ε, nor can anyone make any interpretations. Moreover, in terms of the apparent case, it is a clearer case to decide. It is better in terms of the different angles of the case as well. Also, in terms of removing arguments, if it is seen, then this way was adopted so that the leaders of the Ummah could follow. The laws that are narrated from Rasulullaah ε could be adopted and the law of the Shari'ah could be codified. The knowledge of the unseen that Allaah kept hidden, and He showed part of whatever He wanted to His Rasuls. Whatever Allaah j wanted, He showed to Rasulullaah ɛ, and whatever He wanted, he kept specific. Through this too, there is no shortcoming of the Nubuwwah of Rasulullaah ε, nor is there any problem with the innocence of Rasulullaah ε.

#### **Section 4**

# The Statements of Rasulullaah ε Dealing with the World

The statements of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  in which his conditions and the conditions of others are explained, or those deeds that came from Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ , as we have explained before, it is impossible for something contrary to reality to happen, whether intentional or unintentional, in sickness or in health, in happiness in grief. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  was innocent in these terms as well. This is in terms of whatever information Rasulullaah & gave, or in whatever there was possibility of truth or falsehood. However, those indications – the apparent of which contradicts the hidden – it is permissible for it to occur out of expediency. For example, when Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  would intend to go to battle, he would resort to Tauriyah and he would not expose the reality so that the enemy could not prepare themselves, as is mentioned in the narrations.

#### The Joking of Rasulullaah ε

Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  would joke in order to please the hearts of the Muslims and bring comfort to their hearts. In this way, there would be an increase in their love and they would be pleased. For example, Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  once said to a person, "I shall mount you on the child of a camel" in jest. Similarly, Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  told a woman whose husband had passed away, "The person that had whiteness in his eyes?" all this is true because every camel is a kid of its mother and the eyes of every human has whiteness. Therefore, Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "When I am in a good mood, then too I speak the truth." This was regarding the speech of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  that

relates to information. That which does not relate to information, like worldly matters, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  giving a command or Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  commanding someone, or stopping someone and not desiring in the heart,

Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "It is not appropriate for a Nabi to misuse his eyes." So if it is not correct for a Nabi to misuse his eyes, then how can he misuse his heart?

#### A Doubt

If you ask the meaning of the verse that was revealed regarding the story of Hadhrat Zayd  $\tau$ :

**'When you** (O Rasulullaah  $(\varepsilon)$ ) said to the one on whom Allaah had bestowed His grace (by guiding him to Islaam), and on whom you had bestowed your grace (by teaching and raising him, referring to Zaid bin Haaritha τ), "Keep vour wife and fear Allaah." You concealed in your heart what Allaah was to disclose. You feared (what) the people (would say when you married the wife of your adopted son, whom they regarded as a real son), whereas Allaah is more worthy of being feared. So when Zaid completed his need from her (divorced her), We married her (Zaynab) to you (O Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ ) so that there may not be any restriction on the Mu'mineen with regard to (marrying) the wives of their adopted sons when they (The adopted sons) have fulfilled their need from them (divorced their wives). Allaah's command will always come to pass (and nothing can prevent it).

(Surah Ahzaab (The Armies), 37)

### **Reply to the Doubt**

The reply to this is that from the apparent words of this have person should not the doubt Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  commanded Hadhrat Zayd  $\tau$  to keep his spouse, whereas from his heart Rasulullaah ε wanted that he divorce her (May Allaah save us). Some Mufassireen have mentioned regarding this, that the authentic view is that which the scholars have narrated from Hadhrat Ali bin Husavn τ. Allaah i told His Nabi that Hadhrat Zavnab ρ will become his 3 spouse. Thereafter, when Hadhrat to complain of Hadhrat Zavnab came Rasulullaah ε told him to keep his spouse and fear Allaah.

At this time, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  kept that which Allaah j told him in his heart, i.e. that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  will soon marry Hadhrat Zaynab  $\rho$ . At that time, Allaah j Himself made it apparent. 'When Hadhrat Zayd  $\tau$  divorces her, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  will marry Hadhrat Zaynab  $\rho$ .'

### The Reality of the Matter with Zaynab p

Umar bin Faa'id narrated a similar narration from Zuhri which states that Hadhrat Jibreel  $\upsilon$  came to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and told him, "Allaah j will marry you to Hadhrat Zaynab  $\rho$ ." Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  kept this in his heart. This view of the Mufassireen is supported by the next verse: '...Allaah's command will always come to pass.' (Surah Ahzaab (The Armies), 37)

What this means is that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  will definitely marry Hadhrat Zaynab  $\rho$ . What makes this reality apparent is that Allaah j did not mention else besides that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  will marry her. Therefore, it is proven that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  hid

in his heart what Allaah j made apparent to him. Regarding this incident, Allaah j said:

'There is no sin on the Nabi (ε) with regard to (doing) what Allaah has ordained (made permissible) for him (such as marrying more than four wives). Such was the practice of Allaah among those (Ambiyaa ι) who passed before (whenever the Ambiyaa ι were allowed certain privileges for good reason, they would exercise their privilege without fear of reproach). Allaah's command is a decreed affair (and none has the right to object to His command).'

(Surah Ahzaab (The Armies), 38)

This is proof that there was no problem in whatever Rasulullaah ε did. Tabari said that if Rasulullaah ε did what Allaah j commanded him, he ε cannot be accused of anything because such type of deeds also came from the Ambiyaa ι of before, as Allaah j said, '...Such was the practice of Allaah among those (Ambiyaa ι) who passed before (whenever the Ambiyaa ι were allowed certain privileges for good reason, they would exercise their privilege without fear of reproach)...' (Surah Ahzaab (The Armies), 38)

#### A Doubt and Removing It

If the story is in accordance to the narration of Qataadah (May Allaah save us), that the love of Zaynab  $\rho$  was created in the heart of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and he  $\epsilon$  liked her and he wanted Zayd to divorce her, then a great problem will be created. This is because this can never be in accordance to

the status of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ; he  $\epsilon$  would never gaze in this way at the one from whom he was forbidden, i.e. towards worldly beauty. This intention will arise from the lowliness of jealousy, which is not liked by those who adopt Taqwa, let alone the guide of the Ambiyaa  $\iota$ '.

Qushayri said that whoever attributes something like this

to Rasulullaah ε has adopted boldness, and this is proof that such a person definitely has no recognition of the status and virtue of Rasulullaah ε. How can it be said that Rasulullaah ε saw Hadhrat Zaynab pand she seemed good to him, whereas Hadhrat Zavnab ο was his cousin? Rasulullaah ε had seen her from when she was in cradle. The women would not adopt the veil before Rasulullaah ε because the law of Hijaab revealed later. was Rasulullaah ε himself married Zayd τ Hadhrat to Zaynab p. The reality is that Allaah i wanted Hadhrat Zayd τ to divorce her and Rasulullaah ε to then marry her so that the custom of adoption could be brought to an end and it could be wiped out forever. Therefore, Allaah j said, 'Muhammad & is not the father of any men among you (especially not the father of Zaid τ)...' (Surah Ahzaab (The Armies), 40) Then, Allaah j said, '...So that there may not be any restriction on the Mu'mineen with regard to (marrying) the wives of their adopted sons ...' (Surah Ahzaab (The Armies), 37)

Ibn Faurak has explained the same.

# Why did Rasulullaah $\epsilon$ Command Zayd $\tau$ to keep Zaynab $\rho$ ?

Abu Layth Samarqandi says that if someone asks why Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  commanded Hadhrat Zayd  $\tau$  to keep Hadhrat

Zaynab  $\rho$ , then the answer is that Allaah j told him that she will become the wife of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  stopped Hadhrat Zayd  $\tau$  from divorcing her because he had no love for her and Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  kept in his heart whatever Allaah j told him. When Hadhrat Zayd  $\tau$  divorced her, then out of shame that people will say that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  married the wife of his son, Allaah (purposefully) commanded him to marry Hadhrat Zaynab  $\rho$  so that marriage of the ex-wife of an adopted son could become permissible for the Ummah. Allaah j said, '...So that there may not be any restriction on the Mu'mineen with regard to (marrying) the wives of their adopted sons...' (Surah Ahzaab (The Armies), 37)

Some say that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  commanded Hadhrat Zayd  $\tau$  to keep her in order to stop his desire and remove the demand of his nafs. This attention can be when we accept that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  saw her once and liked her and we link this to human nature that a human looks at beauty and makes his liking apparent. Glancing once at a person is forgiven. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  then stopped his nafs and told Zayd  $\tau$  to keep her.

All the other talk surrounding this issue is useless and rejected. The correct stance is that which we have narrated from Hadhrat Ali bin Husayn  $\tau$ . This is the view of Samarqandi and Ibn Ataa. Qaadhi Qushayri and Ibn Faurak liked this view. Ibn Faurak said that this is the view of the research Mufassireen. Ibn Faurak said, "Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is pure from showing any hypocrisy in this matter and from saying something contrary to his principles (that in his heart he wanted that Zayd  $\tau$  should divorce her and he should marry her himself, (May Allaah save us), and he tells him to keep Zaynab  $\rho$ . Allaah j said, 'There is no sin on the Nabi ( $\epsilon$ ) with regard to (doing) what Allaah has ordained (made

permissible) for him (such as marrying more than four wives)...' (Surah Ahzaab (The Armies), 38) The purity of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  was thus explained. Therefore, whoever thinks wrong about Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  is clearly wrong and in error."

Ibn Faurak also said that the word 'khashyat' was used in this verse. It does not have the meaning of 'fear', but it has the meaning of 'shame', i.e. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  had shame from this that people will say that he married his daughter in-law. This shyness of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  was taken by the hypocrites and the Jews and they came to the Muslims making a big noise about it. (They said) that Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  stopped his daughter in-law from being married and then he married her himself. (did this happen or was this what Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  feared would happen? Other one says the latter) Allaah j then said that Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  did not do something impermissible and that he did only what Allaah j permitted.

### A Rasul cannot Forbid something Halaal upon Himself

Similarly, Rasulullaah ε was cautioned when he considered the wish of his spouses. This was mentioned in Surah Tahreem. '...Why do you declare unlawful that which Allaah has made lawful for you? ...' (Surah Tahreem (The Prohibition), 1) Similarly, Rasulullaah ε was addressed, '...You feared (what) the people, whereas Allaah is more worthy of being feared...' (Surah Ahzaab, 37).

Hadhrat Hasan Basri  $\alpha$  and Hadhrat Ayesha  $\rho$  narrate that had Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  concealed any verse, he would have concealed that verse because there is caution for him  $\epsilon$  in it

and it made apparent whatever was hidden in the heart of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon.$ 

#### Section 5

#### Hadith e Qirtaas

#### An Objection on Hadeeth e Qirtaas and the Reply

If you say that the innocence of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is proven from the narrations and there is no difference of opinion in this matter, whether it was on purpose or by mistake, in health or in sickness, intentionally or unintentionally, in happiness or in anger, and in any of these cases nothing contrary to reality left the tongue of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , yet despite this, what is the meaning of the bequest of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  that is mentioned in the Hadith narrated by Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$ ? This Hadith states that when the time of the demise of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  drew near and there were a few people at home, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Come, I shall write something for you, after this you will not go astray." Upon this, some people said, "Pain has overcome Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ."

One narration states that Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "Bring a paper to me so that I may write something, after me, you will not go astray." An argument took place among the Sahabah  $\psi$  and they said, "What has happened to Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ ? Due to severe pain he is saying something useless. (May Allaah save us). Ask Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  and find out the reality." Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  then said, "Leave me, because I am better in the condition that I am in."

Some narrations state that someone asked, "Can Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  say something useless due to severe illness?" One narration states, "Is this delirium."

Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$  said, "Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  has great difficulty at this time, (so do not worry for us because) we have the Book of Allaah and it is sufficient for our guidance." After this, people began to speak loudly. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  then said, "Move away from here."

One narration states that the people of the household had a difference of opinion. Some were saying that the paper should be given to Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  so he could dictate. Others said that which Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$  said.

Our scholars of Hadith said that Rasulullaah & was innocent from error but he was not innocent from sickness and illness. For example, he suffered severe pain and could overcome unconsciousness him 8. However. Rasulullaah ε was definitely innocent from saying disordered things; even in these conditions, such a thing could not occur. Alternatively, nothing could happen that would affect his innocence or his standing of Nubuwwah. Something that causes a corruption in the Shari'ah, like delirium, could not happen. Based on this, whoever took the meaning of 'hijr' in the Hadith, it is not correct because it necessitates that (May Allaah save us) Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  had delirium. If a person is raving, then it is called 'hijr'. If somebody talks nonsense, then it is said 'ahjar hajran, ahjar hajran'. The correct statement is 'A hajara?". This was said interrogatively to the person that refused the letter to be dictated.

This is the purport of the narration that is narrated in Bukhari through Zuhri and this purport is also shown from the Hadith that Muhammad bin Salaam narrated through Ibn Uyaynah. Asili has also written Ahadith like these in his book. Imam Muslim  $\alpha$  has also proven this from Sufyaan and other narrators.

The narrations that only state 'hijr' will be taken in this light as well and the letter of question will be taken as implied. This is because the speaker was so astonished that he did not use the letter of question. He was astonished that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  intended to write in the condition where he was suffering from severe pain. There was then a difference of opinion. So, he was so astonished at this that he could not record the word and instead of saying 'severe pain', he unintentionally said 'delirium/raving'. It does not mean that it was his belief (May Allaah j save us), that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was uttering something silly. This is exactly like despite the divine promise that Allaah j protected Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  from the hands of people when the Sahabah  $\psi$  wanted to guard his tent.

The narration of 'Ahjar' in Bukhari, that is narrated through Abu Ishaaq Mustamali and the Hadith of Ibn Jubayr through Qutaybah from Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$ , this is regarding those people who had a difference of opinion in front of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  and they addressed each other, "You have a difference of opinion with Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ ? You are speaking useless things in front of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ ." The scholars have said that 'hijw' means 'wrong/evil talk'.

In reply to the question regarding why the Sahabah  $\psi$  had a difference of opinion when Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  gave the command for paper to write, some scholars have given the reply that the standing of the command of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , whether it was compulsory, or preferable, or permissible, could be understood from the circumstances. It is possible that some people understood from the command of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  did not take it to be necessary, but it was a preferable type of command which they had the choice to do. Some people did not think like this

and they mentioned their wish to ask Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  (to clarify what sort of command it was). When they had a difference of opinion, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  stopped them from dictating the statement because he  $\epsilon$  did not take it as necessary. Moreover, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  liked the view of Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$ .

Now the question arises as to why Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$  did not like that a statement be written? Some scholars gave the reply that he saw the difficulty of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and he became fearful **that Rasulullaah**  $\epsilon$  **gets more difficulty by dictating.** Therefore, he said, 'Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  has severe pain.'

Some say that Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$  feared the matters from which people will be helpless (i.e. it is possible that people will not carry it out), and in this way they will be harmed. He understood it appropriate that in such matters, the grounds of Ijtihaad should be left open for the Ummah so that they can think, understand, and choose the correct path. This will be easier for the Ummah because if someone makes the correct decision he will get a reward and if he errs he will still be rewarded. Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$  knew that the Shari'ah has been laid out and the Deen was established. Allaah j said, '...Today I have perfected your Deen for you, completed My bounty upon you...' (Surah Maa'dah (The Set Table), 3)

Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "I bequeath you that, after me, hold firm to the book of Allaah and my household."

In reality, by saying, "The Qur'aan is sufficient for us" Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$  was refuting the people that were arguing with him, not refusing the statement of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  (May Allaah save us).

Some say that in reality, Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$  had the fear that the hypocrites and those with filthy hearts will get a chance to make up stories because this would have been written in solitude and many additions would have been made, as the Raafidis made claims of a bequest, etc.

Some say that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said this out of consultation, in order to know what the reaction of people will be; will people agree or disagree? When he  $\epsilon$  saw the people disagree, he left it.

One group says that some people told Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  to write, so Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said this in reply. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  did not say this from his own side. Then, when Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  saw that some people did not like this, based on the reasons that were mentioned, he remained silent. The proof of this is the view of Hadhrat Abbaas  $\tau$  which Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  made apparent to Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$ : "Take us to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  so that if we, the Banu Hashim are to get the rule, then we can find out." Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$  did not like this and replied, "By Allaah, I shall never do this." The proof is also the statement of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ : "Leave me, because I am in a better condition now", i.e. 'If I leave the matter of the Khilaafat as is, and I leave the book of Allaah with you, then it is better than this which you ask from me.'

Some have said that the people mentioned this wish to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  should write regarding the next Khalifah and appoint him.

#### Section 6

#### The Statement of Rasulullaah ε while Angry

1632-1645. It is common in society that if the masses do not understand something, they level objections against it. If the objection is made regarding the meaning of the Hadith narrated by Hadhrat Abu Hurayrah  $\tau$  in which Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "O my Rabb, indeed Muhammad  $\varepsilon$  is a human. He becomes angry at time like a human and I have made a covenant with you which You will not go against, that if I cause harm to any Muslim, or speak ill to him, or whip him, then You will make the recompense of this deed Your closeness on the day of Qiyaamah."

One narration states, "If I make a du'aa' of misfortune for someone and he is not deserving of it."

One narration states that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "If I speak ill towards any person, curse them or whip them, then make these deeds a means of purity and a means of mercy for them."

Now, the objection levelled here is that how can it be possible that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  curses a person that is not deserving of a curse? Or how can he speak ill to such a person that does not deserve it? Or how can he whip someone that is not deserving of it? Or how can he do these things while angry? Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is innocent (and protected from this).

The reply is (and may Allaah grant your bosom the ability to accept the truth) that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said that the person was not deserving of it. The meaning of this is that according to Allaah, he was not deserving of it from the

inside. This is because Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  issues a command based on the outward part of a person, as Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said. The wisdom in this is also as we have mentioned, i.e. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would pass a decision based on the outward side of a person so that the people that come later can do the same.

Subsequently, looking at the apparent condition, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would issue the command of whipping someone, or he would scold a person to teach him etiquette, or, rarely, he would curse. Despite this, because Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was merciful upon the Ummah – which was mentioned by Allaah in the Qur'aan as well – that is why Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would also make du'aa. This was out of the fear that the du'aa' of misfortune made by Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  for this person should not be accepted. He would make the du'aa', "O Allaah, change my prayer of misfortune to a du'aa' and make my deed a means of mercy for him." At this point, the meaning of not deserving is this. It does not mean that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would do this to an undeserving Muslim. This meaning is correct.

From the statement, 'I become angry like other humans' we should not understand that some inappropriate action would cause Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  to become angry. However, the meaning could be that for the sake of Allaah, when Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  became angry, he would curse or say something bad and make this apparent. It could also be that Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  had the choice between punishing or forgiving the person disobeying Allaah j and Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ .

The purport of this statement could also be that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  made people fearful or he warned the Ummah

through this so that people do not exceed the limits of Allaah i.

There is also a possibility that this du'aa' of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  and an occasion like this where he made a du'aa' of misfortune was unintentional because it was the habit of the Arabs. The meaning of it was not that the du'aa' of misfortune should be accepted, like Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  telling someone, 'May your hands or nose be covered in dust' or 'May Allaah never let your belly be filled', or as he said to a woman, 'barren', or a similar du'aa' of misfortune like this. This is because in other Ahadith where the qualities of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  are explained, it is said that he was not lewd in speech. Hadhrat Anas  $\tau$  said, "Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  never swore anyone, nor was he lewd in speech, nor did he swear." However, if he was greatly displeased by someone, then he would say, "May his forehead be covered in dust, what has happened to him?"

Therefore, the purport of the Hadith should be taken in this light. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  feared that his du'aa' of misfortune may be accepted. So Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  took the following promise from Allaah j, 'My du'aa' of misfortune for my Ummah should be a means of du'aa' of mercy and closeness to Allaah for them.'

Sometimes, the reason for Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  saying this was that he  $\epsilon$  said some words that were a du'aa' of misfortune and he  $\epsilon$  then feared that this du'aa' would be accepted and the person who he made this du'aa' for would become fearful or hopeless. Therefore, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  made this du'aa'.

Sometimes Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said this because whoever he rightfully rebuked, or he gave an appropriate punishment, he  $\epsilon$  wanted that this speaking bad or giving punishment should become a means of recompense for that person's sins. His sin should be wiped out and his punishment in the world should become a means of forgiveness in the hereafter. Therefore, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  made du'aa' to Allaah j, as is mentioned in another Hadith, "He who is involved in these sins (by mistake), then he is punished in the world, then the punishment will be a means of recompense."

If you object to the meaning of the Hadith of Hadhrat Zubayr  $\tau$ , wherein a woman of the Ansaar argued about a stream and Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "O Zubayr, irrigate your land until the water reaches your ankles." And the Ansaari said to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , "O Rasul of Allaah, because he is your cousin. (That is why you decided in his favour)." Hearing this, the face of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  turned and he said, "Zubayr, Take so much water from the stream that reaches the wall."

The reply to this is that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is pure from saying something regarding a Muslim that will create doubt. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  had first given counsel to Hadhrat Zubayr  $\tau$  to give up some of his right in order to reconcile, however, when the opposite group was not happy and they argued, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  gave him his full right.

Therefore, the chapter title that Imam Bukhari  $\alpha$  chose for this Hadith is, 'When a ruler indicates towards reconciliation and another group refuses, then it is appropriate for the ruler to execute reconciliation by way of rule (hukman).' At the end of the Hadith it is said, 'Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  then gave the full right to Hadhrat

Zubayr τ.' The Muslims have made this Hadith a basis in argument. The indication in it is that it is necessary to obev Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  in every command of his, whether he happiness. anger. in said it in or However. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  forbid the judge from deciding matters in a state of anger. The reason for this is that Rasulullaah ε was innocent in anger and joy and the anger of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  was only for the pleasure of Allaah. It was not for himself. This is mentioned in an authentic Hadith.

Similarly, in the Hadith of Hadhrat Ukkasha bin Rasulullaah Mihsan τ when 3 said to Hadhrat Ukkasha τ, "Take your revenge from me." And he ε did not say this intentionally or in anger, for the Hadith itself states said to that Ukkasha τ Rasulullaah "Rasulullaah & hit me using a knife and I do not know whether Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  hit intentionally or he intended to hit the camel." Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  then said, "Ukkasha, I place you in the safety of Allaah, that the Rasul of Allaah may hit you intentionally."

Similarly, another narration states that a Bedouin requested revenge (Qisas) from Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , so Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Take Qisas." The Bedouin said, "I forgive Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ." The incident is that on one occasion, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  hit him using a whip when he was clung to the camel of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  stopped him and said, "You will get your objective." However, he did not want to leave the camel. After stopping him thrice, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  hit him once. This action of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was for this person who did not obey despite Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  stopping him a number of times. This action of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was correct. This was the demand of etiquette. He was not obedient to the

command of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  yet Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was merciful to him for Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  had the right to punish him even more.

The Hadith of Hadhrat Sawaad bin Umar τ wherein he once went to Rasulullaah ε during the year when there was pain in his head, so he ε said, "Pain, pain, take it off." "With a small knife that was in the hand of Rasulullaah E, he pressed my stomach, due to which I had difficulty. I said, 'O Rasul of Allaah, I want revenge.' Rasulullaah ε uncovered his stomach (so Hadhrat Sawaad bin Umar τ could take reveng)." reality. In the is matter Rasulullaah ε pressed him for doing something wrong and he ε did this only to inform him. However, when Hadhrat Sawaad τ got difficulty, Rasulullaah ε told him to exact revenge, as we have explained.

#### Section 7

#### The Worldly Actions of Rasulullaah ε

1646-1656. We have already mentioned the worldly actions that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  did not like and refrained from. However, there is permissibility for error and we have mentioned already that they do not adversely affect the status of Nubuwwah. This would occur very rarely because the general actions of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  were correct. In fact, if this is said that all the actions of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  were worship and a means of gaining closeness to Allaah j, then it will not be inappropriate. This is because Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would take that which was necessary and that which could keep the body alive. Alternatively, there was some expediency for the being of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  so that he  $\epsilon$  could worship His Rabb, establish the Shari'ah, and execute the command upon the Ummah.

Regarding the question of those things that were between him  $\epsilon$  and the people, the condition of it was that when Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  spoke, he would speak well. Alternatively, he would give so much that he would make the person wealthy, or the talk of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was good, or he would console his opposition, or shake his enemy, or give solace to the jealous. All these things were like the other good deeds of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . In his worldly actions, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would differ with others, based on varying circumstances. He would prepare for necessary works beforehand.

If Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  wanted to go to a close place, he would mount a donkey and go. On journey, he would mount a camel and in Jihaad, a mule. This is proof of the resolute nature of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . He would sometimes mount a horse and on occasions of danger, he would keep a horse ready to

mount immediately. In his clothing and other worldly affairs, he  $\epsilon$  would keep the Ummah in mind. In order to keep the administrative system in place, he would work. He would dislike things that were contrary to this.

It sometimes happened that Rasulullaah ε liked one thing in comparison to something else but he would leave it out for the sake of his Ummah. Rasulullaah ε also adopted this in religious affairs if he was given a choice between two things (he chose for the sake of the of the Ummah). For example, he left Madinah Munawwarah for the battle of Uhud even though his personal view was that they should close themselves up in Madinah and face the enemy. He ε also left out killing the hypocrites even though he was definite of their condition (hypocrisy), due to consideration of the Muslims that were related to them, out of winning the hearts of people, and because people would accuse Muhammad ε of companions. killing his That he  $\varepsilon$  did not feel it appropriate to kill them, as is said in a Hadith.

# Despite having the desire, the Foundations of the Ka'bah were not Lifted upon the Original Foundation

Similarly, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  did not build the Ka'bah according to the foundations laid by Hadhrat Ibraaheem  $\upsilon$  so that the enthusiasm of the Quraysh would not be broken. This is because they felt it a bad thing to break the Ka'bah or change it. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  thought that if this is done, then hatred for Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  will be created in the hearts of the Quraysh for him, and possibly the original hatred they had for Islaam and the Muslims will return. An authentic Hadith states that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said to Hadhrat Ayesha

ρ, "If your nation had not just come out of disbelief, I would have definitely built the Ka'bah according to the building of Hadhrat Ibraaheem υ."

# Rasulullaah $\epsilon$ Used to Act according to the Best Counsel in Worldly Matters

It also happened such that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  took a step and then left it because something that was better came in front of him. Like on the occasion of Badr, where the wells were further from the Quraysh, he left them and moved to the wells that were closer, i.e. first he camped far, but upon the suggestion of Habbaab bin Mundhir, he went closer to the Quraysh. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  also said, "If I did that which I did later, then I would not have sent the animals for slaughter."

Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would meet the Muslims and the disbelievers with a smiling face so that he could win their hearts. He  $\epsilon$  would be patient upon the errors of the ignorant. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would give such people the best wealth so that the Deen of Allaah could become beloved in their eyes.

Rasulullaah & would work like a servant in his house and would cover himself when he went outside. His companions would sit with respect before him in such a way as though birds were perched atop their heads. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would speak that which was beloved to his companions and whatever they laughed at, he would also laugh at. Rasulullaah ε would deal with everyone in a good way and justly. Rasulullaah ε would not be angry and he never strayed from the straight path. Rasulullaah ε never hid anything from his companions and he said, "It is not from the grandeur of a Nabi that his eyes are treacherous."

If you ask about the occasion when a person came to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  informed Hadhrat Ayesha  $\rho$  that the person who had come is an evil person of his tribe. However, when he came to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , he  $\epsilon$  dealt with him courteously and with good character. He spoke and laughed with him for a long time. When the person went away and Hadhrat Ayesha  $\rho$  asked him  $\epsilon$  regarding this, he  $\epsilon$  replied that the person was evil and the people feared his evil. How can it be correct that the outward ways of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  contradict his inner thoughts?

The answer to this is that these actions of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  were to please the heart of that person, so that his Imaan remains safe and, on account of this, those who believe him will accept Islaam. When they see him, they will automatically be drawn to Islaam. The reason behind these actions of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , i.e. his worldly actions, were religious.

Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would give people great wealth and please them in order to encourage them towards religion.

# The Character of Rasulullaah $\epsilon$ would bring the Seniors onto the Straight Path

Hadhrat Safwaan  $\tau$  said, "Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  gave me wealth even though I was the one that disliked Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  the most from all the people in the world. However, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would give me to the extent that he became the most beloved of the creation to me."

Moreover, Rasulullaah ε saying, "This person is evil" regarding a person, is not bad, nor can it be called backbiting because this was done so that strangers will know the person's reality and stay away from him.

People will not trust him, especially when he is the leader of the tribe. When the objective of a statement like this is to remove harm, then it is not backbiting. In fact, at times it will be permissible and compulsory. Just as the Muhadditheen criticize the narrators or those who testify, informing regarding the faults of the person testifying.

meaning is asked of If the statement of difficult Hadith Rasulullaah 3 in the narrated by Barirah ρ, wherein Hadhrat Ayesha ρ told Rasulullaah ε that the owner of Barirah p refuses to sell her except on the condition of being the guardian and Rasulullaah ε said that Barirah p should be bought with the condition of guardianship. Hadhrat Ayesha o then bought her.

Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  stood up to deliver a sermon and he said, "What has happened to the people that they make such conditions that are not in the book? The condition that is not in the book is baseless."

Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  first commanded Hadhrat Ayesha  $\rho$  to place a condition and she sold Hadhrat Barirah  $\rho$  with this condition. If this condition was not there, then it was possible that she would not sell, just as before placing the condition, she refused to sell, to the extent that she stipulated the condition. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  then classified this condition as baseless whereas he  $\epsilon$  forbade deception.

Know well, may Allaah grant you honour, that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was pure from those things that pass across the heart of the ignorant.

A group of scholars that take Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  as innocent, have refuted the part of the Hadith where Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said,

"Make the condition of guardianship." This addition is not found in most of the chains of narration. If it is accepted that this addition is correct, then too there will be no objection because the meaning of 'lahum' also comes for 'alayhim'. Allaah j says, 'Upon these people is the curse of Allaah.' (والنك لهم اللعنة). At this point, 'lahum' was used in the meaning of 'alayhim'. Then also, (وإن اسأتم فلها) 'If you do evil, then it will be on them' (Hadith).

In this case, the meaning of the Hadith will be, 'Opposite to them, make the condition of guardianship for yourself.' Regarding the question where Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  stood up and delivered a sermon, the reason for it was that these people made the impermissible condition of guardianship for themselves.

second is that this ofanswer statement Rasulullaah & "Make the condition of guardianship for them" does not carry the meaning of a command, but it has the meaning of equality and goodness, that this condition not be beneficial for them This is Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  had informed them that guardianship is for the one freeing. So, it is as though Rasulullaah ε said to Hadhrat Ayesha of that whether you put the condition or not, it is the same. Therefore, this condition will not be beneficial for them. Dawudi has taken this interpretation and the admonishment of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  points towards this that the people knew of this from before.

The third answer is that the Hadith, "Make the condition of guardianship for them" implies those who make the command of guardianship apparent before them and explain the Sunnah of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  to them that guardianship is for the one that frees. Then, after Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  made this

apparent and because he was opposed to it, that is why he stood up and he admonished them.

### An Objection against Hadhrat Yusuf $\upsilon$ and the Silencing Reply

If an objection is made regarding the meaning of the action of Hadhrat Yusuf  $\upsilon$  towards his brothers, where he placed the utensil in the bag of his brother and they were called thieves and the rest of the incident followed. As well as Hadhrat Yusuf  $\upsilon$ 's statement, "Indeed you are thieves" whereas they were not thieves.

Know well that the verse indicates towards the statement of Hadhrat Yusuf which was (said) by the command of Allaah j. Allaah j said, '...Thus did We inspire a plan for Yusuf (to keep his brother in Egypt). He could not have kept back his brother (with him) according to the law of the king (of Egypt because the Egyptian law ruled diffirently), except if Allaah willed...' (Surah Yusuf, 76)

When this is the case, then there remains no scope for objections. Moreover, before that Hadhrat Yusuf v informed his brother, "I am your brother; do not grieve." Therefore, whatever happened after that was with the pleasure of his brother and he gauged that the result will come out better.

Regarding why he told the caravan, "...O caravan! Verily you are thieves." (Surah Yusuf, 70)

The reply is that this was originally not the statement of Hadhrat Yusuf  $\upsilon$  so no answer need be given. If this was the statement of Hadhrat Yusuf  $\upsilon$ , then it can be interpreted:

Some say that because the brothers ill-treated Yusuf  $\upsilon$  before and they sold him, that is why he called them thieves.

Some say that we should not attribute these things to the Ambiyaa ı aimlessly, even if they did say these statements. Then, in order to prove their innocence, the reply is given that if other people make such an error, then excuses for their error is not necessary (because they were not innocent).

#### Section 8

#### The Divine Wisdom in Testing the Ambiyaa 1'

If it is said, 'What was the wisdom in the illness of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and there was severity in his illness. the same was the condition of the other Ambiyaa  $\iota$ . What was the reason for testing the Ambiyaa  $\iota$  like Hadhrat Ayyub  $\upsilon$ , Hadhrat Ya'qub  $\upsilon$ , Hadhrat Daanyaal  $\upsilon$ , Hadhrat Yahya  $\upsilon$ , Hadhrat Zakariyya  $\upsilon$ , Hadhrat Isa  $\upsilon$ , Hadhrat Ibraheem  $\upsilon$  and others? They were put through difficulty, whereas all of them were the most beloved of the creation to Allaah, His friends, and His chosen servants.'

May Allaah grant you pious ability, understand that all the actions of Allaah j are based on justice and everything from Him is true. There is no change in His word. He tests His servants, just as He said:

"...to see how you behave (to see whether you would learn from their wrongs or would you too do what they did)." (Surah Yusuf, 14)

'...to test which of you carry out the best acts (during his/her lifetime before death)...'
(Surah Mulk (The Kingdom), 2)

<sup>1</sup> Allaah says, 'The words of your Rabb have been completed in truth and justice. There is none to alter His words and He is the All-Hearing, the All-Knowing." (Surah An'aam (Livestock), 115)

Ash Shifaa (Volume Two)

الْ يَمْسَسْكُمْ قَرْحٌ فَقَدْ مَسَّ الْقَوْمَ قَرْحٌ مِّثْلُهُ ١٠ وَ تِلْكَ الْأَيَّامُ نُدَاوِلُهَا بَيْنَ النَّاسِ ١٠ وَ لِيَعْلَمَ اللهُ الَّذِيْنَ المَثُوْا وَ يَتَّخِذَ مِنْكُمْ شُهَدَاءَ ١٠ وَ اللهُ لَا يُحِبُّ الظّلِمِيْنُ ١٢٠٠٠

"...so that Allaah may (make people) know those who have (true) Imaan (and are not hypocrites)..."

(Surah Aal-Imraan, 140)

اَمْ حَسِبْتُمْ اَنْ تَدْخُلُوا الْجَنَّةَ وَ لَمَّا يَعْلَمِ اللهُ الَّذِيْنَ جُهَدُوْا مِنْكُمْ وَ يَعْلَمَ الصليرِيْنَ ١٤٢٠٠

'Do you think that you will enter Jannah (through mere comfort and relaxation) when Allaah has not yet (made) known (to the people) those of you who exert themselves (in Jihaad, experiencing difficulty and hardship) and those who exercise sabr?'

(Surah Aal-Imraan, 142)

وَ لَنَبْلُوَنَّكُمْ حَتِّى نَعْلَمَ الْمُجْهِدِيْنَ مِنْكُمْ وَ الصِّبِرِيْنَ ا وَ نَبْلُوَآ اَخْبَارَكُمْ ٣٠٠٠

'We shall certainly test you until we ascertain those of you who (sincerely) strive (to uplift Allaah's Deen) and those who are steadfast and until We examine your condition.'

(Surah Muhammad, 31)

The test that Allaah j places His servants through, their rank is further raised through it, their status is elevated and Allaah j wants to show the conditions of patience, happiness, acceptance, reliance, du'aa', humility, and helplessness, through them. There is an increase in their foresight, through which they can be affectionate upon someone in difficulty, others can take lesson from them, and they can support others during difficulty. They can be followed in patience and happiness and whatever errors occurred before, or whatever negligence was, it can be wiped out so that they

can meet Allaah j pure and they can receive a full reward from Allaah j.

### Rasulullaah $\epsilon$ said, "A person is tested according to his Deen."

Hadhrat Mus'ab bin Sa'd  $\tau$  narrates from his father that he asked Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , "O Rasul of Allaah, upon whom do the most difficulties come?" Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Most difficulty comes upon the Ambiyaa  $\iota$ , then those who are similar to the Ambiyaa  $\iota$ ." Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  also said, "A person is tested according to his Deen. Tests will come upon a person continuously until he is left in such a state that he walks the earth pure from sin."

As Allaah j said, 'Many were the Prophets with whom large numbers of righteous (pious, religious) men fought...' (Surah Aal-Imraan, 46)

Hadhrat Abu Hurayrah  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Tests come upon the life, wealth, and children of a believer, to the extent that they meet Allaah j pure from sin."

Hadhrat Anas  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "When Allaah j desires good for a person, then He quickens the recompense (upon his errors and sins) and if He desires evil for someone, then whatever difficulty comes due to his sins, He stops them so that he can find his punishment on the day of Qiyaamah."

Another Hadith states, "When Allaah j makes a person His friend, He places him into difficulty so that He may hear his call and pleading."

#### Luqmaan v Advises his Son

Samarqandi has explained that the more honoured a person is in the court of Allaah, the more severely he will be tested. This is so that his virtue can be shown and he can be deserving of reward. This is just as it is narrated regarding Hadhrat Luqmaan  $\upsilon$  that he said to his son, "O my beloved son, silver and gold is placed in fire in order to cleanse them and a believer is placed through tests (in order to cleanse the believer)."

It is narrated that Hadhrat Ya'qub  $\upsilon$  was only tested because during Salaah he turned his attention with love to Hadhrat Yusuf  $\upsilon$ , while the latter was sleeping.

One narration states that both of them were eating the roasted meat of a small goat and they were pleased, whereas there was an orphan who was their neighbour. He smelled the aroma of the meat and he had the desire to eat meat. However, because he could not get it, he cried. When his grandmother saw him crying, she also cried. There was only a wall between Hadhrat Ya'qub v and the orphan but Hadhrat Ya'qub v and Hadhrat Yusuf v were not aware of this. Hadhrat Ya'qub v was taken to task for this and he had to cry so much in grief over Hadhrat Yusuf v that his eyes became white. When Hadhrat Ya'qub v came to know of this later on, it became his practice that a person would climb the roof and call out, 'Whoever wants to can join the family of Ya'qub in meals.' Hadhrat Yusuf v had to go through the difficulty that was mentioned in the Our'aan, i.e. imprisonment.

Layth narrates that the cause of the difficulty of Hadhrat Ya'qub  $\upsilon$  was that he went with the people of his locality to the king. The other people complained of oppression but

Hadhrat Ya'qub v thought about his crop and was lenient and he did not speak harshly like the other people. Only upon this did Allaah j take him to task and he was put through difficulty.

The causes behind the test of Hadhrat Sulaymaan  $\upsilon$  we have mentioned, i.e. he thought that his relatives were on the truth, or that polytheism was happening in his house and he had no knowledge of it.

#### The Severe Nature of the Illness of Rasulullaah a

The sickness of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  was very severe. A reason for this could be that Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  was being tested. Hadhrat Ayesha  $\rho$  said that she never saw the severity of the illness as much as that of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ . Hadhrat Abdullaah  $\tau$  narrates, "During the illness of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ , I asked him, 'You have severe fever.' Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, 'Yes. I have fever equal to that of two people.' I said, 'Is this because you will get double reward?' Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, 'Yes. This is the case'."

Hadhrat Abu Saeed  $\tau$  narrates that a person placed his hand on the body of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and said, "By Allaah, I do not have the ability to place my hand on your body because you have severe fever." Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  replied, "We are from the group of Ambiyaa  $\iota$ , double and multiple difficulty comes upon us." i.e. the Ambiyaa  $\iota$  were affected by difficulty in such a way that they passed away because of the difficulty.

Some were affected by hunger but they were pleased with this difficulty like how others are pleased in comfort and luxury.

#### The Greater the Calamity, the Greater the Reward

Hadhrat Anas  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "The greater the calamity, the greater the reward. When a certain group is beloved to Allaah, He places them into difficulty. Then, whoever is pleased, Allaah is pleased with him and whoever is displeased, Allaah is displeased with him."

Regarding the verse, '...Whoever commits an evil act will meet (receive) its punishment...' (Surah Nisaa (The Women), 123) the Mufassireen have said that the Muslims are placed into difficulty in the world and they are punished. This punishment is a means of wiping out their sins. This is narrated from Hadhrat Ayesha  $\rho$ , Hadhrat Ubayy  $\tau$  and Hadhrat Mujaahid  $\alpha$ .

Hadhrat Abu Hurayrah  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Whoever Allaah intends good for, He places a difficulty upon him."

The narration of Hadhrat Ayesha  $\rho$  states that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Whatever difficulty Allaah sends upon the Muslims, Allaah makes it a means of recompense, even if a thorn pricks him."

Hadhrat Abu Saeed  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Whatever difficulty comes upon a Muslim, grief, worry, even the thorn that pricks him, Allaah makes it a means of wiping his sins out."

Hadhrat Ibn Mas'ud  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Whichever Muslims upon which difficulty comes, Allaah wipes his sins away (through it) like a tree sheds leaves."

A wisdom that Allaah has kept in the sickness of a believer is that his carnal desires are weakened. Through this, it will be easy for his soul to come out and he will not experience the pangs of death and weakness. This is contrary to a disliked death, as is seen with those that pass away. Some pass away easily, while others face great difficulty.

Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "The example of a believer is like that of the branches of a tree, sometimes he is blown this way and sometimes that way."

In the narration of Hadhrat Abu Hurayrah  $\tau$  Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "In whichever direction the wind blows him (the believer), he turns that way and when it stops, the branches stand up straight. When difficulty and calamity affect a believer, he turns this way and that way. The example of the disbeliever is like that of the Sanboor tree; it stands rigid and straight, until Allaah uproots him altogether."

The meaning of this is that a believer is surrounded by calamities and difficulties and he remains pleased with his destiny, obediently. The heart of a Muslim is soft because of being pleased with destiny. He does not become angry. This is exactly the same way as the branches of the tree that are obedient to the winds go in whichever direction the wind blows. When Allaah removes the difficulty from his servant, then he will be like the branches of the tree that stand straight when the wind is not blowing. When a calamity is removed from a believer, then he is not proud, but he is thankful to his Rabb and he turns to His bounties and he remains waiting for His mercy and reward. When this is his case, then sickness and difficulty is not difficult for him. This is because sickness and its severity had made his carnal self accustomed to difficulty and weakness.

The disbeliever is the opposite. He remains healthy most of the time but when Allaah j intends to destroy him, he is deceived at the time of death and is suddenly uprooted. Suddenly, without any softness or mercy, he is caught. In terms of difficulty and hopelessness, his death is very difficult because his body was accustomed to strength and health. Moreover, he will be punished severely in the Aakhirat, as Allaah i says, '...Then We seized (punished) them suddenly while they did not realise (that punishment was coming their way), (Surah A'raaf (The High Wall), 95) This is the habit of Allaah with His enemies. 'We seized (punished) each of them on account of his sin. Against one of them (the Aad) We sent a violent wind (pebble storm to destry them). One of them (the Thamud) was seized (destroyed) by a shout (loud screech)...' (Surah Ankaboot (The Spider), 40)

Allaah j destroyed all of them while they were negligent and rebellious, through sudden death He caught them without them having prepared (for it).

Therefore, it is narrated from the pious predecessors that they disliked a sudden death. The hadith of Ibraheem Nakha'i  $\alpha$  states that the pious do not like to be caught in this way because it is similar to anger, i.e. they felt that a sudden death was bad

### The Third Wisdom is that Sickness Informs of Death.

Subsequently, the more severe the illness is, the more there is fear of death coming. Therefore, those who have illnesses prepare to a certain degree and they understand that the time to meet our Rabb is near and they turn away from the world. Their hearts incline towards the Aakhirat and they come out of that which they fear recompense for, whether it is from Allaah or from the servants, and they fulfil the rights of those they owe them to. Whatever wealth they want to bequeath, they think over it. They make whatever promises they want. Look at Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , in his final illness, whoever had a right upon him, whether it dealt with life or wealth, he fulfilled this right. In the matters of wealth and health, whoever wanted Qisas from him, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  permitted him to take Qisas.

This is narrated in the Hadith of Fadhl and the Hadith of his demise. After this, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  made a bequest regarding the book of Allaah and his pure household. He also made a bequest regarding the Ansaar. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  requested a paper to write something that would help the Ummah not to go astray, or whether it was something else. Ultimately he  $\epsilon$  decided to refrain from writing it.

In summary, the habit of the believers and the slaves of Allaah that have Taqwa is making bequests and the disbelievers are deprived of considering this. This is because Allaah gives them grace in order to sin in abundance. Allaah takes the disbelievers slowly to this stage where they have no idea. Allaah j says:

'(It seems that) They await only a single scream (punishment or Qiyaamah) to seize them while they are arguing. (It seems that only after this they will decide to accept Imaan but then it will be too late!)'

'(When the punishment seizes them, they will have no chance to do anything) Then they will be unable to make any bequest (testament) nor shall they be able to return to their families (homes).' Ash Shifaa (Volume Two)

(Surah Yaaseen, 49-50)

Therefore, Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  recited Tasbeeh upon the disliked death of someone. It was as though Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  felt that this disliked death was the anger of Allaah j. This was because the deceased was deprived of making a bequest. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "A disliked (sudden) death is a means of comfort for a believer, but a means of regret for the disbeliever." The reason for this is that no matter what condition a believer dies in, he is mentally ready to die to a certain degree and he waits for it. So death becomes easy for him. After death, a believer is relieved from worldly calamities, as Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "A Muslim finds comfort from death and he is given comfort." Contrary to when the disbeliever dies, he is not mentally ready for it, nor does he suffer sickness through which it can be gauged whether he is close to death. Allaah j said:

'However, it (punishment) will come to them suddenly, totally dumbfounding them. Then they will neither be able to repel it, nor will they be granted any respite (time to repent).'

(Surah Ambiyaa, 40)

Therefore, death is very severe for them. They are greatly grieved when leaving the world and Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  indicated towards this: "He who loves to meet Allaah, Allaah wishes to meet him and he who does not like to meet Allaah, Allaah also does not like to meet him."

#### Part Four

# Regarding the person who disparages or speaks evil of Rasulullaah v

1657-1669. Qaadhi Abul Fadhl  $\alpha$  says that the rights of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  were explained in the light of the Qur'aan, Sunnah, and consensus of the Ummah. He has also explained the laws pertaining to the honour of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . The more Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is honoured Allaah j has accordingly forbidden that he  $\epsilon$  be harmed. The entire Ummah is unanimous upon the following: he who is insolent to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , or speaks ill towards Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , it is compulsory to kill him. Allaah j says:

'Verily those (the Kuffaar) who hurt Allaah and His Rasool  $(\epsilon)$  (by ascribing partners to Allaah and rejecting the message and Prophethood of Rasulullaah  $(\epsilon)$ ), Allaah curses them in this world and in the Aakhirah, and He has prepared a humiliating (disgraceful) punishment for them.'

(Surah Ahzaab (The Armies), 57)

وَ مِنْهُمُ إِلَّذِيْنَ يُؤْذُوْنَ النَّبِيَّ وَ يَقُوْلُوْنَ هُوَ اُذُنَّ ١ قُلْ اُذُنُ خَيْرِ لَّكُمْ يُؤْمِنُ بِاللَّهِ وَ يُؤْمِنُ بِاللَّهِ وَ يَقُوْلُوْنَ هُوَ اُذُنِّنَ اَمَنُوْا مِنْكُمْ ١٠ وَ الَّذِيْنَ يُؤْمِنُ بِاللَّهِ وَ يَؤْمُونَ رَسُوْلَ اللَّهِ لَهُمْ عَذَابٌ الِيْمُ ٢٠٠٠

'...There is a painful punishment for those who harass the Rasool (the Munafiquen should leave others and please Allaah and His Rasul  $(\varepsilon)$ )'

(Surah Taubah (Repentance), 61)

"...It is not (permissible) for you (Mu'mineen) to hurt the Nabi (ε) (in any way), nor to ever marry his wives after

him (after he passes away). Verily this (hurting Rasulullaah  $(\varepsilon)$  and marrying his  $(\varepsilon)$  wives after his  $(\varepsilon)$  demise) is grave in the sight of your Rabb.'

(Surah Ahzaab (The Armies), 53)

# It is Haraam to mock Rasulullaah $\epsilon$ , even Vaguely or by Indication

Allaah j has forbidden that Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  be mocked at, even if it be by indication. Allaah j says:

'O you who have Imaan! Do not say, Raa'inaa, (to Rasulullaah (\varepsilon). Whereas this word means 'consider us' in Arabic, it was an insult in the language of the Jews. The Jews therefore used this word as an insult when speaking to Rasulullaah (\varepsilon). The Mu'mineen were therefore commanded not to use this word) but (to rather) say, 'Undhurna' (which has the same meaning in Arabic but the Jews could not use it as an insult in their language) and listen (to what you are commanded, with the purpose of obeying). A painful punishment is in store for the Kaafiroon.'

(Surah Al-Baqarah (The Bull), 104)

This verse indicates towards the word 'raa'ina'. Allaah j forbade the Muslims from imitating (the Jews) and He cut off this means of mocking Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . It was in this way that the believers were stopped from using this word. This was so that the hypocrites and disbelievers would stop mocking Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and belittling him.

Some say that they were stopped from using this word 'raa'ina' because of the meaning. 'They hear from us that which they are not worthy of hearing' was the meaning that

the Jews would take. Therefore, the Muslims were prohibited from using it.

Some say that there is disrespect in this word and it goes against the standing of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . They were stopped from it because according to the dialect of the Ansaar it had the meaning, 'consider our rights, then we shall fulfil your rights.' It is as though the meaning is, 'we consider you for this reason that you consider us.' This was a form of disrespect. It is necessary to honour Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  in all conditions. Therefore, the Muslims were stopped form using such a word.

The Muslims were also forbidden from keeping the same title as the title of Rasulullaah ε. Rasulullaah ε said, "Keep your name after my name but do not keep the same title as mine." In this command, Rasulullaah ε protected himself and gave consideration to saving himself from harm. This is said 'Abul because a person Oaasim' Rasulullaah ε replied. But the person said, 'I did not call you, but I called that person.' After this, Rasulullaah ε stopped people from keeping the same title as his so that he does not have to be bothered by replying to the call of the person for nothing. The hypocrites and those who would mock made this a means of giving harm to Rasulullaah ε. Like by saying 'Abul Qaasim' and when Rasulullaah & would turn, they would then say, 'We were calling someone else.' The objective of this deed of theirs was only to mock Rasulullaah ε and to be insolent to him. Rasulullaah ε protected himself from circumstances wherein these people could mock.

# The Prohibition of Keeping the title 'Abul Qaasim' was only during the Life of Rasulullaah ε

Research scholars have limited this prohibition to the life of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . They gave permission from after the demise of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Regarding this Hadith, there are a number of views of the scholars, but there is no scope to mention them all here. We have sufficed on the view of the majority and this is correct. The prohibition was only so that the honour of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  could be considered. To do this is preferable, not prohibited. This is because he  $\epsilon$  did not prohibit others from keeping the same name as his, but Allaah j prohibited that he be called by his name. Allaah j said:

لَا تَجْعَلُوْا دُعَآءَ الرَّسُوْلِ بَيْنَكُمْ كَدُعَآءِ بَعْضِكُمْ بَعْضًا ١ قَدْ يَعْلَمُ اللهُ ١٠٤٠٠

'Do not make the calling of the Rasool (ε) among yourselves like your calling to each other...' (Surah Noor (Celestial Light), 63)

The Muslims would call Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  using the words, 'O Rasul of Allaah' and sometimes 'O Abul Qaasim.'

Hadhrat Anas  $\tau$  narrates that if there was fear of dishonouring the name of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , then it would have been disliked to keep the same name as his and he said, "You keep the name of your children as Muhammad and then you curse them"

It is narrated that Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$  wrote to the people of Kufa that do not name anyone with the same name as

Rasulullaah ε. Abu Ja'far Tabari α has explained this and Muhammad bin Sa'd τ narrated that Hadhrat Umar τ saw a person by the name of Muhammad being sworn at. The person was saying, 'O Muhammad, may Allaah make you like this.' Hadhrat Umar τ then sent his nephew Muhammad bin Zayd bin Khattaab and said, "I do not deem it permissible that Muhammad ε is sworn at through you. By Allaah, as long as I remain alive, you will not be called Muhammad Name him Abdullaah ' Then Hadhrat Umar τ intended that a general prohibition should be passed for the honour of the Ambivaa v that no one should be named with their names. However, he retracted from this view. The correct view is that after the demise of Rasulullaah E. it is permissible to keep both the name of Rasulullaah E, as well as his title. This is because the Sahabah w are unanimous upon this.

There was a Sahabi that named his son Muhammad and gave him the title Abul Qaasim. A narration also states that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  permitted Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$  to do so. Furthermore, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  informed that Hadhrat Mahdi will have the same name and title as his, i.e. Muhammad and Abul Qaasim. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  also named a few children with this name, for example, Muhammad bin Talha, Muhammad bin Amr bin Hazm, Muhammad bin Thaabit bin Qays, and many others. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  also said that there is no problem whether there is one Muhammad, two Muhammads, or three Muhammads in one home.

In this part we have discussed two chapters at length.

### Chapter 1

# The one disparages the Being, Lineage, Deen, or Habit of Rasulullaah ε and Explanation of the one who swears Rasulullaah ε

Know well that whoever swears Rasulullaah ε, (May Allaah save us), disparages him, attributes some defect to him; his being, lineage, Deen, or habits, or he is insolent towards Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  by making a similitude of him to something, or he says that Rasulullaah ε is incomplete, or he belittles the status of Rasulullaah E, then it is as though he has sworn Rasulullaah ε. The ruling regarding this person is the the who clearly same as one swears Rasulullaah ε; he should be killed. We shall throw light on this subject and we shall not exclude the action of anyone from this section, nor shall we display doubt. This swearing can be either clear or vague.

The same rule applies to the person that curses him  $\epsilon$ , or makes du'aa' of misfortune for him  $\epsilon$ , or has hope of harming him, or attributes something to him that he  $\epsilon$  is not worthy of, and if the objective of this person is to portray Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  badly, or to disparage him, or to say something shameless regarding him  $\epsilon$ . The same rule applies to the person who accuses Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  of speaking evil, or lying, or he blames Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  for the difficulties that came upon him (Nabi). All of this is impermissible and forbidden. All the rulings that the scholars have given until now regarding this are unanimous.

### The Scholars State that the Punishment for Insolence Towards Rasulullaah & is Death

Abu Bakr bin Mundhir said that the general scholars are unanimous upon this: 'Whoever swears Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  should be killed.' This is the view of Imam Maalik bin Anas  $\alpha$ , Layth  $\alpha$ , Ahmad  $\alpha$ , Ishaq  $\alpha$  and others. Imam Shafi'i  $\alpha$  has the same view.

Qaadhi Abul Fadhl said that the demand of the statement of Hadhrat Abu Bakr  $\tau$  is also this and according to all the scholars the repentance of such a person is not accepted. This is also the view of Imam Abu Hanifah  $\alpha$  and his companion. Moreover, Sufyaan Thauri  $\alpha$  and the scholars of Kufa and Auza'i  $\alpha$  have the same view.

However, they say that this action is that of *irtidaad*. Walid bin Muslim also narrated this from Imam Maalik  $\alpha$ . It is also narrated from Imam Abu Hanifah  $\alpha$  and his companions that he who disparages Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , or he says that he is free from Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , or he belies Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , then according to Sahnoon, he will be counted among those that swore Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . All this will be part of *irtidaad*. Based on this, there is a difference of opinion whether this person should be made to repent and whether he leaves the fold of Islaam or not. Killing him is the Shar'i punishment, or is referring to him as a disbeliever sufficient? We shall discuss this in the next chapter in detail Insha Allaah.

There is no difference of opinion in the issue of whether it is permissible to kill such a person. The pious predecessors and all the scholars of the various cities are unanimous upon this; many scholars have written that they are unanimous that such a person should be killed and that he leaves the fold of Islaam Some of the Zawaahir scholars, among them is Abu Muhammad Ali bin Ahmad Al Faarisi, have said that he has a difference of opinion about the leaving the fold of Islaam regarding the person that is insolent towards Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . However, the famous view is that which has been narrated from Muhammad bin Sahnoon that all the scholars of the Ummah are unanimous that the one who swears Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  or the one who disparages him  $\epsilon$  is a disbeliever and punishment is promised for him. According to the entire Ummah he should be killed. The one who doubts about this person being a disbeliever or doubts whether he deserves punishment is himself a disbeliever.

#### Khaalid bin Waleed T Kills Such A Person

Ibraaheem bin Husayn bin Khaalid Al Faqeeh uses the action of Khalid bin Waleed  $\tau$  as proof. He killed Maalik bin Nuwayrah only for this reason that he said regarding Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , "He is your companion." (Not your Rasul).

Abu Sulaymaan Khattaabi said, "I do not know any of the Muslim scholars who do not have the view that the one who swears Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  should be killed, when he is a Muslim"

## Imam Maalik $\alpha$ says that even Repentance is not accepted

In the book of Sahnoon, Mabsoot, and Utaybah, Abul Qaasim has narrated the following from Imam Maalik  $\alpha$ , "The Muslim who swears Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  should be killed and his repentance will not be accepted."

Ibn al Qaasim has written in Utaybah, "He who swears Rasulullaah ε, or disparages him ε, or he points out any

defect, he should be killed; according to the entire Ummah, the command to kill him is the same as that of killing a Zindeeq. This is because Allaah j has made it obligatory upon us to honour Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ."

In Mabsoot, it is narrated from Uthmaan bin Kinaanah that, "Whoever is a Muslim and swears Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  should be killed, or he should be hanged, his repentance will not be accepted and the ruler has a choice whether to hang him or to chop his head."

Abu Mus'ab and Ibn Abi Uways narrates that we heard from Imam Maalik  $\alpha$ , "He who swears Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , or speaks ill of him, or disparages him, or attributes some shortcoming to him, should be killed, whether he is a Muslim or a disbeliever, and his repentance will not be accepted."

In the book of Imam Ahmad bin Ibraaheem, Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  said, "Whoever swears Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , or any other Nabi, he should be killed and his repentance will not be accepted, whether he is a Muslim or a disbeliever."

Asbagh says, "He should be killed in all cases, whether he swears openly, or privately, and his repentance will not be accepted because we do not know of the condition of his repentance."

Abdullaah bin Abdul Hakam said, "He who swears Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  should be killed, and his repentance will not be accepted, whether he is a Muslim or a disbeliever."

Ash hab narrates from Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  and Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  narrates from Wahb "Whoever said, 'The shawl of

Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  or the shirt of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is dirty' intending to belittle Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , he should be killed."

# If a Person is Insolent Towards any of the Ambiyaa 1, it is Compulsory to Kill Him

Some of our scholars said that the scholars are unanimous that he who says 'wayl' (punishment) or he makes du'aa' of misfortune for any Nabi, then he should be killed without making him repent.

Regarding the person that said, "He  $\epsilon$  was a burden upon people and the orphan of Abu Taalib." Abul Hasan Qaalbisi said that the ruling is that he should be killed.

Abu Muhammad bin Zayd Al Qateerwaani passed the ruling of killing the person who heard the description of the features of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and, exactly at that time, a person with ugly features passed by so he said, "Do you want to know his features?" the people replied, "Yes." He then indicated towards the ugly person and says, "He was like that." Abu Muhammad bin Zayd said that the repentance of this wretched person will not be accepted and the curse of Allaah is upon him **because whatever he said was a lie.** This cannot be said by a person whose Imaan is safe and sound.

Ahmad bin Abi Sulaymaan Sahnoon says that whoever says that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was black should be killed.

Regarding the person who was told, "By the oath of the truth of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , this can never be." This person replied, "Allaah did this and this with Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , and he uttered something evil," he will be told, "O enemy of Allaah, what are you uttering?" He said, "I meant Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ." Ibn

Abi Sulaymaan said to the person addressed that you be witness, I am your partner. His intention was to be a partner in killing him and in the reward of doing so.

Habib bin Rabi says that in the place where clear words are used, there remains no scope for interpretation and because he did not consider the honour of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , that is why it is permissible to kill him.

Abu Abdullaah bin Itaab has given the ruling of killing the collector that said when collecting the 'ushr', "First give the 'ushr', and if you want to then complain, then complain to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . If I requested the 'ushr', it is because Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  has requested it. If I am ignorant, then (May Allaah save us), Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was ignorant, and he also requested 'ushr'."

The jurists of Andalus were unanimous upon killing Ibn Haatim Taytli and upon hanging him. During a debate, he was insolent to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and called him an 'orphan' and 'father-in-law of Ali'. He made this thought apparent that the abstinence of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was not by choice, but if he had the bounties of the world he  $\epsilon$  would have used them. (May Allaah save us)

The jurists of Qayrawaan and the students of Sahnoon gave the ruling of killing Ibraheem Faraazi. Ibraheem was a master in many forms of knowledge and he was a poet. He would present himself in the gatherings of Qaadhi Abul Abbaas bin Taalib. He was accused of insolence in many of his poems towards Allaah j, the Ambiyaa  $\iota$ , and to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . He was presented in the court of Qaadhi Yahya bin Umar. There were many noted jurists in the court at the time. The judge ruled that he be killed. Subsequently, a knife was pierced into his stomach and he was killed. He was

hung and burnt. Some historians have written that when the wood was moved, it began to move on its own. When his face was turned from the Qiblah, the wood stopped. The people understood this as a sign from Allaah and called out the Takbeer. A dog then came and licked his blood.

It is narrated from Yahya bin Umar that Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "A dog will not drink the blood of a Muslim."

## If he does Not Repent, it is Compulsory to Kill the one who says that Rasulullaah $\epsilon$ fled the Battlefield

Qaadhi Abdullaah bin Muraabit said, "He who says that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  fled the battlefield will be made to repent. If he repents, then well and good, otherwise he will be killed. This is because this is attributing a defect to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was pure from these defects." Every step of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was based on foresight. Therefore, Allaah j made him innocent.

Habib bin Rabi Farwi said that the view of Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  and his students is that he who disparages Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  should be killed without being asked to repent.

Ibn Itaab  $\alpha$  said, "It is proven from the Qur'aan and the Sunnah that whoever harms Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  or disparages him  $\epsilon$ , whether clearly or by way of indication, even if it be something small, it will be compulsory to kill him."

This is because the scholars have counted this as part of swearing Nabi  $\epsilon$ . According to the early and latter day scholars, it is unanimously agreed that it is compulsory to kill this person. However, the scholars have a difference of

opinion regarding killing the person. We have indicated towards this and we shall mention the details later on.

Similarly, I say that whoever belittles Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , or says that he was a shepherd, or that he used to forget, or he was affected by black magic, or he was wounded, or his army was defeated, or difficulties came upon him, or he was inclined to women, and this person picks on him, or makes him a target of criticism, the ruling for all this is that if he intended to fault Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , he will be killed.

The views of the scholars have already been mentioned. The proofs are mentioned ahead.

#### Section 1

# The Proofs that Show that a Person who Swears Rasulullaah $\epsilon$ or Disparages Him $\epsilon$ should be Killed

### Proof from the Qur'aan

In the Qur'aan, Allaah j has cursed the person that gives difficulty to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  in this world and in the hereafter. Allaah j has referred to the harm caused to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  as harm to Him, and he who swears Allaah j, there is no difference of opinion in killing him.

Moreover, the one deserving of curses is the one who is a disbeliever and the ruling of a renegade is that he must be killed. Allaah j said:

'Verily those (the Kuffaar) who hurt Allaah and His Rasool (ε) (by ascribing partners to Allaah and rejecting the message and Prophethood of Rasulullaah (ε)), Allaah curses them in this world and in the Aakhirah, and He has prepared a humiliating (disgraceful) punishment for them.'

(Surah Ahzaab (The Armies), 57)

Similarly, Allaah j has mentioned regarding killing a believer. If Allaah says that someone is accursed in the world, then the meaning is that it is compulsory to kill him. It is mentioned regarding the highway robbers:

لَبِنْ لَمْ يَنْتَهِ الْمُنْفِقُوْنَ وَ الَّذِيْنَ فِيْ قُلُوبِهِمْ مَّرَضٌ وَ الْمُرْجِفُونَ فِي لَا الْمَدِيْنَةِ لَنُغْرِيَنَكَ بِهِمْ ثُمَّ لَا يُجَاوِرُوْنَكَ فِيْهَا إِلَّا قَلِيْلًا ٢٠٠٠ عَمَّ

'They are accursed (cast far from Allaah's mercy). (Therefore), Wherever they go (to seek asylum), they will be seized and massacred (unless they desist from their evil practices).'

(Surah Ahzaab (The Armies), 60)

'...Such shall be their humiliation in this world...'

(Surah Maa'idah (The Set Table), 33)

This is because sometimes 'killing' has the meaning of 'curse'. For example, Allaah j said:

'May those who spread falsehood (who reject the belief in resurrection without valid reason be destroyed)...'
(Surah Dhaariyaat (The Winds That Disperse), 10)

"...May Allaah destroy them! Where are they wandering astray? (They deviate further from Islaam with each passing day)."

(Surah Munaafiqoon (The Hypocrites), 4)

There is a difference between harming the general believers and harming Allaah j. The ruling regarding the one who harms the believers is that he should be punished. However, harming Allaah and His Rasul is far more severe and the punishment for it is killing. **Allaah j said:** 

'Never! By the oath of your Rabb, they cannot have Imaan until they make you (O Muhammed (ε)) judge their disputed and (until) they do not find any dissatisfaction in that which you decide and (until) they accept (your decision) with complete submission (with happiness).'

(Surah Nisaa (The Women), 65)

From this it can be gauged regarding the one that disparages Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Allaah j said:

'O you who have Imaan! Never raise your voices above the voice of the Rasool (ε) (literally and figuratively) and do not speak to him loudly as you speak loudly with each other, lest your deeds be laid to waste without your realising it.'

(Surah Hujuraat (The Rooms), 2)

It is apparent that only disbelief can wipe out good deeds and the ruling of a disbeliever is that he should be killed.

Allaah j says:

"...Sufficient for them is Jahannum which they shall enter (in the Aakhirah)..."

(Surah Mujaadalah (The Lady Who Debated), 8)

'Among them (the Munaafiqeen) there are those who hurt the Rasool (ε)...'

(Surah Taubah (Repentance), 61)

'...There is a painful punishment for those who harass the Rasool ( $\varepsilon$ ) (the Munaafiqeen should leave others and please Allaah and His Rasul ( $\varepsilon$ )).'

(Surah Taubah (Repentance), 61)

'If you have to ask them (the Munaafiqeen about the reason for their mockery) they will (brush it off and falsely) say, "We were only talking and joking (to pass time without intending any harm)." Say, "Were you mocking Allaah, His Aayaat and His Rasool (ε)?" (Regardless of what excuse they give, their action cannot be condoned and constitutes the gravest of sins)'

(Surah Taubah (Repentance), 65)

"...You have surely committed Kufr (by mocking Allaah, Rasulullaah (ε) or Allaah's Aayaat) after (your claim to) having Imaan...'

(Surah Taubah (Repentance), 66)

The scholars of Tafseer have explained that the meaning of this is 'Whatever useless things you said regarding Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is disbelief and it is as though you have become renegade.'

We have explained before that the scholars are unanimous that the one who disparages Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is a disbeliever and it is compulsory to kill him.

Now we study the Ahadith.

#### **Proof from the Ahaadith**

1670-1720. Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Whoever swears a Nabi, kill him."

An authentic Hadith states that Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  gave the command to kill Ka'b bin Ashraf and he  $\varepsilon$  said, "Who will kill Ka'b bin Ashraf because he has harmed Allaah j and His Rasul?" From this Hadith it is proven that the killing of Ka'b bin Ashraf was not because of his polytheism, but it was because of harming Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ .

Similar to this was **the killing of Abu Raafi.** Hadhrat Baraa bin Aazib  $\tau$  narrates that he used to give difficulty to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and he would help the enemies of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  against him. He used to also mock Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .

On the day of the conquest of Makkah, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  gave the command that Ibn Khatl and his two slave girls should be killed because they used to swear Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  in their singing.

Another Hadith states, "A person used to swear Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, 'Who will kill this enemy of mine?' Hadhrat Khalid bin Walid  $\tau$  was ready. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  sent him and the accursed person was sent to hell

Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  gave the command that a group of disbelievers that harmed him  $\epsilon$  be killed. Most of them had sworn at Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Among them were **disbelievers like** Nadr bin Haarith and Uqbah bin Abi Mu'eet. Before and after the conquest of Makkah, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  took the promise from the Sahabah that they will kill him. Subsequently, they were all killed. However, before capturing them, whoever accepted Islaam was forgiven.

Bazzaar narrates that when Uqbah bin Abi Mueet was about to be killed, he said, "People of the Quraysh, today I am being killed before you (and you are silent)." Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "You are being killed because of your disbelief and because of attributing false things to Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ ."

Abdur Razzaaq mentioned that a person swore Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  so Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Who will kill this person?" Hadhrat Zubayr  $\tau$  said, "I." He then fought him and killed him.

It is narrated that a person would swear Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , so Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Who will close the tongue of this woman?" Hadhrat Khalid  $\tau$  killed this woman.

It is also narrated that once a person attributed a lie to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , so Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  sent Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$  and Hadhrat Zubayr  $\tau$  to kill this person.

Ibn Qaani narrated that once a person came to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and said, "O Rasul of Allaah, I heard my father saying insolent things regarding you. I could not tolerate it and killed him." Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  did not show any dislike for this

Muhaajir bin Abi Umayyah was the governor of Yemen in the time of Hadhrat Abu Bakr  $\tau$ . When *irtidaad* spread through Yemen, a woman swore Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Muhaajir bin Abi Umayyah came to know of this and he cut the hand of the woman and he broke her front teeth. Hadhrat Abu Bakr  $\tau$  came to know of this and he said, "If you did not do this, then I would have commanded you to kill her. This is because the one who swears the Ambiyaa  $\iota$  is not punished in the same way as the one who swears a normal person."

Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$  narrates that a woman of the tribe of Khatmah mocked Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , so Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Who will kill this woman for me?" A person of that tribe got up and said, "I shall do it." He went and killed the woman. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  then said, "Not even the horns of a goat will be hit in it." i.e. her blood was permissible. There was no fitnah in this. This was a simile that he  $\epsilon$  mentioned.

### The narrations of Sunan Abu Dawud and Sunan Nasa'i about the one who swears the Rasul

Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$  narrates that a blind Sahabi had a slave girl that would mostly speak ill of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . He stopped her and admonished her but she did not accept. One

night she said something evil regarding Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  so the blind Sahabi killed her. He went to Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  and informed him  $\varepsilon$  of what transpired. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "Her blood was permissible (to shed)." (Abu Dawud)

# The Statement of Hadhrat Abu Bakr $\tau$ is the Final Word Regarding This

Hadhrat Abu Barzah Aslami τ narrates that one day he was sitting by Hadhrat Abu Bakr τ when Hadhrat Abu Bakr τ was angry at a Muslim for some reason. Qaadhi Ismaa'eel and other Imams of Hadith state that the person had sworn at Hadhrat Abu Bakr τ. This is a narration of Nasa'i. The narrator explains that Hadhrat Abu Bakr shouted at the person, so he was foul-mouthed in reply. "I said, 'O Khalifah of the Rasul, permit me to kill him.' Hadhrat Abu Bakr τ said to me, 'You sit down. None but the Rasul has this right'." Qaadhi Abu Muhammad bin Nasr said that when Hadhrat Abu Bakr τ said this, none of the Sahabah objected. From this incident, the scholars of Hadith state, "He who displeases Rasulullaah E, or does something that is a means of the displeasure of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ , or the action causes harm to Rasulullaah ε, or he swears Rasulullaah ε, then he should be killed "

### **Statements During Various Khilafaats**

From amongst these proofs, one proof is that the governor of Kufah asked Hadhrat Umar bin Abdul Aziz  $\alpha$ , "Shall I kill the person that swears Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$ ?" He replied, "It is not permissible to kill a Muslim for swearing. However, it is permissible to kill the one who swears Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . In fact, the blood of the one that swears Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  becomes permissible."

Once the Khalifah Haarun Rashid asked Imam Maalik  $\alpha$ , "How should he who swears Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  be dealt with?" He said that the jurists of Iraq have given the ruling that he should be lashed. **Imam Maalik**  $\alpha$  became angry and said, "Amir ul Mumineen, whichever Ummah swears its Nabi, then what will their abode be? **It is permissible to kill the one who swears the Ambiyaa 1.** And he who swears the Sahabah should be lashed."

Qaadhi Abul Fadhl explains that this narration mentions this. Most of those who have written regarding Imam Maalik α have written in this way. "However, I do not know the jurists of Iraq who gave the ruling to Haaroon ar Rashid. This is because it has passed, i.e. the ruling of the jurists of Iraq, that such a person should be killed. It could be that this is the view of such scholars that are not famous in terms of knowledge. Alternatively, their ruling is not considered reliable, or they were worldly scholars. It is also possible that he was asked about a view of one of their own scholars whose talk was vague and a decision could not be reached whether the talk of the person was swearing or not. It could also be that he retracted from his view or repented and Haaroon ar Rashid did not inform Imam Maalik α of the correct circumstances, otherwise as we have explained, all the scholars are unanimous that it is compulsory to kill the person who swears Rasulullaah ɛ."

The demand of intelligence and analogy is also that he who swears Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , or disparages him  $\epsilon$ , means that his heart is sick and disbelief is hidden within him. Therefore, most of the scholars classify such a person as a renegade. The scholars of Shaam narrate the same from Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  and Auza'i  $\alpha$ . This is the view of Sufyaan Thauri  $\alpha$ , Imam Abu Hanifah  $\alpha$  and the scholars of Kufa as well.

Another view is that insolence towards Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is a proof of disbelief. Therefore, the person should be killed as a punishment of the Shari'ah, although the ruling of disbelief is not passed against him. However, if he persists in his insolence; he does not take his deed to be evil, nor does he stop from it, he will be a disbeliever. His view is clear. This is exactly as though he has belied Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . If he said something belittling Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , or he mocked Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , and he did this knowing that he is mocking, and he refuses to repent, this means that he takes the mocking of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  to be permissible which is clear disbelief. Therefore, such a person is a disbeliever without any difference of opinion.

Allaah j says about such people:

'They (the Munaafiqeen) swear by Allaah that they never said (what was reported about them that they mocked Allaah and Rasulullaah (ε)). They definitely uttered the word of kufr. They committed kufr after (their claim of) being Muslims...'

(Surah Taubah (Repentance), 74)

The Mufasireen have written that the statement of the Munaafiqeen was, "If whatever Muhammad  $\epsilon$  said is the truth, then we are worse than donkeys." Some say that their statement was, "The example of us and Muhammad  $\epsilon$  is like that of a person that says, 'Fatten your dog, one day it will eat you up' or a hypocrite said, "If we return to Madinah, the honourable will remove the despicable."

Some scholars say that the person who says things like this, even if he says it privately, the ruling upon him is that of being a *Zindeeq*. He should be killed. This is because he has changed his Deen and Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "He who changes his Deen should be killed."

Also, it is compulsory to kill this person because the honour of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is much more than that of an individual of the Ummah. The form is that if a person swears an individual of the Ummah, then he will be lashed for accusation, but the person who swears Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  will be killed as punishment. This is because the status of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is much higher than that of a normal person.

#### Section 2

# The Forgiveness of Rasulullaah ε upon the Opposition Harming Him ε

1721-1735. At this point, if you raise an objection, asking why Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  did not kill the Jew who addressed him with the words, 'As saamu Alaykum', because this is a du'aa' of misfortune?

Or why Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  did not issue the command to kill the person who said, 'This distribution is such that the pleasure of Allaah j is not the objective' even though this sentence caused difficulty for Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ , resulting in Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  saying, "Musa was given more difficulty than this, but he adopted patience." (Bukhari, Muslim)

Or why Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  forgave the hypocrites (and did not kill them) even though they gave him difficulty most of the time.

The answer to this is that in the beginning of Islaam, Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  would soften and win the hearts of people. He  $\varepsilon$  would incline the hearts of the people. Imaan was firm in their hearts. He  $\varepsilon$  would forgive them and he  $\varepsilon$  would guide his companions with the same. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said to the Sahabah  $\square$ , "Indeed you have been sent to create ease, and you have not been sent to create difficulty."

"Create ease, do not create difficulty and give solace and do not create hatred." (Bukhari, Muslim)

Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "It should not be that the people say that Muhammad kills his companions."

Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would treat the disbelievers and hypocrites well. He  $\epsilon$  would meet them with good character. Most of the time, he  $\epsilon$  would overlook and be patient upon their harm. They would be angry with Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , but he  $\epsilon$  would tolerate it. However, it would not be permissible for us to tolerate it today.

Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  showed favours to them and forgave them because Allaah j commanded:

'...You & shall continuously discover some sort of treachery from them (from the Jews), except from a few of them (who become Muslims). Forgive them and overlook (if you are not in a position to wage Jihaad). Verily Allaah loves those who are good (the kind ones).'

(Surah Maa'idah (The Set Table), 13)

'Good and evil cannot be equal. Resist (the evil harassment and insults of your enemies) with that which is best (by being kind and forgiving), and (when you do this, you will notice that) the one between yourself and whom there was enmity (your enemy) will instantly become like your bosom (intimate) friend.'

(Surah HaaMeem Sajdah, 34)

Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was given this command because in the beginning of Islaam, there was a need to soften the hearts and win the hearts and join them on one Kalimah. However, once Islaam had become established and it had overpowered other religions, then the ruling changed. Whoever they had power over, and whoever's fitnah was famous, the ruling to kill him was passed. Like the case where Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  passed the ruling of killing Ibn Khatal on the day of the conquest of Makkah. Or he permitted the Jewish leader be killed by deception. Or those that were harming

Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  (were killed). So when Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  got power over them, then on account of their evil, he permitted that they be killed. This was because they did not adopt the company of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and they did not accept Imaan. For example: Ibn Ashraf, Abu Raafi, Nadhr, Uqbah, and others.

Similarly, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  classified the blood of certain people as permissible, like Ka'b bin Zubayr, or Ibn Az Zabari and others. This was because they gave difficulty to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , until they lowered their heads and accepted Islaam.

Regarding the hypocrites, hypocrisy deals with the inside. It is hidden. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would give the ruling based on the apparent. The hypocrites mostly spoke against Islaam in a secret way. On the occasion when Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was informed of it, they would deny it and take oaths that they did not say such and such, whereas they had uttered words of disbelief.

Despite all this, Rasulullaah ε had the desire that they would come with a true heart towards Islaam and they would repent. Therefore, he was patient with all their lewd talk and oppression, just as the great Ambiyaa ı were. On account of this deed of Rasulullaah E, many of them retracted from their disbelief, and their inside became sincere just as their outside was. After this, Allaah j gave benefit to many people and they left out hypocrisy and became ministers in religion, helpers, and supporters, as the Hadith states regarding them. Some of our Imams have given this reply as well.

Some have given the reply that because the statements of the hypocrites that were conveyed to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  were not proven, that is why he did not take any steps against them.

For example: a woman or a child informed him  $\varepsilon$  of it, or one person informed Rasulullaah E, in this case no punishment can be executed because it is not correct to take the life of a person, an immature child, or a woman without testimony. It is necessary for witnesses to testify. The actions of the Jews can be weighed in this light as well. They would twist their tongues and speak unclearly. Do you not see how Hadhrat Ayesha p would be informed of this? If they spoke clearly, then not only Hadhrat Ayesha p would have known, but others would have also understood. Rasulullaah & told his companions what their ways were, how they lie, and how they are treacherous in Salaam. They twist their tongues and they do this because of their enmity of the religion. Rasulullaah & said, "When a Jew greets you and says, 'As Saamu Alaykum' (Death be upon you), then you should say, 'Wa Alaykum (it is upon you)'."

Our Baghdadi companions have said that despite having knowledge (of their treachery), Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  did not kill the hypocrites. This is not proven from the Hadith because their hypocrisy is no proof of the Shari'ah. That is why Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  left them. Also, hypocrisy is hidden and an inner deed. In apparent terms they were believers. Among them were *Dhimmis* also. A promise was made to them. Therefore, they could not be killed.

Moreover, it should also be borne in mind that these people had recently accepted Islaam. It was not clear how many of them had been purified from disbelief and how many were still tainted. It was famous among all the Arabs that they had become Muslims and apparently it was known that they were from the companions of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and the helpers of Islaam. In such a case, if Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  had to kill them for their hypocrisy, or for those things that they

occasionally did, or based on the knowledge that he had regarding their treachery of heart, then those who hate would have got the chance and they would have opened their mouths. The ignorant would have fallen into doubt, the enemy would have lied, and many people would have become worried about accepting Islaam or adopting the companionship of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .

Alternatively, they would have had bad thoughts or an oppressor would have thought that possibly, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  killed them on account of some enmity. Whatever I have explained, (is not from me) but, these are attributed to Imam Maalik  $\epsilon$ . Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "I do not wish that people will say that Muhammad kills his companions." And he  $\epsilon$  said, "These are the people whom Allaah has stopped me from killing."

However, the apparent laws like executing capital punishment, killing, etc. were all executed and everyone was equal in them. Muhammad bin Mawaaz said that if a hypocrite had to make his hypocrisy apparent, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would have definitely killed him. Qaadhi Abul Hasan Qaassaar said the same.

In the Tafseer of the verse:

'If the hypocrites, those with a disease (doubts about Islaam) in their hearts and those who spread rumours in Madinah do not desist (from hurting the Muslims and causing problems among them), We will definitely grant you (O Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ ) authority over them, after which they will hardly be able to live with you there (in Madinah).

They are accursed (cast far from Allaah's mercy). (Therefore), Wherever they go (seeking asylum), they will be seized and massacred.

This is the practice of Allaah with those who passed before. You will never find any change in Allaah's practice.

(Surah Ahzaab (The Armies), 60-62)

Qataadah said the meaning is if they had to make their hypocrisy apparent, then they would have been dealt with in this way.

The verse:

'O Nabi & Strive (And fight as circumstances allow)
against the Kuffaar and the hypocrites and be stern with
them (for their reformation)...'
(Surah Taubah (Repentance), 73)

Muhammad bin Salamah narrates from Zayd bin Aslam in Mabsoot

Regarding the person who told Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , 'The pleasure of Allaah was not considered in this distribution and you  $\epsilon$  have not executed justice,' at the time of distributing the spoils of war, some of our scholars have said that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  did not think of this as an accusation against him, but he  $\epsilon$  understood that this person was in error in his view. This happens amongst the people of the world. Subsequently, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  did not take his statement as swearing but he  $\epsilon$  viewed this as a type of difficulty which he could forgive and he could be patient upon. Therefore, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  did not punish him.

Similar can be said regarding those Jews that said to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , 'As Saamu Alaykum.' This is because there is no clear swearing in it because such a du'aa' is definite, i.e. death comes upon everyone.

Some say that their objective with the word 'As Saam' was not 'death', but 'Saam' and 'Saamah' means 'grief'. This was used as a du'aa' for the person that left his previous religion. In summary, this was not a clear swear word. Therefore, Imam Bukhari  $\alpha$  has mentioned the following chapter heading for this Hadith, 'This is the chapter regarding the Dhimmi Jew who swears Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  by way of indication.'

Some of our scholars say that this swearing was not by indication, but it was an indication of harm. Qaadhi Abul Fadhl says that we have explained that giving harm to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and swearing him is the same thing.

Qaadhi Abu Muhammad bin Nasr gives the reply to the Hadith that has passed. Then he said, "This Hadith does not state whether the Jew was a Dhimmi or a Harbi, and it is apparent that because of something possible, a command cannot be left out when something is proven from a resolute proof."

From all this, the best is that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  wanted to take the path of softening the hearts and forgiving. It was with the hope that they will possibly believe. Therefore, Imam Bukhari  $\alpha$  has written for the Hadith of distribution and the Hadith of the Khawaarij, 'the chapter dealing with abandoning killing the Khawaarij in order to incline their hearts and so that people do not hate.' The view of Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  was explained before and it has been clarified.

The Jews affected black magic upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and they poisoned him but he adopted patience whereas theses deeds were worse than swearing. However, a time came where Allaah j gave him victory and he passed the ruling of killing them. Their appointed time had come. He then expelled them from their forts. Allaah placed awe in their hearts and He decreed for some of them to be banished. Because of their breaking their promise, they were taken out from their homes and such a case was created that they had to break their own homes. The Muslims then destroyed their locality.

Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  spoke ill of them openly, calling them the brothers of the monkeys and pigs. The swords of the Muslims were decisive and they were removed. Allaah j then gave their lands, homes, and wealth to the Muslims. This was so that the word of Allaah could be supreme and the word of the disbelievers could be lowered.

At this point, if you ask about the Hadith of Hadhrat Ayesha  $\rho$  wherein it is narrated that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  never took revenge for himself, but took revenge if someone harmed the honour of Allaah. The reply to this is that it does not mean that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  did not take revenge from the one that swore him or gave difficulty to him or belied him, because in reality these actions were dishonouring to Allaah j. That is why Rasulullaah ε took revenge. However, if someone was disrespectful towards Rasulullaah E, whether by word or deed, whether it was a matter of life or wealth and the objective of the person was not to harm Rasulullaah ɛ, but he did it on his accord, for example: the Bedouins dealt with Rasulullaah ε in ways based on their ignorance, or the person did something in line with human nature, then Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  would not exact revenge but he would overlook

Further examples include these incidents:

A Bedouin caught the cloak of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  and pulled it. Due to this, a mark appeared on the neck of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ .

A Bedouin bought a horse and he then denied it while Hadhrat Khuzaymah  $\tau$  gave testimony and when Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  asked **Hadhrat Khuzaymah**  $\tau$  about what he testified to, he said, "Because you are our truthful Rasul, therefore, I verify what you said." **Rasulullaah**  $\epsilon$  made his testimony equal to the testimony of two people.

When all the spouses gathered and Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  took an oath of not using honey. Or other aspects like this where he  $\epsilon$  forgave.

Some of our scholars said that it is forbidden to cause harm to Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ , whether it is by a permissible deed, or through an impermissible deed. If another person besides Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  is hurt by a permissible deed, then there is no problem. The proof is the verse wherein it is generally stated: 'Verily those who hurt Allaah and His Rasool  $\varepsilon$ , Allaah curses them in this world and in the Aakhirah, and He has prepared a humiliating punishment for them.' (Surah Ahzaab (The Armies), 57)

Or like Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said regarding Hadhrat Faatimah  $\rho$ , "She is a part of my body. Whoever harms her, I am also harmed by it. Listen, I do not forbid that which Allaah has permitted. However, the daughter of the Rasul of Allaah and the daughter of the enemy of Allaah cannot be by one person."

In other cases, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  forgave, for example; Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  forgave the disbelievers that caused him difficulty in the hopes that they would become Muslims. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  forgave the Jew that did black magic on him and the Bedouin that intended to kill him and the Jewish woman that poisoned him. Some say that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  later ordered her to be killed (for causing the demise of a Sahabah by her poisoned the food). There were also certain types of harm that were given to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  by the people of the book and the hypocrites but Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  forgave them because the love for Islaam would have been created in them and others, as we have explained.

#### Section 3

### Insolence towards Rasulullaah ε Unintentionally

Qaadhi Abul Fadhl says that before this, there was a discussion about the person that intentionally swore, belittled, or disparaged Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ , then the rulings are clear (he is to be punished). There is nothing vague about it.

case in which Rasulullaah However. the is unintentionally belittled, verbally abused, or words disbelief are uttered regarding him  $\varepsilon$ , or (may Allaah save us) if he  $\varepsilon$  is cursed or sworn at. Alternatively, something is attributed to him  $\varepsilon$  that is not permissible, or something which is necessary regarding him  $\varepsilon$  is negated. All these things are harmful for the grandeur of Rasulullaah ɛ, e.g. to attribute a major sin to Rasulullaah E, or to say that Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  was lazy in conveying a command or executing it (May Allaah save us). To belie the lineage of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ , to deny his  $\varepsilon$  great knowledge, to overlook his  $\varepsilon$  abstinence or to belie the qualities he  $\varepsilon$  was famous for, or those that have been proven through Mutawaatir chains, or to make effort to refute the Mutawaatir narration, or to speak foolish things or evil things, or to say something regarding Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  that will necessitate swearing.

Although all these actions are not done intentionally and although the person who said them is not swearing Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  because he said it out of ignorance or carelessness. Alternatively, he said such things because he did not have the ability to explain, or because of a defect in his memory, or he said this out of boldness.

In all these cases, the ruling will be the same as was for the first type, i.e. such a person will be killed, and there will not be any hesitance in this regard. This is because it is blasphemy and in blasphemy, things like ignorance, a slip of the tongue, and other matters that we have mentioned, are not considered. A person will not be taken to be excused, as long as he has a sound nature. However, a person will be excused if he was forced, while his heart is content with Imaan. This is the fatwa of the scholars of Andalus, which had been passed regarding Ibn Haatim when he denied the abstinence of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . We have mentioned this before.

Muhammad bin Sahnun has given the fatwa of killing for those who have been imprisoned by the enemy and they swore Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . However, if it is proven that if a person was forced to swear, or he became a Christian, then the ruling of killing him will not be passed.

Abu Muhammad bin Abi Zayd narrates that the excuse of the slip of the tongue regarding insolence towards Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  will not be accepted.

Abul Hasan Qaalbasi has given the fatwa of killing for the person that swears Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  in the state of **intoxication.** This is because it will be thought regarding this person that he has done this based on the belief in his heart and he will do the same when sober.

The second reason is that killing such a person is the Shar'i punishment for such a person and the Shar'i punishment does not fall away because of intoxication, as in the case of the punishment for false accusation and other punishments. This is because he has intoxicated himself. Therefore, whoever intoxicates himself, knowing that his senses will be affected and he will do bad deeds, then the example of this person is like that of the person who does

these deeds intentionally. So we have made it binding upon him in the cases of Talaaq, or freeing, or in executing the punishment.

#### Hadith of Hadhrat Hamzah τ

At this point, it is not appropriate to draw a conclusion from the Hadith of Hadhrat Hamzah  $\tau$  that when he was intoxicated, he said, "You are not but the slave of my father." The narrator says that upon hearing this, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  understood that he was intoxicated and he  $\epsilon$  returned. This was because intoxicants were not forbidden at that time so there was no sin for drinking then. Subsequently, whatever he said was forgiven. Just as when a person says something in which no harm is caused when sleeping or after taking medication.

#### **Section 4**

### Explanation of Those who Belie Rasulullaah ε

The third type in which effort is made to belie that which Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, or that which Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  brought or they reject his Nubuwwah and Risaalat, or they adopt any form of disbelief and choose another Deen – such a person will be a disbeliever by consensus. It will be compulsory to kill such a person. Then it will be seen whether he clearly states these things or not. In this case, the ruling pertaining to him will be that of a renegade.

# The Ruling for the one who Belies is same like the Zindeeq

There is a difference of opinion regarding whether he should be made to repent or not. Moreover, if he pays attention to this, will the ruling of killing fall away or not? The strong view is that the right of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  does not fall away by repentance. However, if the person spoke such a lie through which some shortcoming is attached to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and he hid his talk, then the ruling pertaining to this person is that of a Zindeeq. According to us, the ruling of killing will not fall away from him by repentance. We shall mention this ahead.

### The Fatwa of Imam Abu Hanifah $\alpha$

Imam Abu Hanifah  $\alpha$  and his students say that he who frees himself from Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  or belies him, he is a renegade, and it will be permissible to shed his blood except if he retracts

### The Explanation of the Student of Imam Maalik $\alpha$

Imam Ibn Qaasim  $\alpha$  said that whichever Muslim says that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was not a Nabi, or he was not the Rasul of Allaah, or **the Qur'aan was not revealed upon him, but it is his speech, he will be killed.** He also said that whoever rejects the Nubuwwah of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and the presence of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , whereas he calls himself a Muslim, he is similar to a renegade. Similar will be the case of the person that belies Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  openly. Such a person will be made to repent.

The same ruling will apply to a person who says that he has become a Nabi and that revelation comes to him. This is the view of Sahnun. Ibn al Qaasim says that such a person will be a renegade, whether he calls the people to himself quietly or openly. Ibn Asbagh says that he is a renegade because he has disbelieved in the book of Allaah and he has belied Allaah j.

Regarding the Jew that **claimed Nubuwwah** and thought that he was also sent as a Rasul to the people, or regarding the person who says that after Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ , a Nabi can come, Ash hab said that if he makes this claim openly he will be made to repent and **if he repents, then good. If not, he will be killed. This is because he has belied the statement of Rasulullaah \varepsilon, "There is no Nabi after me." He is falsely accusing Allaah j in his claim of Risaalat.** 

Muhammad bin Sahnun said, "He who attributes a partner to Allaah in a single letter that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  brought, he is a disbeliever and denier." He said, "According to the entire Ummah, it will be compulsory to kill the person who belies Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ."

The student of Sahnun, Ahmad bin Abi Sulaymaan said, "Whoever said that Rasulullaah ε was black, he should be killed because Rasulullaah ε was not black."

Abu Uthmaan Haddaad has also said this. He said, "If someone says that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  passed away before his beard came out, or he says that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was in Cairo, not in Tihaamah, then also he will be killed because this is also a form of negation."

Habeeb bin Rabee says that changing the qualities and the rank of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  is disbelief, the person who makes this apparent will be a disbeliever and he will be made to repent. The person who hides it will be a Zindeeq and if he does not repent, he will be killed.

#### Section 5

# The Ruling about the one who Speaks in a Confusing Way about Rasulullaah ε

The fourth type is that a person speaks in a confusing or unclear way, or he speaks such things that can be interpreted in two ways. The being of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  could be meant and there could be doubt in specifying what the other specified meaning is. A person does not speak in an openly disliked way. In such a case, there can be differences of opinion among the Mujtahideen. This is so that whoever is destroyed, he will be destroyed in the light of proof and whoever remains alive, he will remain alive in the light of proof. There can be two viewpoints regarding such a person:

- 1. **Firstly,** there are those people who have been affected with the 'magic' of the honour of Rasulullaah ε. In every instance, they want to protect it. They say that such a person should be killed.
- 2. **Secondly,** there are those people who have the opinion that human blood must be honoured and they feel that the capital punishment will fall away on the basis of doubt. Also, this speech has another possible meaning, so they do not give the fatwa of killing.

#### The Differences of the Imaams on this Issue

Our Imams have a difference of opinion regarding a person who made his creditor angry and then tells him to recite Durud upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . The creditor becomes angry and says "May Allaah not have mercy on whoever recites Durud upon him  $\epsilon$ ."

Sahnun was asked whether he is like the person who swears Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  or swears the angels who are the ones who send Durud upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ? He replied, "No. This is because he said this in anger and he was not hiding the swearing in his heart."

Abu Ishaaq Barqi and Asbagh bin Farj said that such a person should not be killed because if he swore by this statement, then he has sworn at people, not Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . This is the same thing that Sahnun said. Note that Sahnun does not excuse the one that speaks ill of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  in a state of anger; the reason for his ruling here is that there is a possibility of sanity in the creditor's speech and nothing is proven from it which can be said that the creditor swore Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  or the angels, or anything of that sort. In fact, it is correct that the underlying reason shows that the creditor said this to people because the other person said, "Recite Durud Sharif upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ." This is in accordance to the view of Barqi and Asbagh, the students of Sahnun.

Harith bin Miskeen Qaadhi and others feel that such a person should be killed

Abul Hasan Qaalbasi has ruled that the research should be done regarding killing the person who says, "Every house owner is a cuckold, even if he be a deputed Nabi." He has given the ruling that this person should be imprisoned and harshness should be shown to him so that enquiries can be made from him regarding the meaning of his speech. He should be asked whether he means the present homeowners or not? (If he means the present time, which at that time was) the time of Qaalbasi and there was naturally no Nabi, then his view will not be so harsh. However, Qaalbasi says that if the apparent wording is with regards to all the past and future cuckolds, (then that would include) the past in which the

Ambiyaa ı were present. The Ambiyaa ı also earned. (Thus the verdict would be firm). Abul Hasan Qaalbasi said, "Without any clear proof, steps should not be taken to take the life of a Muslim. Effort should be made to interpret the statement and a decision should be passed after great thought."

Abu Muhammad bin Abi Zayd  $\tau$  was asked about the person who says, "May Allaah's curse be upon the Arabs, curse be upon the Bani Israa'eel, curse be upon the children of Aadam." Then, when he is asked, he replies that he did not refer to the Ambiyaa  $\iota$ , but he said this in reference to the oppressors. Abu Muhammad bin Abi Zayd  $\tau$  said, "Such a person should be notified and the king should inform him in an appropriate way."

He gave a similar fatwa regarding such a person who says, "May Allaah curse those who forbid intoxicants," who then says that he did not know who prohibited liquor.

Such a person who says, "May Allaah curse the one who said that the city dwellers should not sell to the village dwellers. Whoever narrates this Hadith, may the curse of Allaah be upon him."

If these people said what they said out of ignorance and because of not knowing the Hadith, then they will be excused. Despite this, they will be warned. This is because they have apparently not intended to swear Allaah and Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , but in his wrong thinking, he swore. This is the ruling of Sahnun and his students.

Similarly, the ignorant person who sometimes say, "O the progeny of a thousand swine" or "The son of a hundred dogs," if it is seen, then there are Ambiyaa  $\iota$  among this person's forefathers and this reaches until Hadhrat

Aadam  $\upsilon$ . Therefore, it is necessary that such a person is notified in a severe way and his ignorance be clarified to him. If it is known that the person intentionally included the Ambiyaa  $\iota$  in his swear words, then he will be killed.

Similarly, if a person says to a Haashimi, "May Allaah curse the Banu Hashim." And he either says that he means the oppressors, or such a person that has a family link to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , or he says something evil in which his forefathers or children are included, and the person knowingly says, "I am speaking about the children of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ," then harshness will be shown to such a person. If there is no clear reason, then Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  will be removed from his forefathers, and his statement will be interpreted without including Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .

I saw Abu Ishaaq Ibn Munaas being asked about the person who said, "May Allaah curse you, until Aadam υ." He replied that if this is proven, then he will be killed.

Qaadhi said that there is great difference of opinion among our scholars regarding the person who gave testimony against another and the accused says, "What, you accuse me?" The witness replies, "The Ambiyaa ı have been accused, what is your standing?" Shaykh Abu Ishaaq Ja'far says that such a person will be killed because these words appear very bad. Qaadhi Abu Muhammad Ibn Mansur adopts silence regarding such a person because this word has a possibility that the person said that the disbelievers used to accuse the Ambiyaa ı. The Qaadhi of Qurtuba, Abu Abdullaah bin al Haaj also gave this fatwa. Qaadhi Abu Muhammad said that such a person should be jailed for a long time and he gave the ruling of harshness. Then, an oath will be taken from him that whatever was said against him

was a lie. This is because his testimony is weak, then he will be left.

I was sitting by my teacher Qaadhi Abu Abdullaah bin Isa when he was the Qaadhi when a person was brought. His name was Muhammad. He said something shameless and he made a similitude of someone to a dog. He hit him and said, "Muhammad, stand." The person denied this accusation but a group gave testimony against him. The Qaadhi gave the ruling that he be jailed and when asked about such a person, he said that no one should stay in the company of the person whose beliefs are confused and he should be punished by lashing and then freed.

### Section 6

# The Ruling of Making a Similitude of Someone with Rasulullaah ε

The fifth reason is that if a person does not intend to insult, swear, or disparage Rasulullaah e, but rather he mentions some qualities or conditions of Rasulullaah ε as proof which are famous like proverbs. Then, it is brought as proof upon him or upon someone else, or a simile is given, or he is oppressed or some harm is conveyed or he intends to lift the status of someone by mentioning the example of Rasulullaah ɛ. It is not his objective to increase the honour of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ , or he says something to mock Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ , then such a person will also be taken to task. For example: a person says, "If ill is spoken about me, then ill is being spoken of Rasulullaah ε," or "If I am belied, then what is the matter for the Ambiyaa ı were (also) belied," or "If I sin, then what is the problem, the Ambiyaa i would also sin," or "How can I be protected from the tongues of people when the Ambiyaa ı were not protected?" or "I have adopted patience just as the Ulul Azam Ambiyaa ı adopted patience," or "I adopted patience like Hadhrat Ayyub v," or "The Nabi of Allaah adopted more patience than what I adopted," or, as Mutanabbi said: 'In this Ummah, I am a stranger to Allaah just as Hadhrat Saalih v was in the nation of Thamud.'

Similar are the words of the poets that exceeded the limit and they were negligent, like Ma'arri: 'You are Musa unto whom came the daughter of Hadhrat Shu'ayb v. However, there was no poor person among you.'

The second line of this poem is foul mouthed. This is because a Nabi of Allaah j was belittled and another person was given virtue.

Or like this poem: 'If the chain of revelation did not come to an end after Muhammad  $\varepsilon$ , then we say that Muhammad (the person being praised by the poet) is the substitute for his father (Hadhrat Muhammad  $\varepsilon$ ). The praised one is similar to Hadhrat Muhammad  $\varepsilon$ , although Hadhrat Jibreel  $\upsilon$  did not come to him with revelation.'

The first line is insolent, this is because the poet has made a non-Nabi partner in virtue with Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . In the second line, there can be two meanings: one is that the person being praised is made equal to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  (may Allaah save us) and it says that the person is only remained behind in Nubuwwah. The second meaning is that, may Allaah save us, there is no difference between getting Nubuwwah and not getting Nubuwwah, although the person praised by the poet did not get Nubuwwah. Despite this, he is a person of virtue, we seek the forgiveness of Allaah. This is worse than the first subject matter and is insolent.

There is another poem like this: 'When his flag is raised, then he moves between the two wings of Hadhrat Jibreel  $\upsilon$ .'

One of our contemporary poets has said: 'He fled from Jannah and sought protection from us, so Allaah granted patience to the heart of Ridhwaan (the doorkeeper of Jannah).'

Or the poem of Hassaan Masisi. He was from the poets of Spain. In praise of Muhammad bin Abbaas, known as Mu'tamad, and his minister Abu Bakr bin Zaydoon, he said: 'It is as though your minister Abu Bakr, is Abu Bakr

# Siddeeq, and Hassaan is Hassaan bin Thaabit and you are Muhammad.'

Or poems like these. Although we do not like to narrate poems like these, we have mentioned them here because the people praise poems like these and they do not realize the importance of this subject matter. They take this basket to be light and do not understand what a great sin it is to say these words carelessly. In reality, they do not have knowledge and they take it to be light on account of their ignorance. Whereas according to Allaah j, this is a great sin, especially the poets. Some of them openly say severe things. Ibn Haani Andalusi and Ibn Sulaymaan Ma'arri have crossed the limit of ridicule and have reached the point of clear disbelief. We have given the reply. In this section, we do not say that this speech falls under swearing Rasulullaah &, nor does it attribute any shortcoming to the angels. I do not refer to the last two stanzas of the poetry of Ma'arri, nor do I say that the speaker has intentionally ridiculed, but our objective of mentioning examples like this is to definitely say that the poets have not honoured Nubuwwah, nor have they honoured Risaalat, they have also not considered the honour that is linked to the beings of the Ambiyaa 1. Out of greed for gifts, they made a simile of the ones they praised in whatever way they wanted, whether by using the names of the Ambiyaa ı or angels. They did not think that the simile and the people of the gathering will be pleased or they will exceed the limits in praising so that their speech can be elevated. However, a simile was given of such people whose rank was raised by Allaah, He gave honour to them and He made it necessary to honour them – honour to such an extent that He even forbade speaking loudly in front of them. Therefore, this person is such that even if he is not killed, he should at least be admonished and imprisoned. Then it will be seen how much disrespect there is in his speech, whether it is by way of habit, or he is just speaking, or does he utter nonsense now and then. What is the reason behind his speech? Does he regret what he says? As the situation is, he will be punished accordingly.

Whoever speaks like this, he objects to the early day scholars, for example, Abu Nawwaas said regarding Haaroon ar Rashid, and the latter caught him for it: 'If you are the leftover of the magic of Fir'awn, then indeed Musa υ's staff in the form of Khaseeb (a speech of Haaroon ar Rashid) is in the hand.' Haaroon said to Abu Nawaas, "O son of a filthy woman, are you mocking the staff of Musa υ?" He commanded his army to leave at night and Qutaybi mentioned that besides this, Abu Nawaas should be taken to task. He should be called a disbeliever or close to disbelief when he gave a simile of Rasulullaah ε, saying: 'Both Ahmads argued in terms of being similar and both of them are similar in terms of character, just as two shoe laces are cut similar.'

The following poem of his is also criticized, 'The person who is a relative of the Rasul, how can he not fulfil your wish.'

The right of the honour of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is that something is attributed to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , but Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is not linked to something. The ruling pertaining to examples like the ruling of Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  have already been explained.

In Nawaadir, there is a narration of Ibn Maryam that one person mocked another person on account of his poverty. The mocked person replied, "You think that I am lowly on account of poverty whereas Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  had herded goats." Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  said that he mentioned

Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  in a place where he was not supposed to. He feels it appropriate that this person be punished. He also said that it is not appropriate when, in response to the anger shown to them, sinners say, "The Ambiyaa  $\iota$  before also sinned"

One person said to Hadhrat Umar bin Abdul Aziz  $\alpha$ , "Look for such a scribe for me whose father is Arab." One of his scribes said, "The father of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was a non-Muslim." Hadhrat Umar bin Abdul Aziz  $\alpha$  said, "Have you given this example?" (This is great disrespect). Saying this, he removed him from his post and said, "You should not come for my work."

Sahnoon has disliked the practise of reciting Durud upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  at the time of surprise. However, unless a person recites it with the intention of acquiring reward, then there is no problem according to him. In every case it is necessary to honour Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  because Allaah j has given this command.

Qaablisi was asked regarding a person who saw an ugly person and said, "It is as though his face is like that of Nakeer." And if someone had a bitter face, he said, "It is as though his face is like that of Maalik (The angel entrusted with keeping the Fire)." Qaalisi said, "What is the purport of the speaker?" Nakeer is from among the two angels that come to test the person in the grave regarding his faith. Therefore, if he means that by looking at this person fear comes just as fear would come when seeing Nakeer, then it is a separate matter. However, if he means the ugly features, then this is very bad because in this way, he has disliked the features of an angel and this is the same as looking down upon an angel. He should be punished, although he has not clearly sworn at an angel. He has directed the swearing to the

addressee. Such disrespectful people should be whipped and imprisoned to be taught etiquette. Similarly, regarding making a simile of Maalik, it is oppression to make a simile of the ugly features of a person with that of Maalik. However, if there is a harsh ruler and the speaker fears his harshness and he speaks ill of him, saying, "He is for Allaah, showing anger like Maalik." Then this is light; he should not be taken to task for it. However, if he is praising an oppressor, and he brings the harshness of Maalik as proof, this is severe and he should be punished. This is on condition that the objective of the speaker is to ridicule the angels. If he wants to speak ill or mock the angels, then he should be killed.

Abul Hasan said regarding such a pious youth to whom someone says, "Remain quiet because you are dumb." So the vouth said, "Was Rasulullaah ε not unlettered?" the people said that the youth is a disbeliever. And he feared and he regretted what he said. Abul Hasan said, "It is not correct to call him a disbeliever. However, it is an error to bring the fact of Rasulullaah ε being unlettered as proof of his ignorance because being unlettered was a miracle of Rasulullaah E. This youth being illiterate is a shortcoming of his. This is his foolishness that he brought the fact of Rasulullaah ε being unlettered to be proof of his ignorance. Although he repented, he attested to his sin and sought protection from Allaah, therefore he will be left because his statement has not reached the level where he should be killed. He should not be punished because when the speaker in ashamed. there benefit then is is no punishing him."

Similarly, some of the judges of Andalus, among whom is our teacher Abu Muhammad bin Mansur, was asked a ruling regarding the person who picked out a defect of another and that person replied, "You pick out my defect, I am a human, and humans have defects, even Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was not free." (May Allaah protect us) Our teacher gave the ruling that such a person should be imprisoned for a long time and he should be punished. This is because he intended to swear Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Some of the jurists of Andalus said that this person should be killed.

### **Section 7**

## **Narrating Words of Kufr**

If a person narrates the words of someone that is filled with mockery, then it will be studied in the light of the way the person says it. Based upon a difference of what it is, a ruling will be passed. There are four rulings: Waajib, Mustahab, Makruh and Haraam.

If the person witnessed the statement, said it and rejected it, and he informed people and created hatred for it, and he said it to criticize the one who said it, then it will be accepted from him and his step in this direction will be praiseworthy.

### The Compulsion of Narrating the Conversation

Similarly, if he mentions this view in his book, or he mentions the statement in a gathering in order to refute it, and his objective is to mention the speaker as blameworthy and to pass a fatwa against him, then it will be compulsory to explain it.

### A Form of Istihbaab

In a few cases and in terms of the person who says it, it will be Mustahab. For example, the one who said something disrespectful is someone that people acquire knowledge from; like a teacher, the Mufti, a narrator of Hadith, or he is appointed by the government to a post, or he passes fatwa regarding Shar'i issues, then it will be necessary to propagate this so that people can refrain from such a person. In this case, testimony should be given upon his (the deviates) statement and whoever among the rulers knows this, it will be Waajib to refute this statement and to mention his (the deviates) disbelief. Also, he (the ruler) should mention the

disrespectful things that were spoken so that these people do not harm the Muslims and he (the ruler) can fulfil the right of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .

The same ruling will apply for the person from whom such things come and he gives advice to the general public or he teaches children. This is because whoever has such a habit, his heart is filled with filth. There is constant fear that he will tell this to the people. Subsequently, it is necessary to make the filth of this person known in order to fulfil the right of the protection of the Shari'ah.

If the person is not as described, then too, in order to keep the right of the honour of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , it will be necessary to strive. It is compulsory upon every Muslim to protect the honour of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and during his life and after his death, if someone wants to harm him, then he should stand up to help Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . However, if someone stands up to do this through whom the truth can be made apparent (he is a judge or ruler) then this responsibility will fall away from the general Muslims. Although it will still be Mustahab at that time to give testimony against the perpetrator and the ruler should help in this. The scholars are unanimous regarding the person accused in the narration of Hadith, so what is the problem in making the filth of this person apparent?

Abu Muhammad bin Abi Zayd was asked about a person who witnesses someone saying insolent things regarding Allaah j. Is there scope to go to the ruler and explain? He said, "If there is hope that the ruler will implement the law of the Shari'ah, then he must go. Similarly, if he knows that the ruler will not pass the ruling of killing the accused, but will make him repent or admonish him and leave him, then too, he should give testimony in front of the judge."

Bearing these two objectives in mind, it will be correct to propagate the insolent thoughts of the speaker. However, besides this, if a person was insolent regarding Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , then it is not correct to spread it and repeat it and there is no scope for this because it is not for the honour of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Therefore, to speak ill of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , even if it is by way of narrating from someone else, will not be permissible. It will also not be permissible to repeat it without any valid Shar'i excuse.

However, the excuses mentioned in the previous pages, mentioning them under these conditions will be between Wujoob and Istihbaab. Allaah j also mentioned the false things that the disbelievers attributed to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and the other Rasuls by way of refutation in His book. He then warned about their disbelief and mentioned severe warnings for their irreligiousness. Things like this are also mentioned in the Ahadith and all the scholars are unanimous that it is not impermissible to mention the statements of the disbelievers in one's book by way of narration. Similarly, to explain these statements and to refute them, and clarify them.

Although Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal  $\alpha$  objected to Haarith bin Asad, but he (Imam Hanbal) finally left no stone unturned in refuting the Jahamiyyah – those who had the view that the Qur'aan was created. Therefore, it is permissible to narrate the objections of those who object from among the false movements.

However, besides these cases, it is severely prohibited to mention the swearing that was done upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , the incidents that disparaged him  $\epsilon$ , or the false stories of the heretics, or whatever falsehood is spoken of, or tales that are useless and made up for laughter. Similarly, all false talk is prohibited.

If a person mentions these things without any objective and he does not know how severe whatever he narrates is, and he relaxes, or it is not his habit to mention such useless things, and he does not state the evil or reliability of the one narrating, then such a person should be informed and he must be stopped from narrating it in future. In fact, if he is punished lightly, then he will be deserving of it and if his words are evil and it reaches the level of evil, then he must be punished severely.

It is narrated that once a person asked Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  regarding the person that believes in the creation of the Qur'aan. He said, "He is a disbeliever, his life must be taken." The person replied, "I narrated to you the statement of someone (else)." Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  said, "But I heard it from you." Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  said this to notify/admonish the person and he did not issue the command to take the life of the person that said this statement.

However, if the person who narrates an incident like this is accused of making it up and attributing it to someone else, or it is known that it is his habit, or he has interest in such matters, or he takes this to be light, or he continuously mentions poetry that mocks Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ , then the ruling for this person is the same as the person who swears. He will be taken to task for what he said. If he says that he did not say it, but he narrated the speech of someone else, then this will not be beneficial for him. He must be killed quickly and he must be dispatched quickly to his abode.

Abu Ubayd Qaasim bin Salaam said that the person who memorizes poetry that mocks Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is a disbeliever. A scholar has written a treatise on this subject and he said therein that the scholars are unanimous upon this ruling.

Narrating mockery of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ , writing it, reading it and to leave it without erasing it is forbidden.

May Allaah have mercy upon our pious predecessors that possessed a high level of Taqwa and they protected Deen, they left those narrations in the history books and did not narrate them. However, the narrations of this type that were not so bad, they included them so that the punishment can be shown for the one that says these things. Then they mentioned those narrations from which it is proven that Allaah j had taken those to task who had falsely attributed things to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .

Abu Ubayd Qaasim bin Salaam had searched for the poetry that mocks Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and he was so cautious that he did not like to take the name of the person that mocks, but based on his extreme taqwa and abstention, he would use some weighty term for the person so that he does not directly take the name of someone and say that he mocked. He did not want to be partner in the deed. How then can it be hoped that a person of Imaan can ever intend to harm the honour of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ?

### **Section 8**

# The Matters of Rasulullaah ε about which there is Difference of Opinion

The one who says that which can be said regarding Rasulullaah ɛ, or something about which there is a difference of opinion regarding its permissibility, or he attributes human matters to Rasulullaah ε that occur, or something that is possible to attribute to Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ , or he mentions something about which Rasulullaah & was Alternatively, for the sake of Allaah i, he ε adopted patience upon the difficulty given by the enemy, or he mentions the difficulty that Rasulullaah ε faced in the beginning part of his whatever difficulty life. or. Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  tolerated, he mentioned. He mentioned these things as part of the innocence of the Ambiyaa 1. This will be part of the six types mentioned above. This is because he does not have a defect, or any fault, nor is he being belittled. However, if this type of speech is discussed amongst students and among scholars, then definitely they will understand the objective of this discussion and they will research. This speech should not be discussed before those who cannot understand, or there is fear that they will fall into fitnah because of not understanding the discussion. This is because the pious predecessors were so cautious that they would feel it disliked to teach women Surah Yusuf because there is possibility that they will fall into fitnah.

There is no doubt that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said that he  $\epsilon$  had initially herded flocks. There is also no doubt that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said that there was no Nabi that did not herd flocks. Rasullaah  $\epsilon$  also said that Musa  $\upsilon$  did this work. If a person explains it in this way, there will not be any harm

because this was part of the habits and society of the Arabs. There is a great wisdom in this work that the Ambiyaa ı were made to do; they slowly traversed and ascended the stages of piety and they were accustomed to this so that they could rule over their nations. No difference comes about by these things because their honour was written from eternity.

# The Special Bounty of Allaah upon Rasulullaah ε

Similarly, Allaah j mentioned the orphanage and the poverty of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and then stated His bounty upon Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . He mentioned the honour of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . If a person explains the praises of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and mentions how Allaah j favoured him  $\epsilon$ , and there is no belittling of him  $\epsilon$ , but the objective is to show the perfection of Nubuwwah, then this is allowed.

Furthermore, Allaah j made Rasulullaah ε the guide of the Arabs. Allaah granted Rasulullaah ε power over great enemies, expansion to his  $\varepsilon$  rule, and control of other countries. He gave the keys of the treasures to him  $\varepsilon$ . With the help of Allaah j, Rasulullaah ε overpowered them all. Allaah j made the believers devoted to him ε, filling their love for Rasulullaah Allaah with hearts З. him ε by means of angels and He established the honour of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ . If he was the son of a king, or if Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ had an army, then it would have been possible that those of deficient knowledge would have thought that because of these things he  $\varepsilon$  gained power over them.

# The Conversation between Abu Sufyaan $\tau$ and the King of Rome

This is the reason why when Heraclius, the king of Rome, asked Abu Sufyaan about Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , he asked: "Did any king pass among his ancestors?" This was because if there had been a king among the ancestors of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , then it would be thought that the person claiming Nubuwwah wanted the rule that his ancestors had. When Abu Sufyaan replied in the negative, Heraclius was convinced that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is the real and final Nabi. Being an orphan was among his qualities and virtues. The signs of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  mentioned in the previous scriptures stated that he will be an orphan. It is mentioned in the book of Armiyah, Ibn Dhi Yazn said this to Abdul Muttalib, and Bahira the monk said this to Abu Taalib,

## Mentioning 'Ummi' as Praise

If someone mentions the word Ummi as a quality, virtue, and praise of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , as Allaah j has explained, it will be acceptable. In fact, based on this virtue, it is proven that the Qur'aan was the miracle of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  because the Qur'aan is a continuous flowing treasure that was given to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Besides this, it contains the abundant knowledge that was given to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . We have already explained the miracle of knowledge being found in Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  despite him  $\epsilon$  not having sought or wrote it. If this is not astonishing, then what is? Obviously, this is referred to as a miracle. If a person explains it like this, then there is no problem. Moreover, the objective is to acquire knowledge and recognition, writing and reading is just a means.

Whoever acquires this treasure will definitely be independent of the known means of knowledge. Being unlettered is a shortcoming because generally this is proof of the ignorance of the person. Allaah j kept the matter of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  different from that of others; that which was a means of shortcoming in others was a means of honour for him  $\varepsilon$ .

Similarly, certain things are such in which Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is alive, but it is a means of death for others. For example: opening the chest and taking out a drop of blood gave life and strength to the blessed heart of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . In this way, he  $\epsilon$  was given steadfastness and strength. However, the same thing is a means of destruction for others because if this is done to someone else, they will definitely die.

Analogy of other matters can be done upon this, for example, in the biography of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , it is mentioned that he had very little of the bounties of this world. He had simple clothes, simple food, a simple conveyance, he had natural humility, he would do his work on his own, and he would lend a hand in household work. He turned away from the world, he adopted abstinence, the big things and small things of the world were equal before him. He would think that all these things change all the time and will be destroyed. All this is part of the virtue and honour of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ 

Now if someone explains this and his objective is to mention the virtues and perfections of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , then Subhaanallaah, he should mention it. However, if he has an evil intention in mentioning this, and his objective is to belittle Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , then he will be included amongst those people that we have mentioned in the previous sections.

Some of the conditions of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and the other Ambiyaa  $\iota$  that are mentioned in the Ahadith in a way that there could be an objection to the apparent wording, or the purport is not in accordance to the grandeur of the Ambiyaa  $\iota$ , and there is a need to interpret it, then, besides the authentic Ahadith, no other Ahadith should be mentioned. Only the narrations that are proven should be mentioned.

May Allaah j have mercy upon Imam Maalik  $\alpha$ ; he disliked explaining the Ahadith that are of the type that place a person into doubt and can be a means of whispers (waswasah). He said, "What inclines people to narrate Ahadith like this?" He was told that Ibn Ajlaan narrates Ahadith like this, so he replied that Ibn Ajlaan was not from among the jurists. Adopt the way of leaving such Ahadith, as was the way of Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  and they helped him because these Ahaadith are not practised.

The reality is that Rasulullaah ε mentioned these Ahadith to the Arabs. To understand the purport of this, the reality of the speech, the Majaaz, Isti'aarah, eloquence of the speech must be known. Therefore, they would understand the speech of Rasulullaah ε easily. Then, those people came, the people who were majority foreigners. They were mostly ignorant and they did not have the ability to understand Arabic. Therefore, they had differences of opinion in interpreting these Ahadith or in stipulating a meaning for it. Some of them were such that they closed their eyes and believed in them and some rejected it. However, I feel that the Ahadith that are not authentic should not be mentioned. These Ahadith should not be mentioned even if they are regarding Allaah j and His Ambiyaa. Effort should not be made to mention its meaning. It is better that such Ahadith are left and a person does not get involved in them. It is apparent that it is better not to discuss them and take out interpretations for nothing rather than classify them as baseless and refute them.

### Section 9

# Be cautious when Mentioning the Secrat of Rasulullaah ε

#### The Author $\alpha$ Notifies the Mutakallimeen

The people who discuss the Seerah of Rasulullaah ε, or speak about him  $\varepsilon$ , or explain his  $\varepsilon$  biography, it is compulsory that when they speak about Rasulullaah E, they should consider every aspect of the honour of Rasulullaah ε. They should control their tongues and they should not speak carelessly. Moreover, it is necessary that when mentioning Rasulullaah ɛ, there should be signs of respect and etiquette for Rasulullaah E. When mentioning the difficulties that Rasulullaah & tolerated in the path of truth, it is necessary that a condition of love and affection overcomes a person and one should be angry with the enemies of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ . Such a way should be adopted that if a person acquires strength, he should sacrifice it for Rasulullaah ε and he should help Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ . When mentioning the innocence, deeds, and statements of Rasulullaah E, he should use good words and speak with complete respect. He should refrain from evil language.

When speaking about the speech of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , it can be said: 'Is it possible for the contrary to occur?' Or, if the contrary occurs, or there is a slip, then a person should never use the word 'lie'.

When speaking about the knowledge of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , then say, "It is possible that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  knew that which he was shown by Allaah  $\epsilon$  and it is possible that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  came to know of certain things only when revelation came

# to him." At this point, the word 'ignorance' should not be used because this word is had.

When speaking about the actions of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , then say, "Is it permissible for Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  to do something contrary to the commands and prohibitions? Or, can minor sins come from Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ?" It is better to say the previous sentence rather than, "Is it possible that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  disobeys Allaah or does a sin, or he does this and that and he means sin." This is because this is the demand of the honour of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .

When speaking about Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , the highest level of respect should be considered. I have seen some scholars that are not cautious and sometimes they use evil words or words that can be understood to be bad. I do not take this to be correct.

I have seen some oppressors who accuse other scholars of injuring the grandeur of Rasulullaah ε because they (these scholars) did not consider his (the Nabis) rank in the text and he (the scholar) began to criticize, whereas he (the good scholars) refutes this insolence. Then, that oppressor calls the scholar a disbeliever. Respect should always be considered. The rank of people must be considered in society. Why should the rank of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  not be considered when speaking about him? There is great emphasis for this. The text is something that it can become good or bad, something in it can show goodness, or it can show disgrace. As Rasulullaah & said, "Indeed some forms of speech are magic." However, if something is negated in speech or the purity of Rasulullaah ε is mentioned, then there is no problem, for example, to say that lies can come from Rasulullaah e, or he can commit a major sin, or he ε can oppress is not correct. Whenever we speak about

# Rasulullaah $\epsilon$ , his $\epsilon$ honour must be considered at all times.

The condition of the pious predecessors was such that, out of respect for Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , when they began to speak about him  $\epsilon$  a strange condition would come over them, as we have explained in the second part. Some of the pious predecessors were such that when they spoke about the enemies of Allaah j, those people that deny the verses of Allaah j and belie Him, and when they recited the verses which show the honour of Allaah, they would recite these verses softly in fear of being similar with the disbelievers.

## Chapter 2

#### Section 1

# The Punishment for the ones who speak ill of, swears, disparages, and harms Rasulullaah $\epsilon$

Before this, we mentioned the proofs and stated the consensus of the scholars regarding the person who speaks ill of, and causes harm to, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Imam Maalik  $\alpha$ , his students, and most of the scholars are of the view that as punishment, such a person should be killed. This killing will not be because of disbelief, because whether this person shows repentance or not, according to them, the repentance of such a person is not accepted, nor is there any benefit in turning back from his statement. The ruling of such a person is like that of a Zindeeq and like that of a person that hides disbelief in his heart. The punishment must be executed upon this person whether he is caught and he repents after testimony or whether he repents on his own. This is because the punishment does not fall away by repentance.

### The Reason for Killing such a person

Shaykh Abul Hasan Qaalbisi says that if a person swears Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and then repents and even the effects of repentance are shown, then too he should be killed because of swearing. This is because it is the Shar'i punishment. Abu Muhammad bin Abi Zayd has the same view. However, he says that the repentance of the person will prove beneficial for his matter between himself and Allaah j. Ibn Sahnoon says that whichever monotheist swears Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , then repents, then the ruling of killing will fall away by repentance.

## The Ruling regarding the Zindeeq

There is difference of opinion when the Zindeeq repents. Qaadhi Abul Hasan bin Qassaar has two views regarding this. He says that some of our teachers say 'If he attests (to his sin), he should be killed because if he wanted, he could have covered up his Zandaqah.' However, when he attested, we understand that he feared to make his deviation apparent and he went towards attesting. Some teachers are of the view of accepting his repentance because being present and attesting is proof that he corrected the deviation within himself. In this way, we are informed of his inside. This is contrary to the person upon whom a crime is proven through witnesses. Qaadhi Abul Fadhl says that this is the view of Asbagh.

Swearing Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and speaking ill of him is a severe matter. No difference of opinion can be fathomed because this is the right of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and, on account of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , it is the right of the Ummah as well. Rights do not fall away by repentance, as is the case with other rights.

After the Zindeeq is caught, if he repents, then Imam Maalik  $\alpha$ , Layth  $\alpha$ , Ishaaq  $\alpha$  and Imam Ahmad  $\alpha$  state that his repentance will not be accepted. According to Imam Shafi'i  $\alpha$ , his repentance will be accepted. Imam Abu Hanifah  $\alpha$  and Imam Abu Yusuf  $\alpha$  have a difference of opinion regarding this issue. Ibn ul Mundhir narrates from Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$  that he will be made to repent. Ibn Sahnoon says that if a Muslim swears Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and then repents, then the ruling of killing will not fall away. This is because it is not Irtidaad (turning away), but he spoke such a thing for which the punishment is only to be killed. There is no forgiveness for anyone, as is the case with the Zindeeq

because he (the Muslim) did not move from one apparent condition to another apparent condition.

Qaadhi Abu Muhammad bin Nasr gives the proof of his acceptance that the difference between this person (the person who swears Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ ) and the person that swears Allaah j - whose repentance is accepted according to the famous view – is that Rasulullaah ε is a human being. A human being is such that he can be harmed, except that the Nabi has been granted virtue by means of Nubuwwah and Risaalat. However, Allaah j is higher than every type of harm, and He is not like a human being that He can be harmed. It must remain clear that swearing Rasulullaah ε is not like the Irtidaad of a person in which repentance is accepted. This is because Irtidaad is such a sin that is related to the person himself. The right of another person is not linked. Therefore, his repentance is accepted. The person who swears Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  has done such a sin that entails the right of someone else and he has become like that apostate who kills someone in the state of apostasy, or like the apostate that accuses a chaste person of adultery. Now, if such an apostate repents, will qisaas fall away? Or will the punishment of accusation fall away? The ruling is that if an apostate repents, then the punishment for stealing and adultery does not fall away. The one who swears Rasulullaah ε is not killed because of disbelief, he is killed because he harmed the honour of Rasulullaah s. Therefore, it is necessary to remove this harm and repentance will not cause the punishment to fall away.

Qaadhi Abul Fadhl is of the view (and Allaah knows best) that swearing Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is not simply disbelief, but the objective of the one who swears or disparages Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is to injure Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . Once the perpetrator

shows regret for his sin and repent, his disbelief will fall away. Furthermore, in the light of apparent circumstances, we shall not call him a disbeliever. Allaah knows best his inner condition, but we have executed the ruling of swearing upon him.

The view of Abu Imraan Qaalbisi is that whichever person swears Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  has turned renegade and he should be killed. He should not be made to repent because swearing a person is from his freedoms. This does not fall away from an apostate. The summary is that the basis of the view of our Mashayikh is that the person who swears Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  will be killed out of punishment, not because of disbelief. This requires elaboration.

In the light of what Walid bin Muslim narrated from Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  and other scholars is that swearing Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  is *Irtidaad* (apostasy). Therefore, he should be made to repent. If he repents, then he will be punished and if he refuses to repent, then he should be killed. According to this view, the ruling for him is the same as the *Murtad* but the first view we mentioned is more famous.

Now we shall discuss this ruling in detail. Those that do not take this command as *Irtidaad* say that it is compulsory to kill the person as a punishment of the Shari'ah. We explain two forms of this:

- 1. Either they refute this command, against which people give testimony,
- 2. Or they retract from their view and show that they repent.

For the second form, we shall kill the person under the punishment of the Shariah because he has uttered words of disbelief regarding Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and he committed the crime

of belittling Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  when Allaah j commanded us to honour him  $\epsilon$ . We have given the ruling of the inheritance of this person as the same as that of a Zindeeq when his Zandaqah becomes apparent and he refutes or repents.

At this point, if the following objection arises: how can you establish disbelief whereas testimony of disbelief was given already? When testimony of disbelief was given, why were the laws of *Irtidaad* and disbelief not given? i.e. he should have been made to repent.

We say in reply: Although in killing we give the ruling of being a disbeliever, this ruling cannot be explicitly applied. This is because this person attests to Nubuwwah and Tauheed. Also, whatever testimony the witnesses gave against him of a crime, it is his (the doer) rejection or his thought that an error came from him and a sin occurred. He regretted this. There is no problem with this that some of the laws of disbelief are applied to certain people although all the characteristics of disbelief are not proven, like killing the person who abandons Salaah (disbelief has been established upon him. Despite this, many characteristics of Islaam are found in him).

However, if we come to know regarding a person that he believes it permissible to swear Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , then there will be no doubt in his disbelief. There are also a number of forms of swearing, for example, belying Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  (may Allaah save us), or saying things that have no hidden motive. If such a person repents, then too we shall kill him because we shall not accept his repentance and after his repentance we shall kill him because it is the Shar'i punishment. This is because he said something for which the punishment is nothing but killing. After this, his matter is with Allaah –

Who knows the true meaning of his repentance, Who alone knows the condition of the hearts.

The same ruling will apply for the person who apparently does not repent, and this person also attests to the testimony given against him for uttering words of disbelief. Therefore, according to his own view, he is a disbeliever. Moreover, he is responsible for speaking ill about the honour of Allaah j. He thus becomes a disbeliever without any difference of opinion and he will be killed for it. According to this detail, the texts of the jurists will be understood and proof will be brought against the person. Based on this, his inheritance will be dealt with according to the differences of the narrators. If we keep this principle in mind, then the purport of the scholars will become clear. Insha Allaah.

### **Section 2**

## Repentance for a Murtad

## Accepting the Repentance and Killing

The time that we spoke about where (and when) the person should be made to repent, the same difference of opinion exists about the repentance of the Murtad. The scholars of before had a difference of opinion whether it is compulsory, the time period, and the method. Most of the scholars are of the view that the Murtad should be made to repent. Ibn Oassaar said that the method of Hadhrat Umar τ regarding making the person repent is clear because the consensus of the Sahabah w was reached upon it. Hadhrat selected repentance and none Sahabah w refuted this. This is also the view of Hadhrat Uthmaan τ, Hadhrat Ali τ, Hadhrat Ibn Mas'ood τ, Ataa bin Rabaah, Thauri, Maalik and his students, Auza'i, Shafi'i, Ahmad, Ishaaq, Taa'oos and Ubayd bin Umayr.

One narration of Hadhrat Hasan Basri  $\alpha$  states that the repentance of a Murtad should not be taken. This is the view of Abdul Aziz bin Abi Salamah.

Sahnoon  $\alpha$  has refuted this view in the light of a view narrated from Hadhrat Mu'aadh  $\tau$ .

Tahawi  $\alpha$  has narrated from Imam Abu Yusuf  $\alpha$ , and this is the view of the Ahl Zaahir, that the repentance of a Murtad can be beneficial for the person but the ruling of killing will not be dropped because of the repentance. This is because Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "He who changes his religion, kill him."

The view narrated from Ataa is that if a Murtad was born Muslim, then his repentance will not be taken, but he will be killed. If he was a disbeliever before, then accepted Islaam, then became Murtad, then his repentance will be accepted, and majority of the scholars are of the view that a man and woman Murtad are the same in this ruling.

However, there is a narration from Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$  that a Murtad woman will not be killed, but she should be made into a slave. This is the view of Ataa and Qataada.

The view of Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$  is that if the woman becomes Murtad, she should not be killed. Imam Abu Hanifah  $\alpha$  says the same.

Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  says that in this matter, a free person, slave, man, and woman are all equal.

#### Time Given to Murtad

The question regarding giving the Murtad time remains to be discussed. The view of Hadhrat Umar bin Khattaab  $\tau$  and majority of the scholars is that this person should be kept imprisoned for three days. This is one view from Imam Shafi'i  $\alpha$ . This is the view of Ahmad and Ishaaq. Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  also liked this view. He says that a person should wait. Shaykh Abu Muhammad bin Abi Yazid says that by delaying or waiting, Imam Maaik  $\alpha$  means that we should wait for three days. Regarding a Murtad, Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  says that he practises upon the view of Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$ , which is that the person should be imprisoned for three days and repentance should be presented to him every day. If he repents, then well and good, otherwise he should be killed. Abul Hasan Qassaar says that there are two narrations from Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  regarding waiting. Is it

compulsory or is it Mustahab? According to the Ashaab ur Ray', the person should be given a delay of three days and this grace is said to be preferred.

It is narrated that Hadhrat Abu Bakr  $\tau$  once requested a Murtad to repent. The Murtad did not repent so Hadhrat Abu Bakr  $\Pi$  killed him

Imam Shafi'i  $\alpha$  says that a request to repent should be presented to the Murtad, if he does not repent, he should be killed. Muzani said that this view of Imam Shafi'i  $\alpha$  is correct.

Zuhri says that a Murtad should be given the call to Islaam thrice. If he still refuses, he should be killed. Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$  narrates that for a period of two months he should be requested to repent. Nakha'i says that he should always be requested to repent, as long as there is hope. Ibn Qassaar narrated from Imam Abu Hanifah  $\alpha$  that a Murtad should be requested three days to repent, or for three Jumu'ahs, i.e. every Jumu'ah he should be requested to repent. In the book of Imam Muhammad  $\alpha$ , it is narrated from Abul Qaasim that a Murtad should be called thrice to Islaam. If he refuses, he should be killed.

There is difference of opinion whether he should be warned during these days of repentance or whether harshness should be shown to him in order to repent.

Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  says that he does not understand it to be good that the person is kept hungry and thirsty in order to make him repent. He says that the person should be given food that is not harmful. Some scholars say that during the days of seeking repentance from him, he should be threatened that his life will be taken. Also, Islaam should be

presented to him and Abul Hasan Taashi's book says that during this time, advice should be given to him. Jannah should be mentioned to him and he should be warned about Jahannam.

# How Should the Ruler Deal with the person in this Time?

Asbagh says, 'In whichever prison he is kept, he should be tied well'. It does not matter whether he is alone or he is with other prisoners. If there is fear that his wealth will be destroyed, then his expenses should be suspended and he should be fed from that wealth. After he is made to repent and after his Irtidaad, return visits should be done to him. This is the view of Imam Shafi'i  $\alpha$  and Imam Ahmad  $\alpha$ . Ibn al Qaasim has the same view. Ishaaq says that the fourth time, the Murtad should be killed and the Ashaab ur Ray' say that if the Murtad does not repent the fourth time, then he should be killed without asking him to repent. Even if he does repent, then he should be beaten severely and he should not be released as long as the helplessness of Taubah does not appear on him. Ibn Mundhir says, 'We do not know anyone who punished a Murtad on the first occasion when he became a Murtad.' This is the view of Imam Shafi'i α and Imam Abu Hanifah α.

### Section 3

## The Ruling of Shahaadat or non-Shahaadat

In the section before this, we discussed the person who became a Murtad and then repented, and it was verified through witnesses that were just. In this section we shall discuss the person whom:

- 1. One person gave testimony that he became a Murtad,
- 2. Or unworthy people gave testimony,
- 3. Or he repented from his statements that are mixed with Irtidaad.

According to those who say that the repentance of the Murtad is accepted, they say that the killing of this person should be suspended and the Ijtihaad of the ruler should be put to use. This will be based on how famous he (the repenting Murtad) is. The weight of the testimony (and accusation) against the repenting Murtad will be weighed, i.e. is it strong or weak? Did he speak things that are mixed with Irtidaad in abundance? How is his apparent condition? Is he blameworthy or not? It should not be that he is a fool or he was joking.

Now, whoever's matter was severe, the ruler will punish him severely; for example, he should be imprisoned where the prisoners are chained and he should be punished according to what he can bear. He should not be stopped from standing (attending to a) for need. Similarly, he should not be stopped from performing Salaah. This is the ruling for every criminal for whom the decision of killing has been passed.

However, the killing of this person will be put on hold and his matter will be delayed because there is a difficulty regarding it. The conditions of punishment differ. Walid narrated from Imam Maalik α and Auza'i that this is Irtidaad, therefore the person should repent and he should be punished as well. Utaybah, according to the narration of Ash hab that he narrated from Imam Maalik α, says that if a Murtad repents from his Irtidaad he should not be punished. Sahnoon said this. Regarding the person that swore Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  and there were witnesses to it and one of these witnesses was just, Abu Abdullaah bin Itaab gave the fatwa that he should be given a severe beating and he should be imprisoned for a long time until the effects of repentance are shown on him. Qaalbisi also said the same. Furthermore, he said that if a person has to be killed, and then some barrier comes in the way that creates a doubt, then he should be imprisoned and so many chains should be placed on him that he can get up. Similarly, about the person whose killing is difficult, they gave the opinion that he should be placed in chains and he should be punished until his condition is known, i.e. what is compulsory on him (killing punishment). In other rulings they also said that besides clear *Irtidaad*, there is no other ruling but killing. However, for the fools, the punishment of whipping and jailing should be given. In some conditions, such people (fools) should be given severe punishment.

They said that if two witnesses give testimony against a person, and besides these two there are no others and the criminal proves that they have enmity for him, or he does such a crime that renders the testimony void, the condition is that besides these two witnesses, nothing objectionable was heard. The matter of such a person will be light because the ruling of *Irtidaad* will fall away and he will be like the person against whom no testimony was given. However, if

the condition is such that the witnesses are famous and they can also give testimony, but based on enmity for the accuser, the testimony will not be taken. In such a case, although the ruling of *Irtidaad* will not be passed, we will not say that the testimonies of the witnesses are defective. At this point the ruler has permission to stipulate a punishment for the criminal, and Allaah shows the straight path.

### **Section 4**

### The Punishment for the Insolence of the Dhimmi

In the section before this, the rulings pertaining to Muslims were explained. In this section, the rulings pertaining to a *Dhimmi* will be discussed.

If a *Dhimmi* belittles Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , either clearly, or by way of indication, or he dishonours Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , or he ascribes aspects of kufr to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , then, according to us, there is no difference of opinion about killing him. This is because this insolence towards Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is a violation of the allegiance pledged to the Muslims. This is the view of the majority of the scholars. However, Imam Abu Hanifah  $\alpha$ , Sufyaan Thauri  $\alpha$ , and those who follow them say that he should not be killed because he is a polytheist from before and this is a great sin on its own. They feel that he should be punished instead.

Some of our teachers give the following verse as proof of the killing:

'If they break their promises after entering into a treaty and condemn your Deen, then fight the leaders of kufr. Indeed they are such that they have no (regard for the) promises (they make) so that (because of this disregard for promises) they (would not) refrain (from betraying others).'

(Surah Taubah (Repentance), 12)

Included in their proof is the incident where Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  gave the command for the killing of Ibn Ashraf.

At this point, there is something else worth considering: If a Dhimmi steals, then the punishment of cutting his hand will not fall away because of him being a Dhimmi. The same applies to Qisaas after killing; it does not fall away and it does not matter if this killing is not permissible in his religion or not. In the same way, if he is insolent regarding Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ , then he should be killed.

Some of the Zawaahir scholars say that in this case where the Dhimmi explains the causes due to which he did not accept Islaam, there is a difference of opinion narrated. After studying the texts of Ibn Qaasim and Ibn Sahnoon you will be aware of the difference of opinion. Abul Mus'ab mentioned this difference of opinion to his companions in Madinah, when a person was insolent to Rasulullaah ε in the condition of disbelief and then accepted Islaam. Some say that after accepting Islaam, he should not be killed because Islaam wipes out all disbelief before it. However, if a Muslim is insolent and then he repents, then the ruling of killing will not fall away by repentance. This is because we know with conviction regarding the disbelievers that they have hatred for Rasulullaah ε and they have these baseless views regarding Rasulullaah ε at heart. We have forbidden that these views are made apparent. By making these views apparent, the disbeliever has gone against the ruling and has broken his promise. Later, when he turned from his religion and entered the fold of Islaam, then all that happened before will automatically fall away. Allaah j says:

'Tell the Kuffaar that if they desist (stop practising kufr, arrogance and accept Islaam), they will be forgiven for the past (sins they had committed)...'

(Surah Anfaal (The Spoils of War), 38)

This is contrary to the ruling of a Muslim; based upon his internal condition of Imaan, a decision will be passed according to his apparent condition. Therefore, if the contrary happens, then no consideration will be given to his retraction. In such a case, we shall not rely upon his inner condition because his inner condition has been made apparent. Moreover, the rulings that applied to him remain and nothing that will wipe it out will be accepted.

Some say that if a Dhimmi speaks ill regarding Rasulullaah ε and then accepts Islaam, then this Islaam does not cause the ruling of killing to fall away. This is because the right of Rasulullaah ε is compulsory upon him because he attacked the honour of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  and he intended to fault Rasulullaah ɛ. Therefore, although he turned to Islaam, his Islaam does not cause the ruling of killing to fall away. This ruling should be seen in this light: if he killed a person while a disbeliever or he accused a chaste person of adultery, then will this killing or accusation be forgiven by accepting Islaam? No, this will not happen because the right of a Muslim is upon him. This does not fall away by accepting Islaam. How can the right of Rasulullaah ε be forgiven? Moreover, regarding the rights of Rasulullaah ε, when our repentance is not accepted, then how can the repentance of a disbeliever be accepted?

Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  said in the book of Ibn Habib and Ibn Qaasim and Ibn al Maajishoon, Ibn Abdul Hakam and Asbagh said that whoever is disrespectful to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  or any Nabi should be killed, whether he is a Muslim or a Dhimmi.

Ibn al Qaasim said that if a Christian says, 'Our religion is better than your religion, your religion is the religion of donkeys,' or he says similar foolish things, or when the Muezzin says, 'I testify that Muhammad is the Rasul of Allaah', he says 'Allaah has given you such a Rasul?' then he will be given a severe punishment and he should be imprisoned for a long time.

However, if he clearly swears Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , then he should be killed, except if he accepts Islaam. Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  said this more than once and he did not say that the person should be made to repent. Ibn al Qaasim said, 'According to me, the meaning of the statement of Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  is that if he accepts Islaam out of his own happiness.'

Sulaymaan bin Saalim asked Ibn Sahnoon about a Jew who said to the Muezzin, 'You are lying,' when the Muezzin said the testimony of faith during the Azaan. Ibn Sahnoon replied, "He should be imprisoned for a long time and he should be given a severe punishment.'

In Nawaadir, it is narrated from Sahnoon that the Jews and Christians that swear the Ambiyaa  $(\iota)$ , and this swearing is based on their disbelief, should be killed, except if they accept Islaam.

Muhammad bin Sahnoon said, "If the question 'Why did you kill the Jew that swore Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , this is his religion?' is posed, we shall give the reply that the promise (of protection) that we made with the person does not mean that he can go around swearing Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and we sit silently, or he kills us or robs us and we sit quietly, because of the promise. This does not happen. If he kills, then we shall kill him and if he steals our wealth, then we shall take our wealth from him. This will be the case even if he says that killing and looting is permissible in his religion. So if

someone is disrespectful towards our master, even if he does so according to his belief, then how can we tolerate it?"

Sahnoon also said, "If a disbeliever (Harbi) gives jizya on the condition that they shall speak ill of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , then will it be permissible for us to take this jizya? Never. Similarly, whoever swears Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , it is as though he has broken his promise. In this case, it will be permissible to kill him." Another point should be borne in mind; just as it is not acceptable that a person accepts Islaam and then swears Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , in the same way, he will not be given permission to do this after giving Jizya.

Qaadhi Abul Fadhl said that whatever Ibn Sahnoon said from his side and the side of his father is contrary to the view of Ibn al Qaasim. This is because in accordance to the view of Ibn Sahnoon, there is a decrease in the punishment of the Dhimmi because of him being a disbeliever. This is contrary to that which is narrated from the people of Madinah.

Abu Mus'ab Zuhri said, "A Christian was brought to me. He said, 'By the deity that gave virtue to Hadhrat Isa  $\upsilon$  over Muhammad  $\epsilon$ .' The scholars had a difference of opinion regarding giving punishment to this person. However, I got up and hit him so much that he remained alive for a day and night and passed away. I then commanded a person to drag him and throw him in the rubbish dump. The person did this and then the dogs came and ate his body."

Abu Mus'ab was asked about a Christian who said that Hadhrat Isa  $\upsilon$  created Muhammad  $\epsilon$ . He replied that he should be killed.

It is narrated from Ibn al Qaasim that Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  was asked, "Testimony is given that a Christian of Egypt

said, 'Muhammad, the poor one, informs you that he will be in paradise. What is his condition? He cannot give you any benefit, because (may Allaah save us), dogs eat his shins.' If people kill him, then they will be given comfort." Hearing this, Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  said, "He should be killed." Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  also said, "I felt like keeping quiet but I could not keep quiet."

In Mabsoot, Ibn Kinanah said: "Whoever is a Jew or Christian and he swears Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , I give counsel that he should be burnt in the fire. If you want, you can kill him first, then burn his body, or if you want, you can burn him alive, when he said insolent things regarding Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ."

People wrote from Egypt to Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  enquiring his opinion about this ruling, so he told Imam Muhammad  $\alpha$  to write the reply. He said, "Write that he should be killed and his head should be chopped off." Imam Muhammad  $\alpha$  explains that he wrote this and said, "O Abu Muhammad Abdullaah, write that his body should then be burnt." Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  said, "Definitely he is worthy of this." Subsequently, he wrote this and Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  did not object to it and the letter was completed. According to this, the Christian was killed and his body was burnt.

Abdullaah bin Yahya, Ibn Lubaabah and many other scholars of Spain gave the ruling that the woman who denied Allaah j being the Rabb, denied the Nubuwwah of Hadhrat Isa  $\upsilon$ , and denied the Nabuwwaah of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , should be killed. However, if she accepts Islaam, then she will not be killed.

Most of the latter day scholars, amongst whom is Qaalbisi, Ibn al Kaatib, and Abul Qaasim bin al Jalaab have said, "He who swears Allaah and His Rasul, whether a Muslim or a disbeliever, should be killed, and his repentance will not be accepted."

Qaadhi Abu Muhammad  $\alpha$  has two narrations regarding the Dhimmi that swore Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  but then accepted Islaam: One is that the killing will fall away because of accepting Islaam. The second is that Ibn Sahnoon said that false accusation and rights of humans similar to these do not fall away by accepting Islaam. The limits of Allaah can fall away by Islaam. Comeuppance for false accusations is the right of the servants. Punishment becomes compulsory upon the perpetrator of a false accusation against someone, so how can it fall away in the case of a person accusing Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , just because the accuser accepts Islaam?

What is important is whether the punishment executed on the one who accuses Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  should be the same as the punishment executed on the one who accuses average people, or should it be more than this? Because the honour of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  is the highest, therefore the punishment will be killing. Alternatively, will the ruling of killing fall away by accepting Islaam and will he be lashed eighty times? We must ponder over this.

### Section 5

# The Inheritance, Ghusl, and Janaazah Salaah of the person who is killed for swearing Rasulullaah &

There is a difference of opinion among the scholars regarding the inheritance of the person that is killed for being insolent to Rasulullaah a:

Sahnoon is of the view that the inheritance will be given to the Muslims because it is disbelief to speak ill of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and this disbelief is similar to the disbelief of a Zindeeq.

Asbagh said that his Muslim heirs would get inheritance on condition that he hid this belief. If he was openly insolent to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , then his inheritance will be distributed amongst the Muslims. Anyway, he will be killed and he will be asked to repent.

Abul Hasan Qaalbisi said that if he refutes testimony that was given regarding his Irtidaad, then the ruling of his inheritance will be based on his apparent testimony, i.e. it will be given to his heirs. The one who is killed because of a punishment, the Shari'ah does not cause any problem with the inheritance.

Similarly, if he attests to swearing Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ , and then he repents, then although he was killed because of a Shar'i punishment, because the killing was the punishment, the inheritance and all other laws will be in accordance to Islaamic law.

If he attests to swearing Nabi ε and he is proud about it and he refuses to repent, then he is killed, then he will be counted as a disbeliever. His wealth will go to the Bayt ul Maal. He will be bathed, his Janaazah Salaah will not be performed, he will not be shrouded, nor will his private parts be covered. He will be thrown into the sand and buried, as is done with the disbelievers. Shaykh Abul Hasan's view deals with the person that openly shows disbelief and he is persistent upon disbelief, this is clear regarding such a person and there is no difference of opinion. This is because the disbeliever is a renegade, he did not repent, nor did he retract his statement. Asbagh said the same. Ibn Sahnoon related the same ruling regarding the Zindeeq in his book, the ruling that relates to the person that is persistent upon disbelief. Ibn al Oaasim and the students of Imam Maalik  $\alpha$ have written the same regarding the person that announces his disbelief.

Ibn al Qaasim said that the ruling pertaining to him is that of the renegade, that Muslims will not get his inheritance, nor will those people get that left their religion for Islaam, his bequest will not be fulfilled. If he frees his slaves, they will not be freed. This is the view of Asbagh when the person is killed because of Irtidaad, or he dies a natural death in the condition of Irtidaad.

Abu Muhammad bin Abi Zayd said that there is a difference of opinion about the inheritance of this person who has apparently repented but his repentance will not be accepted and he will be killed. However, the Zindeeq that is persistent on his disbelief and is killed, there is no difference of opinion regarding his inheritance; no one will get his inheritance, but it will be gathered in the Bayt ul Maal.

Abu Muhammad said that he who swears Allaah j and then dies a natural death, witnesses will testify about him but there was no research done regarding the witnesses, then his Janaazah Salaah will be performed.

In the book Ibn Habib, Asbagh narrates from Ibn al Qaasim that whoever belies Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , or openly leaves Islaam and chooses another religion, his inheritance will be given to the Muslims. He narrated the view of Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  regarding this that the inheritance of a renegade will be given to the Muslims (it will be collected in the Bayt ul Maal) it will not be given to his heirs. This is also the view of Rabi'ah, Shafi'i, Abu Thaur, and Ibn Abi Layla. There is a difference of opinion from one narration of Imam Ahmad  $\alpha$ .

Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$ , Ibn Mas'ood  $\tau$ , Ibn al Musayyib  $\alpha$ , Hasan Basri  $\alpha$ , Sha'bi  $\alpha$ , Umar bin Abdul Aziz  $\alpha$ , Hakam, Auza'i, Ishaaq and Abu Hanifah  $\alpha$  are of the view that his Muslim heirs will inherit from him.

One view is that this ruling is regarding that wealth which he earned before Irtidaad. The wealth that he earned during Irtidaad will not go to the heirs, but it will be gathered in the Bayt ul Maal of the Muslims. The detail of this ruling from Abul Hasan is correct. This is in accordance to the view of Asbagh, but contrary to the view of Sahnoon. The difference of both of them is in accordance to both views of Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  that deal with the inheritance of a Zindeeq. Sometimes Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  classifies the Muslim heirs of this Zindeeq as heirs, even if they gave testimony against him, whether he attested or rejected and even if he repented. This view was accepted by Asbagh, Muhammad bin Maslamah and many of his students. He was looking at whether he made Islaam apparent and rejected the swearing,

or he repented, therefore his ruling is similar to the hypocrites who were in the time of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .

Ibn Raafi narrated from Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  that the inheritance of this Zindeeq will be given to the Muslims because his wealth follows his blood. A group of students of the Imam accepted this view. Ash hab, Abdul Malik, Muhammad Sahnoon have accepted this view as stated by Ibn al Qaasim in Utaybah.

He also said that if the person repents upon accepting the testimony given against him, and because his repentance is not accepted, he is killed, his heirs will not get his inheritance. If he attests, until he dies a natural death, then his wealth will be distributed amongst his heirs. Ibn al Qaasim says that this ruling will apply to every such person that hides his disbelief and, in this case, his wealth will be distributed according to the laws of inheritance in Islaam.

Abul Qaasim was asked whether the inheritance of a Christian who was killed because he swore Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  will go to the people of his religion or to the Muslims. He replied, "The inheritance will go to the Muslims and this is not as inheritance because inheritance is not distributed amongst people of another religion. This wealth will be given as booty because the Christian has broken his promise." This is the summary of the view of Ibn Qaasim.

## Chapter 3

# Explanation regarding the person who speaks ill of Allaah j, the Angels, the Ambiyaa' (1), or the Family, Spouses, or Sahabah $\psi$ of Rasulullaah $\epsilon$

There is no difference of opinion narrated from the Muslims regarding the Muslim that swears Allaah j; he becomes a disbeliever and his blood becomes permissible. However, there is a difference of opinion regarding whether he should be made to repent or not.

Ibn al Qaasim said in Mabsoot and in the book of Ibn Sahnoon and Muhammad and in the book of Ishaaq bin Yahya, it is narrated from Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  that whichever Muslim swears Allaah, he should be killed and he should not be made to repent. However, if he accuses Allaah j, he turns away from Islaam and accepts another religion, then he will be made to repent and if he hides his disbelief, then he will not be made to repent. In Mabsoot, Mutarrif and Abdul Malik say the same.

Makhzumi, Muhammad bin Maslamah and Ibn Abi Haazim said that if the Muslims swear Allaah, then they will be requested to repent. They will not be killed without first requesting them to repent.

Similarly, if the Jews and Christians swear, then they will be made to repent. If they repent, their repentance will be accepted, otherwise they will be killed. It is necessary to make them repent because this is like Irtidaad. Qaadhi Ibn Nasr attributed this to Imam Maalik  $\alpha$ .

Abu Muhammad bin Zayd was asked for a fatwa regarding a person who cursed and together with this (May Allaah save us), he cursed Allaah. He said that his intention was to curse Shaytaan but his tongue slipped. Abu Muhammad  $\alpha$  replied that based on his apparent words, he will be killed and his excuse will not be heard. However, he is excused regarding the matter between him and Allaah j.

The jurists of Cordova had a difference of opinion regarding Harun bin Habib. He was the brother of the jurist Abdul Malik. He had very bad character, a straitened heart, and no patience. There were many testimonies like this given against him. One of them was that on one occasion, after recovering from an illness, he said, "Even if I had killed Hadhrat Abu Bakr τ and Hadhrat Umar τ, then too I would not have been worthy of receiving so much difficulty in this illness." Ibraaheem bin Husayn bin Khaalid gave the ruling that he should be killed because in this talk, he attributed oppression to Allaah j, whereas indication in a matter is like clear speech. His brother, Abdul Malik bin Habib, Ibraaheem bin Husayn bin Aasim and Qaadhi Sa'eed bin Sulayman gave the fatwa that he should be forgiven from killing. Despite this, the Qaadhi felt it appropriate that he should be imprisoned and punished because there is a possibility (of sin) in this speech and it could be interpreted to be a complaint.

Those people who say that the person who swears Allaah should be requested to repent, they say that such a deed is disbelief and Irtidaad. There is no right of a human in it. Therefore, this deed is similar to the one where someone swears Allaah j unintentionally. From this it is not proven that the person is against Islaam and he wants to accept another religion.

Those who say that he will not be made to repent, but he will be killed, say that it applies to a Zindeeq because his repentance will not be accepted. Then, when he turns away from the religion of Islaam and he swears out of Irtidaad, then it is as though he denied that he has abandoned Islaam. Therefore, the punishment for him can be nothing but killing.

However, if a person adheres to the laws of Islaam and he utters some words of disbelief, then the ruling pertaining to him is that of a **Murtad. According to most of the scholars, he will be made to repent.** This is the view of Imam Maalik  $\alpha$ , as we have explained and we mentioned the difference of opinion as well.

### Section 1

# Attributing such things to Allaah j that is against His Grandeur

The person who attributes such qualities to Allaah that are not in accordance to His grandeur, but he does not do this in a way of swearing, from which Irtidaad can be proven, nor is it apparent that he intends disbelief, but it is out of interpretation, he does this out of Ijtihaad or error, and it is clear that he did not do this out of the desire of the nafs, for example, he makes a simile of Allaah to something, or he says that Allaah has a limb or he negates the perfection of a quality of Allaah, etc. Regarding the *Takfeer* of such a person who has such beliefs, there is a difference of opinion between the early day and latter day scholars. This difference of opinion existed between Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  and his students as well.

If a person with this belief makes his own separate group, then everyone agrees that he should be killed. There is also consensus that he will be made to repent. If he refuses to repent, he will be killed. However, the difference of opinion is about the person who is alone; Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  and most of his students are of the view that Takfeer will not be made of him, nor will he be killed, but he will be punished severely and he will be punished by a long imprisonment. This will be to the extent that the repentance of these people becomes apparent and they are destroyed, as Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$  did to Sabigh. This is the view of Muhammad bin Mawaaz regarding the Khawaarij and the same view was given by Abdul Malik bin Maajishoon and Sahnoon regarding the people of desires.

The narration in Muwatta Imam Maalik from Umar bin Abdul Aziz  $\alpha$  that he narrates from his grandfather and uncle and deals with the Qadariyyah that they will be made to repent. If they repent, then well and good, otherwise they will be killed.

Isa bin Qaasim said that the sect of **Ibaadiyyah** from the Ahwaa' and those from the Ahl us Sunnah that oppose the Qadariyyah and interpolate the Qur'aan by interpretation should be made to repent, whether they hide their beliefs or make it apparent. **If they do not repent, they should be killed.** Their inheritance will be given to their heirs. This was the practice of Umar bin Abdul Aziz  $\alpha$ . Ibn al Qaasim also said this about the Qadariyyah. He said that they will be made to repent in the following way, "Return from your beliefs." In Mabsut, it is written that the Ibadiyyah, Qadariyyah and all the sects involved in innovation should be made to repent because they are, after all, Muslims. **They can be killed for their baseless beliefs. Hadhrat Umar bin Abdul Aziz \alpha used to practice on this.** 

Ibn al Qaasim said that he who said that Hadhrat Musa  $\upsilon$  did not speak to Allaah will be made to repent. If he repents, then well and good, otherwise he will be killed. Ibn Habib and the scholars like him say that the Khawaarij, Qadariyyah and Murji'a are disbelievers.

The same is narrated from Sahnoon; he who says that the Qur'aan is not the word of Allaah is a disbeliever. There are different narrations of this from Imam Maalik α. In the narration of Abu Mushir and Marwaan bin Muhammad Taahiri, they are disbelievers. Someone consulted with him about marrying a Qadari, so he said, "Do not marry them because Allaah j said, '...A Mu'min slave is better than a

(free) Mushrik man even though he (the Mushrik) may be pleasing to you...' (Surah Al – Baqara (The Bull), 221)

One narration from Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  is also that all the people of Ahwaa are disbelievers. Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  also said that the one who discusses the qualities of Allaah j and says that He has 'hands', 'ears', or 'eyes', then those same limbs of the person should be cut off. This is because he made a similitude of Allaah to himself.

According to Imam Maalik  $\alpha$ , the person who says that the Qur'aan is created is a disbeliever and he should be killed. The narration of Ibn Naafi states that he should be lashed, imprisoned until he repents. Bishr bin Bakr Taynasi narrates from Imam Maalik  $\alpha$ , he says that the person should be killed and his repentance will not be accepted.

Qaadhi Abu Abdullaah Barnakaani, Qaadhi Abu Abdullaah Tastari — who is from among the Imams of Fiqh of Iraq, their answers to this question are different. **They say that if a scholar calls to this belief, he should be killed.** Based on this, it is their view that if Salaah is performed behind him, then it should be repeated.

Ibn al Mundhir narrated from Imam Shafi'i α that the repentance of a Qadari will not be accepted and most of the early day scholars say that this person is a disbeliever. Layth bin Uyaynah Ibn Lahi'a is among these scholars and it is narrated (about the Qadari) from him regarding the person that says that the Qur'aan is created. Ibn al Mubaarak, Wakee', Hafs bin Ghiyaath, Abu Ishaaq Fazaari, Haytham and from among the latter day scholars, Ali bin Aasim, most of the Muhadditheen and Mutakallimeen have this above view.

Their view also applies to the Khawaarij, the Qadariyyah and the deviated Ahl Hawaa, as well as the innovators. Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal says the same regarding those who are linked to these sects. The view of these scholars regarding these people also refers to those who have doubts or are reserved about these principles.

Those who do not make Takfeer of these sects are Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$ , Hadhrat Ibn Umar  $\tau$ , and Hadhrat Hasan Basri  $\alpha$ . Some jurists and Mutakallimeen also have this view. Their proof is that the Sahabah and Tabi'een gave the inheritance of the people of Harurah (Khawaarij) and that of the Qadariyyah. They were buried in the graveyard of the Muslims and the laws of Islaam were applied to them.

Qaadhi Ismaa'eel said that the statement of Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  regarding the Qadariyyah and all the deviated groups that they will be made to repent, if they repent, then well and good, otherwise they will be killed. The reason for this is that they cause corruption on earth and the ruling pertaining to them is that of a rebel, that if the ruler is of the view then he has permission to kill them, moreover, the rebel causes corruption for the government, and this is linked to wealth. Although their corruption will affect the matters of Deen as well, i.e. Hajj and Jihaad will become difficult, but there will be a special effect of their corruption in the religious matters. However, the corruption of an innovator is upon religion and sometimes the effect is in religious matters; for example, the innovators place hatred among the Muslims.

### Section 2

# Research of the View of those who view and Classify others as Disbelievers

1736-1750. In these previous sections we explained the views of the pious predecessors that stated that the innovators, those who make interpretations and the Ahl Ahwaa are disbelievers. Those who make interpretations refer to those people who say such things that take a person to disbelief. However, if those who say these things know that these necessitate disbelief, then possibly they would not say such things. Because of this, there is a difference of opinion among the jurists and Mutakallimeen regarding Takfeer of such people. Most of the early day scholars say the above. Some scholars do not make Takfeer and they do not remove them from the group of Muslims. This is the view of majority of the jurists and the Mutakallimeen. They say that these people are sinners and deviated but they do not leave the fold of Islaam. Therefore, we give their inheritance and the laws of Muslims apply to them. Therefore, Sahnoon says that if a person performs Salaah behind him then it is not necessary to repeat the Salaah. They say that this is the view of Imam Maalik α and his students. Among these, Mughirah bin Kisaanah is worthy of mention.

Sahnoon says that the sin of a sinner does not take him out of the fold of Islaam. Therefore we accept him as a Muslim.

Other scholars have doubt regarding this ruling and they adopt reservation regarding the matter of Islaam and disbelief. There are two views narrated from Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  regarding this and he adopts reservation regarding the ruling of performing Salaah behind such a person.

Oaadhi Abu Bakr, the leader of research, has this view; He says that this ruling is difficult because these people did not commit clear disbelief. However, this much can definitely be said that these things will take a person to disbelief. It is as though his view is also like that of Imam Maalik a. To the extent that Qaadhi Saheb said that according to the view of these people (who do not commit open kufr), the one who says that these innovators are disbelievers, it will not be permissible to marry them, nor will it be permissible to eat their slaughtered animals. No Janaazah Salaah will be performed for them. There will be a difference of opinion like this among the heirs too, just as there is among the heirs of a Murtad. They (the scholars) also said, "We have the view that the inheritance should go to the heirs," but they (these sinners) will not be made the heirs of Muslims. Qaadhi Saheb inclines towards not calling them (these sinners) disbelievers. This is the view of his teacher Shaykh Abul Hasan Ash'ari, that they should not be called disbelievers because disbelief refers to a person that is ignorant of the existence of Allaah. Once he said, "Whoever has this belief that Allaah has a body, or Allaah is Maseeh, or whoever he meets on the road is Allaah, then such a person will be a disbeliever."

Hadhrat Abul Ma'aali replied to the questions of Muhammad Abdul Haq. He also made these views apparent and he mentioned the excuse that it is very difficult to classify a person a disbeliever and the research scholars said that it is necessary to stay away from calling those who make interpretations as disbelievers. This is because it is very dangerous to call those who are established on Tauheed and perform Salaah disbelievers and let their blood be permissible. It is easier to understand a thousand disbelievers to be Muslims in error, rather than calling one Muslim a disbeliever and classifying his blood to be permissible.

Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "He who testifies that Allaah is One and I am His Rasul, then his life and wealth will be protected from our hands (we will take it). However, only if a right is established and the reckoning will be with Allaah." From this we learn that he who testifies that 'There is no deity but Allaah and Muhammad is the Rasul of Allaah', must definitely be protected. This ruling cannot fall away, nor will it be permissible to take any steps to the contrary. However, if disbelief is proven by a resolute proof, and it does not contradict the Shari'ah and Qiyaas, then the ruling will fall away.

The words that are narrated in the Ahadith of Takfeer should be interpreted. Some Ahadith clearly state that the Oadarivvah are disbelievers and Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said that they have no share in Islaam, or he said that the Raafidis are polytheists, they should be cursed, or the Khawaarij and other people of Ahwaa. Those who make Takfeer use this Hadith as proof. However, other people reply that these words are used for sinful Muslims, aside from the disbelievers; the objective is to notify people and make them fearful. Their disbelief is a lower degree of disbelief, and their polytheism is a lower level of polytheism. Things like this are narrated regarding those that disobey their parents, disobey their husbands, speak lies, and engage in other sins. When anything like this happens that there are two possibilities, then there can be no conviction upon one thing without any resolute proof.

Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said that the Khawaarij are very evil people. This is the quality of the disbelievers. Or Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "Beneath the skies, this is a very evil group. Very fortunate is the one that kills them, or their

hands are cut." Or Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "When you find them then kill them. Exactly in the same way as the nation of Aad were killed." From these statements the people take proof to state that the Khawaarij are disbelievers.

However, those who do not take them as disbelievers say that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  gave the command to kill them because they stood up to fight the Muslims. They rebelled. The proof of this is in the Hadith that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "They will kill the Muslims." From this we learn that the ruling of killing them was not because they had become disbelievers, but because they committed a crime for which the punishment is death. The simile with the nation of Aad in the Hadith was only to show that it is permissible to kill them.

Secondly, for whichever person the ruling of killing is given, it does not means that he is also a disbeliever. The statement of Hadhrat Khaalid  $\tau$  contradicts this as well. The Hadith states that Hadhrat Khaalid  $\tau$  said, "O Rasul of Allaah, give me permission to chop his neck." So Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "Possibly this person performs Salaah."

If those who refer to the Khawaarij as disbelievers bring the following Ahaadith as proof: "They will recite the Qur'aan but the Qur'aan will not go beneath their throats."

Rasulullaah ε said, "Imaan will not enter their hearts."

Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "They will come out from Deen just like an arrow leaves the bow and then it will not return."

Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Just as the arrow passes through the liver of the prey."

From all these statements it is proven that the Khawaarij have no link with Islaam.

The others who do not take the Khawaarij as disbelievers reply that the Hadith, "The Qur'aan will not go beneath their throats" means that the purport of the Qur'aan will not go into their hearts, nor will their chests open up to the Qur'aan, nor will they practice on the Qur'aan. Moreover, they say that Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "There will be doubt about their arrow, as to whether it passed through the liver or not." The doubt is expressed by this sentence.

Those who classify the Khawaarij as disbelievers, if they take as proof the statement of Hadhrat Abu Saeed Khudri  $\tau$  which states that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Such people will appear in this Ummah that will leave Islaam just like the arrow leaves the bow." In this Hadith, the words 'in this Ummah' are used. From this it is apparent that they will be part of the Ummah and Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  did not say that they will come out of the Ummah.

Hadhrat Abu Saeed  $\tau$  also clarified this word and he defended it. Moreover, it is not clearly mentioned in the narration of Hadhrat Abu Saeed Khudri  $\tau$  that the Khawaarij are not part of this Ummah. The word 'min' was used in the Hadith; this shows a portion. Besides this, the narration that comes from Hadhrat Abu Dhar  $\tau$ , Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$  and Hadhrat Abu Umamah  $\tau$  states, "From my Ummah, and soon in my Ummah such people will come." If it is seen in this way, then the purport of the Hadith of Hadhrat Abu Saeed  $\tau$  and Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$  is the same. There is apparently no reason to show that by means of the word 'fee', they were taken out of the Ummah and effort has been made to make them part of the Ummah by the word 'min'. However, it must be accepted that Hadhrat Abu Saeed Khudri  $\tau$  used the word 'fee' in the

meaning of 'min'. He has done well in this and from this it is proven that the Sahabah  $\psi$  had great knowledge of the research behind the fiqh in words and that the words should be correct and they were cautious in narration.

Whatever I have explained about the Khawaarij, these are the views of the famous groups among the Ahl us Sunnah wal Jama'ah. Besides this, the views of the other groups (like the Shi'a and Mu'tazilah) are contradictory and they are astray.

From the Mu'tazilah, Jahnam and Muhammad bin Shabib's views can be understood; for example, 'disbelief of Allaah' means that they are 'unaware of the name of Allaah'. As long as this is not the case, it will not be correct to call someone a disbeliever.

Abul Hudhayi says that he who makes a simile of Allaah j with the creation, or he says that an action of Allaah is oppression, or he says that a certain piece of information from Allaah is false, is a disbeliever. He who proves that something is eternal like Allaah, then he is also a disbeliever.

Some Mutakallimeen say that if he from the group of people that are aware of the Qur'aan and Sunnah and they base their beliefs on the Qur'aan and Sunnah and they attribute the qualities that are specific with Allaah to the creation, then he will be a disbeliever. However, if he has no link to this group, then he will be a sinner. This is on condition that he is unaware of the principles of religion. It will be said that this person is in error.

Ubaydullaah bin Hasan Anbari thinks that if a Mujtahid makes Ijtihaad in matters of belief and his Ijtihaad contradicts the Qur'aan and Sunnah, then it will be deciphered. If it is possible, then it could be said to be correct. In this matter, Anbari has moved away from all the scholars of the Ummah and has established his own view. This is because all the scholars of the Ummah are unanimous that in the matters of belief, there is only one truth. Therefore, if a Mujtahid slips pass the truth and makes a new belief, then he will be a sinner. However, there is a difference of opinion about whether the person is a disbeliever or not.

Qaadhi Abu Bakr Baaqillaani  $\alpha$  also narrated from Dawud bin Isfahaani and said that a group of scholars said regarding the two above mentioned people that they both have the view that every such person whose condition is apparent and he seeks the truth, whether he is linked to our Islaamic religion or any other, if he wants to make Ijtihaad in the principles of religion and on the foundational beliefs, he has permission. Jaahidha and Thumaamah said something similar. They have said to the extent that the proof of Allaah is not established against the masses, women, fools, ignorant and the followers of the Jews and Christians because their intelligence is not such that a ruling or belief can be established. Imam Ghazaali  $\alpha$  seems to be inclined towards this in his work At-Tafarruqah.

However, the correct view is that a person who has this belief is a disbeliever because the Ummah is unanimous that he who does not refer to the Jews and Christians as disbelievers, or he who leaves the religion of the Muslims, or he adopts reservation about classifying the Jews and Christians as disbelievers, or he doubts their disbelief, then he is a disbeliever himself.

Qaadhi Abu Bakr says that the reason for this is that the Shari'ah and the consensus of the Ummah both agree

upon the disbelief of the Jews and Christians. Therefore, if a person has reservations about this it is as though he is belying the clear texts and the Shari'ah. The one who belies the Shari'ah and consensus, or has reservations about believing it, or doubts it, can only be a disbeliever.

### Section 3

## **Explanation of the Blasphemous Articles**

1751-1754. Know well, in this section, the only thing that can remove doubt is the Shari'ah. In this chapter, there is no resorting to intelligence. One clear thing in this chapter: the speech that clearly denies the Oneness of Allaah, Allaah being the Rabb, or emphasis is given to worshiping something other than Allaah, is disbelief. For example: the statements of the atheists and all the sects that believe in the deity, like the Daysaniyyah, ofanother Maanawiyyah, Saabi'een, or the Jews and the Christians or those people that worship idols, or those that worship the angels, devils, sun, stars, or they worship things besides Allaah, like the Arab polytheists or the polytheists of India, China, and Sudan.

### Refutation of Sects like the Rawaafidh

The entire Ummah is unanimous that the one who has the following beliefs is a disbeliever: the Qaraamita; the people who believe in Hulool; the people who believe in reincarnation; the Tayyaarah sect of the Rawaafidh; the people that believe in the Being of Allaah and His Oneness but they have the belief that He is not alive, or He is not eternal, or He can be destroyed, or **He has a form,** or that He has a son, wife, father, or that He was created from something else; the people who believe that something else is eternal, or the universe has another creator, or the one running the system is someone else; all these are blasphemous beliefs. The philosophers, astrologers, and deviated scientists have this belief.

Similarly, he is also a disbeliever who claims that he sits with Allaah in His gathering or he goes up to Allaah, or he speaks to Allaah or he goes into things, like some ignorant Sufis, and the Baatiniyyah, Christians, and Qaraamitah believe.

Similarly, we also have conviction of the disbelief of those people who say that the world is eternal, or they have the view of the reincarnation of the souls. They understand and have the belief that the souls always move from the body of one person to another body, or they are rewarded or punished in accordance to the purity or filth of their souls.

The one who attests to Allaah being the deity, but denies Nubuwwah in general, or specifically the Nubuwwah of Rasulullaah ε, or denies the Nubuwwah of any Nabi, is also a disbeliever. This is the case despite the fact that Allaah has clearly explained this. However, the person still denies all this knowingly. An example are the Brahmin people, most of the Jews, Arusiyyah Christians, the Gharraabiyyah among the Rawaafidh who believe that Hadhrat Jibreel υ was deputed to bring Nubuwwah to Hadhrat Ali τ, the Mu'attila, Qaraamitah, Isma'iliyyah, and Anbariyyah among the Rawaafidh, as well as the Abdiyyah among the Shi'a. All of them are engaged in disbelief.

Based on this, even if a person testifies to the Oneness of Allaah and believes in the general Nubuwwah and the Nubuwwah of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ , yet he has the belief that the other Ambiyaa ( $\iota$ ) that came with revelation lied (may Allaah save us) – whether he says that the other Ambiyaa ( $\iota$ ) spoke lies out of expediency or not – such a person has blasphemous beliefs. Just as some philosophers, some ignorant people, those that exaggerate, and Ibaahi people have these beliefs. This is because in reality, their belief is

that the apparent Shari'ah and most of the information that the Ambiyaa (1) brought are not like the Ambiyaa (1) Aspects explained. like the Aakhirat resurrection. Qiyaamah, Jannah, and Jahannam, and from their apparent words it is understood. In fact, the Ambivaa mentioned these things out of expediency because it was not possible for the Rasuls to show the reality. If the talk of these deviated people is accepted then the meaning of it will be that (may Allaah save us) that every Shari'ah is baseless and there is no meaning to the commands and prohibitions. The Rasuls will be belied; those that brought the truth will be made doubtful. Therefore, those that have these beliefs are disbelievers by consensus.

By consensus, he who attributes lies to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  in his conveying the message of Risaalat, or he doubts the truthfulness of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , or he is insolent to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , or he says that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  did not convey the commands, or he mocks Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , or he tries to fault Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , or he tries to harm Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , or he kills a Nabi, or wages war against a Nabi, is also a disbeliever.

Similarly, we also take as a disbeliever the one who has the belief that there was a warner and Nabi among the animals, i.e. among the monkeys, pigs, cattle, worms, etc. They take the following verse as proof:

'Verily We have sent you with the truth as a carrier (bearer) of good news (to the Mu'mineen) and (as) a warner (to the Kuffaar). (Your duty is not near to people because) A warner (who cautioned people about the consequences of kufr) passed in (was sent to) every nation.' (Surah Faatir (The Creator), 24)

This is because if this is accepted, then this means that the Ambiyaa (1) are being associated with bad qualities and such noble people are being disparaged. The consensus of the entire Ummah is against this and the one who says this is a liar.

Similarly, we also call the person a disbeliever who attests to the Nubuwwah of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , but he says that (may Allaah save us) Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was black, or that he  $\epsilon$  passed away before his beard could come out, or Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was not the being that was born in Makkah Mukarramah and Hijaaz, or Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was not from the Quraysh. This is because saying things like this about Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  that contradict what is known about him is negating Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and is synonymous with belying him.

Based on this, we also call the person a disbeliever who says that in the era of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  there was another Nabi, or a Nabi can come after Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , like the Isawiyyah group among the Jews (they also say that the Nubuwwah of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  was only for the Arabs), or the Kharmiyyah sect that says that Rasuls will continue to come, or like some Rawaafidh say that Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$  was partner to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  in Risaalat and after Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , according to their belief, the Imam has the same status as the Nabi.

We also call the person a disbeliever who claims Nubuwwah and says, 'Revelation comes to me,' or he says, 'I go to the heavens, I enter Jannah, I see the fruits of Jannah, and I hug the damsels.' All of these people are disbelievers because they belie Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ . This is because Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "I am the seal of the Ambiyaa (t); no Nabi will come after me." The Ummah is unanimous that this speech will be taken according to the apparent meaning and there is no room for interpretation in it. Therefore, there is no room for doubt in any of these groups being disbelievers.

Based on this, we also refer to the person who denies the clear text of the Qur'aan as a disbeliever, or he makes a Hadith specific from his own side, such a narration upon which there is consensus and it is taken upon its literal meaning by consensus, like the person who denies Rajm is called a disbeliever by the Khawaarij.

Because of this we also call the person a disbeliever who does not call the person who believes in another religion a disbeliever, or he has reservations about that person's disbelief, or he doubts that person being a disbeliever, or he refers to that person's religion as correct, even if he shows himself as a Muslim and he says that other religions are baseless. Similarly, we also call the person a disbeliever who says such things that makes the entire Ummah seem deviated or it takes one to making Takfeer of the Sahabah w, like the Keemliyyah among the Rawaafidh who say that all the individuals of the Ummah became disbelievers (may Allaah save us) after the demise of Rasulullaah &, because the Ummah did not choose Hadhrat Ali τ for the Khilaafat (they say that he was more deserving of the Khilaafat). This group say themselves that Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$  is a disbeliever (may Allaah save us). This is because he went forward and why did he not acquire his right of Khilaafat?

This group is counted as disbelievers for a number of reasons:

Firstly, by saying that all the individuals of the Ummah became disbelievers after the demise of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , they are saying that the transmission of the Shari'ah is baseless because it was these same Sahabah  $\psi$  that transmitted the Shari'ah. Therefore, according to their thinking, the narrators were disbelievers. Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  has indicated that they be killed in one of his views, and Allaah knows best.

Secondly, they speak ill of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  by saying that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  made a bequest for Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$  to become the Khalifah after his demise while knowing that Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$  will refuse to take this right. If the person who does not acquire his right of Khilaafat is a disbeliever according to his belief, then the meaning is that (may Allaah save us) Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  made a bequest for the Khilaafat in favour of a disbeliever. All these beliefs are baseless. May Allaah curse those who have these beliefs. May peace and salutations be upon His Rasul and his family.

Based on certain deeds, we make Takfeer on actions regarding which there is consensus of the Muslims that cannot be done by a Muslim. This will be the case even if a person clearly states that he is a Muslim; for example, prostrating before an idol, the sun, moon, fire, a cross, going to a Church or synagogue together with the Christians or Jews, adopting their outer appearance and clothing (like wearing a cross or shaving the head in the middle). The Muslims are unanimous that the one who does these deeds is a disbeliever because these deeds are a sign of disbelief.

The Muslims are also unanimous upon the disbelief of a person that takes forbidden deeds like murder and adultery to be permissible while he knows that they are forbidden. For example, the Qaraamitah and some Sufis that exaggerate.

We have conviction in the disbelief of the person who belies such things that came with Tawaatur from things Rasulullaah £. that are proven from Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  in the light of the laws of the Shari'ah and the Ummah has always been unanimous upon it. For example, he belies the five times daily Salaah or the number of Rak'ats, or Ruku, or Sajdah, or he says 'Allaah has made Salaah obligatory upon us in general. We do not accept the method and conditions because these things are not mentioned in the Our'aan and the status of whatever narrated Ahadith there are, are not more than Khabar Waahid.'

The Ummah is unanimous upon the Takfeer of the person who says that Salaah is only obligatory at the two ends of the day, like the Khawaarij.

There is also consensus upon the Takfeer of the Baatiniyyah, who say that 'the obligations' mean 'those people who have been commanded to follow' and 'filth' means 'those people whom we have been commanded to stay far away from'.

Some Sufis say (which is blasphemy) that the need for worship and striving remains only until the nafs of a human is purified. Once his nafs is purified, all worship and striving fall away and everything for this person is permissible. There is no responsibility of the Shari'ah upon this person anymore.

If a person denies Makkah Mukarramah, the Bavtullaah, Masjid al Haraam; or he says, while on the Haji journey, 'Haji is obligatory in the light of the Qur'aan and it is obligatory to face the Qiblah' but he denies that it should be done in Makkah or Bayt ul Haraam; or he says 'It is possible that the narrators of the Haji or the narrators of the Oiblah made an error and they were mistaken.' The person who says things like this is a disbeliever and there is no doubt in his disbelief. However, this is on one condition: the person who says this is among those who think that he knows the reality of Islaam and that he stays in the environment of Muslims. Conversely, if such a person is a revert, then he will be told, 'You are not aware of the Islaamic forms of worship as yet. Therefore, ask the common Muslim about it. You will realize that there is no difference of opinion among the Muslims. For a long time, the pious predecessors have been fulfilling these forms of worship in a specific way. Makkah is the same Makkah (as before) and the Baytullaah is the same Baytullaah where the Ka'bah and the Qiblah is. Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and everyone else faced it when performing Salaah. Muslims perform the same Hajj and Tawaaf and the form of Hajj is the real form and worship and this is the objective. Rasulullaah ε performed Hajj in this way as well. Salaah is the same that Rasulullaah ε performed and the commentary of the desire of Allaah from us is proven from the actions of Rasulullaah E. Therefore, you should acquire knowledge regarding these realities, just as all the Muslims are aware. You should not have doubt regarding this.' Despite adopting the company of Muslims, the person who debates and denies this is a disbeliever by consensus. His excuse that he did not know will not be accepted. This is because he placed a veil over his lies. It is not possible that he lives his life in the environment of Muslims and he remains ignorant of these realities.

Moreover, when he does not refrain from saying, 'Whatever was narrated was false,' despite the entire Ummah being unanimous that the words and deeds of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  are proven and are the real explanation of the wish of Allaah, then it is as though he doubts the entire Shari'ah. This is because the pious predecessors have narrated the Ahadith and the Qur'aan and by doubting it there will be confusion in religion. Therefore, what debate can there be in the disbelief of such a person?

The person who denies the Qur'aan is also a disbeliever. This is whether he denies the entire Our'aan or just a single letter. The person that changes the Qur'aan, or adds something from his own side (like the Baatiniyyah and Ismaa'eeliyyah do), or says, 'The Qur'aan is not proof for Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ,' or 'this Qur'aan is not a miracle for Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ,' is a disbeliever. An example of this is Hishaam Footi and Mu'ir Dameeri, who say that (May Allaah save us) the Our'aan does not point out to Allaah i, is not any type of proof for Rasulullaah ε, and it does not give the command of reward or punishment. Based on their statements, both of them are disbelievers. We classify them as disbelievers because, according to them, there is no miracle for Rasulullaah ε and there is no proof of Allaah i in the creation of the skies and earth; all of their statements contradict the consensus of the Ummah. This is because Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  uses all of these as proof and the Our'aan clarifies this.

The person that denies such a thing that the Qur'aan clarifies, or he knows that this is present in the Qur'aan, it is in the form of the *Mushaf* that people have. If the person is a fool or a revert and he says that the Qur'aan was not revealed in an authentic way, or the Qur'aan was not transmitted authentically, or he has a doubt about those that transmitted

the Qur'aan, then such a person will be a disbeliever based on two principles: this is because saying things like this is belying the Qur'aan, and he is hiding his real thoughts.

We call the person a disbeliever who denies Jannah, Jahannam, resurrection, reckoning, the record of deeds, and Qiyaamah. This is because the entire Ummah is unanimous upon this.

We say that the person is a disbeliever who, despite believing this, says that Jannah, Jahannam, resurrection, reckoning, reward, and punishment do not have the meaning that is apparently understood, but the purport is something else; it refers to enjoyment of the soul, or it has a meaning like that explained by the Christians, some philosophers, or some Sufis. They say that the meaning of Qiyaamah means death or only destruction, or it refers to the current form of the universe breaking and the elements falling apart.

# We also refer to the extreme Raafidis as disbelievers. They say that the Imams are more virtuous than the Ambiyaa (1).

However, if a person denies something that does not necessitate the denial of religion, or it does not render the Shari'ah baseless, nor is any important law of Deen denied, like the battle of Tabuk, the battle of Mu'ta, or he denies the existence of Hadhrat Abu Bakr  $\tau$  and Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$ , or he denies the martyrdom of Hadhrat Uthmaan  $\tau$  or the Khilaafat of Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$ , or something that does not cause the Shari'ah to be denied, then such denial does not necessitate disbelief. This is because the most that can be said regarding this is that it is lies, like Hishaam and Ibaad, who deny the incident of Jamal. This is denying a battle that took place between Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$  and his opposition. **However, if a** 

person denies these incidents based on the narrators and he places doubt into the Muslims, then we shall make Takfeer of him because this denial is a means of classifying the entire Shari'ah as baseless.

Of the person that denies the consensus that comes with Tawaatur from Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , most of the Mutakallimeen feel that such a person is a disbeliever because he denies such consensus in which all the conditions of consensus are found and they are generally agreed upon. Their proof is the verse:

'Whoever opposes the Rasool after the guidance (the truth of Islaam) has become manifest (clear) to him and follows a path other than that of the Mu'mineen, We shall allow him to do that which he is doing and then enter him into Jahannam. It is the worst of abodes. (This verse makes it clear that those who oppose the Ijma (consensus) of the Ummah are heading for Jahannum.)'
(Surah Nisaa (The Women), 115)

And Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, "He who opposes the group of Muslims, even a hands span, he has removed the yoke of Islaam from his neck"

### **Takfeer of Opposing Consensus**

The person who opposes consensus (ijmaa'), there is consensus that such a person is a disbeliever. The view of other scholars is that reservation should be adopted regarding the Takfeer of such a person who opposes Ijmaa that is especially narrated by the scholars. Some scholars say that reservation should be adopted regarding the Takfeer of a person that opposes Ijmaa that is acquired from Qiyaas. An example of this is Nizaam, he opposes the Ijmaa of the pious

predecessors, whereas the pious predecessors hold onto Ijmaa as proof.

Qaadhi Abu Bakr said, "According to me, the reliable view is that disbelief in Allaah is to be ignorant of His existence and to believe in Him means having knowledge of His existence. A person cannot be called a disbeliever based on his statement or opinion as long as it is not proven that he is ignorant of the existence of Allaah j. The person will be classified a disbeliever if it is proven by means of his statement or his deed that he denied something that is clearly proven from Allaah j, or something that is proven by the consensus of the Muslims, and it is such a denial that makes a person a disbeliever. His disbelief will not be based on his statement or deed, but it will be based on his statement or deed necessitating disbelief.

### In Summary, disbelief can Based on One of Three Things:

- 1. The person is ignorant of Allaah
- 2. He does such an action or says something regarding which Allaah j and His Rasul ε or the Muslims have reached consensus that such a punishment can only be given to a disbeliever; for example, prostrating to an idol, wearing a cross, accompanying the Jews and Christians to their places of worship on the occasions of their festivals.
- 3. The statement or deed of a person is such that it shows a person is ignorant of Allaah.

These last two types are such that although it cannot be said that on account of being ignorant regarding Allaah,

there is definitely a sign that the person who does this is a disbeliever and he does not even have a doubt of Imaan.

The one who denies the Being or a Quality of Allaah; for example, he says that Allaah does not intend, is not powerful, does not speak, etc. (May Allaah save us), or he denies the perfect qualities that are necessary for Allaah, then all four Imams are unanimous that such a person is a disbeliever. Based on this, the view of Sahnoon is that the person who says, 'Allaah has no speech' is a disbeliever, whereas Sahnoon is of the view that the one that makes interpretations is not a disbeliever, as we have explained.

As for the person who is ignorant of the Qualities of Allaah and denies them, there is a difference of opinion among the scholars:

Some scholars say that he will also be classified a disbeliever. This is the view of Abu Ja'far Tabari and Abul Hasan Ash'ari also mentioned a view like this.

A group of scholars feel that such a person will not be called a disbeliever and later on Ash'ari retracted to this view. He says that this person does not believe resolutely in his belief, nor does he understand his Deen and Imaan, therefore he cannot be called a disbeliever. However, Takfeer will be made of the person who insists that this belief of his is correct. They bring as proof the Hadith of the Abyssinian woman from whom Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  only requested that she believe in Tauheed. They also bring the Hadith as proof that states that a person said, "If Allaah constricts me with punishment." One narration states: "Possibly, I shall hide from Allaah." Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  then said, "Allaah forgave him." The scholars have said that if a discussion is held with most people about the Qualities of Allaah, there will be very few people that are aware.

Those who say that the person who denies the Qualities of Allaah is a disbeliever give this reply to the Hadith: 'Oadr' (if Allaah is powerful) is in the meaning of 'Oadr' (restricting in punishment), i.e. the person did not have doubt that Allaah has power to raise the dead, but his doubt was only regarding the resurrection and reckoning. This cannot be known without having complete knowledge of the Shari'ah. It is also possible that such a Shari'ah has not come to him until this time, upon which he could have conviction. Therefore, is it not disbelief to have doubt regarding which there is no clear ruling from the Shari'ah. There is permission to give a decision based on intelligence. Alternatively, it can be said that the Hadith gives the meaning of 'restriction' and whatever the person did, he did according to his thought that he is very sinful. Therefore, Allaah i was very angry. Therefore, his action will be based on him not understanding.

Some say that so much fear came over this person that he erred. Therefore, in such a condition, where a person does not understand, he has no control over his words and therefore he will not be taken to task. He will be forgiven.

Some say that this incident took place at such a time when revelation came to an end. Therefore, general Tauheed was sufficient.

Some say that this speech was *Majaaz* (*metaphorical*) according to the Arabs. The apparent wording shows doubt but in terms of the purport, it is real. This is called *Tajaahul Aarifaanah*. Many examples of this are found in Arabic, as Allaah j says:

## 'Speak to him in gentle (kind) words, perchance he may take heed or fear (Me).'

(Surah TaaHaa, 44)

'Say (to the Mushrikeen), "Who sustains you from the heavens (by sending rain) and the earth (by giving crops)?"

Say (in reply to the question), "Allaah! (Since even the Mushrikeen accept this fact, they should think that it is)

Either we (Muslims) or you (Muskhrikeen who) are certainly correctly guided or clearly misguided." (It is obvious that the misguided ones are those who do not worship Allaah despite knowing that it is Only He Who sustains them.)'

(Surah Saba, 24)

Those who acknowledge the Qualities (Wasf) of Allaah but negate (sifat) it and say, "I take Allaah as knowledgeable but He does not have knowledge. I believe Him to speak but He does not speak." Similarly, they have the same belief regarding all the Qualities of Allaah as the Mu'tazilah; they make Takfeer based on that when one negated knowledge from a being, then it is as though one negated Aalim from Allaah because Aalim refers to one that has knowledge.

Similarly, Takfeer is made of all the sects that are related to them, those who make interpretations, like the Qadariyyah, etc. Those who do not look at the consequence of this belief, and the belief of the Mu'tazilah does not refer to them, that which necessitates negation of Sifat, they do not give the view of Takfeer. This is because when they are told that from the negation of the quality, it is necessitated that Allaah j is not Aalim (May Allaah save us). The Mu'tazilah will immediately reply, 'We do not say that Allaah is not Aalim and we negate the consequence of this statement that you bring upon us. In fact, it is our and your

belief that it is disbelief to have thoughts like this. We say that the consequence you take out does not come out. If these two foundations are understood, then it will become clear to you what the difference of opinion of this ruling is.'

However, the correct view is that they will not be called disbelievers and we will refrain from passing the resolute ruling upon them that they are unfortunate. This is despite the fact that in Oisaas, inheritance, marriage, Janaazah Salaah, burying in the Muslim graveyard, and other matters, the ruling of Muslims will be applied so that the innovator can stop his beliefs. This was the way in which the innovators were dealt with in the first century (of Islaam) and the Sahabah and Tabi'een did the same. They dealt in this way with the Mu'tazilah and Khawaarij. They did not separate their graveyard, nor did they deprive the Muslim relatives of inheritance. However, they adopted the way of abandoning relations with them and sometimes they punished them. They sometimes banished them. If conditions were intolerable, they were sometimes killed. This was because according to these research scholars who did not refer to them as disbelievers, they were sinners and people who committed major sins.

However, some scholars did not agree with these research scholars. They called these people disbelievers. May Allaah j grant us the divine ability to believe that which is correct.

Qaadhi Abu Bakr says that it is better not to make Takfeer of the one that interprets the deep matters like promises, warning, seeing Allaah, creation of deeds, tawaalud<sup>1</sup>. This is because if a person is ignorant of these, it

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The conditions that are created after a deed is referred to Tawaalud by the Mu'tazilah.

is not synonymous with ignorance of Allaah, nor is it synonymous with that which the scholars are unanimous upon – that it is not disbelief if a person does not know them. In the previous section we discussed this subject and we mentioned the difference of opinion with the help of Allaah. That is sufficient, there is no need to repeat it here.

#### **Section 4**

### The Ruling of the Words of Kufr by a Dhimmi

In the previous section, we mentioned the laws regarding the person who is a Muslim and he has wrong beliefs about Allaah j. However, if a Dhimmi does such deeds, then there is a narration from Hadhrat Ibn Umar  $\tau$  in which a Dhimmi said something in front of him that negated the honour of Allaah j and it was against his own religion as well. He began debating with Hadhrat Ibn Umar  $\tau$  so Hadhrat Ibn Umar  $\tau$  took out his sword with the intention of killing him. The Dhimmi fled. Hadhrat Ibn Umar  $\tau$  searched for him but could not find him.

Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  in Kitaab Ibn Habib and Ibn Qaasim in Mabsoot said that whichever Jew or Christian, based on an aspect of disbelief, swears Allaah j, then he will be killed, and his repentance will not be accepted. Ibn Qaasim says that if he accepts Islaam, then his repentance will be accepted. Mabsoot says that he has to become a Muslim happily.

Asbagh says that the basis of disbelief for him is his religion, for example, he attributes a wife to Allaah, children, and a partner, and a promise is taken from him that he will remain firm on his beliefs. However, if he does not promise, and he goes around lying, then this will be taken as breaking that promise.

Ibn al Qaasim says that whichever non-Muslim, without reasons that are mentioned in the book, swears Allaah j, he should be killed, except if he becomes a Muslim.

Makhzumi says in Mabsoot and Muhammad bin Maslamah and Ibn Abi Haazim says that he will not be killed, but he will be made to repent, whether he is a Muslim or a disbeliever. If he repents, then fine, otherwise he will be killed. Mutarrif and Abdul Malik say the same thing that Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  said.

Abu Muhammad bin Abi Zayd says that if a person is insolent regarding Allaah j, without this reason based on which he is a disbeliever, then he should be killed, except if he accepts Islaam. We narrate the view of Ibn Jilaab regarding this and we mentioned the view of Ubaydullaah bin Lubaabah and the scholars of Andalus. This is because the person was insolent regarding Allaah j without the reason based on which he was a disbeliever. All the scholars were unanimous upon this and they found that it is compulsory to kill this person.

If a person is insolent regarding Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ , without reason based on which he is a disbeliever, he will also be killed because there is no difference in being insolent to Allaah j and to Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ . This is because we have taken a promise from the non-Muslims that they will not make their disbelief apparent, nor will they mention their beliefs that entail insolence for Allaah j and Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ . Therefore, if someone does speak, then he will be breaking his promise, which should be punished.

There is a difference of opinion regarding the Dhimmi that becomes a Zindeeq. Imam Maalik  $\alpha$ , Mutarrif, and Asbagh say that the person should not be killed because there is nothing more than moving from one form of disbelief to another. However, Abdul Malik bin Majishoon says that he will be killed because Zandaqah is such a thing that he did not promise to any Muslim, nor is jizya taken from him for it. Ibn Habib says that he does not know that besides this, if anyone has said anything regarding this.

#### Section 5

# Attributing lies to Allaah, claiming Divinity, claiming Risaalat

In the previous section we explained the ruling of the person that is openly insolent regarding Allaah j, or he attributes such things to Allaah j that negates His Divinity and Grandeur. As for the person who attributes lies to Allaah j and claims divinity or prophethood; or says, 'Allaah j has not created me. He is not my Rabb,' or says 'I have no Rabb'; or he says such things that are illogical; or utters nonsense while intoxicated or mad, then despite the intelligence of the person being intact, there is no difference of opinion in the disbelief of this person, as we have explained.

According to the famous view, he will be made to repent and if he repents his repentance will be accepted. His repentance will be beneficial in the sense that he will be saved from being killed but he will be saved from an evil punishment, there will be no decrease in his punishment. This is so that others can take lesson and this person can take note himself to not do this in future. If a person takes this to be light, then this is proof that his inside is bad. The one who repeatedly repents, is falsely repenting. This is proof that the inside of this person is bad and the repentance that he is repeatedly doing is false. The ruling regarding him will be like that of a Zindeeq; we can neither rely upon his inside, nor upon the acceptance of his repentance. The ruling for the drunk and mad will be the same.

As for the person who is mad and it is difficult to recognize whether he uttered disbelief in a lucid state or whether he uttered disbelief while mad, then research will be done regarding the condition in which he spoke. If he said it while mad, then he will not be taken to task, but if he said it in the condition where he could differentiate, then even if he did not have sense and he was not bound (restricted) at the time, then he will be punished so that he stays away from this in the future. He will be punished so that he stays away from other evils. An animal is punished for its evil habits so that it becomes straight.

The person who said that Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$  is a deity was burnt alive by Hadhrat Ali τ. Similarly, Abdul Malik bin Marwaan hung Haarith Mutanabbi, who had claimed Nubuwwah. The Khulafa and rulers dealt with those who made claims like these in this way and the scholars said that their treatment was correct. Their consensus upon this ruling is proven that he who does not take such people to be disbelievers is also a disbeliever. The Maaliki jurists of Baghdad and the chief judge Abu Umar Maaliki were unanimous upon killing Mansoor by hanging because he had claimed divinity and Hulool that Allaah goes into something). He said, "I am the truth." Based on this view, the scholars said that it was compulsory to kill him, even though he appeared to be practising upon the Shari'ah.

### Ibn Abdul Hakam has written in Mabsoot that it is Compulsory to Kill the one who Claims Nabuwwah

Imam Abu Hanifah  $\alpha$  and his students were of the view that he who denies the fact that Allaah is the Creator or says that he has no Rabb, is a renegade. Ibn al Qaasim said in the book Ibn Habib and Muhammad has written in Utaybah that he who claims Nubuwwah will be made to repent, whether he claims Nubuwwah openly or secretly. The ruling regarding him is that he is a renegade. Sahnoon and other scholars have mentioned this.

A Jew claimed Nubuwwah, so Ashbab said, "If he says this openly, then he will be made to repent. If he repents then good, otherwise he will be killed."

Abu Muhammad bin Abu Zayd said that he who curses Allaah and then says that his tongue slipped because he actually meant to curse Shaytan, then he will be killed because of his disbelief and his excuse will not be accepted. This is in accordance to his other view that states that his repentance will not be accepted.

Regarding the wretched person who is drunk and says, "I am Allaah, I am Allaah," Abul Hasan Qaalbisi said that he will be made to repent and he will also be punished. If he repeats what he said, then he will be dealt with in the same way as a Zindeeq. This is because those people whose objective is to mock the Shari'ah do this.

#### Section 6

### About the person who mocks at Belief and the Shari'ah

As for the person who utters nonsense, does not guard his tongue, or says vague things, for example, a person says something that negates the Grandeur of Allaah j, or he makes a simile with such things which the *Mala' ul A'la (the upper level)* enjoy, or he says something regarding the creation that cannot be said for anyone but Allaah. In these cases, even if he does not intend disbelief, heresy, or to mock Allaah j, yet he does this repeatedly and becomes famous, then it is proof that he wants to play with the resolute Deen or negatively affect the honour of Allaah j. His deed is because he is ignorant of the Greatness of Allaah j, therefore there is no doubt in his deed being disbelief. Based on this analogy, it is also regarded as disbelief when a person utters such things that depreciate the Being of Allaah j.

Ibn Habib Asbagh bin Khalil, who was among the jurists of Qurtubah, once gave the ruling of killing the person who was famous as the nephew of Ujab (the wife of Abdur Rahman Umawi, the leader). The incident that took place when he(nephew of Ujab) went out and it rained. He then said, 'Remove the leather socks and sprinkle water on the leather.'(negating usage of leather socks) At the time there were jurists like Abu Zayd, Abdul A'la bin Wahb and Abaan bin Isa living in Qurtubah. They adopted silence regarding killing this person. They said that the person said something untoward and should be punished. They said that would be sufficient. The judge, Musa bin Ziyaad gave the same ruling. Contrarily, Ibn Habib said, "His blood is on my neck (I am responsible for his life). Is it correct that the Rabb that we worship is sworn at and we do not stand up in

support of Him? If this happens, then we shall be classified as very bad servants." Saying this, he began to cry. This conversation reached the leader of Qurtubah, Abdur Rahman bin Hakam Umawi. He came to know of the difference of opinion among the jurists and he passed the law in accordance to the view of Ibn Habib and those who had the same view. The perpetrator was then caught and the ruling of killing him was passed. He was killed in front of both the jurists. The Qaadhi was dismissed because he was lax in the matter of accusation and the jurists were admonished.

If a person does an evil deed like this only once, or he says something like this without thinking, then it is as though there is no mockery. Otherwise, the meaning of his statement will be enquired and he will be punished accordingly.

Ibn Qaasim was asked about a person that called out for another person, who replied, 'Labbayk Allaahumma Labbayk' ('Here I am, O Allaah, Here I am'). Ibn Qaasim replied that if the person was ignorant or he said it out of foolishness then he would not be taken to task. Qaadhi Abul Fadhl says that the meaning of this statement is that he will not be killed because he is ignorant. Rather, he will be admonished and he will be informed that this sentence cannot be used for anyone but Allaah. If it is a foolish person, then he should be punished. If he made the person calling out his Rabb in truth, then he will become a disbeliever and this is the demand of his speech.

There are many foolish poets who have exceeded the limits in their speech and they were accused of mocking Allaah j. This is because they did not consider the honour of Allaah j and they uttered such useless poetry that we do not feel it appropriate to mention it here. If we did not intend to

clarify these rulings, then we would not have mentioned these poems that are difficult upon us. However, the poems that were mentioned on account of the errors of the ignorant, like the following poem of a Bedouin, 'O Rabb of the servants, what has happened with You and us? You give us water to drink. Now what has happened? Send rain upon us, (may Allaah save us), may your father die." This type of nonsense comes from the ignorant and it is the talk of such people who are not aware of the Shari'ah. Only an ignorant person can say such things. Such people should be taught and it is necessary to act harshly with them so that they do not do this again.

Abu Sulaymaan Khattaabi says that this is a very bold matter. Allaah j is pure from all this. Aun bin Abdullaah said, "Consider the honour of your Rabb and do not take His name on every occasion. Is it not better that a person says, 'Allaah has made the dog disgraced or He did this to it and what.' The scholars that we have met would only take the name of Allaah j on occasions where His obedience is mentioned."

Some scholars would say "Jazayta Khayran" ('May you be rewarded') instead of "JazakaAllaahu Khayran" ('May Allaah reward you'). They would only say this out of honour for the name of Allaah j. They considered the fact that in these cases, where the obedience of Allaah is not mentioned, the name of Allaah should not be taken.

A reliable narrator informed us that Imam Abu Bakr Shaashi objected to the scholars of belief delving into the intricate issues regarding Allaah j and debating about His Qualities. He said that they should not do this because it negates the Honour of Allaah j whereas it is necessary to consider the honour of Allaah j all the time. He said that the scholars of belief have made Allaah j like a shawl (i.e. just as

they use the shawl abundantly, they debate and discuss the being and qualities of Allaah j).

The method of explanation in this chapter has been kept in the same way as was adopted in the chapter dealing with insolence regarding Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$ . We mentioned all the details there, and Allaah j gives Divine ability.

#### Section 7

### Being Insolent towards the Ambiyaa' (1) and the Angels

We have explained the ruling regarding the person who is insolent regarding the Ambiyaa' ( $\iota$ ) and the angels, or he who belittles them, or he belies the commands they brought, or he denies that which our Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  brought. Allaah j says:

'Indeed those who disbelieve in (reject) Allaah and His Rusul, who seek to draw a distinction between Allaah and his Rusul (by believing in Allaah and not in His Rusul), those who say, "We believe in some (Rusul, for their selfishness motives) and disbelieve in some (as they feel like)," and who seek to adopt a path between these (between Imaan and kufr)...'

(Surah Nisaa (The Women), 150)

'...such people are true (real) Kaafiroon. We have prepared for the Kaafiroon a disgraceful punishment.' (Surah Nisaa (The Women), 151)

'Say (O Mu'mineen), We have Imaan in Allaah, in what has been revealed to us and in what was revealed to Ibraheem (v), Ismaa'eel (v), Is'haaq (v), Yaqoob (v) and the descendants (of Ya'qoob (v) who were prophets), And (we also have Imaan in) whatever (Books and miracles) was granted to Moosa (v), Isa (v) and what was granted to all the prophets from their Rabb. We make no distinction between any of them (we do not believe in some prophets while rejecting others like the Jews and Christians do) and we are obedient to Allaah.'

(Surah Al-Baqara (The Bull), 136)

'The Rasool (Muhammed (ε)) believed in that which has been revealed to him from his Rabb and (so do) the Mu'mineen. Each one believes in Allaah, His angels, His Books and His Rusul. (They say) We make no distinction between one and another Messenger (We believe in every one of them, unlike others like the Jews and Christians who reject some Prophets) and they say, We hear (Allaah's command) and we obey. (We ask) Your forgiveness, (O) our Rabb, To You is our return.'

(Surah Al- Baqara (The Bull), 285)

Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  in Kitaab Ibn Habib, Muhammad, Ibn al Qasimm Ibn al Maajithoon, Ibn Abdul Hakam, Asbagh, and Sahnoon have passed a ruling **regarding the person that is insolent regarding the Ambiyaa'** ( $\iota$ ) **that he should be killed, except if he becomes a Muslim.** 

Sahnoon has narrated the following from Ibn al Qaasim: he who is insolent regarding the Ambiyaa' (1) based on a reason that a person becomes a disbeliever should be killed, except if he accepts Islaam. The different views regarding this have been mentioned.

In some of his replies, the Qaadhi of Cordova, Sa'eed bin Salmaan, said, "He who is insolent regarding Allaah j and His angels should be killed."

Sahnoon said, "It is compulsory to kill the one who speaks ill of any of the angels."

In Kitaab un Nawaadir, Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  said, "He who says that Hadhrat Jibreel  $\upsilon$  erred in bringing revelation; that revelation was supposed to come to Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$  so therefore he was the Nabi, then such a person will be

requested to repent. If he repents, then good, otherwise he should be killed "

It is narrated from Hadhrat Sahnoon that this is the view for some of the Rawaafidh who are called 'Gharabiyyah' because it is their belief that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  resembled Hadhrat Ali (R.A.) in the same way one crow resembles another (may Allaah save us).

It is the view of Imam Abu Hanifah  $\alpha$  and his companions that he who belies or disparages any of the Ambiyaa' (1), or he says that he is free of a Nabi, is a renegade.

The ruling of Abul Hasan Qaalbisi regarding the one who says to another, 'Your face in anger is like that of the angel Maalik,' with the intention of belittling the angel, is that he should be killed.

Qaadhi Abul Fadhl says that all these laws are regarding the person who is insolent towards all the Ambiyaa' ( $\iota$ ) and angels whom Allaah j has mentioned in His book or there is consensus regarding their Nubuwwah or them being angels in the Mutawaatir narrations. For example: Hadhrat Jibreel  $\upsilon$ , Hadhrat Mikaa'eel  $\upsilon$ , Maalik, Ridhwan, the doorkeepers of Jahannam and Jannah, the carriers of the Arsh, etc., as well as the Ambiyaa' ( $\iota$ ) who are mentioned in the Qur'aan. And those whose existence is proven in the Ahadith, like Hadhrat Izraa'eel  $\upsilon$ , Hadhrat Israafeel  $\upsilon$ , the protecting angels, Munkar and Nakeer, etc.

However, those angels regarding whom there is no specific mention in the Ahadith, nor is there consensus that they were Ambiyaa' ( $\iota$ ) or not, or angels or not, like Haarut and Maarut, Hadhrat Khadir  $\upsilon$ , Hadhrat Luqmaan  $\upsilon$ , Dhul

Qarnayn, Maryam, Aasiya, Khaalid bin Sinaan (regarding whom it is mentioned that he was sent as a Nabi to the people of Rass), and Zadash (regarding whom the Majusis and the historians say was a Nabi), being insolent to them will not carry the same ruling of killing because they do not have the same status that the Ambiyaa' (1) and angels who are mentioned in the Qur'aan have, or they do not have the same status as those regarding whose Nubuwwah there is consensus.

Nevertheless, a person who disparages them should be punished. The punishment will be according to the crime, i.e. if he speaks in low terms of those whose piety is clear.

If a person denies the Nubuwwah of some, or he does not count some from among the angels, then it will be seen how the person is. If he is from the scholars then there is no problem because there are differences of opinion among the scholars. If he is from the general people, then he should be notified to stop. If he refuses to stop, then he should be punished because the general people do not have a right to speak like this.

The pious predecessors did not like that scholars speak in this way, let alone the masses.

#### **Section 8**

## The Ruling Regarding the person who mocks the Qur'aan or the copy of the Qur'aan (Mushaf)

175501756. Know well: he who belittles the Qur'aan or a part of the Qur'aan, or he says something untoward regarding it, or he denies it, or he rejects a letter or verse of it, or he belies the Qur'aan, or he belies any aspect of the Qur'aan, or he belies any clear command of the Qur'aan, or he proves something that the Qur'aan negates, or vice versa, and he does this on purpose, or he doubts any aspect of the Qur'aan, then according to the consensus of the scholars, he will become a disbeliever. Allaah j says:

'Indeed those who disbelieve in the Reminder (Qur'aan) when it came to them (would never have disbelieved if they had contemplated about it). (Had they contemplated about it, they would have realised that) Without doubt, the Qur'aan is a mighty (sublime) book.'

(Surah HaaMeem Sajdah, 41)

'No falsehood (dishonest) can approach (come near) it from the front or from the back (from any direction). It is a revelation from the Wise, Who is Most Worthy of praise. (The Qur'aan can therefore never be altered or corrupted in any way)' (Surah HaaMeem Sajdah, 42)

Hadhrat Abu Hurayrah  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "'Miraa' in the Qur'aan is disbelief." The meaning of 'Miraa' is 'to doubt and argue'

Hadhrat Ibn Abbaas  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Whichever Muslim denies a verse from the book of Allaah, it is permissible to cut his neck off." (Ibn Maajah)

Similarly, he who denies something of the Tauraat, Injeel, or anything revealed by Allaah, or he disbelieves, curses, speaks ill of, or belittles them, then he is a disbeliever.

The Muslims are unanimous that the Our'aan which is recited in various parts of the world, present with the Muslims in the form of a Mushaf, and between the binding, beginning with 'Alhamdulillaah' ('All praise belongs to Allaah...') (Surah Faatiha (The Opening Chapter), 1) and ending at 'Qul 'auudhu birabbin naas' (' Say, "I seek refuge (shelter) with the Rabb (the Creator and Cherisher) of mankind...') (Surah Naas (Mankind), 1), is without doubt the speech of Allaah j and it has been revealed by Him. The Muslims are unanimous that it was revealed to Rasulullaah a and whatever it contains is the truth. Whoever decreases a letter from it intentionally, changes a letter of it for another, increases a letter from his own side intentionally, and that letter is not present in the Qur'aan and there is consensus that it is not part of the Qur'aan, then such a person is a disbeliever without any doubt.

Therefore, Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  has given the ruling of killing the person who is insolent regarding Hadhrat Ayesha  $\rho$ , or he who accuses her. This is because he is belying the Qur'aan by his deed. Therefore, it is compulsory to kill such a person.

Ibn al Qaasim says that the person who says, 'Allaah j did not speak to Musa v,' should be killed. This is the view of Abdur Rahman bin Mahdi as well.

Muhammad bin Sahnoon says that the person who says, '*Mu'awwadhatayn* is not a part of the Qur'aan,' should be killed unless he repents. Similarly, it will be compulsory to kill every such person who belies a letter of the Qur'aan.

If a person gives testimony that a certain person said, 'Allaah j did not speak to Musa  $\upsilon$ ,' and the person against whom the claim is made says, "The witness said that 'Allaah j did not make Hadhrat Ibraaheem  $\upsilon$  His close friend,' then it is compulsory to kill both of them. This is because both of them have unanimously denied Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .

Abu Uthmaan Haddaad said that all the people that are linked to the belief of Tauheed are unanimous that denying a single letter of the Qur'aan is disbelief.

Abul Aaliyah was so cautious that if a person recited the Qur'aan incorrectly before him, he would not say, "Do not read like that," but instead he would say, "I recite in this way," and he would then recite correctly. When Ibraaheem Nakha'i came to know of this he said, "They (Abul Aaliyah) know that if a person denies a single letter of the Qur'aan, he will be a disbeliever."

Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Masood  $\tau$  said, "He who denies a single verse of the Qur'aan is as though he has denied the (whole) Qur'aan and he who belies the Qur'aan is a disbeliever."

Qaablisi was asked about the person who argued with a Jew and the Jew took an oath on the Tauraat, so he replied, "May Allaah curse the Tauraat (may Allaah save us)." A person testified to this and when he was questioned he said that he had cursed the Tauraat of the Jews. Abul Hasan Qaablisi said, "Based on the testimony of one person, he

cannot be killed. There was possibility of interpretation in the statement of the person that he did not mean 'A book of the Jews that was revealed by Allaah' because they had changed that book. However, if two witnesses give testimony that the person cursed the Tauraat in general, then there remains no scope for interpretation."

The jurists of Baghdad, including Ibn Mujaahid, unanimously made Ibn Shunboodh, who was from among the leading Qurraa' of Baghdad, repent for reciting a rare word of Qira'ah that is not part of the Qur'aan. All of them joined and took a promise from him that he retracts and repents. In the presence of the minister Abu Ali, in 323 A.H, he recognized his mistake and wrote the fatwa of those that made him repent. Among them was Abu Bakr Mahdi.

Abu Muhammad bin Abi Zayd  $\tau$  has given fatwa of punishing the person who said to a young boy (who was reciting the Qur'aan) 'May he who taught you, and whatever he taught you, be cursed.' When questioned, the person said that he meant the bad manners of the boy and he did not intend to be disrespectful to the Qur'aan.

Abu Muhammad says, "It is compulsory to kill the one who curses the Qur'aan."

#### Section 9

# It is Haraam to be insolent towards the Household, Spouses, and Sahabah ψ of Rasulullaah ε

1757-1767. Being insolent to, or disparaging the pure household, spouses, or Sabahah  $\psi$  of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , is forbidden. The person who does this will be accursed.

Hadhrat Abdullaah bin Mughaffal  $\tau$  narrates that Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Fear Allaah regarding my companions. Do not make them a target of criticism after me because whoever loves them, loves them out of love for me and whoever hates them, hates them out of hatred for me. Whoever harms them, in reality, he has harmed me, and whoever harmed me, he has harmed Allaah. Whoever harms Allaah, soon Allaah will catch him."

Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Know well: do not speak ill of my companions. Whoever speaks ill of them, the curse of Allaah and all the angels are upon him and Allaah will not accept any of his obligatory and optional worship."

Rasulullaah ɛ said, "Do not swear my companions. In the latter period (times), such a group will come about that will swear my companions. Know well, do not perform their Janaazah Salaah, do not perform Salaah with them, do not marry them, do not sit in their gatherings, if they fall ill, then do not visit them."

Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Hit the one who swears my companions."

In summary, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  has informed that swearing the Sahabah  $\psi$  or giving difficulty to them is synonymous with giving harm to Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , which is forbidden.

In one Hadith, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Do not say anything regarding my Sahabah, thereby giving difficulty to me, because whoever gives difficulty to them, he has given difficulty to me."

Similarly, Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "Do not say anything regarding Hadhrat Ayesha  $\rho$ , thereby giving difficulty to me."

Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said something similar regarding Hadhrat Hadhrat Faatimah  $\rho$ . Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said regarding her, "Faatimah is a part of my body. Therefore, whoever gives difficulty to her, has given difficulty to me."

There is a difference of opinion among the scholars regarding the person that speaks ill of the Sahabah  $\psi$ . The famous view of Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  is that such a person should be punished severely. Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  also said that he who speaks ill regarding Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  should be killed and whoever speaks ill of the Sahabah  $\psi$  should be admonished. He also said that whoever swears the Sahabah  $\psi$ , or he says that Hadhrat Abu Bakr  $\tau$ , Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$ , Hadhrat Uthmaan  $\tau$ , Hadhrat Mu'awiyah  $\tau$ , Hadhrat Ambr bin Aas  $\tau$ , were involved in disbelief (may Allaah save us), then he should be killed. If he does not say this, but he said something bad like when bad is spoken to the general people, then he should be punished severely.

Ibn Habib said, "Amongst the shi'ite, whoever is severe in their hate for Hadhrat Uthmaan  $\tau$  and they speak ill of him, should be severely punished. He who hates Hadhrat

Abu Bakr  $\tau$  and Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$  should be punished even more severely; he should be beaten repeatedly and **he must be jailed for a long time until he dies**. However, he should not be killed for swearing anyone other than Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ."

Sahnoon said, "The one who says that the companions of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  disbelieved, whether it is Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$ , Hadhrat Uthmaan  $\tau$ , or any other companion, he should be given a severe punishment."

Ibn Abi Zayd narrated the view of Sahnoon, that whoever says that Hadhrat Abu Bakr  $\tau$ , Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$ , Hadhrat Uthmaan  $\tau$ , and Hadhrat Ali  $\tau$  disbelieved and were astray (may Allaah protect us), should be killed. Whoever says the same regarding other Sahabah  $\psi$  should be punished severely.

It is also narrated from Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  that the one who swears Hadhrat Abu Bakr  $\tau$  should be lashed and the one that swears Hadhrat Ayesha  $\rho$  should be killed. When Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  was asked, "Why is this?" He replied, "Because he has slandered Hadhrat Ayesha  $\rho$  and has opposed the Qur'aan." Ibn Sha'baan narrated that the view of Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  is because Allaah j said: 'Allaah advises you against repeating the same (behaviour) ever again if you really are Mu'mineen (have Imaan).' (Surah Noor (Celestial Light), 17)

Abul Hasan Saqli narrates that Qaadhi Abu Bakr bin Tayyib said: "When Allaah j mentioned whatever the polytheists attributed to Him j in the Qur'aan, He mentioned His purity; "They (the Mushrikeen) say, 'Ar-Rahmaan has taken children (for Himself).' He is Pure (from needing children)! They (the angels whom they say are Allaah's

children) are but honourable slaves (of Allaah and one's children can obviously not be one's slaves).' (Surah Ambiyaa', 26) This is mentioned in most verses. Similarly, when the hypocrites accused Hadhrat Ayesha p, then Allaah i said, "When you (Muslims) heard about it, why did you not say, 'It is not appropriate for us to discuss this (because we have no idea about whether it is true or not). Allaah is Pure! (In fact,) This is an atrocious smear (which cannot be true because the characters of the people involved have always been pure!) " (Surah Noor (Celestial Light), 16) At this point, Allaah said that she is pure from evil and He attributed purity to Himself. From this, the truthfulness of the view of Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  is shown in his verdict that the person who accuses Hadhrat Ayesha p must be killed." The meaning of this is that Allaah i has taken the one that swore Hadhrat Ayesha p as the same as the one that **swore Him.** The one that swears Hadhrat Ayesha  $\rho$  is equal to the one that swears Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , and the one that swore Rasulullaah e, it is as though he has given difficulty to Allaah i and the punishment of the one that harmed Allaah is death, as we have explained before.

It is narrated that Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$  took a promise to cut the tongue of Ubaydullaah bin Umar because he spoke ill of Hadhrat Miqdaad bin Aswad  $\tau$ . He was spoken to, so Hadhrat Umar  $\tau$  said, "Wait, cut his tongue so that after this no one will have the audacity to speak ill of the companions of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ ."

Abu Dhar Harawi narrates that once a Bedouin was presented to Hadhrat Umar bin Khattaab  $\tau$ . He mocked the Ansaar, so Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  said, "If he was not a Sahabi, I would have taken revenge on your behalf."

#### The Fatwa of Imam Maalik $\alpha$

Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  said that he who speaks ill of a Sahabi should not get a share in the spoils because Allaah j said that the spoils should be given to three people:

'(A share of the booty received without a fight is also reserved) For the poor Muhaajireen who were removed from their homes and their possessions. They seek Allaah's grace (bounty) and pleasure and assist Allaah and His Rasool (ε). These are the ones who are true (in their claim to Imaan).'

(Surah Hashar (The Exile), 8)

'(Part of this booty is also for) Those (the Ansaar) who adopted the place (Madinah) as their home before them (before the Muhaajireen) and (had adopted) Imaan. They (the Ansaar) love those who migrate to them (the Muhaajireen) and find no want (jealousy or envy) in their hearts for what they (the Muhaajireen) are given. They (the Ansaar) prefer (others) above themselves (they prefer to give to others) even though they are themselves in need (of things they give). (Like the Ansaar), Those who are saved (protected) from the miserliness (and greed) of the soul are really the successful ones (who will attain salvation).'

(Surah Hashar (The Exile), 9)

'Those who come after them (after the Muhaajireen and Ansaar ought to) say, "O our Rabb! Forgive us and our brothers (the Sahabah ψ) who passed before us with Imaan. And do not place any impurity (ill will) in our hearts against those who have Imaan. O our Rabb! Indeed you are the Most Forgiving, Most Merciful.' (Surah Hashar (The Exile), 10)

The book of Ibn Sha'baan says: "According to some of our scholars, whoever says that any of them were children of adulterers, whereas their mothers were believers, the punishment will be executed upon such a person. The person will be punished and what he said will not apply to the mother of the person because the Sahabah have more virtue over others.

### Rasulullaah $\epsilon$ said, 'Whoever swears my Sahabah, whip him.'

Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  said, 'Whoever accuses his mother, whereas she is a disbeliever, then he will punished for false accusation because he swore a Sahabi in this way.'

Therefore, if any of the children of the Sahabi are alive, then he will request that the punishment be executed and if none are alive, then whoever is in charge of the affairs of the Muslims will execute the punishment and the Imam must fulfil this. This is because the Sahabah have a special status on account of having the companionship of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ . If the ruler sees that a person is swearing a Sahabi or his mother, or testimony is established against a person, then it is the duty of the ruler to execute the (appropriate) punishment on him."

Ibn Sha'baan said that there are two views of the scholars regarding the person that swears any other spouse of Rasulullaah  $\varepsilon$  besides Hadhrat Ayesha  $\rho$ :

1. One view is that he should be killed. Because if a person swears a spouse (other than Hadhrat Ayesha  $\rho$ ) of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , then he has actually sworn Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ .

2. The other view is that the punishment for accusation that is meted out for one who insults the Sahabah ψwill be meted out on him.

After narrating these views, Ibn Sha'baan says that he accepts the first view. Imam Maalik  $\alpha$  narrates that if a person swears someone who is linked to the household of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , then he should be beaten severely. This must be made famous and he should be imprisoned until he repents. This is because this person is making an effort to hurt the feelings of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and it is therefore necessary to punish him.

### The Fatwa of Hadhrat Abu Bakr $\tau$ , Hadhrat Ayesha $\rho$ of insolence is worthy of being left aside

Faqih Abul Mutarrif Sha'bi was asked about the person who refused to take an oath at night regarding a woman, i.e. he refused in front of the judge, and he said, 'Even if it was the daughter of Abu Bakr  $\tau$ , she would not have been told to take an oath at night, but an oath would be given in the day.' Some jurists have said that this view (mentioned previously) is correct. However, Abul Mutarrif said that the person in question had said something regarding the daughter of Hadhrat Abu Bakr  $\tau$  for which he should be severely beaten and he should be kept in prison for a long time. Whichever jurist said that this view is correct, it is more appropriate that he be called a sinner rather than a jurist. It should be made famous and he should be admonished. In fact, fatwa should not be taken from such a person in future, and his testimony should not be accepted. Such a person has enmity for Allaah.

Regarding such a person who says, 'Even if Abu Bakr  $\tau$  gives testimony against me.' (Then his testimony will not be accepted), Abu Imraan said, 'If he means by this statement

that the testimony of one person will not be accepted in court (for there must be two male witnesses, not only one), then no problem. However, if he intends something else, i.e. ridicule, then he should be beaten so severely until he is close to death.' The scholars have transmitted this view.

#### Conclusion

Qaadhi Abul Fadhl says, "Whatever we have written, this is the last statement. Now, all praise is due to Allaah, the subject matter is complete. The condition we laid down has been fulfilled. I have hope that this book is sufficient for all those that I intended. In every chapter there is a path according to need. Indeed I have explained strange and unique points.

I have drunk from every valley in the research of this work and I have discussed in this work such things that were not discussed in books of before. I have divided it into sections. I wanted to find such an author that discussed these subjects before me, or someone who was famous so that I could take benefit, or hear from him so that I can narrate it. However, I only attest to the favour of Allaah in this matter and I make du'aa' that may He accept this work for His pleasure and may He forgive any shortcomings in it. This is because whatever we have mentioned in this book is out of honour for Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$  and the revelation that came upon him  $\epsilon$ .

My eyes remained awake and I remained constantly engaged in search of the virtues of the guide so that I could show the characteristics and perfections of Rasulullaah ε. May Allaah protect our bodies from the fire of Jahannam because we have supported His honour. I make du'aa' to Allaah that may He include me among those that will not be pushed away from the pond of Kauthar on the day of Qiyaamah, may Allaah j make this work a means (wasilah) for me and every person who wrote or made means to spread this work, or for those who learnt it, so that we can adopt the straight path to our destination.

'On the day when every person will find whatever he did from goodness and whatever evil he did. He will hope that if only, there was a great distance between him and evil. Allaah warns you regarding Himself and Allaah is beneficent upon His servants.'

I make du'aa' to Allaah that He may make this book a provision for the day when every person will need his deeds, may Allaah make us special in the group of Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ , may He include us in the first group on the day of Qiyaamah that will acquire Rasulullaah  $\epsilon$ 's intercession, and may He include us among those that will enter from the door on the right.

We praise Him for guiding us in compiling this work. He granted us understanding of whatever realities we have written. He opened our inner eyes and granted us the ability to understand these realities.

We seek protection from a du'aa' that is not heard, from knowledge that is not beneficial and from deeds that do not take us up (that we have to account for). He is Generous; no questioner returns empty handed from him. Whoever He disgraces, none can help. He does not refuse the du'aa' of the seekers and He does not correct the deeds of the corrupt. Allaah is sufficient for us and He is the best representative and may peace and salutations be upon our guide Muhammad  $\epsilon$ , and upon his family and companions, in great abundance.

All praise is due to Allaah, today we have completed the translation of Ash Shifaa bi Ta'reef Huqooq al Mustafa. Qaadhi Iyaadh  $\alpha$  has made du'aa' at the end of his book. May Allaah include us in it. Aameen.

May Allaah accept this translation and make it general. May He include in His Mercy all those who helped, all those who made an effort in bringing me to where I am, and all those who taught me a single letter, to read and to write. May Allaah grant His special Mercy upon the author, translator, publisher, and all those who helped in spreading it, Aameen.

Translation edited by A.H.Elias (Mufti) May Allaah be with him 1435/2014