



A Gift of Precious Gems

For The Students of Imām Bukhārī's Ṣaḥīḥ

An Introduction to Ṣaḥīḥ Al-Bukhārī

With Supplementary Notes from *Hadāyad Darārī fī Durūsīl Bukhārī*: The Lectures of
Hazrat Mawlānā Fazlur Rahman Sahib Azmi (May Allāh preserve him)

Shaykhul Ḥadīth

Hazrat Mawlānā Fazlur Rahman Sahib Azmi

Azaadville South Africa

(May Allāh preserve him)

This introduction consists of important and very beneficial information with regards to Imām Bukhārī and his Jāmi' Ṣaḥīḥ which has been compiled from various reliable and authentic books.

The tarājim abwāb (chapter titles) of Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī, its chains of transmission, along with important knowledgeable discussions with regards to the common commentaries of Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī, have been discussed fruitfully in a most beautiful manner.

There is hope that by studying it, the students of Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī receive insight and they gain the understanding of the high status of Jāmi' Ṣaḥīḥ.

Darul Iman Institute Barbados

Book Title:

A Gift of Precious Gems For the Students of Imām Bukhārī's Ṣaḥīḥ

Compiled by:

Shaykhul Hadith Hazrat Mawlana Fazlur Rahman Sahib Azmi (May Allāh preserve him)

Translated by:

Students of Baitul Ilm wal Amal

Markaz Da‘watul Haq Barbados

Supervised by:

Darul Iman Institute

Barbados

Darulimaninstitute@hotmail.com

baitulhikmah79@gmail.com

First Edition: *Jumādal-’Ūlā* 1444/December 2022

Distributed by:

Darul Iman Institute

Flint Hall House

Flint Hall, St. Michael, Barbados

All rights reserved. Aside from fair use, meaning a few pages or less for non-profit educational purposes, review, or scholarly citation, no part of this publication may be reproduced, stored in a retrieval system, or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic, mechanical, photocopying, recording or otherwise, without the prior permission of the copyright owner.

If you see any mistakes in this book, or if you have any comments or suggestions, please feel free to contact us. *Jazākallāhu Khairā.*

Available at:

Darul Iman (Da‘watul Haq)
Flint Hall House, Flint Hall, St. Michael
Bridgetown, Barbados

Tel: (+1246) 8204437

Email: Darulimaninstitute@hotmail.com

Idarah Ihyaa us Sunnah

9362 Azaadville 1750 South Africa

Tel. Fax +27 11 413 2661

Tel: +413 2414

Ihyaa us Sunnah (Bolton, UK)

IUS, 140 Blackburn Road

BOLTON BL 1 8DR. Greater Manchester

Tel: +44120 438 8864

Cell: +44 783 323 0540

Email: ihyaa_us_sunnah@rocketmail.com

TRANSLITERATION KEY

ء	' (a slight catch in breath)	ط	ṭ
ا	ā (elongated sound)	ظ	ẓ (heavy dh, with full mouth)
ب	b	ع	‘, ‘a, ‘i, ‘u (like two a’s, e’s or o’s from deep throat)
ت	t	غ	gh (like French r, with full mouth)

ث	th (as in thin)	ف	f
ج	j	ق	q (a guttural q, with full mouth)
ح	ḥ (tensely breathed h)	ك	k
خ	kh (ch in Scottish loch, with full mouth)	ل	l
		م	m
د	d	ن	n
ذ	dh (the soft th in the)	و	w
ر	r	وُ مدية	ū
ز	z	ه	h
س	s	ي متحركة	y
ش	sh	ي مدية	ī
ص	ṣ (heavy s, with full mouth)	ياء لينة	y
		فتحة	a
ض	ḍ (heavy d, with full mouth)	ضمة	u
		كسرة	i

d

A Warm Welcome to the Guests of Nabī n

أَهْلًا وَسَهْلًا بِاللَّذِينَ أَوْدُهُمْ * وَأَجِبُهُمْ فِي اللَّهِ ذِي الْأَلَاءِ

A warm welcome to those whom I love and cherish for the sake of Allāh, the Most Bountiful.

أَهْلًا بِقَوْمٍ صَالِحِينَ دَوَى ثَقَى * عُرَّ الْوُجُوهُ وَرَبَّنِ كُلَّ مَلَأَ

Welcome to the pious, god-fearing group whose faces shine radiantly-the adornment of every gathering.

يَسْعُونَ فِي طَلَبِ الْحَدِيثِ بَعْفَةً * وَتَوَقَّرَ وَسَكِينَةٍ وَحِيَاءَ

Those who are striving in the pursuit of ḥadīth, with chastity, dignity, tranquility and modesty.

لَهُمُ الْمَهَابَةُ وَالْجَلَالَةُ وَالنُّهَى * وَفَضَائِلُ جَلَّتْ عَنِ الْإِحْصَاءِ

Awe-inspiring, honourable and intelligent; for them are virtues innumerable.

وَمَدَادُ مَا تَجْرِي بِهِ أَقْلَامُهُمْ * أَرْكَى وَأَفْضَلُ مِنْ دَمِ الشُّهَدَاءِ

The ink flowing from their pens is purer and superior to the blood spilling from martyrs.

يَا طَالِبِي عِلْمِ النَّبِيِّ مُحَمَّدٍ * مَا أَنْتُمْ وَسِوَاكُمْ بِسِوَاءِ

O seekers of the knowledge of the Prophet Muḥammad (ﷺ), others cannot be compared to you.

Abū Bakr Ibn Durayd Al-ʿAzdī

ENDORSEMENT BY

دامت برکاتہم¹ Hazrat Mawlānā Fazlur Rahman Şāhib Azmi

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

نحمده ونصلی علی رسولہ الکریم، أما بعد.

For quite a long time, there was a need for “*Hadiyyatud Darārī liṭālibī Şaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī (Muqaddamah Şaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī)*” to be rendered in English so that those who do not know Urdu can also gain the opportunity to benefit from it. *Alḥamdulillāh*, it has been translated under the supervision of *Muftī Ahmed Saeed şāhib سلمه* from Barbados. A few other ‘*ulāmā*’ have also reviewed it. Additionally, *Muftī Muhammad ibn Ismā’īl Bhikha سلمه* has documented supplementary notes which I delivered during *dars* and included them in volume one of “*Hadāyad Darārī fī durūs Şaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*”. These documented lectures of Bukhārī have also been published [in Urdu]. These [supplementary notes] have also been translated into English and referenced as ‘*Ifādātush Shaykh*’.

May Allāh ۱ accept the services of these individuals and may He make it a means of guidance, salvation and forgiveness for me. *Āmīn*. This English translation of “*Hadiyyatud Darārī*” is ready to be published. May Allāh ۱ reward the well-wishers and all those who assisted with goodness and May He grant this book acceptance. *Āmīn*.

Fazlur Rahman Azmi

Azaadville

27 Jūmadal-’Ūlā 1444

22 December 2022

¹ This is a translation of Hazrat’s حفظه الله endorsement of ‘A Gift of Precious Gems’ originally written in Urdu.



k

FOREWORD

إن الحمد لله، نحمده ونستعينه ونستغفره، ونعوذ بالله من شرور أنفسنا ومن سيئات أعمالنا، من يهده الله فلا مضل له، ومن يضلل فلا هادي له، وأشهد أن لا إله إلا الله وحده لا شريك له وأشهد أن محمد عبده ورسوله. أما بعد:

Alḥamdulillāh, under the *tawwajjuh* of *Ḥazrat Mawlānā* Fazlur Rahman Azmi *ṣāḥib* دامت برکاتہم، we commenced the honourable task of translating *Ḥazrat's* beautiful *kitāb*, '*Hadiyyatud Darārī*', from Urdu into English.

During the translating and editing process, it became very apparent, how much of a precious gem this *kitāb* indeed is, how in-depth its words are and the vast benefit a reader can acquire from it. *Ḥazrat Mawlānā* Fazlur Rahman *ṣāḥib's* دامت برکاتہم insightfulness, his dedication and effort shine brightly throughout each page of the compilation.

Any student of *Ḥazrat Mawlānā* Fazlur Rahman *ṣāḥib* دامت برکاتہم can attest to how dear this *kitāb* and its notes are to *Ḥazrat* and the enthusiasm with which *Ḥazrat* would teach the class!

Alḥamdulillāh thumma alḥamdulillāh, as the editing process progressed, we were fortunate to acquire the valuable supplementary notes of *Ḥazrat Mawlānā* Fazlur Rahman *ṣāḥib* via my cousin, *Muftī* Muhammad Bhikha who is currently compiling *Ḥazrat's* *durūs* of *Ṣāḥiḥ Bukhārī*, titled '*Hadāyad Darārī fī Durūsil Ṣāḥiḥ Al-Bukhārī*'. May Allāh ۱ accept his efforts and grant him the ability to complete the compilation. *Āmīn*.

These are supplementary notes which *Ḥazrat Mawlānā* would expand on whilst teaching the *kitāb*, '*Hadiyyatud Darārī*'. *Alḥamdulillāh*, they were added to this English translation, thereby allowing the *kitāb* to be of greater benefit to the reader *insha'Allāh*.

Note: These supplementary notes which have been documented from the *durūs* of Ḥazrat حفظه الله have been included in a different colour and have been referenced in this English translation as ‘*Ifādātush Shaykh*’. The written footnotes of Ḥazrat حفظه الله are printed in black and have been referenced with ‘*Fazl*’ or ‘*Fazlur Rahman*’ just as Ḥazrat حفظه الله has referred to it in the original Urdu.

We supplicate to Allāh ۱, that through this *kitāb*, readers will *inshā’Allāh* be granted understanding of the depth and characteristics of the great *kitāb*, ‘*Ṣaḥīḥ Al-Bukhārī*’.

A special acknowledgement to the *Ṭālibāt* of Dārul Imān’s, Baitul ‘Ilm wal ‘Amal, who, with their endless effort and dedication, were instrumental in bringing this *kitāb* to fruition and also to my classmate, *Muftī* Abdullah Moolla, who reviewed and assisted with the editing process.

May Allāh ۱ abundantly reward them and all who were involved in the production of this translation and grant us all *maghfirah* through the *barakah* of this *kitāb*.

May Allāh ۱ forgive our families and, through this *kitāb*, allow our names to be included amongst the legacy of those *muḥaddithūn* who preserve and safeguard the *aḥādīth* of our beloved Nabī n. آمين ثم آمين

Ahmed Saeed Adam

Darul Iman Institute,
Barbados

13th *Jumādal-’Ūlā* 1444

Friday, 8th December 2022

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	TOPIC	Pg.
1	Blessed Words and Marginalia: Ḥazrat Mawlānā Muḥammad ‘Abdur Rashīd Nu‘mān v- Karāchī	1
2	Endorsement by Mawlānā ‘Abdul Ḥaq Ṣāḥib A‘ẓmī v - Shaykh-ul- Ḥadīth of Dārul ‘Ulūm Deoband	3
3	Endorsement by Mawlānā Ni‘matullāh Ṣāḥib Ma‘rūfī A‘ẓmī مدظلہ - Deoband	5
4	Endorsement by Ḥazrat Muftī Nizāmuddīn Ṣāḥib Shāmizī v - Binori Town Karāchī	8
5	Endorsement by Ḥazrat Doctor ‘Alī Aṣghar v -Islāmabād	10
6	Author’s Note	12
7	The Life of Imām Bukhārī v (Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl)	15
8	Name and Lineage	15
9	Pronunciation of بردازيه: An opinion of a Russian Scholar	15
10	Imām Bukhārī’s v Father Ismā‘īl and Ḥammād ibn Zayd	17
11	Ismā‘īl v and Abū Ḥafṣ Kabīr Ḥanafī v	21
12	Birth and Early Life	25
13	Karāmah (The Miracle) of Regaining Vision After Becoming Blind	26
14	Seeking Knowledge	26
15	Travels for Knowledge	30
16	Ḥajj Journey	30
17	Cities He Travelled to	32
18	The Beginning of Authoring & Compiling Books	35
19	Imām Bukhārī’s v Teachers	35
20	The Five Categories of Imām Bukhārī’s v Shuyūkh (Teachers)	39
21	Imām Bukhārī’s: اربع في اربع (Four in Four) [An Interesting Story]	42
22	Imām Bukhārī’s v Mashāyikh (Teachers) mentioned in Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī	46
23	His Unparalleled Memory [Stories]	47
24	Various stories Regarding his Character and Qualities	53
25	Tarāwīḥ and Tahajjud	60
26	The Grief Experienced on the Death of Imām Dārimī v and the Poems Recited	62

27	Praises from the People of Knowledge	64
28	Some Statements of Contemporaries and His Students	70
29	Glad tidings of Following the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ	73
30	The Students and Disciples of Imām Bukhārī v	74
31	Narrators of Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī (Fīrabī etc.)	75
32	Imām Bukhārī's v School of Thought	81
33	Many of Imām Bukhārī's v Teachers were Ḥanafī	83
34	Mention of 'Abdullāh ibn Mubārak v	83
35	Thulāthiyyāt	84,144
36	Our Opinion Regarding Imām Bukhārī's v School of Thought	89
37	Supplement- The schools of Thought of the Five Authors (Muslim, Tirmidhī, Abū Dāwūd, Nasā'ī, Ibn Mājah رحمه الله)	90
38	Imām Bukhārī v and The Aḥnāf	97
39	The narrations of Ḥumaydī, Nu'aym ibn Ḥammād, Ismā'īl ibn 'Ar'arah, and their Answers	98
40	The Opinion of Imām Bukhārī v Regarding Imām Abū Ḥanīfah v	108
41	The Statements of the Scholars Regarding the Reliability of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah v	110
42	The Reality of the Accusation of Irjā'	113
43	Yūsuf ibn Khālīd Simtī, (and) Asad ibn 'Amr	114
44	The Accusation of Imām Bukhārī v in his book "Khayr ul Kalām" towards Imām Abū Ḥanīfah v	115
45	Why did Bukhārī v Not Narrate from Imām 'Aẓam v and Imām Shāfi'ī v?	116
46	The Trials of Imām Bukhārī v and the Incident of his Death	118
47	Leaving Nayshāpur	122
48	Return to Bukhārā and Differences With The Leader of Bukhārā	123
49	His stay in Khartang and His Demise	124
50	The Emitting of Fragrance from his Grave	126
51	The Date of his Death and Two Couplets	127
52	A Lesson	128
53	The Details of His Trials (His Departure from Bukhārā Four Times)	129
54	Books authored by Imām Bukhārī v	133
55	Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī and its Specialties	140
56	Where was Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī Written and the Great Regard with which it was Written	142

57	Reading Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī When In Difficulty	143
58	The Thulāthiyyāt of Bukhārī	144,84
59	The Thulāthiyyāt of Ibn Mājah, Tirmidhī and Abū Dāwūd	144
60	The Thulāthiyyāt, Thunāʿiyyāt Wahdāniyyāt of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah √	145
61	The Definition of Jāmiʿ and the Difference of Opinion Regarding this Definition	147
62	The Motivation Behind the Compilation of Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī	149
63	The Compilations Before Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī	149
64	The Objective of Compiling Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī	155
65	The Different Forms of the Tarājim Abwāb [Chapter Titles]	158
66	The Objectives of the Five Imāms	159
67	The Conditions of Imām Bukhārī √ in Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī and the Authenticity of Bukhārī	162
68	Kawtharī's Review on the Statements of Maqdisī and Ḥāzmi	163
69	Ḥākim's Claim Regarding the Conditions of Ṣaḥīḥayn and Refuting Ḥākim	166
70	A Summary of Maqdisī and Ḥāzmi's Refutation	167
71	The Explanation of Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar √ and its Weakness	170
72	Details of Imām Bukhārī's √ Conditions	171
73	The Five Categories of Narrators	172
74	The Explanation of Mudallisīn	176
75	Examples of Inqīṭaʿ and Iqṭirāb in Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī	178
76	An Important Question and Answer	180
77	Some Important Notes	182
78	The Beneficial Conclusion of Ibn Humām	184
79	Mawlānā Ẓafar Aḥmad 'Uthmānī's Discourse & the Summary of The Discussion	187
80	Awhām (Mistakes) in Bukhārī	188
81	The Valuable Insight of the Author of "Anwārul Bārī"	188
82	Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī: The Most Authentic Book	189
83	A Further Discussion on the Statement of Abū 'Alī Nayshāpūrī	192
84	Ṣan'ānī's Refutation & A Note of Caution	195
85	Who Are 'Some of the Maghāribah'?	197
86	Criticism of Dārquṭnī's Statement	199
87	The Details of Bukhārī's Superiority over Muslim	200
88	The Condition of Ittiṣāl in a Mu'an'an Narration	204
89	The Difference of Opinion Between Imām Bukhārī √ and Imām Muslim √	204

90	Imām Muslim’s Objection (The Objection of Imām Muslim Is Correct)	207
91	Muwatṭā’ Imām Mālik and Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī	211
92	Mawlānā Nu‘mānī’sv Analysis on Ḥāfiẓ’s Research	212
93	Important Note	215
94	Why is There Repetition in Bukhārī?	216
95	Why Is There Taqtī’ in Bukhārī?	219
96	The Number of Aḥādīth in Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī	220
97	Ibn Ṣalāh’s and Nawawī’s Statement and Ibn Ḥajar’s Research	221
98	Differences of Opinion	224
99	Kutub and Abwāb (Books and Chapters)	226
100	Are the Aḥādīth of Ṣaḥīḥayn Mufid Yaqīn [Do They Give the Benefit of Definite Knowledge]?	228
101	The Answer to Ibn Ṣalāh’s Evidence	233
102	Manifestation of Truth	239
103	Statements of Ibn Taymiyyah v and ‘Allāmah Anwar Shāh Kashmīrī v	241
104	The Narrations of Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī Which have been Criticised	246
105	Concise Answer	247
106	Detailed Answer	248
107	The Mutakallam Fih Narrators in Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī	252
108	The Ta’līqāt of Bukhārī	258
109	Examples of Ṣaḥīḥ, Ḥasan and Ḍa’īf	261
110	The Total Number of Ta’līqāt and Mawqūf Narrations	263
111	The Coherence of Arrangement of the Chapters in Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī	265
112	Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī’s Tarājim (Chapter Titles)	279
113	Books Written on the Tarājim of Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī	286
114	Fifteen Principles of Ḥazrat Shaykh-ul-Hind v	289
115	The Commentaries of Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī	310
116	The Author’s Sanad of Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī	358
117	Biographies of the Illustrious Mashāyikh of Ḥadīth Found in our Sanad	367
118	Mawlānā ‘Abdul Laṭīf Nu‘mānī A’ẓmī v	368
119	Muḥaddith Kabīr ‘Allāmah Mawlānā Ḥabīb-ur-Raḥmān Ṣāḥib A’ẓmī v	374
120	Mawlānā Karīm Bakhsh Sanbhalī v	391
121	Shaykh-ul-Hind Mawlānā Maḥmūd Ḥasan Deobandī v	394

122	Ḥujjat-ul-Islām Mauānā Muḥammad Qāsim Nanotwī √	398
123	Imām Rabbānī Mawlānā Rashīd Aḥmad Gangohī √	402
124	Shāh ‘Abdul Ghanī Mujaddidi Dehlawī Muhājir Madanī √	407
125	Musnidul Hind Shāh Muḥammad Ishāq Dehlawī Makkī √	410
126	Shāh ‘Abdul ‘Azīz Muḥaddith Dehlawī √	413
127	Shāh Walīullāh Muḥaddith Dehlawī √	418
128	Shaykh Abū Ṭāhir Kurdī Madanī √	425
129	Shaykh Ibrāhīm ibn Ḥasan Kurdi Kūrānī Madanī √	428
130	Shaykh Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad Qushāshā Mālikī Madanī √	431
131	Shaykh Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī Shināwī Miṣrī Then Madanī √	434
132	Shaykh Shamsuddīn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmed Ramli Manūfi Miṣrī Shāfi‘ī √	436
133	Shaykhul Islām Zayn-ud- Dīn Zakariyyā Anṣārī Shāfi‘ī √	439
134	Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar ‘Asqalānī √	442
135	Shaykh Zayn-ud-Dīn Ibrāhīm Tanūkhī Abū Ishāq √	445
136	Shaykh Aḥmad Al-Ḥajjār Abul ‘Abbās Shihābud-Dīn Ibn Shaḥnah √	446
137	Shaykh Sirāj-ud-Dīn Ḥusayn ibn Mubārak Zabīdī Ḥanafī √	448
138	Shaykh ‘Abul Waqt ‘Abd-ul-Awwal Sijzī Harawī √	450
139	Shaykh ‘Abdur Raḥmān Al-Bawshanjī Ad-Dāwūdī √	452
140	Shaykh ‘Abdullāh ibn Aḥmed Sarakhsī √	454
141	Shaykh Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf Firabrī Shāfi‘ī √	455
142	The Ḥanafī Narrators Found in Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī	457
143	The Birth and Death Dates of The Famous A‘immah and ‘Ulamā’ Kirām	471
144	The Birth and Death Years of the Famous ‘Ulamā’ of Deoband	480
145	Sources and References	484
146	A Brief Biography of the Compiler of This Book	488

بسم الله الرَّحْمَن الرَّحِيم

DEDICATION

Dedicated to:

All of my noble teachers

Especially

Muḥaddith Kabīr Mawlānā Ḥabīb-ur-Raḥmān A‘ẓmī Amīr-ul-Hind

Shaykh-ul-Ḥadīth Ḥazrat Mawlānā ‘Abdul Laṭīf Nu‘mānī A‘ẓmī

My Honourable father, Shaykh-ul-Ḥadīth Ḥazrat Muftī Qārī Ḥafīẓ -ur-Raḥmān A‘ẓmī

نور الله مرفدهم

May Allāh ﷻ enlighten their graves with light.

Blessed Words and Marginalia

The Researcher and Muḥaddith of The Time

Ḥazrat Mawlānā Muḥammad ‘Abdur Rashīd Nu‘mānī, Karāchī¹ ▼

Saturday 13 *Ṣafār*, 1412 A.H.

Respected *Mawlānā* Fazlur Rahman Azmi ṣāḥib

وقفني الله واياكم لما يحب ويرضي.

May Allāh ۱ inspire you and I to that which He loves and is pleased with.

و عليكم السلام ورحمة الله وبركاته. الحمد لله علي العافية.

Your respected letter dated 21 *Muḥarram*, 1412 A.H. has been received. I also received the *muqaddamah* (introduction) of *Sunan Tirmidhī* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. During those days, quarterly examinations were taking place. Therefore, I personally reviewed both introductions. You have mentioned and referenced all the sources used. I reviewed it in haste. I highlighted those things which I found to be incorrect. I reviewed the introduction of *Sunan Tirmidhī* in one sitting and completed the introduction of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* in two sittings.

Whatever has been mentioned until now regarding the discussions of the terms *ḥasan*, *ṣaḥīḥ* and *gharīb* in *Tirmidhī*, I do not understand them as nothing more than the technical terminologies and definitions explained by the teachers. Its true meaning can only be established when all the chains of these narrations are collected and a decision is made just as Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar ▼ exerted his efforts regarding the chains of *Bukhārī*. Otherwise, all other explanations are merely assumptions. For this reason, there are many explanations and comments regarding

¹ Birth: 18 *Dhul Qa‘dah*, 1333 A.H. Death: 29 *Rabī‘uth Thānī*, 1419 A.H. (See: “*Al Kalāmul Muftī fī Taḥrīr il Asānīd*” pages 90-152)

this from many different scholars. Varying opinions can be found regarding this discussion.

Whatever I have written, I have written it in the margins of the introductions which you have sent and in the introduction of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*, I wrote it where there were blank spaces in the actual text...²

² The entire letter is very beneficial. It is mentioned in the biography of *Mawlānā Fazlur Rahman* مدظلہ

Most of the annotations have been included in both books. (‘*Aṭṭā*)

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

ENDORSEMENT

Ḥazrat Mawlānā ‘Abdul Ḥaq Ṣāḥib A‘ẓmī v¹

Shaykh-ul-Ḥadīth of Dārul ‘Ulūm Deoband, India

نَحْمَدُهُ وَنُصَلِّي عَلَى رَسُولِهِ الْكَرِيمِ، أَمَا بَعْدُ.

“Ḥadiyyatud Darārī for the students of the Ṣāḥib of Imām Bukhārī” is a book compiled by Ḥazrat Mawlānā Fazlur Rahman Azmi ṣāḥib, the *Shaykh-ul-Ḥadīth* of Madrasah Arabia Islamia, Azaadville, South Africa. This lowly one has also reviewed a few sections from it.

This praiseworthy scholar has written a thorough discussion on the *isnād* (chains of narrations). Likewise, he has also written a fundamental discussion on the *tarājim abwāb* (chapter titles). There are also other knowledgeable discussions which are lines of guidance for both, teachers and students of *Ṣāḥib Bukhārī*. This book is equally beneficial for students and the teachers. This book is a masterpiece of Ḥazrat Mawlānā’s knowledge of *Ḥadīth*.

The aforementioned *Mawlānā* has also authored many other books, which have gained much acceptance amongst the people of knowledge. There is hope and faith in Allāh ۱ that *inshā‘Allāh* this beautiful book will also be received with acceptance.

¹ Birth: 17th December 1938 C.E. (Approximately 1347 A.H.). Death: 30th *Rabī‘-ul-Awwal* 1438 A.H. [30th December 2016 C.E.]. Age: 91 years. He taught *Ṣāḥib Bukhārī* for approximately sixty-five (65) years- sixteen (16) years) in Mutla‘ Al ‘Awm Bināras, fourteen (14) years in Mau and thirty-four (34) years in Deoband. [See the monthly magazine of Dārul ‘Ulūm Deoband *Rabī‘-ul-Awwal* and *Jumād-al-Awwal* 1438 A.H. edition for details.]

This foreword was written upon this humble servant’s request. He wrote it very briefly due to the rush for it to be printed. He said: If there was no rush for it to be printed, I would have written a more informative and impressive one with more details. (May Allāh reward him in both the worlds.) (Atiqur Rahman Azmi)

This lowly one also prays that Allāh ﷻ favours this book with acceptance and keeps *Ḥazrat Mawlānā* in the best of health and continually bless him with opportunities to be part of other knowledgeable and religious services. *Āmīn*.

آمِن آمِن لَا أَقُولُ بِوَاحِدَةٍ حَتَّى أَضُمَّ إِلَيْهَا أَلْفَ آمِنَا

Lowly and humble servant,
 ‘Abdul Ḥaqq (May Allāh forgive him)
 Servant of Dārul ‘Ulūm Deoband
 16^h *Rajab*, 1418 A.H.

ENDORSEMENT

دامت برکاتہم
 Hazrat Mawlānā Ni‘matullāh Ṣāhib

Teacher of Ḥadīth and Head of Takhaṣṣuṣ fil Ḥadīth Department

in Dārul ‘Ulūm Deoband (Birth:1366 A.H.)

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

الحمد لله وكفى وسلام على عباده الذين اصطفى. اما بعد.

It is a common custom in the religious schools of India, Pakistan and Bangladesh that at the time of commencing the teaching of a book on a particular subject, the teacher defines the subject, it's objective, purpose and the importance and need of the subject.

Along with the above, he mentions the rank of the book which is being taught amongst other books on this topic. Additionally, an introduction of the author, the author's rank in this subject and the history of the compilation of the book are all briefly explained. However, when the *fitnah* (corruption) of *inkār ḥadīth* (rejection and denial of Ḥadīth) began in India then subsequently, while starting the books of Ḥadīth and especially in the beginning of *Bukhārī*, it became a custom to include these matters with details.

When *Mawlānā* Fazlur Rahman Azmi *ṣāhib* Mawwi, went for the purpose of teaching to the Azaadville Madrassa, South Africa, he was given the responsibility to teach *Bukhārī*. So, he penned notes on those topics which are customarily explained in the beginning of the year. Thereafter, he combined them into a book so that benefit will be widely gained from it.

The early scholars did such productive research regarding every aspect of Ḥadīth that the generations thereafter could not add to it. This is clear from the text of Shāmī:

علم نَضِجَ ولا احتَرَقَ وهو علم النّحو والأصول، وعلم لا نضج ولا احترق وهو علم البيان والتفسير، وعلم نضج واحترق وهو علم الحديث. [Shāmī 1/37]

اب بعد میں آنے والے کا بڑا کارنامہ یہی ہے کہ زمانہ کے حالات، لوگوں کی ضرورت اور طلبہ کی صلاحیت و استعداد کی رعایت کرتے ہوئے اس ناپیدار کنار سمندر سے طرح طرح موتیوں کو چن چن کر ایک لڑی میں پرودے۔

Now, it will be a great achievement for those coming afterwards, according to the conditions of the time, the needs of the people and according to the capacity of the students, to select different types of pearls from this far and unseen corner of the ocean and string them together onto one string.

Mawlānā's firmness in knowledge and sincerity in ‘amal (practice) is proven by his following statement:

ہم متقدمین کے خوشہ چیں اور کاسہ لیس ہیں اور کاسہ گدائی لے کر ان حضرات کے خوان علم و حقیق کے گرد گھوم رہے ہیں۔

“We are mere collectors of the research done by our predecessors. With empty hands, we roam around the courts of knowledge and research of these *Hazrāt*.”

Mawlānā has arranged the important points very skillfully in a very orderly manner and has provided such information in this book, that reading this book alone will make one independent from reading others. Some discussions are such that it is difficult to find them in a single book. For instance, the discussion regarding whether the *aḥādīth* of *Sahīh Bukhārī* and *Ṣahīh Muslim* are *mufīd yaqīn* (give the benefit of conviction) or not? Under this heading, the proofs of both sides along with the research of the great scholars of Deoband رحمہم اللہ have been gathered in such a way that the respect of both parties and books is maintained in such a manner that the readers will be satisfied with the research of the elders of Deoband and all doubts and suspicions will be removed.

May Allāh ﷻ accept the book and make it beneficial for the people of knowledge, and a means of provision for the hereafter for the author. *Āmīn.*

Ni‘matullāh (May he be forgiven)

Servant of Dārul ‘Ulūm Deoband

4th *Rajab*, 1416 A.H.

ENDORSEMENT

Shahīdul Islām

Muftī Nizāmuddīn Şāhib Shāmizī ▽

Former Shaykhul Ḥadīth and Muftī, Jāmi ‘ah Binori Town Karāchī

(Death: 10 Rabi‘-uth-Thānī 1425 A.H./30 May 2002)

This humble servant, Muftī Nizāmuddīn Shāmizī has reviewed the book, “*Hadiyyatud Darārī: Introduction of Şaḥīḥ Bukhārī*”, compiled by the outstanding and exceptional student of *Mawlānā Ḥabībūr Raḥmān A‘zmī ▽*, Ḥazrat *Mawlānā* Fazlur Rahman Azmi *şāhib*.

Two years ago, this humble servant, travelled to South Africa. It was during this journey that this humble servant met *Ḥazrat Mawlānā* in Dārul ‘Ulūm Azaadville, wherein *Ḥazrat Mawlānā* is the respected *Shaykh-ul-Ḥadīth* and it was there this valuable gift was presented to me.

This humble servant read some portions of the book during his travel and some was read thereafter. The field of *Ḥadīth*, specifically the introduction of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* and introductory topics of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* are compiled in this book at much length, with great referenced research.

At this time, the book is printed in Pakistan, and *inshā'Allāh* the teachers and students here will also benefit greatly from its extensively researched topics.

At this time, this humble servant, due to his condition, is unable to write in much detail. Nevertheless, it is my hope that *inshā'Allāh* the beauty of this book will attain the praise of and approval from the people of knowledge themselves.

May Allāh ۱ grant this book acceptance in His esteemed court.

May He make it a means of benefit for his creation and grant the author success in this world and the hereafter.

May He grant those in Pakistan who made an effort in the printing (publishing) of this book a great (generous) reward. *Āmīn*.

Nizāmuddīn

Teacher at Jāmi'ah 'Ulūm Islāmiyyah

'Allāmah Binori Town Karachi, Pakistan

ENDORSEMENT

Doctor ‘Alī Aṣghar Chishtī ∇

Head of the Da‘wah Academy and Teacher of Ḥadīth in Fayṣal University, Islamabad

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ نَحْمَدُهُ وَنُصَلِّي عَلَى رَسُولِهِ الْكَرِيمِ، أَمَّا بَعْدُ :

Currently, from amongst the sources and references which are most fundamental and reliable from within the field of the science of *Ḥadīth*, the most authentic and reliable collected compilation is the *Jāmi‘ Ṣaḥīḥ* of Imām Bukhārī ∇.

From the time of its compilation until today, millions of people have benefitted greatly from this book. By the will of Allāh this book will continue to be a means of ongoing benefit until the Day of *Qiyāmah*.

The teachers of *aḥādīth* in religious institutions, would firstly give a detailed introduction of Imām Bukhārī ∇ and his book to their students during class. The objective of this introduction is to give some guidelines which would make the students aware of such important points which later, during the course of the lessons, would prove to be of great benefit.

For a long time, our Respected and Honourable *Mawlānā* Fazlur Rhman Azmi *ṣāḥib* is fulfilling the duty of being *the Shaykh-ul- Ḥadīth* in Madrasah Arabia, Azaadville, South Africa.

His book on the introduction of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* which he has named, “*Hadiyyatud Darārī-Muqaddamah Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*”, is equally beneficial for both students and teachers of *aḥādīth*, and it is filled with vast amounts of information.

The topics covered are very interesting and informative. It is as though *Mawlānā* Azmi has fully covered and studied the important sources of *Ḥadīth* during its compilation. According to their subject matters, he

has drawn together comprehensive and valuable statements for the students of *Ḥadīth*.

This humble one has studied this book and has found it very beneficial in every aspect. The *Shaykh-ul-Ḥadīth* of Dārul ‘Ulūm Deoband has reviewed this book. I do not consider myself worthy of even writing any type of foreword for such a book. It is on the request of Respected *Mawlānā Muftī Shamsuddīn ṣāhib* that I have penned these few lines. It is Respected *Muftī Ṣāhib’s* wish that this introduction also be published in Pakistan so that the students and teachers of *aḥādīth* here may also benefit tremendously from it. I pray to Allāh ۱, the Exalted, to bestow a great reward on *Shaykh-ul-Ḥadīth Ḥazrat Mawlānā Fazlur Rahman Azmi ṣāhib*, who has compiled this book and may He grant his knowledgeable and academic research vast acceptance.

‘Alī Aṣghar Chishtī

Teacher of Ḥadīth

Fayṣal University

Islamabad

AUTHOR'S NOTE

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

الحمد لله الذي بنعمته وتوفيقه يتحصّل العبادُ على الطاعات والصلوة والسلام على خير عبياده
وسيد انبياءه ورسله محمد النبي الأمي وعلى آله وأصحابه وأزواجه وذريّاته وأتباعه أجمعين
. أما بعد .

This book consists of important information regarding the life of Imām Bukhārī ∇ and his most famous book of its time, the most authentic book after the Book of Allāh, “*Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*” which was written for the purpose of teaching students during *dars* (class). There is also mention of other books written by Imām Bukhārī ∇. However, they are not part of the subject-matter of this book. It is for this reason they have not been discussed.

The primary source used is Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar Asqalānī's ∇ introduction of “*Fathul Bārī*,” “*Hadyus Sārī*.” Other sources which were fully utilised are “*Muqaddamah Qaṣṭalānī*” and *Shaykh* Muḥammad Zakariyyā's ∇ introduction of “*Lāmi‘ ad-Darārī*.”

Much has been written regarding *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. However, it is not the objective of this book to combine and include all that has been written in this regard. Conversely, the objective of this book is to mention the fundamental and important concepts so that one can obtain the knowledge concerning the author ∇ and the specialties of his book.

This book does not consist of any newly discovered information. An effort has been made to combine and compile the research which the researchers have done thus far in a particular, organised manner.

An effort has also been made to quote the entire reference of what has been mentioned. The Arabic text has not been included as almost all of the references are from Arabic sources. Thus, if all the Arabic references were quoted the book would have become double in size.

May Allāh ۱ accept the author and all those who served in assisting with this book.

ہم ان متقدمین کے کوشہ چیں اور کاسہ لیس ہیں ، کاسہ گدائی لے کر ان حضرات کے خوان علم و تحقیق کے ارد گرد گھوم رہے ہیں، علم نبوت کا کچھ حصہ نصیب ہو جائے توز بے قسمت۔

We are merely those who collect and gather the research done by these predecessors. With empty hands, we have roamed around the courts of knowledge and research of these *Ḥazrāt*- great, dignified and honourable personalities. How fortunate will we be if we were to receive a small portion of the knowledge of prophethood! وما ذلک علی اللہ بعزیز

Fazlur Rahman Azmi

Azaadville, South Africa

6th *Sha'bān* 1411 A.H

21st February 1990

The Life of Imām Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl Bukhārī ∇

Birth: 13th *Shawwāl* 194 A.H.

Death: Night of *‘Īd ul Fiṭr* 256 A.H.

Age: 62 years

Name and Lineage

His full name is: Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Al-Mughīrah ibn Bardizbah.

(بفتح الباء الموحدة وسكون الراء المهملة وكسر الدال المهملة وسكون الزاء المعجمة وفتح الباء الموحدة بعدها هاء.)

This pronunciation of بَرْدِزْبَه (Bar-diz-bah) is famous. There are also other opinions regarding this word بَرْدِزْبَه (Bardizbah).¹ According to the usage of the people of Bukhārā, the meaning of this word is farmer.

¹ *Mawlānā* Badr ‘Ālam Mīrthī ∇ quotes from a Russian scholar in the footnotes of “*Tarjumān us Sunnah*” (1/252) that it is pronounced as بَرْدَازِبَه (Bardāzbāh) and it means well-mannered and experienced. (*Faḍl* 12)

Note: Imām Bukhārī ∇ differs slightly with the *Aḥnāf*. For this reason, he refers to them with the words, ‘بعض الناس’ and thereafter makes an objection. Ju‘fī, the title given to Imām Bukhārī ∇, is in accordance with the *fiqh* of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇. It is for this reason we mentioned: “This is Imām Abū Hanīfah’s ∇ opinion. According to him, the person upon whose hands Islām was accepted, obtains the right of *walā’*.” (*Fayḍul Bārī*: 1/33) “*Fayḍul Bārī*” was compiled by *Hazrat* *Mawlānā* Badr ‘Ālam Mīrthī ∇ (later known as) Madnī and was written in Dabhel. He also wrote a marginalia on “*Fayḍul Bārī*” called “*Al-Badrus Sārī ‘Alā Fayḍul Bārī*”. He was present in the lessons of ‘Allāmah Kashmīrī ∇ for many years and also benefitted from the lectures of others. He compiled all of this and prepared this book. This is a book students should have. One should refer to “*Lāmi‘-ud-Darārī*” and “*Fayḍul Bārī*” if one wishes to see a summary of

Bardizbah was a Persian and he was a fire worshipper like his people. His son Mughīrah accepted Islam at the hands of Yamān Ju‘fī, the ruler of Bukhārā. Due to this connection of *walā’* (clientship), he was called Mughīrah Ju‘fī. Imām Bukhārī √ is also called Ju‘fī due to this same reason. [مولا هم الجعفي]

This is Imām Abū Hanīfah’s √ opinion. According to him, the person upon whose hands Islām was accepted, obtains the right of *walā’*?² (*Fayḍul Bārī* 1/32)

Mughīrah in Bukhārā

The great grandfather of Imām Bukhārī √, Mughīrah, came to Bukhārā after becoming a Muslim. We did not find his son, Ibrāhīm, being mentioned in the books. However, his son, i.e., Imām Bukhārī’s √ father Ismā‘īl, has been mentioned by Ibn Ḥibbān √ in “*Kitābuth Thiqāt*” under the fourth category of *muḥaddithīn* (scholars of *aḥādīth*). It is written that he has narrated from Ḥammād ibn Zayd √ and Imām Mālik √ and the people of ‘Irāq have narrated from him. (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 477)

Imām Bukhārī √ wrote in “*Tārikh Kabīr*” that his father³ heard from Imām Mālik √ and Ḥammād ibn Zayd √. His father also shook hands with ‘Abdullāh ibn Mubārak √. (*Hadyus Sārī* introduction of *Fatḥul Bārī* pg. 477)

the research of the ‘*ulamā’* of Deoband. (Students should also have “*Fatḥul Bārī*” and “*Umdatul Qārī*” from among the older commentaries.) [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

² This is referred to as *walā’ mawālāt*, i.e., when a person becomes a Muslim on the hands of a person, this person contracts a treaty of clientage with the revert that he will inherit from the revert when he dies and he will also pay on his behalf when he commits an offence. (See: *Al-Qudūrī*) [Translator]

³ From this it becomes known that Imām Bukhārī √ was introduced to knowledge through his father. No mention is made of those before him in any of the books. They were not *muḥaddithīn* nor were they scholars. Imām Bukhārī √ is a non-Arab. He is originally from Persia. However, he is the substantiation of this *Ḥadīth*:

In some manuscripts, instead of صَافَحَ (shook hands), صَجَبَ (in the company of) is written. (See pg. 478 in *Hadyus Sārī* published by Yūsufī in Deoband)

The words of Imām Bukhārī ∇ in “*Tārikh Kabīr*” (pg. 306-Hyderabad India) are:

”رَأَى حَمَّادُ بْنُ زَيْدٍ صَافَحَ ابْنَ الْمُبَارَكِ بِكِلْتَا يَدَيْهِ وَسَمِعَ مَالِكًا.“

The apparent meaning of which is that Ismā‘īl saw Ḥammād ibn Zayd greeting Ibn Mubārak with both of his hands and he heard *aḥādīth* from Imām Mālik ∇. It is not that Ismā‘īl greeted Ibn Mubārak⁴.

لَوْ كَانَ عِلْمٌ بِالْثَرَيَّا أَوْ لَوْ كَانَ الْإِيمَانُ بِالْثَرَيَّا لَنَالَهُ رَجُلٌ مِنْ أُنْبَاءِ قَارِسَ.

“If knowledge was on the Pleiades (star), or if faith was on the Pleiades, men from the sons of Persia would have attained it.” [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁴ Similar to the *muḥaddithīn*, we also shake hands with both of our hands. However, you will come across some people who refer to themselves as *Ahl al-Ḥadīth* (people of *Ḥadīth*), but they only shake with one hand. They are known by the title *Ahl al-Ḥadīth*, whereas we are the ones who act (on the *Ḥadīth*), and they simply hold the title. Imām Bukhārī ∇ mentioned the chapter: باب المصافحة باليدين “Chapter Regarding Shaking With Both Hands” in the second volume of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. In this chapter, he mentions the *Ḥadīth* of Ibn Mas‘ūd z when he was taught the *tashāhhud*. However, those who consider themselves as the *Ahl al-Ḥadīth* take the names of Imām Bukhārī ∇ and Imām Muslim ∇ very often, but when it comes to this matter, they will not shake with both hands. We will say to them: ‘You have shook hands with Imām Bukhārī ∇ with one hand only, not with both hands. Meaning you have taken Imām Bukhārī’s ∇ name for one or two *masā’il* (rulings), but you do not follow him in every *mas‘alah*. Their habit is to shake with one hand, i.e., joining one hand and leaving the other hand loose (half partridge, half quail). Regarding this subject, our teacher’s teacher *Ḥazrat Mawlānā ‘Abdul Ghaffār ṣāhib Naqshbandī*, a great student of *Ḥazrat Ghangohī* wrote a booklet titled: “*Targhīb al-Mutalāqiyīn bil Muṣāfaḥati bil Yadayn*.” A summary of it is found in “*Maqālāt-e- Aẓmī*”. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

However, Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar √ mentioned in his book “*Tahdhīb-ut-Tahdhīb*” in accordance with “*Tārīkh Kabīr*” (Imām Bukhārī’s √ book) that Ismā’īl narrated from Ḥammād ibn Zayd √ and Ibn Mubārak √.

ورأى حمّاد بن زيد صافح ابن المبارك بكتلي يديه -Meaning, he saw Ḥammād ibn Zayd greeting Ibn Mubārak.

He further writes: “: رأيت حمّاد بن زيد وجاءه ابن المبارك بمكة فصافحه بكتلي. قال ابي: “My father said: ‘I saw Ḥammād ibn Zayd greeting Ibn Mubārak with both hands when he came to him in Makkah.’”⁵ (See pg. 274-275 in *Tahdhīb-ut-Tahdhīb*)

In the *muqaddamah* (introduction) of “*Lāmi*”, after Ḥazrat Shaykh Zakariyyā √ mentioned the differences in Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar’s √ texts, he has written that perhaps this (difference in texts) maybe because of the differences present in the *nuskahs* (copies). (*Muqaddamah Lāmi* √ pg. 4)

At this instance, in the introduction of “*Anwārul Bārī*” there seems to be a deficiency in the translation.⁶ (And Allāh √ knows best.)

Imām Bukhārī √ mentioned Ḥammād ibn Zayd greeting Ibn Mubārak in vol. 2 on pg. 926 in *Kitābul Isti’dhān* (The Chapter Regarding Seeking Permission) in the sub-chapter of باب الاخذ باليدين (Chapter Regarding Holding Both Hands) after the chapter of باب المصافحه (Chapter Regarding Shaking Hands). It has also been mentioned in his book “*Tārīkh*” under the biography of ‘Abdullāh ibn Maslamah Murādī √ with a continuous chain. [As Ḥāfiẓ has mentioned in his “*Tahdhīb*”].

⁵ You may have noticed that the two discussions are contradictory. In “*Hadyus Sārī*”, that which Ḥāfiẓ √ has written by referencing Imām Bukhārī’s √ “*Tārīkh*” is mentioning something other than that which is written in “*Tahdhīb-ut-Tahdhīb*”. The apparent of which is that Ismā’īl saw Ḥammād ibn Zayd greeting Ibn Mubārak with both his hands and he also heard the Ḥadīth from Imām Mālik √. It does not mean that Ismā’īl greeted Ibn Mubārak as is understood from “*Hadyus Sārī*”. After reviewing these books, this discrepancy was found. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

The same ‘Abdullāh ibn Mubārak ∇ who met or saw Imām Bukhārī’s ∇ pious father is from amongst the students of Imām A‘zam, Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇. However, it is surprising that Ḥāfiẓ ∇ did not include him among the students of Imām Ṣāhib ∇⁷ in “*Tahdhīb-ut-Tahdhīb*”⁸, whilst the author of “*Tahdhīb-ul-Kamāl*” (Ḥāfiẓ Mizzī ∇) mentioned his name among the students of Imām Ṣāhib ∇. Shaykh Muḥammad Zakariyyā ∇ complained about this. (See *Muqaddamah Lāmi* ‘ pg. 4)

⁷ Our *Mawlānā* A‘zmī ∇ wrote a sentence regarding ‘Abdullāh ibn Mubārak ∇ which is worthy of being written in gold: “Ibn Mubārak is a person who has made Islām proud.” Meaning, “he is such a personality that Islām boasts. There is an ‘Abdullāh ibn Mubārak among my sons.” His life is an example worthy of following. He was also a *mujāhid*. The poem he wrote to Fuḍayl ibn ‘Ayād ∇ is very famous. He was also a very famous *muḥaddith* who was accepted by all and also a jurist. Imām Tirmidhī ∇ has mentioned his opinions. Our *Mawlānā* A‘zmī ∇ has edited one of his books: “*Kitābuz Zuhd War Raqā’iq*”. It was translated by one of our other teachers, *Mawlānā* ‘Abdul Jabbār A‘zmī Mawwī ∇. It is named “*Īthārul Ākhirah*”. It is a very unique book. Our *Mawlānā* A‘zmī ∇ also wrote an introduction for it. Similarly, one of ‘Abdullāh ibn Mubārak’s ∇ other books is also published. (A researcher from Baghdad published it.) It is titled, “*Al-Masnad Li ‘Abdullāh ibn Mubārak*”. This researcher mentions his *sanad* (chain of transmission) through *Mawlānā* A‘zmī ∇. He says: “I have *ijāzah* (authorisation) for this book from *Mawlānā* Ḥabībūr Raḥmān A‘zmī ∇.” [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁸ “*Tahdhīb-ut-Tahdhīb*” of Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar ∇ is an abridged version of “*Tahdhīb-ul-Kamāl*” of Ḥāfiẓ Mizzī ∇. However, Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar ∇ has omitted all that which is beneficial for the *Aḥnāf*. This is Ḥāfiẓ, “الامان والحفيظ.” This is the complaint of ‘Allāmah Kashmīrī ∇. This is his exact words. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar ∇ does not wish to be of any benefit to the *Aḥnāf*. He does not lie, rather he removes their names so that people do not become aware. He does this because Ibn Mubārak ∇ is such a famous personality that if it became known that he was the student of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇, it would be like the saying, ‘A tree is known from its fruit’. This is an important point for the *Aḥnāf*. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

However, according to the narration with the wording صَجَبَ (staying in company of), Imām Bukhārī's √ father would be the student of the student of Imām A'zam, Abū Ḥanīfah √.

Qaṣṭalānī √ has written in the *muqaddamah*: "Dhahabī √⁹ said in "*Tārīkh Islām*" that Bukhārī's father was amongst the pious scholars. Aḥmad ibn Ja'far and Naṣr ibn Ḥusayn narrates from Abū Mu'āwiyah and another group that Aḥmad ibn Ḥafṣ √ (Abū Ḥafṣ Kabīr, the student of Imām Abū Yūsuf √ and Imām Muḥammad √) said: "I came to Abū Ḥasan Ismā'īl ibn Ibrāhīm (the father of Imām Bukhārī √) at the time of his death and he said: "I do not know of a single *dirham* in all my wealth that is doubtful."¹⁰ Aḥmad √ said, "At that time I felt low of myself." (*Muqaddamah Qaṣṭalānī* pg. 36)

In "*Faṭḥul-Bārī*", Aḥyad¹¹ is printed instead of Aḥmad. It is the same in two prints (pg. 479).

⁹ 'Allāmah Shams-ud-Dīn Dhahabī √ was from Damascus. The following is mentioned regarding him in "*Sharḥ Nukhbah*": "من أهل الاستقراء التام." - "He is from among the thorough researchers." The most experienced person in the field of *rijāl* (grading narrators), the author of "*Mizānul I'tidāl*". It is mentioned in the *taqrīr* (discourse) of 'Allāmah Kashmīrī √ that he is so experienced in grading narrators that if he was made to stand on a hill and all the narrators of *Ḥadīth* were placed in the valley, and he is asked regarding the identity of each one of them, he would begin to give the complete details of each one; their names, villages, parents, date of birth and death and whether he is reliable or weak. Few of his books have been mentioned previously; "*Mizānul I'tidāl*", "*Tārīkh Islām*", "*Al-'Ibr*" and "*Siyar A'lāmin Nubalā'*." [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

¹⁰ His father's wealth was totally *ḥalāl* (lawful) and he spent it on his son's education. Allāh 1 blessed his knowledge so greatly that he wrote a book which is known as اصح الكتاب بعد كتاب الله (the most authentic book after the Book of Allāh). His mother's story will also be mentioned. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

¹¹ Is Aḥyad even a name? This is a grave *tahrīf* (alteration). This is deliberately done so that no one would find out who Aḥmad ibn Ḥafṣ √ is and so that the

Aḥmad Ibn Ḥafṣ refers to Abū Ḥafṣ Kabīr ∇ who is a great *Ḥanafī* jurist. He was the student of Ṣāhibayn رَحِمَهُمَا اللَّهُ. He was a resident of Bukhārā. This incident shows that there was a connection between Abū Ḥafṣ Kabīr ∇ and Imām Bukhārī's ∇ father.¹²

connection between Imām Bukhārī ∇ and the *Aḥnāf* does not become apparent. This is great academic dishonesty. This is something which attention must be paid to. Our *Mawlānā* A'ẓmī ∇ says: "This *taḥrīf* is also present in "*Musnad Aḥmad*""

Once, instead of Abū Ḥanīfah, Abū Jayfah was written. This is academic dishonesty. The *Ḥanafīs* are being oppressed. From the very beginning, Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇ was oppressed. However, Allāh's 1 help is with the oppressed. It is for this reason our *mashāyikh* say: "Become oppressed and live your life; do not live your life by becoming oppressors." Allāh's 1 help is with the oppressed. It is for this reason, the *Ḥanafī madh-hab* has gained acceptance. Both this *madh-hab* and its founder are oppressed. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykhī*]

It is written like this in two copies: The famous copy which is published nowadays from Saudi Arabia with Ibn Bāz's *ḥāshiyah* (annotations). The second copy is the one published by Maktabah Yūsūfī. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykhī*]

¹² *Mawlānā* Muḥammad 'Abdul Rashīd Nu'mānī ∇ has written that this relationship continued in both families even after the death of Ismā'īl. Therefore, Imām Bukhārī ∇ and Abū Ḥafṣ Kabīr's ∇ son, Imām Abū Ḥafṣ Ṣaghīr ∇, were companions in the study of *Ḥadīth* and they travelled together. Abū Ḥafṣ Kabīr ∇ had sent so much merchandise to Imām Bukhārī ∇ that some traders bought it from him for a profit of five thousand (5000) rupees and some traders were willing to give double the profit, but Imām Bukhārī ∇ did not want to change his intention. (*Muqaddamah Faṭḥul Bārī* pg. 480)

Imām Bukhārī ∇ had also studied from Abū Ḥafṣ Kabīr ∇. Khaṭīb Baghdādī ∇ mentioned this incident with his *sanad*. Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Mughayrah Ju'fī (Imām Bukhārī ∇) narrated that I was by Abū Ḥafṣ (Kabīr) and I was listening to the *Jāmi'* of Sufyān from my father's book. He passed a letter that was not in my book. I mentioned it to him. He said the same thing again. I mentioned it again to him and he said the same thing again. I mentioned it to him for the third time, so he remained quiet for a little while. Then he asked: "Who is this?" The people said: "That this is the son of Ismā'īl

ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Bardizbah.” He said: “He has spoken the truth. Remember this boy will one day be a man who will be a specialist in this field.” (*Tārīkh Baghdādī* pg. 11 Published in Egypt 1349 A.H.)

In “*Hadyus Sārī*”, Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Hajar √ has also included Abū Ḥafṣ Kabīr √ amongst Imām Bukhārī’s √ teachers and has narrated the following statement of Abū Ḥafṣ Kabīr regarding Imām Bukhārī √: “هذا يكون له صيت” – “He will become famous.” (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 482)

Abū Ḥafṣ Kabīr √ passed away in 217 A.H. He was of the same age as Imām Shāfi‘ī √ and lived for a very long period after him. Some incidents regarding his abstinence and worship are mentioned in Imām Zandostī’s “*Rawḍatul Ulamā*”.

Abū Ḥafṣ Kabīr √ is from amongst Imām Muḥammad’s √ senior students and the prominence of the *Aḥnāf* scholars of Bukhārā ended with him. (Dhahabī mentions this in *Siyar A‘lāmin Nubalā*)

Sam‘ānī has written that countless people have narrated from him. (*Ibn Mājah aur ‘Ilm Ḥadīth* pg.185 and pg. 186)

From the above incidents, it is evident that Abū Ḥafṣ Kabīr is from amongst the famous and leading scholars of *fiqh* (jurisprudence) and *Ḥadīth*. Additionally, it is also evident that Imām Bukhārī √ had a connection to this family from his father’s time. From this, it can be deduced that in the beginning, Imām Bukhārī √ did not have any differences with the *Aḥnāf* to the extent that he was a student of a *Ḥanafī*. Perhaps, he gained the knowledge and understanding of *Ḥanafī fiqh* during this time. However, he later had differences with the *Aḥnāf* due to the changing of circumstances and his connections with people of a different mind-set. Some other reasons regarding this will be discussed later. (See *Muqaddamah I‘lā’-us-Sunan* pg. 234 with *ta‘līq* by Shaykh ‘Abdul Fatāḥ Abū Ghuddah)

In December 2019, we visited the graves of Abū Ḥafṣ Kabīr √ and his son, Abū Ḥafṣ Ṣaghīr √ in Bukhārā. They are located in the heights. The graves of two other *Buzrugs* (righteous personalities) are also present here. *Fazlur Rahman*.



Birth and Early Life

Birth

There is a consensus amongst the scholars that Imām Bukhārī ؓ was born on 13th *Shawwāl*, 194 A.H. after *Jumu‘ah Ṣalāh* in Bukhārā. (*Muqaddamatun Nawawī Sharh Bukhārī* ¹pg. 23 and *Hadyus Sārī* pg. 477)

His father died during his childhood. Therefore, he was raised under his mother’s care.²(*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 477)

Karāmah (Miracles)

In his childhood, Imām Bukhārī ؓ became blind. His mother continuously supplicated to Allāh (*du‘ā*). Once, she saw Ibrāhīm ؑ in a dream saying, “O woman! Due to your abundance of *du‘ā*, Allāh ﷻ has

¹ This is taken from the book, “*Hājatul Qārī*”. Imām Nawawī ؓ also started writing a *sharh* (commentary) of *Bukhārī Sharīf*. He wrote an introduction. However, this book of Imām Nawawī ؓ was not completed. The introduction which he wrote for the commentary of *Bukhārī* is titled “*Hājatul Qārī*” and everyone is not able to obtain a copy this book. Only a few fortunate ones have obtained a copy of it. *Alḥamdulillāh*, we are from amongst these fortunate persons. Sometimes, when referring to this book, I will write “*Hājatul Qārī*” and sometimes I will write “*Muqaddamatun Nawawī lisharḥil Bukhārī*”. It is very difficult to obtain a copy of this introduction Only a few special persons have obtained it. It is the oldest biography of Imām Bukhārī ؓ. For this reason, it is referenced first. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

² Imām Bukhārī ؓ was an orphan. Many great scholars were orphans. They were raised with the support of the Greatest Being. Thus, they became the greatest scholars of their times. This is a very interesting point in history. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

returned your son's eyesight." In the morning, his eyesight had actually returned.³ (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 478)

Seeking Knowledge

‘Allāmah Dhahabī ∇ has mentioned that Bukhārī ∇ began studying and listening to *Ḥadīth* from 205 A.H. He memorised the books of Ibn Mubārāk ∇ in his childhood. (*Tadhkiratul Ḥuffāz*⁴ 2/555) At that time, he was ten years old.

Imām Bukhārī ∇ said: "I thought of memorising *Ḥadīth* from the time I was in *maktab*." *Warrāq Bukhārī* (The scribe of Imām Bukhārī), Muḥammad ibn Abī Ḥatim ∇⁵ asked: "How old were you at that time?" He replied: "Ten years or even less. Then, on leaving *maktab*, I began

³ Imām Bukhārī ∇ became blind. He was not born blind. If a mother supplicates abundantly for her child, such *karāmāt* will also be manifested. The father should pay special attention to the wealth he earns. His wealth should not come from doubtful or *ḥarām* (unlawful) sources. The mother should pay special attention to supplicating for her child. [If the mother and father pay close attention to these things] then their child will become like Imām Bukhārī ∇. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁴ "*Tadhkiratul Ḥuffāz*": This is Dhahabī's ∇ famous book regarding the *ḥuffāz* of *Ḥadīth*. In this book, all the *ḥuffāz* of *Ḥadīth* are mentioned. In "*Mizānul 'Itidāl*" the *mukhtalaf fihī* narrators are mentioned. However, in "*Tadhkiratul Ḥuffāz*", all the *ḥuffāz* are mentioned. It is a very great book. Imām Abū Ḥanīfah and Ṣāhibayn رحمه الله عليهم are also mentioned. Then, Imām Dhahabī ∇ also mentioned him separately in "*Tadhkiratul Ḥuffāz*". Dhahabī ∇ did not mention him in "*Mizānul 'Itidāl*". His opponents are the ones who later added it. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁵ Muḥammad ibn Abī Ḥatim: This is the *kātib* (scribe) of Imām Bukhārī ∇. In the past, the *muḥaddithīn* always had scribes with them who kept a pen and paper. Whatever the *muḥaddithīn* used to say, they would record it. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

attending the gatherings of *muḥaddith* Dākhilī ∇⁶ and others. One day he was mentioning a *sanad* (chain of transmission) in the following manner: Sufyān ibn Abī Zubayr from Ibrāhīm. I said: “Abū Zubayr did not narrate from Ibrāhīm.” So, he scolded me. I said: “If you have the original book with you, check it.” He went and checked. He then came back out and asked: “How is it then, o son?” I said that it is Zubayr Ibn ‘Adī, who narrates from Ibrāhīm. After this, he took his pen and corrected it in his book. Then he said: “You have spoken the truth.” Someone asked Imām Bukhārī ∇, “How old were you at that time?” He said: “Eleven years.””

He said: “I had already memorised the books of Ibn Mubārak and Wakīf by the age of sixteen. I also knew the statements of the *Aṣḥābur- Rāʿy*. After this, I went on a journey for *ḥajj* with my mother and brother.” (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 478)

At this age, before commencing the *ḥajj* journey, I most probably heard the “*Jāmiʿ*” of Sufyān⁷ *Thawrī* from Abū Ḥaḥṣ Kabīr ∇ as has been stated

⁶ I could not find any information regarding *muḥaddith* Dākhilī. (*Faḍl*)

⁷ In one era, the *Jāmiʿ* of Sufyān Thawrī ∇ (death: 161 A.H.) was widely used and accepted. In the biographies of Imām Bukhārī ∇ there is no mention of *Muwattāʾ Mālik*, however there is mention of the *Jāmiʿ* of Sufyān. Imām Abū Dawūd ∇ has graded it better than all other books as is clarified and explained in his letter regarding *Sunan Abū Dawūd* which he wrote to the people of Makkah. {This letter has been published with the *taḥqīq* (research) of ‘Allāmah Kawtharī ∇, and *Sahykh* ‘Abdul Fatāḥ Abū Ghuddah ∇. He sent a letter to the people of Makkah. He wrote a few points regarding his *sunan* in this letter.}

When the *Jāmiʿ* of Sufyān was presented to Imām Zufar ∇ (death: 158 A.H.) in Baṣrah, he said: “These are our own words which are being narrated from others.” (*Jawāhirul Muḍīyyah* pg. 535) {It becomes known that there are many views of the *Ḥanafīs* mentioned in Sufyān’s *Jāmiʿ*. The reason for this is:} Sufyān Thawrī ∇ was a resident of Kūfah. In many rulings, his opinion has coincided with that of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇ as is apparent from *Tirmidhī*. {In his *Sunan*, Imām Tirmidhī ∇ usually mentions at the end of the chapter as follows: “This

by Khaṭīb Baghdādī (2/11). From the aforementioned narrations, it is clear that as long as he remained in Bukhārā he maintained a good

is the opinion of Thawrī and some of the Ahl Kūfah and most of the times, this is precisely what he means.”} Imām Abū Yūsuf √ said: “Sufyān Thawrī is more of a follower of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah than myself.” (*Al-Intiqā* by Ibn ‘Abdil Bar pg. 128) {Ibn ‘Abdil Bar Mālīkī √ mentions this in his book, “*Al-Intiqā*”. We have mentioned this statement and have also translated it in Urdu. *Mawlānā ‘Abdullāh Tā’wli* translated the entire book. The biographies of three Imāms are mentioned in this book. The full name of the book is: “*Al- Intiqā’ fi Faḍā’il Thulāthatil Fuqahā’ Imām Abū Ḥanīfah, Imām Mālīk aur Imām Shāfi’ī*”}.

Even though Sufyān Thawrī √ used to attend the gatherings of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah √ and narrated *Ḥadīth* from him, he studied Imām Abū Ḥanīfah’s *fiqh* from ‘Alī ibn Mus-hir who was a special student of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah √. {From this it becomes known that Sufyān Thawrī’s *fiqh* is also indebted to the *Ḥanafīs*. Meaning, the *fiqh* of the *Ḥanafīs* is a great favour and blessing for Sufyān Thawrī’s *fiqh*. If the *fiqh* of Abū Ḥanīfah √ was non-existent, the *fiqh* of Sufyān Thawrī √ would also be non-existent.} Additionally, he is considered reliable by the consensus of all the *muḥaddithīn*. Yazīd ibn Harūn (death: 206 A.H.) stated that Sufyān Thawrī √ studied the *fiqh* of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah √ from ‘Alī ibn Mus-hir and from his assistance and encouragement, he authored this book which was titled, “*Al-Jāmi’*” (*Ibn Mājah aur ‘Ilm Ḥadīth* pg. 184). *Fazl*

It becomes known that Sufyān’s *Jāmi’* is also indebted to the *Ḥanafīs*. We have translated ‘Allāmah Kawtharī’s √ “*Bulūghul’Amānī fi sīratil Imām Muḥammad ibn Al-Ḥasan Al-Shaybānī*”. In this book, ‘Allāmah Kawtharī has written in details regarding how the *Mālīkī fiqh* has been derived from the *Ḥanafī fiqh*. The *fiqh* of Sufyān Thawrī √ and Mālīk √ is indebted to *Ḥanafī fiqh*. The following statement of Imām Shāfi’ī √ is very famous: *الناس عيال علي فقه ابي حنيفة* - “The people are all dependent on the *fiqh* of Abū Ḥanīfah”

Imām Shāfi’ī √ has also said: *من أراد أن يتبحر فهو عيال علي ابي حنيفة* “Whosoever wishes to become an expert in *fiqh*, he is in need of and indebted to Imām Abū Ḥanīfah √.” Imām Shāfi’ī’s student, Ḥarmalah has narrated this from Imām Shāfi’ī √: *الفضل ما شهد به الأعداء* - “Virtue is that which one’s opponents testify to.” Thus, Imām Abū Ḥanīfah √ did not become Imām A’ḥam just like that.

[Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

connection with the *Aṣḥābur- Rā'ī* and he was also well versed with their views and opinions.⁸

Travels for Knowledge

From the above narration, Ḥāfiẓ Ṣāhib ∇ deduced that Imām Bukhārī's ∇ first journey began in the year 210 A.H. when he was sixteen years old. (Accordingly, Dhahabī ∇ declared this in "*Tadhkiratul Ḥuffāẓ*".) Ḥāfiẓ ∇ mentioned that if he began travelling earlier, he would have met the *mashāyikh* (scholars) of higher categories whom he did not meet but his contemporaries met.

Imām Bukhārī ∇ was present in the time of *muḥaddith* 'Abdur Razzāq.⁹ He also intended to go by him, and it was also possible to meet him. However, he was informed that he passed away. Thus, Imām Bukhārī ∇

⁸"*Aṣḥābur- Rā'ī*" refers to the *Aḥnāf*. Initially, this was used as a form of praise. They are the people of opinions these with deep insight of knowledge. However, it later became a form of swearing. For instance, the word *mullah* in India referred to a higher level of education. It referred to a degree one obtained after studying the *Ālim* course. However, this word is now being used in an abusive manner although it is a very high degree of education and there is a state examination to set in order to acquire it. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁹*Muḥaddith* 'Abdur Razzāq is also known as Ṣan'ānī. He was mentioned previously under the *Ṭabaqāt* and it was also mentioned that this book could not be found. Our teacher, the *Muḥaddith Mawlānā* Ḥabībūr Raḥmān A'ẓmī ∇ did research on this book, edited it and published it. He was from Ṣan'ā which is the capital of Yemen. He is the teacher of Bukhārī's teacher. He is the author of the 11-volume "*Muṣannaf 'Abdur Razzāq*". [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

did not go by him in Yemen. Imām Bukhārī √ indirectly narrated from him. (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 478 onwards)

Hajj Journey

Imām Bukhārī √ travelled for *hajj* with his mother and elder brother in the year 210 A.H.¹⁰ After completing the *hajj*, his brother returned to Bukhārā and passed away there. Imām Bukhārī √ stayed in Makkah Mukarramah to acquire knowledge. (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 478)

There is nothing mentioned in the books regarding Imām Bukhārī's √ mother. It is highly likely that she also returned with Imām Bukhārī's √ brother to Bukhārā. Additionally, Imām Bukhārī √ most probably returned to Bukhārā when he acquired and studied *aḥādīth* from the *mashāyikh* of all these cities.

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar √ narrated the statement of Imām Bukhārī √ from Sahal ibn Sarī: "I went twice to Syria, Egypt and Algeria and I went to Baṣrah four times. I stayed in Ḥijāz for six years and I am unable to count the number of times I visited Kūfah and Baghdad with the *muḥaddithīn*."¹¹ (*Ibid*)

¹⁰ This is correct that he travelled with his mother and elder brother. In some books there is mention of him travelling with his father and sister. However, this is an error from the author or his scribe.

¹¹ From this, it is evident that Baghdād and Kūfah, i.e., 'Irāq were the greatest centres of knowledge. In Kūfah, every room was like a *Dārul 'Ulūm*.

In the biography of Imām Abū Yūsuf √, the following incident is mentioned. Once, a man from Ḥijāz taunted Imām Abū Yūsuf √ and said to him: "What do you all who live in Kūfah know about knowledge? Knowledge is from Ḥijāz. Knowledge was revealed by us. It was there that revelation came." Imām Abū Yūsuf √ replied: "The *wahī* flowed from Ḥijāz and reached us. When it rains, water does not gather and remain in that place. Rather, it flows and collects in a place further away from the place in which it rained. Yes, the rain fell in Ḥijāz but it has flowed and reached us." After the era of Imām Mālik √,

He once said: “After completing *hajj*, I stayed in Madīnah Munawwarah for one year where I continued writing *Ḥadīth* and I stayed in Baṣrah for five years. I had my books with me, and I continued writing and compiling books as well as performing *hajj* and I would come and go to Baṣrah from Makkah Mukarramah. I have hope that Allāh ﷻ will shower His blessings on my books.” (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 228)

Sometimes he would listen to *aḥādīth* in Baṣrah and write in Syria. Sometimes he would listen in Syria and go to Egypt and write it there. (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 487) Ḥākim ∇ has mentioned the names of the *mashāyikh* of the following cities in the “*Tārīkh of Nayshapūr*”: Makkah Mukarramah, Madīnah Munawwarah, Syria, Bukhārā, Marw, Balkh, Herāt, Ray, Nayshapūr, Baghdād, Wāsiṭ, Kūfah, Egypt, Jazīrah. It is written that he went to these cities and stayed with their *mashāyikh*. (*Muqadaamatun Nawawī li Sharḥ Al-Bukhārī* pg. 34 to 36. This book is published under the title, “*Ḥājat-ul-Qārī*”.)

Imām Dhahabī ∇ has mentioned that he heard from the *mashāyikh* of the following cities: Balkh, Baghdād, Makkah, Baṣrah, Kūfah, Syria, Asqalān, Ḥimṣ. (*Tadhkiratul Ḥuffāz* 2/555)

Khaṭīb Baghdādī ∇ said: “Bukhārī went to the *muḥaddithīn* of the following cities: Khurāsān, Jibāl, and all the cities of ‘Irāq. He then wrote in Ḥijāz in Syria and Egypt. He went to Baghdād several times.” (*Muqaddamatun Nawawī of Shar Al-Bukhārī* pg. 36)

Ibn Kathīr ∇ said: “He went to Baghdād eight times and each time he met Imām Aḥmad ∇, , he would urge him to stay in Baghdād and rebuke him for staying in Khurāsān.” (*Muqaddamah Qasṭīlanī* pg. 43)

Madīnah Munawwarah no longer remained a centre of knowledge. Rather, ‘Irāq became the centre of knowledge. The people would travel to ‘Irāq, Baṣrah, Kūfah etc. to acquire knowledge. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

Imām Bukhārī ∇ said: “I was present in the company of Ḥumaydī at the age of eighteen (18).¹² That is, at the beginning of the year of *ḥajj*. There was a difference between him and another person. On seeing me, he said: ‘The person to judge between us has arrived.’ Thereafter, they both presented their case to me and I made a decision in favour of Ḥumaydī because his stance was correct.” (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 483)

Imām Bukhārī ∇ spent majority of his wealth in seeking knowledge. He inherited abundant wealth from his father and he invested his wealth by doing *muḍārabah* (profit-sharing partnership). Imām Bukhārī ∇ said: “I would earn five hundred (500) *dirhams* every month and I would spend it to seek knowledge.” That reward which is by Allāh ﷻ is the best and it is everlasting. (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 479,480)

He said: “When I reached by Ādam ibn Abī Iyās (in Asqalān), there was a delay in receiving my income to such an extent that I started eating grass. When it was the third day of being in such a situation a man who I did not know came to me and gave me a bag of *dinārs*.” (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 480)

In this way Allāh’s ﷻ unseen help came to me.

وَمَنْ يَتَوَكَّلْ عَلَى اللَّهِ فَهُوَ حَسْبُهُ.

¹² Imām Bukhārī began to oppose the *Aḥnāf* by staying in his (Ḥumaydī’s) company. See page 97 for further details. This is the Ḥumaydī who is mentioned in the first *Ḥadīth* of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*; ‘Abdullāh ibn Zubayr Al-Ḥumaydī. He is either ascribed to his tribe or to his forefather Ḥumayd. He was very harsh against the *Ḥanafīs*. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

*Allāh ۱ is sufficient for the one who relies on Him.*¹³

¹³ We were searching the biographies of Imām Bukhārī ۷ and the other *muḥaddithīn* and also the biography of the author of “*Hidāyah*” to find out who their *shuyūkh* of *taṣawwuf* (spiritual guides) were. However, we did not find any information in this regard although all of them were the greatest ascetics, most righteous and God-fearing scholars. Many of the teachers of the author of “*Hidāyah*” had the title “*Zāhid Al-Khaṭīb*”. At that time, the knowledge of *taṣawwuf* had not yet become a separate field. However, these scholars were spiritually rectified and reformed by remaining in the blessed company of their teachers. We specifically searched for this (the spiritual guides of these scholars), but were unable to find anything in the biographies of Imām Bukhārī ۷, Tirmidhī ۷, Muslim ۷, Abū Dāwūd ۷, Nasāʾī ۷ etc. Whereas they were of the highest level of righteousness. These scholars were rectified and purified by remaining occupied in seeking knowledge and *Ḥadīth*, being consistent in their daily acts of worship and remaining in the blessed companionship of their teachers. The knowledge of the Qurʾān and *Sunnah* is such that if a person seeks this knowledge with the correct intentions, this knowledge alone will take him to Allāh ۱.

يَسْعَوْنَ فِي طَلَبِ الْحَدِيثِ بَعْفَةً وَتَوَقُّرٍ وَسَكِينَةٍ وَحَيَاءٍ .

“They are those who are striving in the pursuit of Ḥadīth with chastity, dignity, tranquility and modesty.”

These are very great qualities. They were attributed with these qualities from the time they were studying *Ḥadīth*. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

The Beginning of Authoring & Compiling Books

Imām Bukhārī √ began compiling and writing books from around the time he started seeking knowledge in order to preserve the knowledge he acquired for the future so that others could also be given the opportunity to benefit from this knowledge.

He, himself, said: “When I turned eighteen (18), I had compiled the *fatāwā* and statements of the *Ṣaḥābah* and *Tābiʿīn* رحمه الله. At this time, ‘Ubaydullāh ibn Mūsā was alive. It was also during this period that I wrote “*Tārīkh Kabīr*” in Madīnah Munawwarah by the grave of Rasullullāh √ in the moonlit nights.” He also said: “I know a story regarding approximately all the names of those mentioned in “*Tārīkh*”. However, I did not wish to make the book too lengthy.” (*Tadhkiratul Huffāz* 2/555 and *Hadyus Sārī* pg. 478)

Imām Bukhārī’s √ Teachers

Imām Bukhārī √ said: “I have written *aḥādīth* from over a thousand reliable scholars and there is no *Ḥadīth* amongst those that I have written for which I cannot remember its chain.” (*Muqaddamatun Nawawī* of *Sharḥ Al-Bukhārī* titled *Ḥājat-ul-Qārī li Ṣaḥīḥ-ul- Bukhārī* pg. 36)

Muḥammad ibn Abī Ḥātim √ narrated from Imām Bukhārī √ who said: “I have written *aḥādīth* from one thousand and eighty (1080) teachers who were all *muḥaddithīn*.” He also stated: “I have only narrated from those teachers who were of the opinion that *ʿilmān* comprises of both words and actions.” (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 479)

Abū ‘Abdullāh Ḥākim √ outlined the details of his (Imām Bukhārī’s) teachers in “*Tārīkh Nayshāpūr*” in the following manner:

In Bukhārā:

Muḥammad ibn Salām Al-Bīkandī, Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf, ‘Abdullāh ibn Muḥammad Al-Musnadī, Harūn ibn Al-Ash‘ath رحمه الله and their contemporaries.

In Makkah Mukarramah:

Abul Walīd Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad Al-Azraqī, ‘Abdullāh bin Yazīd Al-Maqrā, Ismā‘īl ibn Sālīm As-Ṣāyigh, Abū Bakr ‘Abdullāh ibn Zubayr Al-Ḥumaydī رحمه الله and their contemporaries.

In Madīnah Munawwarah:

Ibrāhīm ibn Al-Mundhir Al-Ḥizāmī, Muṭarraf ibn ‘Abdullāh, Ibrāhīm ibn Ḥamzah, Abū Thābit Muḥammad ibn ‘Ubaydullāh, ‘Abdul ‘Azīz ibn ‘Abdullāh Al-Uwaysī, Yaḥyā ibn Quz‘ah رحمه الله and their contemporaries.

In Shām (Syria):

Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf Al-Faryābī, Abū Naḍr Ishāq ibn Ibrāhīm, Ādam ibn Abī Iyās, Abul Aymān Al-Ḥakam ibn Nāfi‘, Ḥaywah ibn Shurayḥ, Khālīd ibn Khallā *Qaḍī Himṣ*, Khaṭṭāb ibn ‘Uthmān, Sulaymān ibn ‘Abdur Raḥmān, Abul Mughīrah, ‘Abdul Quddūs رحمه الله and their contemporaries.

In Marw:

‘Ali ibn Al-Ḥusayn ibn Shaqīq, ‘Abdān ibn ‘Uthmān, Muḥammad ibn Muqātil, ‘Abdah ibn Al-Ḥakam, Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā As- Ṣāyigh, Ḥibbān ibn Mūsā رحمه الله and their contemporaries.

In Balkh:

Makkī ibn Ibrāhīm (student of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah v. *Muqaddamah Lāmi*‘ pg.17), Yaḥyā ibn Bishr, Muḥammad ibn Abān, Al-Ḥasan ibn Shujā‘, Yaḥyā ibn Mūsā, Qutaybah ibn Sa‘īd رحمه الله and their contemporaries.

Imām Bukhārī v heard many *aḥādīth* from the *muḥaddithīn* of Balkh. (From amongst the twenty-two (22) *thulāthiyuāt* mentioned in *Ṣaḥīḥ*

Bukhārī, eleven (11) are narrations from Makkī ibn Ibrāhīm v.¹ (*Muqaddamah Lāmi*‘ pg. 30)

Makkī ibn Ibrāhīm v performed sixty (60) *hajj* and married sixty (60) women. (*Tahdhīb* 10/263)

In Herāt²:

Aḥmad ibn Walīd Ḥanafī v.

In Nayshāpūr:

Yaḥyā ibn Yaḥyā Tamīmī, Bishr ibn Al-Ḥakam, Ishāq ibn Ibrāhīm Al-Ḥanzalī (Ibn Rāhwayh)³, Muḥammad ibn Rāfi‘, Aḥmad ibn Ḥafṣ, Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā Ad-Dhuhālī رحمه الله and their contemporaries.

In Ray:

Ibrāhīm ibn Mūsā v.

In Baghdād:

¹ Imām Bukhārī v narrated half of the *thulāthiyyāt* from *Ḥanafīs*. Although he is very displeased with the *Aḥnāf*, he could not leave them out completely. The *ghayr muqallidīn* are also against the *Ḥanafīs*. However, in our city, they call *Ḥanafīs* to teach “*Hidāyah*” in their *madāris* because their ‘*ulamā*’ are not capable of teaching “*Hidāyah*”. “This is that *papad* which only the *Ḥanafīs* are able to roll thinly.” The *ghayr muqallidīn* also come to eat it. However, to make and roll it thinly is the work of the *Ḥanafīs*. This is an Urdu saying which is used to refer to something that is difficult to do. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

² This is a city in Afghanistan and the entire Afghanistan is *Ḥanafī*. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

³ He was the special teacher of Imām Bukhārī v and he will be mentioned repeatedly. He has compiled a *Musnad* titled: “*Musand Ishāq ibn Rāhwayh*”. He is Imām Abū Ḥanīfah’s v student.” [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

Muḥammad ibn ‘Īsā At-Ṭabba‘, Muḥammad ibn Sābiq, Surayj ibn Nu‘mān, Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, Abū Bakr ibn Aswad, Ismā‘īl bin Khalīl, Abū Muslim ‘Abdur Raḥmān ibn Yūnus Mustamlī رحمهم الله and many others.

In Wāsiṭ:

Ḥassān ibn Abī Ḥassān, Ṣafwān ibn ‘Īsā, Badl ibn Al-Muḥabbar, Ḥaramā ibn Ḥafṣ, ‘Uthmān ibn Muslim, Muḥammad ibn ‘Ar‘arah⁴, Sulaymān ibn Ḥarb, Abū Ḥudhayfah An-Nahdī, Abul Walīd At-Ṭayālīsī, ‘Ārim, Muḥammad ibn Sinān رحمهم الله and many others.

In Kūfah:

‘Abdullāh ibn Mūsā, Abū Nu‘aym, Aḥmad ibn Y‘āqūb, Ismā‘īl ibn Abān, Ḥasan ibn Ar-Rabī‘, Khālīd ibn Makhlad, Sa‘ad ibn Ḥafṣ, Ṭalaq ibn Ghannām, ‘Umar ibn Ḥafṣ, Farwah ibn Abil Maghrā’, Qubayṣah ibn ‘Uqbah, Abū Ghassān رحمهم الله and many others. (Qabīṣah is *ṣaḥīḥ* (correct).)

In Miṣr (Egypt):

‘Uthmān ibn Ṣāliḥ, Sa‘īd ibn Abī Maryam, ‘Abdullāh ibn Ṣāliḥ, Aḥmad ibn Shu‘ayb, Aṣbagh ibn Al- Farj, Sa‘īd ibn ‘Īsā, Sa‘īd ibn Kathīr ibn ‘Ufayr, Yahyā ibn ‘Abdullāh ibn Bukayr رحمهم الله and their contemporaries.

In Jazīrah:

Aḥmad ibn ‘Abdul Malik Al-Ḥarrānī, Aḥmad ibn Burayd Al-Ḥarrānī, ‘Amr bin Khalaf, Ismā‘īl ibn ‘Abdullāh Raqqī رحمهم الله and many others.

By mentioning the names of the cities of his teachers, it becomes apparent that Imām Bukhārī ∇ travelled to these cities to seek

⁴ Imām Bukhārī ∇ deviated from the *Aḥnāf* by staying in his company as will be discussed later. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

knowledge. He travelled to these cities and acquired knowledge from their *mashāyikh*. (*Muqaddamah Nawawī li Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* pg. 33 onwards)

The Five Categories of Imām Bukhārī's ▽ Shuyūkh (Teachers)

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar ▽ divided the *shuyūkh* of Imām Bukhārī ▽ into five categories.

These categories are as follows:

- 1) Those *shuyūkh* who heard *aḥādīth* from *Tābi'īn*. The likes of Muḥammad ibn 'Abdullāh al Anṣārī⁵, Makkī ibn Ibrāhīm, Abū 'Āṣim An-

⁵ This Muḥammad ibn 'Abdullāh Al-Anṣārī is a student of Imām Abū Yūsuf ▽ and Imām Zufar ▽. There are three *thulāthī aḥādīth* which have been narrated from him in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. {Similarly, Makkī ibn Ibrāhīm is the student of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ▽ and eleven (11) *thulāthiyyāt* have been narrated from him.} Abū 'Āṣim Nabil, whose name is Ḍaḥḥāq ibn Makhlid, is also a student of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ▽ and six (6) *thulāthiyyāt* have been narrated from him in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. In this way, from amongst the twenty-two (22) *thulāthiyyāt* of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*, twenty (20) are narrated from *Aḥnāf*.

Note: Special care has been taken in the calculating the *thulāthiyyāt* of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* as they are considered to be from amongst the specialities of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. From amongst the *Ṣiḥāḥ Sittah*, this indeed is one of the specialities of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. {Some 'ulamā' have written commentaries regarding the *thulāthiyyāt* of *Bukhārī* and importance should be given for them to be written.} However, most of the narrations of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ▽ are *thulāthī*, as is clear from "*Masānīd Imām ul A'ẓam*" and his "*Kitāb ul Āthār*". {So why does they forget this speciality of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ▽? If they remembers this speciality of Imām Bukhārī ▽, they should also remember this speciality of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ▽. It should not be overlooked.} There are also many *thunā'ī* and also a few *waḥdānī aḥādīth*. This is due to the fact that it is established that Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ▽ met and heard *Ḥadīth* from a few *Ṣaḥābah* ٫. {Meaning, Imām Ṣaḥīb ▽ narrated directly from some *Ṣaḥābah* ٫. Not only the *Ḥanafīs* claim this. Rather, those *Shawāfi'* who are just and unbiased also accept this. However, those who are strong and firm reject that he narrated from the *Ṣaḥābah* ٫ such as Khaṭīb Baghdādī and Dārquṭnī. Otherwise, the others who are unbiased such as 'Allāmah Suyūṭī ▽ have

Nabīl (Ḍaḥāk ibn Makhlad), ‘Ubaydullāh ibn Mūsā, Abū Nu‘aym, Khallād ibn Yaḥyā, ‘Alī ibn ‘Ayāsh, ‘Aṣām ibn ‘Ayāsh, ‘Aṣām ibn Khālīd رحمه الله. All the aforementioned *shuyūkh* are amongst the *Ṭabī‘ Tābi‘īn*.

2) Those *shuyūkh* who were from the era of the *Tābi‘īn*, however they did not have the opportunity of hearing *aḥādīth* from *thiqah* (reliable) *Tābi‘īn*. The likes of Ādam ibn Abī Iyās, Abū Mus-hir ‘Abdul A‘lā ibn Mus-hir, Sa‘īd ibn Abī Maryam, Ayūb ibn Sulaymān ibn Bilāl رحمه الله.

3) This is the middle category (group) of scholars. They heard *aḥādīth* from senior *Ṭabī‘ Tābi‘īn*. The likes of Sulaymān ibn Ḥarb, Qutaybah ibn Sa‘īd, Nu‘aym ibn Ḥammād, ‘Alī ibn Madīnī, Yaḥyā ibn Ma‘īn, Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, Ishāq ibn Rāḥwayh, Abū Bakr ibn Abī Shaybah, ‘Uthmān ibn Abī Shaybah رحمه الله and others. Imām Muslim ∇ also narrated from them (those mentioned above).

mentioned narrations in “*Tabyīḍuṣ Ṣaḥīfah*” which Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇ narrated from *Ṣaḥābah*. “*Tabyīḍuṣ Ṣaḥīfah fī Manāqib Abū Ḥanīfah*” by Imām Suyūṭī Miṣrī-death: 911 A.H. One should also read Ibn Ḥajar Makkī’s ∇ “*Al Khayrātul ḥisān fī Manāqib Abū Ḥanīfah An-Nu‘mān*”}. Hence, we understand from this that the later scholars’ grading of weakness does not affect the earlier scholars. {Meaning, the chains of the later *muḥaddithīn* become longer and a weak narrator is included. However, that same *Ḥadīth* is narrated by the *mutaqaddimīn muḥaddithīn* with very few links. There is no weak narrator in that chain. For this reason, the grading of weakness by the later scholars do not affect that of the earlier scholars. This is the meaning of this statement which has a lot of benefit which one *tablighī* has written and another *tablighī* has quoted.} (*Muqaddamah Lāmi‘* pg. 30)

Shaykh Muḥammad Zakariyyā ∇ is a *tablighī* who is having an academic discussion. A person can be a *tablighī* as well as a great researcher. There is no contradiction between the two. There are some people who you will meet who will tell you that by being a *tablighī*, you are destroying your knowledge. Excuse these people. Listen to them with one ear and allow it to pass through the other ear. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

4) Those who studied with Imām Bukhārī √ and those who studied a bit earlier than him. The likes of Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā Al-Dhuhālī, Abū Ḥātim Rāzī, Muḥammad ibn ‘Abdur Raḥīm Ṣā‘iqah, ‘Abd ibn Ḥumayd, Aḥmad ibn Naḍr رحمهم الله and others. From these teachers, Imām Bukhārī √ mentioned those *aḥādīth* which he did not hear directly from his teachers and also those *aḥādīth* which he did not hear from anyone else other than them.

5) Those scholars who in terms of their age were actually in the category of being Imām Bukhārī’s √ students but for the purpose of benefit, he also narrated from them. For example: ‘Abdullāh ibn Ḥammād Āmli, ‘Abdullāh ibn Abil ‘Āṣ Al-Khawarzamī, Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad Al-Qayānī رحمهم الله and others. Imām Bukhārī √ narrated some narrations from them. By narrating from them, Imām Bukhārī √ practised on the statement of Wakī‘ that a person cannot be an *‘Ālim* (an Islāmic scholar) until he narrates from those persons who are older than him, those of his same age and those younger than him. Imām Bukhārī √ himself said: “A *muḥaddith* is not complete until he narrates and records from his seniors, contemporaries and juniors.”⁶

⁶ There is an interesting story regarding the following statement of Imām Bukhārī √:

لا يكون المحدث كاملاً حتي يكتب عن هو فوقيه وعن هو مثله وعن هو دونه.

“A *Muḥaddith* is not complete until he records from his seniors, contemporaries and juniors.”

This story is mentioned in the introduction of “*Awjazul Masālik*”, the commentary of “*Muwatta’ Mālik*” written by *Shaykh* Muḥammad Zakariyyā √ in the following manner:

Abul ‘Abbās Walīd ibn Ibrāhīm said: “When I became older, I developed an increased zeal for gaining knowledge of *Ḥadīth*. I came into the service of Imām Bukhārī √ and I stated my purpose. After listening he said: “Do not become involved in any field until you become aware of its boundaries and the extent of its subject matter.” I said: “What are the boundaries and the scope of my objective?” He said:

” لا يصير الرجل محدثاً كاملاً في حديثه إلا بعد ان يكتب أربعاً مع أربع مثل أربع في أربع عند أربع بأربع على أربع عن أربع الأربع، وكل هذا الرباعيات لا تتم إلا بأربع مع أربع، فإذا تمت له كلها هان عليه أربع وابتلى بأربع، فإذا صبر على ذلك أكرمه الله في الدنيا بأربع وأثابه بأربع.“

Then after asking, he explained the statement as follows:

”الأربعة التي يحتاج الى كتبها هي أخبار الرسول الله ﷺ وشرائعه والصحابه ومقاديرهم والتابعين وأحوالهم وسائر العلماء وتواريخهم، مع أسماء رجالهم وكُنَاهم وأمكنّتهم وأزمنتهم، كالتحميد مع الخطب والدعاء مع التوسل والبسملة مع السورة والتكبير مع الصلوات، مثل المسندات والمرسلات والموقوفات والمقطوعات، في صغره وفي إدراكه وفي شبابه وفي كهولته، عند فراغه وعند شغله وعند فقره وعند غناه، بالبحار والبلدان والبراري، على الأحجار والأخفاف والجلود والأكتاف إلى الوقت الذي يمكنه نقله إلى الأوراق، عن هو فوقه وعن مثله وعن هو دونه وعن كتاب أبيه يتقين انه بخط أبيه دون غيره، لوجه الله تعالى طالبا لمرضاته والعمل بما وافق كتاب الله عز وجل منها ونشرها بين طالبها ومحبيها والتأليف في احياء ذكر بعده ثم لا تتم هذه الأشياء إلا بأربع هي من كسب العبد أعني معرفة الكتاب واللغة والصرف والنحو مع أربع هي من اعطاء الله تعالى أعني القدرة والصحة والحرص والحفظ، فإذا تمت له هذه كلها هان عليه أربع: الأهل والمال والولد والوطن وابتلى بأربع: بشماتة الأعداء وملامة الأصدقاء وطعن الجلاء وحسد العلماء، فإذا صبر على هذه المِحن أكرمه الله عز وجل في الدنيا بأربع: بعز القناعة وبهمة النفس وبلذة العلم وبحية الأبد، وأثابه في الآخرة بأربع: بالشفاعة لمن أراد من إخوانه وبطل العرش يوم لا ظل إلا ظله ويسقى من أراد من حوض نبيه ﷺ وبمجاورة النبيين في أعلى عِلين في الجنة.“

“A person cannot be a complete *muḥaddith* unless he does the following.

He **writes four with four**: The four things which he must write are: The Prophet's narrations and its injunctions, the statements of the *Ṣaḥābah* and the number of *Ṣaḥābah*, the *Tābiʿīn* and their conditions and all the *ʿulamāʾ* and their history. He must also write the following four things with the above four things: the names, *kunyah* (teknonym), place and era of the narrators. It is necessary that these four are mentioned with the above four in the same manner that it is necessary to mention the praises of Allāh 1 with a sermon, *duʿāʾ* with *tawassul*, *bismillāh* with a *sūrah*, *takbir-tahrīmah* with *ṣalāh*.

Like four in four: He must write the following types of *Ḥadīth*: *musnad*, *marfūʿ*, *mawqūf* and *mursal* narrations. The above must be written in all the following stages of his life: In his childhood, at the age of maturity and understanding, in his youth and in his old age.

In the following four times in four places: The four times when he should write the *aḥādīth* are: During his free time. when he is occupied and busy, in times of poverty and in times of prosperity. The four places where he should write are: During his journeys in every place; in the mountains, oceans, cities and deserts.

On four things from four things for four things: The four things he should write on are: Stones, pottery, skins and shoulder blades. He should write on the above until it becomes possible to copy and transfer it on to pieces of paper. He should write from his seniors, contemporaries and juniors. He should also write from his father's book when there is conviction that it is his book and not someone else's book. The four objectives for his writing are as follows: To seek the pleasure of Allāh ﷻ, to do actions which are in accordance with the book of Allāh ﷻ, to spread it amongst students and loved ones, to write and compile them in a book so that after death, his name remains alive by this book.

The above things cannot be completed except by four with four: Those four things which are attained by his effort are: He should make an effort to gain knowledge about the book, *lughah* (language), *naḥw* (syntax) and *ṣarf* (morphology) The four things which are needed before completion are the things which have been bestowed upon him by Allāh ﷻ like: ability, good health, greed and zeal for knowledge, a strong memory so that he can preserve it.

When all of the above is complete, four things will become easy and he will be afflicted with four trials: The four things which he should become detached from so that gaining and spreading knowledge will become easy are: His family, his wealth, his children and his country. When he achieves the above, the four trials he will be afflicted with are: The enmity of his enemies, the curse of his friends, the criticism of the ignorant and the jealousy of the *'ulamā'*.

When he is patient during these adversities, Allāh ﷻ will honour him in the world with four things and reward him with four things in the hereafter: The four things with which he will be honoured with in his world are: He will be honoured due to his contentment with little, he will be given strength in his *nafs* (inner self), he will receive the sweetness of knowledge, he will remain alive forever. The four ways in which he will receive rewards are: He will be granted the honour of interceding for his friends, he will be granted shade under the throne of Allāh ﷻ on that day in which there will be no shade other than this, he will be granted the honour to give water to those he wishes to from the fountain of Nabī ﷺ and he will be the neighbors of the Prophets in the highest stages of *Jannah*."

When he saw that I became worried, he said: "If this is not possible then study *fiqh* (jurisprudence). This is easy; it can be acquired by sitting at home and

This categorisation was initially formulated by Abul Faḍl Maqdisī ∇ (death- 507A.H.). Nawawī ∇ (death- 672 A.H.) has mentioned this in the introduction of the commentary of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. Maqdisī mentioned that the benefit of this is that sometimes Imām Bukhārī ∇ chooses the shorter chain of narration and sometimes the longer chain. Therefore, this categorisation reveals the differences in the levels (of these categories) and in the case of a shorter chain, there will be no doubt of any narrator being omitted. For example, in some places, the narration's chain is as follows: مكي عن يزيد بن أبي عبيد عن سلمة⁷. In other places, the chain is as follows: قتيبة عن بكر بن مضر عن عمرو بن الحارث عن بكير عن يزيد بن أبي عبيد.

One should not think that the names of some narrators have been omitted⁸ because the name of Yazīd in the first chain came immediately after one narrator. This difference in the chains is because one is shorter and one is longer. This is a very important point. (See *Muqaddamah Nawawī of Sharḥ of Bukhārī* pg. 45) In *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*, two

fiqh is the fruit of *Ḥadīth* and the reward of a jurist is no less than a *muḥaddith*." Thus, I studied *fiqh*. (*Muqaddamah Awjaz* pg. 130)

Ḥāfiẓ ∇ considered this story to be farfetched.

Suyuṭī ∇ also mentioned this story in "*Tadrībūr Rāwī*" 2/157 with its chain.

⁷ Many of the *thulāthī* narrations in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* have been narrated with this chain, i.e., Salamah ibn Akwa's z chain. There are only two links between Imām Bukhārī ∇ and *Sayyidunā* Salamah z, Makkī and Yazīd. However, another chain is as follows: قتيبة عن بكر بن مضر عن عمرو بن الحارث عن بكر عن يزيد بن أبي عبيد عن سلمة. In this chain, there are five links between Imām Bukhārī ∇ and Salamah z. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁸ It would be foolish to think that a narrator has been omitted. Only a person who has no knowledge of the division of the different categories would think so. For this reason, the categories and levels have been mentioned. If the teacher is from a very high category, such as Makkī ibn Ibrāhīm, the *sanad* (chain) becomes shorter. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

hundred and eighty-nine (289) of Imām Bukhārī's √ teachers are mentioned. Of these two hundred and eighty-nine (289), one hundred and thirty-four (134) are Imām Bukhārī's √ teachers only (i.e., they are not Imām Muslim's √ teachers as well). (*Muqaddamah Qasṭalānī* pg. 33)

His Unparalleled Memory¹

Allāh ﷻ intended to take great service from Imām Bukhārī ؓ in the field of *Ḥadīth*. It is for this reason, He blessed him with an extraordinary memory. They are some famous incidents regarding his astonishing memory. The incident that occurred with *muḥaddith* Dākhilī ؓ has been mentioned previously. [See ‘Seeking Knowledge’ pg. 26]

Ḥāshid ibn Ismāʿīl and another companion used to say that Imām Bukhārī ؓ used to go with us to the *mashāyikh* of Baṣrah in his childhood (youth)², but he never used to write. After sixteen days we

¹ Another topic of discussion is the strength of the *muḥaddithīn*'s memory. In “*Tadhkiratul Ḥuffāẓ*”, along with mentioning the *ḥuffāẓ*, Imām Dhahabī also mentioned the state of their memory. He mentioned the stories regarding the memory of many people. *Mawlānā Aʿẓmi* ؓ has written extensively in his book, “*Nuṣratul Ḥadīth*”, which is in refutation to those who reject *Ḥadīth*. In this book, the compilation of *Ḥadīth* has been discussed. When one reads it along with the references, one would be amazed by the depth of knowledge which has been compiled in this book from various sources. There are also separate books which have been written on this topic that are worthy of reading.

The ‘*ulamā*’ have written that if we had not seen ‘Allāmah Kashmīrī ؓ, we would not have developed such strong conviction in the strength of the *muḥaddithīn*'s memory. He used to say: “When I see something, I would be at ease for twenty-five years. I could relate it along with its page number and line.”

It is for this reason that he is known as the walking library. *Ḥazrat Shaykhul Hind* ؓ would ask him: “Maulvi Anwar, which *kitāb* is this from?” (i.e., *Ḥazrat* knew that he read about it but he could not remember from which book.) So, *Ḥazrat Mawlānā Kashmīrī* ؓ would say: “*Ḥazrat*, it is in so-and-so *kitāb* on this page.” In recent times, Allāh ﷻ gave such an example by which the people can develop a conviction in the stories regarding the memory of the *muḥaddithīn* which have mentioned in the books. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

admonished him. He said you all have admonished me considerably. Show me the *aḥādīth* that you all have written. When we took our books, there were more than fifteen thousand *aḥādīth*. Imām Bukhārī √ recited all the *aḥādīth* from his memory. We started correcting our books from what he recited to us from his memory. He stated: “Do you think I am wasting my time?” (*Tadhkirat al-Ḥuffāẓ* 2/556 and *Hadyus Sārī* pg. 478)

Abū Bakr ibn Abī ‘Ayāsh Al-A‘yan said: “We wrote *aḥādīth* on Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf Firyābī’s doorstep from Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl, Imām Bukhārī while he was a beardless youth.” (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 478)

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar √ states that Firyābī passed away in 212 A.H. At that time, Imām Bukhārī √ was almost eighteen years old or even younger. (*Ibid*)

He became a *Shaykh* at such a young age due to his excellent memory.

On one occasion, Firyābī narrated the following chain:

حدثنا سفيان عن أبي عروة عن أبي الخطاب عن أبي حمزة.

Those present did not know who the ones mentioned above Sufyān in the chain were referring to. Imām Bukhārī √ said: “Abū ‘Urwah is Muḥammad ibn Rāshīd. Abūl Khaṭṭāb is Qatādah ibn Di‘āmah and Abū Ḥamzah is Anas ibn Mālik.” He said that Thawrī usually mentions the *kunyah* (teknonym) of the famous ones. (*Ibid*)

From amongst those present, no one remembered the *kunyah* of these famous people. However, Imām Bukhārī √ remembered them. Thus, he understood and recognised (the chain) immediately.

² The meaning of “childhood” here will be correct for young, mature boy only. Imām Bukhārī √ went for *ḥajj* at the age of sixteen. This journey could have only been after that. Therefore, Imām Bukhārī √ had undoubtedly reached maturity by that time. And Allāh ۞ knows best.

The famous story of Baghdād has been narrated by quite a few *mashāyikh* of Baghdād. They have mentioned that when Imām Bukhārī √ came to Baghdād, the *muḥaddithīn* gathered to test his memory. Therefore, they selected one hundred (100) *aḥādīth* and interchanged their *asnād* (chains) and *mutūn* (texts); this *Ḥadīth's* chain with another *Ḥadīth's* text and this *Ḥadīth's* text with another *Ḥadīth's* chain. Ten men were appointed and each man had ten (10) *aḥādīth*. When the *dars* (discourse) of the gathering began and the *Hadharāt* from within and outside the city were all gathered, one man from amongst the ten men began to recite the *aḥādīth* to Imām Bukhārī √ one by one. Imām Bukhārī √ continued replying: "I do not know this *Ḥadīth*." In this manner, the man recited all ten of his *aḥādīth* and Imām Bukhārī's √ reply remained the same: "لا اعرفه" (I do not know it). Then, the second man started reciting his *aḥādīth* and then the third man. In this manner, all ten men recited their *aḥādīth* and Imām Bukhārī √ continued replying that he did not know those *aḥādīth*. On hearing this, those that knew the reality of the situation, looked at each other and began saying that this man has understood. Those that were unaware of the situation thought that his memory was not good; that he was helpless and incapable. When they had finished reciting their respective *aḥādīth*, Imām Bukhārī √ turned his attention to the first man and said: "The first *Ḥadīth* you narrated is not in the manner you narrated it. Rather, it is like this; and he matched the *sanad* (chain) with its correct *matn* (text). Then, he did the same with the second and the third *Ḥadīth*. He mentioned all the *aḥādīth* in the manner they recited them and also recited them in the correct way. He did the same with the second man until he corrected all the *aḥādīth* that were recited by all ten men. At this time, everyone acknowledged his great memory and proficiency. Ḥāfiẓ √ mentions this incident with its chain. (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 486)

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar √ has mentioned: "It is not surprising that he corrected the mistakes. Rather, it is surprising that he remembered the order and manner in which each of the *aḥādīth* were recited to him." (*Ibid*)

A similar incident occurred in Samarqand. Abul Azhar stated: “Four hundred (400) *muḥaddithīn* were gathered in Samarqand and in order to cause Imām Bukhārī √ to make errors, they interchanged (mixed) the chains of narrations; the Syrian chain of narrators with the ‘Irāqī’s chain of narrators, the ‘Irāqī’s chain of narrators with the Syrian chain of narrators, the Ḥaram’s (Makkī’s) chain of narrators with the Yemeni chain of narrators. However, they could not find any mistakes of Imām Bukhārī √.” (Ibid)

Yūsuf ibn Mūsā Marwazī has stated: “I was in the *Jāmi‘ Masjid* of Baṣrah when someone announced that Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl Bukhārī has arrived. The people started going towards him. I was also amongst them. There I saw a youth with a fully black beard (who had no trace of whiteness in his beard), performing *ṣalāh* behind a pillar. When he finished, the people surrounded him and requested him to conduct a gathering for the dictation of *aḥādīth*. He accepted this (request) and a day and place was fixed. Then, the caller announced that Imām Bukhārī will be conducting a gathering tomorrow in such and such a place. Accordingly, approximately one thousand (1000) *muḥaddithīn*, *fuqahā’*, *ḥuffāz* and spectators gathered at this place. Imām Bukhārī arrived at the gathering. First and foremost, he said, “Oh people of Baṣrah! You have requested me to narrate *Ḥadīth*. I will present before you the *Ḥadīth* of your own city which you do not know of.” The people were astonished at this. Imām Bukhārī dictated every *Ḥadīth* in this gathering and before each *Ḥadīth* he would say: “You have this *Ḥadīth* from such and such a person’s chain of narrators, however, you do not have it with the chain of narrators which I am about to narrate to you.” (Ibid)

On one occasion, Ishāq ibn Rāhwayh √ said: “I know from memory, seventy thousand (70,000) *aḥādīth* of my book, as though I am reading from it.” When someone mentioned this statement to Imām Bukhārī √, he said: “You find this astonishing? Perhaps, there are also people in this era who know two hundred million *aḥādīth* from their own book

in a similar manner.” He stated: مَاتِي الْف الْف³. In this statement, he was referring to himself. (Ibid)

Imām Bukhārī ∇ used to say: “I have memorized one hundred thousand (100,000) authentic *aḥādīth* and two hundred thousand (200,000) unauthentic *aḥādīth*.” (Ibid)

Imām Bukhārī ∇ would remember all the different variations of the *aḥādīth* by looking at any book once. (Ibid)

He said: “Once, I thought about the number of *Sayyidunā* Anas’z students. Immediately, three hundred (300) students came into my mind.” (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 488)

Aḥmad bin Ḥamdūn has mentioned that on the occasion of a *Janāzah Ṣalāh*, Imām Bukhārī ∇ and Dhuhālī ∇ were both present. Dhuhālī ∇ was asking Imām Bukhārī ∇ regarding the names of certain narrators and their weaknesses. Imām Bukhārī ∇ read it out like the speed of an arrow just like a person would read قل هو الله أحد (*Sūrah Ikhlāṣ*).

Imām Bukhārī ∇ said: “When I narrate any *Ḥadīth* from the *Ṣaḥābah* or *Tābi‘īn*, I would know majority of their birth and death dates and place (of their birth and death).” (Ibid)

He said: “When I reached Balkh, the people requested me to dictate the *aḥādīth* from all the *shuyūkh* from whom I had written *aḥādīth*. So, I

³ How could there be so many *aḥādīth* in Imām Bukhārī’s ∇ books? Even if we were to count the same *Ḥadīth* with its different chains of narration as an individual *Ḥadīth*, this number is still farfetched. However, there is a narration in “*Hadyus Sārī*” in which the number is stated as two hundred thousand (200,000). This is correct. (*Fazl*)

It seems as though an extra thousand (الف) was added mistakenly. Ḥāfiẓ ∇ mentions this same narration in “*Ta’līq ut Ta’līq*”, in which two hundred thousand (مَاتِي الْف الْف) *aḥādīth* is mentioned. (417_8/5) (*Mawlānā ‘Abdur Rashīd Nu ‘mānī*)

dictated one thousand (1000) *aḥādīth* from one thousand (1000) *shuyūkh*.

(*Muqaddamah Qaṣṣalānī* pg. 39) (*Irshādus Sārī, Sharḥ on Bukhārī*) (*Muqaddamah Lāmi* pg. 37)

The scribe of Imām Bukhārī v mentioned that Imām Bukhārī v said: “I would not sleep at night until I counted how many *aḥādīth* were added to my book. It was approximately two hundred thousand (200,000).” I asked: “Is there any medication to strengthen one’s memory?” He said: “I do not know.” Then he turned towards me and said: “There is nothing more beneficial for sharpening one’s memory other than having zeal for knowledge and placing one’s focus on knowledge in every moment.”

On one occasion, he said: “There are many *aḥādīth* I heard in Syria and I will write in Baṣrah and many I will hear in Baṣrah and write in Syria.” “The narrator says: “I asked: ‘All?’” Imām Bukhārī v remained silent.

Character and Qualities

The knowledge of the Messenger of Allāh n had fully established its effect within Imām Bukhārī v. It is for this reason, Imām Bukhārī v was extremely pious, God-fearing, one of the greatest ascetics and he used to be constantly engaged in worship. The following incidents are testament to this.⁴

Imām Bukhārī v rarely ate food. He used to be very generous to his students. Once, when he became ill, his urine was shown to the doctor (physician), and they said that it is like the urine of the priests who do not eat curry. Imām Bukhārī v confirmed this and said that he had not

⁴ Developing a connection with the knowledge of *Ḥadīth* and being engrossed in (seeking and teaching this knowledge), creates within a person the nobility of the *Ṣaḥābah* ڭ. (Shaykh ‘Abdul ‘Azīz Al-Dehlawī- *Fawā'id Jāmi'ah*, translation of ‘Ujālā-e-Nāfi‘ah pg. 32)

eaten curry for the past forty years. The doctors were asked regarding the treatment and cure for this illness. They said (the treatment is in) eating curry. However, Imām Bukhārī ∇ refrained from (eating curry to treat the illness) until the scholars and *mashāyikh* insisted. He then agreed to eat some sugar with *roti* (bread). (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 481)

Imām Bukhārī ∇ was of a wheatish complexion. he was thin, neither tall nor short. (*Tadhkiratul Huffāz* 2/555)

On one occasion, a debtor withheld twenty-five thousand dirhams from him, so the people suggested obtaining an order from the ruler and receive it from him. He said: "If I get the documents from them, they will have expectations from me, (i.e., they will want me to agree with them) and I can never trade my religion for the world." He then reconciled with the debtor to pay ten dirhams every month (obviously how could such a large sum be received?) Consequently, he lost all his wealth. (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 480)

He stated: "I have never bought or sold anything myself. Rather, I would tell someone to go and buy what I needed on my behalf." He was asked: "Why do you do this?" He replied: "Because there is always some form of inaccuracy and doubt in conducting transactions." (Meaning, I do not conduct the transaction myself in order to avoid falling into this.) (*Ibid*)

On one occasion, wealth sent by Abū Ḥafṣ ∇⁵ was given to Imām Bukhārī ∇. Some merchants from Syria came and requested him to sell this wealth in exchange of a \$5000 profit. He replied: "Go back today." Thereafter, the following day, other merchants came and requested him to sell this wealth in exchange for a \$10 000 profit. So, he replied: "I made an intention last night to give it to the first group of merchants. Thus, I do not wish to annul this intention." (*Ibid*)

⁵ Abū Ḥafṣ ∇ and this incident has been mentioned previously in the footnote on page 23-24. This will also be mentioned on page 97.

On one occasion, when his slave-girl was entering the house, there was an inkpot in front of him and her foot collided with the inkpot. He said to her: "How were you walking?" The slave-girl replied: "How can I walk when there is no path to walk on?" He stretched out both his hands and said: "Go, you are free." It was said to him, "She displeased you." He replied: "I pleased her by my action." (Ibid)

On one occasion, he became tired while writing the *takhrīj* for "*Kitābut Tafsīr*" in Firabar. So, he laid down. His scribe asked him: "You always say that I do not do any action of which I have no knowledge of. Inform me, what is the benefit in this lying down?" He replied: "Today, I have become tired and this is a province along the borders of the country. Thus, I fear the enemy's conspiracies. Therefore, I deem it appropriate that I rest and be prepared so that if the enemy attacks, we will be able to do something." (Ibid)

This same scribe of Imām Bukhārī ∇ said: "Many a time, Imām Bukhārī would practice archery on horseback. I only saw him miss a target twice. He narrates that once his arrow struck a plank of the river's bridge which caused it to split. He dismounted, removed the arrow and said: "Let us return." He turned to me and said, "Oh Abū Ja'far! I have a job for you". On saying this, he became short of breath. Then he said, "The job is that you go to the owner and inform him that we have damaged the plank. Request him to forgive us for this and give us permission to change it or he should take the cost for its repair from us." The owner of the bridge, Ḥumayd ibn Al-Akhḍar, said: "Tell Abū 'Abdullāh that whatever you did is overlooked and our entire possessions are sacrificed for you." On hearing this, Imām Bukhārī ∇ became radiant with happiness and on that day, he recited five hundred (500) *Ḥadīth* to those who came from abroad to this gathering and gave three hundred (300) *dirhams* in charity.

On one occasion, on hearing a *Ḥadīth* from Imām Bukhārī ∇, Abū Ma'shar Ḍarīr became extremely happy and began to shake his hands and head. When Imām Bukhārī ∇ saw this, he smiled. (Then, it occurred

to him, that perhaps this is also a form of backbiting.) Thus, he sought forgiveness. He was pardoned. (Ibid)

He said: "From the time I found out that backbiting is *ḥarām*, I never backbited."

He also said: "I have hope that Allāh ﷻ will not take me to task for backbiting". (Ibid)

Ḥāfiẓ mentioned: "Imām Bukhārī was very cautious about commenting on the narrators of *Ḥadīth*. Many times, when grading and commenting on the narrators' status and reliability, he would use words like 'they have remained silent about him', 'there is a discussion regarding him', 'they have left him out' etc. It was very rare that he would call a person a fabricator or a liar." (Ibid)

An objection was made against him that "In "*Tārīkh*", you have mentioned the ills of others, so how can you claim that you will not be held liable in the hereafter (for backbiting)?" He said: "We have simply narrated and quoted this information. We have not mentioned this from our personal opinions." The Messenger of Allāh ﷺ also said regarding a man: "بئس اخو العشيرة" – "He is a bad member of his tribe." (i.e., the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ mentioned his evil in order to make the Muslims aware of it.) Similarly, the *muḥaddithīn* informed the people regarding the condition of narrators in the chain so that they will not fall into error. Therefore, it is not backbiting regardless of if the *muḥaddith* narrated it himself or if he quoted it from someone else.⁶

⁶ A great *Buzrug* said that: "If we do not grade and highlight the unreliability of weak narrators, no difference will remain between a religious person and a non-religious person. As a result, the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ will ask us on the Day of Judgement, "Why have you not defended our *aḥādīth*?" How will we reply to this? We do not wish to have disputes between us and the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ. We are prepared to dispute with these *mutakallim fihi* narrators. However, we do not have the courage to dispute with the Messenger of Allāh

On one occasion, a wasp bit Imām Bukhārī √ in his *ṣalāh* seventeen times. However, he did not break his *ṣalāh*. He said: "I was reading one verse and I wished to complete it." On completing his *ṣalāh* he said, "What is it that is afflicting me with such difficulty?" When he checked, it was a wasp.⁷

Close to Bukhārā, Imām Bukhārī √ was involved in the construction of a guest house. Many people were helping Imām Bukhārī √. However, he himself was also involved in moving the bricks. Muḥammad ibn Abī Ḥātim Warrāq √ says that I said to Imām Bukhārī √: "It is not necessary for you to go through this trouble; we will do it for you." Imām Bukhārī √ replied: "This is beneficial for me".

n. Thus, when we do *jarḥ* (grade narrators as unreliable and discuss their weaknesses) based on this, it is not considered as backbiting. This is a way of protecting the *Dīn* because if one is not aware that a narrator is weak, then one would consider a person who is not on *Dīn* (a non-religious person) to be a person of the *Dīn* (religious person). One would consider something that is not a *Sunnah* to be a *Sunnah* and to consider something that is not part of the religion to be part of it or to consider something that is not *Sunnah* to be a *Sunnah*, is altering the *Dīn* and this is very harmful". [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁷ His *ṣalāh* was such that it makes one reminisce the *ṣalāh* of the *Ṣaḥābah* √. A famous incident regarding this which is mentioned in *Abū Dāwūd* and one of the *tarjumatul bāb* of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* is as follows: On one occasion, whilst returning from an expedition, a *Ṣaḥābī* was performing *taḥajjud ṣalāh*. Whilst he was performing his *ṣalāh*, the enemy shot an arrow from behind and blood began to flow. However, he did not go into *rukūʿ* until he had completed the *sūrah*. After completing the *rukūʿ*, he woke up his companion. He [the companion] saw that there was a lot of blood, so he asked, "Why did you not awake me immediately (as soon as the arrow struck)?"

The *Ṣaḥābī* replied: "I had commenced a *sūrah* and did not wish to go into to *rukūʿ* without completing the *sūrah*." [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

Imām Bukhārī √ once slaughtered a cow for the people and prepared a feast in which more than a hundred people came. He did not expect such a large number of people to come. We bought three *dirhams* worth of *rotis* from Firabar. In that era, one would receive five *mun* [a measurement] of *rotis* for one *dirham*. We placed the *rotis* in front of the people and after they ate there were still many *rotis* remaining. One *mun* is equivalent to sixty-eight *tola* and three *maaShāh*. (*Awzān Sharī'ah* by Muftī Muḥammad Shafī' √) Generally, it is known to be more than this.

On one occasion, in his gathering a person took out a straw from his beard and placed it on the ground of the *masjid*. Imām Bukhārī √ noticed this. He found an opportunity when the people were not looking. He placed the straw in his pocket, took it outside and threw it away. (Ibid)

In this manner, he paid special attention to the cleanliness of the *masjid*.⁸

The scribe of Imām Bukhārī √ mentioned that he used to accompany him on journeys. I had to spend the night in the same room with him in all seasons other than summer. I have seen that Imām Bukhārī √ would get up fifteen or twenty times in the night, light the lamp and put marks on the *aḥādīth* and then go to sleep. I said: "You put yourself

⁸ Cleaning the *masjid* is a very honourable task. It is not only the responsibility of the *masjid's* caretaker, to clean the *masjid* but rather, it is the responsibility of every Muslim to ensure that they play a role in keeping the *masjid* clean. Regarding this, there is a *Ḥadīth* in *Jāmi' Tirmidhī* which states that, when you see a person taking care of the *masjid* then bear testimony to his *Imān*, for verily Allāh *Ta'ālā* says: *إنما يأمر مساجد الله من آمن بالله واليوم الآخر* until the end of the verse. [Only those who believe in Allāh and the last day frequent and take care of the *Masājid* of Allāh...] Cleaning and lighting arrangements are all part of maintaining the *masjid*. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

through a lot of trouble, why do you not wake me up? He said: "You are a young man, I do not want to disturb your sleep."

Imām Bukhārī ∇ used to perform thirteen *rak'ahs* in the last portion of the night and he would perform *witr* of one *rak'ah*. In *Ramaḍān*, Imām Bukhārī ∇ would perform *tarāwīḥ* with his students, and he would recite twenty verses in each *rak'ah*. By reciting in this manner, he completed the recital of the entire Qur'ān. In the latter portion of the night, he would recite between a half to one-third of the Qur'ān and complete the recital of the Qur'ān in three nights. He would finish the Qur'ān around the time of *iftār* (breaking of fast) and he would say that *du'ā's* (supplications) are accepted on every occasion on which the Qur'ān is completed. (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 481)

Imām Bukhārī ∇ said: "I supplicated (made *du'ā*) twice which were immediately accepted.⁹ Now, I do not wish to make a *du'ā* out of fear that by it being accepted in this world, my good deeds will be decreased in the hereafter."¹⁰ (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 480)

⁹ Therefore, one should be very particular in engaging in *du'ā* and also call one's students to be part of the *du'ā*. This is not a *bid'ah* (innovation). From this story, one can deduce that according to Imām Bukhārī ∇, *tarāwīḥ* and *taḥajjud* are separate prayers in *Ramaḍān*. Those *ghayr muqallidīn* who are of the opinion that *tarāwīḥ* consist of eight (8) *rak'ahs* disagree with this. Their opinion is that both are one *ṣalāḥ*; if it is read after '*ishā*' *ṣalāḥ* in the beginning of the night, it is *tarāwīḥ* and if it is read in the latter portion of the night, it is *taḥajjud*. They use the following *Ḥadīth* of *Sayyidatunā 'Ā'ishah* ∴ which is mentioned in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* as evidence:

10 ما كان يزيد في رمضان ولا غيره على إحدى عشرة ركعة يصلى أربعا ثم يصلي أربعا ولا نساء من حسنهن وطولهن ثم يؤتى بثلاث.

From this *Ḥadīth*, they establish that *tarāwīḥ* consists of eight *rak'ahs*. However, this *Ḥadīth* is actually regarding *taḥajjud*. Imām Bukhārī ∇ mentions this *Ḥadīth* twice in his book; under the chapter of *tarāwīḥ* and under the chapter of *taḥajjud*. Thus, as it is mentioned under the chapter of *tarāwīḥ*, they have considered this to be evidence to support their opinion. However, they

Hākīm ∇ has quoted two poems from Imām Bukhārī ∇ which consist of beautiful advice.

اغتنم في الفراغ فضل ركوع
فعسي ان يكون موتك بغته
كم صحيح رأيت من غير سقم
ذهبت نفس الصحيحة فلتنه

Treasure the virtues of ṣalāh in your free time

Perhaps, death will overcome you suddenly.

How many healthy people with no trace of illness have I seen?

Whose healthy souls have departed suddenly.

Imām Bukhārī ∇ himself departed from this world in a similar fashion as will be discussed in the upcoming chapters in this book. (Ibid pg. 481)

should look at what Imām Bukhārī ∇ practised upon. He performed both *tarāwīḥ* and *taḥajjud* in one night. Thus, it can be deduced that according to Imām Bukhārī ∇, they are separate prayers. The *ghayr muqallidīn* are deprived of this; if they perform *tarāwīḥ*, they do not perform *taḥajjud* and if they perform *taḥajjud*, they do not perform *tarāwīḥ*. Muḥaddith Kabīr, Amīrul Hind Fil Ḥadīth, Mawlānā Ḥabībūr Raḥmān Aʿẓmī ∇ has written extensively regarding this issue. In his treatise, “*Rakʿah wa Tarāwīḥ*”, he refuted them in such a manner that their evidences became like scattered dust [i.e., their evidences were not strong enough to withstand Mawlānā’s refutation]. They then rebutted this in “*Anwārul Misbāḥ*”. Mawlānā Aʿẓmī then wrote footnotes on this, titled “*Muzayyal biradd Anwārul Misbāḥ*”. Pearls of knowledge are scattered throughout these footnotes which refutes “*Anwārul Misbāḥ*”. It is for this reason that it is said that the *ghayr muqallidīn* only shake hands (*muṣāfaḥah*) with Imām Bukhārī ∇ with one hand and not with both hands. If they find that which is in accordance with what they desire, they take and accept it. For instance, they accept and take Imām Bukhārī’s ∇ opinion regarding *rafaʿ yadayn* and *qiraʿah* behind the Imām. However, with regards to other *masāʾil*, they say we are *mujtahidīn*, we do not follow Imām Bukhārī

∇. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

Upon hearing the news of Imām Darimī's √¹¹ death, Imām Bukhārī √ also recited a poem at that time. This poem is as follows:

ان عشت تفجع بالأحبة كلهم وبقاء نفسك لأبنا لك أفجع

If you remain alive, you will have to mourn the loss of all your beloved ones.

And your survival will be the cause of more pain.

In some books, the second stanza is as follows:

وفناء نفسك لا أبنا لك أفجع

Your passing will cause more pain.

(*Qurratul- 'Uyūn in Tadhkiratul Funūn* pg. 72 and *Tarjumān us Sunnah* 1/258)

¹¹ Imām Dārimī √ was from the same era as Imām Bukhārī √. He passed away a little before Imām Bukhārī √. Imām Dārimī √ authored a book titled "*Musnad Dārimī*", which is a *sunan* and holds a very high position. However, it is strange that it has not gained the same level of acceptance as the *Ṣiḥāḥ-e-Sittah*. This acceptance is from Allāh ﷻ. Having the ability does not necessitate acceptance. Sometimes, along with one's capability, one's work is accepted and sometimes although one is capable, one's work is not accepted. The objective is to gain acceptance along with developing one's ability. Simply having the ability should not be the objective. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]



Praises from the People of Knowledge

The rank of Imām Bukhārī √, due to his great virtue and excellence, was such that besides his contemporaries and students, the tongues of his own *mashāyikh* and *akābir* were also moist in singing his praises. Additionally, everyone acknowledged his superiority in the field of *aḥādīth*. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar √ mentioned a few statements and he thereafter mentioned that if the statements of the *muta'akh-khirīn* (later scholars) were also mentioned, ink and paper would have become depleted¹. However, there is no need to mention their statements because when those who have seen and met him praise him so highly, it is clear that those who came after will also narrate from them.

His *Shaykh*, ‘Abdullāh ibn Muḥammad Al-Masnadī √ said: “Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl is the Imām (leader) in this field (of *Ḥadīth*). Condemn those who do not consider him an Imām (leader).” He also stated: “There are three *ḥuffāẓ* of our era”. He then mentioned Imām Bukhārī’s √ name first.

¹ Ḥāfiẓ √ is drowned in his love for Imām Bukhārī √. Consequently, he has exaggerated in praising Imām Bukhārī √. Such a statement can only be made regarding Allāh 1 and His *Kalām* as mentioned in the following verse:

ولو إنا ما في الأرض من شجرة أقلام والبحر يمده من بعده سبعة أبحر ما نفدت كلمات الله.

If all the trees on earth were pens and the oceans were supplemented by another seven oceans, Allāh’s words would never be exhausted.

Therefore, it can be said that what is meant here is not the amount of paper and ink for Allāh’s *Kalām*, rather Ḥāfiẓ √ is referring to the amount which is with him. We interpret it in this manner so that his statement can be valid. Interpretation in this manner is done with the statements of *Buzrugs* so that we can accept them. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

‘Alī ibn Ḥajar √ said: “Khurāsān gave birth to three noble personalities.” Then, he mentioned Imām Bukhārī’s √ name first and then stated: “The one with the most knowledge, understanding and insight of *aḥādīth* from amongst these three personalities was Imām Bukhārī √.”

Aḥmad ibn Ishāq Sarmārī √ said: “Whoever wishes to see the most truthful and rightly guided *faqīh* (Islāmic jurist), should look at Imām Bukhārī √.”

Ḥāshid √ said: “I saw ‘Amr ibn Zurārah and Muḥammad ibn Rāfi‘ asking Bukhārī questions regarding the *‘ilal* (defects) of *aḥādīth*. “When they were leaving, they said to those present: “This man, Abū ‘Abdullāh is a greater *faqīh* and *‘ālim* (scholar) than us. Do not be deceived.”

He also said: “One day, we were by Ishāq ibn Rāhwayh and ‘Amr ibn Zurārah was dictating² from Imām Bukhārī √ and the *muḥaddithīn* were writing. Ishāq stated: He is a better *faqīh* than me.” At that time, Imām Bukhārī √ was a young man.

‘Abdullāh ibn Muḥammad Al-Farhyānī √ said: “I was in the gathering of Ibn Ashkāb when a person who was a *ḥāfiẓ* of *Ḥadīth* entered and said something regarding Imām Bukhārī √. Ibn Ashkāb became angry and left the gathering.”

‘Abdullāh ibn Muḥammad √ said: “When Aḥmad ibn Ḥarb passed away, Ishāq ibn Rāhwayh and Imām Bukhārī √ were walking behind the

² There would be so many students in one gathering that the teacher’s voice would not reach all of them. Sometimes, a *muḥaddith* would have twenty thousand (20,000) writers in one gathering and, in that era, there was no microphone system. Thus, one person would be the *muballigh*; he would repeat whatever the teacher says loudly. In this manner, everyone would be able to hear and write. This is known as *imlā’*. This was one of the methods used by the *muḥaddithīn* in their gatherings. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

janāzah procession. I saw the people of knowledge looking at each other and saying that Muḥammad is a greater *faqīh* than Ishāq.”

Yaḥyā ibn Jaʿfar Baykandī ∇ said: “If it was possible for me to give a portion of my life to prolong the life of Imām Bukhārī ∇, I would have done so as my death is the death of one person while the death of Imām Bukhārī ∇ is the loss of knowledge.” He also used to say: “If it was not for Imām Bukhārī, there would have been no pleasure in living in Bukharā.”

Abū Bakr ibn Abī Shaybah ∇ and Muḥammad ibn ʿAbdullāh ibn Numayr ∇ said: “We have never seen anyone like Imām Bukhārī.” Ibn Abī Shaybah ∇ used to call him “*Al-Bāzil*”, i.e., the complete; the excellent.

Imām Tirmidhī ∇ stated that Imām Bukhārī ∇ was by Ibn Munīr. When he got up ʿAbdullāh ibn Munīr said: “Oh Abū ʿAbdullāh! May Allāh make you the adornment for this *ummah*.” Imām Tirmidhī ∇ stated: “Allāh accepted this *duʿāʾ* of his.”

Even though ʿAbdullāh ibn Munīr ∇ was the *shaykh* (teacher) of Imām Bukhārī ∇ and there are narrations from him in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*, he still wrote *aḥādīth* from Imām Bukhārī ∇ and he used to say: “I am his student”. He also used to say: “I have not seen anyone like him.”

Rajāʾ ibn Rajāʾ ∇ said: “Imām Bukhārī’s virtue over the other *ʿulamāʾ* (Islāmic scholars) are like the virtue of men over women.” He also said: “He is one of the living signs of Allāh ﷻ on the surface of this earth.”

Ḥusayn ibn Ḥurayth ∇ said: “I do not know of anyone similar to Muḥammad ibn Ismāʿīl. It is as if he was born and created for *Ḥadīth*.”

Faṭḥ ibn Nūḥ Nayshāpurī ∇ said: “I saw Imām Bukhārī ∇ sitting on the right side of ʿAlī ibn Madīnī ∇. When ʿAlī would narrate any *Ḥadīth* he would look towards Imām Bukhārī out of awe for him.” Imām Bukhārī ∇ said: “I do not consider myself lower in rank to anyone except to ʿAlī

ibn Madīnī even though sometimes I would narrate such *aḥādīth* which he was not aware of.” When this statement of Imām Bukhārī √ reached ‘Alī ibn Madīnī √, he said: “Do not consider his statement. He himself has not seen anyone who is of his calibre.” Imām Bukhārī √ said: “‘Alī asked me regarding the *shuyukh* of Khurāsān. I mentioned Muḥammad ibn Salām however he did not know of him. Once, he mentioned to me, “Oh ‘Abdullāh! We also like whoever you like.”

‘Umar ibn ‘Alī Al-Falās √ said: “Those *aḥādīth* that Imām Bukhārī do not know, they are not *Ḥadīth*.” He also mentioned: “There is no one like him in Khurāsān.”

Ḥāshid said: “Aḥmad ibn Abī Bakr Zuhri told me: “According to us, Imām Bukhārī √ is a greater *faqīh* and more knowledgeable in *Ḥadīth* than Imām Aḥmad √.” A person from amongst those who were present said: “You are exaggerating.” So, Aḥmad Zuhri said: “If you had met Imām Mālik √ and saw his face and Imām Bukhārī’s √ face, you will consider them both equal with regards to *Ḥadīth* and *fiqh*.” Ḥāfiz *ṣāhib* √ mentioned: “The meaning of this statement is that their methodology of analysis and understanding was similar with regards to *Ḥadīth* and *fiqh*.”

Qutaybah ibn Sa‘īd √ says: “I have sat with jurists, ascetics and extremely devoted worshippers. However, from the time I gained the ability to understand, I have not found anyone like Imām Bukhārī. His virtue amongst the people of his era is like the virtue of *Ḥazrat* ‘Umar amongst the *Ṣaḥābah* √.”

According to Qutaybah, if Imām Bukhārī √ was among the *Ṣaḥābah* √, he would have been a special sign. He also said: “I have pondered over the *Ḥadīth* and even over varying opinions and rulings. I have also sat with the jurists, ascetics and extremely devoted worshippers. However, I have not seen anyone like Imām Bukhārī.” On one occasion, he was asked regarding the ruling of a divorce issued in a state of intoxication. At that moment, Imām Bukhārī √ came. He [Qutaybah]

said: “Here is Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal, Ishāq ibn Rāhwayh, and ‘Alī ibn Madīnī. Allāh ﷻ has sent them all to you.” On saying this, he pointed to Imām Bukhārī ṽ. (i.e., Imām Bukhārī ṽ is the embodiment of the excellences of these three.)

Mahyār ṽ said: “I have seen Qutaybah ibn Sa‘īd and Yaḥyā ibn Ma‘īn coming and going to Imām Bukhārī ṽ. Yaḥyā ibn Ma‘īn was the follower of Imām Bukhārī with regards to knowledge.”

Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad ibn Salām ṽ stated: “The great *muḥaddithīn* (he then mentioned the names of the great *muḥaddithīn* of the time) accepted Imām Bukhārī’s ṽ verdict regarding the *Ḥadīth* over theirs.”

Ya‘qūb ibn Ibrāhīm Dūrqi and Na‘īm ibn Ḥammād Khuzā‘ī said: “Bukhārī is the *faqīh* of this *ummah*.” Bundār Muḥammad ibn Bashār said: “Bukhārī is the greatest *faqīh* from amongst Allāh ﷻ’s creation in our time.” When Imām Bukhārī ṽ reached Baṣrah, Bundār said: “*Sayyid al-Fuqahā*’ (the leader of all jurists) has arrived.”

‘Abdullāh ibn Yūsuf al-Tinnisī said to Imām Bukhārī ṽ: “If you notice any deficiency in my books, inform me.”



Some Statements of Contemporaries and His Students

Muḥaddith ‘Ajli √ said: “I saw Abū Zar‘ah and Abū Ḥātim³ listening attentively to Imām Bukhārī. It was as though Imām Bukhārī was an entire *ummah* (nation). He was righteous and he was an accomplished scholar. He was proficient in everything. He was a greater ‘ālim than Dhuhālī.”

The *muḥaddith* Dārimī √ said: “Imām Bukhārī is a greater ‘ālim, *faqīh* and collector of *aḥādīth* than us.” He was informed about a *Ḥadīth* that Imām Bukhārī √ graded as authentic. So, he (Dārimī) said: “He [Imām Bukhārī] is more insightful than me and he is the most intelligent of Allāh’s creation. He has understood the *amr* (commands) and *nahī* (prohibitions) which Allāh ﷻ has revealed in His Book and through his *Rasūl* ﷺ. He would read the Qur’ān with full concentration. He ponders upon the examples mentioned in the Qur’ān and recognises the *ḥalāl* (lawful) and the *ḥarām* (unlawful). I have seen the ‘ulamā’ of the Ḥaramayn, Ḥijāz and Shām (Syria). However, I have not seen anyone like him.”

Ḥātim ibn Manṣūr √ said: “He attained such a high rank with regards to his understanding and insight in knowledge that he was one of the signs from amongst the signs of Allāh ﷻ.”

³ This is Abū Ḥātim Rāzī √. They are amongst the great *muḥaddithīn* of Imām Bukhārī’s √ era. Abū Zar‘ah Rāzī was a very great *muḥaddith*. The following story has been mentioned about him. On one occasion, a man said that he told his wife: “If Abū Zar‘ah Rāzī does not know one hundred thousand (100,000) *aḥādīth*, you are divorced.” He then came to Abū Zar‘ah Rāzī and asked him: “If I told my wife this [as mentioned above], has my wife been divorced or not?” He replied: “No. I have memorised one hundred thousand (100,000) *aḥādīth*.”

[Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

The *faqīh* Maḥmūd ibn Naḍr √ said: “I have been to Baṣrah, Shām, Ḥijāz and Kūfah and I have seen their ‘*ulamā*’. Whenever Imām Bukhārī was mentioned in front of them, they would give him a position of virtue over themselves.”

Abū Sahl √ said: “I have seen over thirty (30) ‘*ulamā*’ of Miṣr (Egypt). They would say: “To see Imām Bukhārī is one of our worldly needs.”

Ṣāliḥ ibn Muḥammad Jazrah √ said: “Imām Bukhārī was the best memoriser of *aḥādīth*. I organised gatherings of *imlā*’ (dictation) for him. There were twenty thousand (20,000) present in that gathering.”

Faḍlak Rāzī was asked who has a stronger memory, Imām Bukhārī √ or Abū Zar‘ah Rāzī? He said “I only met Imām Bukhārī on one occasion. That was on a journey between Ḥalwān and Baghdād. I remained with him for one *manzil* and I tried to narrate to him such a *Ḥadīth* which he had not heard before. However, I was unsuccessful. As for Abū Zar‘ah, it would have been possible for me to narrate to him *gharīb aḥādīth*, equivalent to the hairs on his head.”⁴

Ibn Khuzaymah √ said: “There is no greater *muḥaddith*, under the sky than Imām Bukhārī.”

Imām Tirmidhī √ said: “There is no one more knowledgeable with regards to *asnād* and *‘ilal* (chains and their defects and weaknesses) than Imām Bukhārī.”

Imām Muslim √ said: “I testify that there is no one like you in this world.” On reciting the *Ḥadīth* regarding the atonement for a gathering, Imām Muslim √ asked Imām Bukhārī √: “Do you know of a *Ḥadīth* better than this?” Imām Bukhārī √ said: “There are better *aḥādīth*, but they are *ma‘lūl*.” Imām Muslim √ said: “*Lā ilāha illallāh* (there is no god

⁴ From this, it becomes apparent that Imām Bukhārī’s √ status was higher than that of Abū Zar‘ah’s. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

but Allāh)” and he started to tremble. Then, he asked, “What is the *‘illah?*” Imām Bukhārī ∇ said: “That which Allāh has kept concealed, I will also keep concealed.” Then, when Imām Muslim ∇ became persistent and was on the verge of crying, Imām Bukhārī ∇ pointed out the weakness to him. Imām Muslim ∇ then said: “Only a very jealous person could hate you, I testify that there is no one in this world like you.”

In a narration, it is mentioned that when Imām Muslim ∇ came, he kissed him between his eyes and he said: “O teacher of teachers, leader of the *muḥaddithīn*, doctor of the *‘ilal* found in *Ḥadīth*, allow me to kiss your feet ...” (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 482-486)

Ḥātim Warrāq ∇ said: “I saw Imām Bukhārī walking behind the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ in a dream. Imām Bukhārī would place his foot in exactly the same spot where the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ lifted his foot.”⁵

Nujaym ibn Fuḍayl saw in a dream that the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ was coming out of his grave. Imām Bukhārī ∇ was walking behind him and was placing his feet in the footprints of Nabī ﷺ.

Firabrī saw the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ in a dream. The Messenger of Allāh ﷺ asked: “Where do you intend to go?” Firabrī replied: “To Muḥammad ibn Isma‘īl”. The Messenger of Allāh ﷺ then said: “Convey my *salām* to him.”⁶ (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 489)

⁵ This is an indication towards Imām Bukhārī’s ∇ great regard for *ittibā‘ sunnah* [emulating and adopting the *sunnah*]. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁶ This is from amongst the glad tidings of his acceptance. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]



The Students and Disciples of Imām Bukhārī √

Some of Imām Bukhārī's √ students were also his *mashayikh* and teachers. Some of their names are:

‘Abdullāh ibn Muḥammad Al-Masnadī, ‘Abdullāh ibn Munīr, Ishāq ibn Aḥmad Al- Sarmārī, Muḥammad ibn Khalaf ibn Qutaybah.

From amongst his age group, the following persons were honoured to be his (Imām Bukhārī's √) students:

Abū Zar‘ah Rāzī, Abū Ḥātim Rāzī, Ibrāhīm Al-Ḥarbī, Abū Bakr ibn Abī ‘Āsim¹, Mūsā ibn Ḥārūn Al-Jamāl, Muḥammad ibn ‘Abdullāh ibn Muṭayyin, Ishāq ibn Aḥmad ibn Zayrak Al Fārsī, Muḥammad ibn Qutaybah Al Bukhārī, Abū Bakr Al-A‘yan رَحْمَهُمُ اللَّهُ.

From amongst the great and famous *muḥaddithīn*, the following scholars have acquired benefit:

Ṣāliḥ ibn Muḥammad Jazrah, Imām Muslim, Abul Faḍl Aḥmad ibn Salmah, Abū Bakr ibn Khuzaymah², Muḥammad ibn Naṣr Al-Marwazī³, Imām Nasā’ī رَحْمَهُمُ اللَّهُ. They have also narrated indirectly from him. Imām Tirmidhī, ‘Umar ibn Muḥammad Al-Buḥayrī, Abū Bakr ibn Abī Dunyā, Abū Bakr Al-Bazzār⁴, Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad Al-Qabbānī, Ya‘qūb ibn Yūsuf Al-Akhram, ‘Abdullāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Nājiyah, Sahl ibn Shādhwiyyah Al- Bukhārī, ‘Ubaydullāh ibn Wāṣil, Al-Qāsim ibn Zakariyyā Al-Muṭriz, Abū Quraysh Muḥammad ibn Jumu‘ah, Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn Sulaymān Al- Bāghandī, Ibrāhīm ibn

¹ He is the author of “*Kitāb-us-Sunnah*”. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

² He is the author of “*Ṣaḥīḥ ibn Khuzaymah*”. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

³ He is the author of “*Mukhtaṣar Qiyām-ul-Layl*”. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁴ He is the author of “*Musnad Bazzār*”. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

Mūsā Al-Jarīrī, ‘Alī ibn Al-‘Abbās At-Tābi‘ī, Abū Ḥāmid Al-A‘mashī, Abū Bakr Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ṣadaqah Al-Baghdādī, Ishāq ibn Dāwūd Al-Ṣawāf, Ḥāshid ibn Ismā‘īl Al- Bukhārī, Muḥammad ibn ‘Abdullāh ibn Al- Junayd, Muḥammad ibn Mūsā An-Nahr Tibri, Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad Al-Naysābūrī, Abū Bakr ibn Dāwūd, Abul Qāsim Al-Baghawī, Abū Muḥammad ibn Ṣā‘id, Muḥammad ibn Ḥārūn Al-Ḥaḍramī, Al-Ḥusayn ibn Ismā‘īl Al-Ḥāmili Al Baghdādī رحمه الله.

Firabrī ∇ said: “Ninety thousand people heard *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* from him [i.e., Imām Bukhārī] and I am the only narrator remaining from amongst the narrators of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. There are no others remaining.” (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 491)

Firabrī’s name was Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf ibn Maṭar ibn Ṣāliḥ ibn Bishr. His *kunyah* was Abū ‘Abdullāh. Firabar is the name of a village in Bukhārā. It is permissible to pronounce the ‘fā’ with a *fatḥah* and a *kasrah*.

Firabrī ∇ heard *Ṣaḥīḥ* twice from Imām Bukhārī ∇: once in 248 A.H. in Firabar and the second time in 252 A.H. in Bukhārā. Firabrī passed away in 320 A.H. Firabrī ∇ also has heard from Qutaybah ibn Sa‘īd ∇ and ‘Alī ibn Khushram ∇ who are among the *shuyūkh* of Imām Bukhārī ∇ and Imām Muslim ∇. Thus, Firabrī shares the honour of narrating from both these teachers of Imām Bukhārī ∇ and Imām Muslim ∇. (*Muqaddamah Sharḥ ul Bukhārī* by Nawawī pg. 60)

Firabrī’s ∇ claim that: “There is no narrator of Imām Bukhārī remaining except me,” is incorrect. It is for this reason that Ḥāfiẓ ∇ said that this statement was limited to Firabrī’s ∇ knowledge. Otherwise, nine years later after Firabrī’s ∇ death, Abū Ṭalḥa Maṣṣūr ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Qarībah Al-Bazdawī ∇ died in 329 A.H. He was also a narrator of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* as mentioned by Ibn Mākūlā and others. (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 491)

Apart from Firabrī ∇ and Abū Manṣūr ∇, the following scholars are also narrators of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*:

3. Ibrāhīm ibn Maʿqil An-Nasaḥī Al-Ḥanaḥī (death: 294 A.H.). However, he was unable to hear some portions from the end from Imām Bukhārī ∇. He would transmit through the medium of *ʿijāzah* (authorisation). According to some, he died in 295 A.H. (Dhahabī and Qurshī mention this.)

4. Ḥammād ibn Shākir An-Nasawī (Ḥanaḥī) has mentioned:

قال الحافظ: أظنه مات في حدود التسعين. اهـ

However, Kawtharī ∇ has mentioned that Nasaḥī is his correct *nisbah* and he died in 311 A.H. (*Ibn Majāh aur ʿIlm Ḥadīth* pg. 214)

There is also a fifth person: Qāḍī Ḥusayn ibn Ismāʿīl Muḥāmilī ∇ (death: 330 A.H.). According to Kirmānī ∇, he (Qāḍī Ḥusayn) was the last person to narrate *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* after hearing it from Imām Bukhārī ∇. However, Ḥāfiẓ ∇ refuted this. Ḥāfiẓ ∇ mentioned that he (Qāḍī Ḥusayn) was only present in some of Imām Bukhārī's ∇ gatherings which took place during his final journey to Baghdād. Therefore, in reality, he did not hear the entire *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. (*Muqaddamah Lāmi* pg. 64)

However, from amongst these chains of narrations, only Firabrī's chain is famous. Ḥāfiẓ *ṣāhib* ∇ clarified this. (*Ḥadyus Sārī* pg. 491) In India, Imām Bukhārī's ∇ narrations also became well-known through this (Firabrī's) chain. (*Muqaddamah Lāmi* pg. 65, 206)

There are twelve (12) individuals who narrated from Firabrī ∇⁵:

⁵ It is through this famous student of Imām Bukhārī ∇ [i.e., Firabrī] that this book has reached us. This book became famous through Firabrī's chain in India and in the cities of Arabia. Firabrī heard it twice from Imām Bukhārī ∇. The names of Firabrī's students will now be listed. Pay close attention to these names. In the copy of *Bukhārī* which we have, there is a special column which

1. (Ibn As-Sakkan) Abū ‘Alī Sa‘īd ibn ‘Uthmān (death: 353 A.H.)

His student is ‘Abdullāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Asad Al-Juhnī.

2. (Al-Mustamlī) Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm ibn Aḥmad (death: 376 A.H.)

His students are:

- a. Abū Dhar Harawī Mālikī (death: 434 A.H.)
- b. ‘Abdur Raḥmān ibn Ḥamdānī (death: 411 A.H.)

3. (Al Akhsīkathī)⁶ Abū Naṣr Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad (death: 376 A.H.)

His student is Ismā‘īl ibn Ishāq As-Ṣaffār Az-Zāhid

4. (Abū Zayd) Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad Al-Marwazī Al-Faqīh (death: 371 A.H.)

His students are:

- a. ‘Abdullāh Aṣīlī Mālikī (death: 392 A.H.)
- b. Abū Nu‘aym Aṣbahānī (death: 430 A.H.)
- c. Abul Ḥasan ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad Al-Qābisī Al-Mālikī (death: 403 A.H.).

5. (Ash-Shabbuwī) Abū ‘Alī Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar ibn Shabbuwīyah.

His students are:

- a. Sa‘īd ibn Aḥmad As-Ṣayrafī Al-‘Ayār
- b. The aforementioned ‘Abdur Raḥmān ibn Ḥamdānī

6. (Al-Jurjānī) Abū Aḥmad Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad Al-Jurjānī (death: 373 A.H. or later)

mentions the variations in different copies. In this column, these names are mentioned. Therefore, if one remembers this page from “*Hadiyyatud Darārī*”, one will have an insight with regards to this. Otherwise, one would have no idea as to what is being referred to in that column. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁶ This can be read in both ways: with a ث (thā) or a ت (tā).

Reading it with a ث is preferred as ت is not from amongst the ‘ajmī (non-‘Arab) letters.

It is the name of a village in ما وراء النهر (cities of Bukhārā and Samarkand/Transoxiana- modern day Uzbekistan, Tājikistān, Southern Kyrgyzstān and southwest Kazakhstān). (*Mu‘jamul Baldān* 1/121) (*Muqaddamah Bukhārī* Publisher- Dār Ṭawqun Najāt)

His students are:

- a. The aforementioned Abū Nu‘aym.
- b. The aforementioned Abul Ḥasan ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad Al-Qābisī Al-Mālikī.
7. (As-Sarakhsī Al-Ḥammuwayyī)⁷ Abū Muḥammad ‘Abdullāh ibn Aḥmad ibn Ḥammuwayyah (death: 381 A.H.)

His students are:

- a. The aforementioned Abū Dhar
- b. ‘Abdur Raḥmān Dāwūdī (death: 467 A.H.)
8. (Al-Kushmayhanī) Abul Ḥaytham Muḥammad ibn Makkī (death: 389 A.H.)⁸

His students are:

- a. Abū Dhar
- b. Karīmah bint Aḥmad (death: 465 A.H.)
- c. Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad Al-Ḥafṣī (death: 466 A.H.)
9. (Al Khush-shānī) Ismā‘īl ibn Muḥammad (death: 391 A.H.)

آخر من حدث عن الفريرى، قاله الحافظ

Ḥāfiẓ v mentions that he was the last to narrate from Firabrī v.

His student is Mustaghfirī (death: 432 A.H.)

Ḥāfiẓ v mentioned the above nine as the students of Firabrī v.

10. Abū Sa‘īd Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad

11. Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Matt

Nawawī v mentioned these two students.

12. (Abū Luqmān) Yahyā ibn ‘Ammār Al-Khatlānī Al-Mu‘ammar.

⁷ It is written like this in “*Hājatul Qārī*” (page 45) with two *yā*. In “*Lāmi*” it is written as Ḥammuwī, with one *yā*. 12 *Fazl*

⁸ Al-Kushmayhanī was a village in Marw which, according to Sam‘ānī, became deserted. (*Al-Jawāhirul Muḍīyyah* 2/341)

Kushmayhanī heard from Firabrī v a few months before his death, in 320 A.H. (Shaykh Zuhayr pg. 35)

He lived for one hundred and forty-three (143) years. This was mentioned in *“Al-Yānī‘ Al-Janī fī Asānīd Shaykh ‘Abdul Ghanī”*.

Abū Dhar Harwī Mālikī’s ∇ chain is the most famous and strongest chain as he narrated from Mustamlī ∇, Sarakhsī ∇ and Kashmīrī ∇. He also differentiated and separated between the three. From this, it becomes known that he memorised it well. (Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar in *Fathul Bārī* pg. 7 and *Muqaddamah Lāmi‘* pg. 28 and 224)

In India, the chain of narration of Dāwūdī from Sarakhsī is more famous (well-known).



Imām Bukhārī's √ School of Thought

Imām Bukhārī's √ School of Thought

In the introduction of “*Fatḥul Bārī*”, Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar √ did not discuss this topic (to my knowledge) (فيما أعلم)¹. It is written under one section of “*Fatḥul Bārī*” that whatever Imām Bukhārī √ quoted with regards to *tafsīr* has also been quoted by the ‘*ulamā*’ of this field like Abū ‘Ubaydah (Ma‘mar ibn Muthannā), Naḍr ibn Shumayl and others رحمهم الله. Majority of the time, he would adopt the opinion of Imām Shāfi‘ī, Abū ‘Ubaydah and others رحمهم الله regarding the discussions and rulings of *fiqh*. He would adopt the opinion of Karābisī, Ibn Kilāb and others رحمهم الله with regards to ‘*aqīdah*’ issues. (*Fatḥul Bārī* 2/243 باب ما يقول عند الخلاء)

However, for a long time there have been discussions regarding the *madhāhib* (schools of thought) of the compilers of the *Ṣiḥāḥ Sittah*. There are many differences of opinion amongst the scholars regarding this. The opinions of the scholars with regards to Imām Bukhārī √ are as follows:

‘Allāmah ibn Taymiyah regards Imām Bukhārī √ as an Imām and *mujtahid* with regards to *fiqh* as mentioned by Jazā‘irī Damashqī² in “*Tawjihun Naẓar*” on page 185.

‘Allāmah Tāj-ud-Dīn Subkī √ mentioned in “*Ṭabaqāt-ush- Shāfi‘iyyatul Kubrā*” that Imām Bukhārī √ was a *Shāfi‘ī*³. The reason for this opinion

¹ If anyone claims that he has mentioned it, then they should also mention where it is mentioned. من ادعي فعلية البيان الي شعبان او الي ما بعد رمضان. (Whoever makes a claim, should also clarify it by *Sha‘bān* or even after *Ramaḍān*.) We have not found this discussion in “*Fatḥul Bārī*” nor in “*Hadyus Sārī*”. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

² This is an amazing book regarding *‘Uṣūl Ḥadīth*. He is a 14th century scholar. He passed away in 1338 A.H. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

was due to the fact that Imām Bukhārī ∇ was the student of Ḥumaydī ∇, and Ḥumaydī ∇ was the student of Imām Shāfi`ī ∇. It is also said that Imām Bukhārī ∇ heard from Za`farānī, Abū Thawr and Karābisī, and they all heard from Imām Shāfi`ī ∇. (*Muqaddamah Lāmi`* pg. 15-19 and *Ma`ārifus Sunan* pg. 211)

However, these reasons are not sufficient for Imām Bukhārī ∇ to be a *Shāfi`ī*. Otherwise, to say Imām Shāfi`ī ∇ was a *Ḥanafī* should also be correct since he was the student of the students of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇.⁴ Similarly, Imām Aḥmad ∇ should also be considered as a *Shāfi`ī* and Imām Shāfi`ī ∇ should also be considered as a *Mālikī*.

Additionally, just as Imām Bukhārī ∇ is a student of Ḥumaydī ∇, Ishāq ibn Rāhwayh ∇ is also his special teacher. Ishāq ibn Rāhwayh ∇ is a student of `Abdullāh ibn Mubārak ∇, and `Abdullāh ibn Mubārak ∇⁵ is a

³ This is a very famous book authored by Tāj-ud-Dīn Subkī ∇. Tāj-ud-Dīn is the son. His father's name was Taqī-ud-Dīn Subkī. He wrote "*Shifā`us-Siqām fi Ziyāratil Khayrīl Anām*". This is a book which refutes Ibn Taymiyyah. Both of them were from Egypt and were great scholars. He was Dhahabī's ∇ student. Subkī used this as evidence. However, it is a very weak evidence. In Persian, it is said, "This evidence is سبک." That is, it is such a weak evidence that it can be blown away by blowing on it. Although Subkī was a great scholar, sometimes a great person makes weak statements and sometimes a person of lower rank makes strong statements. His evidence for Imām Bukhārī ∇ being a *Shāfi`ī* is that Bukhārī ∇ is Ḥumaydī's student and Ḥumaydī is Imām Shāfi`ī's ∇ student. However, this evidence will become like scattered dust [i.e., the extreme weakness of this evidence will be revealed] in the upcoming discussion. [Extracted from *Ifūdātush Shaykh*]

⁴ Imām Shāfi`ī ∇ is Imām Muḥammad's ∇ student and Imām Muḥammad ∇ is Imām Abū Ḥanīfah's ∇ student. Thus, Imām Shāfi`ī ∇ is a *Ḥanafī*. What reply can Subkī give regarding this? [Extracted from *Ifūdātush Shaykh*]

⁵ `Abdullāh ibn Mubārak ∇ was a distinguished personality. *Ḥazrat Mawlānā Ḥabīb-ur-Rahmān ṣāhib A`ẓmī* ∇ has considered him to the pride of Islām. Along with being an Imām of *Ḥadīth* and *fiqh*, he was also a *mujāhid* in the path of Allāh. He also had an important position in Imām Abū Ḥanīfah's ∇ *Majlis-e-Shūrā*. The *masā'il* of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇ were recorded in a book

student of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇. Therefore, [from this angle,] Imām Bukhārī ∇ was a *Ḥanafī*.

Many teachers of Imām Bukhārī ∇ were *Ḥanafī*, such as Ma'la ibn Manṣūr⁶, Abū 'Āṣim Nabīl, Muḥammad ibn 'Abdullāh Al-Muthannā Al-Anṣārī and Makkī ibn Ibrāhīm Balkhī (Imām Bukhārī ∇ has narrated eleven *thulāthiyyāt* from him.) Apart from these, there are many other teachers of Imām Bukhārī ∇ who are *Ḥanafī*. Therefore, the above evidences are not sufficient.

Similarly, agreeing with Imām Shāfi'ī ∇ in some well-known *masā'il* (rulings) cannot be used as an evidence to prove that he was a *Shāfi'ī*. Although he agreed with Imām Shāfi'ī ∇ in certain *masā'il* such as: '*rafa'*

after consultation with the members of the *shurā*. Imām Abū Yūsuf ∇ used to record it in the '*uṣūl*. It is only the *Ḥanafī fiqh* which has the honour of being based on a *shurā*. It is clear that whatever is decided after consultation with the Imām of *Ḥadīth*, *fiqh* and *qiyās*, will be the most preferred and closest to the truth than the individual research of a single *mujtahid*.

⁶ Ma'la ibn Manṣūr narrated books from Imām Abū Yūsuf ∇ and Imām Muḥammad ∇: He narrated both Amālī and Nawādir. Imām Bukhārī ∇ has narrated from him in books other than *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. He was also Imām Abū Ḥanīfah's ∇ student. Abū 'Āṣim Dhiḥāk ibn Mukhlid An-Nabīl was also Imām A'ẓam's ∇ student. In Bukhārī, six *thulāthiyyāt* are narrated from him. Muḥammad ibn 'Abdullāh Anṣārī was a student of Imām Abū Yūsuf ∇ and Imām Zufar ∇. Imām Bukhārī ∇ has narrated three *thulāthiyyāt* from him. Makkī ibn Ibrāhīm is also Imām A'ẓam's ∇ student and is a great supporter of the *Ḥanafīs*. He had heard both *Ḥadīth* and *fiqh* from Imām A'ẓam ∇. (*Muqaddamah Lāmi'* pg.16,17)

Besides them, Yaḥyā Qaṭṭān, Na'im ibn Ḥammād Khuzā'i, Ḥusayn ibn Ibrāhīm, Ishkāb, 'Umar ibn Ḥaṣṣ ibn Ghiyāth, Fuḍayl ibn Ayāḍ, Yaḥyā ibn Ma'in , Waqī' ibn Al-Jarrāh, and many others are the teachers of Imām Bukhārī ∇ and also the students of Imām A'ẓam ∇ or they are the students of his students. (*Ibid*)

yadayn (رفع يدين) ‘*āmīn bil jahr*’ (أمين بالجهر) and ‘*qirā’ah khalf imām*’ (قراءة خلف الإمام), he also disagreed with him and agreed with the *Ḥanafīs*⁷ in many other *masā’il* such as:

وضوء من القبلة،⁸ وضوء من مس الذكر،⁹ وضوء من مس المرأة،¹⁰ جهر بسمله،¹¹ تثليث مسح رأس،¹² طهارة مني،¹³ كلام في الصلوة¹⁴

⁷ They have counted the *masā’il* in which Imām Bukhārī ∇ has differed with the *Ḥanafīs*. We have also counted [them]. We have found that the *masā’il* in which Imām Bukhārī ∇ agrees with Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇ are more than those in which he disagrees with him. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁸ وضوء من القبلة [Performing *wuḍū’* due to kissing]: Imām Shāfi’ī ∇ is of the opinion that *wuḍū’* breaks by kissing a woman. Imām Bukhārī ∇ does not agree with this. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁹ وضوء من مس الذكر [Performing *wuḍū’* due to touching one’s private part]: Imām Shāfi’ī ∇ is of the opinion that *wuḍū’* breaks by touching the private part. Imām Bukhārī ∇ does not agree with this. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

¹⁰ وضوء من مس المرأة [Performing *wuḍū’* due to touching a woman]: This ruling is also as mentioned above. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

¹¹ جهر بسمله [Reading *Bismillāh* loudly]: Imām Bukhārī ∇ has also not mentioned regarding reciting *Bismillāh* loudly. Zayla’ī has discussed this extensively and passionately in “*Naṣbur Rā’yah*”. He usually, does not express such passion in his discussions. He usually exhibits such a calm demeanor that sometimes, he mentions more of the opposition’s evidences than the evidences of the *Aḥnāf*. He has not expressed such passion in the entire “*Naṣbur Rā’yah*” as he has done here. His *Hanafi* pride overflowed regarding this, and he wrote extensively regarding this and expressed his strong opposition. If he had found a slight concession regarding this, he would have brought the evidences. However, Imām Bukhārī ∇ did not mention any evidence regarding reciting *Bismillāh* loudly in his *Ṣaḥīḥ* and he did not mention this ruling. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

¹² تثليث مسح رأس [Making *masḥ* of the head thrice]. Similarly, according to the *Shāfi’ī madh-hab*, *masḥ* of the head must be done thrice. They use the *ghayr maḥfūz* and *shādh* narrations of *Abū Dāwūd* as evidence to support their opinion and they leave out the *ṣaḥīḥ* narrations. Even Imām Bukhārī ∇ did not mention this [doing *masaḥ* thrice]. Rather, he mentioned a chapter titled: مسح الرأس مرة [Masḥ of the head must be done once]. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

and many other *masā'il*¹⁵. (*Muqaddamah Lāmi'* pg. 61,62)

Therefore, the claim that he was a *Shāfi'ī* is not based on any solid evidence.¹⁶

¹³ طهارة مني [The purity of semen]: According to the *Shāfi'ī madh-hab*, semen is pure. Imām Bukhārī ∇ does not mention this. Rather, he indicates towards its impurity in the *tarjumatul bāb*. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

¹⁴ كلام في الصلوة [Speaking during *ṣalāh*]: Similarly, according to the *Shawāfi'*, if a person speaks a little forgetfully during *ṣalāh*, his *ṣalāh* does not become invalid. Imām Bukhārī ∇ mentions such a *Ḥadīth* which shows that any type of speech renders one's *ṣalāh* invalid. He mentions Ibn Mas'ūd's *Ḥadīth*: ان في الصلوة لشغلا [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

¹⁵ All of these *masā'il* [in which Imām Bukhārī ∇ agrees with the *Aḥnāf*] are more than those in which Imām Bukhārī ∇ differs with the *Ahnaf*. If he can be considered a *Shāfi'ī* due to his agreement with Imām Shāfi'ī ∇ in some *masā'il*, then we can say that Imām Bukhārī ∇ has agreed with us more than he has agreed with *Shāfi'ī*. Therefore, he is a *Ḥanafī*. Although we are not in need of Imām Bukhārī ∇ to support our *madh-hab* as it is already strong, we mention this for the purpose of the discussion surrounding the evidence that claims he was a *Shāfi'ī*. Thus, by this, we have proven the claim that he is a *Shāfi'ī* is not substantiated by any form of solid evidence. Although, there is one opinion that he is a *Shāfi'ī*, it is difficult to believe because it is not supported by evidences. So how, can it be accepted when there is no evidence? Things are only accepted if they are based on evidences. Have you accepted this claim [that he was a *Shāfi'ī*] because Subkī mentions this? Have you simply accepted it because a great *ʿālim* made such a claim or are you going to discuss it? [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

¹⁶ *Shāh Muḥaddith* Dehlawī ∇ states in "*Al-Inṣāf*": "Although Imām Bukhārī ∇ is associated with Imām Shāfi'ī ∇ as he is in agreement with many of *Shāfi'ī's masā'il*, he also has differences with him regarding many other *masā'il*. Therefore, his *tafarrudāt* cannot be considered to be part of the *Shāfi'ī* school of thought. (*Muqaddamah Lāmi'* pg. 18)

This exact statement is also mentioned in "*Kashf-uṣ-Ḥunūn*" by Ḥājī Khalīfah ∇. (*Muqaddamah Lāmi'* pg.18)

‘Allāmah Ibn Qayyim ∇¹⁷ has mentioned in “*A'lāmul Muwaqqi'in*” that Imām Bukhārī, Imām Muslim, Imām Abū Dāwūd, Athram رحمه الله and those from amongst the category of scholars who are the *aṣḥāb* of Imām Aḥmad, would follow Imām Aḥmad ∇ more than those *muqallidīn* who were strictly *muqallids* and ascribed themselves to him. (*Muqaddamah Lāmi* ∇ pg.18, 69)

Ibn Abī Laylā ∇ also considered these three (Imām Bukhārī, Imām Muslim and Imām Abū Dāwūd رحمه الله) to be from amongst the *Hanābilah*. (Ibid)

Nawāb Siddīq Ḥasan Khān¹⁸ in “*Abjād ul 'Ulūm*” considers Imām Bukhārī, Abū Dāwūd and Nasā'ī رحمه الله to be from amongst the *Shawāfi'*.

‘Allāmah Nafis-ud-Dīn ‘Ulwā ∇ refuted Subkī and agreed that Imām Bukhārī ∇ was a *mustaqil mujtahid*.

‘Allāmah Anwar Shāh Kashmīrī ∇ has also agreed, without any uncertainty, that Imām Bukhārī ∇ was a *mujtahid*. (*Fayḍul Bārī* pg.58, *Ma'ārifus Sunan* pg. 21)

Mawlānā Muḥammad ‘Abdur Rashīd Nu‘mānī ∇ mentioned in “*Mā tamassu ilayhil Ḥājah*” that like the other authors of the *Ṣiḥāḥ Sittah*, Imām Bukhārī ∇ and Imām Abū Dāwūd ∇ were not followers of any Imām nor were they *muṭlaq mujtahids*. However, they were inclined

¹⁷ ‘Allāmah ibn Qayyim ∇ is Ibn Taymiyyah’s ∇ student. There is a lot of debate surrounding the name of this book. *Shaykh* ‘Abdul Fattāḥ Abū Ghuddah ∇ has discussed this in the footnotes of *Muqaddamah* of “*I'lā'us Sunan*”. One of his conclusions is that its title is: “*E'lāmul Muwaqqi'in*”. This is one of his best books. The other interpretation is that it is titled: “*A'lāmul Muwaqqi'in*”. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

¹⁸ This is famous Indian *ghayr muqallid* scholar. He was not a *Nawāb* himself. Rather, he married a woman who was a *Nawāb*. Thus, he became a *Nawāb*. There were many debates and discussions between him and *Mawlānā* ‘Abdul Ḥay Ṣāḥib. Both of them were from the same era. He refutes him a lot in “*Al Fawā'id-ul-Jahmiyyah*”. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

towards the opinions of the *a'immaḥ*. If they were *mustaqil mujtahids*, like the other *mujtahid* scholars, their opinions would also have been documented in books. However, this has not been found. For example, Imām Tirmidhī ∇, who is one of the notable students of Imām Bukhārī ∇, in his *Jāmi' Tirmidhī*, he mentioned the opinions of the *mujtahidīn* scholars. He has even mentioned the opinions of 'Abdullāh ibn Mubārak ∇ and Ishāq ibn Rāhwayh ∇, but he did not mention the opinion of Imām Bukhārī ∇. This shows that Imām Bukhārī ∇ was not a *mujtahid*.¹⁹ (*Mā Tamassu ilayhil Ḥājah* pg. 27)

If it is accepted that they were *muṭlaq mujtahids* after the *a'immaḥ arba'ah*, then according to the research of *Shaykh-ul-Ḥadīth Mawlānā Muḥammad Zakarriyā* ∇, Imām Bukhārī ∇ was a *mustaqil mujtahid*. There are many differences of opinions regarding this matter. He was definitely not a *Shafi'ī* as he also made objections against the *Shāfi'ī madh-hab* just as he did against the *Aḥnāf madh-hab*. However, his tone was a bit harsher in his objections against the *Aḥnāf*. This fact will become apparent to those who are aware of the differences of the scholars' opinion if they study and ponder upon the *tarājim* (chapter titles) of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*.

His opinions were not documented like that of the *a'immaḥ mujtahidīn*, because he was not an Imām who was followed like the other Imāms who were followed. It is for this reason, his *madh-hab* never became famous. (*Muqaddamah Lāmi'* pg. 19. Pg. 17,60 of the typed edition)

In our opinion, it is difficult to consider Imām Bukhārī ∇ as a *muṭlaq, mustaqil* (i.e., an independent) *mujtahid* like the *a'immaḥ arba'ah*

¹⁹ *Mawlānā Nu mānī* ∇ has refuted those that are of the opinion that he was a *muṭlaq mujtahid* like Ibn Taymiyyah, 'Allāmah Nafīs-ud-Dīn and Kashmīrī رحمهم الله. This is the world of knowledge. A person does not bow his head simply by seeing the face of a person. Rather, each person's opinion is weighed against their evidences. Whichever opinion balances the scale, that opinion is accepted. This is the method of debating. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

because he does not have any *uṣūls* (principles)²⁰. In *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*, there are many places in which his opinion is not clear and obvious. Perhaps, it is for this reason, his statements and opinions are not mentioned in books. Apart from *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*, we do not know of any other book by Imām Bukhārī ∇ which gives details regarding *juzi'yāt* (subsidiary *masā'il*). How can he attain this status, when his students did not consider him to be a *faqīh* or a *mujtahid*? Undoubtedly, he is a special type of *mujtahid* like the other *muḥaddithīn* who compiled *Ḥadīth* books. From amongst the *tarājim* of the *Ḥadīth* books, the *tarājim abwāb* of Imām Bukhārī ∇ are the most profound, deep and insightful. From this, it is understood that in comparison with the other *muḥaddithīn*, his insight was deeper and he possessed a greater intellectual capability to derive proofs from texts. Perhaps, it is for this reason that many scholars called Imām Bukhārī ∇ a *mujtahid*.²¹ And Allāh ﷻ knows best.

Supplement

On this occasion, it will be befitting to mention the statements of the scholars concerning the school of thought of the other compilers of the *Ṣiḥāḥ Sittah* because discussions regarding the compilers of *Ṣiḥāḥ Sittah* are usually mentioned together.

Imām Muslim ∇

²⁰ Every *muṭlaq mujtahid* has some *uṣūls* from which *furū' masā'il* can be derived. Imām Bukhārī ∇ does not have any *fiqh* books. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

²¹ Scholars like Ibn Taymiyyah, 'Allāmah Nafīs-ud-Dīn and Kashmīrī رحمهم الله. Similarly, *Shaykh-ul-Ḥadīth Mawlānā Muḥammad Zakarriyā* ∇ and other scholars who considered him a *mustaqil mujtahid* do not mean he was a *mujtahid* like that of the *a'immaḥ arba'ah*. Rather, they meant that he was a *mujtahid* from the angle that he derived rulings from *aḥādīth*. This is our opinion. However, we do not claim that this is the correct opinion. Rather, we say that Allāh ﷻ knows best. Additionally, you are also not compelled to accept this opinion. Rather, you can form your own opinion. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

‘Allāmah Kashmīrī ∇ has stated that he does not know the *madh-hab* of Imām Muslim ∇ with certainty because he himself did not write the *tarājim* in his book. [Therefore, one cannot deduce his *madh-hab* by studying his *tarājim*.] (*Fayḍul Bārī* pg. 58 and *‘Urf-ush-Shadhī with Tirmidhī* pg. 1)

Nawāb Ṣiddiq Ḥasan Khān *ṣāhib* ∇ mentioned in both of his books, “*Al Ḥaṭṭah Bi Dhikr Ṣiḥāḥ Sittah*” and “*Ithāf An-Nubalā*” that Imām Muslim ∇ was a *Shāfi‘ī*. (*Muqaddamah Lāmi‘* pg. 18 and 68)

‘Allāmah Ibrāhīm Tahtuhwī ∇²² mentions that it is famous that he was a *Shāfi‘ī* from the angle that his *ijtihād* coincided with Imām Shāfi‘ī’s ∇ *ijtihād* and not from the angle that he was a *muqallid* of Imām Shāfi‘ī ∇. He also states that it is indicated in “*Ithāful Akābir*”, that he was of the *Mālikī madh-hab*. From the “*Taqrīb*” of Ibn Ḥajar ∇, it becomes known that Imām Muslim ∇ was a *mujtahid*. (*Muqaddamah Lāmi‘* pg. 18 and 68)

Mawlānā ‘Abdul Rashīd Nu‘mānī’s ∇ opinion has been mentioned above. According to him, Imām Muslim ∇ was neither a *muqallid* nor a *mujtahid muṭlaq*²³.

Shāh Walīullāh Muḥaddith Dehlawī ∇ has considered Imām Muslim ∇ as a *Shāfi‘ī*. (*Al -Inṣāf fī Bayān Sababul Ikhṭilāf* pg. 57)

It is also mentioned in “*Kashfuz Ḍunūn*”²⁴ that he was as *Shāfi‘ī*. 1/555 (*Muqaddamah Lāmi‘* pg. 19 and 70)

²² This is a place in Sindh (India) called Tahtah. In Arabic, it is called Tatah. This province in Sindh is very famous. Many giant scholars visited this place. [Extracted from *Ifādūtush Shaykh*]

²³ We also take this opinion of *Mawlānā* Nu‘mānī ∇; i.e, from one angle he is a *mujtahid*. That is, he is a *mujtahid* in deriving rulings from *aḥādīth*. [Extracted from *Ifādūtush Shaykh*]

²⁴ The author of this book is Ḥājī Khalīfah ∇ also known as Mullā Kātib Chalpī (death: 1067 A.H.). This is an amazing book. The full name of this book is: “*Kashf-uz-Ḍunūn ‘an asāmī kutubul funūn*”. Two appendices have been written on this book:

‘Allāmah Ibn Qayyim ∇ also ascribed him to the *Ḥanbalī madh-hab* just as he ascribed Imām Bukhārī ∇ to the *Ḥanbalī madh-hab*. (*Muqaddamah Lāmi* ‘ pg. 18)

‘Allāmah Ibn Taymiyyah ∇ ascribed him to the *madh-hab* of the *Ahl Ḥadīth*. He did not consider him to be a *muqallid* nor *mujtahid*. Rather, he was inclined towards the statements and opinions of the *a’immah* of *Ḥadīth* such as: Shāfi‘ī, Aḥmad, Ishāq, Abū ‘Ubaydah and others رَحِمَهُمُ اللَّهُ.

According to *Mawlānā* Muḥammad Zakariyyā ∇, apart from Imām Bukhārī ∇ and Imām Abū Dāwūd ∇, the authors of the other books of *Ḥadīth* are in the category of *mujtahidīn fil madh-hab*. They agree with their Imām on some issues and disagree with regards to others. It is for this reason, there are many differences of opinion regarding this. (*Muqaddamah Lāmi* ‘ pg. 17, 19)

A *mujtahid fil madh-hab* is such a person who follows a *mujtahid muṭlaq mustaqil* Imām in the *‘uṣūl* (foundational principles) but not in the *furū’* (subsidiary rulings).²⁵ When someone is deemed as a *mujtahid* of a *madh-hab*, it must also be mentioned of which *madh-hab* and of which Imām. This has not been mentioned in the statement of *Ḥazrat Shaykh*.

We think that the statements of Ibn Taymiyyah ∇ and *Mawlānā* Nu‘mānī ∇ are more appropriate, i.e., these authors of *aḥādīth* derive rulings from the *aḥādīth* themselves. Sometimes, they agree with an Imām *mujtahid* and at other times with another *mujtahid*. This is what is meant by *Shaykh* Zakariyyā’s ∇ statement of *mujtahid fil madh-hab*,

إيضاح المكنون في الذيل على كشف الظنون and هدية العارفين أسماء المؤلفين وآثار المصنفين من كشف الظنون للشيخ باشا بغدادي مولدا نزيل في قرية قرى قسطنطينية م ١٣٣٩ هـ مقدمة كشف الظنون.

In total, there are six volumes. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

²⁵ This is the definition of *mujtahid fil madhhab* which has been mentioned in the *fiqh* books. ‘Allāmah Kamāl Pāshā ∇ mentioned seven categories of *fuqahā’*, which are mentioned in *“Shāmī”*. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

i.e., these people are between being *muqallids* and *mujtahid muṭlaqs*. That is, he is a type of *mujtahid* (as we have stated). The definition of *mujtahid fil madhhab* in *fiqh* is not what is meant by *Ḥazrat Shaykh*. And Allāh ﷻ knows best.

Imām Tirmidhī ∇

According to ‘Allāmah Kashmīrī ∇, Imām Tirmidhī ∇ was a *Shāfi‘ī*. The only ruling in which he has a different opinion (from Imām Shāfi‘ī) is regarding *‘ibrāduḥ Ḍuḥr*’ (إبرادالظهر).

According to ‘Allāmah Ibrāhīm Tahtuhwī, Imām Tirmidhī ∇ is a *mujtahid*. His *fiqh* coincides with Imām Shāfi‘ī’s ∇ *fiqh*.

According to *Shāh Walīullāh Muḥaddith Dehlawī* ∇, Imām Abū Dāwūd ∇ and Imām Tirmidhī ∇ are *mujtahids*. However, they have also been ascribed to Imām Aḥmad ∇ and Imām Ishāq ∇.

‘Allāmah Ibn Taymiyyah considers him to be from the *madh-hab* of the *Ahl Ḥadīth*; he is neither a *mujtahid* nor a *muqallid*. Rather, he is inclined towards the (opinions of the) *Ahl al-Ḥadīth*.²⁶

²⁶ Imām Tirmidhī ∇ has frequently mentioned “عند أصحابنا”. This supports Ibn Taymiyyah’s opinion (that Imām Tirmidhī is of the *Ahl al-Ḥadīth madh-hab*. The way of the *muḥaddithīn* is such, when a *Ḥadīth* reaches them, they use it to derive their own rulings).

After mentioning ‘عند أصحابنا’, he sometimes mentions Imām Shāfi‘ī ∇ and Imām Aḥmad ∇ after a *ḥurf atf* (the conjunction ‘and’) and sometimes without a *ḥurf atf*. From this it can be deduced that he was of a different group (*madh-hab*) from them, yet at the same time, he also had some form of connection with them. (When it is without the conjunction, it becomes known that Imām Aḥmad ∇ and Imām Shāfi‘ī ∇ are his أصحاب. And when there is a conjunction, which is there for *mughayarah*, then it becomes known that his أصحاب are other than them. In comparison to the people of ‘Irāq he has a stronger connection with the people of Madīnah. From the people of Baghdād, he is only connected to Imām Aḥmad ∇. And he is hardly connected to the remainder of the *Aḥnāf*). And Allāh knows best.

According to *Mawlānā* ‘Abdul Rashīd Nu‘mānī ∇, he is neither a *mujtahid* nor is he a *muqallid*. He is inclined towards the opinions of his *a’immah* as mentioned previously.

Shaykh Muḥammad Zakariyyā ∇ places him in the category of the *mujtahids* as mentioned previously. (*Muqaddamah Lāmi* ‘ pg. 19, 67, 71)

Imām Abū Dāwūd ∇

According to ‘Allāmah Kashmīrī ∇ and *Shaykh* Zakariyyā ∇, he was a *Ḥanbalī*.

According to Nawāb Ṣiddiq Ḥasan Khān ∇, he was a *Shāfi’ī*.

According to *Shāh* Walīullāh ∇ he was a *mujtahid* and was ascribed to Ishāq ∇, similar to Imām Tirmidhī ∇ (as mentioned previously).

According to ‘Allāmah Ibn Taymiyah ∇, he was of the *madh-hab* of the *Ahl Ḥadīth* (as mentioned previously). (*Muqaddamah Lāmi* ‘ pg. 18)

Imām Nasā’ī ∇

According to ‘Allāmah Kashmīrī ∇, , he was a *Ḥanbalī*.

According to *Shāh* ‘Abdul ‘Azīz ∇ and Nawāb Ṣiddiq Ḥasan Khān ∇, he was a *Shāfi’ī*.

According to *Mawlānā* Muḥammad Zakariyyā ∇, he was a *mujtahid* of the *madh-hab* (as mentioned previously).

According to ‘Allāmah Ibn Taymiyah ∇, he was of the *madh-hab* of the *Ahl Ḥadīth*.

Imām Ibn Mājah ∇

According to ‘Allāmah Ibn Taymiyah ∇, he was of the *madh-hab* of the *Ahl al-Ḥadīth*.

According to *Shāh* Walīullāh ∇, he was a *mujtahid* and he also ascribed him to Imām Aḥmad ∇ and Imām Ishāq ∇.

According to *Mawlānā* Nu`mānī ∇, he was neither a *mujtahid* nor a *muqallid*. Rather, he was inclined to the opinion of his scholars.

According to *Shaykh* Muḥammad Zakariyyā ∇ he was a *mujtahid* of the *madh-hab*. (*Muqaddamah Lāmi`* pg. 19, 67, 71)

According to `Allāmah Kashmīrī ∇ his *madh-hab* is not known. (*Fayḍul Bārī* pg. 58)

Perhaps, he was a *Shāfi`ī*.<sup>27</sup> (*Al-`Urf-ush-Shadhī* pg. 1)

²⁷ His *madh-hab* is not known. It is possible, i.e., it is not known with certainty, that he was a *Shāfi`ī*. However, we adopt the same opinion regarding him which we adopt regarding all of them. That is, they were of the *Ahl al-Ḥadīth madh-hab*. They were not *mujtahid muṭlaq mustaqil*. Rather, they were a type of *mujtahid*. However, from amongst them, Imām Bukhārī ∇ holds the highest position. It is for this reason, it is said about Imām Bukhārī ∇: "His *fiqh* is within his *tarājim*." There are two explanations for this:

1. His *madh-hab* cannot be found elsewhere; it can only be found from his *tarājim*.
2. The sharpness, intelligence and excellence of Imām Bukhārī ∇ is hidden within his *tarājim*. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]



Imām Bukhārī ∇ And The Aḥnāf

Imām Bukhārī ∇ had the opportunity to be the student of Abū Ḥaṣṣ Kabīr ∇ (death: 271 A.H.) as mentioned previously. From him, he heard the “*jāmi*” of Sufyān Thawrī in his hometown before travelling. A friendly connection existed between Imām Bukhārī’s ∇ father and Abū Ḥaṣṣ Kabīr ∇. After the passing of Ismā‘īl, Abū Ḥaṣṣ Kabīr ∇ would continuously assist Imām Bukhārī ∇. For a long time, Abū Ḥaṣṣ Aḥmad Kabīr’s son (Muḥammad Abū Ḥaṣṣ Ṣaghīr) and Imām Bukhārī ∇ travelled together to seek knowledge. Abū Ḥaṣṣ Kabīr ∇ was the student of Imām Abū Yūsuf ∇ and Imām Muḥammad ∇. He was considered as one of the senior students of Imām Muḥammad ∇. He was of the same age as Imām Shāfi‘ī ∇. He was granted a long life and also lived for a short period after the death of Imām Shāfi‘ī ∇. He was a great *muḥaddith*, *faqīh*, devout worshipper and ascetic. Countless people have heard from him. This father and son were famous Imāms of *Ḥadīth* in Bukārā. It is clear that because of the connection he had with them, Imām Bukhārī ∇ remained very close to the *Aḥnāf*.

Later on, when Imām Bukhārī ∇ built a connection with the student of Imām Shāfi‘ī ∇, Imām Ḥumaydī ∇, and Nu‘aym ibn Ḥammād Khuzā‘ī ∇, Imām Bukhārī ∇ changed because these two opposed the *Aḥnāf* considerably.

Ḥumaydī

Abū Nu‘aym narrated this statement of Ḥumaydī along with its chain in *‘Hilyatul Awliyā’* (9/96):

كُنَّا نَرِيدُ أَنْ نَرُدَّ عَلَى أَصْحَابِ الرَّأْيِ فَلَمْ نُحْسِنْ كَيْفَ نُرَدِّ عَلَيْهِمْ حَتَّى جَاءَنَا الشَّافِعِيُّ فَفَتَحَ لَنَا.

(*Mā Tamassu ilayhil Ḥājah* pg. 20)

“We wished to refute the *Aṣḥābur Rā’y*. However, we could not do this properly until Imām Shāfi‘ī came and opened it up for us (i.e., made it easy for us).”

This was the extent of Ḥumaydī’s knowledge. Despite this, he also said: “When I accompanied Imām Shāfi‘ī v on a journey to Baṣrah, I used to find out *masā’il* from him and he used to acquire *Ḥadīth* from me.” (*Mā Tamassu ilayhil Ḥājah* pg. 20)

The author of *‘Anwārul Bārī’*¹ has written that Ḥumaydī spent an ample amount of time in the service of Sufyān bin ‘Uyaynah v (the

¹ The author of *‘Anwār Al-Bārī’* is ‘Allāmah Syed Aḥmad Raḍa Bijnorī v. Bijnor is a district in the west of Uttar Pradesh. We are from the east. He is the son-in-law and student of ‘Allāmah Kashmīrī v. Both him and *Mawlānā* Yūsuf Binnorī v went to Qāhirah (Cairo) on behalf of *Majlis ‘Ilmī* to print *‘Naṣbur Rā’yah’* and *‘Fayḍul Bārī’*. ‘Allāmah Syed Aḥmad Raḍa Bijnorī v is a distinguished scholar. I would frequently write letters to him (during my stay in Dabhel). It was his wish that a *Takhaṣṣuṣ Fil Ḥadīth* Department be established in Dabhel. Dabhel is home to a very famous *madrasah* of Gujarat. Many great and exceptional scholars are affiliated with this institution.

The preparations for establishing this department were ongoing. I was the intermediary between the principal of Dabhel and ‘Allāmah Syed Aḥmad Raḍa Bijnorī v. It was confirmed that *Shaykhul Hind, Muḥaddith Kabīr*, ‘Allāmah Jalīl, would come to Dabhel for a few months during the year and establish the *Takhaṣṣuṣ Fil Ḥadīth* Department. The syllabus was prepared. It was his wish that the outstanding students of the *Dārul ‘Ulūm* study *Takhaṣṣuṣ Fil Ḥadīth*.

They should study *‘Uṣūl Ḥadīth* and *jarḥ* and *ta’dīl* so that they can refute the *ghayr muqallidīn*. At that time, the expert in this field in India was none other than Amīrul Hind. It is for this reason that he was selected to be the head of this department. However, the establishment of this department in Dabhel did not materialise. We returned to South Africa and thus, regrettably, this dream was not fulfilled.

Thereafter, by the will of Allāh ﷻ, this department was established in Sahāranpūr. The head of this department was also an A’ẓmī, the well-known Mawlānā Zaynul ‘Ābidīn A’ẓmī Purah Ma’rūf. This department was also established in Deoband. *Mawlānā* Ni’matulāh *ṣāḥib* and *Mawlānā* ‘Abdullāh Purah Ma’rūf were the head of the department there. Purah Ma’rūf is a town near Mawnath Bhanjan. Many ‘*ulamā*’ were also from here and there was also a madrasah here. These two great madrasahs established this department.

A book has also been published on this topic. It was compiled by *Mawlānā* Shāhid *ṣāḥib* Sahāranpūrī who was the grandson of *Ḥazrat* Shaykh. An interesting point is that the *fuḍalā’* of Mazāhirul ‘Ulūm have offered their services in the field of *Ḥadīth* more than those of Deoband. For instance: “*Badhlul Majhūd*” and “*‘Ilā’-us Sunan*”. Additionally, Shaykh Muḥammad Zakariyyā’s √ books (*Awjazul Masālik*, *Lāmi’ Darārī*, *Kawkabud Durri*) are all compiled by the ‘*ulamā*’ of Mazāhirul ‘Ulūm. Those that are aware of the history of Mazāhirul ‘Ulūm and its education system, are aware of the fact that from the very beginning, the original objective and main goal of the founders and *akābir* (senior scholars) of Mazāhirul ‘Ulūm was to spread the knowledge of the *Qur’ān* and *aḥādīth*. Even today, after the passing of over a century, this institution adopts this methodology. The advice and words of wisdom of its first principal and founder, *Ḥazrat Mawlānā* Rashīd Aḥmad *ṣāḥib* Gangohī √ reflects the original goal [of this institution]. His statement is recorded on the pages of history in the following words: “It is necessary on the principal of the *madrasah* to ensure that the students study and ponder deeply on *Ḥadīth* and *fiqh*. The study of this is the original purpose of establishing *madāris*. The other fields surround and support this. This should also be the purpose of the teachers (of Mazāhirul ‘Ulūm); that they ensure to encourage the students to pay attention in the *dars* (class). Additionally, during their *dīni* discourses, they should always encourage students to study and research with full

student of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇). Thus, he was very knowledgeable regarding the *aḥādīth* of Sufyān ∇ and he was honoured because of this. It is for this reason that Imām Shāfi'ī ∇ respected him and took him on some of his journeys. Due to his obstinate disposition, he became a cause for the splitting up of his own group. He wanted to become the deputy of Imām Shāfi'ī ∇. However, he was not very proficient in *fiqh*. He did not gain success, so he meaninglessly created disarray. He was also deficient with regards to his knowledge in *fiqh* in comparison to other students of Imām Shāfi'ī ∇. Muḥammad ibn Ḥakam (the student of Imām Shāfi'ī ∇) has considered Ḥumaydī a liar. (*Muqaddamah Anwārul Bārī* 2/28)

Imām Bukhārī ∇ narrated the following from Ḥumaydī ∇ in his “*Tārīkh Ṣaghīr*” on pg. 158 (the edition which was published in Illahabad):

Ḥumaydī ∇ mentioned that Abū Ḥanīfah ∇ said: “When I came to Makkah Mukarrammah, I learnt three *sunan* from a barber: When I sat in front of him, he told me to sit facing towards the *qiblah*. He then started from the right side of my head and stopped until he reached both the bones.”

Ḥumaydī ∇ said that a person who does not have the knowledge of the of the *Sunnah* of the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ and the practice of the *Ṣaḥābah* with regards to the rituals of *ḥajj*, then how can such a

concentration and understanding and that they should also pay great attention to the fields of *dīn*, especially the field of *Ḥadīth*.

وإنا الراجي رحمة ربي

[And I hope for the mercy of my Lord.]

Rashīd Aḥmad Gangohī

عفي عنه

[May he be forgiven.]

[Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

person be followed with regards to inheritance, *zakāh*, *ṣalāh* and other Islāmīc injunctions? Imām Bukhārī ∇ mentions this without refuting it which indicates that he agrees with this statement.

‘Allāmah Kashmīrī ∇ said: “In his *Ṣāḥīḥ*, Imām Bukhārī ∇ speaks with a soft tone. Otherwise, he speaks with a harsh tone. What is this? See “*Juz’ Qirā’ah Khalf Imām*”, “*Juz’ Rafa’ Yadayn*” and other than this.” (*Muqaddamah Anwārul Bārī* 2/26,36)

Shaykh Muḥammad Zakariyyā Khandelwī ∇ states: “Even in his *Ṣāḥīḥ*, he would refute them (the *Aḥnāf*) in a harsh tone without explicitly mentioning their names. He did not refute others in such a harsh tone.”² (*Muqaddamah Lāmi’* pg. 15, 60)

In reply to the narration of Ḥumaydī ∇, ‘Allāmah Muḥammad Zāhid Kawtharī ∇³ stated: “Firstly, Ḥumaydī could not have heard this

² Who is this بعض الناس (“some people have stated”) referring to which Imām Bukhārī ∇ mentions in various places? This is his refutation of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇. In many places, he tries to outline deficiencies in Imām Abū Ḥanīfah’s ∇ opinions and statements. This sharp and harsh criticism is found in *Ṣāḥīḥ Bukhārī* and also in his *juz’*. We will discuss the details and contents of this *juz’* later. The publishers have named this *juz’* on *rafa’ yadayn* as “*Qurratul ‘Aynayn*”. The *juz’* titled, “*Juz’ Qirā’ah Khalf ‘Imām*” was published by the *Ḥanafīs* of Madīnah who are from Bukhārā. They have a publisher named Maktabatul ‘Imān. This *risālah* (treatise) has been published there. They have titled it, “*Aḥsanul Kalām*”. Muḥammad Zakariyyā ∇ has considered it *ṣāḥīḥ* (authentic). In these editions, no name has been mentioned. However, based on the context, who else can it be referring to other than Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇? Who is of the opinion that the period for breastfeeding is two and a half (2 ½) years? It is none other than Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇. There are a few other indications present by which the one who is being indicated towards becomes known. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykhī*]

³ He passed away in 1371 A.H. He wrote “*Tā’nībūl Khaṭīb*”. In this book, he refutes Khaṭīb Baghdādī’s 13-volume book regarding criticism and opposition towards Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇.

statement directly from Imām Abū Ḥanīfah as he was of a later era. Ḥumaydī's death was in 219 A.H.⁴ Thus, there must be a connecting link in the chain between him and Imām Abū Ḥanīfah √. However, the missing link is unknown. Imām Bukhārī √ did not deem it necessary to use an authentic chain to criticise and lower the status of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah √. How can one place such reliance on such a criticism especially when Ḥumaydī's prejudice [towards Imām Abū Ḥanīfah]) is clearly known? (*Muqaddamah Anwārul Bārī* 2/23)

Secondly, even if the narration is considered to be authentic, Ḥumaydī's deduction is inaccurate. This is because it is possible that this was the first *hajj* of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah √ which he performed during his childhood. Therefore, this does not necessitate that he did not know these *masā'il* later in his life. Rather, Imām Abū Ḥanīfah's √ virtue becomes apparent from this; that he had such a great zeal for knowledge and the *Sunnah* to the extent that he benefitted from a barber and remembered what he said (and a person with such great zeal becomes a great scholar). (See *Ar-Rafa' wat Takmil* - Imām Luckhnawī's footnotes pg. 396)

Additionally, many '*ulamā'*' consider the *masā'il* of *hajj* to be intricate. Making errors and mistakes the first time, has also been narrated from many other great '*ulamā'*'. Ḥumaydī's deduction gives an insight into his inner desires and thoughts. *فالى الله المشتكى - To Allāh, we complain alone.*

Kawtharī was a strong and firm *Ḥanafī*. He was from Turkey. He resided in Cairo, Egypt towards the end of his life. He was such a great scholar that he was offered to be appointed as the Shaykh of Al-Azhar. This is a very honourable position to be given in Egypt. However, he did not accept this offer. He was an expert in manuscripts, let alone the publishing of books. He gave a very composed yet strong reply. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁴ Imām Abū Ḥanīfah √ passed away in 150 A.H. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

Nu‘aym

The second person is Nu‘aym ibn Ḥammād √. Dhahabī √ has written in “*Tadhkiratul Huffāẓ*” that although he was an Imām, he was *munkarul Ḥadīth*.⁵ Dolābī √ said: “Nasā’ī √ considered him weak. Someone else said: “He fabricated *aḥādīth* to strengthen the *Sunnah* and he made up tales in order to place Imām Abū Ḥanīfah √ in a negative light.” Abul Fath Azdī √ mentioned this with the word ‘قالوا’, i.e., the people have said that he did such and such.

Ḥāfiẓ √ did his best to remove this *jarḥ* (criticism - grading as unreliable) from Nu‘aym because Imām Bukhārī √ mentions his narrations in a few places and he also mentions him in the *ta’līqāt*. Imām Muslim √ also narrates from him in one place in the introduction. Before Ḥāfiẓ √, Ibn ‘Adī √ also refuted and objected against Dolābī’s *jarḥ*. He [i.e., Ibn ‘Adī] states that Dolābī √ was a supporter of the *Ahl Rā’y*. Due to this, he erred in his accusation against Nu‘aym. (He mentioned this criticism because Nu‘aym usually opposes the *Ahl Rā’y*). However, Ḥāfiẓ √ said that Ibn ‘Adī √ accused Dolābī, whereas he is free from it (the accusation). The accusation is on his *Shaykh* as he is *majhūl* (unknown). Similarly, the *jarḥ* of Azdī is also unreliable because the *fā’il* (speaker) of قالوا is unknown.

In short, Ibn ‘Adī √ and Ḥāfiẓ ibn Ḥajar √ differed and contradicted each other in their refutation of the criticism against Nu‘aym. (See *Tahdhīb-ut-Tahdhīb* 1/462) و اذا تعارضا تساقطا.⁶ -When both contradict each other, both are discarded.

⁵ Imām Bukhārī √ also changed by staying in his company. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁶ When both of them contradict each other, we will say: “اذا تعارضا تساقطا.” Thus, neither Ibn ‘Adī’s √ nor Ibn Ḥajar’s √ view is correct and this criticism remains in its place. Therefore, Nu‘aym is *majrūḥ* (criticized-unreliable). [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

Mawlānā ‘Abdur Rashīd Nu‘mānī ∇ said: “Azdī and Dolābī are amongst the scholars of *jarḥ* and *ta’dīl* (grading narrators as reliable or unreliable). They transmit *jarḥ* from their scholars. This excuse of Ḥāfiẓ ∇ cannot remove the *jarḥ* against Nu‘aym. Perhaps, it was as though Ḥāfiẓ ∇ never heard Nu‘aym’s fabrications against Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇. It is for this reason that he presented these excuses.” (*Mā Tamassu ilayhil Ḥājah* pg. 20)

In his “*Tārīkh Ṣaghīr*”, on page 174, Imām Bukhārī ∇ narrates from this very same Nu‘aym that Fazārī said: “I was sitting with Sufyān (perhaps, it was Thawrī) when he received the news of the death of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah. Sufyān said: “*Alḥamdulillāh*, he was destroying the gatherings of Islām. No one more wretched than him has been born.” (Meaning, he has passed away. That is good, العياذ بالله -*Allāh forbid*.)

In the book of Imām Bukhārī ∇ titled “*Ḍu‘afā’ Kabīr*”, Imām Bukhārī ∇ narrated a few narrations from Nu‘aym which were in criticism of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇.

The ‘*ulamā*’ prevented us from following Imām Bukhārī ∇ in this regard. Ḥāfiẓ Sakhāwī ∇ mentions in “*Al-I‘lān bit Tawbīkh*” on page 65 that some scholars have criticized some of the *a’immah matbu‘īn* in their books. Sakhāwī ∇ then listed the names of some of these scholars and their books. They are as follows: Ḥāfiẓ Abū Shaykh Ibn Ḥibbān ∇ in his book “*As-Sunnah*”, Abū Aḥmad Ibn ‘Adī ∇ in “*Al-Kāmil*”, Ḥāfiẓ Abū Bakr Khaṭīb ∇ in “*Tārīkh Baghdād*” and also some scholars before them such as Ibn Abī Shaybah ∇ in his “*Muṣannaḥ*” as well as Imām Bukhārī ∇ and Imām Nasā’ī ∇. Sakhāwī ∇ further mentions that it is appropriate to refrain from following these scholars in this regard [i.e., in criticizing the *a’immah matbu‘īn*].⁷ (*Mā Tamassu ilayhil Ḥājah* pg. 20)

⁷ There should be no criticism against the *a’immah matbu‘īn*. Subkī ∇ has written a treatise regarding this. *Shaykh* ‘Abdul Fattāḥ ∇ edited and published it. This has been discussed with great passion and details in this treatise.

This is Sakhāwī's √ opinion. However, his teacher defends Nu'aym in order to support Imām Bukhārī's √ opinion. However, it is known from the word قالوا that many of Azdī's teachers also said this regarding Nu'aym. Imām Nasā'ī √ regards Nu'aym as *ḍa'īf* (weak). However, Imām Bukhārī √ also mentioned his narrations in his book, "*Ṣāḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*".⁸

Ismā'īl Ibn 'Ar'arah

The third person is Ismā'īl ibn 'Ar'arah. His qualities and characteristics are completely unknown. There is no mention of any of his narrations in the *Ṣiḥāḥ Sittah*. (*Hadyus Sāri* pg. 447)

Similarly, 'Allamāh Ibn 'Abdil Barr Mālikī √ has mentioned this in "*Jāmi' Bayānul 'Ilm wa Faḍlihi*". Criticising the *a'immaḥ matbū'in* is like spitting on the sun; the spit returns on one's mouth and does not go on the sun. Or it [i.e., criticizing the *a'immaḥ matbū'in*] is like a person who crashes his horns into a mountain. To such a person it is said:

يا ناطح الجبل العالي ليكلمه اشفق علي الراس ولا تشفق علي الجبل

O the one who is going to crash the mountain with his horns! Have mercy on your own head and not on the mountain.

The mountain will not crumble by your horns. Rather, it is your horns that will break.

This principle has been written in *uṣūl-Ḥadīth* under the topic of *jarḥ* and *ta'dīl*. However, these principles are neglected when it comes to Imām Abū Ḥanīfah √. This is indeed oppressive. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁸ Many narrators of *Ṣāḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* are also *mutakallam fihī*. Our teacher's teacher, *Mawlānā* 'Abdul Ghaffār *ṣāḥib* Mawwī Naqshbandī has written a book titled, "الجام المتغنن". It has been published in "*Al Ma-āthir*" which is a magazine which has been published in our city in memory of *Mawlānā* A'zmī √. In that magazine, this book has been published. In that book, many narrators of *Bukhārī* and *Muslim*, who have been criticized greatly, have been discussed. Therefore, one should not think that all the narrators of *Bukhārī* and *Muslim* are angels. This is not so. However, despite this, undoubtedly, their narrations are *ṣāḥīḥ*. This will be discussed later. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

Additionally, there is no mention of his narrations in Imām Bukhārī's √ "*Tārīkh*". Imām Bukhārī √ in his "*Tārīkh Ṣaghīr*", mentioned the following one narration from him: Imām Abū Ḥanīfah √ said: "One of the women from the tribe of *Jaham* came by us and became the teacher of our women."

This Ibn 'Ar'arah is from the era after (Imām Bukhārī). Therefore, there is a break in this narration. How has Imām Bukhārī √ remained silent after transmitting such a narration? There is something in the heart which cannot be expressed verbally. Are the principles of narrating *aḥādīth* not applicable to Imām Abū Ḥanīfah √?

Additionally, did the woman (who came from the tribe of *Jaham*) have the same belief as Jaham ibn Safwān? Is there any proof for this claim? Imām Abū Ḥanīfah √ addressed Jaham as a *kāfir* (disbeliever) and expelled him. (*Fayḍul Bārī* 4/514 -quoted from "*Al-Musāyirah*")

Even if this woman was of this mindset, why was she then kept as a teacher? (See *Muqaddamah Anwārul Bārī* 2/22-25)

This woman was from the tribe of *Jaham*. Was Jaham ibn Safwān also of the same tribe? It is important to note that it was not said that this woman was connected to the *Jahmiyyah* sect.

فا عتبروا يا أولى الأبصار

So take warning, O people of vision!

Imām Bukhārī's √ Opinion Regarding Imām Abū Ḥanīfah √

Due to the effect of the companionship of these scholars, the following words were written by Imām Bukhārī √ regarding Imām Abū Ḥanīfah √:

كان مرجئاً ، سكتوا عنه وعن رأيه وعن حديثه . (تاريخ كبير ٨١/٤ قسم ٢)

Translation: “Imām Ṣāhib was a *Murjī*. People remained silent about him, his opinion and his *Ḥadīth*.”

‘Allāmah Kawtharī ∇ defended this statement of Imām Bukhārī ∇ and maintains a good opinion of Imām Bukhārī ∇. In response to this, he mentioned that perhaps this refers to the misguided sects such as the *Khawārij* and *Mu‘tazilah*. Imām Ṣāhib ∇ used to debate with them.¹⁰ (See *Muqaddamah Anwārul Bārī* 2/21)

⁹ This is Imām Bukhārī’s ∇ *jarḥ* against Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇. The following is a rebuttal to this criticism: ان كنت ريحا وقد لاقيت اعصارا (If you are a wind, then know, you have met a tornado.) It is said in the Urdu language that it is like giving a reply to a brick with a stone. Imām Bukhārī ∇ did not quote this criticism from anyone else. What effect does this criticism have? Is it able to degrade Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇? It has become like the poet said:

اشفق علي الراس ولا تشفق علي الجبل

يا ناطح الجبل العالي ليكلمه

¹⁰ That is, they are the ones who became silent from Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇, his opinion and his *Ḥadīth*. Is there any answer better than this? It is given without any form of harshness, in a very gentle manner. Where has he twisted the place of the pronoun to? All of Imām Bukhārī’s ∇ tactics have gone in vain. What remains to be discussed is with regards to him being a *Murjī*. This will be discussed later.

These are all fabrications. In reality, there is no basis to these statements. There is a saying which is as follows: ‘Stones are thrown at such a tree which is bearing fruits.’ They saw that he was rapidly gaining acceptance, so people began to throw stones at him. Some fruits have fallen, however, the tree will not stop bearing its fruits. Rather, for every fruit that has fallen, it will bear four more fruits. This [criticism of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇] has been ongoing from the era of Ibn Abī Shaybah ∇. In the end of his “*Muṣannaʿ*”, he writes a chapter titled, “*Ar-Radd ‘Anin Nu‘mān*” which refutes Nu‘mān very clearly. ‘Allāmah Kawtharī ∇ wrote the following in refutation to this: “*An-Nukaṭ Ṭarīqah fit taḥadduth ‘an rudūd Ibn Abī Shaybah ‘alā Abī Ḥanīfah*”.

Imām Nasāʾī ∇ makes an objection against Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇ that he is الحفظ السيء -*sayyi’ul ḥifẓ* (has a bad retention). This word has passed in “*Sharḥ Nukhbah*”. (If you are الجيد الحفظ -*jayyidul ḥifẓ* (have a good retention), you will remember its meaning and if you are السيء الحفظ -*sayyi’ul ḥifẓ*, you would have

It is also possible that stupid, ignorant people and those who do not research and investigate are meant. Such people who consider every type of rumour and false report to be true. Otherwise, this claim clearly contradicts the reality. Half or two-thirds of the Islāmic world knows and believes in Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇ and follows his school of thought. From his era until today, many great *fuqahāʾ*, *muḥaddithīn*, mystics and pious people have relied on his research. Many of them are the *Shaykhs* (teachers) of Imām Bukhārī ∇ as well as the *Shaykhs* of his *Shaykhs*. Imām Waqīʿ ∇ and Yaḥyā ibn Saʿīd Qaṭṭān ∇ used to pass *fatāwā* on the opinions of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇. (Dhahabī mentioned this in *Tadhkiratul Huffāz* under the biography of Wakiʿ) (*Mā Tamassu ilayhil Ḥājah* pg. 20)

Yaḥyā ibn Maʿīn ∇ said: “Abū Ḥanīfah was *thiqah*. I have not heard of anyone who classified him as weak.” (Ibn ʿAbdil Barr mentioned this in *Al-Intiqāʾ*)

Ibn Maʿīn ∇ also mentioned that Abū Ḥanīfah ∇ was *thiqah*. He only narrated those *aḥādīth* which he knew and remembered. He would not narrate those which he did not know. (Ḥāfiẓ ∇ mentioned this in *At-Tahdhīb* from Ibn Saʿad Al-ʿAwfi)

From this it can be deduced that the criticisms which have been mentioned were compiled afterwards [and not by his contemporaries].

Ibn Maʿīn ∇ also put an end to the claim that he made mistakes frequently. He did this by making the following statement: “He only

forgotten. So, we will remind you of its meaning.) *Sayyiʿul ḥifẓ* is used to describe such a person whose mistakes are more than that which he correctly narrates. (Our *Mawlānā* Aʿẓmī has challenged) that if a someone grades half or more of those *aḥādīth* which are narrated from Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇ as weak, then it would be accurate to label him as *sayyiʿul ḥifẓ*. Otherwise, it is like firing a pistol in the air. Its effect simply remains in the atmosphere. The bullet makes a sound, but no one falls from it. These criticisms are just like that; they are scattered particles of dust floating in the atmosphere [i.e., they bear no weight or value. They are not strong and do not have an effect]. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

narrated that which he knew by memory, and he did not narrate that which he did not commit to memory.” (*Tahdhīb* 10/450)

He also said that Shu‘bah also had a good opinion regarding him, and he was truthful in *Ḥadīth*. Ibn ‘Abdil Barr √ mentioned this in “*Jāmi‘ Bayānul ‘Ilm*”. (*Muqaddamah I ‘lā’-us-Sunan* 3/19)

Ibn Madīnī √ said: “Abū Ḥanīfah √ is *thiqah*. There is nothing wrong about him.”

Shu‘bah √ said: “By Allāh! Abū Ḥanīfah had a good understanding and good memory.”¹¹ (*Muqaddamah I ‘lā’-us-Sunan* pg. 19)

Ibn ‘Abdil Barr Mālīkī √ wrote: ‘Alī bin Al-Madīnī stated: “Thawrī, Ibn Mubārak, Ḥammād ibn Zayd, Ḥaytham, Wakī‘ ibn Jarrah, ‘Abbād ibn ‘Awwām and Ja‘far ibn ‘Awn narrated from him. He is *thiqah* and nothing is wrong in narrating from him.”

Additionally, he also stated: “Amongst those that narrated from Abū Ḥanīfah, the ones that considered him *thiqah* and praised him are more than those who criticised him.”¹² (*Jāmi‘ Bayānul ‘Ilm wa Faḍlihi* 2/149)

¹¹ Where is Nasā’ī√, who claimed that he was *سيء الحفظ-sayyi‘ul ḥifẓ*? Perhaps those who grade Imām Abū Ḥanīfah√as *سيء الحفظ-sayyi‘ul ḥifẓ*, do not remember its correct meaning or they have forgotten its meaning totally. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

¹² This is Ibn Abdil Barr Mālīkī who is an author from the early times. He mentions that Thawrī has also narrated from him. Similarly, all the following have narrated from him: Ibn Mubārak, Ḥammād ibn Zayd, Ḥaytham, Wakī‘ ibn Jarrah, ‘Abbād ibn ‘Awwām and Ja‘far ibn ‘Awn. He further mentioned: “He was *thiqah* and nothing is wrong in narrating from him.”

He further mentioned: “Those persons who have accepted Imām Abū Ḥanīfah’s narrations, considered him reliable and praised him are more than those who have criticized him. So, will the opinion of the majority be accepted or the minority? [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

There are many other *‘ibārāt* (texts) similar to the above regarding Imām Abū Ḥanīfah’s √ reliability. See the introduction of *‘Iḥṣā-us-Sunan*” volume 3 for details. After reading these *‘ibārāt*, it becomes clear that the tongues of the *muḥaddithīn* of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah’s √ era were moist in praising him. Therefore, in Imām Bukhārī’s √ *‘ibārāt*, how can the silence of ambiguous, unknown people affect Imām A‘ẓam’s √ reliability? As discussed previously, Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar √, in support of Nu‘aym ibn Ḥammād, refuted the *jarḥ* [against Nu‘aym] by Dolābī and Azdī by stating that it is not known who they are. It is clear, that here, there is only mention regarding being silent. There is no actual *jarḥ*. Therefore, this does not have any effect on Imām A‘ẓam’s √ great personality.

What remains to be discussed, is the accusation of *irjā’* on Imām Abū Ḥanīfah √. It is known that he was a *Sunnī*. If he was ascribed to *irjā’*, his *irjā’* would be something according to *Sunnah* and not the *irjā’* of *bid‘ah*. In reality, his differences with the *muḥaddithīn* were only *lafẓī* [i.e., in its wording]. There was no difference in reality. Therefore, from this word “*irjā’*”, his reliability is not affected in any way.

The Reality of the Accusation of Irjā’

The reality of the situation is that when Imām Abū Ḥanīfah √ overpowered the *M‘utazilah* and others with strong and solid evidences, and established that actions are not a part of *‘īmān*, rather, they (i.e., actions) are excluded from its definition, they began to call him a *Murjī‘ī*. Ghassān Kūfī, who was from the *Murjī‘īyah* sect, regarded Imām Abū Ḥanīfah √ as a *Murjī‘ī* in order to deceive the people. He ascribed statements of *irjā’* to Imām Ṣāḥib √ so that his *madh-hab* would become known through Imām Ṣāḥib √. That is, he wished to take unfair advantage of Imām Ṣāḥib’s √ acceptance.

Those *muḥaddithīn*¹³ who were displeased and disagreed with the *Ḥanafī* judges of the time, they also used this word *irjā'* for their own benefit and placed accusations on Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇ and the *Aḥnāf*. However, where can the truth remain hidden? (See *Mā Tamassu ilayhī Ḥājah* pg. 19)

If this statement of Imām Bukhārī ∇ is correct, it would also be correct to say that Imām Bukhārī ∇ and those with similar beliefs to him were all *Mu'tazilites* because like the *Mu'tazilah*, these scholars also consider actions to be part of *'īmān*. If a differentiation is made [between the *jamhūr* and the *Mu'tazilah*], this would be the same differentiation between the Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇'s school of thought and the *Murji'iah*. Why is this disregarded? In *Kitābul 'Īmān*, it has become apparent that the differences between Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇ and the *muḥaddithīn* are merely differences with regards to the subtle details of the way it is interpreted. In the outcome, there is no difference. It is for this reason, the words of Imām Bukhārī ∇, "He was a *Murjī'*", is based on harshness and not on reality. And Allāh ۞ knows best.

Imām Bukhārī ∇ also used similar words for other *Ḥanafīs*. For example:

Yūsuf ibn Khālīd Simtī ∇: He is the student of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇, a famous *muḥaddith* and *faqīh*. He solved forty thousand (40,000) *masā'il* from Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇. He was a special member of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah's ∇ *majlis*¹⁴ (committee) for the compilation of *fiqh*. His narrations are found in *Sunan Ibn Mājah*. Imām Muzanī ∇ regarded him to be amongst the *akhyār and abrār* (pious and righteous servants of

¹³ At that time, in most places, most of the *qāḍīs* (judges) were *Ḥanafīs* because it is the *Ḥanafī fiqh* which finds solutions to the rulings with ease. The other types of *fiqh* do not have such a broad scope. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

¹⁴ It becomes known that Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇ had a consultation committee for *fiqh*. The rulings would be written after consulting with the members of the consultation committee. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

Allāhﷻ). However, Imām Bukhārī ∇ also regarded him as *maskūt* ‘*anhu*. (Muqaddamah Anwārul Bārī 2/25)

Asad ibn ‘Amr ∇:

He is also the student of Imām Abū Hanīfah ∇ and a special member of the *majlis*. He is the *Shaykh* of Imām Aḥmad ∇ and Aḥmad ibn Munī‘ ∇. Imām Aḥmad ∇ considered him truthful. He narrated from him. Nasā’ī ∇ said: “There is nothing wrong with him.” After the passing of Imām Abū Yūsuf ∇, Hārūn Rashīd ∇ appointed him as the judge of Baghdad and Wāsiṭ. He also married his daughter to him. Imām Bukhārī ∇ ended the discussion by labelling him as *Ṣāḥib-e-Rā’y* and by grading him as weak. (Muqaddamah Anwārul Bārī 2/25)

You can observe the harsh opposition of Imām Bukhārī ∇ against the *Ḥanafīs* in his treatise titled, “*Khayrul Kalām Fil Qirā’ah Khalf Imām*”. He showed his displeasure regarding Imām Abū Hanīfah ∇ and wrote:

ويزعم أنَّ الخنزير البري لا بأس به، ويرى السيف على الأمة. (Pg. 24)

He was of the opinion that pigs on land are *ḥalāl* (lawful) and that it is permissible to draw one’s swords on the *ummah*.

He did not explicitly state Imām Abū Hanīfah’s ∇ name [and ascribe this opinion to him]. However, this becomes clear from the context.

Both these accusations are unjust and incorrect. ‘Allāmah Ibn Taymiyyah ∇ defended Imām Abū Hanīfah ∇ and he wrote: “To ascribe the opinion of the permissibility of pigs to Imām Abū Hanīfah ∇ is definitely false.”¹⁵ (*Minhāj-us-Sunnah*¹⁶ 1/259)

¹⁵ This is the *Sunnah* of the noble people. Whenever someone becomes greatly accepted, other people fabricate narrations against them and wish that these fabrications become well known so that the acceptance they have gained comes to an end. This has been occurring from that era until today. If per chance, this also happens to you, then do not become agitated and angry about

It is apparent that Imām Bukhārī √ did not transmit this from anyone. Rather, this is an accusation he made without a supporting chain. This discussion is very lengthy. We will not go into further details. For more details one may refer to “*Tā’nīb Al-Khaṭīb*” by Kawtharī √.

Question: Why did Imām Bukhārī √ not mention any of Imām Abū Hanīfah’s √ narrations in his *Ṣāḥih*, even though he met the younger students of Imām Abū Hanīfah’s √ students?

Answer: As mentioned previously, he considered Imām Abū Hanīfah √ to be *maskūt ‘anhu*. He disagreed with Imām Abū Hanīfah √ to the extent that he said: “I will not collect any narration of such a person who is of the opinion that actions are not part of *īmān*.” (*Ibn Mājah aur ‘Ilm Ḥadīth* pg. 107 and *Hadyus Sārī* pg. 479)

Similarly, Imām Bukhārī √ did not collect any of Ja‘far Ṣādiq’s narrations which other people have accepted. (*Ibn Mājah aur ‘Ilm Ḥadīth* pg. 107)

He also did not collect any of Imām Shāfi‘ī’s √ narrations although he met his students. He only collected two narrations from Imām Aḥmad √: one *ta’līqan* (with a break in the beginning of the chain) and the other with a *wāṣṭah* (with the connecting link of the chain). Similarly, Imām Muslim √ did not collect any of Imām Bukhārī’s √ narrations. Imām Aḥmad √ did not collect any of Imām Mālik’s √ narrations from Nāfi‘ through Shāfi‘ī although, with the exception of four chains, this is from the most authentic of chains.

it. Rather, remain calm and bear it with patience. إن الله مع الصابرين - *Verily, Allāh is with the patient ones*. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

¹⁶ **Minhāj-us-Sunnah:** This is Ibn Taymiyyah’s √ book which is in refutation of the *Shi‘as*. It is a highly accepted book. However, there is slight harshness within it. Due to this, it has been criticised. See “*Tanwīr-ul-Hāwī*” for details. We have discussed the details regarding this in this book. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

Kawtharī ∇ explained the reason for this. He said that in light of the faith and trustworthiness of these *a'immaḥ*, it is apparent that he believed that the *aḥādīth* of these *a'immaḥ* were *maḥfūdh* (protected and preserved). There was no fear of losing their *aḥādīth* as their students had memorised and preserved them. It is indeed a form of oppression to believe that he did not collect their narrations due to him being affected by the criticism done by others or due to him being prejudiced. If such criticism was to be considered, no one would be saved.¹⁷(Kawtharī's Footnotes on Hāzimī's *Shurūḥul Aimmah* بمعناه (paraphrased) Pg. 81)



¹⁷ However, how would Kawtharī ∇ and those who have a similar opinion reply to the following objection: If this is the case, then why did Imām Bukhārī ∇ narrate frequently from Imām Awzā'ī, Sufyān Thawrī, Ibn Jurayj and Layth ibn Sa'ad رحمه الله? Was there a fear of losing their narrations and had not their students memorised and preserved their narrations? What is the benefit of formulating such an explanation on every occasion? Since Imām Bukhārī ∇ did not have a good opinion of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇, then why would he narrate from him? From the words Imām Bukhārī ∇ used when mentioning Imām Shāfi'ī ∇ in "*Tārīkh Kabīr*", it can be deduced that Imām Shāfi'ī ∇ also did not hold any high significance in his (Imām Bukhārī's ∇) opinion. He did not even write a letter in his praise; he only mentioned his name, lineage and *kunyaḥ*. (Mawlānā Muḥammad 'Abdur Rashīd Nu'mānī) (رحمه الله رحمة واسعة)

The Trials of Imām Bukhārī ∇ and the Incident of His Death¹

There was a difference of opinion regarding the issue of *'Khalq-e-Qur'ān'* between Imām Bukhārī ∇ and his *Shaykh*, Imām Dhuhalī ∇. After this, the trials of Imām Bukhārī ∇ began. Ḥāfiẓ ∇ mentioned a few narrations regarding this in his introduction. A brief summary is as follows:

In 250 A.H. Imām Bukhārī ∇ went to Nayshāpūr². When Imām Dhuhalī ∇ was informed of his arrival, he said in a gathering, “Tomorrow I am going to welcome Imām Bukhārī ∇. Whosoever also wishes to go [to welcome him] can accompany me.” Accordingly, Imām Dhuhalī ∇ and some other *'ulamā'* of Nayshāpūr went ahead two or three *manzils* to meet and welcome him. Imām Muslim ∇ said: “I have never seen the people of Nayshāpūr welcome any *'ālim* or leader in such a manner.” On arriving, Imām Bukhārī ∇ stayed in Dārul Bukhāriyayn, and he began narrating *aḥādīth*. Imām Dhuhalī ∇ also told the people, “Go, and listen to *aḥādīth* from this pious man.”³

Some narrations states that the gathering of Imām Dhuhalī ∇ began to decrease. Due to this, he began making objections against Imām

¹ Being afflicted with difficulties and trials is also the way of the *Buzrugs* (noble, righteous personalities). For example, Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇ and Imām Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal ∇ also experienced trials. This is because sometimes, a person is faced with certain situations when he tells and supports the truth.

[Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

² The first time (he visited Nayshāpūr) was in 209 A.H. The second time was in 250 A.H. and he stayed there for five years. (*Siyar A'lāmun Nubalā'* 12/406 fi Tarjumatil Bukhārī)

³ This was the first meeting in the beginning. At that time, their relationship was good. Differences did not arise as yet. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

Bukhārī ∇. In some places, it is mentioned that Imām Dhuhālī ∇ prohibited the people from asking about ‘*aqīdah*’ (belief) issues. On one occasion, there was a huge gathering two or three days after he arrived. Someone asked the question: Is لفظي بالقرآن *makhlūq* or not. At first, Imām Bukhārī ∇ ignored this question. Upon the person’s insistence, he replied:

الْقُرْآنُ كَلَامُ اللَّهِ غَيْرُ مَخْلُوقٍ، وَأَفْعَالُ الْعِبَادِ مَخْلُوقَةٌ، وَالِامْتِحَانُ بَدْعَةٌ.

“The Qur’ān, the word of Allāh is not created, the actions of the servants are created and to ask about this is an innovation.”

In the narration of Imām Muslim ∇, the wording is as follows:

أَفْعَالُنَا مَخْلُوقَةٌ وَأَلْفَاظُنَا مِنْ أَفْعَالِنَا.⁴

“Our actions are created and our words are from our actions.”

Consequently, differences of opinion arose amongst the people. Some were saying that he said that لفظي بالقرآن are مخلوق (created) and some were saying that he did not say this. When they went into an uproar regarding this, the owners of the house came and drove the people out of the house.

Imām Bukhārī ∇ said: “Whosoever claims that I said that لفظي بالقرآن are مخلوق (created), is a liar. I did not say this. Rather, I said that أفعال العباد مخلوقة (the actions of man are created).”

In one narration it is mentioned: “People’s movements, their voices, their earnings and their writings are all created. However, the Qur’ān

⁴ In that era, a person was classified as a *bid‘atī* (innovator) if he said لفظي بالقرآن مخلوق. So, some people paraphrased and interpreted Imām Bukhārī’s ∇ words and claimed that Bukhārī ∇ said: “لفظي بالقرآن مخلوق”. Therefore, he has become a *bid‘atī* and they also informed Imām Dhuhālī ∇ of this. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

which is established in book form and protected in the hearts, is the *Kalām* (speech) of Allāh ﷻ and it is غير مخلوق (not created)."

“بَلْ هُوَ آيَاتٌ بَيِّنَاتٌ فِي صُدُورِ الَّذِينَ أُوتُوا الْعِلْمَ .”

“Rather it (the Quran) is clear verses [preserved] in the hearts of those who have been given knowledge.”

When the people informed Imām Dhuhalī ∇ that Imām Bukhārī ∇ said that لفظي بالقرآن are created, he said: “Whoever says such a statement is an innovator. No one should sit next to him [the one who makes this statement] nor should he speak to him. Those who go to Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl are considered accused because only those who follow him, will go by him.” When Dhuhalī ∇ announced this, the people began to disconnect themselves from Bukhārī ∇. Only Imām Muslim ∇ and Aḥmad ibn Salamah ∇ remained with Imām Bukhārī ∇. Dhuhalī ∇ said: “Whoever has such a belief is not allowed to come in our *majlis*.” Imām Muslim ∇ took his cloth and placed it on his *‘imāmah* (turban)⁵ and in front of everyone, he stood up and left (the gathering). He loaded those *aḥādīth* he wrote from Dhuhalī on camels and returned them back to him.⁶ (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 490)

⁵ It becomes known that he wore an *‘imāmah* in his teacher’s *majlis*. If you consider Imām Muslim ∇ to be a personality worthy of respect and honour, then you all should also wear an *‘imāmah*. Imām Bukhārī ∇ also wore an *‘imāmah* in his final moments in this world. Learn the method of wrapping an *‘imāmah* now so that it does not occur that if it unwraps, it remains unwrapped forever. Therefore, inculcate the habit of wrapping it from now. It is an excellent action. The rewards of *ṣalāh* also increase if it is worn. This is the *fatwā* of Ḥazrat Gangohī ∇ as mentioned in his “*Fatāwā Rashīdiyyah*”. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁶ This is a great tragedy. Such corruption is created by false reports. This is an incident which teaches an important lesson. Ponder upon it for a short period of time. How powerful is the destruction which is caused by false rumours? [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

On this occasion Ḥāfiẓ Ṣāḥib ∇ wrote that Imām Muslim ∇ has done justice by not including any narration from Imām Bukhārī ∇ nor Imām Dhuhālī ∇ in his book.

Aḥmad ibn Salamah ∇ said: “I told Imām Bukhārī that in Khurāsān and specifically in this city Nayshāpūr, he (i.e., Imām Dhuhālī) is a person who is recognised and respected and he has remained firm in his opinion on this *mas’alah* (issue) None of us are able to speak to him. So, what is your opinion? Imām Bukhārī ∇ held his beard and said:

“أَفَوَضْتُ أَمْرِي إِلَى اللَّهِ ، إِنَّ اللَّهَ بَصِيرٌ بِالْعِبَادِ.”

“I entrust my affair to Allāh. Indeed, Allāh is All-Seeing of His servants.”

O Allāh! You know that I did not choose to stay in Nayshāpūr to boast or seek leadership. The only reason I do not wish to go to my native country is because my adversaries there are very dominant. (From this, it becomes known that before this incident people in Bukhārā had opposed Imām Bukhārī ∇. Other narrations which also support this will be further mentioned.) This person (Dhuhālī) is jealous simply because of my knowledge.

Aḥmad, I will leave this city tomorrow so that you all can be saved from the trouble that you all are facing because of me.” (*Hadyus Sāirī* pg. 491)

In one narration it is mentioned that when Imām Muslim ∇ and Aḥmad ibn Salamah ∇ left Dhuhālī’s *majlis*, Dhuhālī said: “This person cannot stay with me in this city.” From this statement, Imām Bukhārī ∇ perceived that his life was in danger and thus, he departed from this city.

It is narrated that on the occasion of this dispute, Muḥammad ibn Na‘īm asked Imām Bukhārī ∇ about *īmān*. So, he said:

قَوْلٌ وَعَمَلٌ يَزِيدُ وَيَنْقُصُ، وَالْقُرْآنُ كَلَامُ اللَّهِ غَيْرُ مَخْلُوقٍ، وَأَفْضَلُ أَصْحَابِ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ أَبُو بَكْرٍ ثُمَّ عُمَرُ ثُمَّ عُثْمَانُ ثُمَّ عَلِيٌّ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ. عَلَى هَذَا حَيِّثُ وَعَلَيْهِ أَمُوتُ وَعَلَيْهِ أُبْعَثُ إِنْ شَاءَ اللَّهُ تَعَالَى .

“(Imān is a combination of) qawl (speech) and amal (actions). It increases and decreases. The Qur’ān, the word of Allāh is not created. The most virtuous of the Messenger of Allāh’s n companions is Abū Bakr, then ‘Umar, then ‘Uthmān, then ‘Alī g. Upon this [belief] I live, upon it I will die and upon it I will be resurrected.”

Return to Bukhārā and Differences with the Leader of Bukhārā

Ḥāfiẓ ∇ wrote in his introduction: “When Imām Bukhārī ∇ returned to Bukhārā (from where and when has not been mentioned in the narration), a dome was erected one *farsakh* (three miles) away from the city and all the note-worthy personalities welcomed him. *Dirhams* and *dinārs* were showered upon him. He stayed there until a period of time and then he had differences with the leader of Bukhārā. So, he (the leader) commanded him to leave the city. At this time, Imām Bukhārī ∇ went to Baykand.” (*Hadyus Sāir* pg. 493)

In one narration, the reason for the difference has been mentioned as follows: “The leader of Bukhārā, Khālīd ibn Aḥmad Dhuhālī, commanded Imām Bukhārī ∇, via a messenger as follows: ‘Come by me and recite to me your *“Jāmi”* and *“Tārīkh”*.’ Imām Bukhārī ∇ told the messenger: ‘Tell him that I will not disgrace this knowledge; I will not take it to the door of a king. If there is a need, come to my house or the *masjid* to listen and if you dislike this, then you are the *sultān* (king); prevent me from hosting a gathering so that it can be an excuse for me on the day of *Qiyāmah* in front of Allāh ۱ to be saved from the punishment of concealing knowledge.’” (*Ibid*)

Another narration mentions that the leader of Bukhārā, Khālīd ibn Aḥmad Khalīfah ibn Ṭāḥir said: “Come to my house and recite *“Jāmi”* and *“Tārīkh”* to my children.” Imām ∇ refused and said it is not befitting that I recite *aḥādīth* to a special group of people where there is no permission for others (to participate).⁷ Because of this, Khālīd used Ḥarīth ibn Abī Warāqah and others (to object against Imām Bukhārī ∇). They all made objections to Bukhārī’s *madh-hab*, so the leader expelled him from the city. Imām Bukhārī ∇ supplicated against them: “Oh Allāh! The desire that these people have regarding me (in

⁷ In the beginning, the leader had ordered for him to come to his home and recite. Thereafter, he ordered for a special *majlis* for his children as has been mentioned in another narration. Imām ∇ rejected this. (*Muqaddamah Lāmi* ‘ page 12)

dishonouring me), also make them experience the same with regards to themselves, their children and their families.”

Consequently, in less than a month's time, the leader, Khālid was dishonoured, disgraced and imprisoned and Ḥarith experienced such a thing within his family which is not worthy of being mentioned and so and so was also tested regarding his children and was afflicted with difficulties. (Ibid)

In one narration it is mentioned that after leaving Bukhārā, he went to Khartang, a village in Samarqand, where he had relatives. (This village is two to three *farsakh* from Samarqand. (12 *Muqaddamah Lāmi* pg. 30) He made this his residence. ‘Abdul Quddūs ibn ‘Abdul Jabbār ∇ said: “One night, after the night prayer, I heard him supplicating in the following manner: “-اللهم قد ضاقت علي الأرض بما رحبت فاقبضني إليك .”-“Oh Allāh, the earth (land) has become narrow for me despite its vastness, so raise me to you.” He passed away within a month. (Ibid)

An objection is raised against this: praying and wishing for death has been prohibited in the *Ḥadīth*. Imām Bukhārī ∇ himself mentions this narration in his *Ṣaḥīḥ*. So why then did he still desire and pray for death?

A possible answer for this is that the prohibition mentioned in the *Ḥadīth* is regarding praying or hoping for death out of fear of worldly difficulties. If one does this to save oneself from corrupting one's *Dīn*, then there is nothing wrong in doing so. This action of Imām Bukhārī ∇ should be interpreted like this. (*Muqaddamah Lāmi* pg. 5)⁸

⁸ It is mentioned in a *Ḥadīth*: “وإذا أردت فتنة في قوم فتوفني غير مفتون” - “And if You wish to test the people with trials, grant me death without [placing me] in this trial.” Therefore, he prayed for death in order to end the *fitnah*. Thus, there is nothing wrong with this. *Mawlānā* ‘Abdul Jabbār *ṣāḥib* A‘ẓmī ∇, the author of “*Jami‘ad-Darārī*” gave this answer. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

“The differences of opinion among people causes *fitnah* (corruption). By my death, the disputes and *fitnah* will come to an end.” (*Jāmi‘-ud-Darārī* pg. 42)⁹

Muḥammad ibn Abī Ḥātim, *Warrāq Bukhārī*, said: “I heard Ghālib ibn Jibrā‘īl, (Imām Bukhārī √ stayed by him during his stay in Khartang) saying that Imām Bukhārī √ fell ill for a few days. The people of Samarqand sent an envoy to invite him to come by them. Imām √ accepted and prepared to depart. He put on his socks, tied his turban, and he took approximately twenty steps to mount his animal. I was holding his arm when he said to me: “Leave me, I have become weak.” We left him. He supplicated and lied down. He then passed away. (*Indeed, to Allāh ۱ we belong and to Him we shall return.*) After this, lots of perspiration emitted from his body. He had told us to shroud him in three cloths without a turban and *kurta* (upper garment). We did exactly as he told us. After shrouding him and performing the *janāzah ṣalāh*, we placed him in his grave. A very nice fragrance, like musk, emanated from his grave and it remained for a few days. For a few days, people took soil from the grave until we placed a wooden lattice on top of the grave.” (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 493)

رسید از دست محبوبے بدستم	گلے خوشبوئے در حمام روزے
کہ ازبوئے دلاویز تو مستم	بدو گفتگم کہ مشکى یا عبیری
و لیکن مدتے با گل نشستم	بگفتہ من گلے ناچیز بودم
و گر نہ من ہماں خاکم کہ ہستم	جمال ہمنشیں در من اثر کرو

⁹ In our opinion, the reason for this is that it had now become difficult to spread knowledge. So, what was the benefit of remaining alive? *Fazl*

{The objective of living was to spread knowledge, to spread the *Dīn*. Now, it became difficult to go to his native country. Residing in another place also became difficult. So, now what is the purpose of remaining alive? Therefore, he did what he did. He now desired to go to that place where he will receive the rewards for his actions. He also prayed for this. This is the humble opinion of the compiler of “*Hadiyyatud Darārī*”. If you do not agree, it can be refuted.}
[Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

(گلستان سعدی)

(*Jāmi‘-ud-Darārī Muqaddamah Sharḥ Bukhārī* pg. 42 by Mawlānā ‘Abdul Jabbār Ṣāhib A‘ẓmī, former Shaykhul Ḥadīth in Madrasah Qāsimiyyah Shāhī Murādabād)¹⁰

In Kirmānī’s √ introduction, the following is mentioned: “When Imām Bukhārī √ was buried, there was a beautiful fragrance of musk emanating from his grave and above the grave towards the sky white, high walls became apparent, and people were carrying the soil of the grave for blessings until it became a pit. When it became difficult to protect it by appointing guards, a wooden lattice was placed. Even then, people continued to take the soil and pebbles surrounding the grave. This fragrance remained for so many days to the extent that this was well known amongst the people of the city. It is not farfetched for such a *karāmah* to occur for such a *Buzrug* (great, noble and righteous personality). (pg.12)

Date of Death

¹⁰ Shaykh Sa’dī √ has mentioned a hypothetical scenario to highlight the benefit which is gained from being in good company. (Similarly, there are many hypothetical scenarios in *Mawlānā Rūmī’s* √ statements. They have not occurred. Rather, they are fictional. However, there is advice within it. It is for this reason it is presented in this manner.) There is a fragrant soil. One day, in the bathroom, this fragrance came into my hands from my beloved’s hands. I asked the soil: “Are you musk or amber? Because I am in love with your fragrance which attracts the hearts.” The soil replied: “I was an insignificant particle of soil which had no value. However, for a long period of time, I sat with the flowers. So, the beauty of my friend (the flowers) left an effect on me. Therefore, I became fragrant. Otherwise, I was only soil. However, due to the company of my friend, the fragrance also became part of me” Similarly, the grave of Imām Bukhārī √ is also saying something similar to this:

“When Imām Bukhārī √ came into me, he came with the fragrance of *aḥādīth*. So, through his company, I have also become fragrant.” [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

‘Abdul Wāḥid ibn Ādam Ṭawāwaysī said: “I saw the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ in a dream and there were also a group of the noble *Ṣaḥābah* with him. The Messenger of Allāh ﷺ was standing in one place. I said *salām* and asked: “*Ḥazrat* why are you standing here?” He said: “I am waiting for Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl.” When I received the news of Imām’s death, I calculated that it was at that same time I saw Messenger of Allāh ﷺ in my dream.” This incident took place on Saturday night, *‘Īd-ul-Fiṭr* 256 A.H. His blessed age was thirteen days less than sixty-two (62) years.

تغمده الله برحمته - *May Allāh envelop Him with His mercy. Āmīn.* (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 493)

Someone has combined the year of birth and death and his blessed age in a poem:¹¹

كَانَ الْبَخَارِيُّ حَافِظًا وَمُحَدِّثًا	جَمَعَ الصَّحِيحَ مُكَمَّلَ التَّحْرِيرِ
مِثْلَهُ صِدْقٌ وَمُدَّةٌ عَمْرُهُ	فِيهَا حَمِيدٌ وَانْقَضَى فِي نُورِ
١٩٤	٦٢
ص: ٩٠	ق: ١٩٤ = ١٠٠
ح: ٨	م: ٤٠
ن: ٥٠	و: ٦
	ر: ٢٠٠ = ٢٥٦

(*Muqaddamah Bukhārī* -Muḥaddith Mawlānā Aḥmad ‘Alī Sahāranpūrī pg. 5)

A Lesson

Qasatālānī ؎ mentioned that after the death of Imām Bukhārī ؎, his opponents came to his grave and repented. On one occasion, there was a drought. They supplicated many times for rain. However, no rain fell. Upon the suggestion of one pious man, the *qāḍī* of that time and the people of Samarqand went by the grave of Imām Bukhārī ؎ and

¹¹ This is a separate field. Some people are very experienced in this. They can derive numbers from poems. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

(supplicated) through the *wasīlah* of the person in the grave (i.e., Bukhārī ∇). Thereafter, it rained. (*Muqaddamah Lāmi* ‘ pg. 10,44)¹²

The Details of His Trials

From the combination of all the narrations, it can be deduced that Imām Bukhārī ∇ was expelled from Bukhārā many times. *Mawlānā* ‘Abdur Rashīd Nu‘mānī ∇ has discussed this in detail in the footnotes of “*Dirāsātul Labīb*”¹³. The summary of this discussion is that such an occasion occurred four times:

¹² Some people consider this to be an act of *shirk* (polytheism). However, the people of Bukhārā did not consider it to be *shirk*. The *a’immah arba’ah* and *mujtahidīn* also do not consider it to be *shirk*. According to Ibn Taymiyyah, this *tawassul* is *shirk*. This will be discussed *inshā’Allāh* in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* in the chapter of *Istisqā’*. Books have also been written on this topic specifically. In Karāchī, one of our students has also written a book on this. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

¹³ “*Dirāsātul Labīb*” is a famous book. Its author is Shaykh Mu‘īn-us Sindhī ∇. He died in 1161 A.H. He is Shāh Walīullāh Muḥaddith Dehlawī’s ∇ student. His name is mentioned in Shāh Ṣaḥīb’s ∇ travelogue of the Ḥaramayn Sharifayn. However, he became a *ghayr muqallid* and became inclined towards *Shi‘ite* beliefs. It is for this reason, the *ghayr muqallidīn* like this book a lot. The *Ḥanafīs* have written a refutation on this book. Shaykh ‘Abdul Laṭīf Ḥāshimī Qurshī Sindhī Tatwī ∇ (death:1189 A.H.) has written a reply to this. The two-volume book is titled: ذب ذبایات الدراسات عن المذاهب الأربعة المتناسبات. *Mawlānā* ‘Abdur-Rashid Nu‘mānī ∇ has written a marginalia on “*Dirāsātul Labīb*” because he also has been forefront in refuting the *ghayr muqallidīn*. There are also details of this in “*Mā tamassu ilayhil Ḥājah*”. We are compiling this information from that book. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

The First Occasion

When Imām Bukhārī ∇ returned from his journeys of knowledge, Abū Ḥafṣ Kabīr ∇ (death: 217A.H.) was also alive. He prevented (Bukhārī ∇) from issuing *fatāwā*. However, Bukhārī ∇ did not refrain from this. Thus, on one occasion, he issued the *fatwā* that *ḥurmat raḍa'ah* (prohibition of foster relations) will be established between a girl and boy who drinks milk from the same goat. Due to this *mas'alah* (ruling), the people expelled him from Bukhārā.

There is a difference in opinion regarding the authenticity of this incident. *Mawlānā* ‘Abdul Ḥay ṣāhib ∇, in “*Al-Fawā'idul Bahiyah*” (pg. 18), considered this to be improbable. *Mawlānā* ‘Abdur Rashīd Nu‘mānī ∇ considers this to be possible as he was young at that time. It is possible that he did not get a chance to ponder over it and thus, he gave such a reply. It has also been narrated regarding some other *a'immaḥ* that they were not able to give a reply in some of the well-known *masā'il* as this was not their field. *Mawlānā* Nu‘mānī ∇ writes that this incident has also been mentioned by *Qāḍī* Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan Mālikī ∇ in his famous “*Tārīkhul Khamīs*” (vol. 2, pg. 382). Ibn Ḥajar Makkī ∇ also indicated towards it in “*Alkhayratul Ḥisān*” (pg. 70). (*Mā Tamassu ilayhil Ḥajāh* pg. 27)

The Second Occasion

The second time when the scholars of Bukhārā wrote a public declaration¹⁴ stating: “*‘Imān* is *ghayr makhlūq*. Whoever considers *‘imān* to be *makhlūq* is a *kāfir* (disbeliever).” Imām Abū Bakr ibn Ḥāmid, Imām Abū Ḥafṣ Zāhid and Shaykh Abū Bakr Ismā‘īlī endorsed it. At this time, many people departed from Bukhārā. Imām Bukhārī ∇ was also amongst them.¹⁵ The author of “*Fuṣūl ‘Amādiyyah*” also mentioned this. Abū Ḥafṣ Kabīr was also alive at this time. Imām Bukhārī ∇ was twenty-three (23) years old at that time.

The Third Occasion

The third time he left was after the incident in Nayshāpūr when Imām Dhuhālī ∇ wrote about Imām Bukhārī’s ∇ incident to the rulers and scholars of Bukhārā. At that time Abū Ḥafṣ Ṣaghīr (death 264 A.H.) expelled Bukhārī ∇ towards the boundaries of Bukhārā. Dhahabī ∇ mentioned this incident in “*Siyar A‘lāmin -Nubalā’*”. (‘Allāmah Kashmīrī ∇ expressed his doubts regarding Abū Ḥafṣ Ṣaghīr being part of this expulsion because Imām Bukhārī ∇ and Abū Ḥafṣ Ṣaghīr were travel companions for knowledge. They would exchange gifts with each other. Therefore, until the cause for dislike is unknown, this story cannot be relied upon.)¹⁶ (*Muqaddamah Lāmi* ‘ pg. 13)

¹⁴ محضر - a public declaration, i.e., in the form of a written document. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

¹⁵ This is because how can a person’s *‘imān* be *ghayr makhlūq*? When the human being is *makhlūq* (created), how can *Imān* be *ghayr makhlūq*. It is not known how those persons signed and endorsed this document. Imām Bukhārī ∇ said: “This is incorrect. I will not endorse it. I will leave but I will not be part of this wrongdoing.” [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

¹⁶ However, the reason he left is because the ruler of Bukhārā became very angry and had evil intentions with regards to Imām Bukhārī ∇. However, the son of Abū Ḥafṣ Kabīr Muḥammad ibn Ḥafṣ (Abū Ḥafṣ Ṣaghīr) found out about this and sent Imām Bukhārī ∇ to the boundaries of Bukhārā. (See *Fawā'id Bahiyah* page 19)

The Fourth Occasion

The final time he was banished was the one after which he went to Khartang. He passed away there. At that time, he was expelled due to the story which has been mentioned previously.

Khartang is known as Khājā Ābād nowadays. A pious person from Bukhārā narrated this from *Shaykh* Jalālul Dīn Qāsmī √. *Mawlānā* Taqī-ud-Dīn Madhāhirī Nadwī √ mentioned this (on pg. 76) in the book he wrote about Imām Bukhārī √.



(Extracted from *Tahqīq Ahl Ḥadīth*. Author: ‘Allāmah Ḥabibur Raḥmān A‘ẓmī (May Allāh1 enlighten his grave.) (Page 31)

In the narration the word “*khufyah*-secretly” is not mentioned, however due to the friendship between the two, this meaning of the narration was taken. And Allāh 1 knows best. *Fazlur Rahman Azmi*.

Books Authored by Imām Bukhārī ؓ

Qasṭalānī ؓ said: “His books are famous in the world like the sun. Only someone affected by *Shayṭān* would reject their status.” His books are as follows:

1. Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī (صحيح البخاري)

Its full name is: الجامع المسند الصحيح المختصر من أمور رسول الله ﷺ وسننه وأيامه

(*Muqaddamah Nawawī lī Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* pg. 39)

Ḥāfiẓ ؓ has written it as: من حديث رسول الله ﷺ وسننه وأيامه (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 7)

This is that book which made Imām Bukhārī ؓ renowned and the book which is the most authentic after the Qur’ān.

2. Al-’Adabul Mufrad (الأدب المفرد)

It was printed in India. It is part of the syllabus in some *madāris*. Persian and Urdu translations have also been published.

3. Juz’ Rafa’ Yadayn (جزء رفع اليدين)

This was also published in India. Currently, it has been published in Kuwait by the title “*Qurratul Aynayn*”.

4. Juz ‘Qira’ah Khalf Imām (جزء القراءة الخلف الامام)

This was also published in India. It has been published in Madīnah Munawwarah by Maktabatul Aymān by the title, “*Khayrul Kalām*”.

5. At-Tārīkh-ul-Kabīr (التاريخ الكبير)

This was published in Hyderabad, India. This is the book which Imām Bukhārī ∇ wrote in Madīnah Munawwarah during the moonlit nights as mentioned previously. This is the book which Ishāq ibn Rāhwayh ∇ presented to the leader, ‘Abdullāh ibn Ṭāhir and said: “Should I not show you magic?” Ibn ‘Abdul Barr Mālikī ∇ benefitted from this while compiling his book, “*Al-Istī‘āb*”¹. (Muqaddamah Lāmi‘ pg. 21, type-written pg. 76)

6. At-Tārīkh-ul-Awsaṭ (التاريخ الاوسط)

This is from amongst the books regarding which Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar ∇ and Suyuṭī ∇ mentioned that it was present at that time.²

7. At-Tārīkh-uṣ-Ṣaghīr (التاريخ الصغير)

¹(*Al-Istī‘āb*) الاستيعاب: This is a book regarding the biographies of the *Ṣāḥābah*∇. Many books have been written on the biographies of the *Ṣāḥābah*∇. For example: Ibn Al-Athīr Jazarī’s ∇ “*Uṣḍul Ghābah*”. Before this, Ibn ‘Abdul Barr Mālikī’s ∇ “*Al-Istī‘āb*” was written. The final book is Ḥāfiẓ’s ∇ “*Al-Iṣābah fī Tamīziṣ Ṣāḥābah*”. Similarly, there is Ibn Mundah’s ∇ “*Ma‘rifatuṣ Ṣāḥābah*” and Baghwī’s ∇ “*Mu‘jamuṣ Ṣāḥābah*”. Books have also been written in Urdu regarding the *Ṣāḥābah*∇ and their importance. “*Maqāmuṣ Ṣāḥābah*” is authored by Muftī Muḥammad Shafi‘ ṣāḥib ∇ and “*Ṭa‘īfah Manthūrah*” is authored by Mawlānā Sarfarāz ṣāḥib ∇. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

² The full copy of “*At-Tārīkh Al-Awsaṭ*”, Ibn Kathīr’s ∇ written copy of “*Al-Jāmi‘ Kabīr*”, *Asāmī Ṣāḥābah*, *Kitābul Mabsūṭ*”, the copies of “*Jāmi‘ Ṣaghīr*” and Ibn Taymiyyah’s full written copy of “*Musand Kabīr*” were all present in the German *Dārul ‘Ulūm*’s library before the second world war. (Footnotes of *Fayḍul Bārī* page 63 from the footnotes of *Sīratul Bukhārī*)

These are all false reports. An Arab traveller who came and mentioned such false reports to Mawlānā ‘Abdus Salām Mubārakpūrī ∇ and then he went away. He mentioned it all in “*Sīratul Bukhārī*”. If this was a truthful report, there would have been mention of it in the index of “*Bir wa Kalmān*” and also in the index of the famous Turkish scholar (Fawād Soz Khan). (Mawlānā Muḥammad ‘Abdur-Rashīd Nu‘mānī ∇) *Fazl*

This book was published in Illahabad. Like “*Tārīkh Kabīr*”, there are also some points within it which are objectionable. (*Muqaddamah Anwār-ul-Bārī* pg. 24)

8. *Khalq Af‘ālul ‘Ibād* (خلق افعال العباد)

Imām Bukhārī ∇ wrote this book to establish his stance on the issue of *Khalq Qur’ān*. Currently, it has been published in Kuwait by Anwārus-Salafiyyah inclusive of the research done by Badrul Badr.

9. *Kitābuḍ Ḍu‘afā’* (Şaghīr) (كتاب الضعفاء الصغير)

This book has been published in Hyderabad, India. Imām Bukhārī ∇ classified Imām Abū Yūsuf ∇ in this book as *matrūk*. (*Muqaddamah Anwār-ul-Bārī* pg.25)

10. *Al-Jāmi‘ Kabīr* (الجامع الكبير)

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar ∇ and Suyuṭī ∇ did not find this book. In “*Muqaddamah Anwār-ul-Bārī*” on pg. 24, it is mentioned that its manuscript was in Germany. In “*Faḍlul Bārī*” on pg. 62, it is mentioned that Ibn Kathīr ∇ wrote this entire book with his pen.

11. *Al-Musnad Al-Kabīr* (المسند الكبير)

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar ∇ and Suyuṭī ∇ did not find this book. In “*Muqaddamah Anwār-ul-Bārī*” on page 24, it is mentioned that its manuscript was in Germany.

12. *At-Tafsīr-ul-Kabīr* (التفسير الكبير)

This book was previously mentioned. While writing its *takhrīj*, he became tired and laid down as mentioned by Firabrī.

13. *Kitābul ‘Ashribah* (كتاب الأشربة)

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar ∇ and Suyuṭī ∇ did not find this book. In “*Lāmi‘*”, it is mentioned that Daraquṭnī ∇ mentioned it. (*Muqaddamah Lāmi‘* pg. 21)

14. *Kitābul Hibah* (كتاب الهبة)

There are five hundred (500) *aḥādīth* in this book. On the other hand, in Imām Wakī’s ∇ “*Kitābul Hibah*”, there are only two or three *aḥādīth*

and in ‘Abdullāh ibn Mubārak’s ∇ *“Kitābul Hibah”*, there are five *aḥādīth*. Suyuṭī ∇ did not find this book.

15. Asāmī Ṣaḥābah (اسامي الصحابة)

‘Allāmah Baghwī ∇ benefitted from this while compiling his book, *“Mu’jamuṣ Ṣaḥābah”*. Ibn Mundah ∇ also benefitted from it while compiling his book, *“Ma’rifatuṣ Ṣaḥābah”*. The manuscript of this book was also in Germany. (*Faḍlul Bārī* pg. 64 & *Anwār-ul-Bārī* pg. 24)

16. Kitābul Wuḥdān (كتاب الواحد)

This refers to those *Ṣaḥābah* who have only narrated one *Ḥadīth*. Ibn Mundah quoted from this book. However, from Qasṭalānī's text, it appears that "*Kitābul Waḥdān*" is written by Ibn Mundah and he copied from Imām Bukhārī's "*Asāmī Ṣaḥābah*" in this book of his. (*Muqaddamah Lāmi* pg. 22,79)

Sometimes, '*wuḥdān*' can also refer to that narrator from whom only one narrator has narrated, whether the narrator is a *Ṣaḥābī* or a *Tābi'ī* or someone else and regardless of whether only one *Ḥadīth* has been narrated from him or more than one *Ḥadīth* has been narrated from him. This definition is taken in "*Sharḥ Nukhbah*". وهو من لم يرو عنه الا واحد (pg. 70). This book of Imām Bukhārī was not found as mentioned by Ḥāfiẓ and Suyuṭī.

17. Kitābul Mabsūṭ (كتاب المبسوط)

Khalīlī mentions this book. Ibn Ḥajar and Suyuṭī did not find this book. It is mentioned in "*Muqaddamah Anwār-ul-Bārī*" on page 25 that its manuscript is most likely present in Germany. This is also mentioned in the footnotes of "*Faḍlul Bārī*" on page 63.

18. Kitābul 'Ilal (كتاب العلل)

Ibn Mundah mentions this book. Suyuṭī did not find it.

19. Kitābul Kunā (كتاب الكنى)

Ḥākim Abū Aḥmad mentions this book. It was published in Dā'iratul Ma'ārif, Hyderabad, India. Suyuṭī did not find this book. Dhahabī arranged it in alphabetical order and named it "*Al-Muntaqā fī Sardil Kunyah*". (*Muqaddamah Anwār-ul-Bārī* pg. 26)

20. Kitābul Fawā'id (كتاب الفوائد)

Tirmidhī mentions this in *Kitābul Manāqib* under the chapter *Manāqib Sayyidunā Ṭalḥah* (2/215). Suyuṭī did not find it.

21. Birrul Wālidayn (بر الوالدين)

Ibn Ḥajar √ and Suyuṭī √ mentions this book and considered it to be among the books which are available. However, until today, no copy of it has been found. (*Faḍlul Bārī* pg. 63)

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar √ and Imām Suyuṭī √ have only mentioned the above books. They have not mentioned “*Qaḍāyāṣ Ṣaḥābah wat Tābi‘īn*” although it is Imām Bukhārī’s √ first book.

22. Qaḍāyāṣ Ṣaḥābah wat Tābi‘īn (فضايا الصحابة والتابعين)

This is Imām Bukhārī’s √ first book.

23. Kitābur Riqāq (كتاب الرقاق)

This has been mentioned in “*Anwār-ul-Bārī*” on page 25 with reference to “*Kashfuz Ḍunūn*”.

24. Al-Jāmi‘ Ṣaghīr (الجامع الصغير)

This has been mentioned in the introduction of “*Anwār-ul-Bārī*” on page 25 and in “*Faḍlul Bārī*” on page 63. It is also mentioned that its copy is found in Germany. It is also mentioned in “*Faḍlul Bārī*” that ‘Abdullāh ibn Muḥammad Al-Ashqar is its narrator and that Ibn Ḥajar √ wrote it with his hand. However, in “*Hadyus Sārī*” on page 492, it is mentioned that Al-Ashqar is the narrator of “*At-Tārīkh Ṣaghīr*” and no mention has been made of any of Imām Bukhārī’s √ books by the title “*Al-Jāmi‘ Ṣaghīr*”. Imām Suyuṭī √ has also not mentioned any book under this title. **فليحقق** (So, this should be researched.)

25. Bad’ul Makhlūqāt (بدء المخلوقات)

This has been mentioned in “*Zafrul Muḥaṣṣilīn*” on page 109 without any description.

Imām Bukhārī √ wrote all his books three times. “**وصفْتُ جميعَ كُتُبِي ثَلَاثَ مَرَّاتٍ.**” (I have written all of my books three times.)³ (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 487)

³كأنه أراد باتقريب التنقيح (i.e., with regards to revising and editing.) (*Mirqāt* 1/13)

{Recently, in *Ramaḍān*, I met Shaykh Zuhayr in Masjid Nabawī who was working on *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. He published a *Bukhārī* in Egypt which is considered to be the best copy. However, he is revising it once more. (So, I



asked him: “How far have you reached?” He replied posing a question: “What do the words of Bukhārī ﷺ: صَنَّفْتُ جَمِيعَ كُتُبِي ثَلَاثَ مَرَّاتٍ mean?” Sometimes, it can mean that the author firstly writes it. He then corrects it. He then checks it over a third time. Perhaps, Imām Bukhārī ﷺ said: “I have written all my books three times. That is, I do not distribute it among the people after writing it once. Rather, I checked over it a second time and made some additions and excluded some things. Thereafter, I checked it over a third time and made more corrections. Only after this it was distributed among the people.” The point of this is that it is necessary for every author to do this. It is for this reason students are told not to leave immediately after completing an exam. Rather, they should check it over two and three times to see what they have written. Sometimes, something is written instead of what is actually meant. There are many books written by Imām Bukhārī ﷺ. However, we only have a special love for one of them. We do not have that special love for any of the others. We have only mentioned their names.} [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī and Its Specialities

Name

As mentioned previously, the title of this book is:

الجامع المُسنَدُ الصَّحِيحُ المُختَصَرُ مِنْ أُمُورِ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ ﷺ وَسُنَنِهِ وَأَيَّامِهِ .

Imām Bukhārī √ himself gave it this title. (*Muqaddamah Nawawī li Sharḥil Bukhārī* pg. 39)

Instead of “أُمُورِ”, Ḥāfiẓ √ used the word “حديث”:

مِنْ حَدِيثِ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ ﷺ وَسُنَنِهِ وَأَيَّامِهِ.¹ (*Muqaddamah Fathul Bārī* pg. 7)

Specialities

1. This is the first book which was written for the compilation of only authentic *aḥādīth*. (*Muqaddamah Nawawī li Sharḥil Bukhārī* pg. 39)
2. There is a consensus amongst the scholars that the most authentic books from amongst the *Ḥadīth* books are *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. Majority of the scholars agree that *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* is more authentic and beneficial than *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. (*Ibid*) It is the most authentic book after the Book of Allāh.
3. Imām Bukhārī √ took sixteen years to write this book.² He selected *aḥādīth* from six hundred thousand (600,000) *aḥādīth*. This has

¹ The oldest reference is Nawawī's √ book, “*Ḥājatul Qārī*” and this was mentioned by others also. Therefore, learn the name of the book as mentioned above. *Shaykh* ‘Abdul Fattāḥ Abū Ghuddah √ has written on this topic. In this book, he presents research on the correct names of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*, *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* and *Jāmi‘ Tirmidhī*. The name of the book is: “*Taḥqīqu Ismī Ṣaḥīḥayn wa Ism Jāmi‘ Tirmidhī*”. People do not even know the correct names of these books. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

been narrated from many angles. (Ibid pg.41) He made this book as a proof between him and Allāh 1. (Ibid)

4. Imām Bukhārī √ performed *ghusl* before writing each *Ḥadīth*. He would perform two *rak'ahs ṣalāh* and then write the *Ḥadīth*.³ It is in this manner that this book was compiled. (Hadyus Sāirī pg. 7)
5. Imām Bukhārī √ reviewed his *tarājim* (chapter titles) between the noble grave and *minbar* (pulpit) of Nabī n and he then prayed two *rak'ahs* on each *tarjumah*. (Ibid pg.489 and Muqaddamah Nawawī pg.41)

This narration has been mentioned previously that he stayed in Baṣrah for five years. [He said:] “I had my books with me.” He used to write and also used to perform *ḥajj* every year. He used to return to Baṣrah from Makkah Mukarramah.

One narration is as follows: he said: “I wrote “*Kitābul Jāmi*” in Masjid Ḥaram and before writing each *Ḥadīth*, I performed *istikhārah*, prayed two *rak'ahs* and became assured of its authenticity. I did not include any *Ḥadīth* in this book until I did this.” (Ibid pg.42)

Abul Faḍl Maqdisī √ wrote in “*Jawāb Muta'annatil Bukhārī*” that Imām Bukhārī √ wrote his *Ṣaḥīḥ* in Bukhārā. It has also been said that he wrote it in Makkah Mukarramah. He then mentioned the above narration and gives preference to the first narration. He said: “In my opinion, the first opinion is more correct (i.e., that he wrote it in Bukhārā).”

Imām Nawawī √ mentioned that it is possible to reconcile these differing opinions. Rather, it can definitely be done. (Thus, there is no need for giving preference.) It was mentioned previously that it was written in sixteen years. Therefore, it can be understood that it was

² The author of “*Hidayah*” took thirteen years to write “*Hidayah*”. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

³ Therefore, the one studying *aḥādīth* should also perform at least two *rak'ahs* before coming to class. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

written in all the following places: Makkah, Madīnah, Baṣrah and Bukhārā. (Ibid pg.42)

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar √ reconciles between all these narrations in the following manner:

Firstly, the first draft of the *tarājimul abwāb*, arranged in order, was prepared in Masjid Ḥaram. Then, between the grave and the *minbar* of the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ, he edited the drafts. He worked on the *takhrīj* of the *aḥādīth* under the *tarājim* in his city and the other cities. (Hadyus Sārī pg. 490) All of this work was completed in sixteen years.

6. After compiling this book, Imām Bukhārī √ showed it to Imām Aḥmad √, Yaḥyā bin Maʿīn √, ʿAlī bin Madīnī √ and many others. These people approved it and testified on its authenticity, with the exception of four *aḥādīth*. ʿUqaylī mentioned that even in these four *aḥādīth*, Bukhārī's √ opinion is the correct one as these *aḥādīth* are authentic. (i.e, in ʿUqaylī's opinion.) (Hadyus Sārī pg. 7)
7. Abū Zayd Marwazī √ said: "I was sleeping between the *rukn aswad* and *Maqām Ibrāhīm* and I saw the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ in my dream. He said: "Abū Zayd! Until when are you going to continue reading Imām Shafiʿī's √ book? You do not read my book." I asked, "Oh Messenger of Allāh which one is your book?" He replied: "The *Jāmiʿ*" of Muḥammad ibn Ismāʿīl."⁴ (Hadyus Sārī pg. 489)
A dream similar to this has also been narrated from the Imām al-Ḥaramayn. (Muqaddamah Lāmiʿ pg. 24,85)
8. If *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* is read at the time of any difficulty or hardship, that difficulty will be removed. Also, if it is taken while mounting on a conveyance, that conveyance will be protected. This has been narrated from the people of knowledge and virtue.

⁴ In this dream, it was also called "*Jāmiʿ*", and we will mention another dream of *Mawlānā* Muḥammad Zakariyyā √ which contradicts this. He mentions this in "*Al-Abwāb wat-Tarājim*". [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

Shaykh ‘Abdul Ḥaq Muḥaddith Dehlawī √ has written that many *mashāyikh* and reliable scholars have read this to achieve their objectives, to solve their problems, to repel calamities and as a cure for their illnesses and their objectives have been fulfilled and they have been successful in their purpose. They have found it to have an effect similar to an antidote.⁵ This is very famous among the *muḥaddithīn*.

Shaykh Jamāl-ud-Dīn Muḥaddith √ said: “Our teacher, *Shaykh* Aṣīl-ud-Dīn √ mentioned that I read *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* one hundred and twenty times for myself and others. The purpose for which I read it, that objective was fulfilled.” Shāh ‘Abdul ‘Azīz Muḥaddith Dehlawī √ also mentioned something similar to this in “*Bustān-ul Muḥaddithīn*”. (*Muqaddamah Lāmi* ‘ pg. 24,84)

Ḥāfiẓ √ also mentioned the experience of the people of virtue from Ibn Abī Jamrah⁶ through the people of knowledge.⁷ (*Hadyus Sāri* pg. 14)

9. Amongst the *Ṣiḥāḥ Sittah*, *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* also has this speciality that twenty-two (22) *aḥādīth* are *thulāthī*. On the other hand, there are only five (5) in *Sunan Ibn Mājah* and only one (1) in *Sunan Abū*

⁵ This is the cure for poison. However, it must be kept close to the person and not far away from the person. Otherwise, the following Persian saying will be true:

مار گزیده مرده شود

تا تریاق از عراق آورده شود

When the antidote is brought from ‘Irāq, by that time, the person bitten by the snake will die. It is for this reason, the antidote must be in the house and not in ‘Irāq. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁶ This is a very famous *ṣūfi*. He compiled a book with the summary of approximately three hundred *aḥādīth* from *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. The book’s name is “*Bihjatun Nufūs*”. It will be mentioned in the chapter regarding the commentaries. It was also translated in Urdu and published in Pakistan. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁷ This is based on experience. Some people classify this as a *bid’ah*. Even when something is *Sunnah*, they consider it a *bid’ah*. This sentiment of theirs is not taken. This is connected to experience. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

Dāwūd. (Originally *rubāʿī* is under the same category as *thulāthī*. *Fazl*) There is also only one (1) *thulāthī* in *Jāmiʿ Tirmidhī*. There are no *thulāthī* narrations in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* and *Sunan Nasāʾī*. (*Ibn Mājah aur ʿIlm Ḥadīth* pg. 119)

Twenty of the twenty-two of the *thulāthīyyāt* of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* have been narrated from Imām Bukhārī's √ *Ḥanafī* teachers. Eleven have been narrated from Makkī ibn Ibrāhīm √, Imām Abū Ḥanīfah's √ student (1-4,6,7,11,12,14,17,19). Six have been narrated from Abū ʿĀsim Nabīl Dhaḥāk ibn Makhlad √, Imām Abū Ḥanīfah's √ student (5,8,9,15,18,21). Three have been narrated from Muḥammad ibn ʿAbdullāh Anṣārī √, the student of Imām Zufar √ and Imām Abū Yūsuf √ (10,16,20). Two remains: number 13 which has been narrated by ʿĀsim ibn Khālīd Ḥamsī √ and number 22 which has been narrated from Khallād ibn Yaḥyā Kūfī √. It is not known whether these two were *Ḥanafīs*. (*Muqaddamah Lāmiʿ* pg. 30. Published in Hījr)

Note:

In the copy published in India, it considers the nineteenth *thulāthī* to be the *Anṣārī Ḥadīth* in 'بَابُ: السِّنِّ بِالسِّنِّ' (1018/2). This is a mistake. This *Ḥadīth* is the twentieth *thulāthī*. The nineteenth is before that: pg.1017, Makkī ibn Ibrāhīm's √ narration in 'بَابُ إِذَا قَتَلَ نَفْسَهُ خَطَاً فَلَا دِيَةَ لَهُ'. (*Ibid*)

N.B.

This speciality regarding the great amount of *thulāthīyyāt* is in comparison with the other *Ṣiḥāḥ Sittah*. Otherwise, the *mutaqiddimīn* had many *thulāthī* narrations. Rather, they even had *thunāʿī* and *wuḥdāniyyāt* narrations.

A separate book has been written on Imām Abū Ḥanīfah's √ *wuḥdāniyyāt*. Imām Aʿzam √ saw *Sayyidunā* Anas z. Even Darquṭnī √ accepted this. Imām Yaḥyā ibn Maʿīn √ has clarified that Abū Ḥanīfah √ heard *Ḥadīth* from ʿĀʾishah bint Ajrad. Abū Nuʿaym Aṣḥafānī Shafīʿī, Khaṭīb Baghdādī's teacher, has clarified that Abū Ḥanīfah √ saw and

heard from *Sayyidunā* Anas, *Sayyidunā* ‘Abdullāh ibn al-Ḥārith and *Sayyidunā* ‘Abdullāh ibn Abī Awfā ḡ. (*Al Intiṣār wat Tarjīḥ lisabḥ ibn Jawzī* pg. 10-11)

Ibn ‘Abdil Barr Mālikī √ also mentions a narration of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah √ in which Abū Ḥanīfah √ has clarified that he heard from *Sayyidunā* ‘Abdullāh ibn al-Ḥārith ibn Juz’ z and there is no criticism on the chain of this narration. (*Jāmi‘ Bayānul ‘ilm Wa Faḍlihi*, published in Mayriyah, Egypt pg. 45)

Imām Suyūṭī √ also mentioned similar narrations in “*Tabyīdhus Ṣaḥīfah*”. (See *Ibn Mājah aur ‘Ilm Ḥadīth* pg. 117)⁸

Thunā’ī narrations can be found in Imām Abū Ḥanīfah’s √ “*Kitābul Āthār*”. Along with the *thulāthiyyāt* of Bukhārī, this reality should not be disregarded.⁹

⁸ We have mentioned more research regarding this topic in “*Sīrah Imām Abū Ḥanīfah*”. A summary of this is as follows: Many *Aḥnāf* scholars and some other scholars have mentioned that Imām Ṣāḥib √ heard from some *Ṣaḥābah* ḡ. However, when one has pondered upon their chains, it has been found that they are not reliable. ‘Ā’ishah bint Ajrad was not a *Ṣaḥābiyyah*. (*Iṣabah* by Ḥāfiḡ) Shaykh Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf Ṣāliḥ √ writes in “*Uqūdul Jumān*” that none of these chains are free of a narrator who has been accused of fabricating narrations. (Page 62,63)

Currently, a book by the title, “*Al-Aḥādīthus Sab‘ah ‘anis sab‘ah minas Ṣaḥābah*” has been published. Its author is Shaykh ‘Abul Makārim ‘Abdullāh bin Al Ḥusayn Naysabūrī √. The researcher of this book, *Mawlānā* Laṭīfur Raḥmān Behrāchī, has not even found information regarding the author and the condition of some of the narrators is not known. Without a doubt, Imām Ṣāḥib √ is a *Tabī‘ī*, he has seen some of the *Ṣaḥābah*ḡ. Not having an established narration does not lower his status. (See *Sīrah Imām Abū Ḥanīfah* pg. 44)

⁹ Rather, this should be preserved in the heart. It will be mentioned that “*Kitābul Āthar*” is Imām Abū Ḥanīfah’s √ book which become famous through Imām Muḥammad √ and Imām Abū Yūsuf √. In reality, it was written by Imām Ṣāḥib √. Suyūṭī √ has clarified that the first book to be compiled according to the *fiqhī abwāb* was written by Imām Abū Ḥanīfah √. In the same way he is the

10. Amongst the *Ṣiḥāḥ Sittah*, *Ṣaḥiḥ Bukhārī* is called *Jāmi‘* like *Tirmidhī*.

There is a difference in opinion regarding *Ṣaḥiḥ Muslim* being *Jāmi‘*. Majority of the scholars have considered it to be *Jāmi‘* as well. Shāh ‘Abdul Azīz Muḥaddith Dehlawī ∇ did not consider it to be *Jāmi‘* as there are very few *aḥādīth* regarding *tafsīr*. Shāh ‘Abdul ‘Azīz ∇ has defined *Jāmi‘* as follows: That which comprises of eight fields which have been combined in this poem:

سير وآداب وتفسير وعقائد فتن واحكام واشراط ومناقب.

Siyar (Military Expeditions) and *Ādāb* (Etiquettes) and *Tafsīr* (Exegesis) and *Aqā'id* (Beliefs)

Fītn (Trials), *Aḥkām* (Rulings) and *Ashrāt* (Signs of *Qiyāmah*) and *Manāqib* (Virtues)

In the words of Shāh Ṣāhib ∇:

عقائد, احكام, رفاق, آداب, تفسير, تاريخ, سير, فتن, مناقب ومثالب.

Aqā'id (Beliefs), *Aḥkām* (Rulings), *Riqāq* (Heart Softening), *Ādāb* (Etiquettes), *Tafsīr* (Exegesis), *Tārīkh* (History), *Siyar* (Military Expeditions), *Fītn* (Trials), *Manāqib* and *Mathālib* (Virtues). (‘*Ujāla-e-Nāfi‘ah* pg. 14)

However, the author of “*Fawā'id Jāmi‘ah*”, *Mawlānā* ‘Abdul Ḥalīm Chāshtī has objected against this¹⁰; that this terminology is not found

founder of the compilation of *fiqh*, he is also the founder of compiling *Ḥadīth* according to the order of *fiqhī abwāb*. It is Suyutī ∇, a *Shafī‘ī*, who clarifies this. It is not a *Hanafī* who is making this claim. One should read and study “*Tabyīḍus Sāḥīfah*” regarding this. The full name of the book is: “*Tabyīḍus Sāḥīfah fī Manāqib Abū Ḥanīfah*”. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

¹⁰ In our opinion, this objection of *Mawlānā* Chishtī is very comprehensive. No answer to this objection is known. However, in India, this definition is famous:

in the books of the *mutaqaddimīn* (earlier scholars).¹¹ Perhaps, Shāh Ṣāḥib ∇ has defined this from his own opinion or by hearing it from his teachers. Otherwise, according to the *mutaqaddimīn*, the word *Jāmiʿ* is used for both *Sunan* and *Muṣannaf*. It is for this reason that *Muwaṭṭʿā* is called *Jāmiʿ*. Imām Abū Dāwūd ∇ has called “*Kitāb Sufyān*”, *Jāmiʿ*. *Tirmidhī* is known by both *Sunan* and *Jāmiʿ*. (*Fawā'id Jāmi'ah* pg. 155)

See page 27-28 of this book along with the footnote.

تلك عشرة كاملة



Jāmiʿ is that which comprises of eight fields. However, this definition is not found in the books of the *mutaqaddimīn*. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

¹¹ This definition is not found in the books of *Uṣūl Ḥadīth* which are famous such as “*Muqaddamah ibn Ṣalāḥ*”, “*Tadribur Rāwī*”, “*Faṭḥul Mughīth*”, “*Tawjīhun Naẓr*” and other than these. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

The Motivation Behind the Compilation of Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī

Why did the thought of compiling such a book cross Imām Bukhārī's mind?

There are many reasons for this. However, before this, it is necessary to know how many books were compiled before the era of Imām Bukhārī and what their specialties were.

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar has written: "In the era of the *Ṣaḥābah* and the senior *tābi'īn*, *aḥādīth* were not compiled. [This was due to the following reasons:]

Firstly, in the beginning, the *Ṣaḥābah* were prohibited from writing *aḥādīth* as mentioned in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* 2/414, so that wordings of the *Ḥadīth* do not become mixed with the verses of the Qur'ān.

Secondly, the memory of the *Ṣaḥābah* was very strong and most of them did not know how to write. Then, in the last era of the *Tābi'īn*, the compilation and arrangement of *Ḥadīth* in chapters began when there were many 'ulamā' in different countries and cities and there was an increase in groups like the *Rawāfiḍ*, *Khawārij* and those who denied *taqdīr* (fate). Therefore, Rabī' ibn Ṣabīḥ¹ and Sa'īd ibn Abī 'Arūbah

¹ Before him, Imām Zuhri and Abū Bakar Muḥammad ibn Ḥazam compiled *aḥādīth*. (*Muqaddamah Lāmi* pg. 22)

In my opinion, I think that Ḥāfiẓ means that these two were the first to compile a book of *Ḥadīth* which was arranged under different chapters. Imām Zuhri compiled *aḥādīth* only and it was not arranged in *fiqhī* order. Ḥāfiẓ himself clarifies that the first compiler of *Ḥadīth* was Zuhri, who compiled it in the end of the first century due to 'Umar ibn 'Abdīl 'Azīz's request to do so. It is mentioned in "*Fatḥul Bārī*" 1/208:

أول من دَوَّن الحديث ابنُ شهاب الزُّهري على رأس المئة بأمر عمر بن عبد العزيز.

were the first to compile *Ḥadīth*. These righteous personalities separated each chapter until the *akābir* of the third group compiled the rulings. Accordingly, Imām Mālik √ wrote “*Muwattāʾ*” and in this book, he compiled the strongest *aḥādīth* of the people of Ḥijāz. Coupled with that, he also compiled the *fatāwā* and statements of the *Ṣaḥābah* ∓ and *Tābiʿīn*. Ibn Jurayj √ in Makkah, Imām Awzāʿī √ in Syria, Sufyān Thawrī √ in Kūfah and Ḥammād bin Salamah √ in Baṣrah wrote books. Then, many of their contemporaries wrote books according to their style.

In the end of the second century, few of the *aʿimmah* thought of compiling only the *aḥādīth* of the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ. ‘Ubaydullāh ibn Mūsā ‘Absī Kūfī √ wrote a *musnad*, Musaddad ibn Musarhad Baṣrī, Asad ibn Mūsā Amwī and Nuʿaym ibn Ḥammād Khuzāʿī رحمه الله also wrote *masānīd*.

The *aʿimmah* that came after them also compiled and wrote books. There is rarely any *muḥaddith* who does not have a compilation. Aḥmed ibn Ḥanbal, Ishāq ibn Rāhwayh and Uthmān ibn Abī Shaybah رحمه الله also compiled *masānīd*. Abū Bakr ibn Abī Shaybah √ also compiled a *musnad*. He also compiled a book in *abwāb* (chapter) format. (*Hadyus Sāir* pg. 4-5)

Our Shaykh Muḥaddith Jalīl Allāmah Ḥabīb-ur-Raḥmān Aʿẓmī (متننا الله بعلمه (ونور الله مرقده) has written very great details regarding this in the introduction of “*Nuṣrat-ul-Ḥadīth*”.

He wrote: “The compilation of *aḥādīth* began from the era of the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ. Then, more attention was given to it during the *Ṣaḥābah*’s ∓ era, and it developed further during the era of the *Tābiʿīn*.”

After mentioning each one's evidence, he wrote:

“Apart from this custom of compiling *aḥādīth*, the writing of books also began. Thus, in Makkah Mu‘adh-dhamah Ibn Jurayj ∇ (death: 150 A.H), in Yemen Mu‘amar ibn Rāshed ∇ (death: 153 A.H), in Baṣrah Sa‘īd ibn Abī ‘Arūbah (death:152 A.H) and Rabī‘ ibn Ṣabīḥ رَحْمَهُمَا اللهُ (death:141 A.H), wrote *Ḥadīth* books. In that same era, Mūsā ibn ‘Uqbah ∇ (death 141 A.H.) and Ibn Ishāq (death:151 A.H) رَحْمَهُمَا اللهُ ² also wrote books.

After them, in Syria Imām Awzā‘ī ∇ (death: 157 A.H.), in Khurāsān Imām ‘Abdullāh ibn Mubārak ∇ (death: 181 A.H.), in Baṣrah Ḥammād bin Salamah ∇ (death:167 A.H.), in Kūfā Sufyān Thawrī ∇(death: 161 A.H.), in Rai Jarīr bin ‘Abdul Ḥamīd ∇(death: 188 A.H.) and in Wāsiṭ, Hushaym ∇ (death:183 AH.) wrote *Ḥadīth* books. It is also in this era that Imām Mālik ∇ (death: 179 A.H.) wrote his famous book. Abū Ma‘shar Sindhī ∇ (death:170 A.H.) wrote a book on the battles of the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ. Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad Aslamī ∇ (death: 184 A.H.), the teacher of Imām Shāfi‘ī ∇, wrote a *Muwatṭā’* in the style of Imām Mālik ∇ which was double the size of Mālik’s *Muwatṭā’*.

Ma‘afī ibn ‘Imrān Mawṣalī ∇ (death: 185 A.H.) wrote “*Kitābus Sunan*”, “*Kitābus Zuhd*”, “*Kitābul Ādāb*” and “*Kitābul Fitan*”. Imām Abū Yūsuf ∇ (death: 182 A.H.) wrote “*Kitābul Āthār*”³, “*Kitābul Khirāj*”, and many others. Imām Muḥammad ∇ (death: 189 A.H.) wrote “*Muwatṭā’*”, “*Kitābul Āthār*”, “*Kitābul Ḥajj*”⁴, and many others. Walīd ibn Muslim ∇

² He was known as the Imām of *maghāzī*. He was from the same era as Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇. He passed away only one year after Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

³ Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇ wrote “*Kitābul Āthār*”. His students, Imām Abū Yūsuf ∇ and Imām Muḥammad ∇ narrated it from Imām A‘zam ∇ just like *Muwatṭā’* which is written by Imām Mālik ∇ and then it was narrated by several of his students from him. (***Mawlānā Nu‘mān***)

⁴*Kitābul Ḥujaj* or *Kitābul Ḥujjah*.

{This book of Imām Muḥammad ∇ refutes the *Ahl Madīnah*. The full book title is: “*Kitābul Ḥujaj ‘alā Ahl Madīnah*”}. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

(death: 195 A.H.) wrote seventy (70) books on different chapters/topics...” (*Muqaddamah Nuṣrat-ul- Ḥadīth* pg. 18-20)

Imām Bukhārī ∇ was not able to meet *Muḥaddith* ‘Abdur Razzāq. His *Muṣannaf* was completed before Imām Bukhārī ∇.

From these details, it becomes known that before Imām Bukhārī ∇, many *aḥādīth* books, big and small, were completed and published. So, which deficiency did he intend to rectify by authoring his *Ṣaḥīḥ*?⁵ Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar ∇ mentioned two reasons for this:

1. Imām Bukhārī ∇ saw that in those books, there were *ḍa‘īf aḥādīth* along with the *ḥasan* and *ṣaḥīḥ aḥādīth*. It is for this reason, he thought that such a book should be compiled in which there are only *ṣaḥīḥ aḥādīth*. This intent became even stronger when, on one occasion, Imām Ishāq ibn Rāḥwayh ∇ said in one of his gatherings⁶: “(It would be good) if you can compile a brief collection of the *ṣaḥīḥ aḥādīth* of the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ.” Imām Bukhārī ∇ said: “This request became embedded in my heart, and I started the compilation of *Al-Jāmi‘ al-Ṣaḥīḥ*.”
2. On one occasion, Imām Bukhārī ∇ saw in a dream that he was standing in front of the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ. He says: “I had a fan in my hand, and I was defending him ﷺ with it. I asked some interpreters of dreams for its interpretation. They said: “You will remove the accusations from the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ.” This incident had such an effect on me that I made the intention to write *Al-Jāmi‘ al-Ṣaḥīḥ*.” (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 7 and *Muqaddamah Nawawī* pg. 41)

⁵ That is, what motivated Imām Bukhārī ∇ [to write *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*] when so many books were already present in the world? The answer to this is now understood. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁶ It is mentioned in the *muqaddamah* of Imām Nawawī ∇ that we were in the gathering of Imām Ishāq ibn Rāḥwayh ∇ when some of our companions said to us. (page40), it is possible that “some companions” could specifically mean Ishāq ibn Rāḥwayh. And Allāh knows best. *Fazl*.

Imām Bukhārī ∇ himself said: “I have only collected *ṣaḥīḥ* narrations in this book, and those *ṣaḥīḥ aḥādīth* which have not been mentioned in this book are even more than this amount.⁷ Ismā‘īlī, who narrated this statement, said: “If all the *ṣaḥīḥ aḥādīth* had been mentioned, then in one chapter, many narrations of the *Ṣaḥābah* ∇ would be compiled, and by compiling every *ṣaḥīḥ* chain for these narrations, the book would become very lengthy.”

Ibrāhīm Nasafī ∇ also said that I heard Imām Bukhārī ∇ saying: “I have only compiled *ṣaḥīḥ aḥādīth* in this book, and I have also omitted many *ṣaḥīḥ aḥādīth* so that the book would not become too lengthy. (*Hadyus Sūri* pg. 7)

⁷ This is a point to remember because the *ghayr muqallidīn* say: “We only accept the *Ḥadīth* of *Bukhārī* and *Muslim*. Therefore, for every *mas’alah* bring evidence from *Bukhārī* and *Muslim*.” They should be asked: “Are *ṣaḥīḥ aḥādīth* only in *Bukhārī* and *Muslim*? Is there no *ṣaḥīḥ ḥadīth* in other than these two books?” Imām Bukhārī ∇ used to say: “Those *ṣaḥīḥ aḥādīth* which are not mentioned in this book are even more than those mentioned in this book.” Imām Muslim ∇ also mentioned something similar to this. Ibn Ṣalāḥ ∇ quoted their statements in his *muqaddamah*. So how can they claim that they only accept *Bukhārī* and *Muslim’s aḥādīth*? These people recite *bismillāh* loudly before *Sūrah Fātiḥah*. Let us begin discussing and we will begin the discussion with *bismillāh*. Bring evidence for reading *bismillāh* loudly from *Bukhārī* and *Muslim*. They will begin seeing stars during the day.

”ودونه خرط القطاط“ Only *ṣaḥīḥ aḥādīth* were collected. He did not say that all the narrators of the *Ḥadīth* I collected are all reliable. There is a big difference between the two. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]



The Objective of Compiling [Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī]

The objective of the compilation of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* has been made apparent from the previous chapter, ‘The Motivation Behind the Compilation of Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī’, i.e., to compile authentic *aḥādīth* as apparent by the title, “*Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*”, and the afore-mentioned details. However, the objective of Imām Bukhārī √ is not restricted to this. Rather, highlighting beneficial *fiqhī* points and deriving *fiqhī* rulings are also among Imām’s √ most important objectives.

Ḥāfiẓ √ said: “It is established that Imām Bukhārī √ made authenticity a necessary condition in this book; he made it binding to compile only *ṣaḥīḥ aḥādīth*. This is the primary objective. This is established from the title of the *Ṣaḥīḥ* and the explanations of the *a’immah*. Thereafter, Imām √ did not want his book to remain void of *fiqhī* benefits and wise points. Therefore, from his understanding, he derived many meanings from the text of the *aḥādīth* and then placed this *Ḥādīth* in appropriate places which he divided into different chapters. Additionally, Qur’ānic verses regarding laws were also given importance and he derived unique meanings and proofs from them. He was very efficient regarding this and he also indicated towards the *tafsīr* of the verses.¹

Shaykh Muḥiyy-ud-Dīn √ (i.e., Nawawī in “*Muqaddamah Sharḥ Bukhārī*” on page 51) says: “The objective of Bukhārī √ is not only *aḥādīth*, but rather, his objective is also to derive rulings and proofs from them according to the chapters. It is for this reason, many chapters are void of a chain of transmission and the statement of the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ is indicated towards by the name of a *Ṣaḥābah* √,

¹ This is also one of the specialities of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* which is not present in the other *Ḥādīth* books. He includes many Qur’ānic verses and derives rulings from them, and he selects the best and most suitable verses according to the topic. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

or only the text is mentioned and not the chain of narration, or it is mentioned as a *mu‘allaq* narration. He did this because the object is to prove the *Tarjumatul Bāb* (chapter title) and many a times the *Ḥadīth* is known. Sometimes it has already been mentioned, sometimes it has recently been mentioned (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 8) and sometimes it will soon be mentioned.

In many chapters, he mentions many different narrations. Some chapters only have one narration, and some have no narrations. Some scholars have claimed that Imām Bukhārī √ has done this intentionally to show that according to him, no narration has been established which is similar in meaning to the *tarjumah*. It is for this reason, in some copies of the book there are also some instances where there is no chapter above the *Ḥadīth*, or if there is a chapter, then there is no *Ḥadīth*. In such cases, to understand Imām Bukhārī’s √ objective is difficult.

The solution to this difficult problem is solved from the statement of ‘Abul Walīd Bājī Mālīkī √. In the introduction of his book, regarding the narrators of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*, he quoted Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm ibn Aḥmad Mustamlī √ (with a chain): “I have narrated *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* from the original copy which his student Firabrī had. I have seen a few things in it which are incomplete. There are a few blank spaces. Some have a *tarjumah* without *aḥādīth* mentioned under it and some have *aḥādīth* with no *tarjumah*. Therefore, we joined some with some.”

‘Allāmah Bājī √ mentioned that this is confirmed by the fact that the narrations of Mustamlī, Sarakhsī, Khushmayhanī and Abū Zayd Marwazī vary with regards to the order, although they all narrated from one source. In such instances, these scholars have arranged it based on their personal estimation. Whatever they found written on a paper (or in a footnote)², they added it to a specific place according to

² Here, the word ‘طره’ is written. It can be translated as footnote or a piece of paper. *Fazl*.

their personal estimation. It is for this reason, in some instances, you will find two or more *tarājim* which are connected with no *Ḥadīth* between them.

‘Allāmah Bājī ³ said: “I mentioned this because the people of our city seek to find a connection between the *Ḥadīth* and *tarjumah* and for this, they would go through such formalities which were not appropriate.”

Ḥāfiẓ Ṣāhib ^v quoted this and then stated that this is a good rule to apply when reconciliation is difficult. However, such instances are rare.

³ Bājī is not a Gujarati or a Pakistani. Rather, Bajah is a place in Spain. He used to live in this area. Baji in Gujarat and Pakistan refers to something else. ‘Allāmah Bājī ^v was a great researcher. He was a Mālikī. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

He then mentions:

The Different Forms of the *Tarājim Abwāb*

“I have understood that Imām Bukhārī’s *ṽ Tarājim Abwāb* are in varying styles:

1. If a *Ḥadīth* is found which is connected to the *tarjumah*, even if it is in a subtle manner, and it is in accordance with the conditions of Imām Bukhārī *ṽ*, he mentions them with words like “حدثنا” etc. If *عننه* is also in accordance with the conditions, it is also taken in those instances.
2. If a *Ḥadīth* is not in accordance with the condition, but it is worthy of being used as evidence, it is also mentioned in the *bāb* (chapter). However, the *ṣegah* (inflection) and style is changed. It is for this reason, the *ta’līqāt* are mentioned.
3. If an authentic *Ḥadīth* was not found, but such a *Ḥadīth* was found which is worthy of being a support and can be used as a proof and it is also such a *Ḥadīth* which a group gives preference to over *qiyās* (analogy)⁴, then it is mentioned by using its wording or meaning as the *Tarjumatul Bāb*. Then, within that chapter, a Qur’ānic verse or such a *Ḥadīth* is mentioned which supports that *Ḥadīth*.

In this manner, the *tarjumah* of the *aḥādīth* are of three types...” (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 9)

⁴ The *Aḥnāf* are included in this group. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

The Objective of the Five Imāms

‘Allāmah Muḥammad Zāhid Kawtharī √ (death: 1371 A.H.) discussed the purpose and objectives of the five authentic books⁵ (*Bukhārī*, *Muslim*, *Abū Dāwūd*, *Tirmidhī* and *Nasā’ī*) in the following manner:

“The objective of Bukhārī √ is to collect *ṣaḥīḥ*, *muttaṣil aḥādīth* and derive *fiqh*, *sīrah* and *tafsīr* from them. It is for this reason he mentions the *mawqūf* and *mu‘allaq* narrations, the *fatāwā* of the *Ṣaḥābah* √ and *Tābi‘īn* and the opinions of others by the way. Due to this, the texts and chains of narrations of the *aḥādīth* are scattered throughout the chapters of the book.

The objective of Imām Muslim √ is only to mention *ṣaḥīḥ aḥādīth*. His objective is not to derive anything from them. It is for this reason, he compiles the different chains of the *aḥādīth* in one place, so that the differences in the texts and the number of chains become apparent. Due to this, the texts of the *aḥādīth* are not scattered throughout the book.

The objective of Imām Abū Dāwūd √ is to compile those *aḥādīth* which the scholars use as evidence, and those which form the basis (foundation) of the laws. It is for this reason, he collected *ṣaḥīḥ*, *ḥasan*, *layyin*, and those *aḥādīth* which can be practised upon. Abū Dāwūd √ himself said: “I have not mentioned those *aḥādīth* in my book regarding which there is a consensus on leaving out.”

Whichever *Ḥadīth* was weak, its weakness was mentioned and a separate chapter was established for every *Ḥadīth* which a scholar used as evidence or made it his *madh-hab*. Those *aḥādīth* upon which he remained silent, they are *ṣāliḥ* in his opinion. A *faqīh* is most in need of this.

⁵ There is a famous book regarding this: “*Shurūṭul A’immah Khamsah*” by Ḥazmī. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

The method of Imām Tirmidhī ∇ is a combination of both the aforementioned methods. It is as though Imām Tirmidhī ∇ liked the method of Shaykhayn (Imām Bukhārī ∇ and Imām Muslim ∇); i.e., he did not leave it ambiguous. He clarified it. He also liked the method of Imām Abū Dāwūd ∇ and (thus, he followed his style and) mentions the opinions of all the different *madhāhib*. Furthermore, he also mentions the *madhāhib* of the *Ṣaḥābah* ∇, *Tābiʿīn* and great *fuqahā*. He also summarises the chains of the *aḥādīth* by mentioning one *Ḥādīth* and then indicating towards other similar narrations (with different chains). He also mentions the grading of every *Ḥādīth*⁶; whether it is *ṣaḥīḥ*, *ḥasan* or *munkar*. He also mentions the reason for weakness of a narration or whether it is *mustaḍīf* or *gharīb*.

Nasāʾī ∇, even though he is of a later era, some have considered it (his book) to be directly after the *Ṣaḥīḥayn* (*Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*) in rank⁷. This is because he is harsher than Shaykhayn with regards to the criticism of the narrators, and after the *Ṣaḥīḥayn*, the *aḥādīth* of his book have been the least criticized. He also explains the hidden defects in a beautiful manner.⁸

⁶ This is mentioned based on the predominant state. Tirmidhī ∇ did not mention the grading of every *Ḥādīth*. There are also many *aḥādīth* which he did not grade. However, he graded most of them. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁷ Imām Nasāʾī's ∇ era was the latest from among the *Ṣiḥāḥ Sittah*. It is close to Taḥāwī's era.

It is for this reason, researchers like 'Allāmah Kawtharī ∇ and 'Allāmah Kashmīrī ∇ stated: "After the *Ṣaḥīḥayn*, *Nasāʾī* is next in rank in terms of authenticity. Then, *Abū Dāwūd*, then *Tirmidhī* and then *Ibn Mājah*." [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁸ Kawtharī ∇ only mentioned this regarding *Sunan Nasāʾī*. However, Imām 'Abdullāh ibn Rushayd ∇ said: "*Sunan Nasāʾī* is the best written book from among the *Sunans*. The order is very good. It is a combination of the method of both *Bukhārī* and *Muslim*. Along with that, the hidden defects are also mentioned. In summary, after the *Ṣaḥīḥayn*, it is such a book in which there

Imām Bukhārī √ pondered on the opinions and obtained the knowledge of *fiqh* from the *Ahl Ra'y Fuqahā'* of Bukhārā. He memorised the books of 'Abdullāh ibn Mubārak √, the student of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah √, before leaving Bukhārā. He also met different *fuqahā'* during his journeys for knowledge. It is due to this he did his own *ijtihād*.⁹ (*Hāshiyah Shurūḥul A'immatul Khamsah* by Ḥāzimī pg. 82 with *Ibn Mājah*, published by Qadīm Kutub Khāna, Karachi)



are very few criticized narrators and weak narrations. Close to it is *Abū Dāwūd* and *Tirmidhī*." (*Muqaddamah Zahrur-Rābī* by Suyūṭī √ pg. 3)

That is, the objective of Imām Nasā'ī √, like Imām Bukhārī √, is to derive rulings from the *aḥādīth* and to mention the chains of narration along with their hidden defects. In many instances, there is similarity in the wordings of the *abwāb* in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* and *Sunan Nasā'ī* and like *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*, there is also repetition.

⁹ 'Allāmah Kawtharī √ is also of the opinion that Bukhārī √ was a *mujtahid*.
[Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

The Conditions of Imām Bukhārī ∇ In Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī and the Authenticity of Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī

The Conditions of Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī

‘Allāmah Abul Faḍl Muḥammad ibn Ṭāhir Maqdisī ∇ (death: 507 A.H.) wrote in the beginning of his book *“Shurūṭ ul A’immah Sittah”*: “The conditions of the books of Imām Bukhārī ∇, Imām Muslim ∇ and the other *Ṣiḥāḥ Sittah* are mentioned. It is necessary to know that the conditions of their books have not been mentioned by the authors themselves. Rather, you will become aware of their conditions upon analysing their books.”¹

Thereafter, he mentioned that the condition of Imām Bukhārī ∇ and Imām Muslim ∇ is that they collect the narrations of such narrators whose reliability is agreed upon.² [They collect] such narrations which reach until the *Ṣaḥābah* ∇³ and whose chains are *muttaṣil* without any

¹ That is, the later scholars analysed and studied these books in depth. Thereafter, they deduced that these were the conditions of the authors for their respective books. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

² ‘Allāmah Maqdisī ∇ is a great scholar. However, he has made an error here. We do **not agree** with his following statement: “The condition of Bukhārī ∇ and Muslim ∇ is that they collect the narrations of such narrators whose reliability is **agreed** upon.” We have mentioned the following statement of Imām Bukhārī ∇ previously: “I have only collected *ṣaḥīḥ aḥādīth* in my book, *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*.” This statement is correct. He did not say that all the narrators are reliable. There are almost one hundred narrators of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* mentioned in my teacher’s book, *“Iljām ul Muta’annitīn”*, regarding whom there is criticism. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

³ ‘Allamāh Kawtharī ∇ wrote in the footnote that Ḥāfiẓ al-‘Irāqī ∇ objected to this in his commentary of *“Alfiyah”*. He objected because Imām Nasā’ī ∇ has graded a group of narrators (which Shaykhayn or one of them has collected

narrations from) as weak. The explanation of this is mentioned below as extracted from “*Shurūṭul Ḥāzimī*”. (Page 70)

Ḥāzimī √ (death: 584 A.H.) mentioned the following question and answer in his “*Shurūṭ ul A’immah al-Khamsah*”:

Question: Why have Shaykhayn collected narrations from *mutakallam fīhi* narrators when they have made authenticity binding in their books? The likes of Fulayḥ ibn Sulaymān, ‘Abdul Raḥmān ibn ‘Abdullāh ibn Dinār, Ismā’īl ibn Abī ‘Uways in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* and persons like Muḥammad ibn Ishāq ibn Yasār in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*.

Answer: In *Ṣaḥīḥayn* there are a few narrations of such people to whom weakness has been ascribed to. However, the weakness is not so severe that their *aḥādīth* are rejected. Furthermore, we do not believe that Imām Bukhārī √ considered it correct to collect *aḥādīth* of such narrators in whom there is some weakness. If he was of the opinion that they were weak, he would not have collected their *aḥādīth*.

Kawtharī’s Review

Regarding this, Kawtharī √ has written: There is criticism surrounding many of the narrators of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. (In *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*: eighty (80) narrators, and in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: one hundred and sixty (160) narrators.) The criticism is due to the following factors: *bid’ah*, *jahālah*, *mukhālafah*, *tadlīs* and *irsāl*. Some people have answered this objection by saying that these narrations are mentioned as *shawāhid* and *mutābi’āt* (i.e., as supporting chains). They are not mentioned as the *uṣūl*. Alternatively, they collected the narration before the reason for weakness became apparent. In the introduction of “*Faṭḥul Bārī*”, Ḥāfiẓ √ refutes this objection very strongly.

The high status of Imām Bukhārī √ and Imām Muslim √ is not lowered by slight discrepancies in their books. This is because they were not flawless. Additionally, Imām Bukhārī √ passed away before the final review of his book as has been established in many narrations. (Ḥāshiyah *Shurūṭ ul A’immah al-Khamsah* by Ḥāzimī pg. 83)

inqiṭā'. If there are two narrators narrating from the *Ṣaḥābī*, this is better. Otherwise, they also collected narrations with only one narrator once the chain is *ṣaḥīḥ*. However, Imām Muslim √ collected narrations from such narrators whose *aḥādīth* Imām Bukhārī √ did not collect due to a doubt. After removing this doubt, Imām Muslim √ accepted their *aḥādīth*. For example, he accepted the *aḥādīth* of the following narrators: Ḥammād ibn Salamah, Suhayl ibn Abī Ṣāliḥ, Dāwūd ibn Abī Hind, Abū Zubayr, 'Alā' ibn 'Abdur Raḥmān and others. We have mentioned these five as examples because they are famous and have many narrations. There has been some criticism regarding them. However, it is not to the extent that their reliability and uprightness is negated. Despite this, Imām Bukhārī √ did not collect their *aḥādīth* out of caution. Imām Muslim √ accepted them after establishing their reliability.

For example, there is a discussion regarding whether Suhayl bin Abī Ṣāliḥ heard from his father or not. Some have mentioned that he used to narrate from a *ṣaḥīfah*. Bukhārī √ did not collect Suhayl's narrations. (He has only taken his narrations as supportive evidence- *Dhahabī*.) He has collected the narrations of his father's other students. However, Imām Muslim √ has collected Suhayl's narrations as he has found that sometimes he says: "أبيه عن دينار بن عبد الله عن" and sometimes he says: "أبيه عن الاعمش عن". From this, Imām Muslim √ deduced that he heard

From Ḥāzimī's statement, it becomes known that there are differences regarding narrators. A narrator may be weak according to a certain *muḥaddith* but according to another *muḥaddith* he is reliable. This is why *Muḥaqqiq* ibn Humām √ said that authenticity is not definitely proven when Shaykhayn or one of them considers a narrator to have met all the conditions of authenticity. It is also possible that this grading can be against the reality. In *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* there are *mutakallam fīhi* narrators. Therefore, it is befitting to say that this issue is based on the *ijtihād* of the '*ulamā*'. Similarly, conditions are also based on the *ijtihād* of the '*ulamā*'. Details regarding this will be further mentioned. *Faḍl*

from his father. Yes, he did not hear some *aḥādīth* directly from his father. Rather, he heard it through Ibn Dinār or A‘mash or his brother and all three of them heard from his father. If the narrations were from a *ṣaḥīfah*, then why were those additional links mentioned? Thus, it has been deduced that he heard those *aḥādīth* directly from his father. (*Shurūṭul A‘immah Sittah* by Maqdisī ma-‘a *Ibn Mājah*, pg. 70- Published in Karachi)

Ḥammād ibn Salamah was also mentioned as an example.

Ḥākim’s ∇ Claim⁴

Abū ‘Abdillāh Ḥākim ∇, the author of “*Mustadrak*” claims that for a *Ḥadīth* to be authentic, it is necessary that the *jahālah* regarding the *Ṣaḥābī* is clarified in such a manner that there are two people narrating from him until the end (of the chain), i.e., there are two narrators narrating from each narrator like a testimony upon a testimony.

In “*Sharḥ Nukhbah*” on page 14, Ḥāfiẓ ∇ quoted this statement of Ḥākim ∇ from his book, (*Ma‘rifah ‘Ulūm Ḥadīth*). He also writes that Qāḍī Abū Bakr ibn Al-‘Arbī ∇ considers this as a condition of Imām Bukhārī ∇. In the introduction of “*Fatḥul Bārī*”, Ḥāfiẓ ∇ mentions Ḥākim’s ∇ opinion regarding this being a condition of Imām Bukhārī ∇ and Imām Muslim ∇.

In “*Shurūṭul A‘immah*” on page 74, Ḥāzimī ∇ (death: 584 A.H.) quoted a lengthy statement of Ḥākim ∇ from his “*Kitābul Madkhal*”. In this,

⁴ Ḥākim ∇ is a great *muḥaddith*. Some people have praised Ḥākim ∇ by saying that he knows all the *aḥādīth* with their chains and *‘ilals*. However, this praise is not found in any reliable book. It has only been mentioned in the footnote of “*Sharḥ Nukhbah*”. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

Ḥākim ∇ also mentions that Imām Bukhārī ∇ and Imām Muslim ∇ collected narrations from such narrators who had at least two students. Maqdisī ∇ also mentions this statement of Ḥākim in “*Shurūṭul A’immah*” on page 71.⁵

Refuting Ḥākim ∇

Both Maqdisī ∇ and Ḥāzimī ∇ strongly refuted Ḥākim’s ∇ statement. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar ∇ also refuted it in “*Sharḥ Nukhbah*” and “*Hadyus Sārī*.”

A Summary of Maqdisī and Ḥāzimī’s Refutation

A summary of the statement of Maqdisī ∇ and Ḥāzimī ∇ is as follows:

Neither Imām Bukhārī ∇ nor Imām Muslim ∇ had such conditions. Nothing like this has been narrated from them. Rather, this is simply Ḥākim’s ∇ assumption. By Allāh! This condition would have been good had it been present in both of these books. However, this principle of Ḥākim ∇ is incorrect. For example, from among the *Ṣaḥābah* ∇, there is the *Ḥadīth* of Mirdās Aslamī ∇ which only Imām Bukhārī ∇ mentions: “يذهب الصالحون الأول فالأول” - “The pious will depart one after the other.” (2/598,952) Only this one narration is narrated from this *Ṣaḥābī* in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. None of his other narrations are mentioned in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*.

⁵ Kawtharī ∇ has written that Bayhaqī ∇ also agrees with Ḥākim ∇ regarding this issue. A text from *Kitābuz Zakāh* in “*Sunan Bayhaqī*” makes this apparent. Ibn Athīr ∇, in “*Jāmi’-ul-Uṣūl*” also agrees with Ḥākim ∇. It appears as though he did not find Ḥāzimī’s ∇ book. (*Shurūṭ ul A’immah* by Ḥāzimī pg. 76)

Ibn ‘Arbī ∇ refutes this statement in the commentary of *Muwatta’*.⁶ (Kawtharī’s marginalia on Maqdisī’s *Shurūṭ*) This means that he retracted from his previous statement.

Abū Ḥafṣ Mayānjī ∇, in “*An-Nukt ‘alā ibn Ṣalāḥ*”, also mentions that having two (students of a narrator) is a condition of Shaykhayn (Imām Bukhārī ∇ & Imām Muslim ∇). Among the earlier scholars, Ismā’īl ibn ‘Ulayyah ∇, considers it a condition for authenticity. (1/241) (*Ḥāshiyah Dhafarul Amānī* by Shaykh ‘Abdul Fattāḥ Abū Ghuddah page 45) *Fazl*.

Only Qays ibn Abī Ḥāzm, the student of Mirdās, is the narrator of this *Ḥadīth*. No one else has narrated from him.

Additionally, Ḥākim √ considered Mirdās Aslamī z to be such a *Ṣaḥābī*, who has no narrations in the *Ṣiḥāḥ*. This is also an error from Ḥākim √.⁶ His narration is mentioned in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*.

Imām Bukhārī √ and Imām Muslim √ have narrated the narrations of Ḥazan ibn Abī Wahab al Makhzūmī z. His only student was his son Musayyab, whose student was Saʿīd ibn Musayyab. There are two narrations from him in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*:

(1/541) جَاءَ سَيِّلٌ فِي الْجَاهِلِيَّةِ فَكَسَا مَا بَيْنَ الْجَبَلَيْنِ⁷
(914/2) أَنُ النَّبِيِّ ن قَالَ: مَاسَمَكُ⁸.

Imām Bukhārī √ mentioned one *Ḥadīth* from Zāhir ibn Al-Aswad Al-Aslamī z. His only student is his son Majzaʿh ibn Zāhir. This *Ḥadīth* is as follows:

⁶ Ḥākim √ did not remember. Ḥākim √ has been praised because of the claim that he knows all the *aḥādīth* with their chains and *ʿilals*. How can this praise regarding Ḥākim √ be correct when he does not know the narrations of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* which are brighter than the sun and clearer than daylight? [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁷ “In the pre-Islāmic period of ignorance a flood of rain came and filled the valley in between the two mountains (around the *Kaʿbah*).” The *Kaʿbah* also was covered. The mud was taken out by digging with a spade. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁸ Nabī n asked: “What is your name?” He replied: “My name is Ḥāzn. Nabī n said: “Change it! Ḥazan means harsh”. He replied: “I will not change it. My father kept this name.” Saʿīd ibn Musayyab √ said: “It is for this reason, there is harshness in our family. Everyone has a hot and harsh temperament.” The name does have an effect on the person who is named. This narration is also mentioned in *Mishkāṭ*. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

إِنِّي لَأَوْقِدُ تَحْتَ الْقُدُورِ بِلُحُومِ الْحُمْرِ إِذْ نَادَى مُنَادِي رَسُولِ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ: أَنَّ رَسُولَ اللَّهِ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ يَنْهَاكُمْ عَنْ لُحُومِ الْحُمْرِ.

“I was kindling fire under pots which contained donkey meat when the announcer of the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ announced that the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ has prohibited you from donkey meat.” [2/600]

Similarly, they both mentioned names of a few other *Ṣaḥābah* from whom only one person narrated. For example, ‘Abdullāh ibn Hishām ibn Zahrah Qurshī, ‘Amr ibn Taghlab, ‘Abdullah ibn Tha‘labah ibn Ṣu‘ayr and others.

Ḥāzimī also refuted Ḥākim by mentioning that Bukhārī’s first *Ḥadīth*, “الْأَعْمَالُ بِالنِّيَّاتِ” (which Imām Muslim has also narrated) is narrated with a *ṣaḥīḥ* chain only from *Sayyidunā* ‘Umar z. Additionally, only ‘Alqamah has narrated it from him (i.e., *Sayyidunā* ‘Umar z.) and only Ibrāhīm Taymī has narrated it from ‘Alqamah and only Yaḥyā ibn Sa‘īd⁹ has narrated from Ibrāhīm.

Ḥāfiẓ quote the following statement of Ibn Rushayd in *Sharḥ Nukhbah* on page 15: “Bukhārī’s first *Ḥadīth* is sufficient to invalidate this claim made by Qāḍī since this *Ḥadīth* is *gharīb* (*fard*) and the condition of having two narrators narrating from each narrator in the chain is missing.”

Kawtharī wrote in the footnotes of “*Shurūṭ-ul A‘immah*” by Ḥāzimī on page 76: “Bukhārī’s final *Ḥadīth* is also *gharīb* as Ḥāfiẓ Burhān Biqā‘ī and others have explained.” Rather, in *Ṣaḥīḥayn* there are over two hundred (200) *aḥādīth* like this. It is for this reason, Ḥāfiẓ Diyā‘ul Maqdisī compiled a book titled, “*Gharā‘ibush Ṣaḥīḥayn*” in which he

⁹ This became famous after him. So, did Ḥākim not notice the first *Ḥadīth*? If he had seen the first or last *Ḥadīth*, he would not have said this. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

compiled the *gharīb aḥādīth* of *Ṣaḥīḥayn*.”¹⁰ (*Shurūṭ-ul A’immah* by Ḥāzimī, pg. 76)

Ḥāfiz’s ∇ Explanation

Ḥāfiz ∇ has written very briefly regarding this opinion of Ḥākim ∇ in *Hadyus Sārī*. He has also written that although the condition which Ḥākim ∇ has mentioned can be refuted with regards to the *Ṣaḥābah* ٥, it is valid for those who came after the *Ṣaḥābah* ٥. It is for this reason, there is no *aṣl Ḥadīth* in Imām Bukhārī’s ∇ book from such a narrator who only has one student. فليس في الكتاب حديث أصل من رواية من ليس له إلا راو واحد قط. (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 9)

¹⁰ It becomes known how far from the reality Ḥākim’s ∇ statement is. This is the academic world. One should not bow to a person simply by looking at his face [i.e, his reputation]. Rather, his statements should be examined and scrutinized. If it has passed the test of authenticity, then it is fine. علي الرااس. Otherwise, it is returned with respect. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

However, Ḥāfiẓ ∇ has erred in this statement because Ḥākim ∇ does not claim that every narrator of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* must have two students. There would have been no objection if Ḥākim ∇ actually said this because it is an accepted fact that a narrator of a *ṣaḥīḥ Ḥadīth* should be free from *jahālah*. Additionally, it is necessary to have two narrators to remove *jahālah*. Therefore, it is necessary for every narrator (other than the *Ṣaḥābah*) of a *ṣaḥīḥ Ḥadīth* in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* to be like this.

Ḥākim's ∇ claim was that every narration in *Ṣaḥīḥayn* is such that there are at least two narrators narrating this particular *Ḥadīth* in every link. This has been established to be incorrect. Therefore, this is a weak explanation from Ḥāfiẓ ∇. Before Ḥāfiẓ ∇, Ghassānī ∇ and Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ ∇ also explained Ḥākim's ∇ claim in this manner. However, Ḥākim's ∇ statement does not seem to coincide with this explanation. Kawtharī ∇ later refuted this opinion. When he refuted this opinion, he referred to them as: "some people". It is highly likely that Ibn Ḥajar ∇ is also included in this group of people which he refutes. And Allāh ﷻ knows best. (See Kawtharī's marginalia on *Shurūḥul A'immaḥ* by Ḥāzimī pg. 76)

Details of Imām Bukhārī's ∇ Conditions

Maqdisī's ∇ statements regarding the conditions of Imām Bukhārī ∇ have been mentioned previously. 'Allāmah Ḥāzimī ∇ has discussed the conditions in detail. In "*Hadyus Sārī*", Ḥāfiẓ ∇ has mentioned a summary of it. The original (of that summary) with a few additions is as follows:

1. The chain is *muttaṣil* (continuous).
2. The narrator is a truthful Muslim.
3. The narrator is not a *mudallis*.
4. The narrator is not *mukhtaliṭ*.
5. The narrator is ascribed with the quality of '*adālah* (upright).
6. The narrator is *ḍābit* (has an excellent retention).

7. He remembers well.
8. He is sound-minded.
9. He is *qaleelul wahm* (makes very few errors).
10. His beliefs are correct.

Hāzimī ∇ mentioned: "That person who wishes to collect an authentic *Ḥadīth*, should investigate regarding the condition of the 'ādil (upright) narrator and his reliable teachers. This is because some of their *aḥādīth* are authentic, and some have been criticised. This is a difficult matter which can be clarified if the categories of the narrators and their position in knowledge are identified." We will mention an example of this:

There are five categories of Imām Zuhri's ∇ students and every category has a greater virtue than the category below it. The narration of the narrator in the highest category is the most authentic. This is the objective of Imām Bukhārī ∇.

Those in the second category are also 'ādil like those of the first category. However, in the first category, along with *ḥifẓ* and *itqān*, the narrator was also ascribed with the quality of *ṭūl mulāzamat* (long period of companionship) with his teacher to the extent that some would stay with Imām Zuhri ∇ both during travels and while at home. Those in the second category only spent a short time with Zuhri ∇. Thus, they did not gain expertise in Zuhri's ∇ *aḥādīth* as the first group did. Therefore, in terms of precision, they are placed in a lower category than the first group. To be in this category is the condition of Imām Muslim ∇.

Examples of those in the first category:

1. Yūnus ibn Yazīd
2. 'Uqayl ibn Khālīd
3. Mālīk ibn Anas
4. Sufyān ibn 'Uyaynah

5. Shu'ayb ibn Abī Ḥamzah¹ رحمه الله

Examples of those in the second category:

1. Awzā'ī
2. Layth ibn Sa'd
3. 'Abdur Raḥmān ibn Khālīd ibn Musāfir
4. Ibn Abī Dhi'b (Nu'mān ibn Rāshid has been mentioned instead of him in "*Shurūṭ-e-Ḥāzimī*") رحمه الله

Examples of those in the third category:

1. Sufyān ibn Sulaym As-Sulamī
2. Ja'far ibn Barqān
3. 'Abdur Raḥmān ibn 'Umar ibn Ḥafṣ Al-'Umarī √ (This name is not mentioned in "*Hadyus Sārī*".)
4. Zam'ah ibn Ṣāliḥ Al-Makkī √ (This name is mentioned in the fourth category in "*Hadyus Sārī*".)

This, like the first group, stayed with Imām Zuhri √ for a long time, however they were not able to stay away from criticism. To be of this category is Imām Nasā'ī's √ and Imām Abū Dāwūd's √ condition.

Examples of those in the fourth category:

1. Ishāq ibn Yaḥyā Al-Kalbī
2. Mu'āwiyah ibn Yaḥyā Aṣ-Ṣadafi
3. Ishāq ibn 'Abdur Raḥmān ibn Abī Farwah Al Madanī
4. Ibrāhīm ibn Zayd Al Makkī
5. Al-Muthannā ibn uṣ-Ṣabāḥ and others رحمه الله

Those in this category are similar to those in the third group, i.e., they have been considered reliable (by some) and have also been criticized

¹ This group consists of those who are very *thiqah* and they have also accompanied their *Shaykh* for a long time, i.e., they accompanied him on his journeys and also stayed with him while at home. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

(by some). However, they did stay long in the company of Imām Zuhri √. This is Imām Tirmidhi's √ condition. However, since Imām Tirmidhi √ mentions the reason for weakness in a *Ḥadīth*, the conditions of Imām Tirmidhi √ are more stringent than Imām Abū Dāwūd's √ conditions.

Examples of those in the fifth category:

1. Baḥr ibn Kathīr-us Saqqā
 2. Ḥakam ibn ʿAbdullāh Ad-Daylī
 3. ʿAbdul Quddūs ibn Ḥabīb Ad-Dimashqī
 4. Muḥammad ibn Saʿīd Al-Maṣlūb and others رَحْمَهُمُ اللَّهُ
- This group consists of many people.

These are the weak and unknown narrators. Imām Abū Dāwūd √ and those lower than him have narrated their narrations as supportive evidence. Shaykhayn did not narrate from them.

Imām Bukhārī √ collected the *aḥādīth* which are narrated from those in the first category.² Sometimes, he would also collect the *aḥādīth* of those in the second category which are deemed reliable.

Imām Muslim √ narrated from both these categories. Sometimes, he also collected *aḥādīth* of those in the third category if it is reliable.

Ḥāfiẓ √ said: "Most of the time Imām Bukhārī √ mentions the *aḥādīth* of those in the second category *taʿlīqan*. Sometimes he would also bring *aḥādīth* from the third category in the *taʿlīqāt*." The example we have mentioned above (of Zuhri √) is regarding the *mukath-thirīn*³. Based on this, the companions of Nāfiʿ, Aʿmash and Qatadah can be

² That is, those who are *ʿādil* and they are of the highest calibre with regards to memory and precision. Additionally, they have also accompanied their *Shaykh* for a long period of time. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

³ According to the *muḥaddithīn*, the "*mukath-thirīn*" are those whose narrations are more than one thousand in number. (*Taqrīr Tirmidhi* Muḥī Taqī ʿUthmānī 1/99) *Faḍl*

understood. From among those who are not *mukath-thirīn*, Shaykhayn only collected the *aḥādīth* of those among them who were *thiqah*, *ʿādil* and made very few mistakes. The *mufrad* and *gharīb aḥādīth* were also taken from those who are more reliable among them. For example: Yaḥyā ibn Saʿīd Anṣārī. The narrations of those from among them who are not as reliable, are only taken when their narrations coincide with what has been narrated from others. There are many cases like this. (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 10)

The Explanation of Mudallisīn

When Ḥāzimī √ mentioned these conditions, Kawtharī √ makes this point clear in a footnote that after mentioning the names of the *mudallisīn* in his very beneficial book (*Jāmiʿut Taḥṣīl li Aḥkāmīl Marāsīl*), Ḥāfiẓ Abū Saʿīd Ṣalāḥ-ud-Dīn ʿAlāʾī √ wrote that all these *mudallisīn* are not on the same level in the context that their معنعن (*muʿanʿan*) narrations will not be accepted until it is explicitly mentioned that they heard (directly). Rather, the *mudallisīn* are of many categories:

1. Some do such little *tadlīs* that it is inappropriate to include them among the *mudallisīn*. Example: Yaḥyā ibn Saʿīd, Hishām ibn ʿUrwah and Mūsā ibn ʿUqbah.

The second category are those whom the *aʿimmah* have accepted their *tadlīs* and collected their *aḥādīth* in their *Ṣiḥāḥ*, even though they did not explicitly indicate to have heard (directly). This is due to:

- a) Their *imāmah*.
- b) Their *tadlīs* being very little in proportion to their narrations.
- c) They only do *tadlīs* from reliable narrators⁴ like Zuhri, Aʿmash, Ibrāhīm Nakhʿī, Ismāʿīl ibn Abī Khālid, Sulaymān Taymī, Ḥumayd Ṭawīl,

⁴ From this category, it becomes known that the *Ḥadīth* of a *mudallis* can sometimes still be accepted even if it is not explicitly mentioned that he heard (directly). [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

Ḥakam ibn 'Uṭaybah, Yaḥyā ibn Abī Kathīr, Ibn Jurayj, Thawrī, Ibn 'Uyaynah, Sharīk and Hushaym.

Many narrations from this group are found in *Ṣaḥīḥayn* in which it is not explicitly mentioned that they heard (directly). Some *a'immah* have said that this is based on the fact that Ṣhaykhayn were aware that this *mudallis* heard this specific *Ḥadīth* (directly) from his *Shaykh*.

However, it is difficult to accept this reasoning. It is apparent that this is due to one of the aforementioned reasons.

Furthermore, Kawtharī ∇ mentioned that Ibn Ḥibbān ∇ and Ismā'īlī ∇ included Mūsā ibn 'Uqbah among the *mudallisīn*. Ismā'īlī ∇ has also mentioned that although Mūsā did not hear from Zuhri, his narration is found in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. The narration of Abān ibn 'Uthmān is found in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, while Imām Aḥmad ∇ said that he did not hear from his father. Ibn Mardawiyah mentions that the narration of Abū Ishāq Fazārī from Abū Ṭawālah is found in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* even though he did not hear from him. The narration of Zuhri bin Ma'bad from Ibn 'Umar is found in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*, while Ibn Abī Ḥātim ∇ has remained silent regarding it. The narration of Sulaym ibn 'Āmir from Miqdād ibn Aswad is found in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, whereas Abū Ḥātim states that Sulaym did not meet Miqdād. Imām Aḥmad ∇ mentioned regarding Sha'bī, that he did not hear from Abū Hurayrah_z, even though his narration is present in *Ṣaḥīḥayn*. Many examples of this can be found in this magnificent book.⁵

Kawtharī ∇ said: "From this discussion it is known that despite these narrations being *munqaṭi'* they are accepted due to some other reason. Similarly, the *mursal* narrations should also be accepted as is the *madh-hab* of the four Imāms and their companions, with little

⁵ Mizzī ∇ said: "وما يسعنا الا تحسين الظن." - "We have no choice but to have good thoughts." (*Tadrīb* 1/116, *Hāshiyatul Mūqīzah* pg. 137) *Fazl*

differences in their conditions of it being acceptable,⁶ even though the terminology of the later *muḥaddithīn* is contrary to this. (*Shurūṭul Ḥāzimī* pg. 78)

An Example of *Inqīṭā'* in Bukhārī

An example of *inqīṭā'* in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* is as follows: In *Kitābut Tafsīr* 2/732 and *Kitābuṭ Ṭalāq* 2/796, the chain of one narration is as follows:

هشام عن ابن جريج وقال عطاء عن ابن عباس الخ.

There is an objection on this that Ibn Jurayj ∇ did not hear from 'Aṭā' Khurāsānī ∇. Rather, he narrated from a book he received from 'Uthmān (the son of 'Aṭā') ∇. 'Uthmān ∇ is a weak narrator and 'Aṭā' Khurāsānī ∇ did not hear from Ibn 'Abbāsh. Thus, the narration is *munqaṭi'*.

In reply to this, Ḥāfiẓ Ṣāhib ∇ mentioned that it is possible that Ibn Jurayj ∇ heard this narration from both 'Aṭā' Khurāsānī ∇ and 'Aṭā' ibn

⁶ What is a *mursal* narration? A *mursal* narration is one in which a *Tābi'ī* mentions a statement or action of Nabī n without mentioning the name of a *Ṣaḥābi*. There is a difference of opinion regarding this. The *Aḥnāf*, *Mālikiyyah* and *Ḥanābilah* (the preferred opinion of Imām Aḥmad ∇) accepts them, while the *Shawāfi'* do not accept them. However, the *Shawāfi'* do accept them, with a slight difference in the conditions of acceptance. (This is 'Allāmah Kawtharī's ∇ interpretation). It is mentioned in some books that Imām Shāfi'ī ∇ was the first to reject the *mursal Ḥadīth* as a proof, everyone before him accepted it as evidence. The *muḥaddithīn* today, like 'rain frogs', simply write: ضعيف لارساله—'it is weak due to being *mursal*'. Albānī etc. wrote it like this. Why is it weak? Because it is *mursal*. So, throw it into the waste basket. There are also separate books regarding using *mursal Ḥadīth* as evidence, even though the terminology of the later *muḥaddithīn* is contrary to this. Rather, they are re-defining the term. The *mujtahid* Imāms based their deductions of rulings on their definition and passed on, and their *fiqh* was compiled. Now, who can bring them back from their graves and say to them: "Come, we have made new principles, you can re-formulate your *fiqh*." [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

Abī Rabāḥ v. Imām Bukhārī v mentioned the narration assuming it to be from ‘Atā’ ibn Abī Rabbāḥ v. Ḥāfiẓ v then wrote: “This is such a matter that giving a clear answer is quite difficult.” ولا بدّ للجواد من كبوّة. (Every racehorse has to slip.)⁷ (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 375)

An example of Iḍtirāb

In *Kitābudh Dhabā’ih* 2/827, there is a narration of Nāfi‘ v. Sometimes, he narrates this *Ḥadīth* from the son of Ka’b ibn Mālik, sometimes from an *Anṣārī* and sometimes from a man from Banū Salamah. Dārquṭnī v mentions that there are considerable amount of *ikhtilāf* (differences) in this narration and Imām Bukhārī v collected it.

Ḥāfiẓ v mentions that its *‘illah* (defect) is clear and the answer is difficult. (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 376) Then, Ḥāfiẓ v gave no answer.

⁷ From this discussion it is understood that there are *mu’an’an* narrations from *mudallis* narrators in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. You can interpret it with *ḥusn i’tiqād* (having good thoughts) and accept it, yet it contradicts the principle. The principle is that the *mu’an’an* of a *mudallis* is not accepted until it is not explicitly stated that he heard clearly from that narrator. However, there are many exceptions to this principle found in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. When you are aware of this principle, and you are using a *mursal Ḥadīth* as evidence and a *ghayr muqallid* says to you: “This is weak.” You should ask him: “Who said this is weak?” “Are the *mu’an’an* narrations of a *mudallis* also weak? If yes, then Imām Bukhārī v and Imām Muslim v collect them. What answer will you give to this?” This is why it is important to learn *Uṣūl Ḥadīth*. If the *ghayr muqallids* were to be debated, the *Mawlvīs* of today will join the debate like bleating sheep. Like a ‘wet cat’, they will say “We did not study *takhaṣṣuṣ* (of *Ḥadīth*) (therefore we do not have an answer).” This is why “*Hadiyyatud Darārī*” is for this.

ولا بدّ للجواد من كبوّة: This is an Arabic proverb: “Even the best of the Arabian horses sometimes stumbles and falls, sometimes it falls without stumbling.” The same answer is given here, Imām Bukhārī v made a mistake, he slipped and fell. *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* is not like the Qur’ān. There is a huge difference between *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* and the Noble Qur’ān. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

An Important Question and Answer

After mentioning the conditions of the *a'immah*, 'Allāmah Ḥāzimī ∇ raises an objection and mentions its answer⁸:

Question:

If Shaykhayn رحمهما الله made it binding to only collect *ṣaḥīḥ aḥādīth*, why did they mention narrations of such narrators who have been criticised such as Fulayḥ ibn Sulaymān, 'Abdur Raḥmān ibn 'Abdillāh ibn Dinār, Ismā'īl ibn Abī Uways in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*, and Muḥammad ibn Ishāq ibn Yasār and others like him in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*?

Answer:

Imām Bukhārī ∇ and Imām Muslim ∇ have accepted the narration of few narrators to whom weakness has been ascribed, however, this weakness is not to such a level which causes their narrations to be rejected. Apart from this, we also say and agree that Imām Bukhārī ∇ does not consider it correct to collect the *aḥādīth* of weak narrators in his *Ṣaḥīḥ*. Regarding those narrators who are ascribed with weakness, if that weakness was considered reliable according to Imām Bukhārī ∇, he would not have accepted their narrations in his *Ṣaḥīḥ*.⁹

It is worth noting at this point, that there are various reasons for weakness. The scholars differ in this regard. According to the *fuqahā'*,

⁸ This has been briefly mentioned previously. Here, we mention it with some more details, along with some points in favour of the *Ḥanafīs*. It is for this reason that it is being repeated. إذا تكرر تقرر في ذهن السامعين حتي الغافلين. "When it is repeated, it becomes firm in the minds of the listeners, even the neglectful." [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁹ This is a very beneficial discussion. From this it is known that narrators being reliable or weak is an *ijtihādī* matter in which there are difference of opinion. This is not any definite matter from Allāh 1. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

the reasons for weakness are fixed and they are mainly according to the apparent rulings of the *Sharī'ah*. According to the *a'immaḥ* of *riwāyah*, the reasons for weakness are other than that and the *fuqahā'* do not consider them correct. Then, there is also a huge difference of opinion among the scholars of *naql*. One narrator would be considered trustworthy according to 'Abdur Raḥmān ibn Mahdī, while according to another Imām, for example Yahyā ibn Sa'īd, he would be criticized and vice versa, even though both of them are such scholars of *jarḥ* and *ta'dīl*, who form the foundation of *naql* and statements are mainly narrated from them.

As for Imām Bukhārī ∇, he was unmatched in his time. There was none of his likes in the fields of discussion and criticism. After knowing his status, an objection cannot be made against him. He is able to say: "I made it binding on myself to mention those *aḥādīth* whose *ṣiḥḥat* (authenticity) is agreed upon. I did not make it binding on myself that I will mention the *aḥādīth* of such narrators whose *'adālah* is agreed upon because this is impossible. Different people have different reasons for considering a person weak."

Additionally, a specific *Ḥadīth* may be considered established by Imām Bukhārī ∇ and it has different chains. Sometimes he gives preference to the *nuzūl* (longer chain)¹⁰ and thus, he would leave out the most authentic chain and choose the *nuzūl*. Sometimes he would do this to prevent repetition. There can be various other reasons for doing such. Imām Muslim ∇ has mentioned this clearly. (*Shurūṭul A'immaḥ* by Ḥazīmī pg. 83, 84)

Some Important Notes

¹⁰ Meaning, one of the narrators may be *mutakallam fīhi* (criticized), however, this *Ḥadīth* is narrated from a higher and more authentic chain in which there is no weak narrator. Therefore, the *Ḥadīth* is *ṣaḥīḥ* but a *mutakallam fīhi* narrator comes in the *nāzil sanad* (lower chain). This is what is meant by this. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

From this question and answer, some important points are derived which Kawtharī ∇ has indicated towards. One great benefit is that *jarḥ* and *ta'dīl*, grading narrators authentic or weak and also grading *Ḥadīth* authentic or weak are all matters that are *ijtihādī*. For this reason, there are always differences, as is apparent from the differences of opinion of the earlier *a'immah* of *jarḥ* and *ta'dīl*. There are discussions (criticism) regarding many of the narrators of *Ṣaḥīḥayn*. Eighty (80) in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* alone, one hundred and sixty (160) in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* alone and many more in both of them together. The reasons for criticism are as follows: *bid'ah*, *jahālah*, errors, *mukhālafah* (of *thiqah*) or *tadlīs* and *irsāl*.¹¹ The answer to all these objections have been mentioned. These narrators are brought either as *mutābi'āt* and *shawāhid* or this narration was collected before the narrator became *mukhtaliṭ* or because of a high chain. The *aṣl* (primary) *Ḥadīth* is established from another *ṣaḥīḥ* chain or this weakness is not established according to Shaykhayn رحمهما الله. Ḥāfiẓ ∇ mentioned an answer to this with details in "*Hadyus Sārī*", the introduction of "*Faṭḥul Bārī*".

There is criticism regarding two hundred and ten (210) *aḥādīth* of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. There are seventy-eight (78) in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* alone, one hundred (100) in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* alone and in both of them there are thirty-two (32). Different reasons for criticism have been mentioned. Ḥāfiẓ Ṣāhib ∇ gave the detailed answer in the introduction of *Faṭḥul Bārī*. Before the detailed answer a concise answer was written. A summary of this is as follows:

¹¹ If you remember what you read in "*Sharḥ Nukhbah*", you would know that there are ten reasons for criticism: five regarding *'adālah* (uprightness) and five regarding *ḍabt* (memory and precision). [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

Imām Bukhārī ∇ and Imām Muslim ∇ were the greatest Imāms of their time.¹² They had the knowledge of ‘Alī ibn Madīnī ∇ and Dhuhālī ∇. They collected such *aḥādīth* in their *Ṣaḥīḥs* which are free from hidden defects. If there are any hidden defects, then according to both of them, it does not affect it (the authenticity of the *Ḥadīth*). If the critics’ criticism was accepted, the most that can be said is that the critics’ criticism contradicts the research of Shaykhayn رَحِمَهُمَا اللهُ. It is clear that in such a situation preference will be given to the opinion of Shaykhayn رَحِمَهُمَا اللهُ. In this manner, the objection would be dismissed. (*Ḥadyus Sūnī* pg. 274)

Ibn Humām’s ∇ Conclusion¹³

From this, the researcher, Ibn Humām ∇ concluded that if Imām Bukhārī ∇ and Muslim ∇ both consider a specific narrator to be the embodiment of all the conditions of authenticity, then this is not definite. Rather it is possible that his decision is contrary to reality. Imām Muslim ∇ narrated from many narrators who have been criticised. Similarly, there are *mutakallam fīhi* narrators in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. This is why the issue of narrators revolves around the *ijtihād* of the scholars. This is also the case regarding the conditions (*shurūṭ*). There are also differences of opinion regarding this. One condition may be necessary according to one scholar, whereas another condition is necessary for another scholar. Yes, it is true that the non-*mujtahid* rely on what most agree on. As for the *mujtahid*, who is independent with

¹² Commenting on this, the *Aḥnāf* will say: “If such is said regarding Imām Bukhārī ∇ and Imām Muslim ∇ due to their high status, should such not be said regarding the *a’immah arba’ah*, when they are their (Imām Bukhārī ∇ and Imām Muslim’s ∇) teachers or teacher’s teachers. Their (*a’immah arba’ah*’s) status in *fiqh* and *Ḥadīth* is agreed upon. (See: Introduction of *Lāmi’* pg. 73 (handwritten) or pg. 268 (typed), and the introduction of *In ‘āmul Bārī* 2/40)

¹³ Even today, on hearing Ibn Humām’s ∇ conclusion many people gnash their teeth (grind their teeth in anger). It would be said to them: “Bring forth an answer, “مُوتُوا بِغَيْظِكُمْ” (perish in your rage). What will be the outcome of your anger? [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

regards to considering or not considering a condition [as valid] and who has inspected and assessed the narrator and narration himself, he will act on his own opinion (Shaykhayn's opinion cannot be imposed on him). Therefore, a *ṣaḥīḥ* narration from other than the *Ṣaḥīḥayn* may contradict the narration of *Ṣaḥīḥayn*.¹⁴ (*Faṭḥul Qadīr* 1/317,3/186)

Ibn Amīr Ḥāj ∇ stated in his commentary of “*At-Taḥrīr*”, “*At-Taqrīr wat Taḥrīr*”: “It should be known that *Ṣaḥīḥayn* is regarded as the most authentic only in comparison to those that came after them, not in comparison to the *mujtahidīn* who came before them¹⁵. Even though

¹⁴ This statement affects many people.

This following point which is mentioned in “*Sharḥ Nukhbah*” or “*Muqaddamah Ibn Ṣalāḥ*”, that the narrations of *Ṣaḥīḥayn* are superior to all other narrations, is a belief and principle which was formulated later. In the era of the *a’immah arba’ah’s mujtahidīn*, *Ṣaḥīḥayn* did not exist. We say: “The authentic narrations of *ghayr Ṣaḥīḥayn* can contradict the *Ṣaḥīḥayn*. If there is one *ṣaḥīḥ Ḥadīth* in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* and one *ṣaḥīḥ Ḥadīth* in *Jāmi’ Tirmidhī*, we consider both these *aḥādīth* to be on the same level. We then bring an external reason for preference. Consider the following examples of *rafa’ yadayn* and *tark rafa’ yadayn* so that this is understood clearly. The *aḥādīth* regarding *rafa’ yadayn* are from *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. The *aḥādīth* of *tark rafa’ yadayn* are from *Jāmi’ Tirmidhī* and *Sunan Abū Dawūd* and they are also *ṣaḥīḥ* according to us. We are responsible for stipulating conditions of authenticity. We have conditions for authenticity, and we also establish principles for the conditions of authenticity. We do not follow Imām Bukhārī ∇ regarding this. Both these *aḥādīth* are *ṣaḥīḥ* and both are established from Nabī ﷺ. It is for this reason we bring an external reason for preference and give preference to one of them. If there is an external reason for preference by which it becomes known that the *Ḥadīth* of *Sunan Abū Dawūd* and *Jāmi’ Tirmidhī* are worthy of being given preference, we will give it preference. You cannot frighten us by saying: “There is a *ṣaḥīḥ Ḥadīth* contradicting us. How can you leave out *ṣaḥīḥ aḥādīth*?” We say: “The *ṣaḥīḥ aḥādīth* of *ghayr Ṣaḥīḥayn* can contradict those in *Ṣaḥīḥayn*.” This is how splendid the research of the author of “*Faṭḥul Qadīr*” is. Ibn Humām ∇ mentions this in two places in “*Faṭḥul Qadīr*”: 1/317 and 3/182. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

¹⁵ Remember this well and say this firmly. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

this is quite clear, some people are still unaware of it, or they are mistaken.¹⁶

‘Allāmah Kawtharī √ mentioned in the commentary of this that Shaykhayn رحمهما الله and their contemporaries and the authors of the *Sunans*, came after the compilation of Islāmic jurisprudence and they collected only specific types of *aḥādīth*. The *a’immah mujtahidīn* before them had more resources. Along with *marfū’ aḥādīth* they had *mawqūf* and *mursal aḥādīth*, and also the *fatāwā* of the *Ṣaḥābah* ∩ and *Tābi’īn*. They were not only looking at one type of *Ḥadīth*. This can be seen from the books compiled by the students of these *mujtahid* Imāms or the students of their students.¹⁷ It was easy for these Imāms to research the chains of the *aḥādīth* due to their high status (being of such an early generation), especially when it is accepted that a *Ḥadīth* being used as evidence (for a ruling) is its authentication¹⁸. (*Hāshiyah Kawtharī on Ḥāzimī pg. 83*)

Mawlānā Ṣāfir Aḥmad ‘Uthmanī’s √ Discourse

¹⁶ We will say that we will take benefit from the pious, ignorant ones. These are our researchers; they are publicizing it to everyone. If the *Salafīs* of today were to hear this, they would become angry and would think that *Qiyāmah* has arrived. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

¹⁷ For example: look at “*Muwatṭā’*”, then “*Kitābul Āthār*” of Imām Ṣāhib √. Additionally, look at “*Muṣannaf Ibn ‘Abdur Razzāq*” and “*Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah*”. These books do not only have *marfū’ aḥādīth*. Along with *marfū’*, there are also lots of *mawqūf* and *maqṭū’ aḥādīth*. This is also the style of Imām Ṭaḥāwī √. The name of his book is “*Sharḥ Ma’āniul Āthār*”, but *āthār* is not only used for *marfū’ ḥadīth*. It is also used for *mawqūf* and *munqaṭi’ aḥādīth*, i.e, the statements of the *Ṣaḥābah* ∩ and *Tābi’īn*. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

¹⁸ When a *mujtahid* uses a *Ḥadīth* as evidence, it means that he considers it worthy of being used as a proof, otherwise if it was not worthy of acceptance, he would not have used it to derive rulings. At that time there were no differences of opinion, this came afterwards. This is ‘Allamāh Kawtharī √. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

Mawlānā Zafar Aḥmad ‘Uthmanī ∇ has a separate chapter in the introduction of “*I’lā’ us Sunan*” (“*Qawā’id fi ‘Ulūmil Ḥadīth*”) titled: ‘**The grading of narrators reliable or weak and grading of *aḥādīth* as authentic or weak is an *ijtihādī* matter.**’ To establish this principle, he then mentions the text of Ibn Taymiyyah ∇, Ibn Jarīr ∇, Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar ∇, Imām Suyūṭī ∇, Imām Tirmidhī ∇ and ‘Allāmah Dhahabī ∇. (See *Muqaddamah I’lā’ us Sunan* pg. 33 onwards)

Summary of the Discussion

The summary of the discussion is that in *Ṣaḥīḥayn*, Shaykhayn رَحِمَهُمَا ﷺ has necessitated authenticity based on their conditions.¹⁹ One should not object against this. If in some instances, reasons for weakness are found, it does not affect the authenticity of these books.

Kawtharī ∇ mentioned: “If there is some form of criticism on these two books, the high status of these two books is not lowered by this criticism. After all, they were also human beings. They were not free from making errors.” It is also known that Imām Bukhārī ∇ departed this world before he did the final edit of his book as was previously explained in Abul Walīd Bājī’s ∇ discussion. (See ‘**The Objective of Compiling Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī**’ - pg.156, 157 and pg. 164)

Awhām (Mistakes) in Bukhārī

There are also *awhām* a few places in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. Commentators and annotators have drawn attention to this. *Ḥazrat* Shaykh Muḥammad Zakariyyā ∇ counted fifty (50) *awhām* and he has written that a commentary of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*, “*At Tawdīḥ lil Awhāmil Wāqī‘ah fiṣ Ṣaḥīḥ*” is mentioned in “*Kashfuz Zunūn*”. This commentary was written by Aḥmad ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Sabṭ Al- Ḥalabī ∇ (death: 884 A.H.). He has compiled the *awhām* from the commentaries of Ibn Ḥajar ∇,

¹⁹ We also show great reverence to *Ṣaḥīḥayn*. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

Kirmānī ∇ and Barmādī ∇. (See *Kashfuz Żunūn* 1/553 and *Muqaddamah Lāmi* pg. 73)

The Valuable Insight of the Author of “*Anwārul Bārī*”

Mawlānā Sayyid Aḥmad Raḍā Bijnorī ∇, author of “*Anwārul Bārī*”, penned a very fine work on this subject. He has written: “After all Imām Bukhārī ∇ was also a human being. His status is not degraded by a few errors and mistakes. Rather, in this regard, his status is elevated even higher. If there were any deficiencies, whether concerning the narrations or the narrators, in the form of error or repetition of *aḥādīth*, the other *muḥaddithīn* have criticized it in a straightforward, humble manner and they were not afraid of Imām Bukhārī’s ∇ distinguished status.²⁰ After these weaknesses are affirmed, the value and esteem of (the remainder of) the entire book increases. Those narrations which are weak due to a weak narrator, became strong due to the *mutābi‘āts*.” (*Muqaddamah Anwārul Bārī* 2/44)

Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī: The Most Authentic Book

It has been mentioned previously under the ‘Specialities of Bukhārī’ that this book is the most authentic book after the Book of Allāh ۱ (the Qur’ān), after which is *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* and thereafter, the other books.

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar ∇ quotes the following from Shaykh ibn Ṣalāḥ ∇ in the introduction of “*Faṭḥul Bārī*”: “The scholars have agreed on the fact that *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* is ranked higher than *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* with regards to authenticity.” *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* being the most authentic is not established from the following statement which has been narrated from teacher, Ḥāfiẓ Abū ‘Alī Nayshāpūrī ∇:

²⁰ This is because this is the academic world. We do not prevent ourselves from objecting by looking at the status of someone. We do not submit and accept every statement of so and so person simply due to his renowned status. In the academic world, this is not accepted. Rather, each and every statement of such a person is examined. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

"ما تحت أديم السماء كتاب أصح من كتاب مسلم بن الحجاج"

"Under the skies, there is no book more authentic than the book of Muslim ibn Hajjāj."

This statement does not establish that *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* is more authentic (than *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*). Rather, the most that can be established is equality (being on the same level as *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*). However, this necessitates negating that *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* is the most authentic. The reply to this is that Abū 'Alī Nayshāpūrī's √ *Shaykh*, Imām Abū 'Abdur-Raḥmān Nasā'ī √ also said: "From among all these books, there is no book better (*ajwad*) than the book of Muḥammad ibn Ismā'il." The word '*jūwdah*', is apparently referring to the *asānīd* (chains). Imām Nasā'ī √ is known for grading the narrators with extreme caution. One group of the *aḥādīth* experts, ranked him higher than Imām Muslim √ in the field of *Ḥadīth*. Dārquṭnī √ gave preference to Nasā'ī √ over Ibn Khuzaymah √. It is for this reason, the statement of Imām Nasā'ī √ is preferred over the statement of Abū 'Alī Nayshāpūrī √.

Muḥaddith Ismā'ilī √ in his book, "*Al-Madkhal*" stated: "Other people also wrote books according to the style of Imām Bukhārī √. Imām Muslim √, who was from the same era as Imām Bukhārī √, is also amongst them. He benefitted from Imām Bukhārī √ and his books. However, Imām Muslim √ did not establish such stringent conditions which Imām Bukhārī √ adopted. Bukhārī √ did not collect the narrations of many people from whom Imām Muslim √ collected narrations from. Each of their intentions were correct. However, no one can reach the *tashaddud* (stringency) of Imām Bukhārī √...."

Imām Ḥākim Abū Aḥmad Nayshāpūrī √, the contemporary of Abū 'Alī Nayshāpūrī √, who is more proficient than him with regards to the knowledge of the condition of narrators (*ma'rifatur rijāl*) also mentioned that those who wrote books after Imām Bukhārī √

benefitted from Imām Bukhārī's √ books like Muslim ibn Ḥajjāj Qushayrī √.

When *Ṣaḥīḥayn* was mentioned to Dārquṭnī √, he said: “لولا البخارى لما ذهب مسلم ولا جاء”. (“If not for Bukhārī, Muslim would have never come and go.”) Sometimes, he said: “What did Muslim do? He took Bukhārī's book, prepared his *mustakhraj* and made some additions to it.”²¹

Imām Muslim √ himself was of the opinion that Imām Bukhārī √ was of a higher rank and calibre. In the famous incident, he left Imām Dhuhālī √ due to his respect and regard for Imām Bukhārī √. There are many statements similar to this from the *a'immaḥ*. From all of them, weakness of Abū 'Alī Nayshāpūrī's √ statement is apparent.

Some of the *Maghribī* scholars (mainly Abū Muḥammad Ibn Ḥazm) have mentioned that the book of Imām Muslim √ is better than Imām Bukhārī's √ book. This does not mean that *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* is more authentic than *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* because the word *ṣiḥḥat* (authenticity) was not used. Rather, the reason for stating that Imām Muslim's √ book is better than Imām Bukhārī's √ is because the statements of the *Ṣaḥābah* √ and *Tābi'īn* are not mentioned along with the *marfū' aḥādīth* in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. After the *khuṭbah*, he began listing the *marfū' aḥādīth*. On the other hand, there are *mu'allaq aḥādīth* as well as *mawqūf* and *maqṭū'* narrations in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī's tarājim*. Alternatively, it means that the arrangement and order of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* is excellent. All of the narrations are mentioned with its variations and varying chains in one place. On the other hand, in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*, the narrations are shortened, separated and scattered in portions throughout the book. If this statement does mean that *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* is better than *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* with regards to authenticity, this statement is rejected because

²¹ This is not a good statement even though it was made by Dārquṭnī. Imām Muslim √ is degraded by this. This statement is worthy of being criticised. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

this statement goes against the proofs. (*Hayus Sārī* pg. 10-13 and *Sharḥ Nukhbah* pg. 29)

Muḥaddith ‘Abdur Raḥmān Yamanī Shāfi‘ī ∇ mentioned two poems regarding this:²²

تنازع قومٌ في البخارى ومسلم
أى دين يُقدّم
لدى فقالوا:

فقلتُ: لقد فاقَ البخارىُّ صحَّةً
كما فاقَ في حسن الصنّاعة المسلم

A group disputed regarding Bukhārī and Muslim,

In my presence. They said: Which one do you prefer?

I said: Bukhārī has excelled in authenticity,

Like how Muslim has surpassed in beautiful style.

(*Muqaddamah of Dars-e-Bukhārī* by Mawlānā Shabbir Aḥmad ‘Uthmānī, pg. 10 and *Wa mā Yanfa‘un Nās* pg. 45)

A Further Discussion on the Statement of Abū ‘Alī Nayshāpūrī ∇

It becomes known from Imām Nawawī’s ∇ discussion that Abū ‘Alī Nayshāpūrī ∇ and some *Maghāribah* consider *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* to be more authentic than *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. Nawawī’s ∇ words are as follows:

وقال أبو علي النيسابوري وبعض علماء المغرب: صحيح مسلم أصح. انتهى كلامه في مقدمة شرح البخارى له ص ٣٩ وفي مختصره في علوم الحديث.

(*Muqaddamah Sharḥ Bukhārī* pg. 39 and also in his *Mukhtaṣar fī ‘Ulūmil Ḥadīth*)

²² In my presence, some people have begun debating regarding *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. Which is superior? I said: “Listen to the verdict. With regards to authenticity, *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* is superior and with regards to its beautiful arrangement and style, *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* is superior.” [Extracted from *Iḥdātush Shaykh*]

Ḥāfiẓ ∇ mentioned that this is not what is meant by Abū ‘Alī’s ∇ statement. It is also possible that by his statement, he intended that they are equal in authenticity. I have understood that Abū ‘Alī Nayshāpūrī ∇ has given *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* virtue over *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* for reasons other than the conditions for authenticity. Imām Muslim ∇ wrote his book in his city with his *‘uṣūl* (written copy) before him in the lifetime of many *mashāyikh*. Therefore, caution could be taken when mentioning the words of the *aḥādīth* and in light of this, rulings were not derived as was done in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. Thus, all the variations and chains were combined and compiled together and he only sufficed on *marfū‘ aḥādīth*. He did not consider the *mawqūf* narrations except in a few instances. Even then, it was mentioned for support and not as the *aṣl* (primary evidence). Imām Bukhārī’s ∇ objective was to derive rulings. It is for this reason that he included chapters and mentioned portions of the *aḥādīth*. It is from this angle that Abū ‘Alī ∇ has given preference to *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. I have seen that some of the *a’immah* say that it is possible that Abū ‘Alī ∇ did not see *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. However, in my opinion, that this is a far-fetched claim. The more correct reasoning is that which I have mentioned. If Abū ‘Alī ∇ explicitly explained that *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* is higher in rank than *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* based on authenticity, his opinion will be refuted with the aforementioned evidence. (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 12)

Mawlānā Rashīd Nu‘mānī ∇ stated that Ḥāfiẓ Dhahabī ∇ mentioned the following words from Ibn Mundah ∇ with a continuous chain:

سمعتُ أبا علي النيسابوري يقول وما رأيْتُ أحفظَ منه: ما تحت أديم السماء أصح من كتاب مسلم.

“I heard Abū ‘Alī Nayshāpūrī saying, ‘I have not seen anyone with a better retention than him. There is no book under the skies more authentic than Muslim’s book.’”

(*Tadhkiratul Ḥuffāẓ, Tadhkirah Abū ‘Alī Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī Nayshāpūrī*)

The way in which Ibn Mundah ∇ narrated his statement shows that he is also of the same opinion. Abū ‘Alī Nayshāpūrī’s ∇ opinion regarding

Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim being the most authentic book has been transmitted very clearly. Nothing as explicit as this has been transmitted from any of the *mutaqaddimīn* regarding *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* being the most authentic. Yes, Imām Nasā'ī ∇ made a statement regarding this (i.e., *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* being the most authentic). However, it is not explicit in proving that it is the most authentic (because he used the word '*ajwad*'). From the word, '*ajwad*', it is possible that he is referring to the subject matter being '*ajwad*' (most excellent) even though, according to Ḥāfiẓ ∇, it refers to the *jūdah* (excellence and authenticity) of the chains. However, since there are both possibilities, this word is not explicit in proving that it is the most authentic. It is important to note that Imām Nasā'ī ∇ has included a few of the narrations of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* in "*Kitābuḍ-Ḍu'afā' wal Matrūkīn*". Additionally, he graded the following *Ḥadīth* of Ibn 'Umar^h, which has been narrated in Ḥammād ibn Shākir's *nuskhah*, as *mawḍū'* (fabricated): كيف بك اذا عمرت بين قوم يحبون رزق سنة: (Ibn Mājah aur 'Ilm Ḥadīth pg. 116)

However, in light of the evidence, the *mutakh-khirīn* (later scholars) accepted *Bukhārī* as the most authentic. This issue has become unanimous. And Allāh 1 knows best.

Ḥāfiẓ ∇ has also narrated the same words which *Mawlānā* Nu'mānī ∇ quoted from Dhahabī's ∇ "*Tadhkiratul Huffāẓ*". How can one claim that it is clearly understood from this statement that *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* is the most authentic when it is also possible that Abū 'Alī ∇ considered both *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* to be on the same level of authenticity? If such is the case, it would be correct to say: "There is no book more authentic than *Muslim* under the skies." So, ponder upon this!

Ṣan'ānī's Refutation

In "*Tawḍīḥul Afkār*", Ṣan'ānī ∇ refuted Ḥāfiẓ ∇ and wrote: "If someone says: "ما تحت أديم السماء أعلم من فلان" - "There is none, under the skies, more knowledgeable than so-and-so", according to customary usage (*'urf*)

this usually means that so-and-so is the greatest scholar and there is no one equal to him. Yes, from the grammatical angle, there is the possibility of someone being equal to him as Ḥāfiẓ ∇ mentioned. However, the *‘urfī* meaning is given precedence when praise and exaggeration is intended. (It is for this reason the following meaning is accepted: Abū ‘Alī ∇ considered *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* to be more authentic than *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*.) (*Ḥāshiyatun Nukat* pg. 284)

A Note of Caution

It is important to note that *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* being the most authentic does not mean that each *Ḥadīth* of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* is given preference over all the *aḥādīth* in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. Rather, *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* is the most authentic after a full survey as Zarakshī ∇ and other researchers have clarified and explained. Similarly, the *Ṣaḥīḥayn* being the most authentic also means that overall, these two books are given virtue over the other books. Thus, it is possible that a *Ḥadīth* is only in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, however, it is narrated through various chains. Hence, it is given virtue over *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī's* *mufrad Ḥadīth*. Similarly, if there is such a *Ḥadīth* which is *ṣaḥīḥ* and it is not mentioned in the *Ṣaḥīḥayn*, however, its chain is one of the most *ṣaḥīḥ* chains, then it is given virtue over that narration which is only in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* specifically when there is a *mutakallam fīhi* narrator in the narration of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. (See the introduction of *Fatḥul Mulhim* pg. 95 and 107 and *Sharḥ Nukhbah* pg. 33)²³

Ibn Kathīr ∇ said: “In *‘Musnad Aḥmad*”, there are various chains and texts which are on the same level as the *aḥādīth* of not only *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* but also *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*.²⁴ Furthermore, these *aḥādīth* are not

²³ This statement of Zarakshī ∇ is similar to Ibn Humām's statement ∇ which was mentioned previously, i.e., “The *ṣaḥīḥ aḥādīth* of *ghayr Ṣaḥīḥayn* can rival the *aḥādīth* of *Ṣaḥīḥayn*.” [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

²⁴ Some *aḥādīth* of *‘Musnad Aḥmad*” are better than *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim's* *aḥādīth*. Hence, the virtue (of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*)

mentioned in the *Ṣaḥīḥayn* nor the *Sunan Arba'ah*." (*Al-Bā'ithul Ḥathīth*²⁵ pg. 24)

This supports Ibn Humām's √ statement which was mentioned previously. The statement is as follows: The authentic *aḥādīth* of *ghayr Ṣaḥīḥayn* can be equal to the *aḥādīth* of *Ṣaḥīḥayn*. In *Sunan Ibn Mājah*, there are many *aḥādīth* which are more authentic than the *aḥādīth* in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. (See *Ibn Mājah aur 'Ilm Ḥadīth* pg. 242)

Who Are 'Some of the Maghāribah'?

Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī's virtue over *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* has not been mentioned from any of the *mashāyikh* of *Maghrib* with regards to *ṣiḥat* (authenticity). Yes, it is narrated in general. Ḥāfiẓ √ states that in "*Al-Ilmā*", Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ √ narrates from Abū Marwān Ṭubnī √ that some of their *mashāyikh* considered *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* to be more virtuous than *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. I have found the details of this from some of the *Maghāribah*. In Abū Muḥammad Qāsim ibn Qāsim Tajībī's √ index, I read that Abū Muḥammad ibn Ḥazam √ considered the book of Imām Muslim √ to be more virtuous than the book of Imām Bukhārī √ because in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* after the *khuṭbah*, only *aḥādīth* are mentioned. I think that this Ibn Ḥazam √ is the *Shaykh* of Abū Marwān Ṭubnī √ who Qāḍī 'Iyāḍ √ did not specify. It is possible that it could be someone else. However, both of their statements would mean the same.

Dārquṭnī's √ contemporary, Muslamah ibn Qāsim Qurṭubī √ made a similar statement. Regarding *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, he said: "لم يضع أحد مثلاً", - "No one has written a book like this." This can also mean that no one

which is mentioned is regarding the entire book and not each individual *Ḥadīth*. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

²⁵ *Al-Bā'ithul Ḥathīth*: This is the abridged version of "*Muqaddamah Ibn Ṣalāḥ*" compiled by Ibn Kathīr √. Its original title is: "*Mukhtaṣar 'Ulūm-ul-Ḥadīth*". Other people have also penned annotations for it. Aḥmad Shākīr √ has also written one and it is this one which is published by the title: "*Al-Bā'ithul Ḥathīth*". [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

has written a book in such a good style and order. I have seen many *Maghāribah* like ‘Abdul Ḥaq who mentioned *aḥādīth* without their chains in the books of *aḥkāṁ* (laws). In those books he relied on *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* and not on *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* because in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* the full *matn* (text) can be found, whereas Imām Bukhārī √ only mentioned portions of the *matn*. It is clear that this has nothing to do with authenticity. (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 13)

Ḥāfiẓ √ said: “If *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* is more virtuous due to this factor²⁶, then in comparison to it, *Bukhārī Sharīf* is more virtuous due to the following reasons: difficulties are removed by reading it and when it is with a person on a journey by sea, the boat does not sink as Ibn Abī Jamrah narrated from the Ahl Faḍl.” He further stated that Imām Bukhārī √ was *mustajāb-ud-da‘wāt* (i.e., his supplications were accepted). He supplicated for its reciter. Similarly, the *tarājim* of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* has this virtue that its *taḥwīl* and *tabyīḍ* (editing) was done by Imām Bukhārī √ between the grave and the pulpit of Nabī n. Additionally, he would offer two *rak‘ahs* for every *tarjumāh*. It is for this reason, the *tarjumāh* is mind boggling and people are amazed by it. (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 13)

Criticism of Dārquṭnī’s Statement

The following statement of Dārquṭnī √ appears to be impolite and inappropriate for the status of Imām Muslim √: “What has Muslim

²⁶ Meaning, (it is more virtuous because) its order is very good and only *marfū‘ aḥādīth* are mentioned. There are very few *ghayr marfū‘* narrations. Ḥāfiẓ √ does not like that *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* is given preference to *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* in any aspect. Thus, Ḥāfiẓ √ has not remained silent regarding this. To refute this, he has compiled so many virtues of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* so that the status of Bukhārī remains with Bukhārī. This is being faithful (to Bukhārī). However, the reality is that *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* does possess some virtues and *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* possesses many virtues. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

done? He has made a few additions to Bukhārī's book and did *istikhrāj* (narrated those *Ḥadīth* with his personal chains)." This is an impolite and rude statement to make regarding Imām Muslim ∇.

Mawlānā Muḥammad ‘Abdur Rashīd Nu‘mānī ∇ mentioned that Ḥāfiẓ ∇ is drowned in being faithful to Bukhārī ∇. Thus, he has not mentioned anything regarding this. Abū Aḥmad Ḥākim Nayshāpūrī ∇ (death: 287 A.H.), who is famous by the name Ḥākim Kabīr, and whose opinion has been mentioned previously also stated: "The "*Tārīkh*" which Imām Muslim ∇ has written is also written word for word from Imām Bukhārī's "*Tārīkh*"; only a few additions have been made which can be easily counted. By copying, he has displayed great boldness to the extent that he did not even ascribe it to the original speaker." This respectable one did not only accuse Imām Muslim ∇ of this. Rather, the same accusation was made against other great *muḥaddithīn* such as Abū Ḥātim Rāzī ∇ and Abā Zur‘ah Rāzī ∇. (See *Ṭabaqātush Shāfi‘iyyah Al-Kubrā* by Tāj-ud-Dīn As-Subkī). Whereas, in reality Abū Ḥātim Rāzī ∇ actually criticised Imām Bukhārī's ∇ "*Tārīkh*" and pointed out many errors.

It is ironic that people have also hurled this accusation against Imām Bukhārī ∇. [They claim that] when ‘Alī ibn Madīnī ∇ went elsewhere, he (Bukhārī) bribed his [‘Alī ibn Madīnī's] son with money and took ‘Alī ibn Madīnī's "*Kitābul ‘Ilal*" and got it copied from the scribes. When ‘Alī ibn Madīnī ∇ became aware of this, he became very disheartened and it is in this sorrow that he passed away. After this book, Imām Bukhārī ∇ had no need for ‘Alī ibn Madīnī ∇. He went to Khurāsān and compiled his *Ṣaḥīḥ*.²⁷

²⁷ When this was narrated regarding Imām Bukhārī ∇, Ḥāfiẓ ∇ became very perplexed and he refuted it. This is being faithful (to Imām Bukhārī ∇). حُبُّكَ الشَّيْءِ يُبْعِي وَيُصِمُّ (Your love for something blinds and deafens.) [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

Regarding this, Ḥāfiẓ Ṣāhib ∇ has mentioned that this narrative is absolutely erroneous. He refuted it with details. However, he mentioned a similar narrative regarding Imām Muslim ∇ without refuting or criticising it. Rather, he also used it as an evidence.

The correct opinion is that no one took any one's book nor did they copy them. All of these *a'immah* were from the same era. Many of their teachers were the same. Thus, their statements and knowledge were also similar. Things they knew were similar. Yes, it is true that every later scholar benefitted from an earlier scholar's book. Hence, every earlier scholar has a greater virtue over a later scholar. (*Ibn Mājah aur Ilm Ḥadīth* pg. 95-97)

The Details of The Superiority of Bukhārī Over Muslim

Previously Ḥāfiẓ Ṣāhib ∇ briefly mentioned the virtues and superiority of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. Thereafter, Ḥāfiẓ Ṣāhib ∇ discussed the virtues of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* in detail. He stated: "If one wishes to know the details of *Bukhārī* being the most authentic, then he should first understand that *Bukhārī* is more authentic than *Muslim* for six reasons:

1. There are less *mutakallam fihi* narrators in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* than *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. The narrators of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* are over four hundred and thirty (430). There is criticism regarding only eighty (80) of them, There is a total of six hundred and twenty (620) narrators in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. There is criticism regarding one hundred and twenty (120) of them. That is, there is criticism regarding eighteen percent (18%) of the narrators of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* and twenty-six percent (26%) of those in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. (The narrators of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* are four hundred and thirty-five (435).) (*Nukat* pg. 286 and *Fatḥul Mughīth* by Sakhāwī 1/29)
2. The narrations of the *mutakallam fihi* narrators in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* are very few. 'Ikramah narrating from Ibn 'Abbāsh, is the only *mutakallam fihi* chain which comes often in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. On the other hand, Imām Muslim ∇ mentions the narrations of many of the *mutakallam fihi* narrators often. For example: Abū Zubayr Makkī

narrating from Jābir, Suhayl narrating from his father, 'Alā' ibn 'Abdur Raḥmān narrating from his father, Ḥammād ibn Salamah narrating from Thābit among other chains.

3. Most of the narrations of those specific *mutakallam fīhi* narrators which Imām Bukhārī ∇ collects, are from among his teachers whom he met and sat with. He studied and observed their conditions and *aḥādīth*. On the other hand, many of the specific *mutakallam fīhi* narrators of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* are from the earlier times. It is obvious that a *muḥaddith* knows the *aḥādīth* of his teachers better than the *aḥādīth* of the *mutaqqadimīn*.
4. Imām Bukhārī ∇ is very selective with regards to the narrations narrated by the narrators of the *ṭabqah thāniyah* (second category) he collects whereas Imām Muslim ∇ collects them in the primary section of his book (his *ʿuṣūl*) in great numbers across the board (with *istīʿāb*) as mentioned in Ḥāzimī's ∇ statement previously. These reasons were with regards to *itqān*.
5. According to Imām Bukhārī ∇, it is necessary (for the narrators) in a *muʿanʿan* (معنعن) chain to have at least met once for it to be considered *mutṭaṣil*.²⁸ He has strictly adhered to this in his *Ṣaḥīḥ*. Whereas, according to Imām Muslim ∇, simply being from the same era is sufficient once the narrator is not a *mudallis*. Even if we accept that the opinion of Imām Muslim ∇ is correct, the method Imām Bukhārī ∇ chose is more apparent in showing its *ittiṣāl*.²⁹
6. The total number of narrations which are criticised (*muntaqad ʿalayh*) in *Ṣaḥīḥayn* is two hundred and ten (210). Seventy-eight (78) are in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* only and one hundred (100) are in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* only. The remainder thirty-two (32) are found in both. It is clear that the one who has been criticized less is superior to the one who has been criticized more. (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 12)

Here, the words of Ḥāfiẓ ∇ are ambiguous. He has written:

اختص منها بأقل من ثمانين وبأقل ذلك يختص بمسلم. ("Less than eighty (80) is from

²⁸ Additionally, they must also have at least heard from each other once.

²⁹ Meaning, Bukhārī's ∇ conditions are strict. Hence, *Bukhārī* is more *ṣaḥīḥ*.
[Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

it only and the remainder of that is in Muslim only.”) However, from the remainder, thirty-two (32) narrations are present in both *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, as Ḥāfiẓ ∇ mentioned after the detailed answer on page 383. The summary is that there is criticism on one hundred and ten (110) *aḥādīth* of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*.³⁰

This discussion has been explained by a poet in one of his poems:

لْمُسْلِمِ	وَقَافُ	لِجُعْفَى	فَدَعْدُ
		وَيَلِي لَهَا فَاحْفَظْ وَقَيْتَ عَنِ الرَّدَى	
			٧٨
			١٠٠
			٣٢

78 for J'ufi and 100 for Muslim.

32 for them both, so remember

and you will be protected from error.

(Mā Yanfa'un Nās pg. 50 and Muqaddamah Kawkab pg. 24)

³⁰ Ṣan'ānī ∇ disapproved of this statement of Ḥāfiẓ ∇ and said: Narrators are of three types:

1) Those who are in both (*Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*). There are many of these. No virtue of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* can be established from this.

2) Those who are only in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. The virtue of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* can be established by this because these narrators are of a higher calibre than the narrators of the third type which are those found in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. This is because the conditions of Imām Bukhārī ∇ are found in them. Additionally, the narrators of this second type should not be *mutakallam fihi*. (*Ḥāshiyah Nukat* pg. 289)



The Condition of Ittiṣāl in Mu‘an‘an Narrations¹

When will the *mu‘an‘an* narrations of a *ghayr mudallis* narrator be accepted and when will it not be accepted? There is a difference of opinion in this matter. If the narrator (*rāwī*) and the one narrated from (*marwī ‘anhu*) are not from the same era and the narration is narrated with *عن* *عن*, this is termed as ‘*irsāl-e-jalī*’ (ارسال جلي). Due to the break in the chain (*inqiṭā’*), such a narration will not be accepted except in the case where a *Tābi‘ī* mentions the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ’s name for a statement or action. That is, there is a well-known difference of opinion regarding the acceptance of such a *Ḥadīth* in which a *Ṣaḥābī* is omitted from the chain. According to the *Aḥnāf* and *Mālikiyyah*, it is accepted. According to Imām Shāfi‘ī ∇ and Imām Aḥmad ∇, it is accepted with some conditions. It is not accepted in all cases.

If it is established that both were from the same era, but meeting each other is not established, according to Imām Bukhārī ∇, ‘Alī ibn Madīnī ∇, Abū Bakr Ṣayrafī ∇ and the *muḥaqqiqīn*, such a *Ḥadīth* will not be classified as *muttaṣil*. Nawawī ∇ says that this is the most correct view. (*Muqaddamah of Sharḥ Nawawī* pg. 77)

According to Imām Muslim ∇, such a *sanad* will be considered *muttaṣil*. Imām Muslim ∇ has mentioned this as the *madh-hab* of the *mutaqaddimīn* and the *mutakh-khirīn* and has labelled the ones adopting the first opinion as “منتحلي الحديث”, i.e., those who claim to be *muḥaddithīn*. It is apparent from this that he is referring to Imām Bukhārī ∇ and he refuted this view in a very harsh tone. He writes that

¹ This discussion is also mentioned in “*Sharḥ Nukhbah*” and in the introduction of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. However, we have also mentioned some of the research of ‘Allāmah Shabbīr Aḥmad ‘Uthmānī ∇ which is rare and cannot be found in “*Sharḥ Nukhbah*”. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

this is the opinion of the innovators and no one else is of this opinion.² (*Muqaddamah Muslim of Nawawī* pg. 21-22)

However, the later scholars followed Imām Bukhārī's √ opinion. Imām Nawawī's √ verdict has been mentioned previously: "وهو الاصح" (and that is the most correct). Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar √ has mentioned the following in "*Sharḥ Nukhbah*":

"Imām Bukhārī's √ narrations are preferred with regards to *ittiṣāl* because according to him, to establish *ittiṣāl*, it is necessary for the *rāwī* and *marwī 'anhu* to have met at least once. On the other hand, Imām Muslim √ considered *mu'āṣarah* (المعاصرة) (being from the same era) sufficient to establish *ittiṣāl*. Additionally, he (Imām Muslim √) made it binding on Imām Bukhārī √ not to accept *mu'an'an* narrations at all (due to the possibility that the narrator did not hear directly). However, this does not become binding on Imām Bukhārī √ because once one meeting³ has been established, the doubt of him not having heard would necessitate that the narrator is graded as a *mudallis*, whereas this discussion (i.e., this difference of opinion) is regarding the scenario in which the narrator is not a *mudallis*." (*Sharḥ Nukhbah* pg. 30)

To understand this, it is necessary to understand the difference between *irsāl* and *tadlīs*. One type of *irsāl* which has been mentioned above is *irsāl jalī* in which both (the *rāwī* and the *marwī 'anhu*) are not from the same era (i.e., no *mu'āṣarah* (المعاصرة)).

² متحلي الحديث: There are some people who claim to have become *muḥaddith*. There is difference of opinion as to who this is referring to. Many people say that it is referring to Imām Bukhārī √ and many say 'Alī ibn Madīnī √. Imām Muslim √ has written that this is the statement of the innovator and no one else is of this opinion, whereas this is the opinion of many great illustrious *a'immaḥ* such as 'Alī ibn Madīnī √ who is his teacher and Imām Bukhārī √ who is also his teacher. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

³ Meeting means having heard (the *Hadīth* from him) and not simply meeting. (*As-Sunan Al-Abyan* by Ibn Rushayd Al-Fihri- Footnotes of pages 29, 54) *Fazl*

The second type of *irsāl* is *irsāl khafī*. There is a very subtle difference between this and *tadlīs*. *irsāl khafī* is when *mu‘āṣarah* between the *rāwī* and the *marwī* ‘*anhu* has been established. However, *liqā’* (لقاء) (meeting each other) is not established.

Tadlīs: Although both *mu‘āṣarah* and *liqā’* are established, a narration which has not been heard directly is narrated with such a *ṣegah* (inflection) in which there are both possibilities; hearing directly or indirectly. For example: using the word *عن* ‘*an* etc. (*Sharḥ Nukhbah Karāchī* print pg. 54)

Therefore, if the narrator is known to be a *mudallis*, there is a consensus that his *mu‘an‘an* narrations are rejected as long as *samā’* (سماع) (hearing directly) is not explicitly mentioned. However, if the narrator is not a *mudallis*, then according to Imām Bukhārī ∇, it is necessary for them to have met at least once. Otherwise, his narrations will be considered *munqaṭi’*. According to Imām Muslim ∇, *mu‘āṣarah* is sufficient to establish *ittiṣāl*. Imām Bukhārī ∇ said: “If there is no *liqā’*, there is the possibility that he is doing *irsāl*, i.e., he is narrating without having heard directly.” Yes, if he was to do so after having met, it would be called *tadlīs*, not *irsāl* because in *tadlīs* both *mu‘āṣarah* and *liqā’* are established. If there was no *liqā’* [and he narrates without hearing], then this is known as *irsāl*. As we have already mentioned previously, our discussion is regarding the narrator who is not a *mudallis*. Therefore, he is not included in this discussion. This is a summary of Imām Bukhārī’s ∇ explanation.

Imām Muslim’s ∇ Objection

Imām Muslim ∇ made the following objection. Having met and heard once does not necessitate that each and every *Ḥadīth* which was narrated with a *ṣegah muḥtamalah* (probable inflection) was heard directly. It is possible the narrator narrates some *Ḥadīth* using the word *عن* etc. without actually having heard (directly). Therefore, whenever a narration is narrated with *عن*, the possibility of not having

heard directly remains. It is for this reason, Imām Bukhārī √ should not have accepted any *mu'an'an* narrations.

More Details Regarding This Discussion

Imām Muslim's √ objection seems valid due to the following reason. When *liqā'* is not proven, it is possible that there is no *samā'* (سمع). Similarly, this possibility (i.e., no *samā'*) is also present when *liqā'* has been established once. This possibility (i.e., no *simā'*) remains in both scenarios whether one calls the first scenario *irsāl* and the second one *tadlīs*. The reason for this is that this narrator has not been proven to be a *mudallis* from any external factor. Therefore, he will be considered a *ghayr mudallis*. Now, if the discussion was to arise regarding whether a specific *Ḥadīth* is *muttaṣil* or not, then in such an instance this narration cannot be classified as the *عنقة* of a *mudallis* since there is no proof that the narrator is a *mudallis*. Rather, the accepted view is that it is the *عنقة* of a *ghayr mudallis*. This is a matter to ponder over.

Mawlānā Shabīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī √ commented that when *mu'āṣarah* is established, but *liqā'* and *samā'* is not established, then from one angle it can be called *tadlīs* since *mu'āṣarah* is established and from the other angle, it can be called *irsāl* as *samā'* has not been established. However, it cannot be called *irsāl jalī* as *mu'āṣarah* has been established. Neither can it be *tadlīs* as *samā'* and *liqā'* have not been established. Even then some people have called it *tadlīs* while others have also called it *irsāl*. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar √ has named it *irsāl khafī*. However, I am saying that it should be partially graded as *tadlīs* and partially graded as *irsāl*. If only *mu'āṣarah* has been proven and there is no evidence for *samā'* and *liqā'*, rather, it is proven that there was neither of the two, then this is classified as *mursal*, because there is no deception in this case. If *mu'āṣarah* is proven and *samā'* is neither established nor negated, then this situation is unknown. It should be considered *tadlīs* as this is the difference between *irsāl* and *tadlīs*. It is

tadlīs when deception is evident and when it is proven that there was no *samā'*, it is *irsāl*. This has been mentioned by Sakhāwī ∇ and others.⁴

Now understand that Imām Muslim's ∇ objection is valid because Imām Bukhārī ∇ says that there is the possibility of *irsāl* when there is no *liqā'* and after *liqā'*, there remains the possibility of *tadlīs* and not *irsāl*. In reply to this, Imām Muslim ∇ will say: "It will be *tadlīs* when *liqā'* is established and also when it is not established regardless of whether one calls it *irsāl khafī* or something else. This is because in all instances, there is ambiguity in *عننة* narrations and in *irsāl* there is no ambiguity. *والمسئلة مفروضة في غير المدلس* (And the topic of discussion is regarding the *ghayr mudallis*.)

Additionally, our discussion is regarding the *ghayr mudallis*. (So just like it is accepted after *liqā'*, it should also be accepted before *liqā'* because of the reliability of the narrator and adhering to *ḥusn ḥan* (good thoughts) regarding him.)

With regards to Mukhaḍramīn's⁵ narration, it is correct that it is *mursal* and not *mudallis* because it is established that they did not meet Nabī n. When it is established that the narrators did not meet and hear from each other, the matter becomes clear and there remains no ambiguity. Therefore, it should be called *mursal* and not *mudallis*. (*Darse Bukhārī* of 'Allāmah Shabbīr Aḥmad 'Uthmānī pg. 15-16, published by Dabhel)

Now the question remains: is *liqā'* a condition according to Imām Bukhārī ∇ for the *عننة* *aḥādīth* of a *ghayr mudallis* to be classified as *ṣaḥīḥ* in general or is it only a condition for it to be included in *ṣaḥīḥ*

⁴ This is not mentioned in "*Sharḥ Nukhbah*". Sakhāwī's ∇ book is: "*Fathul Mughīth bisharḥi 'Alfiyyatul Ḥadīth*". قاله الكشميري: "وهو من احسن كتب اصول الحديث". Kashmīrī ∇ said: "This is one of the best Uṣūl Ḥadīth books." [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁵ Ḥāfiẓ ∇ objected to the narration of the Mukhaḍramīn. See the answer to it. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

Bukhārī?⁶ Some scholars say it is the former while others say it is the latter. *Ḥazrat* Shaykhul Hind √ said that this is a condition for (it to be included in) *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* and not for the *Ḥadīth* itself to be graded as *ṣaḥīḥ*. (Darse Bukhārī by ‘Allāmah Shabīr Aḥmad ‘Uthmānī pg. 15-16, published by Dabhel)

Ḥāfiẓ √ said that it is for the actual *Ḥadīth* to be graded as *ṣaḥīḥ*. In his “*Tārīkh*”, he has graded many *aḥādīth* as weak due to this hidden defect. (*Nukat ‘alā Ibnīṣ Ṣalāḥ* 2/595)

This statement of Ḥāfiẓ √ is contradictory. Therefore, one should refer to ‘Abdul Fattāḥ Abū Ghudah’s marginalia on “الموقف” by Dhahabī pg. 136.



⁶ Meaning, is this for general authenticity or is this simply a stringent condition specific to *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*? If this was accepted as a condition for the general authentication of *aḥādīth*, then many *aḥādīth* of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* will be considered weak because they were collected by Imām Muslim based on the establishment of *mu‘āṣarah* and *liqā’* was not established. Whereas there is a consensus of the *Ummah* that just as *Bukhārī* is *ṣaḥīḥ*, *Muslim* is also *ṣaḥīḥ*. Yes, it is accepted that *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* is more authentic, however, *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* is also authentic. Therefore, it must be accepted that meeting is not a condition for the authenticity of a *Ḥadīth*, rather *liqā’* is a condition for it to be included in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

Muwaṭṭā' Imām Mālik and Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī

The following is a famous statement of Imām Shāfi'ī ∇:

”ما أعلم في الأرض كتاباً في العلم أكثر صواباً من كتاب مالك.”

“I do not know of any book of knowledge on this earth more correct than the book of Mālik.”

Some people narrate: “أصح من كتاب مالك” - “...more authentic than the book of Mālik.” From this statement, the authenticity of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* has been degraded. The answer to this is that at that time, *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* were not present. If these books were present, then perhaps, Imām Shāfi'ī ∇ would not have made such a statement. Therefore, the meaning of this statement is: *Muwaṭṭā' Mālik* was the most *ṣaḥīḥ* of all the books which were present at that time. This is the summary of Ibn Ṣalāḥ's ∇ answer. This [answer] maintains that *Ṣaḥīḥayn* is the most authentic.

Ḥāfiẓ ∇ said: “Some of the *a'immaḥ* found it difficult to accept that *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* is considered more authentic than *Muwaṭṭā'* because authenticity has been made a condition in both these books and extraordinary importance has been given to investigating and verifying.”

However, the answer is that Imām Bukhārī's ∇ condition of authenticity is strict. He considers *inqiṭā'* to be a deficiency in the authenticity. Imām Mālik ∇ does not consider *inqiṭā'* in the chain to be a deficiency. It is for this reason, the *marāsīl*, *munqaṭi'āt* and *balāghāt* are mentioned in the main subject matter of this book. Imām Bukhārī ∇ does not do this. The *mu'allaqāt*, etc. are mentioned in the *tarājim*, which is not part of the main subject matter of the book. (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 10)

The *tarājim* also have an important purpose. How can it be right to exclude them from the subject matter? The objective of Imām Bukhārī ∇ was also to derive *masā'il* as mentioned previously.

Mawlānā Nu'mānī's ∇ Analysis on Ḥāfiẓ's ∇ Research

Mawlānā Muḥammad 'Abdul Rashīd Nu'mānī ∇ has commented on this research of Ḥāfiẓ ∇ in "*Ibn Mājah aur 'Ilm Ḥadīth*". He stated: "If this statement of Ḥāfiẓ ∇ is only based on the apparent differences of the two books, it is certainly correct. Otherwise, in reality, all the *marāsīl*, *balāghāt* and *munqaṭi'āt* narrations of *Muwaṭṭā'* are *muttaṣil* and *marfū'*. This is because Ibn 'Abdil Bar ∇ has proven that all the *mursalāt*, *balāghāt* and *munqaṭi'āt* with the exception of four, are *muttaṣil* and *ṣaḥīḥ*. Ibn Ṣalāḥ ∇, in a separate book of his, has established that these four are *muttaṣil*." Allāmah Ṣāliḥ Fulānī ∇ said: "I have a handwritten copy of that compilation."¹ From this, it becomes clear that there is no difference between *Muwaṭṭā'* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*." This research of 'Allāmah Fulānī ∇ has been mentioned by 'Allāmah Kattānī ∇ in "*Ar-Risālah Mustatṭirifah*" on page 6. *Mawlānā* Nu'mānī ∇ has quoted this from this book.

Ṣāliḥ Fulānī ∇ has also written that Ḥāfiẓ's ∇ statement is debatable. If he had examined *Muwaṭṭā'* as he had studied *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*, he would not have made that statement. His statement that Mālik's *balāghāt* are *munqaṭi'* is incorrect because although Yaḥyā's narration (from Mālik) is mentioned *balāghān* or *mursalan*, other students narrate that same narration from Imām Mālik ∇ *mawṣūlan* and *musnadan*. Similarly, Ḥāfiẓ's ∇ claim that *mursal* narrations are evidence according to Imām Mālik ∇ and his followers and not according to others is also incorrect. This is because according to Imām Shāfi'ī ∇ and the *muḥaddithīn*, it is also evidence, when it is supported by another chain as Ibn 'Abdil Barr

¹ This book has been published with the research of *Shaykh* 'Abd-ul Fattāḥ Abū Ghuddah ∇. *Fazl*

∇, Suyūṭī ∇ and others stated. Similarly, 'Irāqī's ∇ claim that some of the Mālik's ∇ *balāghāt* are rejected and not accepted is also incorrect because all of these have been established through *ṣaḥīḥ* and *mawṣūl* chains. (See *Ar-Risālah Mustatṭrifah* pg. 6)²

Shāh Waliullāh Muḥaddith Dehlawī ∇ considered *Muwatṭā'* to be the most virtuous and superior of all the *aḥādīth* books. The evidence for this has been mentioned in "*Muṣaffā*", a commentary of *Muwatṭā'*.

Mawlānā 'Abdur Rashīd Nu'mānī ∇ mentioned the following as evidence for giving preference to *Muwatṭā'*:

1. A big group of senior *Tābi'īn* were present at the time that *Muwatṭā'* was written. *Ṣaḥīḥayn* was not privileged with this honour.
2. According to Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇ and Imām Mālik ∇, , , , it was necessary for the narrator to memorise the narration he was narrating. According to Shaykhayn رحمهما الله, this was not necessary.
3. According to Imām Mālik ∇, the narration of a *bid'atī* (an innovator), is not worthy of acceptance even if he is honest and upright. However, *Ṣaḥīḥayn* mentions narrations of such innovators who are *thiqah* (reliable) and صادق الهمجة (true to his word).

(The gist of this is that after deep thought and research, the authenticity of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* over *Muwatṭā'* should be carefully considered.) (*Ibn Mājah aur 'Ilm Ḥadīth* pg. 180)

In the afore-mentioned book of research by *Mawlānā* Nu'mānī ∇, it is mentioned that the first *Ḥadīth* book which was published in *fiqhī* order was the writing of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇ (*Kitābul Āthār*) which many of his students narrate from him. A strong evidence and support

² Ibn 'Abdil Barr Mālikī ∇ carried out this task by writing "*At-Tamhīd*" and "*Al-Istidhkār*". Only four *aḥādīth* were not included. Ibn Ṣalāh ∇ included them. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

for this claim is mentioned on page 158 onwards. Imām Mālik ∇ followed this style. Imām Suyūṭī ∇ clarified this. He wrote:

” من مناقبِ أبى حنيفة التى انفرد بها أنه أولُ مَنْ دَوَّنَ علمَ الشريعة ورتبه أبواباً ثم تبعه مالكٌ في ترتيب الموطأ ولم يسبق أباً حنيفةً أحدٌ. “

“Amongst Imām Abū Ḥanīfah’s ∇ special virtues is that he was the first to organise the knowledge of Ḥadīth in chapter format. Imām Mālik ∇ followed this style in arranging the order of Muwaṭṭā’. No one surpassed Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇ in this.”³ (*Tabyīḍus Ṣaḥīfah* pg. 36)

In both these compilations, the Messenger of Allāh’s ∇ sayings were listed as *mabnī awwal* (main text) and the *fatāwā* of the Ṣaḥābah ∇ and Ṭābi’īn were listed as *mabnī thānī*. If one looks at it from this angle, then there is no difference between *Muwaṭṭā’* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. (*Ibn Mājah aur ‘Ilm Ḥadīth* pg. 169)

From this research, it also becomes clear that the well-known narrative that *Muwaṭṭā’* was the first book to have been published in *fiqhī* order is incorrect. This statement is accurate with regards to Imām Abū Ḥanīfah’s ∇ “*Kitābul Āthār*”⁴

Note:

Additionally, it should be noted that the following has been narrated with a *muttaṣil* chain that Imām Mālik ∇ studied the books of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇ for research and he would gain tremendous benefit from them. (*Ibn Mājah aur ‘Ilm Ḥadīth* pg. 161)

³ His superiority in the field of *fiqh* is well known and widely accepted. From this, his superiority in the field of *Ḥadīth* is also established. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁴ This is so well known to the extent that *Mawlānā* Sulaymān Nadwī ∇ has also written this. *Mawlānā* ‘Abdur Rashīd Nu’mānī ∇ strongly refuted him. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

Sufyān Thawrī ∇ was also a student of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇. He used to attend his classes. However, he acquired the *fiqhī* knowledge of Imām Ṣāhib ∇ from his student, ‘Alī ibn Mus-hir, and through his help and advice he prepared his *Jāmi’*. Yazīd ibn Hārūn explained this. (See *Ibn Mājah aur ‘Ilm Ḥadīth* pg. 184 for references and proofs.)

The narration of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ∇ from Imām Mālik ∇ is not established. See: أقوم المسالك في بحث رواية مالك ∇ عن أبي حنيفة ∇ ورواية أبي حنيفة ∇ عن مالك ∇ للكوثري ∇

See “*Bulūghul Amānīfī Sīratil Imām Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan Shaybānī*” by Muḥaddith Kawtharī, page 10 onwards, for the details regarding how the student of Imām Muḥammad √, Asad ibn Furāt compiled the *fiqh* of Imām Mālik √ and the contribution of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah √ and Imām Muḥammad’s √ books towards this compilation.

Why Is There Repetition in Bukhārī?

In the introduction, Ḥāfiẓ √ quoted Maqdisī √: “Imām Bukhārī √ brings one *Ḥadīth* multiple times with different chains and in every instance, through his excellent ability to derive, he would derive the best meaning according to the chapter. There are very few places where he would repeat the same *Ḥadīth* with the same wording and chain.” (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 15)

Imām Bukhārī √ himself said in ‘*Bāb-ut-Ta’jīl ilal Mawqaf*’ volume 1 page 226:

قال أبو عبد الله: يزداد في هذا الباب 'هم' هذا الحديث حديث مالك عن ابن شهاب ولكني أريد أن أدخل غير مُعاد. اهـ

It is known from this text of Imām Bukhārī √, that he does not like to repeat *Ḥadīth*. Even then, there is repetition of the *sanad* and *matn* in some places. According to Ḥāfiẓ √, there are a total of twenty-one [repetitions]. Qaṣṭalānī √ added one more which would make it twenty-two¹. Qaṣṭalānī √ mentioned them in the introduction of his

¹ *Hazrat Shaykh* Muḥammad Zakariyyā √ wrote in the footnotes of the introduction of “*Lāmi*”: “*Mawlānā Yūnus Ṣāhib*, the teacher of *Ḥadīth* in Madrasah Mazāhirul ‘Ulūm (death: *Shawwāl* 1438 A.H √), added one hundred and twenty-eight [such *Ḥadīth*] and wrote a treatise on it titled, “*Irshād ul Qāsid ilā mā Takarrara fil Bukhārī bi Isnādin Wāḥidin*” (*Muqaddamah Lāmi* page 31) (Currently, it is published in the third volume of “*Al Yawāqīt-ul-Ghāliyah*”).

It is possible that in these places the *sanad* is the same but there are slight differences in the *matn*. The commentators do not consider this as repetition.

commentary. One of Ibn Ḥajar's √ writings which I found mentions twenty-one *Ḥadīth*. (*Muqaddamah Qasṣalānī* pg. 29-30)

Otherwise, in the introduction of "*Faṭḥul Bārī*", Ḥāfiẓ √ only wrote the following: "وإن كان قد وقع له من ذلك شيء فعن غير قصد. وهو قليل جداً". "Even though in a few places there has been repetition of the *sanad* and *matn*, this is very rare." (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 16) Yes, there are many repetitions where there is a difference in either the *sanad* or *matn*. However, there is a benefit in this.

Maqdisī √ mentions eight reasons for repetition:

1. After mentioning the *Ḥadīth* of one *Ṣaḥābī*, he mentions the same *Ḥadīth* from another *Ṣaḥābī* so that there is no *gharābah*. Similarly, he does this with the lower categories until their teachers.
2. Imām Bukhārī √ has authenticated many *Ḥadīth* by using the principle of *mutābi'āt* and supporting chains. Each *Ḥadīth* comprises of various meanings. It is for this reason they are mentioned in different chapters with varying chains.
3. Some narrators shorten a *Ḥadīth* and some narrate the complete *Ḥadīth*. Imām Bukhārī √ mentions every narrator's narration as they have narrated it so that this doubt is removed from the narrator.
4. The texts of the narrators are all different. In one narrator's narration, there is a word which has a possible meaning. Another narrator narrates that same narration using such a word which has the possibility of another meaning. Thus, Imām Bukhārī √ mentioned its different variations and established a different chapter for each word.
5. There is a difference with regards to *ittiṣāl* and *irsāl* in narrations. Although *ittiṣāl* is preferred, he still mentions the narrations of *irsāl* to show that this *mursal* narration does not affect giving preference to the *mawṣūl* narration.
6. This is also the case with *mawqūf* and *marfū'* narrations.
7. In some chains of certain *ḥadīth*, there are extra narrators. According to the research of Imām Bukhārī √, both chains of the narration are

established (through the *Shaykh* and also the chain which does not go through the *Shaykh*). Both of them are mentioned (to show that this is from *'mazīd fī muttaṣil asānīd'* (مزید فی متصل الاسانید)).

Some narrations are narrated as a *معنعن* narration. However, it is clear from another chain that he heard directly. Therefore, he also mentions this chain to show that *liqā'* (meeting of the narrators) is established. (*Hadyus Sūrī* pg. 15)

Why is there Taqṭī' in Bukhārī?¹

Imām Bukhārī ∇ has fragmented and shortened the texts (*mutūn*) of the *aḥādīth*. Maqdisī ∇ mentioned that the reason for this is as follows: "If the text is short or it is interconnected and comprises of a few rulings, Imām Bukhārī ∇ repeats it and mentions a benefit of the *Ḥadīth*. For example, he would narrate that same narration from another teacher. If this is not possible because that *Ḥadīth* has only one chain, he alters it slightly. For example, if he mentions it *mawṣulan* in one chapter, he mentions it as a *mu'allaq* narration in another chapter. Sometimes, if he summarizes it in one chapter, he mentions the complete *Ḥadīth* in another chapter. If the text is long and it comprises of various meanings and they are not inter-connected, rather they each have a separate meaning, then each sentence is brought under a separate chapter so that it does not become lengthy. Sometimes, if there was enthusiasm, he mentioned the entire *Ḥadīth*."

¹ Imām Bukhārī ∇ has fragmented *aḥādīth*. He mentions a portion under one chapter and mentions the other portion under another chapter. This is why it is difficult to find a *Ḥadīth* in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. It is for this reason people have marked off and made note of the *aṭrāf* of *Bukhārī*. *Mawlānā* 'Abdul 'Azīz Punjābī Suhālī ∇ (the author of the marginalia on the first volume of "*Naṣbur Rāyah*") also wrote "*Nibrāsus Sārī 'alā aṭrāfil Bukhārī*" In this book, he mentioned all the different places where the same *Ḥadīth* is repeated. We also benefitted from this book by noting the varying places where the *Ḥadīth* is mentioned in our *Bukhārī*. Additionally, the *sanad* is not mentioned in this book. We also mention the *sanad*: was it narrated from Zuhri or from his student Mūsā ibn 'Uqbah or was it from Zuhri's teacher? These are very interesting points which our *Bukhārī* is filled with. *Alḥamdulillāh*, we have completed this task by staying awake for numerous nights. [Extracted from *Iḥdātush Shaykh*]

In summary, he did not intentionally repeat any *Ḥadīth* which had the same *matn* and *sanad*. If repetition of such a *Ḥadīth* did occur, it was unintentional and this has occurred in very few instances.

In some places, he shortens a *Ḥadīth* and he also does not mention the remainder of that *Ḥadīth* in another place. The reason for this is as follows: the portion which was not mentioned was *mawqūf* on the *Ṣaḥābī* (i.e., it was a statement of the *Ṣaḥābī*). It could not be categorized as *marfūʿ*. For example, the *Ḥadīth* of Huzayl ibn Shurāḥbīl from ʿAbdullāh ibn Masʿūd z: قَالَ: إِنَّ أَهْلَ الْإِسْلَامِ لَا يُسَيَّبُونَ وَإِنَّ أَهْلَ الْجَاهِلِيَّةِ يُسَيَّبُونَ الخ. (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 16)

The Number of Ahādīth in Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī¹

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar v has discussed regarding the number of *aḥādīth* in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* on page 468 and 477 of the introduction of “*Fatḥul Bārī*”. He also discussed this in “*Fatḥul Bārī*” in volume 1, page 84 and volume 13, page 543. However, he first mentions Ibn Ṣalāḥ’s v and Nawawī’s v statements and refuted them.²

Ibn Ṣalāḥ’s v and Nawawī’s v Statement

Ibn Ṣalāḥ v has written that the number of *aḥādīth* in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* is seven thousand two hundred and seventy-five (7275) with repetitions and four thousand (4000) without repetitions.

¹ We have exerted lots of effort in researching the number of *aḥādīth* in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. We take this opportunity to present to you all the differences we have found in this regard. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

² This has also been written in the *Muqaddamah* of Muḥaddith Sahāranpūrī v which is printed in the beginning of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. However, this is not supported by research. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

Nawawī ∇ also followed him, and he also mentioned this same number in “*Taqrīb*”. (*Taqrīb ma-a ‘Tadrībūr Rāwī* 1/102) Yes, in the *sharḥ*, (i.e., the introduction of *Sharḥ Bukhārī*) the restriction of *musnad* was added and it was mentioned that the total number of *musnad* narrations in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* with repetitions is seven thousand two hundred and seventy-five (7275). *Ta’līqāt* and *ghayr musnad* narrations are excluded by the restriction of *musnad*. They were then listed in detail in the style of an index. (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 465, *Muqaddamah Nawawī* pg. 45)

Ḥāfiẓ ∇ mentioned them and where there were deficiencies, he rectified them. He expresses his surprise regarding the astonishing mistakes he found. This is because Nawawī ∇ quoted this from Hamawī ∇ and Hamawī ∇ quoted this from Abul Faḍl Muḥammad ibn Ṭāhir Al-Maqdisī’s ∇ book (جواب المتعنت). Then, other authors continued to quote from this. Poets wrote poems so that they can be remembered easily. However, they did not conduct any research. فيها للعجب.

After listing the chapters, Ḥāfiẓ Ṣāhib ∇ mentioned in the end that the total number of all the *aḥādīth* with repetitions is seven thousand three hundred and ninety-seven (7397) after excluding the *mu’allaqāt* and *mutābi‘āt*.³

After counting the *mu’allaqāt* and *mutābi‘āt*, he mentioned the total number of *mu’allaqāt* to be one thousand three hundred and forty-one (1341) and three hundred and forty-one (341) regarding the *mutābi‘āt* coupled with the اختلاف روايات. Then, all will be added together in the following way:

Mawṣūlāt: 7397

³ It is clear that there is an error in “*Tadrībūr Rāwī*”. The error is that six thousand (6000) was mentioned instead of seven thousand (7000).

فبلغت بالمكررة سوى المعلقات والمتابعات ستة آلاف وسبعماية وتسعين.

“All the *aḥādīth* with repetitions reach six thousand seven hundred and ninety (6790) excluding the *mutābi‘āt* and *mu’allaqāt*.” (*Tadrībūr Rāwī* 1/103) *Faḍl*

Mu‘allaqāt: 1341

Mutābi‘āt and the others: 341

Total: Nine thousand and seventy-nine (9079)

However, in conclusion, Ḥāfiẓ ∇ wrote that all the *Ḥadīth* including the repetitions are (تسعة آلاف واثنان وثمانون حديثاً) nine thousand and eighty-two (9082) in total. (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 69)

It is not known how three more were added. In “*Muqaddamah Lāmi‘*”, *Shaykh* Muḥammad Zakariyyā ∇ mentioned that this is questionable. (*Muqaddamah Lāmi‘* pg. 37, 126)

In the introduction of “*Irḥsād-us-Sārī*”, Qaṣṭalānī ∇ mentioned that the total number of the *mutābi‘āt* coupled with the اختلاف روايات is three hundred and forty-four (344).⁴

⁵وجملة ما فيه من المتابعات والتنبيه على اختلاف روايات ثلثمائة وأربعة وأربعون حديثاً. (*Muqaddamah Qaṣṭalānī* pg. 33)

If it is counted in this manner, the calculations would be correct, and the total number would be established to be nine thousand and eighty-two (9082). This is correct. Accordingly, in the end of “*Faṭḥul Bārī*”, which was written approximately thirty years later, Ḥāfiẓ ∇ mentioned this same figure. He wrote: “All the narrations in *Jāmi‘ Bukhārī*- the *mawṣulāt*, *mu‘allaqāt* and *mutābi‘āt* along with repetitions, total to nine thousand and eighty-two (9082). All the *mawṣul* and *mu‘allaq* narrations excluding the repetitions are two thousand five hundred and thirteen (2513) in total. From among them, there are one hundred

⁴ The total of three hundred and forty- one (341) *mutābi‘āt* mentioned above is an error. Instead of three hundred and forty-one (341), it should be three hundred and forty-four (344). Hence, three will be added. The total of nine thousand and eighty-two (9082) will now be correct. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁵ Three hundred and eighty-four (384) ثلثمائة وأربعة وثمانون is printed in “*Tadrībūr Rāwī*” 1/103. It is clear that this is an error. *Faṣl*

and sixty (160) *mu‘allaq* and *mutābi‘āt* narrations. The remainder (i.e., 2353) are *mawṣūl*.” (*Fathul Bārī* 13/543)

The total number (9082) which has been mentioned is with regards to the *marfū‘* narrations. The *mawqūf* and *maqṭū‘* narrations are not included in this total. Ḥāfiẓ v said: “This total excludes the *mawqūf* narrations of the *Ṣaḥābah* g and the *maqṭū‘* narrations of the *Tābi‘īn* and others. I have listed the *mawṣūl* variations of all these narrations in my book, “*Ta‘līq-ut-Ta‘līq*” I have mentioned this total after conducting thorough research⁶ which Allāh 1 opened for me. I do not know of anyone before me who have explained it as I have done, but I am still not free of making mistakes and errors. والله المستعان (And Allāh is the One sought for help).” (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 469)

A Difference of Opinion⁷

In “*Hadyus Sārī*”, Ḥāfiẓ v wrote that according to the research, all the *mawṣūl* narrations in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* are two thousand six hundred and two (2602)⁸ excluding the repeated narrations.

The *mu‘allaq marfū‘* narrations which are not mentioned *mawṣūlan* anywhere in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* are one hundred and fifty-nine (159).

In total, there are two thousand seven hundred and sixty-one (2761). There is a big difference in this total and the total mentioned by Ibn Ṣalāḥ v. (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 477)

⁶ This book has been published with additional research. The *muḥaqqiq* titled it “*Taghlīqut Ta‘līq*” (with a ġ). *Faṣl*

⁷ After researching, we noticed this difference of opinion which I am mentioning. Perhaps, one of you who does lots of *muṭāla‘ah* can solve this problem and clarify this for us. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁸ In some copies 2464 is mentioned here [instead of 2602] and the total mentioned is 2623. This calculation is also correct. $159 + 2464 = 2623$. *Faṣl*

Ibn Ṣalāḥ √ mentioned that the total is four thousand excluding the repeated narrations. In the first volume of *“Fatḥul Bārī”*, it is stated: “According to the research, the number of *Ḥadīth* in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* is two thousand five hundred and thirteen (2513) as I have mentioned with details in the introduction.” (*Fatḥul Bārī* 1/84)

However, in the introduction the number two thousand five hundred and thirteen (2513) is not mentioned. (To my knowledge.) (فيما أعلم)

If the following question arises: How many *marfū‘ aḥādīth* are there in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* excluding the repetitions? According to the text mentioned in *“Hadyus Sārī”* on page 477, the following answer can be given: the total of all the *marfū‘*, *mawṣūl* and *mu‘allaq* narrations is two thousand seven hundred and sixty-one (2761). According to that which is mentioned in *“Fatḥul Bārī”* volume one, page 84 the answer will be two thousand five hundred and thirteen (2513). This number is also mentioned in *“Fatḥul Bārī”* 13/543.

Another Difference of Opinion

There is also a difference of opinion with regards to the answer to the following question: How many *mawṣūl* narrations are there in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* excluding the repeated narrations?

From the *muqaddamah*, the answer will be two thousand six hundred and two (2602).⁹ (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 477)

⁹ This is as it is mentioned in *“Fatḥul Mughīth”* by Sakhāwī √ [1/34]. Shaykhul Islām Zakariyyā √ has also quoted this in “شرح ألفية العراقي”. (*Hāshiyah Tadrīb* 1/103)

From “*Fathul Bārī*”, the answer will be two thousand three hundred and fifty-three (2353). (*Fathul Bārī* 13/543)

Another Difference of Opinion

There is also a difference of opinion with regards to the answer to following question: how many *mu‘allaq marfū‘* narrations are there excluding the repeated narrations?

If the answer is given from page 477 of the *muqaddamah*, the answer will be one hundred and fifty-nine (159) and if it is given from page 469, the answer will be one hundred and sixty (160). If the answer is given from “*Fathul Bārī*” 13/543 the answer will also be one hundred and sixty (160). And Allāh ۱ knows best.

The total number of narrations which are *mawqūf* on the *Ṣaḥābah* ۛ or those who came after them, is one thousand six hundred and eight (1608). (*Fathul Bārī* 13/543)

Kutub And Abwāb (Books and Chapters)

In *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*, the total number of *kitāb* (book) titles are more than one hundred and the total number of *abwāb* (chapter) titles are three thousand four hundred and fifty (3450) with slight differences. (*Muqaddamah Qaṣṣalūnī* pg. 33)

All the *marfū‘ mutṭaṣil*, *ghayr mutṭaṣil*, *mawqūf* and *maqṭū‘ aḥādīth* of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* including the repeated narrations are $9082 + 1608 = 10690$. All the *marfū‘*, *mawqūf* and *maqṭū‘ aḥādīth* excluding the repeated narrations are¹:

¹ If the *maqṭū‘* narrations are included, Ibn Ṣalāḥ’s ۛ statement will be stronger. However, he has restricted it to the *marfū‘ mutṭaṣil* narrations as mentioned in “*Ḥājaṭul Qārī*”. Thus, the contradiction remains. There is also a contradiction in Ḥāfiẓ’s ۛ statements. His second statement is that the total is four thousand three hundred and sixty-nine (4369). Ḥāfiẓ ۛ mentions that

Four thousand one hundred and twenty-one. [2513+1608= 4121]

Or

Four thousand three hundred and sixty-nine. [2761-1608= 4369]



there are two thousand seven hundred and sixty-one (2761) (instead of 2512) excluding the repeated narrations. If this (2761) is added to one thousand six hundred and eight (1608), it totals to four thousand three hundred and sixty-nine (4369). The total being four thousand one hundred and twenty-one (4121) or four thousand three hundred and sixty-nine (4369) arises due to this contradiction in Ḥāfiẓ's √ statements. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

Are the Ahādīth in Ṣaḥīḥayn Mufid Yaqīn?

Do the Ahādīth in Ṣaḥīḥayn Give the Benefit of Definite Knowledge?

There is a difference of opinion among the scholars regarding whether the *ahādīth* of *Ṣaḥīḥayn* are *mufid yaqīn* or not. There are great *muḥaqqiqūn* ‘*ulamā*’ on both sides of the argument. In his introduction to *‘Ilm Ḥadīth*, Ibn Ṣalāḥ ṽ (death: 643 A.H) claimed that the authenticity of *Ṣaḥīḥayn’s muttafaq ‘alayhi* (متفق عليه) *ahādīth* are definite and *‘ilm nazrī*¹ is acquired from them. However, some people reject this and say that only (‘*ilm ḡannī*)² can be acquired from them. The *ummah* accepted this because it is *wājib* (necessary) to practise on *ḡan*³ even though *ḡan* can be incorrect at times.

Ibn Ṣalāḥ ṽ stated: “Initially, I was also of this opinion. However, later it became apparent that the first opinion is correct.⁴ This is because the *ummah* is معصوم عن الخطأ (protected from making errors) and the *ḡan* of a معصوم does not err. It is for this reason that the *ijmā’* (consensus of the *ummah*) which is based on *ijtihād* is definite. Most of the *ijmā’āt* are like this.⁵ This is a very beneficial point. The conclusion of this is that the narrations mentioned only in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* or *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* will also be like this.⁶ Yes, those narrations which have been criticised by Darquṭnī ṽ are exempted from this.” (*Muqaddamah Ibn Ṣalāḥ* pg. 14 Published in Pakistan)

¹ This refers to opinions arrived at through analogical deductions. [Translator]

² Predominant belief. [Translator]

³ Nearly conclusive evidence. [Translator]

⁴ Meaning *‘ilm yaqīnī* is acquired even though it is *nazrī*. One should ponder deeply over the statement of Ibn Ṣalāḥ ṽ. We will be refuting it. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁵ The answer for this will be mentioned further. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁶ Meaning, not only the *muttafaq ‘alayhi* (متفق عليه) narrations. Rather, those narrations which are found in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* or *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* alone are also like this. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

After mentioning Ibn Ṣalāḥ's √ statement in "*Taqrīb*" (*ma'a Tadrīb* 1/133), Imām Nawawī √ (death: 676 A.H) mentioned: خالفه المحققون والأكثر فقلوا: يفيد الظن ما لم يتواتر The *muḥaqqiqūn* and majority of the '*ulamā'* have opposed this. They say: "It gives the benefit of *ẓan* as long as it is not *mutawātir*." (Nawawī also mentions this in *Muqaddamah Sharḥ Bukhārī* pg. 40)

The reason for this is further explained in *Sharḥ Muslim* that this is the condition of *āḥād* (narrations). There is no difference in this between *Ṣaḥīḥayn* and other than *Ṣaḥīḥayn*. The only difference is that there is no need to ponder over the *ahādīth* of *Ṣaḥīḥayn* in order to practise upon them while there is a need to ponder over the *ahādīth* that are in other than *Ṣaḥīḥayn*. With regards to *talaqqī bil qabūl* تلقى بالقبول (the *ummah's* complete acceptance), the obligation of '*amal* (practising on the *Ḥadīth*) is established from it. There is also a consensus on the obligation of '*amal* in such a case. This does not necessitate that it is definitely Nabī n's statement. Ibn Burhān and Ibn 'Abdus Salām also refuted Ibn Ṣalāḥ's √ statement. In his "*Alfiyah*", Ḥāfiẓ Zayn-ud-Dīn √ also considered Nawawī's √ statement to be the opinion of the *muḥaqqiq* scholars. Sakhāwī √ considered it to be the opinion of majority of the '*ulamā'*. (*Tadrībūr Rāwī* 1/132 and *Fathul Mughīth* 1/51)

In support of Ibn Ṣalāḥ √, Bulqīnī √ said that the statement of Nawawī √, Ibn 'Abdus Salām √ and others are not acceptable, because just like Ibn Ṣalāḥ √, some of the later *ḥuffāẓ* have narrated an opinion of a group of *Shāfi'īyah* such as:

Abū Ishāq Asfirā'inī, Abū Ḥamid Asfirā'inī, Qāḍī Abū Tīb, Shaykh Abū Ishāq Shayrāzī رحمه الله

From the *Ḥanafīyah*: Sarakhsī √

From the *Mālikiyyah*: Qāḍī 'Abdul Wahhāb √

From the *Ḥanābilah*: Abū Ya'lā, Abūl Khaṭṭāb, Ibnus Zaghwānī رحمه الله

From the *Ashā'irah*: Ibn Fawrak √

Most of the *Ahl Kalām*, all the *muḥaddithīn* and majority of the *salaf*

رحمهم الله.

Ibn Ṭāhir Maqdisī ∇ (death: 507 A.H.) also included those *aḥādīth* which are on the condition of *Ṣaḥīḥayn*.⁷

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar ∇ agreed that Nawawī's ∇ opinion is the opinion of the majority scholars, however, he did not accept this as the opinion of the *muḥaqqiqīn*. Rather, he said that the *muḥaqqiqīn* (i.e., some of them) even agreed with Ibn Ṣalāḥ ∇. (*Tadrībūr Rāwī* 1/132) The conclusion is that there is also a difference of opinion among the *muḥaqqiqīn*.

In "*Sharḥ Nukhbah*", Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar ∇ discussed this issue in a very relevant and befitting manner. A summary of this is as follows. In reality, this difference of opinion is *lafdhī* (in the wordings). Those who said '*mufīd 'ilm*', by using the word '*ilm*' they meant '*ilm nazrī*', that which is deduced from proofs. Those who oppose this (i.e., *mufīd 'ilm*), meant '*ilm badīhī*' which is only acquired from *mutawātir*. '*Ilm ḡannī*' is acquired from *āḥād* (narrations), not '*ilm yaqīnī*'. However, even these people agree that those *āḥād* which are محقق بالقرائن (surrounded by circumstantial evidence) are given preference over those which are not محقق بالقرائن. (And with progress it can become '*ilm yaqīnī*').⁸

One type of محقق بالقرائن which has been mentioned is that when a *ḥadīth* is *muttafaq 'alayhi* but it has not reached the level of *tawātur*, there has been no criticism on it and there is no *Ḥadīth* of the same status which has a meaning contradictory to it, then it will be '*ilm yaqīnī*'.⁹

The external factors are:

1. The high status of Shaykhayn in the field of *Ḥadīth*.

⁷ Notice how Bulqīnī ∇ supported Ibn Ṣalāḥ ∇. On both sides there are great '*ulamā'*'. Such a matter becomes very delicate. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁸ Even those who say *mufīd ḡan* agree that after محقق بالقرائن it gives the benefit of '*ilm yaqīnī*'. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁹ Notice that Ibn Ṣalāḥ ∇ did not add these conditions. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

2. Their superiority in differentiating between *ṣaḥīḥ* and *ghayr ṣaḥīḥ*.
3. The acceptance of their books alone is stronger for *ifādat-e-‘ilm* than having many chains.

Objection: If someone makes the objection that there is a consensus regarding the obligation to practise on the *aḥādīth* of *Ṣaḥīḥayn*, but there is no consensus on it being *‘ilm yaqīnī*, the following reply will be given.

Answer: [Ibn Ḥajar √] replies by saying that there is a consensus regarding the obligation to practise on every *Ḥadīth* [whether it is in *Ṣaḥīḥayn* or *ghayr Ṣaḥīḥayn*]. Since this is the case, then what remains regarding the superiority of *Ṣaḥīḥayn* which is universally accepted? [Therefore, in order to prove the virtue and superiority of *Ṣaḥīḥayn*, along with the consensus of the obligation to practise on every *Ḥadīth*, there should also be a consensus that *‘ilm qaṭ‘ī* is acquired from the *aḥādīth* of *Ṣaḥīḥayn*.]

However, this answer can be refuted by saying that the superiority of *Ṣaḥīḥayn* is established by their *aḥādīth* being the most authentic. By accepting this alone, *Ṣaḥīḥayn*’s superiority is established. (*Sharḥ Nukhbah* pg. 21)¹⁰

It is not necessary to consider their *aḥādīth muḥīd ‘ilm* [to prove their superiority]. Therefore, that which Ḥāfiẓ Ṣāhib √ wrote regarding *ifādiyat-e-‘ilm* is pointless and the objective has not been achieved.

The summary is that Ḥāfiẓ √ agreed with Ibn Ṣalāḥ √. Similarly, Ibn Kathīr √ and Suyūṭī √ (also agree with Ibn Ṣalāḥ √). However, their evidence is not concrete, as its weakness becomes apparent from the

¹⁰ His final statement destroyed all that he said before it. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

final statement of Ḥāfiẓ v. Similarly, Ibn Ṣalāḥ's v evidence is also not strong.¹¹

The Answer to Ibn Ṣalāḥ's Evidence

Firstly, it should be understood that a *ṣaḥīḥ Ḥadīth* is one in which the conditions of *ṣiḥḥat* (authenticity) are found. It does not mean that it is definite in itself. Meaning, a *Ḥadīth* being authentic does not make it definite that it is the statement of Nabī n. (See *Tadrībūr Rāwī* pg. 1-75 and *Fatḥul Mughīth* by Sakhāwī pg. 1-21)

Now understand that there is a consensus that the *aḥādīth* in *Ṣaḥīḥayn* are all authentic. Therefore, from this consensus, the authenticity of the *aḥādīth* in *Ṣaḥīḥayn* becomes definite (based on the *iṣṭilāḥī* definition of *ṣaḥīḥ* which was previously mentioned). This is because *qaṭ'iyat* (certainty) is only established for precisely that thing upon which there is *ijmā'* (consensus) and it is not established for other things.¹² Therefore, this *ijmā'* does not prove the *ṣiḥḥat fiqhī* (juristic authenticity of the *Ḥadīth*), i.e., the certainty of the subject and meaning [of the *Ḥadīth*] is not established [by this *ijmā'*].

¹¹ When the evidence does not support his opinion, then how can you agree with it? An opinion which is not supported by evidence should not be accepted because it is the evidence which inclines a person towards (accepting) a particular opinion. This is why it is called a proof.

Ibn Ṣalāḥ said: "Initially, I was of the same opinion as Nawawī that it is *mufīḏ ḡan*. Later, I retracted and adopted this opinion [that it is *mufīḏ yaqīn*]." However, we are saying that your first opinion was correct. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

¹² Meaning the *aḥādīth* of *Ṣaḥīḥayn* contain all the conditions of authenticity and this is established with certainty. However, it is not established with certainty that it is the statement of Nabī n. There is a difference between the TWO. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

Even though Imām Suyūṭī ∇ supported Ibn Ṣalāḥ ∇, he did not present any answer to the contradiction between Ibn Ṣalāḥ's ∇ opinion and the above-mentioned opinion of the *muḥaddithīn* regarding هذا حديث صحيح. It is for this reason he only mentioned this much: فالينظر في الجمع بينهما فاتّه عسرٌ، لم أر من تنبّه له (Tadrīb pg. 1-134)¹³

In reality, we cannot think of any answer this problem. The only way this can be solved is if one understands the correct meaning of [the principle that] ‘There is *ijmāʿ* on *Ṣaḥīḥayn* being the most authentic’. After understanding the correct meaning of [this principle] no objections will remain. However, even in such a case Ibn Ṣalāḥ ∇ cannot be supported.

It should also be noted that just as there is a consensus regarding the authenticity of *Ṣaḥīḥayn* (or regarding *Ṣaḥīḥayn* been the most authentic), similarly, there is a consensus on the authenticity of all such *aḥādīth* which contain all the conditions of *ṣiḥat* even if they are not found in *Ṣaḥīḥayn* or are not according to their (*Ṣaḥīḥayn*'s) conditions. So, will *ʿilm yaqīnī* be acquired from all of these *ṣaḥīḥ aḥādīth*?¹⁴ It is obvious that no one holds this opinion. So, if *ʿilm Yaqīnī*

¹³ The meaning of هذا حديث صحيح is as we have mentioned. Ibn Ṣalāḥ's ∇ opinion has another meaning. However, there is a consensus on the authenticity of the *Ḥadīth*. How can this consensus establish that it is definitely the statement of Nabī n? Imām Suyūṭī ∇ says: “Ponder on the combination of both as this is problematic. I have not seen anyone addressing this issue.” Suyūṭī ∇ would be asked: if you could not solve this problem, then why did you agree with Ibn Ṣalāḥ? After accepting the *muḥaddithīn*'s definition of هذا حديث حسن صحيح as correct, one cannot agree with Ibn Ṣalāḥ ∇. You have to differ with him. Before Suyūṭī, Ḥāfiẓ ∇ was in this same position. In the end, he demolished the building he constructed and went away just like that. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

¹⁴ Ibn Ṣalāḥ ∇ will be asked: if there is consensus on the authenticity of every *Ḥadīth* which is inclusive of all the conditions of authenticity and as you said *ijmāʿ* is معصوم عن الخطأ (protected from making errors), hence, *ʿilm yaqīnī* is established from it, then should *ʿilm yaqīnī* be acquired from every *ṣaḥīḥ Ḥadīth*? Where will Ibn Ṣalāḥ ∇ go? He is trapped. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

is not established by a consensus on the authenticity of any *ṣaḥīḥ khabar wāḥid* narration nor by the consensus on the compulsion of practising on it, then how can *‘ilm yaqīnī* be established by a consensus that the *aḥādīth* of *Ṣaḥīḥayn* are *ṣaḥīḥ*? This is an issue to ponder over.

The *Ḥadīth* regarding جمع بين الصلاتين بالمدينة (combining two *ṣalāhs* in one timing in Madīnah) is found in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* (1/246) (and also in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* 1/77,157) with a *ṣaḥīḥ* chain. Despite this, Imām Tirmidhī √ states that no one practices on it (1/47). Notice that the *Ḥadīth* is *ṣaḥīḥ* according to the *iṣṭilāḥī* definition (of *ṣaḥīḥ*) i.e.: the narrators are reliable, the chain of narration is *muttaṣil*, and it is not *shādh* nor *mu‘allal*. However, this does not mean that the subject matter is *qaṭ‘ī* (definitely correct).¹⁵

Similarly, it should also be understood that everyone agrees that if a case is presented to the judge and two reliable witnesses give testimony supporting the مدعي (person making the claim) then it is necessary (for the *Qaḍī*) to pass the verdict in favour of the مدعي. There is a consensus regarding this. However, this does not necessitate that the judgment of the *Qaḍī* is *qaṭ‘ī* (absolute) and according to the reality of the matter. Rather, it is possible that the *Qaḍī* made a mistake; the

¹⁵ Even though Imām Tirmidhī √ said that no one practices on this *Ḥadīth*. However, those who have been criticized for leaving out *aḥādīth* [i.e., the *Ahnāf*] {قرعه فال بد نام من ديوانه زنند} say, leave us to practice on this *Ḥadīth*. No one else practices on this *Ḥadīth*, give it to us, we will use it. This is the *Ḥadīth* of Ibn ‘Abbās h that Nabī n “صلي ثمانيا جميعا من غير خوف ولا مطر ولا سفر”. In dire circumstances, Nabī n did this sometimes. However, this was *jama‘ ṣūrī* (جمع صوري). That is, performing *Zuḥr* in the ending time [of *Zuḥr*] and ‘*Aṣr* in the beginning [time of ‘*Aṣr*], *Maghrib* in the ending [time of *Maghrib*] and ‘*Ishā’* in its beginning time. We are those who take this *Ḥadīth* and keep it close to our hearts. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

one who he thought was ‘*ādil* (just and upright) was not. Think of this issue in a similar manner.¹⁶

This is the same objection due to which the evidence which Ḥāfiẓ mentioned in “*Sharḥ Nukhbah*” was rejected. Also ponder! How can those *aḥādīth*, which were *khavar āḥād* (i.e., they were *ẓannī*) before being included in *Ṣaḥīḥayn*¹⁷ become *Mūwjab Yaqīn* (that which necessitates certitude) after they are included in *Ṣaḥīḥayn* and become universally accepted (*talaqqī bil qabūl*)?¹⁸ If *aḥādīth* become *mūwjab-e-yaqīn* by being included in *Ṣaḥīḥayn*, then why are the *mutakallam fih aḥādīth* (those *aḥādīth* regarding which there is criticism) excluded?¹⁹ Is it that at the time of including these (*mutakallam fih*) *aḥādīth* in *Ṣaḥīḥayn*, Shaykhayn’s academic status was weakened? It is clear that this is not the case. Even if *talaqqī bil qabūl* is said to be the ‘*illah* (reason), it cannot be specific to *Ṣaḥīḥayn*. Many other *aḥādīth* from

¹⁶ Meaning this *ṣaḥīḥ Ḥadīth* consists of all the conditions required to authenticate a *Ḥadīth*. However, a narrator forgot, made a mistake, got confused or intentionally lied, even though intentionally lying is far-fetched. It is human to make a mistake or get confused. الإنسان مركب من الخطأ والتسلي. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

¹⁷ Meaning, before the era of Imām Bukhārī ∇ and Muslim ∇. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

¹⁸ Meaning initially, it was not [*mufid yaqīn*] and it later became such. Those that are *mufid yaqīn* were so from the beginning; not that they acquired this by Imām Bukhārī’s ∇ and Imām Muslim’s ∇ acceptance. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

¹⁹ In this case, we would respectfully ask Ibn Ṣalāḥ: why then did you exclude the *aḥādīth* which Dārquṭnī ∇ criticised? Dārquṭnī ∇ came a very long time after Imām Bukhārī ∇ and Muslim ∇. Imām Bukhārī ∇ and Muslim ∇ wrote their books and passed on. At that time according to you, they were considered *mufid ‘ilm yaqīnī*. So how could Darquṭnī ∇ come and exclude them from being *mufid ‘ilm yaqīnī*? It is strange to say that before *Shaykhayn* it was *mūwjab ẓan* and when they came and included it in their books, it became *mūwjab ‘ilm yaqīnī*. Thereafter, when Darquṭnī ∇ came and criticize it, it was excluded from being *mūwjab ‘ilm yaqīnī*. This is mockery. This should not be so. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

other than *Ṣaḥīḥayn* have also achieved the status of being *talaqqī bil qabūl*. Then, these should also be considered as *mūwǧib ‘ilm*.

Also ponder! Before Dārquṭnī ∇ came, all the *aḥādīth* of *Ṣaḥīḥayn* were *mūwǧib ‘ilm*. So, how did Dārquṭnī ∇ have the audacity to criticise *mūwǧib ‘ilm aḥādīth* and invalidate that they are *mūwǧib ‘ilm*? It should also be noted that all of Dārquṭnī’s ∇ criticisms are not valid. Rather, Ḥāfiẓ ∇ has given satisfactory replies to most of them by which it becomes known that majority of these *aḥādīth* are *ṣaḥīḥ* and Shaykhayn’s verdict is also correct. Then why are all of them excluded? Ibn Ṣalāḥ ∇ only excluded the *mutakallam fīh* narrations. After adding the restriction: ما لم يقع التخالف بين مدلوليه (*Sharḥ Nukhbah* pg. 20)²⁰ Ḥāfiẓ ∇ also excluded those *aḥādīth* from being *mufiḌ ‘ilm*, in which there are contradictions within the meaning. It is as though Ibn Ṣalāḥ and others considered these *aḥādīth* to be *mūwǧib ‘ilm*. Ḥāfiẓ ∇ rejected that they

²⁰ Translation: On the condition that there is no contradiction or discrepancy in the *madlūl* (purport) of the two *aḥādīth*.

Meaning, according to Ibn Ṣalāḥ, the *aḥādīth* in which there is inconsistency/contradiction in the *madlūl* are *ilm yaqīnī*. According to Ḥāfiẓ ∇, they are *zannī*. An example of this is the *Ḥadīth* of *Sayyidunā* Ibn ‘Abbās ḥ: When Nabī ḥ entered the *Baytullāh* on the occasion of *Fatḥ Makkah* (the conquest of Makkah) he did not perform *ṣalāh*. He only sufficed on the *takbīrāt*. In *Sayyidunā* Ibn ‘Umar’s ḥ narration, it is mentioned that he also prayed *ṣalāh*. Now, which of the two narrations is *‘ilm yaqīnī*? If you meet ‘Allāmah Ibn Ṣalāḥ ∇, ask him: “*Ḥazrat*, what type of conviction do you have? Did Nabī ḥ pray *ṣalāh* or did he merely make *du‘ā*?” The narrations are contradictory in *Ṣaḥīḥayn*. Ibn Ḥajar ∇ has written a commentary and have written lengthy discussions. It is for this reason, he excluded them. Ibn Ṣalāḥ ∇ did not write a commentary of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* nor did he write lengthy discussions like Ibn Ḥajar ∇. Thus, he did not have this in mind. This is why he did not exclude them. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

be considered *mūwǧib ʿilm*. From this a doubt is created regarding the *ifādat* of the remainder.²¹

This discussion which I am writing is taken from *Mawlānā* Shabīr Aḥmad ʿUthmānī’s ∇ discussion in the introduction of “*Faṭḥul Mulhim*” page 107, and it is very informative.

From this it has been established that the opinion of *jamhūr* and the majority of the scholars is correct in this regard. Ibn Taymiyyah ∇ also supported Ibn Ṣalāḥ ∇.²² Rather, he was from amongst the first to support him. He also wrote two articles on this topic as is mentioned by Jazāʾirī ∇ in “*Tawjīhun Naẓr*” on page 132.²³

Mawlānā ʿUthmānī ∇ writes that Ibn Taymiyyah ∇ and others of a similar mind-set did not pay attention to this point which I mentioned in reply to Ibn Ṣalāḥ’s ∇ evidence. Otherwise, they would not have said such.²⁴ It is also strange that Ibn Ḥajar ∇ and Suyūṭī ∇ remained firm on their opinion although they were unable to reply to the objections.

Manifestation of Truth

After all of this, it should be understood that what Ḥāfiẓ ∇ mentioned in the beginning of this discussion in “*Sharḥ Nukhbah*” is correct to a

²¹ Because, as you have heard, in *Uṣūl Fiqh* when there is a عام مخصوص منه البعض (general from which few have been specified), then it becomes *ẓannī*, it does not remain *qaṭʿī*. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

²² Meaning he agreed that it necessitates *ʿilm yaqīnī*. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

²³ These are the *ʿulamāʾ* of Deoband who hold an esteemed status in the entire academic world. أولئك أبائي فجنني بمثلهم ، إذا جمعتنا يا جرير المجامع. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

²⁴ *Ḥazrat* Thānwī ∇ also said something similar to this regarding the issue of *tawassul*. Ibn Taymiyyah ∇ considers it impermissible, while all of the *jamhūr* scholars consider it permissible. *Ḥazrat* Thānwī ∇ said in one lecture that if Ibn Taymiyyah ∇ was to hear my speech, perhaps he would have retracted his opinion. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

certain degree. This means that the *ikhtilāf* is *lafẓī*. However, that discussion is not connected to *Ṣaḥīḥayn* or other than *Ṣaḥīḥayn*. Rather, some *akhābr āḥād* are *mūwǧib ‘ilm* for a person who is an expert in the science of *aḥādīth*, familiar with all the chains of *aḥādīth*, knows the condition of the narrators and is an expert in the *‘ilal* (hidden defects) of the *aḥādīth*. *‘Ilm nazrī* can be acquired by such a person after pondering and analyzing. This is not specific to *Ṣaḥīḥayn*. Rather, such knowledge can also be obtained from *aḥādīth* which are found in other than *Ṣaḥīḥayn*. Accordingly, Ḥāfiẓ ∇ discussed this further on in “*Sharḥ Nukhbah*” and mentioned three types of *muḥtaf bil qarā’in*:

1. The *Ḥadīth* of *Ṣaḥīḥayn*
2. *Mash-hūr Ḥadīth*
3. *Ḥadīth Musalsal* (بالائمة الحفاظ المتتقين)

He mentions them after saying ‘منها’, meaning, there are not only these three types of *muḥtaf bil qarā’in*, rather, there are also many other types.

The summary of this claim (وقد يُفَعُّ منها ما يُفِيدُ العلمَ النَّظَرِيَّ بالقرائن على المختار) of Ḥāfiẓ ∇ in “*Sharḥ Nukhbah*” is that we accept this and agree that the *aḥādīth* of *Ṣaḥīḥayn* are *mūwǧib ‘ilm* but not for everyone. It is *mūwǧib ‘ilm* for the giant experts of the chains of narration only. Additionally, the *‘ilm* will be *nazrī* and *istidlālī*, i.e., acquired from *nazr* (analogical deductions) and *istidlāl*. A *Ḥadīth* being found in *Ṣaḥīḥayn* is not sufficient. Rather, they (the experts in *Ḥadīth*) would research to find out the number of chains through which this *Ḥadīth* was narrated and whether or not the *Ṣaḥābah*, *Tābi’in*, *Tab’i Tābi’in* and those who came after continued narrating this *Ḥadīth*. Additionally, they would also research to find out how many of these people [who narrate the *Ḥadīth*] were reliable and whether or not it has been continuously practiced upon. Then, they would only acquire *‘ilm nazrī* from it [after conducting this research]. These conditions can also be found in the *aḥādīth* of other than *Ṣaḥīḥayn*. Perhaps this is the reason why Ibn

Ṣalāḥ √ did not specify these conditions to the *muttafaq ‘alayhi aḥādīth*. Rather, he also applied these conditions to those *aḥādīth* which are in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* or *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* alone. Before him Ibn Ṭāḥir Maqdisī √ (death: 507 A.H) also applied this ruling to those *aḥādīth* which were on the conditions of *Shaykhayn*. (See: *Tadrībūr Rāwī* 1/133)

Ibn Taymiyyah’s Statement

At this point, consider this profound statement of Shaykh-ul-Islām ‘Allāmah Ibn Taymiyyah √. In *“Minhājūs Sunnah”*, he has written: “In the authentication of *aḥādīth*, the Imāms of *Ḥadīth* did not follow Imām Bukhārī and Imām Muslim.²⁵ Most of the *aḥādīth* of *Ṣaḥīḥayn* were considered accepted and *Ṣaḥīḥ* according to the Imāms of *Ḥadīth* before the existence of Shaykhayn. They remained *ṣaḥīḥ* in Shaykhayn’s lifetime and also after their death. When the Imāms of *Ḥadīth* saw their books, they agreed with them regarding the authentication of the *aḥādīth*. Only a few *aḥādīth*, approximately twenty, have been criticized most of which are found in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. Some have agreed with those who criticized the *Ḥadīth* and some have agreed with Shaykhayn. There are more details on this topic.” (*Muqaddamah Faṭḥul Mulhim* pg. 96)

Meaning the *nāqid’s* (critic’s) opinion is correct regarding some and Shaykhayn’s opinion is correct regarding some.

The Statement of ‘Allāmah Anwar Shāh Kashmīrī √

²⁵ This is because when a person is a *mujtahid* in a particular field, he cannot do *taqlīd* in that same field. Those who are *mujtahids* in *Ḥadīth* cannot do *taqlīd* in *Ḥadīth*. Those who are *mujtahids* in *fiqh*, cannot do *taqlīd* in *fiqh*. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

Finally, read this statement of the *Khātimatul Muḥaqqiqīn* (the last of the researchers), ‘Allāmah Anwar Shāh Kashmīrī ∇:

In “*Fayḍ-ul-Bārī*”, he mentioned: “There are differences of opinion regarding the *ṣaḥīḥ ahādīth* being *mufīd qaṭa’*. *Jamhūr* do not consider it *mufīd qaṭa’*. Ḥāfiẓ ∇ is of the opinion that it is *mufīd qaṭa’*.²⁶ Sarakhsī, Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn Ṣalāḥ رَحِمَهُمُ اللَّهُ are also of this opinion. Even though they are a few, their opinion is the opinion. Furthermore, Ḥāfiẓ ∇ explained that *ifādat-e-qaṭa’* is *naẓrī* like the case regarding the miracle of the Qur’ān. This is not something which is known by all, rather, only those who have excelled in the science of Arabic are aware of this. It is for this reason it is said: “لَمْ يَدْرِ اعْجَازَ الْقُرْآنَ إِلَّا الْأَعْرَجَانُ” – “Only two crippled people were aware of the miracle of the Qur’ān.” (Zamakhsharī and Jurjānī)²⁷

If you were to make the objection that there are also *akḥbār āḥād* in *Ṣaḥīḥayn*, so they will only be *mufīd ẓan*, [the following reply will be given].

Answer: Yes, originally it is *mufīd ẓan*. However, it became *mufīd yaqīn* due to being *muḥtaf-bil-qarā’īn* and being narrated from many chains. This is why this can only be achieved by the experts of this field who can differentiate between what is authentic and what is defective and those who are aware of the conditions of the narrators and knowledgeable with regards to *jarḥ* and *ta’dīl*. Such people will research the chains of the *Ḥadīth* and the condition of the narrators and then they will acquire this knowledge. From this, it becomes clear that *ifādat-e-qaṭa’* is not established by the consensus of the *ummah* regarding *Ṣaḥīḥayn*.²⁸ Rather, it comes about after deep thought and

²⁶ Meaning like Imām Nawawī ∇. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

²⁷ After this, Shaḥ Ṣāḥib ∇ said – “And I am the third.” (وَأَنَا ثَالِثُهُمَا). [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

²⁸ Ibn Ṣalāḥ ∇ was of the opinion regarding it being *mufīd-qaṭa’* due to the consensus of the *ummah* and Ibn Taymiyah ∇ supported him. It becomes

research regarding the conditions of the narrators.²⁹ The real secret here is that the different types of *aḥādīth* were categorized³⁰ keeping the first three eras in mind. Therefore, consensus and non-consensus is according to that era. If a *khavar wāḥid* becomes *mash-hūr* in the later times, its popularity is not accepted. Something which was originally *ẓannī* cannot become *qaṭʿī* due to becoming *mash-hūr* later on.³¹ Therefore, the consensus of the *ummah* regarding the *aḥādīth* of *Ṣaḥīḥayn* cannot make them *muḥīd qaṭaʿ*,³² because originally, they were *āḥād*. Yes, it is possible that if one looks at it from the angle of the status of the *isnād* and the conditions of the *rijāl*, it is *muḥīd qaṭaʿ*. An example of this is the incident regarding the *Ṣaḥābah* turning in *ṣalāḥ* [towards the *Kʿabah* when the change in the direction of the *qiblah* was revealed] based on a *khavar wāḥid*. In this case the *khavar wāḥid* is *qaṭʿī* due to being *muḥtaf-bil-qarāʾīn*. (*Fayḍ-ul-Bārī* 1/45)

Notice how Shāh Ṣāḥib ∇ accepted the conclusion. However, he did not accept the evidence which Ibn Ṣalāḥ ∇ gave nor did he accept the evidence which Ḥāfiẓ ∇ mentioned first. With regards to the evidence, this is not specific to *Ṣaḥīḥayn*. Rather Ḥāfiẓ Ṣāḥib ∇ himself made it general and included other types as we have mentioned before. *فتدبروا وكونوا علي بصيرة*—*So ponder upon this and be amongst those with insight*.

Now, understand the value of Ibn Humām’s statement which is based on this reality. He said: “To say this (is not correct. Rather, it) is an enforcement in which *taqlīd* is not permissible. This is, to say that the

known the Shāh Ṣāḥib ∇ does not agree with him with regards to the evidence. Rather, he only agrees with his conclusion.

²⁹ The proof which Ibn Ṣalāḥ ∇ presents is not *ṣaḥīḥ* (correct). [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

³⁰ متواتر، مشهور، آحاد. *Mutawātir, mash-hūr and āḥād*. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

³¹ The *Ḥadīth*: انما الأعمال became *mash-hūr* later on. Initially, it was *gharīb*. It cannot become *mutawātir* and *mash-hūr*. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

³² Notice that this is refuting Ibn Ṣalāḥ ∇. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

aḥādīth of *Ṣaḥīḥayn* will (always) take precedence over all the *aḥādīth* which have been narrated from the narrators of Shaykhayn in other than *Ṣaḥīḥayn*. Similarly, they [i.e., the *aḥādīth* of *Ṣaḥīḥayn*] will also take precedence over all those *aḥādīth* which coincide with the conditions of Shaykhayn even if the person collecting them is an *Imām*

The objective of all these discussions (May Allāh protect us) is not to lower and degrade the rank of *Ṣaḥīḥayn*. Whoever does this, we consider him to be an innovator and one that has deviated as is the *madh-hab* of our *akābīr*.³³ Rather, our objective is to reaffirm the importance of the other *Ḥadīth* books. This is because in these books there are also many *aḥādīth* which are like the *aḥādīth* in *Ṣaḥīḥayn* and many are authentic in general upon which there is a consensus of the *ummah* that it is necessary to practice upon. Therefore, along with accepting the authenticity and importance of *Ṣaḥīḥayn*, it is also necessary to refrain from any form of extremism. Faith, loyalty and love for Nabī n and his *aḥādīth* should be due to the fact that those are the *aḥādīth* of the Rasūl n, they are authentic, and have been narrated with a reliable chain. It should not be due to the fact that they have been narrated in such and such a book.

والله يَقُولُ الْحَقَّ وَهُوَ يَهْدِي السَّبِيلَ، وَالْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ عَلَى مَا وَقَفْنَا لِهَذَا،
وَصَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَى خَيْرِ خَلْقِهِ مُحَمَّدٍ وَآلِهِ وَأَصْحَابِهِ أَجْمَعِينَ.

And Allāh speaks the truth and He guides toward the straight path.

All praises are due to Allāh that He granted us the ability to do this.

***And may Allāh's blessings and peace be upon the best of creation,
Muḥammad n and his family and all his companions.***

³³ The superiority of *Ṣaḥīḥayn* should not be mentioned in such a manner that it is as though the other *Ḥadīth* books are thrown in the bin. This is a great degradation of the *aḥādīth*. Some people make statements like: "We want the *Ḥadīth* of *Ṣaḥīḥayn*." What do they mean by this? (Are they saying) do not present before us *aḥādīth* from other than the *Ṣaḥīḥayn*? Are these also not *aḥādīth*? The remedy for such people is intended here. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]



The Narrations Of Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī Which Have Been Criticized

Dārquṭnī ∇ made objections against one hundred and ten (110) narrations of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. Thirty-two (32) of these are also found in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, while seventy-eight (78) are only found in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. Ḥāfiẓ ∇ answered these objections in two ways:

1) Concisely.

2) In detail.

Before he answers the objections, he mentioned that these are those same narrations which Ibn Ṣalāḥ ∇ and others claim did not achieve the status of *talaqqī bil qabūl* like the rest of the book. (This is why *ilm yaqīnī* cannot be acquired from them.)

Ḥāfiẓ ∇ mentioned that this is the best exemption. Thereafter, he said that there are various statements of Imām Nawawī ∇ regarding these criticized narrations. It is mentioned in the introduction of the commentary of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* that the objections of some *muḥaddithīn* are based on extremely weak principles. Therefore, one should not be deceived by them. (*Muqaddamah Nawawī Li Sharḥ Bukhārī* pg. 68) Ḥāfiẓ ∇ mentioned that this statement of Nawawī ∇ is incorrect.

In the introduction of the commentary of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, Nawawī ∇ stated: “Some people made objections against some of the *aḥādīth* in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* in which all of their conditions are not found.” Dārquṭnī ∇ wrote a book (titled “*Kitābul Ilzāmāt wat Tatabbuʿ*”). Abū Masʿūd Dimashqī ∇ also did *istidrāk* (redressing) of these. Abū ʿAlī Ghaslān ∇ in the chapter of *ʿilal* in “*At-Taḥfīd*” also redressed those parts which are defective and he gave answers for them or most of them.”

Ḥāfiẓ ∇ said: “This point from Nawawī is correct because the answers for some of the objections are not sufficient.” (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 346)

Concise Answer

Ḥāfiẓ ∇ gave a concise answer:

Imām Bukhārī ∇ and Imām Muslim ∇ have a higher rank than the *muḥaddithīn* of their era and those after them in knowing whether a *Ḥadīth* is *ṣaḥīḥ* or *maʿlūl*. It is also agreed upon that ‘Alī ibn Madīnī ∇ was the greatest scholar of his time with regards to *ʿilāl Ḥadīth*. Imām Bukhārī ∇ mastered this field of knowledge from him and he said: “I did not consider myself to be lower than anyone else besides ‘Alī ibn Madīnī.” Despite this, when this statement of Imām Bukhārī ∇ reached ‘Alī ibn Madīnī ∇, he used to say: “Disregard his statement. He has not seen anyone like himself.”

Imām Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā Dhuhālī ∇ was the most knowledgeable in his era regarding the hidden defects of Zuhrī’s *Ḥadīth*. Shaykhayn رحمهما الله benefitted from him. It is narrated from Imām Bukhārī ∇ that he said: “I included each *Ḥadīth* in *Bukhārī* after having conviction of its authenticity and performing *istikhārah*.” Imām Muslim ∇ said: “I showed Abū Zur‘ah Rāzī my *ṣaḥīḥ*. I took out those *aḥādīth* in which he pointed out a hidden defect.”

It becomes clear from these statements that Shaykhayn رحمهما الله only included *ṣaḥīḥ aḥādīth* in their *Ṣiḥāḥ*. Even if the objections of the critics are accepted, the most that can be said is that their statements are contradictory to the research of Shaykhayn رحمهما الله. It is apparent that when the superiority of Shaykhayn رحمهما الله in this field is accepted. Thus, when there is a contradiction, the research of Shaykhayn رحمهما الله is given preference. (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 46)

Detailed Answer

Before giving a detailed answer, Ḥāfiẓ ∇ presented a discourse from which a summary of the answers can be derived. We mention a summary of this discourse here. The detailed answer is very lengthy. The detailed answer can be read in “*Hadyus Sārī*”.

There are six types of criticized narrations:

1. Those narrations in which there are differences regarding the addition and subtraction of narrators in the chain. If the chain of the *Ḥadīth* in the *Ṣaḥīḥ* has an additional narrator, it is not correct to contradict it with a *nāqīṣ* chain put forth by the critic. This is because there is *inqiṭāʿ* in the *nāqīṣ* chain. How can it be correct to contradict a *ṣaḥīḥ Ḥadīth* with a *munqaṭiʿ*, *ḍaʿīf Ḥadīth*? *Ḥadīth* number forty-five is an example of this.

Even if the narration which comes in *Ṣaḥīḥ* is from among the *mazīd fī muttaṣil asānīd* (مزید فی متصل الاسانید), the objection is still incorrect because it is possible that both *aḥādīth* are authentic as it is in *Ḥadīth* number two and eight.

If the narration that comes in *Ṣaḥīḥ* has a *nāqīṣ* chain and an objection has been made with a chain with additional narrators, it will be seen whether the additional narrator is a *Ṣaḥābī* or a reliable non-*mudallis* who has definitely met the *marwī ʿanhu*. Alternatively, if he is a *mudallis*, then is *samāʿah* established in any of the chains clearly? If that is the case, the objections in all these cases will be invalid. Otherwise, it is clearly *inqiṭāʿ*. In this case the answer will be that according to the author, the authenticity of this *Ḥadīth* has been established after a full survey. Its authenticity is either established through a *qarīnah* (an external factor-circumstantial evidence) or a *mutābiʿ* (supporting chain) was found to support it.¹ *Ḥadīth* twenty-four is an example of this.

¹ Similarly, it should be understood that those narrations which the *aʿimmah mujtahidīn* used as evidence are worthy of being used as evidence even

Some critics criticized those narrations in which the *rāwī* did not narrate by hearing it directly from the *marwī* *‘anhu*. Rather, he narrated based on *mukātabah* or *ijāzah*. The answer to this is that according to the author² it is correct to narrate based on *ijāzah*. This is why it is not correct to grade it as *inqiṭā’*.

2. Those narrations in which there are differences in the narrations due to the alterations made by some of the narrators in the chains. In such a case, if both varying narrations can be reconciled since both of them are equal in *ḥifẓ* and *‘adal*, it is deduced that this narration was narrated from the narrator through both of the chains. *Ḥadīth* number forty-eight is an example of this.

If it is not possible to reconcile them since those narrating differently are not on the same level, rather, they are almost on the same level with regards to *ḥifẓ* and *‘adal*, then the author collects the *rājiḥ* (preferred) chain and he either leaves out the *marjūḥ* chain or indicates towards it. *Ḥadīth* number seventeen is an example of this. For this reason, the *ikhtilāf* (differences) regarding all these types do not necessitate *idtirāb*.

though the *muta-‘akh-khirīn* have seen some defect in it. Imām Abū Ḥanīfah √ and Imām Mālik √ accept the *mursal* narrations of reliable and upright *Tābi‘īn* based on this.

According to the preferred opinion, Imām Aḥmad √ also accepts their narrations. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

² From this answer, it becomes known that it is not correct to make an objection on those *a’immah mujtahidīn* who grade a *Ḥadīth* as *ṣaḥīḥ* based on their school of thought, whereas, those who came after them did not grade it *ṣaḥīḥ* due to differences in the principles. Alternatively, according to the *mujtahidīn* authenticity has been established through supporting chains or *qarīnah* (external factor) while according to others, it has not been established. Another reason can be that it reached them with a *ṣaḥīḥ* chain while it reached the *muta-‘akh-khirīn* with a longer chain in which a *mutakallam fih* narrator is present. In all these cases there will be no objection upon the *a’immah mujtahidīn*.

(See فتنكر وكن على ذكر فانه نفيس

Muqaddamah Lāmi’ page 84) Fazl.

3. Those narrations in which some of the narrators made some additions, however, those narrators who have not mentioned this addition are more in number or they are more precise (*adbat*). There will be nothing wrong with this unless the addition is so contradictory that it is impossible to reconcile them. (If this is the case, there will be an objection.) If it is not contradictory in such a manner that this addition is regarded as a completely separate *Ḥadīth*, then there is no objection unless it is established by a strong proof that this addition in the text is from some of the narrators. If it is of this type, then it will have an effect. See *Ḥadīth* thirty-four.
4. Those narrations in which there are a few weak narrators, and they are alone in narrating (this *Ḥadīth*). There are only two *aḥādīth* of this type: number thirty-seven and forty-three. Weak narrators are also present in the chains of other than these two *aḥādīth*, however, they have other *mutābi*‘ chains to support and strengthen them. This is why Dārquṭnī ∇ did not mention them. He only mentioned those two *aḥādīth* by considering them to be *tafarrud* (without any *mutābi*‘). However, the correct answer is that in *Ḥadīth* thirty-seven, Ubay ibn ‘Abbās ibn Abī Sahl (who is a weak narrator) was supported and strengthened by his brother ‘Abdul Muhaymin³ and his narrations are found in *Jāmi*‘ *Tirmidhī* and *Sunan Ibn Mājah*. In *Ḥadīth* forty-three, Ismā‘īl ibn Abī Uways (who is a weak narrator) was supported and strengthened by Ma‘an ibn ‘Īsā and both narrated this *Ḥadīth* from Mālik. (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 363-389)
5. Those narrations regarding which there is *wahm* (a doubt). Some doubts are considered defects while others do not cause it to be defective.

³ However, ‘Abdul Muhaymin is also weak, so it will not strengthen it. In “*Nukat*” Ḥāfiẓ ∇ states that Imām Bukhārī ∇ graded it as authentic due to its combined strength and by also considering the fact that this *Ḥadīth* is not discussing jurisprudence. (*Nukat* pg. 418) *Fazl*

6. Those narrations in which there are differences in the *matn* due to alterations in some of the words. Most of these narrations can be reconciled or one can be given preference.

Dārquṭnī √ and others did not discuss the objections regarding the *matn*. They only discussed the objections connected to the chains. Some examples of the differences in the *matn* which the scholars of *naqd* (criticism) did not object to are:

- The narration of Jābir z regarding the story of Jamal.
- Jābir's z narration regarding fulfilling the debts of his father.
- The narration of Rāfi' ibn Khadīj z regarding *mukhābarah*.
- The story of Dhul Yadayn narrated by Abū Hurayrah z.
- The narration of Sahl ibn Sa'd z regarding the woman who gifts herself.
- The narration of Anas z regarding the ruling of beginning recitation with *Alḥamdulillāhil Rabbil 'Ālamīn*.
- The story narrated by Ibn 'Abbās h regarding the woman who asked regarding her sister's or mother's oath.

The explanation of each of these will come in its relevant place.

After investigation and research, *alḥamdulillāh* it was found that this difference does not affect the main subject-matter of the book, except very rarely. (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 348) والنادر كالمعدوم (*And rare is like non-existent*.)

The Mutakallam Fīh Narrators in Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī

Ḥāfiẓ √ discussed in detail all those narrators who have been criticised in alphabetical order. He wrote an article before the discussion from which the principle to these answers will become known. See "*Hadyus Sārī*" for details. The summary of the article is as follows:

Before delving into the details, know that in order for the author of the *Ṣaḥīḥ* to collect the narration of any narrator, it is necessary that according to him, the narrator is upright, has a good retention and does not make any errors especially since the *jamhūr a'immaḥ* accepted the *Ṣaḥīḥayn* as authentic. This is not found in the narrators whose

narrations were not collected by Shaykhayn رحمهما الله. In this way, *jamhūr's* consensus regarding the reliability of the narrators of *Ṣaḥīḥayn* become established. This is with regards to those narrators whose narrations Imām Bukhārī ∇ has collected in his *uṣūl*. Those narrators whose narrations have been taken in the *mutābi'āt*, *shawāhid* and *ta'līqāt* are on different levels with regards to strength of retention etc. even though they are all truthful.

If one of the Imāms criticise a narrator of *Ṣaḥīḥayn*, his criticism cannot contradict the author of *Ṣaḥīḥ's* accreditation of the reliability of that narrator. Therefore, this *jarḥ* (criticism) will not be accepted until it [the *jarḥ*] is clarified. Such a cause should be mentioned which necessitates a deficiency in the narrator's upright nature or precision or a deficiency regarding the precision of a specific *Ḥadīth*. This is because there are various causes of *jarḥ*. Some cause deficiencies and some do not.

Shaykh Abul Ḥasan Maqdisī ∇ used to say: "The narrator whose narrations have been collected in the *Ṣaḥīḥ* has 'crossed the bridge' (جاوز القنطرة)." Meaning, his criticism will not be taken into account.

Shaykh Abul Faṭḥ Qurayshi ∇ mentioned in his *mukhtaṣar*: "This is our belief. We say precisely that which Maqdisī ∇ said except in the case where there is clear evidence, and it is such a convincing argument which creates such a strong predominant belief that it overpowers [the belief] of the consensus on the authenticity of *Ṣaḥīḥayn* which dictates that their narrators are all regarded as 'ādil."

Ḥāfiẓ ∇ said: "The criticism of a narrator is not accepted until it is clear because there are various causes of *jarḥ* and they are based on five factors:

1. *Bid'ah* (innovations)
2. *Mukhālafah*
3. Mistakes

4. *Jahālat-e-Ḥāl*

5. When there is a claim that there is *inqiṭāʿ* (break) in the chain.

For instance, when the narrator is *mudallis* or *mursil*.”

[The details of the above are as follows:]

1. No narrator of the Ṣaḥīḥ has been accused of *jahālat-e-ḥāl*.
2. With regards to mistakes, some narrators make few mistakes and some make many. If a narrator has been classified as *kathīrul ghalat* (one who makes many errors), research should be conducted to find out if this narration has also been narrated by such a narrator who has not been accused of such. If it has been narrated [by a narrator who has not been accused of *kathīrul ghalat*], it becomes known that the author relied on the *aṣl Ḥadīth* and not on this specific chain of narration. However, if this *Ḥadīth* has not been narrated from another reliable narrator, one should remain silent with regards to grading this *Ḥadīth* as *ṣaḥīḥ* (authentic). However, all praises are due to Allāh ﷻ, there are no such narrations in the *Ṣaḥīḥ*.

If the narrator has been classified as *qillat-e-ghalat* (one who makes few errors); for instance, if statements like the following are made about him: ‘*sayyiʿul ḥifẓ*’ (سيء الحفظ) or ‘*lahu awhām*’ (له اوهام) or ‘*lahu manākīr*’ (له مناكير), the ruling in this case will also be like the case mentioned above. The narrations of such narrators are mentioned more often in the *mutābiʿāt* (supporting chains) in comparison to the first type of narrators.

3. With regards to *mukhālafah* through which *shudhūdh* and *nakārat* are created, if a truthful narrator with a strong memory narrates a *Ḥadīth* and someone whose memory is stronger than his, or a few persons whose strength in memory is equal to his narrate it differently and they cannot be reconciled according to the principles of the *muḥaddithīn*, it is called *shādh*. If there is a big difference [in the narration] or the narrator is weak in memory, the *Ḥadīth* is called *munkar*. There are very few of these narrations in the *Ṣaḥīḥ*.

4. With regards to the claim of *inqiṭā'* (break in the chain): Imām Bukhārī's stance is known (that he does not consider being of the same era to be sufficient. Rather, it is necessary that the *rāwī* and *marwī* *'anhu* met each other at least once). Thus, this objection cannot be made on (Bukhārī's) narrators. Despite this, if there is an accusation of *tadlīs* or *irsāl*, then research is done regarding the *mu'an'an* narrations. If it becomes clear that they met and heard from each other, then the objection no longer remains. Otherwise, the objection remains.
5. With regards to *bid'ah*, the narrator maybe involved in either *bid'at-e-mufassiqah* or *bid'at-e-mukaffirah*. In *bid'at-e-mukaffirah*, it is necessary that the narrator has been classified as a *kāfir* by consensus. For example, there is consensus regarding the disbelief of the *ghālī Rawāfiḍ*. Some of them claim the divinity of *Sayyidunā 'Alī* or someone else or that *Sayyidunā 'Alī* will return to the world before *Qiyāmah* or they make other similar claims. The narrations of such *ghālī rawāfiḍ* are not in the *Ṣaḥīḥ* at all.

The second type of *bid'ah* is the one which does not reach the level of *kufir*; rather, a person is only classified as a *fāsiq* (open sinner) by perpetrating such an innovation (such as the *Khawārij* and *ghayr ghālī Rawāfiḍ*). Also included in this category, are the innovations which clearly contradict the *Ahl Sunnah Wal Jamā'ah*, however, a [weak] interpretation is given to justify them and there is a leeway for this. When such innovators refrain from speaking lies and do not do anything contrary to human nature and they are pious and righteous, there is a difference of opinion regarding the acceptance of their narrations. Some are of the opinion that all their narrations will be accepted and some are of the opinion that all their narrations will be rejected. Some have outlined certain conditions- the narrator's narration is rejected if he calls towards the *bid'ah*. Otherwise, it is accepted. This third opinion is more befitting. The *a'immah* have chosen this opinion. Some have added finer details to this. They say that if the narration of one who does

not call towards his *bid'ah* supports or beautifies the *bid'ah*, then it will not be accepted. Others have said: If the narration of the narrator who calls towards his *bid'ah* refutes this *bid'ah* then it is accepted, otherwise, it is rejected.

Abul Fath Qushayrī v chose another condition. If this narration is also narrated from a narrator other than this innovator, then no regard is given to the innovator. If his narration has no support and it is only narrated by him and the *Ḥadīth* has no connection to the *bid'ah* and the above conditions are present, then his narration is accepted so that we do not lose this *Ḥadīth* and *Sunnah*.

Note

It should also be noted that some people criticized some narrators due to differences in their beliefs. No consideration is given to this unless the criticism is proven to be true. Similarly, some righteous people criticize those narrators who are involved in worldly matters. However, the reality is that this objection is incorrect if they are truthful and precise. Additionally, no consideration is given to criticism which is related to having a connection with or being from the same era as someone else. Some have also criticized those who are more reliable and greater scholars of *Ḥadīth* than themselves. This is also not considered. (*Hadyus Sāri* pg. 384-385)

Second Note

In his *Ṣaḥīḥ*, Imām Bukhārī v mentions the narrations of such narrators that he himself graded weak in his "*Kitābud Ḍu'afā'*". For example: Ayyūb ibn 'Ā'idh, Thābit ibn Muḥammad, Ḍuhayr ibn Muḥammad Tamīmī, Ziyād ibn Rabī', Sa'īd ibn 'Ubaydullāh Thaqafī, 'Abbād ibn Rāshid, Muḥammad ibn Yazīd and Miqsam, the freed slave of Ibn 'Abbās h.

It is possible that this is due to difference in *ijtihād* or that the *Ḥadīth* has been established or it has many chains; some higher and some

lower and he chose the lower chain. Alternatively, it can be due to another reason.

(*Mā Tamassu Ilayhil Ḥājah* pg. 21) For instance, to avoid repetition. (*Faṭḥul Mughīth* 1/275)

The Ta'liqāt of Bukhārī

Ta'liq is a narration in which a narrator in the beginning of the chain is omitted regardless of if one narrator, more than one or all the narrators have been omitted. The *ta'liqāt* in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* are mentioned in two ways:

1. Sometimes, it is mentioned with '*qāla*' (قال) or a *ṣegah jazam* (صيغه جزم) similar to it.
2. Sometimes, it is mentioned with '*tudhkuru*' (تذكر) or a *ṣegah tamrīd* (صيغه تمرير) similar to it.

Thereafter these *ta'aliqāt* are also of two types:

1. It is mentioned *mawṣūlan* in another part of the book. It is counted in the *mawṣūlāt* which have been previously mentioned.
2. It is not mentioned *mawṣūlan* anywhere in the book.

This second type is being discussed here. There are two types:

1. Those *ta'liqāt* that are mentioned with the *ṣegah* of *jazam* are *ṣaḥīḥ* until the *mu'allaq 'anhu*. However, one must ponder upon the [reliability] of those narrators whom Imām Bukhārī ∇ has mentioned. It is known from research that some coincide with the conditions of Imām Bukhārī ∇. They were not mentioned in the *aṣl* (primary subject matter) of the book because most probably, its substitute was already mentioned. It is for this reason it no longer remained necessary to mention it with its chain. Alternatively, [its chain was not mentioned] because he did not hear this *Ḥadīth* from his teacher through *taḥdīth*. Rather, he heard it in a form of a *mudhākirah*, or there is doubt regarding *samā'ah* or he heard it through someone else. However, in this case Imām Bukhārī ∇ cannot be accused of *tadlīs*¹ because Khaṭīb and others have explained that

¹ Ibn Mundah ∇ has accused Imām Bukhārī ∇ of this. (*Muqaddamaah Anwārul Bārī* 2/48)

the word قال does not prove *samā'ah*. Yes, if it was someone's habit to mention قال when there is *samā'ah* [in the scenario when he has heard directly], and he mentions قال when he has not heard directly, it will be called *tadlīs*. However, Imām Bukhārī ∇ is not known for having a habit of doing this. Thus, this word has the possibility of both *samā'* and *ghayr samā'*. For this reason, it cannot be called *tadlīs*.

Some of the narrations that have been mentioned with the *ṣegah jazam* which are not according to Imām Bukhārī's ∇ conditions are, at times, according to the conditions of other than Imām Bukhārī ∇. Sometimes, they are worthy of being used as a strong evidence. Sometimes, they are weak. However, they are not weak due to the criticism of the narrators. Rather, they are weak due to a minor *inqiṭā'* (break in the chain).

In *Kitābut Ṭahārah*:

وقالت عائشة كان النبي ﷺ يذكر الله على كل أحيانه. (pg. 44)

This is a *Ḥadīth* from *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. The (chain of the) narration in *Sunan* is as follows:

بهز بن حكيم عن أبيه عن جده

Sakhāwī ∇ mentioned that Imām Bukhārī ∇ differed with Imām Dhuhālī ∇. This is why when his name comes in narrations, at times, he only states Muḥammad or sometimes he ascribes him to his grandfather and say Muḥammad ibn 'Abdullāh. At times, he ascribes him to his great grandfather and say Muḥammad ibn Khālid. From this, the listener has this doubt that they are different *shuyūkh* but in reality, it is not like this. This action of Imām Bukhārī ∇ is close to *tadlīs* but this does not necessitate that the intention of the narrator remained like this. One should always keep the purest thoughts regarding the people of piety and *taqwā*. The reason Imām Bukhārī ∇ did not mention his name clearly is so that a person does not misunderstand and think that Imām Bukhārī ∇ agreed with Dhuhālī ∇ in the famous *ikhtilāf masā'il* (contentious issue) regarding *khalq Qur'ān*. (*Faṭḥul Mughhīth* 1/181)

This *Ḥadīth* is *ḥasan*. This came in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* on page 42 *ta'līqan*.

In *Kitābuz Zakāh*:

وقال طاؤس قال معاذ بن جبل لاهل اليمن: ائتوني بعرض ثياب من خميص الخ. (pg. 94)

This is *ḍa'īf* (weak) as Ṭā'ūs did not hear from Mu'ādh. However, the chain is authentic until Ṭā'ūs.²

- Those *ta'līqāt* which are mentioned with *ṣegah tamrīd*. The authenticity of the *ta'līqāt* with this *ṣegah* is not known until the *mu'allaq 'anhu*. Through research it has been found that some of them are authentic and some are not. Very few of those that are authentic are according to Imām Bukhārī's ∇ conditions. An objection is raised that why are those that are according to Imām Bukhārī's ∇ conditions mentioned with *ṣegah tamrīd*? The reply to this is that Imām Bukhārī ∇ narrated these as *riwāyat bil ma'nā*. Thus, the *ṣegah* (inflection) was changed. For example, Abū Sa'īd Khudrī's z narration regarding *ruqyah* mentioned in *Kitābut Ṭib* (Chapter on Medicine) is as follows:

ويذكر عن ابي سعيد عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم في الرقي بفاتحة الكتاب (2/854)

This *ruqyah* was not established by Muḥammad n himself. Rather, Abū Sa'īd's z method of recital in the *ruqyah* is established by the approval of the Messenger of Allāh n.

Some of those *ta'līqāt* which are not according to Imām Bukhārī's ∇ conditions are *ṣaḥīḥ*. Some are *ḥasan*. Some are *ḍa'īf*. However, they are practised upon. Some are so weak that there is nothing to strengthen them (i.e., they are not strengthened by being practiced upon).

An Example of a Ṣaḥīḥ [Ta'līq]

² However, Ṭā'ūs met many of *Sayyidunā* Mu'ādh's szstudents. Thus, reliance can be placed on his statements. It is for this reason that Imām Bukhārī ∇ used it as evidence. Imām Shāfi'ī ∇ also considered it reliable. He said:

وقد قال الشافعي: طاؤس عالم بأمر معاذ z وان لم يلقه لكثرة من لقيه ممن أدرك معاذًا، وهذا مما لا أعلم من أحد فيه خلافاً.

(*Nilul Awqār* 4/191. Published in Dār-ul Jīl, Beirut)

An example of a *ṣaḥīḥ* [*ta'līq*] is the narration that is mentioned in *Kitābus Ṣalāh* (1/106):

وَيُذَكَّرُ عَنْ عَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ السَّائِبِ قَالَ قَرَأَ النَّبِيُّ ﷺ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ فِي صَلَاةِ الصُّبْحِ حَتَّى إِذَا جَاءَ ذِكْرَ مُوسَى وَهَارُونَ
الْخ

This is a *Ḥadīth* from *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*.

An example of a Ḥasan [Ta'līq]

An example of a *ḥasan* [*ta'līq*] is the following *ta'līq* which is mentioned in *Kitābul Buyūʿ*:

وَيُذَكَّرُ عَنْ عُثْمَانَ أَنَّ النَّبِيَّ ﷺ قَالَ: إِذَا بَايَعْتَ فَيْلًا وَإِذَا ابْتَعْتَ فَائِلًا. (1/285)

(Dārquṭnī and Aḥmad narrates it.)

An Example of A Ḍaʿīf Ma'mūl Bihi

An example of a *ḍaʿīf* [*ta'līq*] is the following narration regarding bequests:

وَيُذَكَّرُ عَنْ النَّبِيِّ ﷺ أَنَّهُ قَضَى بِالذَّيْنِ قَبْلَ الْوَصِيَّةِ. (1/384)

Imām Tirmidhī √ narrates it *mawṣūlan* from Ḥārith Al Aʿawar who narrates it from ʿAlī. Ḥārith is weak, however, everyone practices on this *Ḥadīth*.

An Example of A Ḍaʿīf Ghayr Majbūr

An example of such a *ḍaʿīf ta'līq* which is not strengthened by practicing upon it, is this *ta'līq* mentioned in *Kitābus Ṣalāh*:

وَيُذَكَّرُ عَنْ أَبِي هُرَيْرَةَ رَفَعَهُ: لَا يَتَطَوَّعُ الْإِمَامُ فِي مَكَانِهِ، وَلَمْ يَصِح. (1/117)

This is a narration from *Sunan Abū Dāwūd*. It is weak due to Layth ibn Abī Sulaym.

Such narrations are very few in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. Imām Bukhārī himself would clearly mention the weakness just as he mentioned here: 'لم يصح' "it is not *ṣaḥīḥ*."

These are all the types of *ta'liq marfū'*. The difference which Imām Bukhārī considered between the *ṣegah jazam* and the *ṣegah tamrīd* is in accordance with the methodology of the *muḥaqqiqīn*. Many *fuqahā'* and authors did not consider this difference, which is not good. Bayhaqī harshly criticized this and said that this statement of Imām Bukhārī: "ما أدخلت في الجامع إلا ما صح" - "I did not include in my *Jāmi'* except that which is *ṣaḥīḥ*", is referring to the *musnad* narrations and not the *ta'liqāt*.

Ḥāfiẓ said that there was no need for this explanation which Bayhaqī gave because it became known from the explanation we have mentioned that all the narrations of Bukhārī are *ṣaḥīḥ*, i.e., accepted in

totality and there are no rejected narrations, except very few. (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 17-19) وفى كلام الحافظ نظر ظاهر

The Total Number of Ta'liqāt

In *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*, there are one thousand three hundred and forty-one (1341) *mu'allaq* narrations. (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 469)

Mawqūfāt

In the *ta'liqāt*, the narrations which are *ṣaḥīḥ* and *mawqūf* on the *Ṣaḥābah* و and *Tābi'īn* are mentioned with the *ṣegah jazam* even if does not fulfil Imām Bukhārī's و conditions. Similarly, those weak narrations which are supported by many chains or by being famous [are also mentioned with the *ṣegah jazam*].

Imām Bukhārī و mentions the *fatāwā* of the *Ṣaḥābah* and *Tābi'īn* and their explanatory statements regarding rulings which have differences of opinion to strengthen and support his own opinion. For this reason, it is befitting to say that all these *mawqūfāt* are either *mutarjam bihi* (i.e., part of the *tarjumah*) or *mutarjam lahu* (i.e., they support and prove the *tarjumah*). However, the primary objective of the compilation is to mention the authentic *aḥādīth*. Therefore, these are all part of the *mutarjam bihi* (i.e., the *tarjumah*). Yes, they are all interconnected to each other, even to the *musnad aḥādīth*. Based on this, some are *mufasssir* (explanatory) for the other and some are *mufassar* (explained) by the other. These *ta'liqāt* can also be called *mutarjam lahu* from that angle. However, the primary objective is the *uṣūl* (i.e., the *aḥādīth mawṣūlah*). Understand this well. This is the best way to evade this issue as it dismisses many of the objections which are created when the author brings such narrations. (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 19)

The number of narrations from the *Ṣaḥābah* و and *Tābi'īn* in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* are one thousand six hundred and eight (1608). (*Fathul Bārī* 13/543)

Fazlur Rahman Azmi

Azaadville, South Africa

Jumādal- 'Ūlā 1410 A.H.

December 1989



The Coherence of Arrangement of The Chapters In Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar √ mentions in the introduction of "*Fatḥ ul Bari*" that our *Shaykh* Abū Ḥafṣ 'Umar Bulqīnī √ has explained the coherence of the arrangement of the chapters of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. He (Ibn Ḥajar √) then mentions this ['Umar Bulqīnī's √ explanation] and adds a few of his own points. In the end, he states that unique, intricate and subtle points have been mentioned regarding this.

'Allāmah Bulqīnī √ said: (Ḥāfiẓ has mentioned a summary of Bulqīnī's discussion). (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 470-473) "Imām Bukhārī √ commenced the book with كيف بدء الوحي (How Divine Revelation Began), and not with كتاب بدء الوحي (The Chapter Regarding the Beginning of Revelation) because the beginning of *waḥī* (Divine Revelation) is also part of the revelation." Ḥāfiẓ √ said: "*Bāb* (باب) was not added to this title because every upcoming chapter is on this same topic. This chapter is the *ummul abwāb* (ام الابواب). It is for this reason that it could not be divided under different headings." Bulqīnī mentioned: "*Bad'ul Waḥī* was mentioned first because Divine Revelation is the source of all good. It is from this that *Sharī'ahs*, prophethood, 'īmān and knowledge came into existence. *Qirā'ah* (Recitation), *rubūbiyah* (Divinity) and the creation of mankind were the topics addressed in the first verse which was revealed. From this (verse), 'īmān also became compulsory. For this reason, after this [chapter *Bad'ul Waḥī*], [the chapters of] 'īmān and knowledge were mentioned. Practicing comes next in line after acquiring knowledge. From among the bodily acts of worships the most virtuous is *ṣalāḥ* and *ṣalāḥ* is not valid without *ṭahārah* (ritual purity). Therefore, the chapter regarding *ṭahārah* is mentioned and the different types and kinds are mentioned. It is also possible that a person is unable to find water and soil, so in such a case what would they do? (The rulings regarding this are also mentioned.) Similarly, those *masā'il* are mentioned which apply to both men and women

equally. Thereafter, those *masā'il* are mentioned which are specific to women. (For example, the rulings of *ḥayḍ* (menstruation) and *nifās* (lochia).)

Thereafter, the next chapter is '*Kitābuṣ Ṣalāh*' wherein he mentions its various types. He then mentions '*Kitābuz Zakāh*'. This order is precisely as it is in the *Ḥadīth* بَنِيَ الْإِسْلَامُ عَلَى خُمْسٍ (Islām is based on five things). There are differences in the *nuskhāhs* as to whether '*Kitābuṣ Ṣawm*' or '*Kitābul Ḥajj*' is mentioned first. Similarly, in the *aḥādīth*, there are also differences in its order. He chose to title the chapter as '*Kitābul Manāsik*' instead of '*Kitābul Ḥajj*' so that '*umrah*' and other rulings connected to both (*ḥajj* and '*umrah*') could be included. Usually, those going for *ḥajj* also visit Madīnah Munawwarah. Therefore, he also included chapters regarding visiting Madīnah Munawwarah and the Ḥaram of Madīnah.

Ḥāfiẓ v explains that the reason for mentioning the chapter of *ḥajj* after the chapter of *zakāh* is due to the fact that actions are either solely connected to the physical body, solely connected to wealth or a combination of both. Thus, he mentions *ṣalāh*, *zakāh* and then *ḥajj*. Fasting is also an action, however, it is an action connected to the *nafs* (inner self) and entails refraining [from doing certain actions]. It is for this reason it is mentioned last. If reliance was placed on the *Ḥadīth* بَنِيَ الْإِسْلَامُ..., it (*Kitābuṣ Ṣawm*) would have been mentioned before *ḥajj* as Ibn 'Umar h objected to his student who narrated this *Ḥadīth* mentioning *ḥajj* first (before fasting). Although other narrations have mentioned *ḥajj* first, they are *riwāyat bil ma'nā* narrations (narrated by meaning). It is possible that the narrator did not know of Ibn 'Umar's h objection. And Allāh knows best."

The aforementioned chapters are regarding '*ḥuqūqullāh*' (حقوق الله) (the rights of Allāh). After this, he mentions '*ḥuqūqul 'ibād*' (حقوق العباد) (the rights of people). In '*Kitābul Buyū'*', he mentions general transactions first. Then, he mentions *bay' salam*, which is a specific type of credit sale. Thereafter, he mentions *bay'ul qahrī*, i.e., *bay' shuf'ah*. After mentioning *bay' ikhtiyārī* and *bay'ul qahrī*, he mentions *ḥawālah*. Sometimes in a transaction, the exact item is present from one side (the buyer or seller) either at the beginning of the contract or at the *majlis* (place of the contract). Sometimes, the sale is such that it is

credit from both sides (the buyer and seller), and it is not necessary for possession to be taken during the *majlis* nor is it necessary to specify either of them. This is known as *hawālah*. It is for this reason that Imām Bukhārī √ then mentions [the chapter regarding] *hawālah*. In a *hawālah* contract, the debt is transferred from one person's responsibility into the responsibility of another. Thus, *wakālah* is mentioned thereafter as its purpose is also the protection of wealth. In *wakālah*, reliance is placed on a person. Therefore, after this, he mentions such chapters in which reliance must be placed on Allāh √. For example, '*Kitābul Ḥarth wal Muzāra'ah*' (The Chapter Regarding Crops and Agriculture). Along with this, he mentions those rulings which are connected to land such as موات (reviving of barren land), غرس (planting crops), شرب (irrigation). These chapters are all regarding taking benefit. Thus, after this he mentions '*Kitābul Istiqrāḍ*' (The Chapter Regarding Debts) as the theme of benefitting others is found in this chapter. He then mentions the ruling regarding a slave being a guardian over his master's wealth. Thus, he cannot conduct transactions without his (master's) permission. From this, the rulings regarding a slave become known.

Transactions can sometimes result in disputes and arguments. Therefore, upon completing the mention of the chapters regarding transactions, the chapters regarding *ashkhāṣ* (disputes), *mulāzamat* (employment) and *iltiqāṭ* (picking up a lost item) are mentioned. In *iltiqāṭ*, the lost item is a *shar'ī amānah* (trust) in the possession of the *multaqiṭ* (person who picked it up). For this reason, he thereafter mentions the chapters regarding *dhulm* (oppression) and *ghaṣb* (usurping), where possession is taken oppressively. Thereafter, some instances are mentioned where apparently it seems to be *ghaṣb*, whereas in reality, it is a *shar'ī* right. For example: placing of a stick on the neighbour's wall, spilling wine in the street, sitting in the balcony, digging a well in the pathway. In this regard, he mentions those rights which are shared. Since robbery occurs in partnerships, the rules of looting (taking an item without permission) are mentioned.

After mentioning the rulings of general partnership, the rules regarding specific types of partnerships are mentioned i.e., '*Kitābush*

Shirkah' etc. These matters are related to benefits between people. Thereafter, those rulings which are connected to the benefits of the transaction, i.e., *rahn* (pawning) is mentioned. In *rahn*, the need arises to remove the burden of debt, and this is necessary from the *rāhin's* side, and it is also permissible from the *murtahin's* side. For this reason, after this, he mentions the chapter regarding *i'tāq* (freeing of slaves) which discusses slavery and the freeing of slaves. This is solely fulfilled from the owner's side not the slave's. Coupled with *i'tāq*, all those things which are connected to it like *umm walad*, *walā'*, *tadbīr*, good conduct with slaves and other rulings related to slavery are also mentioned. For example: *kitābah*. *Kitābah* involves giving. Allāh ﷻ says: وَأَتَوْهُم مِّن مَّالِ اللَّهِ الَّذِي آتَاكُمْ. ("And give them from the wealth of Allāh which He has given you.") Therefore, after this he mentions '*Kitābul Hibah*' and along with it, he also mentions the chapters regarding *ruqbā*¹ and '*umrā*². *Hibah* (gifting) is the handing over of the full ownership of an item without any exchange. After this '*āriyah* is mentioned, as this also is handing over the benefits of the item without an exchange.

Sometimes in transactions, disputes occur and there is a need for witnesses. Therefore, upon completing the rulings of transactions and transferral of ownership, '*Kitābush Shahādah*' is mentioned. Sometimes, contradictions occur among witnesses. For this reason, he mentioned *qur'ah* (drawing lots) which is necessary when the matter becomes difficult. Sometimes, when there are disputes and differences, *ṣulah* (reconciliation/treaty) is done and sometimes [a treaty is contracted] even in the case where there is no dispute. For this reason, '*Kitābuṣ Ṣulah*' was mentioned next. At times, conditions are added to the *ṣulah*. Therefore, he then mentions '*Kitābush Shurūt*'. *Ṣulah* is done either in one's life or after one's death. For this reason, he then

¹ '*Umrā* is a gift which is given for the duration of the person's life. It is given on the condition that once the receiver of the gift dies, it reverts to the giver or his heirs. However, this condition is not valid. [*Qāmūsul Fiqh* 4/415] [Translator]

² *Ruqbā* is a gift which is given on the condition that if the giver dies first, the gift will belong to the one it is given to. However, if he dies first, the gift reverts to the giver. [*Qāmūsul Fiqh* 3/489] [Translator]

mentions '*Kitābul Waṣiyyah*' (The Chapter Regarding Bequests) and '*Kitābul Waqf*' (The Chapter on Endowments).

On completing those topics which are connected to both the creator and the creation, such topics are mentioned which are only connected to the creator, but also requires effort i.e., *jihād*. This is because by *jihād* the message of Allāh ﷻ is elevated and the non-believers are humiliated since they are killed and their women, children and slaves are taken as captives. Firstly, the virtues of *jihād* are mentioned. Thereafter, such is mentioned which indicate that a *mujāhid* should desire to be counted amongst the *shuhadā'* (martyrs). Therefore, باب التحنط عند القتال (The Chapter Regarding Applying *ḥanuṭ* before Battle) is mentioned. Spies, who inform regarding the motives of the enemies, is similar to this. Therefore, it is mentioned. Thereafter, the *aḥādīth* regarding horses are mentioned as the spies are also in need to ride horses. Thereafter the camel and mule of Nabī ﷺ is mentioned. *jihād* is the male's duty, however, some females also participate. For this reason, the rulings [pertaining to women participating] in *jihād* are mentioned. Thereafter matters related to *jihād*, the tools, the matters regarding the battle and the *du'ā's* (supplications) to be recited before the battle etc. are mentioned.

All of these discussions are amongst the narrations regarding him being sent [to all of mankind]. For this reason, the chapter دعاء النبي الناس الي الاسلام (The Invitation of Nabī ﷺ Towards Islām) is mentioned next. It is necessary to accept the dictates of the *imām* (leader) as much as possible, therefore this is mentioned. Sometimes *jihād* is fought without wages and sometimes with wages, therefore, this is also mentioned. The *imām* should be leading [the army]. For this reason, the chapter مبادرت عند الفزع (The Setting Out of The Imām Before the People at the Time of Fright) is mentioned. The usage of means is not against *tawakkul* (reliance on Allāh). For this reason, the chapter, حمل الزاد في الغزو (Taking Provisions in Battle) is mentioned. Thereafter, the chapter regarding the etiquettes on travelling was mentioned. Those returning from the battle sometimes receive *māl ghanimah* (spoils of war), therefore, the chapter regarding '*farḍul khumus*' is mentioned. Wealth taken from the disbelievers is either acquired by war or through peace. For this reason, the matters related to *jizyah* and *dhimmi* are mentioned. Thereafter, those chapters are mentioned which are related to *ṣulaḥ* (peace), '*aḥad* (covenant) and refraining

from deception. Since [the knowledge of] all these matters are derived from Divine Revelation, he mentions these three types of matters in succession starting with the chapter regarding '*Bad'ul Waḥī'*' (beginning of revelation). After mentioning these three matters, he then mentions the chapter regarding '*Bad'ul Khalq*' (the beginning of creation).

Ḥāfiẓ v mentioned that it seems to me that the Chapter of *Bad'ul Khalq* was mentioned after the Chapter of *Jihād* because by participating in *jihād* a person loses his life. Thus, [he mentioned the Chapter of *Bad'ul Khalq* after *Jihād*] to show that this universe is *ḥādīth* (created) and in the end it will perish. Nothing is eternal.

(It came to the blemished and deficient mind of this unworthy translator [i.e., *Ḥazrat Mawlānā* Fazlur Rahman *ṣāḥib*] that the reason *Bad'ul Khalq*, in which *Jannah* and *Jahannam* is mentioned, came after *jihād* is because when a *mu'min mujāhid* (believing warrior) is martyred, he goes to *Jannah* and the *kāfir* (disbeliever) that was killed goes to *Jahannam*. (*Fazl 12*) *Jannah* and *Jahannam* are mentioned due to their connection with *Bad'ul Khalq* because the final abode of the human being is either one of these two. After mentioning *Jahannam*, *Iblīs* and his army is mentioned due to its strong connection as they are the fuel of *Jahannam*. Thereafter, *jinn* were mentioned. The reason the creating of *Ādam* p was mentioned after the *jinn* and animals is because animals were also created before *Ādam* p.

The Noble Prophets p are mentioned in the order in which we believe in them. (This seems appropriate. *Fazl 12*) *Dhūl Qarnayn* is also mentioned in this chapter because according to *Imām Bukhārī* v he was a Prophet. He was mentioned after *Ibrāhīm* p because he was sent before *Ibrāhīm* p. (He was mentioned 'before' is correct. *Fazl 12*)

The reason *Ayūb* p was mentioned after *Yūsuf* p is because both of them were afflicted with difficulties.

After the story of Yūnus ؑ, واسئلهم عن القرية التي كانت حاضرة البحر (And ask them about the village that was present at the sea) was mentioned because the fish swallowed Yūnus ؑ due to which he was afflicted with difficulty but he remained patient and attained salvation. Those people were also tested. Some of them remained patient and attained salvation. However, others transgressed and thus, they were punished.

After mentioning Sulaymān ؑ, Luqmān ؑ was mentioned either because according to Imām Bukhārī ؒ he was also a Prophet or because he was from amongst the disciples of Dāwūd ؑ.

The reason Maryam ؑ is mentioned is because according to him (Imām Bukhārī ؒ), she was a Prophet. After mentioning the Prophets, a few strange incidents from the era of the *Banū Isrāʾīl* were mentioned. Thereafter, some of the virtues of this *ummah* were mentioned although they are not from among the Prophets.

He began by mentioning [the virtues of] the Quraysh as the Qurʾān was revealed in their language. When mentioning [the tribes of] Aslam and Ghifār, he also mentioned the acceptance of Islām of Abū Dhar ؓ as he was the first to accept Islām from that tribe. He then mentions the names and sublime qualities and conduct of Muḥammad ؐ and he also mentions the signs of his prophethood. Then, the first to accept Islām among the *Ṣaḥābah* ؓ were the *Muhājirīn* and *Anṣār*. The *Muhājirīn* accepted Islām before the *Anṣār*. Thus, they were mentioned first. Amongst them, Abū Bakr ؓ was the first [to accept Islām]. Thus, he was mentioned first. The *Anṣār* are mentioned after the *Muhājirīn*, and then all the other *Ṣaḥābah* ؓ are mentioned.

Before mentioning what the *Ṣaḥābah* ؓ did to proclaim and spread the word of Allāh with the Messenger of Allāh ؐ, he mentions the conditions of the period of *jāhiliyyah* (period of ignorance) which came to an end by prophethood. He then mentions the way the *mushrikīn* (polytheists) ridiculed the Messenger of Allāh ؐ and the *Ṣaḥābah* ؓ. He then mentions the condition of the Messenger of Allāh ؐ before the migration to Abyssinia. He then mentions the migration to Abyssinia, the journey to *miʾrāj* etc.

He then mentions the migration to Madīnah and the battles in the order which is correct according to his opinion. He begins the chapter of *‘Maghādhi’*; by mentioning ‘Abdullāh ibn Salām z in hope that this be a good omen for peace. After mentioning the battles, he mentions other delegations and *Ḥajjatul Widā’* and then mentions the approach of the death of the Messenger of Allāh n and his death. The Messenger of Allāh n passed away at such a time when the *Sharī‘ah* he brought was extremely clear and complete. The Qur’ān was also completed. Thus, he mentions *‘Kitābut Tafsīr’* after that. He then mentions the virtues of the Qur’ān and etiquettes regarding its recitation.

Memorising and studying the *Kitāb* and *Sunnah* (Qur’ān and *Ḥadīth*), studying it’s *tafsīr* and discussing its rulings are the means by which the *Dīn* will be preserved in the entire world and the rulings will remain despite the changing and passing of time. It is from this that eternal life will be obtained. For this reason, after this, *nikāḥ* is mentioned. It is through marriage that the human progeny will spread. People who will memorize and preserve the Qur’ān will be born. Thereafter, breast feeding is mentioned because the impermissibility of marriage is connected to it. After that there is the mention of permissible and impermissible women, then in-law relations, *ḥarām* (forbidden) and *makrūḥ* (disliked) marriages, proposals, contracts, dowry (*mahr*), guardian (*walī*), beating the drum (*daff*), *walimah* (wedding feast), conditions in a *nikāḥ* and the remaining details regarding the *walimah*. Thereafter, he mentions kind treatment to women, and he then mentions divorce and marriage to a disbeliever. In the Qur’ān, *ilā’* is mentioned after marriage to the *mushrik*, so Imām Bukhārī v also mentioned it in this order. Then, *ḡihār* is mentioned, which is a temporary separation. Thereafter, *li‘ān* is mentioned, which is a permanent separation. Then, *‘iddah* and *murāji‘ah* are mentioned. Then, intercourse outside of marriage is mentioned. Thereafter, the chapters regarding the wages of a prostitute and invalid *nikāḥ* are mentioned. Then, *mut‘ah* is mentioned. Upon completing the mention of the rulings relating to *nikāḥ*, *nafaqah* (maintenance) was mentioned, which is directly connected to the husband. Since *nafaqah* is related to food, *‘Kitābul Aṭ‘imah’* is mentioned after it which includes the rulings

and etiquettes of eating. Thereafter, mention of a specific type of food, ‘*aqīqah*’, is mentioned. In ‘*aqīqah*’, slaughtering is necessary. Therefore, ‘*Kitābudh Dhabā’ih*’ was mentioned after the chapter regarding ‘*aqīqah*’. Hunting is also a type of slaughtering. Thus, the rulings regarding hunting are mentioned after [*Kitābudh Dhabh*]. Some slaughtering is only done once a year. Therefore, after this ‘*Kitābul ‘Uḍḥiyah*’ is mentioned. After eating, drinking is necessary. Thus, ‘*Kitābul Ashribah*’ is mentioned after [*Kitābul Aṭ‘imah*]. Sometimes, sicknesses develop from eating and drinking, due to which visiting a doctor becomes necessary. For this reason, ‘*Kitābuṭ Ṭib*’ is mentioned after [*aṭ‘imah* and *ashribah*], in which the reward for being ill and those things which are permissible, disliked or impermissible to use for cure, treatment and *ruqyah* are mentioned.

After completing the chapters regarding eating, drinking, medicine and treatment, the *masā’il* of clothing, beautification, fragrances etc. are mentioned which are from amongst the etiquettes of the *nafs* (personal hygiene). Thereafter, the chapters regarding *adab*, *bir* and *ṣilah* (good manners, kindness and ties of kinship) and *isti’dhān* (asking permission) are mentioned. By *salām* and *isti’dhān*, the doors of this world are opened. For this reason, the chapter regarding *da’wāh* was thereafter brought which opens up the doors of the heavens. *Du‘ā’* is also a means of forgiveness. For this reason, the chapter regarding *istighfār* (seeking forgiveness) was mentioned. By seeking forgiveness, one’s sins are forgiven. For this reason, the chapter regarding *tawbah* (repentance) is mentioned. Thereafter, he mentions the *adhkār* and *istighfār* which are specified for a certain time and also those which are not specified. (This is because this is also a form of *dhikr* like *istighfār*.)

Guidance is attained from *du‘ā’* and *dhikr*. For this reason, *mawā’iz* (exhortation), *zuhd* (abstinence) and many of the conditions of the day of *Qiyāmah* were thereafter mentioned. Then, it was mentioned that all matters are in the hands of Allāh, so it was said that the chapters regarding *qadr* (Divine decree) and the matters pertaining to *qadr* were mentioned. Vows are also connected to *qadr*. For this reason, the

chapter regarding vows was thereafter mentioned. There is also an expiation (*kaffārāh*) for [breaking] vows. For this reason, oaths were added. In oaths and vows, *kaffārāh* is needed. For this reason, the chapter regarding *kaffārah* was mentioned.

Upon completing the mentioning of the worldly matters of the people, the conditions after death were mentioned and the chapters regarding inheritance and its laws were mentioned. Upon completing the mention of the rulings other than *jināyāh*, the rulings regarding those connected to crimes are mentioned. The chapter regarding *hudūd* is mentioned and in the end the laws regarding apostates are mentioned. Sometimes an apostate is not considered a disbeliever when he was forced. For this reason, the chapter regarding *ikrāh* (coercion) is mentioned. Sometimes the one who is being forced uses a *ḥīlah* (strategy) and keeps the reality hidden in his heart. For this reason, the chapter regarding *Ḥiyāl* is mentioned in which both the permissible and forbidden types of *ḥīlah* are mentioned. Sometimes, certain things remain hidden in *ḥīlahs*. For this reason, the interpretation of dreams is thereafter mentioned because [the interpretation of] dreams are hidden even though it is apparent to the interpreter. With regards to dreams it is said:

(وَمَا جَعَلْنَا الرُّؤْيَا الَّتِي أَرَبْنَاكَ إِلَّا فِتْنَةً لِلنَّاسِ)

(And We have made what We brought you to see only as a test for the people). For this reason, the chapter regarding *fitan* (trials) is thereafter mentioned. Sometimes, the rulers are also affected by these trials. Thus, they make an effort to eradicate these trials. For this reason, '*Kitābul Aḥkām*' is thereafter mentioned, in which there is mention of the condition of the leaders, rulers and judges.

Some people also wish for leadership and authority. Thus, '*Kitābut Tamannī*' (wishes) is thereafter mentioned. The laws of the rulers are mostly based on the *akhbār āḥād*. For this reason, he mentions the chapter proving the validity of using a *khavar wāḥid* as evidence. All laws and rulings require the Qur'ān and *Sunnah*. Therefore, the chapter regarding *I'tisām bil Qur'ān wa Sunnah* (Holding on to the Qur'ān and *Sunnah*) is mentioned in which *ijtihād* and *istinbāt* (deriving rulings)

from the *Qur'ān* and *Sunnah* are mentioned, and the dislike of disagreement and disunity is stated. The basis of the preservation of Islām lies within [the belief] of *tawḥīd*. It is for this reason, he ended the book with chapter on *tawḥīd*. The last thing which will attest to one's success and failure is whether the scale [with one's deeds] will be heavy or light. It is for this reason he dedicated the last chapter to this and titled it:

بَابُ قَوْلِ اللَّهِ تَعَالَى {وَنَضَعُ الْمَوَازِينَ الْقِسْطَ لِيَوْمِ الْقِيَامَةِ} وَأَنَّ أَعْمَالَ بَنِي آدَمَ وَقَوْلَهُمْ تَوَزَّنْ

Chapter: the statement of Allāh ۱ "And we shall set up balances on the Day of Resurrection" and that the deeds and statements of the sons of Ādam will be weighed.

Imām Bukhārī √ started the book with the *Ḥadīth* of *أَتَمَّا الْأَعْمَالُ بَانِيَاتٍ* (Actions are judged by intentions) and ended it with *أَعْمَالُ بَنِي آدَمَ تَوَزَّنْ* (The actions of the son of Ādam will be weighed). By doing this, he indicates that only those deeds which are done for the sake of Allāh ۱ are accepted.

In the last chapter, the following *Ḥadīth* is mentioned:

كَلِمَتَانِ حَبِيبَتَانِ إِلَى الرَّحْمَنِ، خَفِيفَتَانِ عَلَى اللِّسَانِ، ثَقِيلَتَانِ فِي الْمِيزَانِ سُبْحَانَ اللَّهِ وَبِحَمْدِهِ، سُبْحَانَ اللَّهِ الْعَظِيمِ.

“(There are) two words which are beloved to the Most Beneficent (Allāh) and very light (easy) on the tongue, but very heavy in the balance. They are: ‘*Subḥān Allāhi wa-bi ḥamdiḥi*’ and ‘*Subḥān Allāhil - Adhīm*.’”

In *kalimatān* there is indication towards the ease with which these words are recited and encouragement [to recite these words]. The mention of *ḥabībatan* is to encourage one to recite these words because these two words are beloved to Allāh ۱ and in *khaḥīfatān*, there is encouragement because this action is very easy. The reward for this is expressed in *thaqīlatān*. The order of arrangement of this *Ḥadīth* is in a very unique and great style. That is, the love of Allāh ۱

takes precedence. [After the love of Allāh ﷻ enters a person's heart], he then remembers Allāh ﷻ and consequently, the *dhikr* becomes light on his tongue. After this, the reward of these two words is until the Day of Resurrection. Additionally, the meaning of these two words come at the end of the *du'ā* of the people of *Jannah*. Allāh ﷻ says:

دَعَاؤُهُمْ فِيهَا سُبْحَانَكَ اللَّهُمَّ وَتَحِيَّاتُهُمْ فِيهَا سَلَامٌ وَأَخْرَجَ دَعْوَاهُمْ أَنْ الْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ رَبِّ الْعَالَمِينَ.

[This is a summary of Shaykh Al-Bulqinī's statement.]

وَلَقَدْ أَبَدَى فِيهِ لَطَائِفَ وَعَجَائِبَ، جَزَاهُ اللَّهُ خَيْرًا بِمَنْهَ وَكَرَمِهِ.

(*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 472)

Fazlur Rahman Azmi

May Allāh ﷻ forgive him, his parents, his teachers, his students, and all the believing men and women.

Azadville, South Africa-Before *Jumu'ah*

7th *Sha'bān* 1411 A.H. 22nd February 1991

وَصَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَى النَّبِيِّ الْأَمِيِّ وَأَلِهِ وَصَحْبِهِ أَجْمَعِينَ. وَالْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ رَبِّ الْعَالَمِينَ.



Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī's Tarājim (Chapter Titles)

Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī's tarājim are unique. 'Allāmah Kashmīrī ∇ said: "Imām Bukhārī ∇ was the first person to establish chapter titles and he excelled above all in this regard. No one else before him established such chapter titles and no one else after him could copy or mimic his style. He is the one who opened this door and closed it as well. He also mentions Qur'ānic verses which are connected to the chapter title and sometimes he examined the related Qur'ānic verses.

He also mentions subsidiary rulings (*furu'ī masā'il*) and he also highlights the method of deriving them through the *aḥādīth*. He also draws attention to the aspects of *fiqh* within the Qur'ān. Rather, he establishes *fiqh* from the Qur'ān. In this manner he showed the connection between the Qur'ān, *Ḥadīth* and *fiqh*.

Imām Bukhārī ∇ manifested his proficiency with regards to *ijtihād* and *istinbāt* and the excellence of his profound intellect was displayed in the *tarājim*. It is for this reason that it has been said that: "فقه البخارى فى تراجمه" - "The *fiqh* of Bukhārī is in his chapter titles." In this manner, *fiqh*, *uṣūl fiqh* and *ilm kalām* are different branches of knowledge within the author's *tarājim* which he indicates towards with great brevity. Thus, to understand this is not within everyone's ability." (*Fayḍul Bārī* 1/40)

Kirmānī ∇ has stated: "I have explained the connection between the *aḥādīth* and the *tarjumah* in every chapter. This is such a matter which the successful and accomplished scholars and the greatest of experts in every era remained incapable of doing and thus, they left it out by presenting excuses." He then mentioned Abul Walīd Bājī's ∇ statement. (*Sharḥ Kirmānī* pg. 4)

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar ∇ wrote the following regarding the *tarājim* of Bukhārī in "*Hadyus Sārī*":

The *tarājim* of Imām Bukhārī ∇ are of different types:

1. If he finds a *Ḥadīth* that is connected to the chapter and it meets his conditions, he mentions it with *ṣegah taḥdīth* even though the connection may be vague. He also accepts *ʿanʿanah* (عننه) narrations once his conditions are found.
2. If he does not find a *Ḥadīth* which fulfils his conditions, but it is worthy of being used as an evidence, he does not mention it with the *ṣegah* of *taḥdīth*. Rather, he mentions it in another form. The *taʿliqāt* are also mentioned for this same reason as will be mentioned.
3. If he does not find any *ṣaḥīḥ Ḥadīth* which fulfils Imām Bukhārī's or anyone else's conditions of authenticity, however, the narration can be used for *istinbāṭ* and a group of people gives precedence to it over *qiyās*, then he also collected this type of narration and used its wording or meaning to establish the chapter title. Thereafter, he would mention a Qur'ānic verse or *Ḥadīth* which supports this *Ḥadīth*.

In this manner, the *aḥādīth* mentioned in the chapter titles are of three types. Details of this will be mentioned later. (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 9)

He further mentioned the following details: (see pg. 13,14)

1. Sometimes the chapter title is within the *Ḥadīth* that is mentioned [under its chapter]. The entire *Ḥadīth*, a portion of it or its meaning is mentioned by establishing it as the chapter title. Majority of the time, he does this when more than one possible meaning can be derived from the chapter title. Thus, one meaning is fixed and established by the *Ḥadīth* which is mentioned under the chapter.
2. Sometimes, it is vice versa. Meaning, there is more than one possible meaning for the *Ḥadīth* mentioned in the chapter. Thus, he specifies one meaning for the *Ḥadīth* by adding a restriction to the chapter title. In this way, the chapter title explains the meaning of the *Ḥadīth*. For instance, if a jurist says that the meaning of this *khāṣ* (specific) *Ḥadīth* is *ʿām* (general) or that this *ʿām Ḥadīth* has this *khāṣ* meaning due to some *ʿillah* or that this *muṭlaq* (general)

is *muqayyid* (restricted) or that this restriction is not necessary, and it is not *iḥtirāzī*. In the same way, he explains the explanation of a *mushkil*, the *tafsīr* of a *ghāmiḍ* (ambiguous), the *ta'wīl* of a *zāhir*, the *tafsīl* of a *mujmal*. Such instances are usually extremely difficult. For this reason, a group of *fuḍalā'* says: “فقه البخارى فى تراجمه”.

3. Imām Bukhārī √ usually does this when he does not find any *Ḥadīth* with a clear meaning, according to his conditions to fulfil his objective.
4. Sometimes he does such to sharpen the intellects so that the hidden meanings of the *Ḥadīth* can be derived.
5. He usually adopts the method of doing the *tafsīr* of the *ghāmiḍ* or the *ta'wīl* of the *zāhir* in the case where a *mufasssīr Ḥadīth* is mentioned before or after this chapter. It is as though, he is indicating or referencing towards that [*Ḥadīth*].
6. There are many places where he establishes the chapter title in the form of a question. For example: باب هل يكون كذا ومن قال كذا or one similar to this. This is done when one form cannot be taken with certitude. The objective of mentioning this is to determine whether this command is established or not. Thereafter, he either establishes it, negates it, or establishes the possibility of both.
7. Sometimes one possibility is apparent however, his objective is that there is room for contention. He intends to show that in this case there is such a possibility or contradiction which dictates one to remain silent on. He does this in such instances where he intends to be concise or so that the *mustadil* can have a difference of opinion.
8. In some places, the chapter title appears to be very ordinary and trivial, which does not seem to serve any purpose. However, after pondering, its benefit and purpose is recognised. For example, باب قول الرجل ما صلينا (The Chapter Regarding The statement of a man: “We have not prayed..”) (*Bukhārī pg. 89*)

His objective is to refute the opinion of those who consider this to be *makrūh*. Another example exactly like this is: باب قول الرجل فاتتنا

الصلوة. (The Chapter Regarding The statement of a man: "We have missed the prayer...") (*Bukhārī* pg. 88)

9. Sometimes, he mentions a specific command along with a specific occasion in the chapter title. For example, باب استياك الامام بحضرة رعيته (The Chapter Regarding the Imām Using the Miswāk In the Presence of His Followers). (This chapter is not in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*.) *Using the miswāk* is something which some people consider it to be an insignificant matter which is related to one's personal life. It is for this reason that they consider it better to hide this. However, the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ used the *miswāk* in front of the people. From this, it is deduced that using the *miswāk* is from amongst the matters regarding cleanliness and not from another chapter. Ibn Daqīqul 'Īd ﷺ mentions this. (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 14)

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar ﷺ has mentioned: "I have not seen this chapter in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. Perhaps (Ibn Daqīqul 'Īd) simply mentioned this as an example." (*Muqaddamah Irshādus Sārī* by Qaṣṭalānī pg. 28)

Shaykh Muḥammad Zakariyyā ﷺ has written: "This statement of Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar ﷺ is not in this copy of the introduction of "*Faṭḥul Bārī*" which we have. However, the statement is true because I have also not seen this chapter in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. Yes, in his *Sunan*, Imām Nasā'ī ﷺ mentions the chapter title as follows: باب يستاك الامام بحضرة رعيته (The Chapter Regarding the Imām Using the Miswāk In the Presence of His Followers). (*Nasā'ī* pg. 5) The details of this have been mentioned in *aṣṣ* number 54. (*Al Abwāb wat Tarājim* pg. 14, footnote 1) Ḥazrat Shaykh ﷺ also mentioned that an example similar to this can possibly be: باب دفع السواك (The Chapter Regarding Giving the Miswāk to the Eldest). (*Bukhārī* pg. 38) because it indicates towards a specific occasion which occurred while in an awakened state or in a dream. Ḥazrat Shaykh ﷺ also mentions other examples. (See *Al Abwāb wat Tarājim* pg. 15)

We think that the following chapters are also accurate examples:

باب البول عند صاحبه (The Chapter Regarding Urinating Besides One's Companion) (pg. 35) and باب غسل المرأة أباهَا الدم عن وجهه (The Chapter Regarding Washing Blood By a Woman from her Father's Face) (pg. 38).

10. Sometimes, he used such words in his chapter titles which indicate towards the *Hadīth* which is not according to Imām Bukhārī's ∇ conditions. Alternatively, he mentions a *Hadīth* which is not *ṣaḥīḥ* according to his conditions as the chapter title. He then mentions a *Hadīth* in the chapter which gives the same meaning that is mentioned in the chapter title. Sometimes he does this explicitly and sometimes implicitly. For example, in: باب الامراء من قريش (The Chapter Regarding the Rulers Are from the Quraysh).

This is (the wording of) *Sayyidunā 'Alī's* z *Hadīth* which is not according to Imām Bukhārī's ∇ conditions. However, in this chapter, he mentions the following *Hadīth*: لا يزال وال من قريش (The caliphate will remain in the Quraysh).

This *Hadīth* supports the chapter title.

11. Similarly, he mentions the following chapter: باب اثنان فما فوقها جماعة (The Chapter Regarding Two Are More Persons Are Considered as A Group (for congregational prayer)).

This is (the wording of) Abū Mūsā Ash'arī's z *Hadīth* which is not according to Imām Bukhārī's ∇ conditions. However, in this chapter the following *Hadīth* is mentioned which supports this: فَأَذْنَا وَأَقِيمَا (...let the two of you call the *adhān* and let the two of you call the *iqāmah*...).

12. Sometimes he mentions the words of such a *Hadīth* as his chapter title which is not *ṣaḥīḥ* according to Imām Bukhārī's ∇ conditions. Coupled with this, he mentions a verse or narration. By doing this, it is as if he is saying that there is no *Hadīth* according to my conditions in this chapter.

Due to the lack of awareness and understanding regarding these subtle objectives, those who are superficial in their thinking believe that the author left the book without editing it. However, those who ponder

upon it, will understand it and those who make efforts will be successful. (*Hadyus Sāir* pg. 14)

Mawlānā Muḥammad Zakariyyā Khāndelwī ∇ has written that Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar ∇ mentions eleven (11) *uṣūl* (principles). However, there are more than eleven in reality. (*Al Abwāb wat Tarājim* pg. 6)

The summary of this discussion is that *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī's tarājim* are confusing to the mind by which the intellects become bewildered. Someone beautifully mentions:

أَعْيَا فُحُولَ الْعِلْمِ حُلُّ رُمُوزِهَا

أبداه فى الأبواب من أسرار

Unravelling its secrets exhausted the masters of knowledge.

There will always be secrets within its chapters.

The reason for this is that Imām Bukhārī ∇ revised and edited his *tarājim* between the noble grave and the *minbar* (pulpit) of the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ. He also performed two *rak'ahs ṣalāh* for each *tarjumah*. *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* attained this rank and status due to this. (*Muqaddamah Qaṣṭalānī* pg. 69)

یہ مرتبہ بلند ملا جس کو مل گیا
ہر مدعی کے واسطے دار و رسن
کہاں



Books Written on the Tarājim of Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī

1. Al Mutawārī 'Alā Tarājimul Bukhārī (المُتَوَارِي عَلَى تَرَاجِمِ الْبُخَارِي)

Author: Nāṣir-ud-Dīn Aḥmad ibn Al-Munayyir Khaṭīb Al-Askandariyah ∇ (death: 683 A.H.)

Four hundred (400) of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī's tarājim* have been discussed in this book. Badr-ud -Dīn ibn Jamā'ah ∇ compiled an abridged version of it and made some additions. Nāṣir-ud-Dīn's brother, Zayn-ud-Dīn 'Alī ibn Muḥammad Al-Manṣūr ibn Al-Munayyar ∇ also went into deep discussion on the *tarājim* in his ten-volume commentary. (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 14 and *Muqaddamah Lāmi* pg. 134)

2. Fakkul Agrāḍul Bukhārī Al- Mubhamatu Fil Jama' baynal Ḥadīth wat Tarjumah (فَكَ أَغْرَاضُ الْبُخَارِي الْمُبْهَمَةُ فِي الْجَمْعِ بَيْنَ الْحَدِيثِ وَالتَّرْجُمَةِ)

Author: Muḥammad ibn Manṣūr ibn Jamā'ah Sajalmāsī Maghribī ∇. He discussed approximately one hundred chapter titles. (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 14)

3. Tarjumānut Tarājim (ترجمان التراجيم)

Author: Abū 'Abdullāh ibn Rushayd ∇ (death: 721 A.H.) (*Muqaddamah Lāmi*)

Ḥāfiẓ ∇ has written: "I came across the first volume of Abū 'Abdullāh ibn Rushayd Sabtī's ∇ book, "*Tarjumānit Tarājim*" and it ended at the chapter of fasting. Had it been completed, it would have been very beneficial. It is still very beneficial although it is incomplete." (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 14)

4. Ta'liqul Maṣābaih 'Alā Abwāb Al-Jāmi' uṣ Ṣaḥīḥ (تعلیق المصابيح على أبواب الجامع الصحيح)

Author: 'Allāmah Badr-ud-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr Al Askandarānī Al-Damāminī ∇ (death: 828 A.H.)

The author of "*Kashfuz Żunūn*" included this book among the commentaries of *Şaḥīḥ Bukhārī* and wrote that 'Allāmah Damāminī ∇ wrote this book for the king of India, Aḥmad Shāh ibn Muḥammad Mudhaffar Shāh. (*Muqaddamah Lāmi* ' pg. 90)

'Allāmah Ibn Khaldūn ∇ wrote in his introduction that many commentaries have been written on *Şaḥīḥ Bukhārī*, however this *ummah* still remains indebted to it. Its right has not been fulfilled. Sakhāwī ∇ wrote in his book, "*Al-Ḍaw'ul-Lāmi*": "My teacher wrote "*Fathul Bārī*" and fulfilled the right of *Bukhārī* on behalf of the *ummah*." (*Taqrīr Mawlānā Shabbir Aḥmad 'Uthmānī* printed in Dabhel pg. 22)

In "*Kashfuz Żunūn*", Mullā Kātib Chalpī ∇ wrote that Ibn Khaldūn ∇ quoted this from many of his *mashāyikh* (teachers). I say that perhaps this debt was fulfilled by the researchers, Ibn Ḥajar, Qaṣṭalānī, and 'Aynī. رحمه الله (*Kashfuz Żunūn* pg. 641)

However, a portion of the debt remains to be fulfilled. Meaning, the responsibility of [explaining] the *Ḥadīth* has been lifted, however, the responsibility of [explaining] the *tarājim* still remains. *Ḥazrat* Shāh Walīullāh ∇ wrote a treatise on the *tarājim* of *Şaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. Shāh Şāḥib was the accepted Imām of his time. However, his teacher said that the responsibility still remains. (*Taqrīr 'Uthmānī* pg. 23)

5. Sharḥ Tarājim Abwāb Şaḥīḥ Bukhārī (شرح تراجم أبواب صحيح بخاری)

Author: Shāh Walīuallāh Muḥaddith Dehlawī ∇. This book is printed along with *Şaḥīḥ Bukhārī*.

6. During *Ḥazrat* Shaykhul Hind's ∇ stay in Malta, compiled a translation of the Qur'ān and also a commentary on the *tarājim* of *Şaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. He began this work but was unable to complete it. (*Taqrīr 'Uthmānī* pg. 23)

Ḥazrat Shaykhul Hind ∇ compiled fifteen (15) principles and prepared an index of the *Şaḥīḥ Bukhārī's tarājim*. *Ḥazrat* Mawlānā Ḥusayn Aḥmad Madanī ∇ published it. This can be read in "*Imdād-*

ul-Bārī”, volume 4 page 9-26. This has also been translated in Arabic in “*Al-Abwāb wat Tarājim*”. Shaykul Islām Mawlānā Husayn Aḥmad Madanī ∇ published it under the title “*Al-Abwāb wat Tarājim*”.

7. *Shaykhul Ḥadīth, Mawlānā Muḥammad Zakariyyā* ∇ completed this task, and he discussed each *tarājim* in detail in the book titled, “*Al-Abwāb wat Tarājim*”. The truth is that with this service, the right of the *tarājim* has been fulfilled completely. *Ḥazrat* ∇ mentions seventy (70) principles which were also mentioned in “*Muqaddamah Lāmi*”. The principles of Ḥāfiẓ ∇ and Shaykhul Hind ∇ were also included amongst them. By this service, the debt of the *tarājim* of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* has been fulfilled. فالحمد لله على ذلك، وجزاهم الله خيراً. عَنَّا وعن جميع طلبة العلم.

We are also including the fifteen principles of Shaykhul Hind ∇ as one of the chapters in our book.



Fifteen Principles of Ḥazrat Shaykh-ul-Hind v¹

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

اللهم لا سهل الا ما جعلته سهلاً وانت تجعل الحزن اذا شئت سهلاً ولا حول ولا قوة الا بالله العلي العظيم، وصلى الله على سيدنا ومولانا محمد على آله وصحبه وسلم

رفعت آن شیریں قلندر خوش کہ در ا طوار سیر
تسبیح ملک در حلقہ ز نآر داشت

Principles

This unjust and ignorant servant is appealing in the courts to [the people of] understanding and justice. For quite a long time, it has been my heart's desire and the request of some noble, special servants that I try writing (in the name of Allāh¹) regarding the *tarājim* of the most authentic book after the Book of Allāh (the *Qur'ān*) which has always been the goal of the *akābir 'ulamā'*. These *tarājim* are considered to be the lifelong hard work and earnings of the *Amīrul Mu'minīn* of *Ḥadīth* and a major pillar of the most authentic book. There is no doubt that an equivalent to the lengthy, concise and moderate commentaries which have been written on this blessed and sacred book can rarely be found and it is something for Muslims to take pride in.

جزاهم الله عَنَّا أحسن الجزاء وأفضل الجزاء.

May Allāh¹ reward them with the best and most virtuous of rewards.

However, the respected *akābir* did not find the opportunity to ponder upon and give extra attention to conduct research on the *tarājim* and remain consistent in doing this task due to being preoccupied in

¹ This treatise had become very rare. However, by including it in our book, we have made it easily available. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

research in all fields of knowledge, *tafsīr*, *hadīth*, *fiqh*, *aqīdah*, *asmā’ rijāl*, *lughah* among others. Thus, the respected *akābir* found it more befitting to suffice on the amount necessary. If anyone had done such, we have been deprived of it until now. In summary, the discussions regarding the *tarājim* in the available commentaries are not sufficient for us. Undoubtedly, there is a need for such a person who will be able to offer his services in this field; one who will be able to consistently exert his full efforts in this task with deep thought and ponder upon the available commentaries of the *akābir* and choose the opinion which is most deserving of acceptance. However, as is known to everyone, our condition is such that we can never be worthy of being successful, even in the smallest of ways in fulfilling this important and great task. What can be achieved by the mere yearning of the heart? Thus, at that time I was unable to do anything. I was fortunate to come across a copy of “*Hujjatullāh ‘alal ‘Ālamīn*”, Shāh Walīullāh Dehlawī’s ∇ brief booklet on this topic which was published in Hyderabad. Upon seeing this booklet, I began to see life in my dying hopes and dreams and the unripe fruits began to ripen.² By reading this booklet, it became clear that many of the author’s ∇ mysteries and secrets remain hidden in corners. The booklet is extremely astonishing. However, because of its conciseness, to take full benefit is definitely difficult. However, this long desire and zeal overlooked and disregarded all difficulties and preparations to begin this task was made. However, my helplessness and desperation are not such that it could be overlooked. Thus, I was compelled to select a few knowledgeable and proficient individuals in this field so that this task can be completed in the best possible manner.

حسبنا الله ونعم الوكيل.

Sufficient for us is Allāh and He is the best disposer of our affairs.

²Meaning, the intent [to write regarding this] became firm. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

Now, whatever we mention has all been derived from the research of the elder scholars. However, where necessary, whatever extra is understood will also be mentioned. If there is an error, then there is no need to explain the reason. We, ourselves, are the reason [for this error]. If it is correct then it is from the grace of Allāh and the blessings of the elder scholars.

وفى أموالهم حقٌ للسائل والمحروم، والله الموفق والمعين.

And of their wealth there is a rightful share for those who ask and the destitute. And Allāh is the one who gives the ability, and He is the helper.

Firstly, we wish to mention those principles which the author considered in the chapter titles and are also applicable to the other parts of the book.

It is a known fact that the respected author did not document these principles, rather, the researchers derived these instinctively or after pondering on the chapter titles. For this reason, these principles will always be as the Persian saying goes: ³بهر آنکه دریافت مزید برآن نمود. Thus, it becomes apparent that even now, if someone after pondering, adds such a valid point to the principles which is beneficial and coincides with the objectives of the author, then that would be accepted and appreciated. It will never be rejected.

وَلَا تَنْظُرُوا إِلَى مَنْ قَالَ، فَتَقُولُ بِهِ تَسْتَعِينُ⁴

³ A person will derive in proportion to the amount of effort he puts in. The person who exerts more effort, will derive more principles.

⁴ Do not say that no one until now has written regarding this. How can such a statement be made? After pondering upon the principles, whenever a point is added which is beneficial and useful in finding a connection between the *tarjumah* and the *Ḥadīth* of the chapter and it supports the author's objective, then it is worthy of being accepted and valued. This is because sometimes, a

And do not look at those who say, so we say and from Him we seek help.

Fifteen (15) Principles

(1) Sometimes, the author ∇, uses the wording of the *Ḥadīth* or he uses someone's opinion or statement as the *tarjumah*. However, its apparent coinciding meaning is not the objective. Rather, that which is established by indication is the compiler's objective. Therefore, the evidence that he will mention [under that chapter] will be according to this hidden objective. It is not necessary for it to be clearly connected to the *tarjumah*. Those who consider the apparent *tarjumah* as the objective will not be able to give an acceptable reconciliation even after lots of hard work and effort.

The first chapter which the author ∇ mentioned is:

باب كيف كان بدء الوحي الى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم (The Chapter regarding How Divine Revelation Began). Under this chapter, he mentions six *aḥādīth*. In some of them, revelation is not even mentioned and there is no mention regarding the beginning of revelation in most of them. The beginning of *waḥī* in *Hirā'* is only mentioned in one *Ḥadīth*. It is for this reason that some scholars have clearly stated: "Many of the *aḥādīth* of the chapter are not connected to *waḥī* nor the beginning of *waḥī*. So, how can the chapter be titled: '*Bad'ul Waḥī*'-the beginning of Divine Revelation?"

Majority of the scholars have exerted their efforts in finding a connection by making various *ta'wīlāt* (interpretations) which are mentioned in the commentaries in detail. However, the reality is that none of the researchers have found a connection which is befitting for the author's great status by which all the *aḥādīth* will reconcile with

great point emanates from the lips of a person of low status. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

the *tarjumah* without any doubt. If this is the case in the beginning of the book, how will it be in the other parts of the book?

قیاس کن زگلستان من بہار مرا

However, upon pondering on the *aḥādīth* mentioned in this chapter and from the statements of *Ḥazrat Shāh Walīullāh ṣāhib* v and others, it becomes known that the author's primary objective is not to mention the beginning of *waḥī*. Rather, his primary objective is to highlight the greatness of *waḥī* and to show that it is free from mistakes and errors, and thus, it is binding upon a person to accept and follow its dictates. This is befitting and beneficial to mention in the beginning of the book. It includes both *waḥī matlū* and *ghayr matlū*. The *mabda'* (commencement of *waḥī*) is also general; whether it is regarding the time or the place, or referring to the character or the conditions. In short, the objective is to highlight all the aspects of *waḥī*. Now, [after this is understood], the connection between the *aḥādīth* and the *tarjumah* can be clearly seen. When the occasion arises, we will discuss it in details *insha'Allāh*. In summary, it is important and necessary to understand the objective of the author. It is very beneficial and useful in many instances.

(2) It is a known fact that in his entire book, the author does not repeat any *aḥādīth* nor any *tarjumah*. If repetition does occur, it is considered to be a mistake. Repetition of the *tarjumah* refers to the objective being the same in both the *tarjumahs*. It does not refer to the wordings of the *tarjumah* being the same. For example, in *Kitābul 'Ilm*, there are two chapters with the title, '*Bāb Faḍlul 'Ilm*'. Regarding this, the senior scholars (*akābir*) have stated that what is meant by *faḍl* in one of the chapters is not meant in the other chapter.⁵ Therefore, it is not considered to be repeated. However, this implies that in the cases

⁵ In the first chapter, it means virtue and in the second chapter it means the knowledge which remains. *Faḍl*

where the objective is the same, repetition is not negated by the changing of one or two words until and unless the objectives are different. The objection regarding repetition remains; simply the changing of some words is of no benefit to differentiate between the two. For example: in the beginning of the book, he mentions the chapter: باب كيف كان بدء الوحي الى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم

(The Chapter Regarding How Divine Revelation Began). Thereafter, in *Kitāb Faḍā'il Qur'ān* he mentions the chapter: باب كيف نزول الوحي وأول ما نزل. (The Chapter Regarding How *Waḥī* was Revealed and the First Revelation to be Revealed) Simply by the changing of some words, it does not negate repetition. Rather, it is necessary to highlight the differences between the objectives of each chapter.⁶

(3) It is apparent that the *tarjumatul bāb* is the *mudda'ā* (claim) and the *Ḥadīth* is the evidence for it. However, in many chapters, the author √ has added such a clause or explanation which has not been mentioned in the *Ḥadīth*. Thus, the inability to reconcile necessitates that one becomes perplexed; how can a *muqayyad* (restricted) or *mufaṣṣal* (clear) principle be established by this *muṭlaq* (general) or *mujmal* (ambiguous) evidence? Thus, an objection is made against the author due to this inability to reconcile or one is compelled to go through difficulty to search for a *ta'wīl*. Consequently, there are examples of this mentioned in the commentaries. However, the reality is, as the *muḥaqqiq* (researcher) 'Allāmah Sindhī √ mentions, that the author's *tarājim* are not restricted to the *Ḥadīth* being an evidence for it. Rather, some *tarājim* are such that they are commentaries for the *aḥādīth* and explain them. Thus, if in the *Ḥadīth* mentioned, there is such a generality or ambiguity that there is the possibility of it being

⁶ Therefore, the difference between the two chapters has been highlighted in different ways. In *Kitābul Faḍā'il*, only *waḥī matlū* is meant. *Waḥī ghayr matlū* is not meant. Additionally, the conditions surrounding the one to whom *waḥī* was revealed is not discussed [in *Kitābul Faḍā'il*]. For this reason, "الى رسول ن" الله" is not included in this chapter title. **Fazl**

misunderstood, the author in light of other *aḥādīth* and other evidences, removes this generality in the *tarjumah* and the correct meaning of the *Ḥadīth* becomes apparent. Alternatively, it can also be said that if the evidences appear to be contradictory, the author adds a clause in the *tarjumah* due to the need to reconcile them. For example, in ابواب الحيض (The Chapters on Menstruation), he mentions a sub-chapter titled: باب الصفرة والكرة في غير أيام الحيض (The Chapter on yellow and muddy coloured blood in other than the days of *Ḥayḍ*). In this chapter, he mentions the following *Ḥadīth* of *Umme ‘Aṭiyyah* ر: لا نعد الكرة والصفرة شيئاً (We do not count yellow or muddy coloured blood as anything). The restriction of في غير أيام الحيض which was mentioned in the *tarjumah* was not mentioned in the *Ḥadīth*. However, the author adds this restriction due to other *aḥādīth* [which are inclusive of this restriction] and evidences by which the *ṣaḥīḥ* (correct) and true meaning of the *Ḥadīth* becomes clear.⁷ Alternatively, it can also be said that there is a clear contradiction between this *Ḥadīth* of *Umme ‘Aṭiyyah* ر and the narration of *Ṣiddiqah* ر which states: ولا تعجلن حتي ترين القصة البيضاء (Do not hasten until you see pure white). The two are reconciled by the restriction of the author (in the *tarjumah*).

قلله درّه ثم لله درّه

His success is from Allāh. How excellent and capable he is!

(4) Sometimes, there is one meaning for the chapter title which is apparent and another hidden meaning. In such a case, most of the *Ḥazrat-e-Naazirīn* (respected readers) fixes the apparent meaning, whereas the author intended the second meaning. Due to this, it becomes difficult to find the connection between the *Ḥadīth* and the *tarjumah*, the result of which would be the same as mentioned above. Many suspect that the author did not connect [the *Ḥadīth* to the

⁷ This restriction is mentioned in *Sunan Abū Dāwūd* (1/43 بعد الطهر شيئاً).

chapter] while some others would exert lots of effort to find a connection by bringing far-fetched *ta'wīlāt*. For example, he mentions the chapter: باب ما يقول بعد التكبير ('The Chapter Regarding What is Recited after the *Takbīr*') and mentions three *aḥādīth* under this chapter. One narration is regarding *Ṣalātul Kusūf* which has no connection to the chapter title. Therefore, some commentators searched for an interpretation, while some of the researchers rejected these interpretations and did not accept them. However, the root reason for this confusion is because the apparent meaning of the chapter title is taken, i.e., the compiler intended specifying a *du'ā'*. However, after pondering on the *Ḥadīth* of the chapter it becomes clear that the compiler intended to highlight that there is leniency regarding [reciting] the *du'ā'*, i.e., one has the choice regarding reciting it or not and also regarding whether one reads it continuously or separately. Additionally, one may read whichever *du'ā'* one wishes to. Now, in this manner, all three *aḥādīth* are connected to the chapter title. Similarly, it was mentioned in the second principle that the chapter regarding the virtue of knowledge is mentioned twice. There are two meanings regarding the virtue of *ʿilm* (knowledge): the apparent and the hidden. The author √ placed the first chapter in accordance with the first meaning and the second chapter in accordance with the second meaning. However, the one who takes the apparent meaning in both instances, would definitely raise the objection against the author that the chapter title is repeated which in reality is an objection against his own intellect and understanding, and not on the author.

(5) Sometimes, according to the author, the meaning of the *tarjumah* is precisely that which is apparent. However, there is some difficulty and intricacy in reconciling the *Ḥadīth* with the *tarjumah* which we are unaware of. Due to this, we make objections against the author or the opportunity to make unacceptable interpretations arise. For example, by establishing the chapter: باب ما يذكر في الفخذ (The Chapter Regarding That which is mentioned About the Thighs), he mentions the evidence regarding the thighs being part of the *ʿawrah* and the evidence

regarding the thighs not being part of the *‘awrah*. He also mentions the following narration of Zayd ibn Thābit z as evidence that the thighs are not part of the *‘awrah*: وفخذه على فخذي (And his thigh was on my thigh). However, the manner in which this establishes the objective of the *tarjumah* is not clear. Those scholars who understand the primary discussion, clarify the way it can be reconciled without any difficulty.⁸ Some have only undertaken formalities. This will become clear when this is discussed in its relevant chapter *inshā’Allāh*.

(6) In some instances, the author v mentions a *Ḥadīth* which is not connected to the *tarjumah*. However, in another chapter, he mentions such a *Ḥadīth* which has a word which is clearly connected to the previous *tarjumah*. A person who is unaware of this is compelled to go through unnecessary difficulty [to find a connection].

In the beginning of the book, the author v mentions *Sayyidunā Ibn ‘Abbās*’s narration: بَيْتُ فِي بَيْتِ خَالَتِي مَيْمُونَةَ الْخ (I spent the night in my maternal aunt, Maymūnah’s house...) under the chapter, باب السمر في العلم (The Chapter Regarding Late Night Conversations Pertaining to Knowledge) In this narration, there is no mention of *samar* (late night conversation). The commentators were compelled to come up with various interpretations. However, they are all far-fetched. *Muḥaqqiq* (The researcher) Ibn Ḥajar v, after pondering and researching, found a *Ḥadīth* in a *Kitābut Tafsīr* which clearly has the following wording: فَتَحَدَّثَ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ ﷺ مَعَ أَهْلِهِ سَاعَةً ثُمَّ رَقَدَ .

والحمد لله وجزاه خيرا

All praise is for Allāh¹. May Allāh¹ reward him.

⁸ The author v placed this to be in the situation where there was no barrier [between the two thighs] and in this way, he uses it as evidence that the thigh is not part of the *‘awrah*.

Sometimes, the *Ḥadīth* whose wording coincides with the wording of the *tarjumah* is not according to the compiler's conditions even though it may be *ṣaḥīḥ* (authentic) and reliable. For this reason, the author did not mention this narration in his entire book. Only a person who researches and studies the books of *Ḥadīth* and tries to avoid the method of interpretation which appears to be obvious, easy and concise will become aware of this. From all the points which we have mentioned until now, and also from many others, it becomes clear and obvious in many places that this is the objective of the *ʿAmīrul Muʾminīn* in *Ḥadīth*. I have made this conclusion after working hard year after year in its compilation and research. Many other scholars have also paid full attention in order to understand it and solve it according to their abilities. For these reasons, the scholars said that *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* is most beneficial for the *khawāṣ* (specialists). Despite the length and difficulties, the amount of attention the *akābir ʿulamāʾ* paid in the service of this blessed book is unparalleled. فجزاه الله وإياهم عَنَّا
أحسن الجزاء

(7) In many instances, coupled with the *tarjumatul bāb*, the author √ quotes the narrations and statements of the *Ṣaḥābah* ∩ and the opinions of the *tābiʾīn* before mentioning the *Ḥadīth*. Thus, there are two cases regarding this:

Their narrations and statements are used as evidence to support the *tarjumah* and this is apparent.

Secondly, the narrations and statements are not evidence, but if there is a connection even in the smallest of ways, it is mentioned to strengthen the point. الشيء بالشيء يُذكر. Most of the scholars only consider them to be evidence for the *tarjumah* and thus undergo formalities or they are compelled to raise objections against the author. صرح به العلامة
السندھی وغیرہ (ʿAllāmah Sindhī and others have clarified this.)

(8) In some instances, the author only mentions the word '*bāb*' and thereafter mentions a *musnad Ḥadīth*. He does not mention any

chapter title. The commentators mention a few possibilities regarding this which are known to the *naẓīrīn* (readers). However, after pondering and researching, the preferred opinion is that the *tarjumah* was not omitted mistakenly nor forgetfully. Neither was it omitted with the intention to establish an appropriate *tarjumah* at a later time. Rather, he intentionally omitted the *tarjumah* and this is precisely his objective. There are two reasons for this omission:

Firstly, this chapter is joined to the previous chapter, and it has some form of connection to the previous chapter. The scholars regard this as a *faṣl* to the previous chapter. The *muḥaddithīn* call it '*bāb minhu*' in their compilations. However, it must be taken into consideration that according to the expansive foresight of the author, the scope of the connection is also extensive.

Secondly, in some instances, the author intends to sharpen the mind and develop a person's insight. The objective of this is so that the experts in this field can also derive rulings from this *Ḥadīth*. This matter is self-evident that any type of deriving is not enough. Rather, it is necessary to consider two points:

Firstly, it should be other than the rulings which the author derived from this *Ḥadīth*. Secondly, such a *tarjumah* is derived which is in cohesion with the chapters under which this chapter without a *tarjumah* is mentioned. This matter is befitting to both the author's status and style. Thus, whenever we see a chapter without a *tarjumah*, we should first check if there is any connection with the previous chapter or not. If there is, then so be it; the previous *tarjumah* will be sufficient. If it is not connected, then it is necessary to think about formulating a new *tarjumah* by considering the aforementioned two restrictions.

Due to mere far-fetched possibilities, this matter is befitting and beneficial for various reasons. Despite the author mentioning many chapters without a *tarjumah*, all of them are restricted to the aforementioned two cases. However, in certain instances, it is necessary to

truly ponder upon it. If, per chance, one or two chapters are found in the entire book which cannot be placed in any of the two cases, then the dictates of the mind and intellect demands that we place it upon our deficient understanding and intellect. The one who denies this to the extent that he places it upon someone's error or mistake and makes his heart happy and content in two or four places of the book benefits the author as this protects him from the effects of the evil eye.

In summary, after exempting instances of need, such chapters are placed in those two scenarios even though there will be some sort of difficulty, because the matter is known and accepted that the author, in many places does not hesitate in establishing his objective even if it is through a distant similarity. Some chapters are such that there are both possibilities, i.e., it is connected to the previous chapter and establishing a new chapter title is also befitting (without any formality or difficulty). Alternatively, many new chapter titles can be applied in this context. Thus, by pondering upon such a case, the most preferred opinion becomes known that the knowledgeable author omitted the title due to the numerous benefits and due to the fear of restricting the benefits he did not fix nor establish a title. Sometimes, there is some sort of misunderstanding or objection in the previous chapter(s). Thus, in order to remove this misunderstanding or objection, the author brings this chapter without a title and mentions such a *Ḥadīth* which clarifies the confusion. Sometimes, due to some fear or caution he does not consider it befitting to explicitly mention the title.

(9) In many places, only the *tarjumah* is mentioned along with the chapter, however, the *musnad Ḥadīth* is not mentioned. We call these *tarājim mujarradah*. The commentators and researchers also mention a few possibilities regarding this. Where the *tarjumah mujarradah* is mentioned, there are these same possibilities. However, in our opinion after pondering over it a more accurate explanation can be found. For this reason, it is said that the *tarājim mujarradah* are of two types:

Although there is no mention of a *musnad Ḥadīth* under the title, however, an *āyah*, *Ḥadīth* or the statement of someone is mentioned under the *tarjumah*. We call this '*tarājim mujarradah ghayr maḥḍah*' and many examples of this type is found in the book.

After establishing the title, nothing else is mentioned. That is, just as no *musnad Ḥadīth* is mentioned under the title, similarly, no *āyah*, *Ḥadīth* nor *āthār* was included. Nothing else was mentioned other than the claim. We consider it appropriate to name this type, '*tarājim mujarradah maḥḍah*'. There are very few examples for this. In the second type i.e., '*tarājim mujarradadah maḥḍah*', there are a few chapters where the author uses a verse as the chapter title. Now, the *tarjumah mujarradah* would be of three types:

Firstly, *tarājim mujarradah ghayr maḥḍah*.

Secondly, *tarājim mujarradah maḥḍah*. *Tarājim maḥḍah ṣūrīyah* is a suitable name for those in which the *āyah* is used as the *tarjumah*.

Thirdly, *tarājim mujarradah maḥḍah*. The one in which the author uses his statement. Thus, this type of *tarjumah* can be named *tarājim maḥḍah ḥaqīqīyah*.

After mentioning these details, it is clear that in the first type, i.e., *tarājim mujarradah ghayr maḥḍah*, coupled with the *tarjumah*, a verse or *Ḥadīth* or a *musnad* statement which is worthy of being used as an evidence is mentioned which is sufficient to prove the objective. Thus, it is clear that in order to prove the author's objective, no probability remains which would necessitate that another evidence be brought forth.

By the author sufficing on the evidences mentioned, it does not cause any type of confusion. Similarly in type two, i.e., *tarājim maḥḍah ṣūrīyah*, although no evidence is mentioned along with the *tarjumah*, however, the *tarjumah* itself is the *Qur'ānic* verse which is the strongest evidence over all the other evidences. Thus, it is clear that

there is no need for an evidence to prove itself. It appears to be merely a *tarjumah* but in reality, it is دعوى دليلها نفسها it is a claim for which its evidence is itself. For this reason, the condition of this type of *tarājim* should be (to a higher degree) precisely that which was mentioned for the first type. In these two types, why did the author not bring a *musnad mustamirah Ḥadīth* and only sufficed on an *āyah* etc.? The reason for this can be either one of the following:

The author did not find a *Ḥadīth* according to his conditions.

There is such a *Ḥadīth*, however, it is mentioned in another place. Therefore, it is not repeated here.

It is to sharpen the mind and intellect.

In the third type, i.e., *tarājim maḥdah ḥaqīqiyah*, no evidence is mentioned along with it nor can it be considered a proof or evidence itself. Therefore, it appears to be a claim without an evidence. Regarding this type, even after thorough research, very few of this type of *tarjumah* is found. They do not even reach ten. Based on our deficiency in searching and differences in the *nuskhahs*, there could be more than this number and it is also possible that they can be less in number. So, of these very few *tarājim*, most of them are such that a clear *musnad Ḥadīth* is mentioned in a previous or upcoming chapter. In total, there are two or three chapters that although a *Ḥadīth* which connects to the title is not found in the chapters close to it, however, a *Ḥadīth* can be found which connects to the title in chapters further away from it. After considering these points, the preferred opinion seems to be that the author also sufficed on the *tarjumah maḥdah* intentionally in these cases. Additionally, in order to refrain from repetition or to sharpen the intellects or due to the other two reasons mentioned previously, he considers those *aḥādīth* which are mentioned in a chapter that is attached to this one or a further chapter to be sufficient to prove the claim of the *tarjumah*.

هذا ما عندنا من التفصيل، والله أعلم بالصواب ويُرَادُ العباد.

(10) In some instances, the author √ establishes and proves one objective in repetitive *tarājim* and chapters. There are different forms of this. For example, they are concise in one chapter and are explained in another chapter. Sometimes, the point of the *tarjumah* is proven in the first chapter with evidence other than the *musnad Ḥadīth*. In the second chapter, it is proven with a *musnad Ḥadīth*. Sometimes, there is more than one *tarjumah* but their objective is the same. Sometimes, the *Ḥadīth* which is brought to prove the *tarjumah* is deficient in proving the objective. After this, the *Ḥadīth* which is brought in the second chapter rectifies the defects of the former. Sometimes, a *musnad Ḥadīth* is mentioned to prove a *tarjumah* and this *Ḥadīth* also establishes another chapter in its appropriate place. After this, when the second *tarjumah* is established, this *Ḥadīth* is not mentioned again. The first *Ḥadīth* is sufficient. Those who do not ponder over it, say that Imām Bukhārī √ could not bring the *ḥadīth* for some reason although Imām Bukhārī √ has already mentioned it previously. كما فصلنا في تراجم المجردة (As we have outlined in the discussion regarding the *tarājim mujarradah*.) Sometimes a few matters are mentioned in the *tarjumah* but only some are mentioned in the *Ḥadīth*. In such a case, it is compensated by the *āthār* and statements mentioned below the *tarjumah*, and sometimes it is proven by *qiyās* (analogy). In many cases in the *tarjumah*, such an unknown, vague and ambiguous word is mentioned that even the commentators differ regarding specifying and explaining its meaning. In such a case, the possibility which is most befitting in the context and that which does not cast any doubts regarding the author should be preferred. If both possibilities are equal, then we will understand that the author intends both meanings and that is why he chose such a word.

(11) In many instances, there are such *tarājim* for which there is no need to explain. There are a few reasons for this. Firstly, it indicates towards the refutation of someone's statement. For example, Shāh

Walīullāh ^v9 mentions that the author indicates in many instances towards the refutation of the statements of *Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah* and *Muṣannaf ‘Abdur Razzāq* which becomes known by researching their books.

Secondly, there is the possibility of doubt in certain instances or there is a doubt regarding the contradiction of a narration. The author does this to remove this (doubt).

Thirdly, although there is no need to mention the *jawāz* and *ibāḥah* (permissibility), there is however, a need to establish a *sunnah* or *istiḥbāb* which is suspended on the statements and actions of the legislator. Also, see how beneficial and important it is to make those rulings which are derived and based upon logic *maṣṣūṣ*.

(12) Sometimes, the author mentions a *tarjumah* which fulfils his objective. However, in the narration, its evidence is not precisely found. Alternatively, there are few evidences or there is a doubt in them. Therefore, after the *tarjumah*, he mentions another befitting *tarjumah* for which its exact evidences are explicitly mentioned. He mentions narrations according to the second *tarjumah* and the objective of this narration is to establish the first *tarjumah* which is the primary objective. The second *tarjumah* is mentioned to create ease with regards to the evidences.

(13) Sometimes, two matters are mentioned in the chapter title. However, only one portion is mentioned in the *Ḥadīth*. On seeing this, such a thought may occur that one part of it has been left without being proven, whereas the objective of the author was only the first part and the other part is accepted and apparent. It is only mentioned by the way or as a precaution. Therefore, there was no need to mention a *Ḥadīth* which was connected to it.

⁹ Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar ^v also mentions this in various places. He also mentions the names of those who made the statements. (*Faṣl*)

(14) Sometimes, after mentioning the *tarjumah* and a *Ḥadīth* connected to it, another such narration is mentioned in which its connection to the chapter title is not apparent. The reason for this is that there is some discussion in the first *Ḥadīth* which is worthy of mentioning and the second *Ḥadīth* is brought in order to complete it. It is not brought to establish nor prove the chapter title. Rather, sometimes due to some necessity, the second *Ḥadīth* which contradicts the *tarjumah* is mentioned.

(15) In many instances, the ruling of the chapter title is not mentioned. The title is mentioned on its own in its generality. Most of the time it is understood without any difficulty. Sometimes a dispute arises among the ‘*ulamā*’. Sometimes, due to this, the situation arises where the author is accused of mentioning a *Ḥadīth* which does not coincide with the *tarjumah*. In such situations it is befitting that after pondering over the narrations, one establishes either the generality or the restrictions of the chapter title, whichever is best. Additionally, the connection of the *Ḥadīth* must also be considered when specifying the restriction.

The booklet of Shaykhul Hind ∇, which is published by the title “*Al Abwāb wat Tarājim*”, compiled by *Hazrat* Shaykhul Hind *Mawlānā* Maḥmūdul Ḥasan قدس سره and published by *Shaykhul Islām Mawlānā* Ḥusayn Aḥmad Muhājir Madnī, the resident of Kolkata, India, which is printed by Maktabatul Muḍāribah Deoband, also came into my possession. A comparison was also made with this. After this, Shaykhul Hind ∇ discussed each chapter from the beginning until باب من أجاب السائل بأكثر مما سأله. Another booklet was also found, which included a discussion on a few chapters after this as well. The entire book is priceless.



An Introduction and Enlightenment on the

Commentaries and Marginalia of Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī

The author of *“Kashfuz Zunūn”* mentioned seventy-nine (79) *shurūḥ* (commentaries), *hawāshī* (marginalia) and *mukhtaṣarāt* (abridged versions) of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* and *Shaykh* Muḥammad Zakariyyā v mentioned one hundred and thirty-two (132) commentaries, footnotes and *amālī* (dictations) in the introduction of *“Lāmī‘ud Darārī”*.

Shaykh Muḥammad ‘Aṣām ‘Arrār Al-Ḥusaynī Ad-Dimashqī v mentioned three hundred and seventy-five (375) books which have been written regarding *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* in his book *“Itḥāful Qārī bi M‘arifatil Juhūd wa A‘mālil ‘Ulamā’ ‘alā Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī”*.

I got this book from Damascus. It was written on 25/12/1405 A.H.

The Most Famous Commentaries of Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī

1. *Faṭḥul Bārī bi sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* (فتح الباری بشرح صحيح البخاري)

Author: Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar Al-Asqalānī ∇

Birth: 773 A.H

Death: 852 A.H¹

The compilation of this commentary began in 817 A.H and it was completed in the beginning of *Rajab* 842 A.H. In this manner, this work was completed in twenty-five (25) years. Before this, the introduction, i.e., “*Hadyus Sārī*” was completed in 813 A.H. Even earlier than this, in 804 A.H, “*Taghlīq ut Ta’līq*” was completed, in which the *takhrīj* of the *ta’līqāt* of Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī was done. (*Faṭḥul Bārī* 13/546 and *Muqaddamah of Taghlīqut Ta’līq* pg. 215)

In his book “*Intiqādul I’tirād*”, Ḥāfiẓ ∇ wrote: “I commenced the (writing of the) *sharḥ* of *Bukhārī* in 813 A.H. Before this I had collected the *mu’allaqah aḥādīth* in a separate book called “*Taghlīqut Ta’līq*”, which was completed in 804 A.H. Thereafter, an introduction was also prepared, which comprised of all the objectives of the *sharḥ* other than *istinbāt*. This was completed in 813 A.H. In this same year, I started working on [compiling] the commentary. I wrote one part which was very detailed and explanatory. Then I feared that [by writing] in such a detailed manner, the commentary may not be completed. Therefore, I

¹ This is that ingenious personality who came to this world. Read regarding him and the manner in which Ḥāfiẓ ∇ wrote this *sharḥ*. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykhī*]

² Ḥāfiẓ ∇ wrote this book as a reply to the objections of ‘Allāmah ‘Aynī∇. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykhī*]

started writing a moderate sized commentary which was titled *“Fathul Bārī bi sharḥil Bukhārī”*. After approximately five years, a quarter of this commentary was prepared. Thereafter, I met a group of skilled and efficient students who assisted me in compiling this *sharḥ...*”³ (*Muqaddamah Lāmi* ‘ pg. 128)

From this statement of Ḥāfiẓ ∇, it becomes known that the work on this commentary commenced in 813 A.H. And Allāh ۞ knows best!

“Intiqāḍul I’tirāḍ” was written as an answer to the objections of ‘Aynī ∇. Likewise, another book *“Al Istīnṣār ‘alat Ṭā‘īnil Ma‘thār”* was also written to expose the errors of ‘Aynī ∇.⁴

“Fathul Bārī” comprises of thirteen (13) volumes and the introduction, *“Hadyus Sārī”* is one large volume. This commentary of Ḥāfiẓ ∇ is known to be the best of *sharḥs* and it is the most famous of them.

When this commentary was completed on Monday 2nd *Sha‘bān*, Ḥāfiẓ ∇ hosted a magnificent feast in which almost all the prominent people were present. Five hundred (500) *dinārs* were spent on this feast. The kings of foreign lands arranged for [many copies of] this *sharḥ* to be written, and it was sold for three hundred (300) *dinārs*, thus becoming famous in the entire world.⁵ (*Muqaddamah Lāmi* ‘ pg. 128)

2. ‘Umdatul Qārī sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī (عمدة القارى شرح صحيح البخاري)

³ He completed this work with his students. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁴ The meaning of ‘*ma‘thār*’ is the one who makes a lot of errors. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁵ They still recognised and accepted [this *sharḥ*] despite their differences in *madhāhib*. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

Author: ‘Allāmah Badrud Dīn Abī Muḥammad Maḥmūd ibn Aḥmad Al-‘Aynī ∇ (death: 855 A.H)⁶

‘Allāmah ‘Aynī ∇ was born on the 17th of *Ramaḍān* 762 A.H in ‘Ayn Tāb which is three *manzils* from Ḥalab thus he was eleven years older than Ibn Ḥajar ∇ and he also died three years after Ḥāfiẓ ∇ in *Dhul Ḥijjah* 855 A.H.

“*Umdatul Qārī*” comprises of twenty-five (25 volumes) which has been published in Egypt in twelve (12) volumes. However, ‘Allāmah ‘Aynī ∇ divided it in to twenty-one (21) volumes. In the end of the *sharḥ*⁷ ‘Aynī ∇ wrote: “I completed the writing of the 21st volume of this work in the end of the first third of Saturday night, 5th *Jumād-al-‘Ūlā* 847 A.H and began the compilation of this work in the end of *Rajab* 820 A.H.” (In this way, this work was completed in twenty-seven (27) years.)

He thereafter mentioned the details [regarding its compilation]. The first volume was completed on 6th *Dhul Ḥijjah* 820 A.H, the second volume on 7th *Jumād-al-‘Ukhrā* 821 A.H, the third volume on 8th *Jumād-al-‘Ūlā* 833 A.H. (It is possible that 838 A.H is more correct. (*Muqaddmah Lāmi* ∇ pg. 129)) I then stopped writing for half a year. The gap between these two volumes is sixteen (16) years⁸. The fourth volume was

⁶ ‘Allāmah ‘Aynī ∇ was a *Ḥanafī*. He and Ḥāfiẓ ∇ were from the same era. Both resided in Cairo, Egypt. There were a lot of heated arguments and discussions between the two. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁷ It was his habit to add the year etc. in the end of his compilation. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁸ It would be sixteen (16) years in the case if it is accepted that he completed the third volume in 838 A.H. it is due to this that *Shaykh* Muḥammad Zakariyyā ∇ said that changes have been made here.

During this gap, ‘Aynī ∇ went to Rome on the request of the King Mu’ayid and he became the *Qaḍī ul Qaḍāh* (chief judge) in 829 A.H. During this time, he translated his Arabic history book into Turkish and read it out to the King,

completed on the 9th *Rabīʿul Awwal* 839 A.H. Thereafter, the writing and compiling continued in a steady and consistent manner until the book was completed in 847 A.H.

ʿAynī ∇ started writing his commentary shortly after Ḥāfiẓ ∇ and completed it five years after Ḥāfiẓ ∇. ʿAynī’s *sharḥ* was completed five years before the death of Ḥāfiẓ ∇. There was rivalry between these two. They refuted one another. Both of their books were written around the same time. Some students would regularly come by both of them⁹. Burhān ibn Khidr, a student of Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar ∇, showed ʿAynī ∇ a portion of Ḥāfiẓ’s ∇ *sharḥ*. For this reason in some places, ʿAynī ∇ quotes and refutes Ḥāfiẓ’s ∇ statement by referring to him with the words ‘بعضهم بعضهم’.

When ʿAynī’s ∇ commentary was published, Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar ∇ wrote “*Intiqāḍul I’tirāḍ*” to refute ʿAynī ∇. He wrote the objections leaving blank spaces to write the answers. However, he never had the opportunity to do so. He passed away. From this, it is known that the ʿAynī’s ∇ objections were strong. Ḥāfiẓ ∇ gave satisfactory answers to some of them. In some other places, ʿAynī’s ∇ objections are completely weak. (*Badrud Dīn ʿAynī wa Athriḥī* by Shaykh Ṣāliḥ Maʿtūq)

Ḥāfiẓ ∇ wrote that in 822 A.H., a student showed me a booklet written by the *muḥtasib* (superintendent)¹⁰ of Cairo, Egypt in which there was

Ashraf Barsbāʿi. ʿAynī ∇ resigned from the position of judge in 842 A.H. and Saʿdud Dīn Damīrī Ḥanafī became the judge.

⁹ This student would bring information from both teachers and show it to the other teacher. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

¹⁰ Allāmah ʿAynī ∇ was the superintendent of Cairo, Egypt. The job of the superintendent is to guard the city and make sure that no one does anything wrong. This is one branch of *amr bil maʿrūf* and *nahī ʿanil munkar* (enjoining good and forbidding evil). The one who goes around doing this is called a

more than eighty (80) errors. I wrote one volume regarding it, which was called “*Al Istiṣṣār ‘alāt Ṭā‘īnīl Ma‘thār*”. In this volume, there was a response to the *fatwā* regarding the introduction of ‘Aynī’s ∇ *sharḥ*.

Kawtharī ∇ wrote that after ‘Aynī’s ∇ *sharḥ* was published, Ibn Ḥajar ∇ made a few corrections in his book. (*Muqaddamah Lāmi’* pg. 130, 139, *Muqaddamah ‘Umdatul Qārī* by Kawtharī pg. 9 and *Muqaddamah Fayḍul Bārī* pg. 38)

Some people accuse ‘Aynī ∇ of benefitting from Ibn Ḥajar’s ∇ *sharḥ* without referencing him. The proof [which supports this accusation] is that in some places, the text is exactly the same as the text mentioned in “*Faṭḥul Bārī*”. Kawtharī ∇ answered this by saying that the sources they both utilized were the same. Thus, the text would also be the same. (*Muqaddamah ‘Umdah* pg. 9 and ‘*Allāmah Badrud Dīn aur ‘Ilme Ḥadīth main un ki naqshi Dawām* pg. 174)

Nevertheless, “*Faṭḥul Bārī*” was published first and ‘Aynī ∇ obtained a copy of it. Thus, it is obvious the ‘Aynī ∇ benefitted from it and on seeing the references of the sources used, he referred to the original sources. This is why there is similarity in the texts. (‘*Allāmah Badrud Dīn aur ‘Ilme Ḥadīth main un ki naqshi Dawām* pg. 174)

A Comparison Between the Two

The question remains as to which of the two is superior and better? The truth is that there are some specialties in ‘*Umdah* which are not in *Faṭḥ* and other specialties in *Faṭḥ* which are not in ‘*Umdah*.

It is mentioned in the discourses of ‘Allāmah Kashmīrī ∇ that Ḥāfiẓ’s ∇ *sharḥ* is better in terms of displaying the art of *Ḥadīth* and also from the angle that the language and layout is good. Specifying the interpretation and meaning of the *Ḥadīth* and establishing the

muḥtasib-a superintendent. He also used to do *ghasht*. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

reliability of the narrations (i.e., searching for supporting chains) has been done in an excellent manner.

‘Aynī’s ∇ *sharḥ* is better from the angle that the explanation and commentary of the words are mentioned in a nice and organised manner and the statements of the pious predecessors are mentioned frequently. However, the information is scattered. The layout is not as good as Ḥāfiẓ’s ∇ layout. These details continue until the fourth volume. In summary, Ḥāfiẓ’s ∇ *sharḥ* is given precedence. (*Muqaddamah Fayḍul Bārī* pg. 38)¹¹

Shaykh Ṣāliḥ Ma’tūq ∇ mentioned the following specialties of *‘Umdah*:

1. The total number of pages in “*Umdatul Qārī*” is seven thousand six hundred and thirty-one (7631). The total number of pages in “*Faṭḥul Bārī*”, excluding the introduction, is seven thousand five hundred and fifteen (7515). The pages in *‘Umdah* are also larger in size. Therefore, *‘Umdah* is approximately a quarter (¼) larger than *Faṭḥ*.
2. ‘Aynī ∇ separates each *Ḥadīth* from the other and then writes the commentary of each *Ḥadīth* individually. Ḥāfiẓ ∇ writes all the *aḥādīth* of the chapter and then mentions the commentary. He does not separate the *aḥādīth*. (In fact, Ḥāfiẓ ∇ did not even copy the *aḥādīth* in his *sharḥ*. Those after him added them. (See *Faṭḥ* pg. 4)¹²

¹¹ Look how ‘Allāmah Kashmīrī ∇ is not supporting and being biased towards his *madh-hab*. ‘Aynī ∇ is a *Ḥanafī*. Therefore, we always try to somehow prove that his *sharḥ* is the best. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

¹² ‘Allāmah ‘Aynī ∇ has narrated the entire text of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* in his *‘Umdah*. For this reason, “*Umdatul Qārī*” appears to be very lengthy, because the entire text of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* is also mentioned. The text of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* is not in “*Faṭḥul Bārī*”. Ḥāfiẓ ∇ wrote the commentary by simply writing “*qawluḥu*”, *qawluḥu*. The “*Faṭḥul Bārī*” we have today has the entire text mentioned in it. This was not in the *Faṭḥ* of Ḥāfiẓ ∇. This is why ‘Aynī’s ∇ (*sharḥ*) appears to be very lengthy. This is mentioned on page 4 of “*Faṭḥul Bārī*”. Perhaps Shaykh Ṣāliḥ Ma’tūq ∇ was unaware of this. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

3. He discusses the *takhrīj* of the *aḥādīth* in detail and he also mentions all those, other than Imām Bukhārī √ who did the *takhrīj* of the *Ḥadīth*.

He has also mentioned other specialties. (The translation of *Badruddīn ‘Aynī wa athrihi fi ‘ilmil Ḥadīth* pg. 162)

The following has been mentioned regarding the specialities of “*Fathul Bārī*”:

1. “*Muqaddamah Hadyus Sārī*” holds great significance. (In ‘*Umdah*, ‘Aynī √ only mentions ten benefits in ten pages.)¹³
2. In the end of each chapter, Ibn Ḥajar √ mentions the number of *aḥādīth* in details. He mentions the *marfū‘*, *mawqūf*, *mukarrar* and *mu‘allaq* narrations separately. He also mentions those which Imām Muslim √ also mentioned.
3. “*Fathul Bārī*” has detailed commentary right to the end of the book. Whereas, in the beginning of ‘Aynī’s √ (*sharḥ*), there is detailed commentary while in the end it is significantly brief. (Ibid pg.70)

‘Allāmah Kawtharī √ gave preference to ‘*Umdah* over *Fath*¹⁴ and he mentions those details which ‘Aynī √ mentioned in his *sharḥ*. He writes that the difference between the two is like the difference between the full moon and shooting star.¹⁵ (*Muqaddamah ‘Umdah* pg. 9) The full moon

¹³ Whereas *Muqaddamah Hadyus Sārī* is very long and very detailed. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

¹⁴ This is because he was biased with regards to his own *madh-hab*. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

¹⁵ ‘Aynī’s √ title is ‘Badr-ud-Dīn’. Ḥāfiẓ’s √ title is Shihābud-Dīn. *Badr* is known as the full moon whereas the shooting star only shines for a little while before its shine disappears. ‘Allāmah Kawtharī √ played on the literal wording. He also opposes Ibn Taymiyyah √ and writes very harshly against him. When we asked our teacher, ‘Allāmah ‘Aẓmī √, he replied: ‘Allāmah Kawtharī √ did not understand Ibn Taymiyyah’s √ condition. He was too harsh, he has not done right. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

shines with complete brightness whereas shooting stars are not always radiant. (*Muqaddamah Lāmi* ‘pg. 120)

However, this explanation is only found in the first four volumes, not in the full book. (*Tarjumah Badruddīn ‘Aynī* pg. 176)

Someone said to Ḥāfiẓ ∇: ‘Aynī’s ∇ *sharḥ* is better than your *sharḥ* with regards to rhetoric etc. He immediately said that he (‘Aynī) took it from Ruknud Dīn’s (death: 783 AH) *sharḥ*. I knew of it, however, I did not quote from it because it is incomplete. It is only a small portion. Due to this, ‘Aynī ∇ did not discuss this topic further on. (*Muqaddamah Lāmi* ‘pg. 130)¹⁶

In both *sharḥs*, they are unnecessarily defending their *madh-habs*.

Ibn Khaldūn mentions from his *mashāyikh* that Imām Bukhārī’s *sharḥ* is a debt on the *ummah*. Sakhāwī ∇ is of the opinion that Ibn Ḥajar ∇ had paid it off. In “*Kashfuẓ Ḥunūn*”, on page 641 Ḥājī Khalīfah ∇ said that Ibn Ḥajar ∇ and ‘Aynī ∇ has repaid this debt. Kawtharī ∇ says that according to the author, ‘Aynī ∇ had a bigger portion of it [i.e., in repaying the debt]. (*Muqaddamah ‘Umdah* pg. 9)

Nevertheless, the later commentators were inspired by these two *sharḥs* and they gathered the research and information from these two commentaries. May Allāh 1 accept the service of these two and allow us to benefit from them! *Āmīn*.

3. Irshād us Sārī Ilā sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī (ارشاد الساري الى شرح صحيح البخاري)

Author: Shaykh Shihābuddīn Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad Al Khaṭīb Al Qasṭalānī Al-Miṣrī Ash Shāfi‘ī∇

¹⁶ This is someone else’s wealth which you are adding into your book. When that is completed, this will also be completed. See how Ḥāfiẓ was immediately taken to task. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

Birth: *Dhūl Qa‘dah* 851 A.H.

Death: *Muḥarram* 923 A.H.

It is as if this *sharḥ* is a summary of “*Fathul Bārī*” and “*Umdatul Qārī*”. He also benefitted from the commentaries of Barmāwī, Damāmīnī, Nawawī and others. This *sharḥ* is also famous by the title, *Qaṣṭalānī*. It can be read both ways: *Qaṣṭalānī* and *Qaṣṭallānī*, with a *tashdīd* on or *takhfīf* of the *lām*.

He completed this compilation on 17th *Rabī‘uth Thānī* 916 A.H. and completed *Kitābul Aḥkām* on 15th *Muḥarram* 916 A.H., i.e., from *Kitābul Aḥkām* until the end was written in two months and two days.

His most famous book is “*Mawāhib Ladūniyyah*”. He completed it in 998 A.H. Zarqānī ∇ wrote a *sharḥ* on it which is a very famous book of *sīrah*.

He is ascribed to Qaṣṭalīnah, which is located somewhere in Africa. He was born in Miṣr (Egypt) and he also died there. He is buried next to ‘Aynī ∇.

He was an expert in *qirā‘ah*. He also wrote a *sharḥ* on *Shāṭibiyah*, *Laṭā‘iful Ishārāt fil Qirā‘atil Arba‘ Asharah* and also on *Qasīdah Burdah*.

He was the student of Sakhāwī ∇ and *Shaykhul Islām* Zakariyyā Al Anṣārī ∇.

Suyūṭī ∇ was displeased with him because in *Mawāhib* he narrated points from Suyūṭī’s book without referencing his book¹⁷. When this issue was mentioned in the presence of *Shaykh* Zakariyyā Anṣārī ∇, Qaṣṭalānī ∇ was unable to prove himself innocent.

¹⁷ One must not plagiarise with regards to knowledge. If any point is taken from another book, it must be referenced. This plagiarism creates defects.
[Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

He was a very good lecturer. He performed *hajj* a few times and he also stayed in Makkah Mukarramah. (*Muqaddamah Lāmi* ‘ pg. 130)

4. **Kawākibud Darārī fi sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī**

(الكواكب الدراري في شرح صحيح البخاري)

Author: ‘Allāmah Shamsuddīn Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf Al Kirmānī Al Baghdādī Ash Shāfi‘ī ∇

Birth: 16th *Jumād-al-’Ukhrā* 717 A.H.

Death: 16th *Muḥarram* 786 A.H.

This name was inspired to him. He completed this *sharḥ* in Makkah Mukarramah in the year 775 A.H. One day, while he was sleeping in the *maṭāf* (area around the *Ka’bah*), this name was inspired into his heart. Ibn Ḥajar ∇, ‘Aynī ∇ and those coming later benefitted from this *sharḥ*. This *Shaykh* was an Imām in *Ḥadīth*, *tafsīr*, *fiqh*, *ma’ānī* and Arabic.

He first studied under his father and then he went to Kirmān where he stayed twelve years in the service of *Qādī* ‘Aḍduddīn ibn Yaḥyā ∇. Thereafter, he started travelling and sought knowledge from the scholars of Egypt, Syria, Hijāz and ‘Irāq. In Egypt, he heard *Ḥadīth* from Nāṣiruddīn Bukhārī ∇. He performed *hajj* and then took up residence in Baghdād where he stayed for thirty years. He remained completely isolated from worldly people. The king would come to him and seek his advice and *du‘ā’s*. He performed *hajj* towards the end of his life. He passed away on his return. A grave was prepared for him near *Shaykh* Abū Ishāq Shīrāzī ∇ in Baghdād and he was buried there. رحمه الله رحمة واسعة

Kirmānī’s *sharḥ* is beneficial but it has some errors in it. This *sharḥ* was compiled using the books of Khaṭṭābī Shāfi‘ī, Ibn Baṭāl Mālikī and Mughalṭay Ḥanafī. (*Muqaddamah Lāmi* ‘ pg. 131)

Some Other Commentaries

(Extracted from Muqaddamah Lāmi ‘)

5. Sharḥ Imām Nawawī (شرح الإمام النووي)

Birth: 631 A.H.

Death: 676 A.H.

Age: 45 years

This *sharḥ* is older than the aforementioned commentaries. However, it is only until باب النصح لكل مسلم - *Bāb An-Nuṣḥi Li Kulli Muslim* (Chapter on advice for every Muslim) of *Kitābul 'Īmān*. After writing this, Imām Nawawī √ passed away. He also started writing a *sharḥ* on *Sunan Abū Dawūd*, however, this was also not completed. He wrote an introduction for the *sharḥ* of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* which is published by the title "*Hajatul Qārī*".

Imām Nawawī √ never got married. He did a lot of *mujāhadah*. He only ate a little after '*Ishā*' and used to drink a sip of water in breakfast.¹⁸ The *sharḥ* of Nawawī is published.

(For details see: *Muqaddamah sharḥun Nawawī Lil Bukhārī* by Doctor 'Abdullāh ibn Umar Ad Damijī, pg. 27-84.)

6. A'ālīmus Sunan (اعلام السنن)

Author: Khaṭṭābī ibn Abī Sulaymān Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm Al Bustī √

Death: 308 A.H.

It is a concise *sharḥ* of one volume. Before this, Khaṭṭābī wrote a *sharḥ* of *Sunan Abū Dawūd* by the title "*Ma'ālīmus Sunan*". (It has been

¹⁸ He lived a life of extreme poverty. He lived with simplicity in Damascus. After his death, the people's screams could be heard in Damascus. He was a person who was greatly accepted. However, before his death, he left Damascus and returned to his hometown. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

published in Makkah Mukarramah by the title “*A’lāmul Ḥadīth*” in four volumes.)

Imām Muḥammad Tamimī (or Taimī) made additions to it and pointed out the errors of Khaṭṭābī.

7. Sharḥ Dāwudī (شرح الداودي)

Author: Abū Ja‘far Aḥmad ibn Sa‘īd or Aḥmad ibn Naṣr Dāwūdī Asadī √

He was from among the *Maghribī Mālikī* scholars. He was in Tarābilis. He moved to Talmasān and passed away there in 402 A.H. He wrote a *sharḥ* on *Muwattā’*. The name of the *Bukhārī’s sharḥ* is “*An-Nasīhah*”. Ibn Tīn narrates from it. (This Dawūdī is other than the Dāwūdī in the chain. He passed away in 467 A.H. and his name was ‘Abdur Raḥmān.)

8. Sharḥ Al-Muhallab (شرح المهلب)

Author: Al Muhallab Abū Qāsim ibn Asad ibn Abī Saфра At-Taymī √

He is from among the senior students of Asīlī. *Bukhārī Sharīf* became famous in Andalus, Spain due to him. He wrote an *ikhtīṣār* (abridgement) of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*, which was titled: “*An-Nasīh fi Ikhtisaaris Ṣaḥīḥ*” and he also wrote footnotes for it.¹⁹ He was a *Mālikī* and an expert in the fields of *Ḥadīth* and *fiqh*. He was the judge of Mālīka and he died in 433 A.H. One of his students, Abū ‘Abdullāh Muḥammad ibn Khalaf (death: after 480 A.H), compiled an *ikhtīṣār*

¹⁹ This is a very beneficial book. In some *madāris*, this book is taught because there are many repeated narrations in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. In “*An-Nasīh*”, the repeated narrations are omitted. By [reading] this book, one becomes aware of all the *aḥādīth* in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

(abridged version) of his *sharḥ* and also added a few beneficial points.²⁰

9. Sharḥ Ibn Baṭṭāl Al Magribī Al Mālikī (شرح ابن بطال المغربي المالكي)

Death: 444 A.H.

He mainly mentions the *Mālikī fiqh*. Kirmānī benefited from his *sharḥ* as was mentioned previously.

10. Sharḥ ibn Tīn (شرح ابن التين)

Hāfiẓ √ narrates many points from the *sharḥ* of Ibn Tīn As-Safāqasī. His name was ‘Abdul Wāḥid and he passed away before the 9th century.

11. Sharḥ ul Imām (شرح الإمام)

Author: Zayn ud Dīn ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn Mansūr ibn Munnīr √

Death: 695 A.H.

He wrote a ten volume *sharḥ* of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*.

His brother Nāṣirud Dīn Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn al Munnīr wrote a book on the *tarājim* of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* titled “*Almutawārā ‘Alā Tarājimil Bukhārī*”. He passed away in 683 A.H. (Muqaddamah Lāmi‘ pg. 134)

He discussed four hundred *tarājim*. Badr ibn Jamā‘ah wrote a summary of it and also added to it. ‘Alī ibn Munīr also went into depth on the discussion of *tarājim* in his book. (*Hadyus Sārī* pg. 14)

²⁰ In “*Faṭḥul Bārī*”, Muhallab’s [*sharḥ*] is quoted a lot. Dāwudī is also quoted a lot. The *muṭāla‘ah* of “*Faṭḥul Bārī*” will become easy for a person who reviews these books. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

12. Sharḥ ul Imām Quṭbud dīn ‘Abdul Karim ibn ‘Abdun Nūr Al-Ḥalabī Al-Ḥanafī (شرح الإمام قطب الدين عبد الكريم بن عبد النور الحلبي الحنفي)

Death: 735 A.H.

This is a *sharḥ* of half of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. It is printed in ten volumes.

13. Sharḥ ul Imām Ḥāfiẓ ‘Alā’ ud Dīn Mughaltāy ibn Qalīj Al-Turkī Al-Misrī Al-Ḥanafī (شرح الإمام الحافظ علاء الدين مغطاي ابن قليج التركي المصري الحنفي)

Death: 735 A.H.

This is a large *sharḥ*, titled “*At-Talwīḥ*”.

This ‘Allāmah Mughaltāy was a very great *muḥaddith*.²¹ He authored more than one hundred books. He wrote *sharḥs* on *Sunan Ibn Mājah* and *Sunan Abū Dāwūd* which are incomplete. He also wrote footnotes on “*Tahdhībul Kamāl*” of Mizzī ∇ from which Ḥāfiẓ ∇ took benefit from in “*Tahdhībūt Tahdhīb*”.²²

Those after them, especially Ibn Mulaqqin, gained tremendous benefit from the *shurūḥ* of Quṭbud Dīn Ḥalabī and ‘Allāmah Mughaltāy. Jalālud Dīn Tabānī, (death 793 A.H.) compiled an abridged version of the *sharḥ* of Mughaltāy.

14. Sharḥ Taqī ud Dīn Yaḥyā ibn Muḥammad Kirmānī (شرح تقي الدين يحيى ابن محمد كرماني)

²¹ He was also a giant expert in grading *aḥādīth*. One of his *sharḥs* of *Ibn Mājah* will be mentioned in which a specific *Ḥadīth* is mentioned. If Allāh wills, we will mention it when discussing the ruling of *tark rafa’ yadayn*. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

²² He wrote footnotes on Mizzī’s “*Tahdhībul Kamāl*”. From this, his position in the field of *asmā’ rijāl* can be gauged. “*Tahdhībūt Tahdhīb*” is a summary and abridged version of this “*Tahdhībul Kamāl*”. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

This is the *sharḥ* of Kirmānī's son (mentioned above). Qaṣṭalānī ∇ saw this book. It is in eight large volumes.

15. Sharḥ Sirājud Dīn ‘Umar ibn ‘Alī ibn al Mulaqqin Ash Shāfi‘ī
(شرح سراج الدين عمر بن علي بن الملقن الشافعي)

Death: 804 A.H.

This comprises of twenty volumes. There is an important introduction in the beginning. The title of this *sharḥ* is “*Shawāhidut Tawḍīh*”. Its main sources were Mughaltay and Qutbud Dīn.²³

16. Sharḥ ‘Allāmah al Barmāwī (شرح العلامة البرماوي)

Death: 813 A.H.

Author: ‘Allāmah Shamsud Dīn Abū ‘Abdullāh Muḥammad ibn ‘Abdud Dā’im ibn Mūsā Al Barmāwī Ash Shāfi‘ī ∇

The name of this *sharḥ* is “*Al Lāmi‘us Ṣabīḥ*” and it comprises of four volumes.

17. Sharḥ of Shaykh Burhān ud Dīn Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad Al Ḥalabī
(شرح الشيخ برهان الدين ابراهيم بن محمد الحلبي)

He was famous by the name Sabṭ ibn al ‘Ajmi. He passed away in 841 A.H. The title of his *sharḥ* is “*At Talqīḥ Li Fahm Qārī us Ṣaḥīḥ*”. This

²³ After writing a commentary of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*, he began writing commentaries on the *zawā'id* of *Muslim*, *Abū Dāwūd*, *Tirmidhī*, *Nasā'ī* and *Ibn Mājah* from the first chapter in each book. He wrote a commentary on each book. He is Ḥāfiẓ's ∇ teacher. He is also a contemporary of Ḥāfiẓ's teacher 'Irāqī. He is famous by the name Ibn Mulaqqin. We have mentioned him in our compilation of *Nasā'ī* because he is also the commentator of the *zawā'id* of *Nasā'ī*. His father passed away. Thus, he was under the supervision of a man who was a scholar. This is why he became famous. He did not like to be called Ibn Mulaqqin. However, he became famous by this name. It is said that he has written three hundred books. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

sharḥ consists of two volumes when written in his handwriting and it consists of four volumes when written by others. There are beneficial points in it. He had two hundred teachers of *Ḥadīth*. He read *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* more than sixty times and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* twenty times. He also wrote footnotes on *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, *Sunan Abū Dawūd* and *Sunan Ibn Mājah*. Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad Ash-Shāfī'ī (death: 864 A.H.) compiled an abridged version of his *sharḥ*.

18. The *sharḥ* of Zarakshī titled *Tanqīḥ* (شرح الزركشي المسمى بالتنتقيح)

Muḥammad ibn Bahādūr ibn 'Abdullāh Turkī Al Aṣl Miṣrī Badr-ud-Dīn Zarakshī (death: 794 A.H.) ∇ wrote a concise *sharḥ*. Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf Sanūsi Malikī (death: 895 A.H.) ∇ compiled an abridged version. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar ∇ and Qāḍī Muhib ud Dīn Baghdadi Hanbali (death 844 A.H.) ∇ wrote some points on this revised version.

19. Ta'īqul Maṣābiḥ 'Alā Abwābil Jāmi' Ṣaḥīḥ

(تعليق المصابيح على ابواب الجامع الصحيح)

This is a book authored by Abū 'Abdullāh ibn Abī Bakr Makhzūmī ∇ (death 828 AH). Qaṣṭalānī ∇ did *muṭāla'ah* from this book. Badr ud Dīn was his title. He wrote this book for King Aḥmad Shāh Hindī. This is what some people think. This is not written in the introduction of the book, rather, in the end it is written that the publishing was completed in Zubayd, Yemen on the tenth of *Rabī'ul-Awwal* 828 A.H.

Shāh 'Abdul 'Azīz Muḥaddith Dehlawī ∇ has written that in the end he came to Ahmedabad in India. He died there in *Sha'bān* 828 AH. In "*Nīlul Abtāj*", it is mentioned that he died in Ghalbargha.

20. At-Tawshīḥ 'Alāl Jāmi' Ṣaḥīḥ (التوشيح على الجامع الصحيح)

This is the book of Imām Suyūṭī ∇ (death 911 AH). Like the *tanqīḥ* (revised version) of Zarakshī, there is one *ta'liq* by the title, “*Tarshīḥ*”, which is incomplete. Suyūṭī ∇ wrote the *ta'liqāt* for the *Sihāḥ Sittah* and *Muwattāʾ*.

ʿAlī ibn Sulaymān Dimanātī²⁴ *Maghribī Malikī* compiled the abridged versions of all of them. The name of the abridged version of “*Tawshīḥ*” is “*Rūḥhut Tawshīḥ*”. The amazing thing is that all these abridged versions were written in approximately six months. They were all published in the end of 1298 A.H. and in this same year the compiler of the abridged versions passed away.

21. Sharḥ of Ibn Kathīr Dimashqī (شرح ابن كثير الدمشقي)

Death: 774 A.H.

This is a *sharḥ* of a portion from the beginning of the book.²⁵

22. Faṭḥul Bārī (فتح الباري)

This is the *sharḥ* of Ḥāfiẓ Zayn ud Dīn ʿAbdur Raḥmān ibn Aḥmad ibn Rajab Dimashqī Ḥanbalī ∇ (death: 795 AH). It is until *Kitābul Janāʾiz*.²⁶

²⁴ Suyūṭī ∇ also wrote a commentary on *Jāmiʿ Tirmidhī*. Dimanātī ∇ summarised it. Its title is “*Quwwatul Mughtadī*”. We have mentioned the details of this in “*Hadyatul Aḥwadhī*”. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

²⁵ He is a giant *muḥaddith* and *mufasssir*. Ibn Kathīr ∇ has also written many books on *Ḥadīth*. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

²⁶ He also has a commentary on *Jāmiʿ Tirmidhī*. We have mentioned its details in the introduction of *Tirmidhī*. He was very great scholar. He was of a similar mindset as Ibn Taymiyyah. His book “*Laṭāʾif Al Ma-ʿārīf*” has been mentioned previously. He prepared his grave and went and sleep in it and saw that it was very good. He then left. When he died, he was buried there. See “*Hadyatul Aḥwadhī*” for details. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

23. Fayḍul Bārī (فيض الباري)

Author: ‘Allāmah Sirājud Dīn Bulqinī²⁷ Shafī‘ī (death 805 AH) ∇.

He wrote a *sharḥ* by this title until *Kitābul ‘Īmān* which comprised of fifty booklets. Qaṣṭalānī ∇ compiled it into one volume. Ibn Fahd said that this is a very lengthy *sharḥ*. If it was completed, it would have been one hundred (100) volumes.

24. Minhul Bārī Bis Saihil Fatīhil Majārā Fi sharḥ il Bukhārī

(منح الباري بالسيح الفسيح المجاري في شرح البخاري)

Author: ‘Allāmah Majdud Dīn Fayroz Ābādī Shīrāzī (death 817 AH) ∇

Qaṣṭalānī ∇ mentioned that the name is “*Faṭḥul Bārī*”. As said by Qaṣṭalānī, twenty volumes consist of one quarter of the *‘ibādāh* (acts of worship) and the full book is of forty volumes. A lot has been narrated from the *futūḥāt* of Ibn al-‘Arabī. For this reason, those who do not agree with Ibn al-‘Arabī find faults in it. Ḥāfiẓ ∇ saw a small portion of it, which was eaten by wood ants and thus, it could not be read.²⁸

²⁷ This is the same Bulqinī who is Ḥāfiẓ Ṣāhib’s teacher. He is the one who has written very beautifully regarding the sequence of the chapter titles of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. The translation of this has been mentioned in “*Hadiyyatud Darārī*”. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

²⁸ This is Ḥāfiẓ Ṣāhib’s teacher. He has written a very famous Arabic dictionary, “*Al-Qāmūs*”. Murtaḍā Zabīdī, a man of Indian origin who moved to reside in Egypt wrote the commentary (*sharḥ*) on *Qāmūs*, titled “*Tāj ul ‘Urūs min Jawāhirul Qāmūs*”. Our teacher wrote a biography on Zabīdī which was published in “*Al Be’tḥul Islāmī*”. The *Dārul ‘Ulūm* publishes this Arabic magazine. Many Arabs are not aware that he was of Indian origin. He was from Balgaram which is a city close to Lucknow. At first, his family migrated to Yemen and then to Cairo, Egypt. He was a great *muḥaddith*. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

25. Bahjatun Nufūs wa Ghāyatuhā Bi Ma‘rifati mālahā wa Mā ‘Alayhā (بهجة النفوس وغايتها بمعرفته مآلها وما عليها)

‘Ārifbillāh ‘Abdullāh ibn Abī Ḥamzah (death: 699 A.H.) ∇ compiled an abridged version of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* in which there is approximately three hundred (300) *aḥādīth*. He omitted the chains of narration so that it is easy to memorize. Thereafter, wrote a *sharḥ* in two volumes, in which deep and intricate points has been mentioned. (Ḥāfiẓ usually quotes his statements.) The respected author was a great saint of *karāmāt*. He says that by the grace of Allāh¹, I have never disobeyed Allāh¹. An Urdu translation for it has also been published.

26. Taghliqut Ta‘liq (تغليق تعلیق)

Author: Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar Asqalānī ∇

This is a very great book. No other book has ever been written like this. In “*Hadyus Sārī*”, by omitting the chains of narrations, he summarized this book. It was completed by 804 or 807 A.H. In this book, he mentions the *mu‘allaq* narrations of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* with their *mawṣūl* chains. Some people say this was Ḥāfiẓ’s ∇ first book (which was published with his research and footnotes). Ḥāfiẓ himself compiled an abridged version of it titled: “*At tashwīq ilā waṣṣil mubham minat ta‘liq*”. Thereafter, an abridged version of this was also compiled, titled: “*At tawfīq bi ta‘liqit ta‘liq*”.

27. The sharḥ of Imām Raḍī ud Dīn Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad Ṣaghānī Lāhūrī Ḥanafī (death: 650 A.H) (شرح الإمام رضي الدين حسن بن محمد (صغاني))

This is a brief one-volume (*sharḥ*). Ṣaghānī is the author of “*Mashāriq ul Anwār*”. His family were the residents of Ṣaghān in *Mā warā’un Nahr*. Someone from among his forefathers came to Lahore, and this was where this *Mawlānā* Ḥasan was born. He was from the family of

Sayyidunā ‘Umar z and was a great linguist, scholar and *muḥaddith*. He heard *Ḥadīth* from the great scholars of Makkah Mukarramah, ‘Adn, and India. He went to India as a messenger for the *khalīfah* of Baghdad. He passed away in Baghdad and according to his bequest, his body was taken to Makkah Mukarramah. “*Majma‘ul Baḥrayn*” is the name of the book he authored on Arabic language. He also wrote two booklets on the topic of *Ḥadīth*, however, he included both *ṣaḥīḥ* and *ḍa‘īf Ḥadīth*. Sakhāwī ∇ complained about this in “*Faṭḥul Mughīth*”.

28. The Sharḥ of Mawlā Fāḍil Aḥmad ibn Ismā‘īl ibn Muḥammad Kawrānī Ḥanafī (death: 893 A.H)

(شرح المولي الفاضل احمد بن اسماعيل بن محمد كوراني حنفي)

The name of this *sharḥ* is “*Al-kawtharul Jārī ‘Alā Riyāḍil Bukhārī*”. He refutes Ibn Ḥajar ∇ and Kirmānī ∇. He completed writing it in 874 A.H. This *sharḥ* comprises of two volumes. In this book, there are also explanations of the difficult words and the vowelisation (pronunciation) of the names of the narrators. This Shams Kawrānī was the teacher of Muḥammad ibn ‘Uthmān, the conqueror of Turkey²⁹. In the era of Sulṭān Muḥammad Khān he was promoted to the position of issuing *fatwā*. Around this same time, he was also preoccupied in writing the *tafsīr* of the *Qur’ān*, “*Ghāyat ul Amālī*”. He would engage in worship the entire night and would complete one entire *Qur’ān* every night. He was very outspoken and truthful.

²⁹ On a wall outside an area in Istanbul, where it is said to be the grave of *Sayyidunā* Abū Ayyūb Anṣārī z it is written that the *Shaykh* of Sulṭān Muḥammad Fātiḥ, *Shaykh* Ahmad Shams-ud-Dīn was divinely inspired that the grave of *Sayyidunā* Abū Ayyūb z is in this area. We visited it on one of our travels in September 1993. We also saw it after this. In “*Faṭḥul Bārī*” 6/103 Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar ∇ writes that at the time of his death, *Sayyidunā* Abū Ayyūb Anṣārī (Zayd ibn Khālid) z made a bequest that any sign of his grave should be removed. (Fazl)

29. The Sharḥ of Imām Fakhr ud Dīn ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad Al Bazdawī al Ḥanafī (death: 482 A.H) (شرح الإمام فخر الإسلام علي بن محمد البزدوي الحنفي)

This is a brief *sharḥ*. ‘Allāmah Bazdawī Ḥanafī √ was a great Imām, he was an embodiment of all the varying fields of knowledge, an Imām of the world with regards to the *uṣūl* and *furū’*. His *mabsūṭ* comprises of eleven volumes. “*Usūl Bazdawī*” is a great and reliable book on the principles of jurisprudence. He also authored a *tafsīr* which is said to be one hundred and twenty (120) volumes, each of which is a large book itself. Nawāb Sidīq Ḥasan Khān mentioned his date of death to be 884 A.H which is incorrect. The author of “*Kashfuṣ Zunūn*” also wrote such, but that is an error. Imām Lucknawī √ mentions this in “*Fawā’idul Bahīyah*”. (*Muqaddamah Lāmi’* pg. 141)

30. Kitāb un Najāḥ fī sharḥi kitāb il Akhbār iṣ Ṣiḥāḥ (كتاب النجاة في شرح أخبار الصحاح)

Author: Shaykh Najmud Dīn Abī Ḥaḥṣ ‘Umar ibn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Ismā’īl An-Nasafī Al-Imām, Az-Zāhid, Al-Ḥanafī √ (death 537 A.H)

He was born in Nasf in 461 A.H and passed away in Samarqand.

It has been narrated that he went to visit ‘Allāmah Jārullāh Zamakhsharī in Makkah Mukarramah, when he knocked on the door Zamakhsharī asked: “Who is there?”

Nasafī: “‘Umar.”

Zamakhsharī: “Go away/Return.” (انصرف)

Nasafī: عمر لا ينصرف “‘Umar does not turn away.” (‘Umar is not *munṣarif*)

Zamakhsharī: “When he is rejected, then he turns away.

(إذا نكر ينصرف) (When the word *‘umar* is a common noun, it is *munṣarīf*.)

He was a *faqīh*, *muḥaddith*, *mufassir*, writer and *muftī*. He wrote a few books on *Ḥadīth* and *tafsīr*. He narrated *Ḥadīth* from five hundred and fifty (550) scholars. He would pass *fatāwā* for the *Jinns*. Due to this he was known as *Muftī-uth-Thaqalayn*. He was the teacher of the author of “*Hidāyah*”. Much is not known about this *sharḥ*.

31. Shawāhidut Tawdīḥ wat taṣḥīḥ li Mushkilātīl Jāmi‘ uṣ Ṣaḥīḥ

(شواهد التوضيح والتصحيح لمشكلات الجامع الصحيح)

Author: Shaykh Jamālud Dīn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abdullāh ibn Mālik An-Naḥwī Ash-Shāfi‘ī v (death: 672 A.H)

This is a small booklet and is published in India. ³⁰

He was born in either 600 or 602 A.H. He was extremely fluent in languages. He was also an Imām in *qirā’ah* and a leader in justice. After *ṣalāh*, the *Qāḍī ul Qaḍāh*, Shamsuddīn ibn Khalikān would escort him to his residence. He also possessed an endless ocean of knowledge in *naḥw* and *ṣarf*. He was righteous and a devout worshipper. He would perform lots of optional *ṣalāh*. He authored many books.

32. The Sharḥ of Qāḍī Abī Bakr Muḥammad ibn ‘Abdullāh ibnul

(شرح القاضي ابي بكر محمد بن عبدالله ابن العربي المالكي)

Death: 543 A.H.

³⁰ He did the *tarkīb* (grammatical analysis) of the text of those *Ḥadīth* which comes in *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

Birth: 468 A.H

His *sharḥ* of *Jāmi‘ Tirmidhī*, “*‘Ārīdatul Aḥwadhī*” is also famous. From among his publications are: the *sharḥ* of the *Ḥadīth* of Umm Zara‘ and a *tafsīr*, “*Anwārul Fajr fī Tafsīr il Qur’ān*” which comprises of eighty (80) volumes. He passed away while returning from Morocco and was taken to Fez to be buried. (*Muqaddamah Lāmi‘* pg.142) The details of this *Bukhārī sharḥ* is not known.

33. Ta‘līq of ‘Allāmah Shamsud Dīn Aḥmad ibn Sulaymān ibn Kamāl Pāshā (death: 940 A.H)³¹

(تعليق العلامة شمس الدين احمد بن اسماعيل بن كمال پاشا)

He acquired his knowledge from many prominent scholars. Among them is Mawlā Luṭfā-e-Luṭfallāh Tawqānī Rumī √ who was an embodiment of *manqūl* (prophetic) and *ma‘qūl* (rational) knowledge. He wrote footnotes for a small portion of the beginning of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. ‘Allāmah Ibn Kamāl Pāshā √ served as judge of different areas. In his final days, he became the *Muftī* of Constantinople and he passed away there. He has many books which are reliable. The number of his publications exceeds three hundred (300). He left behind a book in almost every field.

Other than these, the author of “*Kashfuz Ḍunūn*” also mentioned the *talīqāt* of ‘Allāmah Faḍl ibn Jamāl √ (death: 991 A.H) and Muṣliḥud Dīn Muṣṭafā ibn Sa‘bān As Sarūrī √.

³¹ He mentioned the seven categories of the *fuqahā’* and there are objections against this. See: *Sīrah Imām Abū Yūsuf*. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

Abridged Versions

Many people compiled abridged versions of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*.

34. Al-Mufhim (المفهم)

One *ikhtiṣār* (abridgement) is that of Shaykh Jamālud Dīn Abul ‘Abbās Aḥmad ibn ‘Umar Anṣārī Qurṭubī ∇ (death: 656 A.H). He is famous by Ibnul Muzayyin and his title is Ḍiyā’-ud-Dīn. He was a great *Malikī* scholar. He made Iskhandariyyah¹ his place of residence and passed away there. He wrote a very comprehensive *sharḥ* of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* which is titled, “*Mufhim*”. He compiled abridged versions of both *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. He was born in 598 A.H.

35. At-Tajrīduṣ Ṣarīḥ li Aḥādīthil Jāmi‘ Ṣaḥīḥ

(التجريد الصريح لأحاديث الجامع الصحيح)

Another famous abridgement is “*At Tajrīduṣ Ṣarīḥ li Aḥādīthil Jāmi‘-us-Ṣaḥīḥ*” which was compiled by *Shaykh* Imām Zayn-ud-Dīn Abul ‘Abbās Aḥmad ibn Aḥmad ibn ‘Abdul Laṭīf Sharjī Zubaydī ∇ (death: 893 A.H). The chains of narration and the repeated narrations have been omitted and only the *matn* (text of the *Ḥadīth*) is mentioned. It was completed in 889 A.H. *Shaykh* Sharqāwī ∇ and *Shaykh* Ghazī ∇ wrote a commentary on this edition. This book has also been translated in Urdu.

N.B. The copy of this book published in Egypt has the author’s name as Ḥusayn ibn Mubārak Zabīdī, which is incorrect. Ḥusayn Zabīdī passed away in 631 A.H. His name comes in the chain of narration of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. The author of “*Tajrīd*” is Aḥmad ibn ‘Abdul Laṭīf Zabīdī. He passed away in 893 A.H. Kawtharī ∇ has written this and the commentators of “*Tajrīd*” also mentioned this name. The author of “*‘Awnul Bārī*” also mentioned this as the author’s name.

¹ Iskhandariyyah was also the residence of Ibn Ḥumām ∇. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

36. Irshādus Sāmi‘ Wal Qārī Al-Muntaqā min Ṣaḥīḥil Bukhārī

(ارشاد السامع والقارى المنتقى من صحيح البخاري)

Another abridgement is that of *Shaykh* Badr-ud-Dīn Ḥusayn ibn ‘Umar Halabī ∇ (death: 779 A.H). Its title is: “*Irshādus Sāmi‘ wal Qārī Al-Muntaqā min Ṣaḥīḥ il Bukhārī*”.

37. An-Naṣīḥ fi Ikhtiyāriṣ Ṣaḥīḥ (النصيح في اختيار الصحيح)

The commentator of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*, *Shaykh* Miḥlab Tamīmī ∇ also compiled an abridgement. Its title is: “*An Naṣīḥ fi Ikhtiyāriṣ Ṣaḥīḥ*” as mentioned previously.

38. Al Ifhām bimā Waqa‘ fīl Bukhārī minal Ibhām

(الإفهام بما وقع في البخاري من الاوهام)

Shaykh Jalāl-ud-Dīn ‘Abdur ‘Raḥmān ibn ‘Umar Bulqīnī ∇ (death: 824 A.H.) wrote a book on the *ibhām* (ambiguous portions) of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*, the title of which is “*Al Ifhām bimā Waqa‘ fīl Bukhārī minal Ibhām*” It was completed in 822 A.H.

39. *Shaykh* Imām Abū Naṣr Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ḥusayn Kalābādī ∇ (death: 398 A.H) wrote a book on the narrators of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*.

40. Kitābut Ta‘dīl wat Takhrīj li Rijālil Bukhārī

(كتاب التعديل والتخريج لرجال البخاري)

Qāḍī Abul Walīd Sulaymān ibn Khalaf al-Bājī ∇ (death: 474 A.H) wrote “*Kitābut Ta‘dīl wat Takhrīj li Rijālil Bukhārī*”. He is ascribed to Baja, Andalus.

41. Ta‘liqul ‘Allāmah As-Sindī Al-Ḥanafī (تعليق العلامة السندي)

The *ta'liq* of 'Allāmah Sindī Ḥanafī ∇ (death: 1138 A.H). His name is Abul Ḥasan Nūr-ud-Dīn Muḥammad ibn 'Abdul Hādī. He was born in Thatta, Sindh and he grew up there. Then he travelled to Tustar. He benefitted from the scholars there. Thereafter, he migrated to Madīnah Munawwarah. He obtained knowledge from the *shuyūkh* of Madīnah, the likes of *Shaykh* Sayyid Barzanjī ∇, and *Shaykh* Ibrāhīm Kūrānī ∇ and began giving lessons in the Ḥaram. He was famous for his virtues and excellence. He wrote beneficial books. He also penned footnotes for the *Siḥāḥ Sittah*. The footnotes for *Jāmi' Tirmidhī* are incomplete. He penned an excellent annotative commentary for *Musnad Aḥmad*. He also compiled a few books on *fiqh* and *usūl fiqh*. (He also penned footnotes on "*Bayḍāwī*" and "*Fathul Qadīr*" until *Kitābun Nikāḥ*. (Fawā'id Jāmi'ah pg. 220)

He passed away on 12 *Shawwāl* 1138 A.H.² On that day, the shops remained closed and many people attended his *janāzah*. The authorities also lifted his corpse to Masjid Nabawī. He was buried in Baqī'. (Muqaddamah Lāmi' pg. 144)

Shaykh Muḥammad Ḥayāt Sindhī ∇ was his student. (Fawā'id Jāmi'ah pg. 217)

Note: there are two scholars famous by the name 'Allāmah Sindhī. One is Sindhī Kabīr- the aforementioned, 'Allāmah Abul Ḥasan Nūr-ud-Dīn. The other is Imām Abul Ḥasan Muḥammad Ṣādiq Sindhī. He was also born in Sind and migrated to Madīnah. He is famous by the title Ṣaghīr so that he could be differentiated from Kabīr. He benefitted from *Shaykh* Muḥammad Ḥayāt Sindhī for some time³ and thereafter commenced teaching in Masjid Nabawī. He was an unmatched scholar

² It has also been mentioned that he passed away in 1136 A.H., 1139 A.H. or 1141 A.H. (Fawā'id Jāmi'ah page 220)

³ One ruling discussed is regarding whether the hand is held on the chest or under the navel in *ṣalāḥ*. Many booklets were written regarding this. The Sindhis wrote these. Muḥammad Ḥayāt Sindhī was among them. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

of his time. He also wrote a commentary on “*Jāmi‘ Usūl*”. He passed away in 1087 A.H. in Madīnah Munawwarah. (Lāmi‘) (1187 A.H. is correct.)⁴

42. Minhul Bārī Sharḥul Bukhārī (منح الباري شرح البخاري)

This is a Persian book written by *Shaykh* Muḥammad Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad Ṣiddīq Peshāwarī Ḥanafī ∇. Due to his height, he was known as Ḥāfiẓ Darāz. He was famous in his era for *fiqh*, *tafsīr* and *Ḥadīth*. He studied by his father and spent his entire life learning, teaching and spreading knowledge. He passed away in 1263 A.H. at the age of 61.

43. Ḍaw‘ud Darārī (ضوء الدراري)

This is the book of *Mawlānā* Sayyid Ghulām ‘Alī Āzād Balgharāmī ∇. It is actually an abridgement of Qaṣṭalānī’s “*Irshādus Sārī*” with a few additional points. It is until *Kitābuz Zakāh*. He passed away in Aurangabad. He passed away in either 1194 A.H. or 1200 A.H. He was born in either 1110 A.H. or 1112 A.H. His title was Hassān-ul-Hind.⁵

44. Taysīrul Qārī (تيسير القاري)

This is a Persian book written by the son of Shāh ‘Abdul Ḥaq Muḥaddith Dehlawī ∇, ‘Allāmah Nūrul Ḥaq Dehlawī ∇ (death 1073 A.H.). It is published in India in six volumes. He studied by his father. King Shāh Jahān made him the judge of Agra (Akbarabad) and he fulfilled the right of this position with great honesty. This commentary

⁴ مات ليلة الجمعة لخمس بقين من شهر رمضان سنة سبع وثمانين ومئة وألف بالمدينة المنورة. (نزهة الخواطر ٩/٦) فالظاهر أن لفظ المائة سقط في الامع.

He died on the night of *Jumu‘ah*, when there was five days remaining of *Ramaḍān* 1187 A.H. in Madīnah Munawwarah. (Nuzhatul Khawāṭir 9/6) so it is apparent the word ‘hundred’ had been omitted in *Lāmi‘*.

⁵ He was a great poet. This is why he was known as Hassānul Hind. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

was published with the help of Nawāb Maḥmūd ‘Alī Khān, the governor of Tonk in 1298 A.H. In the footnotes, he included the commentaries of *Shaykh-ul-Islām*, Muḥammad ibn Muhibullāh Dehlawī (in Persian) and Ḥāfiẓ Darāz. *Mawlānā* ‘Abdul Hay Luknawī endorsed this compilation. ‘Allāmah Nūrul Ḥaq Bukhārī Dehlawī ∇ was the substantiation of the saying, ‘الولد سر لاييه’ (‘A son (child) is the happiness of his father.’) He passed away in 1073 A.H. in Delhi at the age 90 or 92. He wrote this commentary on the request of his father.

45. Ḍiyā’ us Sārī (ضيء الساري)

This is *Shaykh* ‘Abdullāh ibn Sālim Baṣrī Makkī’s ∇ (death: 1134 A.H.) book. He was unable to complete it. Shāh Waliullāh Muḥaddīth Dehlawī ∇ wrote a biography of him in “*Insān-ul ‘Uyūn*”.⁶ One of his praiseworthy feats is his work on the *taṣḥīh* of the *Ṣiḥāḥ Ṣittah* on which he spent approximately twenty years. He read *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* in the *Ka’bah*.⁷

46. Fayḍul Bārī: Sharḥ of Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī (فيض الباري شرح صحيح البخاري)

This was compiled by Sayyid ‘Abdul Awwal ibn ‘Alī ibn ‘Alā al Ḥusaynī ∇ (death: 968 A.H. in Delhi).⁸ His family were the residents of Zaidpur in the district of Jaunpur. Someone from among his forefathers moved to Dakan where he was born and grew up. He learnt *Ḥadīth* from his grandfather ‘Alā’-ud-Dīn ∇, who learnt from *Shaykh* Ḥusayn ∇, who learnt from Muḥammad ibn Jazarī ∇, the author of “*Ḥiṣn-ul-Ḥaṣīn*”.

⁶ The pupil of the eye. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁷ He was the famous *Shaykh* of Makkah Mukarramah. He was born in Makkah and also passed away in Makkah. He has been mentioned in many places. He is in our chain of narration, both for the *Musalsalāt* and the *Rasā’il Awā’il*. (*Al Imdād fī Ma’rifati ‘Ulūmil Isnād*) [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

⁸ This is near our province. Once it was known as Shīrāz Hind. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

Shaykh ‘Abdul Awwal √ then went to Gujarat⁹ where he stayed for some time. Then he went to the Ḥaramayn Sharīfayn. He stayed in Ahmedabad for some time after his return from *ḥajj* and *ziyārah*. Thereafter, he went to Delhi where he stayed for two years. He passed away in Delhi in 968 A.H. and was buried in the graveyard of Ghurabā’. This commentary is well-researched, accurate and approved.¹⁰

47. Nūrul Qārī (نور القاري)

This was compiled by *Shaykh* Nūr-ud-Dīn ibn Muḥammad Sālīḥ al Gujaratī Aḥmedbādī √ (death 1155 A.H) of Ahmedabad. He was born in 1063 A.H. He began his quest for knowledge from childhood. He studied the “*Ghulistān*” of *Shaykh* Sā‘dī from his mother in one week. He acquired the knowledge of *Ḥadīth* from *Shaykh* Muḥammad Ja‘far Ḥusaynī Bukhārī √. He also received *ṭarīqat* from him. Akram-ud-Dīn Gujarātī built a grand *madrasah* in Ahmedabad for him, in which he spent one hundred and twenty-four thousand.

Shaykh Nūr-ud-Dīn √ was a very Allāh conscious person (*muttaqī*). He would perform *tahajjud* twice during the night. When lying down, he would recite the *Kalimah Tahlīl* one thousand times and *Durūd Sharīf* one thousand times. He would not accept the gifts of the kings. He went for *ḥajj* in 1143 A.H. On returning after a year, he visited the shrine of *Sulṭān al Awliyā’* (the leader of the *awliyā’*), *Ḥazrat* Nizāmuddīn √. He has more than one hundred and fifty (150) publications. Apart from “*Nūrul Qārī*”, he wrote footnotes for many books such as, “*Sharḥ*

⁹ The people of Gujarat value the ‘*ulamā’*’, specifically Ahmedabad as it became the centre and sanctuary for the ‘*ulamā’*’. There are lots of historical details regarding this. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

¹⁰ But it is not available. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

Mawāqif”, “*Sharḥ Mutālī*”, “*Talwīḥ*”, “*Sharḥ Wiqāyah*” and others.¹¹ His grave is close to the Ahmedabad Madrasah.

Marginalia (Footnotes)

48. ‘Allāmah Muḥaddith Kabīr Aḥmad ‘Alī Sahāranpūrī (death: 1297 A.H.) ▽

These footnotes are printed in the edition of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* published in India. It is very beneficial for students. After reading this, it would not be necessary for beginners to read any other footnote. About twenty-five (25) volumes of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* were written by Muḥaddith Aḥmad ‘Alī Sahāranpūrī ▽. The remaining five volumes were written by *Mawlānā* Muḥammad Qāsim Nanotwī ▽ who also passed away in *Jumād-al-Ūlā* 1297 A.H, two days prior to Shaykh Aḥmad ‘Alī Sahāranpūrī. *Ḥazrat* Sahāranpūrī passed away on the 6th and *Ḥazrat* Nanotwī on the 4th.

Shaykh Aḥmad Sahāranpūrī ▽ was born around 1225 A.H. He studied the syllabus books of *fiqh* and *Ḥadīth* with the scholars of India. Then, he desired to be taught by *Musnidul Hind*, *Mawlānā* Shāh Muḥammad Ishāq Dehlawī Muhājir Makkī ▽. *Mawlānā* Dehlawī ▽ had already migrated in *Dhul-Qa’dah* 1225 A.H. Therefore, *Mawlānā* Sahāranpūrī ▽ travelled to Makkah. In Makkah, he wrote the books of *aḥādīth* with his hands and then read them to Shāh Muḥammad Ishāq ▽. From *Fajr* to *Ṣuḥr*, he would copy and record the *Ḥadīth* and then from *Ṣuḥr* to ‘*Aṣr*, he would read. He read all the books of *Ḥadīth* in this manner.

On returning from Ḥijāz, he established the Ahmadiyyah Publishing House, from where the books of *Ḥadīth* were edited and published with footnotes. This was the first Publishing House in India to publish *Ḥadīth* books.

¹¹ “*Sharḥ Nukhbah*: is not mentioned here, however, he also wrote a footnote on this. He also wrote footnotes on “*Bayḍawī*” among other books. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

This Publishing House reminded until *Ghadr*¹² (the betrayal) in 1857 (1273 A.H.) and continued publishing many beneficial books. When the British betrayed the brave Shāh Zafar and martyred him, there was great turmoil in Delhi due to which this Publishing House was destroyed.¹³ Within a few days it was reopened in Meerut and from here a few books were published with *Muḥaddith* Sahāranpūrī's edited footnotes. In Meerut, *Hazrat* Nanotwī ∇ was also preoccupied in the editing and publishing of books.¹⁴

The publishing of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* with this footnote began in 1264 A.H. in Delhi and was completed on 1270 A.H. It was published a second time by Ahmadiyyah publishers in Meerut in 1280 A.H. and it continued to be published after this. This service of *Muḥaddith* Sahāranpūrī ∇ and *Hazrat* Nanotwī ∇ was so greatly accepted that this became the foundation for all other future publications.

جزاهما الله خير الجزاء عنا وعن سائر قارئ الكتاب الحديثية

49. Ghāyat-ut-Tawḍīḥ (غاية التوضيح)

Author: *Shaykh* Ya'qūb ibn Ḥasan Ṣarfī Kashmīrī Ḥanafī (death: 1003 A.H.) ∇.

He was born in 908 A.H. in Kashmīr. He travelled to the Ḥaramayn and heard *Ḥadīth* from *Shaykh* Ibn Ḥajar Makkī ∇.¹⁵ A few publications of his are as follows: "*Tafsīrul Qur'ān*" which is incomplete, the commentary of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*, "*Gazwāte Nabawī*" among others.

¹² *Ghadr* meaning conflict. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

¹³ The English came in slowly and reached Kolkata. Thereafter from there, they reached the capital, Delhi and with deception and chaos they martyred the brave Shāh Zafar ∇ and occupied Delhi. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

¹⁴ *Shaykhul Hind* ∇ also studied by *Hazrat* Nānotwī ∇ during this time. This will be mentioned further on. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

¹⁵ He was also the teacher of Mullā 'Alī Qārī ∇. They both shared the same teacher. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

50. The Sharḥ of Shaykh ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Isā ibn Ibrāhīm Sindhī Burhānpūrī ∇ (death: martyred in 1008 A.H.)

(شرح شيخ عثمان بن عيسى بن ابراهيم سندي برهانپوري)

He was born and raised in a village named Bubakan. He went to Gujarat and studied *fiqh* and *uṣūl fiqh* from *Shaykh* Wajīhud Dīn (Aḥmad Ābādī) ∇ and others. When he went to Burhānpūr in 983 A.H., the *amīr*, Muḥammad Shāh ibn Mubārak¹⁶ honoured him and promoted him to the position of *iftā’* and teaching. He maintained this post for twenty-seven years. He excelled in *mantīq* (logic) and *ḥikmah* and he was also an experienced doctor. He was a very righteous, God-fearing person. He would stay away from all doubtful things. He did not eat anyone’s food for forty (40) years. He wrote a commentary on *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. He wrote a marginalia on “*Bayḍawī*” and he also compiled some other books. In the end of his life, he migrated to a village in Burhānpūr. Here, bandits martyred him along with seventeen others from his home. May Allāh have mercy on him.

51. The Sharḥ of Shaykh Ṭāhir ibn Yūsuf As-Sindhī Burhānpūrī ∇

(death: 1004 A.H.) (شرح الشيخ طاهر بن يوسف السندي البرهانپوري)

This commentary was sourced from Qaṣṭalānī’s commentary. The author was born in Pāyri, a village in Sindh. In his childhood, he accompanied his father and went to *Shaykh* Shihāb-ud-Dīn Sindhī ∇. He studied Ghazālī’s “*Minhāj*” by him. In 905 A.H., he went to Gujarat and stayed for quite some time in the company of *Shaykh* ‘Abdul Awwal ibn ‘Alī Ḥusaynī Jawnpūrī Dehlawī ∇ and acquired the knowledge of *Ḥadīth*. He then went to Khandesh and settled in Burhānpūr. Among his books are: “*Tafsīr Majma‘ul Baḥrayn*” which is in line with the taste and fervour of the *ṣūfīs*, the abridgement of Qaṣṭalānī’s *Al-Mawāhib Al-Laduniyyah* and the abridgement of Kirmānī’s “*Sharḥ Asmā’ Rijālil Bukhārī*”.

¹⁶ The town became famous due to kings and scholars. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

52. Al-Khayrul Jārī (الخير الجارى)

Author: Shaykh Ya‘qūb Abū Yūsuf Bayānī ∇ (death: 1098 A.H.)

Shaykh Abū Yūsuf Ya‘qūb ∇ was born in Lahore. He was very famous with regards to *fiqh* and *Ḥadīth*. He was an embodiment of *ma‘qūl* (prophetic) and *manqūl* (rational) (knowledge), *fiqh* and *usūl*. He was a teacher in Madrasah Shāhjahāniyah. Many people benefitted from him here. He excelled in *Ḥadīth*. He would indirectly refer to Fāḍil Sayālkūtī in his classes.¹⁷ He wrote a commentary on *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* titled “*Al-Khayrul Jārī*”, a commentary of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* titled “*Al-Mu‘allim*”, a commentary of *Muwatta‘* titled “*Muṣṭafā*” and a marginalia on “*Bayḍāwī*”. He passed away in Delhi in 1098 A.H. and was buried in his home. His grave is well known and is visited. This three-volume commentary is preserved in the state library of Rāmpūr. *Muḥaddith Sahāranpūrī* ∇ used this commentary as a source while compiling his marginalia on *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. He mentions this in his introduction.

53. Fayḍul Bārī (فيض الباري)

Author: Shaykh Muḥammad A‘ẓam ibn Sayfud Dīn Sarhindī Al-‘Umri Al-Ḥanafī ∇ (death: 1114 A.H.)

He was born and grew up in Sarhind. At first, he studied with his paternal uncle then with his honourable father. He spiritually reformed himself under the guidance of his father. He wrote a beneficial commentary on *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. He is buried in Sarhind next to his father.

54. The Sharḥ of Shaykhul Islām Muḥammad ibn Muḥibbullāh Bukhārī Dehlawī (شرح شيخ الاسلام محمد بن محب الله البخاري الدهلوي)

This commentary consists of 6 volumes. It is published in the footnotes of *Shaykh Nūrul Ḥaq Muḥaddith Dehlawī*’s commentary, “*Taysīrul*

¹⁷ He wrote a marginalia on “*Sharḥ ‘Aqā’id*” titled, “*Khayālī*”. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

Qārī". He was from the family of *Shaykh-ul-Islām* Shāh ‘Abdul Ḥaq Muḥaddith Dehlawī ∇. His lineage and *sanad* is:

Muḥammad narrates from Fakhrud Dīn Abil Makārim ‘Abduṣ Ṣamad, from his father, *Shaykh* Muḥibbullāh ibn *Shaykh* Nūrullāh, from his great grandfather, the famous author, *Shaykh* Nūrul Ḥaq, from his father, *Shaykh-ul-Muḥaddithīn* ‘Abdul Ḥaq ibn Ṣayf-ud-Dīn Dehlawī (place of residence) Al-Bukhārī (origin), Adh-Dhakī (by lineage) Al-Ḥanafī (his *madh-hab*) Al-Qādirī (*silsilah*) An-Naqshabandī.

In the era of *Shaykh-ul-Islām* Sulṭān Muḥammad Shāh, he was appointed as the chief judge in Shahjahanabad and he remained in this position until the beginning of the era of Nādir Shāh. He thereafter passed away and was buried in the graveyard of *Shaykh* ‘Abdul Ḥaq Muḥaddith. The year of his death is unknown.

55. ‘Awnul Bārī fī Ḥallī Adillatil Bukhārī

(عون الباري في حل أدلة البخاري لسيد النواب صديق حسن خان الحسيني البخاري القنوجي البهوبالي)

Author: Sayyid Nawāb Ṣiddīq Ḥasan Khan Al-Ḥusaynī Al-Bukhārī Al-Qanūjī Al-Bhūbālī ∇ (death:1307 A.H.)

He was among the great ‘*ulamā*’ of the *ghayr muqallidīn*. However, he respected the *mujtahidīn*, *fuqahā*’ and *ṣūfiyyah*. This commentary consists of four volumes. This is the commentary of “*Tajrīdus Ṣaḥīḥ*”, an abridgement of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. “*Tajrīdus Ṣaḥīḥ*” was compiled by *Shaykh* Shihāb-ud-Dīn Abul ‘Abbās Aḥmad ibn Aḥmad ibn Zayn-ud-Dīn ‘Abdul Laṭīf Ash-Sharjī Az-Zabīdī Al-Ḥanafī (death: 893 A.H.). Nawāb Ṣiddīq Ḥasan Khān *ṣaḥīb* was born in 1148 A.H. His books are famous. Amongst them are: “*Al-Ḥiṭṭah bidhikriṣ Ṣiḥāḥ Sittah*”, “*Iṭḥāfun Nubalā’ Muttaqīn biḥyā’ Ma-āthirul Fuqahā’ wal Muḥaddithīn*” and “*Abjadul ‘Ulūm*”. He compiled a commentary on *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* titled “*Ghunyatul Qārī*” which was published in India.

56. Fayḍul Ṭārī- Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī (الفيض الطاري الشرح صحيح البخاري)

Author: *Shaykh* Ja'far ibn Muḥammad Al-Ḥusaynī Al-Bukhārī Gujarātī (death: 1085 A.H.) √

It is mentioned in “*Nuzhatul Khawāṭir*” that most probably, he was famously known as Badr ‘Ālam. He was born in 1023 A.H. His household was a household of knowledge and *ṭariqah* (spirituality). He studied and benefitted from his father and other teachers. He excelled his father in *Ḥadīth*, *tafsīr* and *taṣawwuf*. After the death of his grandfather, Muḥammad ibn Jalāl, even during the lifetime of his father, he was appointed as the spiritual guide of the spiritual gatherings of advice. He was quick at writing and could write the *Qur’ān* in fifty-four (54) hours. His book, “*Kitābur Rawḍāt*” consists of few volumes. He also authored a few booklets of *tafsīr*. He is buried alongside his father.

57. I‘ānatul Qārī-Sharḥ Thulāthiyātul Bukhārī

(اعانة القاري شرح ثلاثيات البخاري)

Author: *Shaykh* Yahyā ibn Amīnūl ‘Abbāsī Ilahabadi √ (death: 1144 A.H.)

He was born in 1080 A.H. He acquired knowledge from his uncle, *Shaykh* Muḥammad Faḍl √. After his (uncle’s) death, his responsibilities were handed over to him. There was no ‘ālim and spiritual guide like him in his era or city. Apart from “*I‘ānutul Qārī*”, he wrote many other books.

Note: Mullā ‘Alī Qārī √ (death: 1014 A.H.), Muḥammad Shāh ibn Ḥasan √ (death: 939 A.H.) and *Shaykh* Mawlānā ‘Abdul Bāṭin ibn Mawlwī Rustam ‘Alī ibn Mullā ‘Alī Aṣghar √ (death: 1149 AH) also wrote commentaries on the *thulāthiyāt* of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*.

58. Nibrāsus Sārī Fī Aṭrāfil Bukhārī (نبراس الساري في أطراف البخاري)

Author: *Shaykh* Muḥammad ‘Abdul ‘Azīz Ḥanafī Suhālwī √

In this book, the section in which each *ḥadīth* of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* can be found is mentioned. This book is very beneficial for studying the *aṭrāf* and *ṭurūq* of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. The author was the student of *Shaykh-ul-Hind* √. He also studied by *Mawlānā* Khalīl Aḥmad Sahāranpūrī √ and

Mawlānā Ḥusayn ‘Alī Panjābī ∇. *Mawlānā* Ḥusayn was the student of *Ḥazrat* Gangohī ∇. He compiled a summary of the lectures of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* which were delivered in 1303 A.H.

Mawlānā Muḥammad ‘Abdul ‘Azīz ∇ also wrote an excellent, valuable marginalia of “*Naṣbur Rāyah*” until *Kitābul Ḥajj*.¹⁸

59. Lāmi‘ud Darārī ‘Alā Jāmi‘il Bukhārī (لامع الدراري على جامع البخاري)

This is the discourse of *Ḥazrat Mawlānā* Rashīd Aḥmad Ghangohī ∇ (death: 1323 AH) which *Ḥazrat Mawlānā* Muḥammad Yaḥyā Khāndhelwī ∇ compiled from *Ḥazrat’s* last class in year 1313 A.H.¹⁹ *Ḥazrat Shaykhul Ḥadīth*, *Mawlānā* Muḥammad Zakariyyā published it with a very comprehensive and beneficial marginalia and introduction. It consists of three volumes.

60. Fayḍul Bārī ‘alā Ṣaḥīḥil Bukhārī (فيض الباري على صحيح البخاري)

This is the discourses of ‘Allāmah ‘Anwar Shāh Kashmīrī ∇ (death: 1352 A.H.) which *Mawlānā* Badre-‘Ālim Mirthī compiled in Jami‘ah Islāmiyah Ta‘līmud Dīn Dabhel. Majlisī ‘Ilmī Dabel, Simlak published it in four volumes from Cairo, Egypt. This is the discourse of his last class as mentioned by the compiler.

61. Darse Bukhārī [Faḍlul Bārī] (درس بخاري)

‘Allāmah Shabīr Aḥmed ‘Uthmānī ∇, the commentator of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* (death: 1369 A.H.). One volume was published by Jami‘ah Islāmiyah after *Mawlānā* Ḥabībūr Raḥmān A‘ẓmī ∇ reviewed it. *Mawlānā* ‘Abdul Waḥīd Ṣāḥib Ṣiddīqī ∇ compiled these lectures. This discourse, along

¹⁸ “*Naṣbur Rāyah*” consists of four volumes. He wrote the footnotes of the first volume. The remaining three volumes were written by *Mawlānā* Muḥammad Yūsuf Kāmilpūrī ∇. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

¹⁹ We have written more details on this in the introduction of *Jāmi‘ Tirmidhī*, “*Kawkabud Durri*”. The full details regarding when *Ḥazrat* Gangohī ∇ commenced and completed *dorah ḥadīth* is written in that introduction. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

with some additions, were published in Pakistan in two volumes under the title “*Faḍlul Bārī*” by *Mawlānā Qāḍī* ‘Abdur Raḥmān *ṣāhib* v. He was unable to complete the remainder. So many additions were made to this commentary that it became a separate commentary.²⁰

62. Taqrīr Bukhārī (تقرير بخاري)

Author: *Ḥazrat Shaykhul Islām Mawlānā Ḥusayn Aḥmad Madnī* v (death: 1377 A.H), *Shaykhul Ḥadīth* Dārul ‘Ulūm Deabond. A small portion of this dictation, from the beginning until the beginning of *Kitābul Imān* has been published. Many students compiled the lectures of *Ḥazrat Madnī* v.

63. Tashkīl Asānīdul Bukhārī (تشکیل اسانید البخاری)²¹

Author: *Mawlānā Fārūq Aḥmad Anbhatwī Sahāranpūrī*, *Shaykhul Ḥadīth* of Jami‘ah ‘Abbāsiyah, Bhāwalpūr, Pakistan.

In this commentary, the author mentions the chains of narrations of *Ḥazrat* Ghangohī, *Ḥazrat* Nānotwī, *Mawlānā* Khalīl Aḥmad Sahāranpūrī, *Shaykhul Hind*, *Ḥazrat* Thanwī, *Ḥazrat* Madnī, ‘Allāmah Kashmīrī and

²⁰ In “*Faḍlul Bārī*”, it is not known which points were mentioned by ‘Allāmah ‘Uthmānī and which points were added by *Mawlānā Qāḍī* ‘Abdur Raḥmān *ṣāhib*. It has become completely combined. It is no longer ‘Allāmah ‘Uthmānī’s discourse alone. However, the one which has been published by Jami‘ah Dabhel is purely ‘Allāmah ‘Uthmānī’s. The tone, style and all the words are ‘Allāmah ‘Uthmānī’s. Upon reading it, one remembers ‘Allāmah ‘Uthmānī. ‘Allāmah ‘Uthmānī is a giant scholar. His memoirs, titled “*Tajalliyāt Uthmānī*” have been published. This should be read. *Ḥazrat* Nanotwī’s knowledge has been transferred to him. For this reason, he mentions the specialities of Islām in a very unique style. *Ḥazrat* Thānvī placed his own ‘*amāmah* on his [‘Allāmah ‘Uthmānī’s] head. He was the bearer of *Ḥazrat* Nānotwī’s knowledge. He remained as the *Shaykhul Ḥadīth* of Dārul ‘Ulūm Deoband for a very long time and many ‘*ulamā*’ graduated during this time. Nowadays, one may find many students of *Shaykhul Islām* ‘Allāmah Shabīr Aḥmad ‘Uthmānī. The students of ‘Allāmah Kashmīrī most probably have all passed away. [Extracted from *Ifādūtush Shaykh*]

²¹ The *sanads* of Bukhārī were mentioned in one form. [Extracted from *Ifādūtush Shaykh*]

other *mashāyikh* □ until Imām Bukhārī v. He also placed it in chart form due to which understanding the chains become very easy.²²

64. Īdāḥul Bukhārī (ایضاح البخاري)

This is the compilation of the lectures of *Mawlānā* Fakhrud Dīn *ṣāhib* v, *Shaykhul Ḥadīth* of Dārul ‘Ulūm Deoband.²³ It was compiled by *Mawlānā* Riyāsat ‘Alī Bijnūrī *ṣāhib* in thirteen parts in two volumes.

65. Anwārul Bārī (انوار الباري)

Compiler: *Mawlānā* Sayyid Aḥmad Raḍā Bijnūrī v, the student of ‘Allāmah Anwar Shāh Kashmīrī v. This is a commentary of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* in light of the lectures of ‘Allāmah Kashmīrī on *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. It consists of a very beneficial two-volume introduction. This commentary has been published in approximately twenty volumes.

66. Al-Abwāb wat Tarājim (الابواب والتراجم)²⁴

Author: *Hazrat Shaykhul Ḥadīth Mawlānā* Muḥammad Zakariyyā *ṣāhib* v

67. Taqrīr Bukhārī (تقرير بخاري)

²² Recently, “*Al-Kalāmul Mufīd*” (a new book) by a Bangladeshi ‘ālim was published. *Mawlānā* Rūḥul Amīn Farīdpūrī mentioned the biography of each of the *rijāl* (narrators) in all the *sanads* of *Mawlānā* ‘Abdur Rashīd Nu‘mānī. It is a very beneficial book. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

²³ After *Hazrat* Madnī, he was the *Shaykhul Ḥadīth* of Dārul ‘Ulūm Deoband. He also remained the *Shaykhul Ḥadīth* for a long time. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

²⁴ In this commentary, there is a very detailed commentary on the *Tarājimul Abwāb* of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

These are *Ḥazrat Shaykhul Ḥadīth Mawlānā* Muḥammad Zakariyyā *ṣāhib's* lectures of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* compiled by *Mawlānā* Muḥammad Shāhid Sahāranpūrī √.

68. Irshādul Qārī (ارشاد القاري)

The lectures of *Mawlānā Muftī* Rashīd Aḥmad Ludhyānwī √. (death: 6th Dhūl Ḥijjah 1422 A.H.)

69. ‘Ādātul Imām Bukhārī fī Ṣaḥīḥi (عادات الامام البخاري)

Shaykh ‘Abdul Ḥaq ibn ‘Abdul Wāhid Al-Hāshimī Al-Makkī √ (1302-1392 A.H.)

Those who wrote an *istikhrāj* of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* are as follows:

1. Abū Bakr Aḥmad ibn Ibrāhīm ‘Ismā‘īlī Jurjānī √ (death: 371 A.H.)
2. Abū Bakr ibn Muḥammad Khawārzamī Burqānī √ (death: 425 A.H.)
3. Abū Aḥmad Muḥammad ibn Ḥāmid Ghatrifi Jurjānī √ (death: 377 A.H.)
4. Muḥammad ibn Abū ‘Abbās ‘Abdullāh ibn Dhuhāl Dhibī Harawī √ (death: 378 A.H.)
5. Abū Bakr ibn Mardawiyah Aḥmad ibn Musā Aṣbahānī √ (death: 416 A.H.) (*Tadrībūr Rāwī* 111/1 and *Tarjumah ‘Awāriful Manan* ‘Allāmah Binnorī)

Sirājul Qārī: *Ḥazrat Shaykh* Muḥammad Zakariyyā *ṣāhib's* lectures of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* (compiled by) *Mawlānā* ‘Abdur Rahīm Motalā *Ṣāhib* Chapata, Zambia. (death: 25th Muḥarram 1434 A.H or 9/12/2012)

Kashful Bārī: *Ḥazrat* Mawlānā Salīmullāh Khān Ṣāhib (death: Rabī‘uth Thānī 1438 A.H/ January 2017)

Taqrīrul Bukhārī: *Ḥazrat* Muftī Nizāmudīn Shāmizī (death: 10th Rabī‘uth Thānī 1425 A.H.)

Imdādul Bārī and it's abridged version:

Jāmi'ud Darārī: *Ḥazrat Mawlānā* ‘Abdul Jabār Ṣāhib A‘zmī Ma‘rūfi, *Shaykhul Ḥadīth* of Shahimuradabad (death: 1409 A.H.). It was completed by *Mawlānā* Zaynul ‘Ābidīn Ma‘rūfi A‘zmī (death: 16th *Jumād-al-Thānī* 1434 A.H.)

Ta‘dīlur Rijālil Bukhārī: *Muḥaddith Kabīr*, ‘Allāmah Ḥabībūr Raḥmān A‘zmī (death: 1412 A.H.) (Replies to objections raised against the narrators of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*.)

At-Taswībāt Limā Waqa‘ Fī Hawāshil Bukhārī Minat Taṣhīfāt:

Ḥazrat Mawlānā ‘Abdul Jabbār Ṣāhib A‘zmī Mawwī, *Shaykhul Ḥadīth* of Mazāhirul ‘Ulūm, Banāras and Mirqātul ‘Ulūm, Mau, U.P., India. (death: 1414 A.H.)

In‘āmul Bārī: *Muftī* Taqī ‘Uthmānī مد ظله.

Naṣrul Bārī: *Mawlānā* Muḥammad Ghanī, *Shaykhul Ḥadīth* مد ظله, Waqf Mazāhirul ‘Ulūm Sahāranpūr.

Al-Khayrul Jārī: *Mawlānā* Ṣūfi Muḥammad Sarūr ṣāhib مد ظله, Jāmi’ah Ashrafiyah Lahore Pakistan.



بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

والحمد لله ربّ العالمين والصلوة والسلام علي سيد الأنبياء والمرسلين

رجال سند الصحيح للأمام البخاري

مع سني ولادتهم وسني وفاتهم وأعمارهم

Our Chain of Transmission (Sanad) of Imām Bukhārī's Ṣaḥīḥ

Inclusive of their Birth and Death Dates and Ages

١. فضل الرحمن الأعظمي المنوي:

Birth: 14 *Ṣafar* 1366 A.H./ 7 January 1947 C.E.

Graduated in 1386 A.H. from Miftāḥul ‘Ulūm, Mau

The son of *Qārī, Muftī, Ḥafīẓur Raḥmān A‘ẓmī* ∇, the *Shaykhul Ḥadīth* of Madrasah Mirqātul ‘Ulūm, Mau, U.P, India.

Birth: 1345 A.H./1926 C.E.

Graduation: 1367 A.H./1948 C.E. from Miftāḥul ‘Ulūm, India

Death: 2nd *Shawwāl*, 1430 A.H./22 September 2009 C.E. (Tuesday)

Age: 85 years

٢. عن المحدث الجليل الشيخ حبيب الرحمن الأعظمي ∇:

Birth: 1319 A.H./1901 C.E.

Death: 10 *Ramaḍān* 1412 A.H./ 17 March 1992 C.E.

Age: 92

وعن العلامة شيخ عبد اللطيف النعماني الأعظمي:✓

Birth: 17 *Ramaḍān* 1315 A.H./1898 C.E.

Death: 3 *Dhul Qa‘dah* 1392 A.H./6 January 1973 C.E.

Age: 77

٣. كلاهما عن الشيخ كريم بخش السنبهلي:✓

Birth: 1317 A.H. in Deoband

Death: 1362 A.H.

٤. عن الشيخ محمود حسن شيخ الهند الديوبندي:✓

Birth: 1268 A.H./1851 C.E.

Death: 1339 A.H./1920 C.E.

Age: 71

٥. عن الشيخ محمد قاسم النانوتوي:✓

Birth: 1248 A.H./1831 C.E.

Death: 1297 A.H./1789 C.E.

Age: 49

والشيخ رشيد احمد كنكوهي:✓

Birth: 1244 A.H./1828 C.E.

Death: 1323 A.H./1905 C.E.

Age: 79

٦. عن الشيخ عبد الغنى المجددى الدهلوى ثم المدنى:

Birth: 1235 A.H. in Delhi

Death: 1296 A.H. IN Madīnah Munawwarah

Age: 61

٧. عن شيخ محمد اسحاق ابو سليمان الدهلوى ثم المكى:

Birth: 1197 A.H. in Delhi

Death: 1262 A.H. in Makkah Mukarramah

Age: 65

٨. عن الشيخ عبد العزيز المحدث الأجل (جدّه أب الأم) الدهلوى:

Birth: 1159 A.H.

Death: 1239 A.H.

Age: 80

٩. عن الشيخ الشاه ولى الله بن عبد الرحيم المحدث الدهلوى:

Birth: 1114 A.H.

Death: 1276 A.H.

Age: 62

١٠. عن الشيخ أبى طاهر محمد عبد السميع الكردى المدنى:

Birth: 1081 A.H. in Madīnah Munawwarah

Death: 1163 A.H. in Madīnah Munawwarah

Age: 62

١١. عن والده الشيخ إبراهيم ابن حسن الكردي الكوراني المدني:

Birth: 1024 A.H. in Kurd

Death: 1101 A.H. in Madīnah Munawwarah

Age: 76

١٢. عن الشيخ أحمد بن محمد البدري القشاشي المالكي المدني:

Birth: 991 A.H.

Death: 1071 A.H. in Madīnah Munawwarah

Age: 80

١٣. عن الشيخ أحمد بن عبد القدوس الشنأوى المصرى ثم المدني:

Birth: 975 A.H. in Egypt

Death: 1028 A.H. in Madīnah Munawwarah

Age: 53

١٤. عن الشيخ شمس الدين محمد بن أحمد بن حمزه الرملى المصرى:

Birth: 919 A.H. in Egypt

Death: 1004 A.H. in Egypt

Age: 85

١٥. عن الشيخ الإسلام زكريا بن محمد الأنصاري السنيكي المصري:

Birth: 823 A.H. in Egypt

Death: 926 A.H. in Egypt

Age: 103

١٦. عن الشيخ أحمد بن حجر العسقلاني القاهري شارح البخاري:ؕ

Birth: 773 A.H. in Egypt

Death: 852 A.H. in Egypt

Age: 79

١٧. عن الشيخ زين الدين ابراهيم أحمد التتوخي البعلبي ثم الشامي ثم المصري:ؕ

Birth: 709 A.H. in Egypt

Death: 800 A.H. in Egypt

Age: 91

١٨. عن الشيخ أبي العباس أحمد بن أبي طالب الحجار الصالحي:ؕ

سمع الزبيدي في ٦٣٠ هـ في جامع الصالحية (لامع: ٧١)

Birth: 622 A.H. in Ḥudūd [*Lāmi*:71]

Death: 730 A.H. in *Ṣafar*

Age: 108

١٩. عن الشيخ سراج الدين حسين بن مبارك الزبيدي الأصل البغدادي:ؕ

Birth: 544 A.H. or 545 A.H.

Death: *Ṣafar* 631 A.H. in Baghdād

Age: 86

٢٠. عن الشيخ عبد الأول عيسى بن شعيب السجزي الهروي:

Birth: 458 A.H.

Death: 553 A.H.

Age: 95

٢١. عن أبي الحسن الشيخ عبد الرحمن بن مظفر البوشنجي الداودي:

Birth: 374 A.H.

Death: 467 A.H. in Baushanj

Age: 93

٢٢. عن الشيخ أبي محمد عبدالله بن أحمد بن حمويه السرخسي:

Birth: 293 A.H.

Death: 381 A.H. (*Lāmi'* pg. 71)

Age: 88

٢٣. عن الشيخ أبي عبدالله محمد بن يوسف بن مطر الفريزي:

Birth: 231 A.H.

Death: 320 A.H.

Age: 89

٢٤. أمير المؤمنين أبي عبدالله محمد بن اسماعيل بن ابراهيم بن المغيرة بن بردزبه:

Birth: 194 A.H.

Death: 256 A.H.

Age: 62

رحمهم الله رحمة واسعة. وجزاهم عنا جميع المسلمين خير الجزاء

Second Sanad

سند رسالة الأوائل

فضل الرحمن بن حفيظ الرحمن الأعظمي، عن الشيخ المحدث الجليل حبيب الرحمن الأعظمي، عن الشيخ أبي الأنوار عبد الغفار المنوي¹ (الأعظمي)، عن الشيخ عبد الحق الإله آبادي المهاجر المكي، عن الشيخ قطب الدين الدهلوي ثم المكي، عن الشيخ محمد اسحاق الدهلوي ثم المكي، عن الشيخ عمر بن عبد الكريم بن عبد الرسول، عن الشيخ محمد طاهر، عن والده العلامة محمد سعيد سنبل المكي صاحب الرسالة،

وسنده مذكور في الرسالة إلى المؤلفين . رحمهم الله²

The Third Sanad (The Highest)

Muḥaddith Jalīl also received *ijāzah* (authorisation) from *Mawlānā ‘Abdur Raḥmān Bhopālī*. Who received from *Mawlānā ‘Abdul Qayūm Badhānwī*. Who received *ijāzah* from *Shāh Muḥammad Ishāq ṣāhib*,

¹ *Ḥazrat Mawlānā ‘Abdul Ghaffār ṣāhib* ∇ was the student of *Ḥazrat Mawlānā Rashīd Aḥmed Gangohī* ∇. He studied the *Ṣiḥāḥ Sittah* by him in 1305 A.H. and 1306 A.H. (For details, see *Ḥayāt Abul Ma-āthir* Page 118-130) Additionally, in “*Tadkhkirar Rashīd*”, from among the students of *Ḥazrat Gangohī* ∇, his name is mentioned first. (1/280 New edition published by Deoband)

² اجازة المحدث الكبير الشيخ حبيب الرحمن الاعظمي ∇

الحمد لله وكفى وسلام على عباده الذين اصطفى ، أما بعد !

فقد قرأ على هذه الرسالة الولد العزيز الفاضل الذكي فضل الرحمن بن حفيظ الرحمن المنوي ، وأجزت له رواية ما تحويه بشروطها المعتبرة عند أهل العلم ، وأوصيه بتقوى الله في السر والعلانية واتباع السنة واجتناب البدعة واقتفاء آثار السلف الصالح واحسان الظن بهم واکرامهم واکرام من بعدهم من العلماء والدُّبِّ عنهم ، وأن لا ينسانا في دعواته ، وفَّقنا الله وإياه لما يُحبُّه ويرضاه.

قاله بفمه وسطره بقلمه حبيب الرحمن الأعظمي في رابع شوال من سنة ١٣٩٣ هـ.

who is also the son-in-law of Shāh Ṣāhib. (Majallah Al-Ma-āthir pg 73, Muḥarram Rabi'ul Awwal 1416)

This is the highest *sanad* (chain).



*Biographies of
The Illustrious Mashāyikh
of Ḥadīth
in Our Sanad*



Ḥazrat Mawlānā Shaykh ‘Abdul Laṭīf Nu‘mānī¹ Mawī A‘ẓmī ▽

Birth: 1315 A.H.

Death: 1392 A.H.

Age: 77 years

Date of Death: 1392 A.H. اللهم اغفر له (May Allāh forgive him.)

Birth

Mawlānā Nu‘mānī was born on 17 *Ramaḍān*, 1315 A.H. (February 1898) in Imamganj which is near to the province, Mau. His father’s name was ‘Abdul Ḥafīẓ who was a great Ḥāfiẓ.²

The Beginning of His Studies

He first studied Qur’ān *Nāẓirah* (recitation of the Qur’ān) in Madrasah ‘Āliyah, Jamālpūrah, Mau. After completing this, he entered the Dārul ‘Ulūm in Mau. (*Taẓkirah Nu‘mānī* pg. 25,26)

In 1916, *Mawlānā* Nu‘mānī ▽ studied a Mullā (B.A.) course. In March 1917, he set the exam. “*Kāfiyah*” and “*Shāfiyah*” were on the syllabus of this programme. In *Shawwāl*, 1337 A.H. (1919) he went to Dārul ‘Ulūm Deoband. However, he was affected by a sickness connected to the change of the season. Therefore, he returned home in *Muḥarram* 1338 A.H. Thereafter, he also went to Deoband in 1339 A.H. However, due to various reasons he had to leave Deoband and thus, he went to Meendu (a province in Aligarh). He stayed there for approximately one month. He then went back to Dārul ‘Ulūm Mau. In Meendu, he studied a

¹ His title was Nu‘mānī due to his connection to Nu‘mān ibn Thābit. He was very harsh against the *ghayr muqallidīn*. He rectified many of the *ghayr muqallidīn*. He never feared anyone. Rather, everyone feared him. (*Faẓl*)

² Our colleague, *Mawlānā* Ṣuhayr Ḥasan ▽ wrote this. However, I have some reservations regarding this. (*Faẓl*)

portion of "*Jalālayn*" from *Mawlānā Ḥāfiẓ* 'Abdur Raḥmān *ṣāhib* Amruhi v. Before this, he also studied some lessons of "*Jalālayn*" from *Mawlānā Ibrāhīm Balyāwī* v in Dārul 'Ulūm Mau. (*Tazkirah Nu'mānī* by *Mawlānā Ḥabībūr Raḥmān A'ẓmī* v pg. 13)

Graduating & Teaching

Mawlānā 'Abdul Laṭīf *ṣāhib* v graduated from Dārul 'Ulūm Mau in *Sha'bān* 1341 A.H. *Mawlānā* Karīm Baksh Sanbhalī *ṣāhib* v was his *dorah ḥadīth* teacher. After graduating, he started teaching there and in the first year of his teaching he taught "*Mībdhī*", "*Sharḥ Hidāyatul Ḥikmah*" and "*Mīr Zāhid Risālah ma'a ghulām Yaḥyā*". *Mawlānā* Manẓūr Nu'mānī v was also one of the students. He has written: "He taught in such a manner that it was as though an experienced teacher of *manṭiq* and philosophy was teaching." (*Tazkirah Nu'mānī* pg. 14,34)

This occurred in 1342 A.H. In 1347 A.H., at the time of Miftāḥul 'Ulūm's renaissance, *Mawlānā* Abul Ḥasan *ṣāhib* 'Irāqī employed *Mawlānā* Ḥabībūr Raḥmān A'ẓmī in Miftāḥul 'Ulūm. At that time, *Mawlānā* 'Abdul Laṭīf *ṣāhib* left *Dārul 'Ulūm* Mau and was now a teacher in Sanbhul. When he came to Mau during the *Īd-ul-'Aḍḥā* holidays, *Mawlānā* A'ẓmī also employed *Mawlānā* Nu'mānī in Miftāḥul 'Ulūm. After a few days, *Mawlānā* Ayyūb *Ṣāhib* A'ẓmī was called from Dewrya and was appointed as the administrator.

It is from this time that *Mawlānā* Nu'mānī v offered his services in teaching. Approximately, in 1371 A.H., when *Mawlānā* A'ẓmī v stopped teaching in Miftāḥul 'Ulūm and began writing books, he became the head teacher. (*Tazkirah Nu'mānī* pg. 15)

In 1377 A.H., when he became a member of the assembly, he stopped teaching. He then returned to the position of head teacher and *Shaykhul Ḥadīth* in 1381 A.H. and he remained in this position until his final days. From *Shawwāl* 1341 A.H. until 1392 A.H., with the exception

of five years, he taught for forty-five years. He has thousands of students and he also later became the principal.

The Excellences of Mawlānā Nu‘mānī

Mawlānā Nu‘mānī ∇, in the terminology of our *Dīnī Madāris*, was an expert, knowledgeable and well-versed teacher in *ma‘qūlāt* (rational knowledge) and *manqūlāt* (Prophetic knowledge). He was a prolific speaker and also very successful in debating. He also had a deep connection with the national politics. He was also very active in local politics and the affairs of the city. He was also the chairman of the board three times and was also the chairman at the time of his death. He was also a member of the assembly. He used to fulfil the right of every work. Allāh blessed him with extraordinary abilities and undying strength to carry out actions. (*Taḏkirah*: 135 by Mawlānā Manzūr Nu‘mānī ∇)

He defeated the leader of Raḏākanīs, Mawlvī Ḥashmat ‘Alī, many times in debates. He also debated with the *Ahl Ḥadīth*. *Mawlānā* Thanāullāh Amratsarī used to publish the replies [of *Mawlānā* Nu‘mānī] to the objections of the *Ahl Ḥadīth* in “*Al ‘Adl Gho Jaranwala*”. (*Taḏkirah*: pg. 48 by Mawlānā Muḥammad Ayyūb A‘ẓmī ∇)

Character and Habits

Mawlānā’s character and habits were of a very high calibre. He interacted with both the common people and those with a higher position in the same manner. He would walk miles for the work of the poor and ordinary people. He was very humble amongst the gatherings of his friends and loved ones. He would never act as though he was greater and higher in status. Rather, he always presented himself as a servant. (*Taḏkirah*)

Iṣlāḥ and Tablīgh (Rectification & Propagation of Islām)

Guiding, rectifying and *tablīgh* was *Ḥazrat’s* special focus. By his inspiring lectures, he accomplished the great work of rectifying the

general public. For this (great work of his), the nation will always remember him. Other than his city, he also went to the suburbs and outskirts for the purpose of rectifying the Muslims there. Due to his numerous commitments, he did not travel much. (*Taḏkirah Nu'mānī* pg. 29 Maulvī Ḥayr Ḥasan Miftāḥī)

Ma' mūlāt (His Routine)

Ḥazrat √ organised his time according to the *Sunnah* in such a manner that there was no inconsistency, nor did he mismanage his time. *Hazrat* √ always awoke during the latter part of the night and performed *tahajjud ṣalāh*. After that, he recited the Qur'ān. He performed *Fajr ṣalāh* with *jamā'ah* (congregation) and also woke up the children for *Fajr ṣalāh* since, he remained in the *madrasah* during the day and night towards the end of his life. When it was time for *madrasah*, he would become preoccupied in *dars* and teaching. (*Taḏkirah* pg. 31)

During his time as chairman, he remained preoccupied with teaching until 10 o'clock. He then would go to the board and look at the papers. He examined the work of the workers and he issued commands. He would complete this at 12 o'clock and then ate lunch. He would then take an afternoon nap (siesta- *qaylūlah*). He taught class after *Ḥuhr*. After teaching, he would go to examine and attend to the matters of the board and societies. After *Maghrib*, he taught class. After *'Ishā'* he busied himself in studying books. (*Taḏkirah Nu'mānī*: by Mawlānā Muḥammad Ayyūb A'ẓmī √, pg. 49,50)

Death

On 6 January 1973, after *'Ishā'* while he was busy with writing books, he suffered from his first heart attack suddenly around 10:30 and in 10-15 minutes this wayfarer departed to his permanent abode. (*To Allāh we belong and to Him do we return.*) This was the 1st night of *Dhul Ḥijjah*, 1392. Around forty to fifty thousand Muslims attended his

janāzah. He was buried in the *madrasah*. (Extracted from *Taḏkirah Nu'mānī-Mawlānā Muḥīṭ Zafīr-ud-Dīn Miḥṭāḥī* ♥)³

³ We also studied “*Mīr Quṭbī*” and “*Baydhāwī*” by him. He did not have the book. We took our books with us. When the students would read the ‘*ibārah*’ (text), that would be his *muṭāla‘ah*. He would then raise his head and begin to lecture. He would rarely look into the book. He would teach like how a person reads the newspaper. He did not need to do *muṭāla‘ah* and he would say: “During my student days, until I do not complete doing *muṭāla‘ah* of all the *kitābs* at night, I will not eat food.” He would complete all his work and then eat because laziness overcomes a person after eating. He would mention: “With regards to teaching, we are *mujtahids*, i.e., we are *mujtahids* in our teaching style. We are not *muqallids* of anyone with regards to that.” It was his habit to repeat important points two or three times. If the student is intelligent, focused and listens attentively, then after class, he remembers all the topics taught.

He defeated the Radhākhānī’s leader, Maulvī Ḥashmat ‘Alī, many times in debates. It is the habit of Barelwis to label Gangohī, Nanotvī and Thānvī as *kāfirs* (disbelievers). These people have the treasure of *kufīr* on their side. Now, the work of our Maulvī is to establish that these *mashāyikh* are Muslims. He states: We thought that why should we be foolish and simply show our innocence whenever they accuse us? Therefore, I changed the method of debating. I quoted the ‘*ibārah*’ (text) from Maulvī Radhā Khan’s book and then made an announcement that I have a proclamation to make, “Listen! Your Maulvī Aḥmad Radhā Khan is a *kāfir*.” Until now, they had never heard this. They were astonished. “How can you label him a *kāfir*? It is your Deoband *fatwā* that we do not grade anyone as *kāfirs*.” He [Mawlānā Nu‘mānī] then mentions that: “The Ulama of Deoband may not be aware. I have found out. I have the texts from which I have read and establish his *kufīr* (disbelief). Now, you establish his Islām. Let the Deoband *fatwā* remain here.” When he adopted this style, they were not ready to take this line of debate. Under the pretext of urinating, they left the scene and did not return thereafter.

A priest came and he went to various places in India and called the Muslims to Christianity. He read the *Qur’ān* and used it as evidence against the Muslims. Once he came and translated so Mawlānā said: “What is the *bāb* of this word? What is the *ṣegah* (inflection) of this word? What is the *māddah* (root) of this word, etc.? He only knew the translation and knew nothing else. He became silent and ran away. He said: “Debate is that which silences the opposition. What does the layman know regarding discussions about knowledge?”



Muḥaddith Kabīr ‘Allāmah Jalīl Mawlānā Ḥabīb-ur- Raḥmān A‘ẓmī ∇

Amīrul Hind

The Great Mawlānā

Birth: 1319 A.H. /1901 C.E. Death: Ramaḍān 1412 A.H./1992 C.E.

The aforementioned was born in 1319 A.H./1901 C.E. in Maunath Bhanjan¹ in the district of Azamgarh. He acquired his early education from the scholars of his area. His father, *Mawlānā* Muḥammad Ṣābir *ṣāhib* ∇ (death:1365 A.H.) was a *murīd* (disciple) of *Ḥazrat* Thānwī ∇. He was an ascetic, a man of *taqwā* (Allāh consciousness), good character, hospitable and performed *tahajjud* regularly. He recited the Qur’ān in abundance. He taught children in the *masjid* of the locality for Allāh’s sake for approximately twenty-six (26) years. *Mawlānā* A‘ẓmī ∇ prospered in the field of knowledge under the shadow of such a father for forty-six years. He obtained most of his knowledge from *Mawlānā* ‘Abdul Ghaffār *ṣāhib* ∇ who was the special student of *Ḥazrat* Gangohī ∇. He studied all the books regarding *adab* (literature) and also books in other fields by him. In the end, he also studied *Tirmidhī Sharīf* by him. *Mawlānā* ‘Abdul Ghaffār *ṣāhib* ∇ passed away in 1341 A.H. He was one of the great ‘*ulamā*’ of Mau. He was also a teacher in Gorakhpur and Mazharul ‘Ulūm, Varanasi. *Mawlānā* A‘ẓmī ∇ also went to those places to seek knowledge. In 1918 C.E., he set the Mullā (B.A.) exam. In March 1919 C.E., he set the *fāḍil* examination and attained a high level of success.

In Dārul ‘Ulūm Deoband

¹ Maunath Bhanjan is the biggest province in Azamgarh. It has now become a separate district. In this town, there are now more than three hundred *masājid* and there are seven *Dārul ‘Ulūms*. There are also educational institutions for girls. [Extracted from *Ifādātush Shaykh*]

He first entered Dārul ‘Ulūm Deoband in *Shawwāl* 1337 A.H. (July 1919 C.E.). He scored marks with distinction in the entrance examination. During his studies, there was a malaria outbreak. He was also afflicted by it. Thus, he returned home during the end of *Ṣafar*.

Teacher in Maẓharul ‘Ulūm, Varanasi

He taught in Maẓharul ‘Ulūm, Varanasi from Jumād-al-‘Ūlā 1338 A.H. (February 1920 C.E.).

Returning to Deoband

He re-entered *Dārul ‘Ulūm* in *Shawwāl* 1339 A.H. (June 1921 C.E.) and joined the *dorah ḥadīth* class. He studied *Tirmidhī Sharīf* by ‘Allāmah Anwar Shāh Kashmirī [∇]2 and benefitted from him greatly. He studied *Muslim Sharīf* from ‘Allāmah Shabīr Aḥmad ‘Uthmānī [∇] and he studied *Abū Dāwūd Sharīf* by Miyā Aṣghar Ḥusain *ṣāhib* [∇]. He used to praise ‘Allāmah Anwar Shāh Kashmirī [∇] profusely.

He became afflicted with the fever during this year as well. Additionally, due to the nationalist and independence movements, riots were also occurring during that year. It is for this reason that he returned home in *Rabī‘-ul-Awwal* 1340 A.H. due to his father’s command to do so.

Completion of Dorah Ḥadīth in Dārul ‘Ulūm Mau

After recovering from his illness, he entered Dārul ‘Ulūm Mau. Until then, *Ḥazrat* Shaykhul Hind’s [∇] student, *Mawlānā* Karīm Baksh Sanbhalī [∇] came to Dārul ‘Ulūm and only one student, *Mawlānā* Abul

² Perhaps, he also studied *Bukhārī Sharīf* by him because *Ḥazrat* Kashmirī [∇] also taught *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. (*Fazl*)

Shāh Ṣāhib remained as Shaykhul Hind’s deputy in Dārul ‘Ulūm Deoband from 1334 A.H. until 1345 A.H. (*Tārīkh Dārul ‘Ulum Deoband* by Sayyid Maḥbūb Raḍwī 2/202) (*Fazl*)

Majīd *ṣāhib*, was studying *dorah ḥadīth* by him. He graduated with him in *Sha‘bān* 1340 A.H. (April 1922 C.E.). He studied the *Ṣiḥāḥ Sittah* by *Mawlānā* Karīm Baksh *ṣāhib* v. After studying *dorah ḥadīth*, he also studied some subjects in the field of *ma‘qūlāt* (Shamse bāzighah etc.) by *Mawlānā* Karīm Baksh *ṣāhib* v.

As a Teacher in Dārul ‘Ulūm Mau

He became a teacher from *Shawwāl* 1340 A.H. in Dārul ‘Ulūm and he taught advanced books. During this time, *Mawlānā* Maḥmūd Manẓūr Nu‘mānī v studied many books by him. *Mawlānā* Muḥammad Ḥusayn Bihārī, the late *ustādh* of *Dārul ‘Ulūm* Deoband, *Ḥazrat Mawlānā* ‘Abdul Jabbār *Ṣāhib* A‘zmī and many other famous ‘*ulamā*’ also studied by him at that time.

Head Teacher in Mazḥarul ‘Ulūm

Due to some reason, he left Dārul ‘Ulūm Mau and he accepted the post of head teacher in Madrasah Mazḥarul ‘Ulūm Varanasi in 1343 A.H. He remained there until 1347 A.H.

In Miftāḥul ‘Ulūm Mau

In *Shawwāl* 1347 A.H. (1929 C.E.), he was appointed (by persistence) as the *Shaykhul Ḥadīth* and head teacher of Miftāḥul ‘Ulūm, Mau. It is from here that the renaissance of Miftāḥul ‘Ulūm was born. It formed into a *jāmi‘ah* (educational institution) very rapidly and it became famous across the world.

He remained as the *Shaykhul Ḥadīth* there from 1347 A.H. until 1369 A.H. Usually, he taught *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* and *Jāmi‘ Tirmidhī* and *Mawlānā* ‘Abdul Laṭīf *Ṣāhib* Nu‘mānī v taught *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* and *Sunan Abū Dāwūd*. He chose to resign from teaching in 1369 A.H. due to his writing and research commitments. He only remained as a member and a patron of the *shūrā* (consultation). In some years, he would also teach some portions of *Bukhārī Sharīf*. Sometimes, he would also teach

other books but without taking a wage. [We studied some parts of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* by *Ḥazrat* in this manner. *Dars* (Class) would take place in the *masjid* of *Ḥazrat*’s locality. (*Fazl*)]

Administration of Miftāḥul ‘Ulūm Mau

In 1366 A.H., the responsibility of the administration of the *madrasah* was also entrusted to him. He offered his services in this area until 1371 A.H. During this period, he gave special attention to the structure and building of the *madrasah* and built many rooms.

Member of the Assembly

In 1952 C.E., by the insistence of Jawāhir Lāl he became a candidate for the U.P. Assembly, and he became very successful although he did not go anywhere from his chosen circle for even a minute. He remained as a member until 1957 A.H. It is for this reason that he had to stay in Lucknow. During that period, he taught *Bukhārī Sharīf* in Nadwatul ‘Ulamā’, Lucknow. He also taught in Dārul Muballighīn, Lucknow for a few days. He had a very deep and close connection with *Mawlānā* ‘Abdush Shakūr Lucknawi √.

Connection with Jami‘atul ‘Ulamā-e-Hind and the Consultation of Dārul ‘Ulūm Deoband

From 1953 C.E., he was appointed as the head of the working committee of Jam‘iatul ‘Ulamā-e-Hind and also of the *majlis shūrā* of Dārul ‘Ulūm Deoband. He remained in this position until the end of his life. Most of the time, the *majlis shūrā* was conducted under his chairmanship and his opinion was highly considered. He used to attend the conferences and gatherings of *Jami‘atul ‘Ulamā*’ regularly.

Rather, on one occasion, *Ḥazrat Mawlānā* Ḥusayn Aḥmad Madanī √ decided that whenever a *fiqhī* matter was presented to the working committee, a verdict would not be passed without consulting *Muḥaddith Jalīl Ḥazrat Mawlānā* Ḥabīb-ur-Raḥmān A‘Ẓmī √. This plan

was unanimously accepted by all the administrators of the *majlis* at a time when *Mawlānā* A‘Ẓmī was not even present in that gathering. [See *Ḥayāt Abul Ma-āthir* pg. 198 for details.]

In 1945 C.E., *Ḥazrat Shaykhul Islām Mawlānā* Ḥusayn Aḥmad Madnī ∇ and the principal of Dārul ‘Ulūm Deoband, *Qārī* Muḥammad Ṭayyib *ṣāhib* ∇, came to Mau from Deoband and offered *Mawlānā* A‘Ẓmī ∇ the opportunity to be the head of the *Iftā’* department. However, the people of Mau were not pleased with this (i.e., that he leaves Mau). Therefore, he excused himself. After the death of ‘Allāmah Ibrāhīm Balyawī ∇ he was also offered the post of the head of teaching at Dārul ‘Ulūm. However, he also excused himself.

Returning to Miftāḥul ‘Ulūm

When *Mawlānā* ‘Abdul Laṭīf Nu‘mānī ∇, the principal and head of studies of Miftāḥul ‘Ulūm, passed away in *Dhul Ḥijjah* 1392 A.H. (January 1973 C.E.), he was once again appointed as head lecturer and *Shaykhul Ḥadīth* of Miftāḥul ‘Ulūm. He offered his services for a few years at Miftāḥul ‘Ulūm for the sake of Allāh. He then separated from *Jāmi‘ah* due to a few reasons.

The Establishment of المعهد العالي and Mirqātul ‘Ulūm

After leaving Miftāḥul ‘Ulūm, he established an organisation by the name, “المعهد العالي للدراسات العليا”. The purpose of this organisation was to make the *fuḍalā’* of the *madrasah*, experts in *Ḥadīth* and *fiqh*. However, due to not finding the students who met his requirements, he established Madrasah Mirqātul ‘Ulūm where he made arrangements for teaching from the beginning years. Until the end of his life, he remained as the principal and was responsible for this organisation. He also taught *Dorah ḥadīth* for a few years and within the premises of this organisation, he was buried.

Imārat-e-Hind [Influential & Leadership Position in India]

In 28 *Ṣafar*, 1407 A.H. (2ND November 1986 C.E.), he was appointed as the Amīrul Hind and Amīr Shar‘īah by consensus in a public gathering for Indian nationals in New Delhi. He remained in this post until the end of his life.

Other Excellences:

He was a very great debater. There were many occasions where he succeeded and won debates against Raḍā Khānī and the *ghayr muqallidīn* ‘ulamā’. In the district of Adri in Mau, on the 24th, 25th and 26th of *Jumād-aḷ’ Ukhrā*, 1352 A.H. (15,16,17 October 1933 C.E.), *Mawlānā* Ḥabībūr Raḥmān A‘ẓmī, *Mawlānā* ‘Abdul Laṭīf Nu‘mānī and *Mawlānā* Muḥammad Manzūr Nu‘mānī رحمهم الله debated against Maulvī Ḥashmat ‘Alī and Maulvī Na‘īm-ud-Dīn. After being defeated, the Raḍā Khānī ‘ulamā’ left secretly.

He had a very strong memory. He knew books by heart. Studying books was his passion. He acquired tremendous benefit from the libraries of the cities he travelled to. His memory was so proficient that he could reference the page numbers and lines of books which he read a long time ago.

Once, he himself said: “You all do not have enthusiasm. I thought, let me see how many Arabic poems I know. So, from my memory, I wrote five hundred poems from those that ended with the letter *alif*. Then I thought, what if pride enters my heart [due to this]. So, I stopped writing from memory.”

Once, a poet recited his poem in a poetry reading which took place in Mau. After his performance ended, he called *Mawlānā* A‘ẓmī and said: “Recite the poems which you heard from me.” ‘Allāmah √ recited the entire poem, word for word. The poet said: “Ok, brother! Today, I bear

witness to your strong memory. Allāh ﷻ has blessed you with a great bounty.” (For details, see *Hayāt Abul Ma-ūthir* pg. 472)

He was a great *mufasssir*, *muḥaddith*, *faqīh*, speaker, debater, preacher, adviser, orator, writer, poet, historian, researcher, teacher, author and an exceptional scholar with regards to *asmāʿ-e-rijāl*. During his teaching career and even after, he dedicated his time to writing and compiling. The government of India awarded him for his services in writing and he was also given an honorary award.

Some Impressions (Ta’athurāt) of the Famous ‘Ulamā’ Kirām

Ḥakīm ul Ummah, *Ḥazrat Thānwī* ﷺ praised and described “*Al-Tanqīdus-Sadīd ‘alat Tafsīril Jadīd*” in the following manner:

“This lowly, most unworthy slave, Ashraf ‘Alī Thānwī (may he be pardoned) read each word of this critical article with great interest and enthusiasm and found it to be the *miṣdāq* (substantiation) of the following *Ḥadīth*. The Messenger of Allāh ﷺ said:

يَحْمِلُ هَذَا الْعِلْمُ مِنْ كُلِّ خَلْفٍ عُدُوَّهُ يَنْفُونَ عَنْهُ تَحْرِيفَ الْغَالِيْنَ وَاتِّخَالَ الْمُبْطَلِيْنَ وَتَأْوِيلَ الْجَاهِلِيْنَ.

“In each successive generation those who are reliable authorities will preserve this knowledge, rejecting the alterations made by the extremists, the plagiarisms of those who make false claims for themselves and the interpretations of the ignorant.”” (*Mishkāṭ* from Bayhaqī) (*Mishkāṭ* pg. 36 Kitāb ul ‘Ilm, Chapter two)

Ḥazrat completed compiling the book, “*Al-Ḥāwī liriḡālīṭ Ṭaḡāwī*” which comprises of the narrators of “*Sharḡ Ma‘ānī Al-Āthār*” and “*Sharḡ Mushkil Al-Āthār*” in *Jumād-al-‘Ūlā* 1348 A.H. as *Ḥazrat* mentions at the end of this book.

" انه والله تصنيف شريف " was extracted from the number 1348 (which was the year in which *Ḥazrat* completed this compilation). This is the amazing work of ‘Allāmah A‘Ẓmī for which there is no other equivalent. This is because many scholars have worked on the narrators of “*Sharḡ*

Ma‘ānī Al-Āthār”. However, the work he has done on “*Sharḥ Mushkil Al-Āthār*” is unparalleled, unique and special to him. The fact that the giant scholars in this field such as ‘Allāmah Anwar Shāh Kashmīrī ∇ and ‘Allāmah Shabbir Aḥmed ‘Uthmānī ∇ have praised and approved of this book is sufficient to prove the value of “*Al-Hāwī*”. Ḥazrat was only twenty-nine (29) years old when he wrote this book. (*Ḥayāt Abul Ma-āthir* 178)

Shaykhul Azhar, Dr. ‘Abdul Ḥalīm Maḥmūd ∇ addressed *Mawlānā* Manzūr Nu‘mānī ∇ and *Mawlānā* ‘Alī Miyān ∇ and said: “I testify that if anyone in the world deserves the title of “محدث اعظم” – “*The Great Muḥaddith*”, it is this person.” And he said in Dabhel: “بل انه أكبر علماء العالم الإسلامي” - “*Rather, he is the greatest scholar in the Islāmic world.*” (See *Ḥayāt Abul Ma-āthir* 1/364,572)

The most important and valuable work of *Shaykh* Aḥmad Shākir is the research and commentary of “*Musnad Imām Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal*”. Thus, great effort was made to publish this book. It is published in sixteen volumes. During the research and publication of this book, in its third volume in *Shawwāl* 1366 A.H., he published a notice which addressed the scholars from all over the world. He requested them to send him any errors, objections, feedback or suggestions they have. After publishing this notice *Shaykh* Aḥmed Muḥammad Shākir ∇ waited for eight or nine years. Finally, after nine years a letter reached him. Read the details of this in the words of *Shaykh* Aḥmed Shākir ∇ himself:

” ثم جاءني كتاب من أخ عالم كريم، ولن يكن لي شرف معرفته من قبل. وقد عرفت من كتابه فضله وعلمه وتحققه بالبحث الدقيق. وكتابه هذا مؤرخ ٢٦ / ذى القعدة ١٣٤٥ هـ، وطواه على استدراكات وتعقبات دقيقة، منالجزء الأول إلى جزء الثامن، وهذا الأخ العلامة: هو الأستاذ حبيب الرحمن الأعظمي.”

“Then I received a letter from a noble, knowledgeable brother. I did not have the honour of knowing him from before. From his letter, I became aware of his virtue, his knowledge, and his ability to conduct thorough research. This letter is dated 26 *Dhul Qa’dah* 1375 A.H. It consisted of

deep and precise suggestions and corrections from the first eight volumes. This extremely knowledgeable brother is the *ustādh*, Ḥabībūr Raḥmān Al-A‘ẓmī.”

Shaykh Aḥmad Muḥammad Shākir ∇ published these corrections of ‘Allāmah A‘ẓmī ∇ in the fifteenth volume of “*Musnad Aḥmad*”, which is spread over fifty pages. Along with this, bear in mind that these corrections were only for eight volumes of “*Musnad Aḥmad*”. One can gauge the extent to which he was impressed by the research and scholarly work of ‘Allāmah A‘ẓmī by a letter written by *Shaykh* Aḥmad Muḥammad Shākir to ‘Allāmah A‘ẓmī after reading his corrections:

حضرة الأخ العلامة الكبير المحقق الأستاذ حبيب الرحمن الأعظمي....جاءني كتابكم الأول النفيس.... أما استدراكاتكم فكلها نفيسة عالية ولا أقول هذا مجاملة...، وأشركم خالص الشكر على هذه العناية الجيدة، وأرجو أن تزيدوني من إشاراتكم وإرشاداتكم خدمة للسنة النبوية المطهرة، وأنتم كما رأيتم من عملكم، من أعظم العلماء بها في هذا العصر فالحمد لله على توفيقكم...، ثم أكرر الرجاء أن لا تحرموني من آراءكم النيرة وتحقيقاتكم النفيسة حفظكم الله وبارك فيكم. (حيات ص ٥٤٤)

“Respected Brother, the great scholar and researcher, the teacher Ḥabībūr Raḥmān A‘ẓmī... I received your precious letter As for your corrections, they are all very valuable, and I am not saying this out of humility and I thank you sincerely for this great gift. And I hope that you will continue to support and help me with your suggestions and statements in the service of the purified *Sunnah* of the Prophet ﷺ. And you, as I have observed from your work, are from amongst the greatest scholars in this era. Praise be to Allāh for your success..... I reiterate that I hope that you do not deprive me of your opinions and your valuable research. May Allāh protect you and bless you.” (*Ḥayāt Abul Ma‘āthir* pg. 577)

When “*Naṣbur Rāyah*” was published by Majlis ‘Ilmī Dabhel, *Shaykh* ‘Allāmah Muḥammad Zāhid Kawtharī ∇ added ‘Allāmah Qāsim ibn Quṭlūbhā’s *takrīj* of “*Hidāyah*” titled, “*Munyatul ‘Alma’ī*” in the beginning of the fourth volume.

‘Allāmah A‘Ẓmī ∇ noted a portion of ‘Allāmah Qāsim ibn Quṭlūbhā’s ∇ *takhrīj* from a handwritten manuscript of Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar’s ∇ book “*Dirāyāh*” and sent it from Mau. Originally, this is ‘Allāmah Qasim’s additions to “*Dirāyāh*”.

After receiving this, ‘Allāmah Kawtharī ∇ in his introduction on “*Munyatul Alma‘ī*” which was written in *Ramaḍān* 1369 A.H., mentioned ‘Allāmah A‘Ẓmī in the following words:

“The *Mawlānā*, the ‘*Allāmah*, the skilled, the genius, the erudite, the expert, *Abul Ma-āthir*, Ḥabībūr Raḥmān A‘Ẓmī.” (*Munyatul Alma‘ī* 5)

In another place, while thanking ‘Allāmah A‘Ẓmī, he writes:

“هذا وإنني أشكر مولانا العلامة النحرير والجهيد الخبير أبا المآثر حبيب الرحمن الأعظمي السالف الذكر على تفضله بكتابة التعليقات بخط يده المباركة ومبادرته بإرسالها الى هذا العاجز مع ما له من الأشغال الكثيرة فإنه هو السبب الأوحد لنشر الاثنین معا.”

“This and I thank *Mawlānā*, the ‘*Allāmah*, the skilled, the great, the genius, the erudite, the expert, *Abul Ma-āthir*, Ḥabībūr Raḥmān A‘Ẓmī, the aforementioned, for taking the initiative to write his comments with his blessed hand and for taking the initiative to send them to this helpless, unworthy one despite his busy schedule. This is the only reason we were able to publish both together.”

While in this state of happiness, he also supplicated abundantly for ‘Allāmah A‘Ẓmī:

“فأدعو الله سبحانه أن يطيل بقاء الأستاذ الجليل المشار إليه في خير وعافية ويمتدح المسلمين بعلمه النافعة، ويكافئه مكافأة المحسنين إزاء هذا الفضل الجسيم.” (حيات ٥٧١)

“So, I pray to Allāh, Glory be to Him, to prolong the life of the aforementioned esteemed teacher with goodness and ‘*āfiyah*, and may the Muslims gain benefit from his beneficial knowledge, and give him a great reward, the reward of the *muḥsinīn* in return of this great favour of his.” (*Ḥayāt Abul Ma-āthir* pg. 571)

See “*Ḥayāt Abul Ma-āthir*” for the perceptions/impressions of *Shaykh* ‘Abdul Fattāḥ Abū Ghuddah, *Shaykh* ‘Abdullāh ibn Bāz, *Shaykh* Shu‘ayb Arnāwuṭ, *Shaykh* al-Albānī and *Shaykh-ul-Ḥadīth Mawlānā* Muḥammad Zakariyyā رَحْمَهُمُ اللّٰهُ.

Many of the drafts of his works could not be published due to being old and eaten by worms. Many of his first drafts are preserved and effort is being made to publish them. For this purpose, a quarterly magazine has been issued under the name “*Al-Ma-āthir*”.

Bay‘ah (Pledge of Allegiance) and Khilāfah

He had pledged allegiance to *Ḥazrat* Thānwī ∇ while he was a student and *Qārī* Munīruddīn *ṣāḥib*, a caliph of *Ḥazrat* Ḥājī Imdādullāh Muhājir Makkī, also gave him permission and caliphate. *Mawlānā* A‘zmī ∇ used to take the pledge of allegiance from many people. Many people in Malegaon and Nāgpūr did *bay‘ah* with him. (*Tarjumān-ul-Islām Special Edition* pg. 233)

Mawlānā Waṣīullāh Fataḥpūrī ∇ also authorised *Ḥazrat*.

Published Compilations

1. *Nuṣratul Ḥadīth*
2. *Rak‘āh Tarāwīḥ*
3. *Rak‘āh Tarāwīḥ Madhayl Bard Anwārul Maṣābīḥ*
4. *A‘alāme Marfū‘ah*
5. *Azhār Marbū‘ah biradde Āthār Maṭbū‘ah* in 2 volumes.
6. *A‘yānul Ḥujjāh* in 2 volumes
7. *Shāri‘ Ḥaqīqī*
8. *Aḥkāmun Nadhr liawliyā‘ullāh wa tafsīr mā uhl bihi lighayrillāh*
9. *Taḥqīq Ahl ul Ḥadīth*
10. *Daf‘ul Mujādilah an āyātil Mubāhilah*
11. *Irshād uth Thaḡalayn fī Jawābi Ittiḥād ul Mirfaqayn*
12. *At Tanqīd us Sadīd ‘alā Tafsīril Jadīd*
13. *Tanbīhul Kādhibīn*

14. *Ibtāl ‘Azādārī*
15. *Ta‘ziyah Dārī Sunnī Nuqtā Nazr Se*
16. *Riḥbar Ḥujjāj wa Dalīl ul Ḥujjāj*
17. *Ahl dil ki dil Āwez Bāten*
18. *Dast Kār Ahl Sharf*
19. *Al-Albānī shudhu-dhuhu wa akhtāuhu*
20. *Ta‘qibāt ‘Alā Ta‘līqāt Aḥmed Muḥammad Shākīr*
21. *Ta‘dīl Rijāl Bukhārī*

Edited Books

Ḥazrat √ has published many rare books after editing and penning footnotes for them which is a very great and important task and responsibility. Sometimes doing this is more difficult than compiling a separate, new book. These books are as follows:

1. *Intiqā’ ut Targhīb wat Tarhīb* by Ibn Ḥajar
2. *Musnad Ḥumaydī* in two (2) volumes
3. *Kitāb uz Zuhd war Raqā’iq* by Ibnul Mubārak
4. *Sunan Sa’īd ibn Manṣūr* in two (2) volumes
5. *Al Maṭālabul ‘Āliyyah* by Ibn Ḥajar in four (4) volumes
6. *Talkhīṣ Khawātim Jāmi‘ul Uṣūl* by Muḥammad Ṭahir Patnī
7. *Muṣannaf ‘Abdur Razzāq* in eleven (11) volumes
8. *Majma‘ Biḥār ul Anwār* by Muḥammad Ṭahir Patnī
9. *Kashful Astār ‘an Zawā’id Musnad Bazzār* in four (4) volumes
10. *Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah* (Only four volumes have been published. Work has been done on most of the parts.)
11. *Taḥqīq Ḥayātuṣ Ṣaḥābah*
12. *Faṭḥul Mughīth by Sakhāwī*
13. *Takmilul Idh-hān Mawlānā Shāh Rafī‘ud Dīn*
14. *Risālatul Awā’il* by Shaykh Muḥammad Sa’īd Sunbhul

Unpublished Compilations

1. *Al-Ḥāwī Irijālīṭ Ṭaḥāwī*
2. *Al-Ithāf-us-saniyah bidhikri Muḥaddithil Ḥanafīyyah*

3. *Rad Taḥqīqul Kalām*
4. *Many fatāwā*
5. *‘Azmate Ṣaḥābah*
6. *Kitābuth Thiqāt by Ibn Shāhīn*
7. *Al Ḥujajul Qawīyyah*
8. *As-Sayrul Ḥathīth*
9. *Al Tawṣīyah bi isrārit Tasmiyah* (Arabic)
10. *Ḥadrul Lithām ‘an wajhil Qirā’at Khalfal Imām*
11. *Mu‘jizāt wa Karāmāt*
12. *Islām aur Ṣinf Nāzūk*
13. *Kashf ul Mu‘aḍalāt fī raddi ḥallil Mughllaqāt*
14. *Al Qawl-ul-Mukhtār fī tazayyī bi ziyīl kuffār*
15. *Al Rawḍ-ul-Majūd fī taqdīmīr rukbatayn ‘indas sujūd*
16. *Tawṭīn-ul Jā’ishāh bi Sharḥil binā’ bi ‘Ā’ishāh*
17. *Tadhkirah Udabā’-il-Hind* (Arabic)

Travels

In 1950 A.H., *Ḥazrat* v had the honor of visiting the Ḥaramayn Sharīfayn for the first time. He was thereafter fortunate to visit again and again. When he travelled to Beirut during the publishing of “*Muṣannaf ‘Abdur Razzāq*”, along with his travel for *hajj* and *ziyārah*, he also visited Damascus, Sidon, Baalbek (Ba‘labakka), Latakia, and other cities of Syria. He also travelled to Baḥrayn. All these trips were filled with *‘ilmī* benefits. The companions who accompanied him on his journey narrate such events from which it becomes known that *Ḥazrat*’s remarkable intellectual ability was manifested everywhere.

Students

It is difficult to count the students of *Muḥaddith Jalīl*. Many great scholars used to also benefit from *Ḥazrat* through letters and also through direct conversations. It is also difficult to count those who studied officially with *Ḥazrat* in *madāris*. Many Arab *Shuyūkh* would go to India or while travelling, studied *Ḥadīth* books by *Ḥazrat* and

obtained *ijāzah* from him. *Mawlānā* Muḥammad ‘Uthmān Ma‘rūfī *ṣāhib* v has recorded their names in his treatise.

Death: On 10th *Ramaḍān* 1412 A.H. (Saturday 17th March 1992)³ at the time of *iftār* (from this angle, one can also say 11th of *Ramaḍān*) this sun of knowledge and research set forever and his soul was buried in the land of Mirqāt-ul-‘Ulūm. An estimated two hundred thousand (200,000) Muslims attended the *janāzah* (funeral prayer) in the state of fasting. The *janāzah* took place on the railway field outside the city.

(This information is extracted from *Mawlānā* Muḥammad ‘Uthmān Ma‘rūfī’s article in *Nadā’e Shāhī* June 1992 edition and the July 1992-December 1992 special edition of *Tarjumānul Islām* Banaras. For details, refer to “*Tarjumānul Islām*”).

(*Hazrat’s* biography has been published in two large volumes under the title of “*Ḥayāt Abul Ma-āthir*” by *Mawlānā* Dr. Mas‘ūd A‘ẓmī (مد ظله)

A Story

Mawlānā Yunus ibn Qārī said: “In the fourth year, I took a *jamā‘ah* to Dholiah (Maharashtra). It became known that *Ra’īs-ul-Muḥaddithīn Ḥazrat Mawlānā* Ḥabīb-ur-Raḥmān *ṣāhib* had arrived. So, I went by *Mawlānā* and inquired about his health. He said that he had undergone an abdominal operation and there is still weakness. The doctors forbade him to read and write. However, it was not possible for him not to write or read or say anything. Tomorrow in Malegaon....” Footnotes have also been written along with the book. (*Sawānīḥ Mawlānā Aḥmadullāh Rāndīrī* v pg. 29)



³ Date of Death: هو أهل التقوى وأهل المغفرة (He is from among the people of *taqwā* and the forgiven ones.) 1992 CE. (*Ḥayāt Abul Ma-āthir* page 723) (Fazl)

Ḥazrat Mawlānā Karīm Baksh Sanbhalī ∇

He graduated from Dārul ‘Ulūm Deoband in 1317 A.H. **Death:** 1362 A.H.

(Mashāhīr ‘Ulamā’ Dārul ‘Ulūm Deoband, Muftī Zūfīr-ud-Dīn Ṣāḥib ∇ pg. 57)

The detailed biography of *Mawlānā* Karīm Baksh Sanbhalī ∇ remains unknown. What is known is that he studied the books until the middle years in his hometown, Sanbhal, and then left for Amruhah. Here, he learnt a few lessons by *Mawlānā* Aḥmad Ḥasan ∇. Then, he entered Dārul ‘Ulūm Deoband and completed *dorah ḥadīth* in 1317 A.H. by Shaykhul Hind ∇. He was a very proficient scholar. He remained a teacher in various *madāris*. While he was a teacher in Hāpūr, *Mawlānā* Sayyid Fakhrud Dīn Aḥmad ∇, who later became the *Shaykhul Ḥadīth* in Shāhi Muradabad and Deoband, was also taught by him. He remained the head teacher in *Jāmi‘ul ‘Ulūm* in Kānpūr. Then, he was appointed as the head teacher of Dārul ‘Ulūm, Mau Azamgharh. During that time, *Mawlānā* Ḥabīb-ur-Raḥmān A‘ẓmī ∇, *Mawlānā* ‘Abdul Laṭīf Nu‘mānī A‘ẓmī ∇ and *Mawlānā* Muḥammad Manẓūr Nu‘mānī ∇ learnt some *Ḥadīth* books by him. He passed away in 1362 or 1361 A.H. (*Ḥayāt Abul Ma-āthir* pg. 167 & *Tārīkh Dārul ‘Ulūm Deoband-Sayyid Maḥbūb Ridwī* 2/85)

He came to Mau to serve as the *Shaykhul Ḥadīth* and head teacher of *Dārul ‘Ulūm* Mau. Our teachers, *Mawlānā* Ḥabīb-ur-Raḥmān A‘ẓmī ∇, *Mawlānā* ‘Abdul Laṭīf Nu‘mānī ∇ and *Mawlānā* Shams-ud-Dīn ṣāḥib Maui ∇ studied *dorah ḥadīth* by him.

I heard *Mawlānā* Shams-ud-Dīn ṣāḥib ∇¹ saying: “We were not enraptured on the first day he taught. This was because there was no

¹ This teacher of ours studied some books with *Mawlānā* A‘ẓmī ∇. He graduated one year after him in 1341 A.H. He passed away in 1392 A.H. He remained as a teacher and deputy administrator in Miftāḥul ‘Ulūm رحمه الله الواسعة *May Allāh’s mercy be upon Him; His vast and endless mercies. (See Ḥayāt Abul Ma-āthir* pg. 167,662) (Fazl)

lantern at night for him to do *muṭāla‘ah*. The next day, when he obtained a lantern, his expertise was exhibited, and I realised that he was a very proficient and note-worthy scholar.”

I heard *Mawlānā* ‘Abdul Laṭīf Nu‘mānī ∇ saying: “He gave details regarding *fiqhī* rulings only for *Jāmi‘ Tirmidhī*. In *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* (‘s class), he only spoke regarding the specialities of that book. Thus, we would read many pages of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* every day.”

From this, it becomes known that his teaching style was like that of *Ḥazrat* Shaykhul Hind ∇. *Ḥazrat* Shaykhul Hind’s lectures were brief but comprehensive. This fact is apparent from the publication of his *Jāmi‘ Tirmidhī* lectures, and we also heard this from our teachers. Lengthy lectures in Dārul ‘Ulūm Deoband began with ‘Allāmah Anwar Shāh Kashmīrī ∇. He possessed the treasures of knowledge which overflowed like a fountain during *dars* (class). He collected the details and information of every science. After him, an effort was made to continue this style to an extent so that there be no doubt of being disadvantaged in the student’s mind.

Mawlānā Sanbhalī ∇ was in Dārul ‘Ulūm Mau in 1340 A.H. (1920) and 1341 A.H. for sure. In the first year, *Mawlānā* Ḥabībūr Raḥmān A‘ẓmī ∇ and *Mawlānā* ‘Abdul Majīd *ṣāḥib* Maui ∇ studied *dorah ḥadīth* by him. In the next year, *Mawlānā* ‘Abdul Laṭīf Nu‘mānī ∇ and his classmates studied by him.

We do not know more than this regarding *Mawlānā* Sanbhalī’s ∇ biography. *Mawlānā* Muḥammad Manzūr Nu‘mānī ∇ was his very close and dear friend. He came with him to Mau during his childhood. After graduating, *Mawlānā* A‘ẓmī ∇ and *Mawlānā* Nu‘manī ∇ immediately became teachers in Dārul ‘Ulūm Mau. Thus, both of them received the honour of being students here. *Mawlānā* Nu‘mānī ∇ has written that he came to Dārul ‘Ulūm Mau in *Shawwāl* 1339 A.H. (*Tadhkirah Nu‘mānī* pg. 33)

By seeing such worthy students, one can accurately conclude that *Mawlānā* Sanbhali ∇ was a great and exceptional teacher. Along with *manqūlāt* (Prophetic knowledge), he was also a great scholar in *ma'qūlāt* (rational knowledge). رحمه الله رحمة واسعة *Mawlānā* A'ẓmī ∇ also studied advanced books regarding *ma'qūlāt* by him. (*Tadhkirah Nu'mānī* pg.143)

Mawlānā Manzūr Nu'mānī ∇ has written that he bade farewell to this world on Wednesday, 17 *Shawwāl*, 1361 A.H. at 8 a.m. in the morning. انا لله وانا اليه راجعون - *To Allāh we belong and to Him is our return.* (*Māhnāmah Al Furqān* pg. 15- July,1977)



Shaykhul Hind Ḥazrat Mawlānā Maḥmūd Al-Ḥasan Deobandi ∇

1268 A.H. (1851)

1339A.H. (1920)

Age:71

Name and Lineage:

Name: Maḥmūd Ḥasan

Father's name: Dhulfiqār 'Alī.

Grand-father's name: Shaykh Fataḥ 'Alī.

Birth

Ḥazrat Shaykhul Hind ∇ was born in the year 1268 A.H. (1851) in Bareilly whilst his father *Mawlānā* Dhulfiqār 'Alī ∇ was residing there due to work commitments.

His Studies

He began his studies at the age of six. He studied majority of the Qur'ān from Miānjī Manglūrī ∇. He studied some portions of the Qur'ān and the beginner *Fārsī kitābs* (Persian books) by Miānjī *Mawlānā* 'Abdul Laṭīf *ṣāḥib* ∇. He studied the other Persian books and the beginner Arabic books by his uncle, *Mawlānā* Mihtāb 'Alī ∇.

The Establishment of Dārul 'Ulūm Deoband

In *Muḥarram* 1283 A.H. (1867) when he was 15 years old, the *Dārul 'Ulūm* was established under the name of "*Arbī Madrasah*". The first teacher appointed was Mullā Maḥmūd Deobandi (death:1304 A.H.) ∇. *Mawlānā* Maḥmūd Ḥasan *ṣāḥib* ∇ was also amongst the first students of the *madrasah*. In 1284 A.H., he studied "*Kanzud Daqā'iq*", "*Mibdhī*", "*Mukhtaṣar Ma'ānī*" etc. In 1285 A.H., he set the exam for "*Hidāyah*", "*Mishkāt Sharīf*", "*Maqāmāt*" etc. In 1286 A.H., he began studying the *Ṣaḥīḥ Sittah* and some other books by his teacher *Mawlānā* Muḥammad Qāsim Nanotwī ∇ (death:1297 A.H.). At that time, *Mawlānā* Nanotwī ∇

was working on editing a book in a publishing house in Meerut. Thereafter, when the publishing house moved to Delhi, he also resided in Delhi. Sometimes, he resided in Deoband and Nanotah. He fulfilled the rights of a teacher in all these places and continued his lessons. In 1289 A.H., these books were completed. At that time, he studied books on *adab* (literature) and also studied the fields of *ḥisāb* (accounting) etc. and thus graduated in *aqlī* and *naqlī* knowledge. In *Dhul Qa‘dah* 1290 A.H., at the *madrasah’s* graduation ceremony, he attained the virtue of graduating, receiving his certificate of completion and turban of honour on the hands of the *akābir ‘ulamā’* (senior scholars).

Teaching

Before graduating, in 1289/1290 A.H, he began teaching different books as an assistant teacher. He also continued to teach after graduating. In 1292 A.H., he was appointed as a teacher who was given wages. In 1293 A.H., he taught “*Mishkāṭ*”, “*Hidāyah*” and “*Jāmi‘ Tirmidhī*”. In 1295 A.H., he also taught “*Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*”. Due to his great ability, he advanced very quickly.

His Journey for Ḥajj

In *Shawwāl* 1294 A.H., he went for *ḥajj* in the caravan with the *akābirs*. Here, he obtained a chain of *Ḥadīth* from Shāh ‘Abdul Ghanī Mujaddidī ṽ. He took *bay‘ah* on the hands of Ḥājī Imdādullāh ṽ. Ḥājī Ṣāḥib ṽ gave him *ijāzah* (authorisation) for *khilāfah*. *Ḥazrat* Nanotwī ṽ also accepted his *bay‘ah* in all four *silsilahs* (legitimate orders) and granted him *ijāzah*.

In 1305 A.H., he was appointed as the head teacher. He taught advanced books from the very beginning. However, *Mawlānā* Sayyid Aḥmad Dehlawī ṽ, who was the first teacher, left for Bhopal and before him *Mawlānā* Ya‘qūb Nanotwī ṽ and Mullā Maḥmūd ṽ passed away. Thus, he was appointed as the head teacher. Shaykhul Hind ṽ taught in Dārul ‘Ulūm Deoband until 1333 A.H. In these 40 + years, many great

‘*ulamā*’ and people of virtue benefitted from him and a world [of knowledge] blossomed. *Mawlānā* Ashraf ‘Alī Thanwī ∇ also learnt by him. *Allāmah* Anwar Shāh Kashmīrī ∇, *Allāmah* Shabbir Aḥmed ‘Uthmānī ∇, Muftī Kifāyatullāh Dehlawī ∇, *Mawlānā* Ḥusayn Aḥmad Madanī ∇ and *Mawlānā* Sayyid Aṣghar Ḥusayn Deobandi ∇, who were internationally renowned, were all his students Through him, the *Dārul Ulūm* became a global institution.

Freedom Movement

He inherited animosity for the British from his teachers, *Ḥazrat* Nanotwī ∇ and Gangohī ∇. He was passionate regarding *jihād* to free India from the oppression of the British. In this regard, he was captured in 1333 A.H. after *hajj*. He remained imprisoned in Malta for over three years. It is during this time that he completed a translation of the Holy Qur’ān. Before being imprisoned, he had completed six *paras*.

During this time, he also wrote a commentary on sixty-seven (67) chapters of *Saḥīḥ Bukhārī*. After being freed from his imprisonment in Malta, he was addressed by the title, ‘*Shaykhul Hind*’.

Death:

Five months after arriving in Mumbai, he passed away in Delhi on 18 *Rabī‘-ul-Awwal* 1339 A.H. (30 November 1920). He was buried in Deoband ∇- *May Allāh’s mercy be upon him*.

His Books:

He also left the following compilations as memoirs:

- *‘Adillah Kāmilah*
- *Īdāḥul ‘Adillah*
- *Sharḥ ‘Awthaqul ‘Urā fī Tahqīqil Jumu‘ah fil Qurā* by Gangohī ∇

- *Jadhul Muqil fī tanzīhil Muʿiz wal Mudhil* and many others.
(Extracted from *Az Ḥayāt Shaykhul Hind* by Mawlānā Sayyid Aṣghar Ḥusayn Deobandi ۞ and *Naqsh Ḥayāt Ḥazrat Madnī*)



Hujjatul Islām Hazrat Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim Nanotwī ۞

1248 A.H. (1832)

1297 A.H. (1880)

Age: 49 years

Name and Lineage

Name: Muḥammad Qāsim ibn Asad ‘Alī ibn Ghulām Shāh ibn Muḥammad Baksh Şiddīqī Nanotwī

Birth

He was born in Nanotwah in 1248 A.H.

Acquiring Knowledge

From his childhood, *Hazrat* Nanotwī ۞ left Nanotwah and went to Deoband. He studied Arabic in the house of *Shaykh* Karāmah ۞. He then went to Sahāranpūr with his maternal grandfather. Here, he studied the beginner Arabic and Persian books by *Mawlānā* Muḥammad Nawāz Şāhib Sahāranpūrī ۞. After this, he went by *Mawlānā* Mamlūk ‘Alī Şāhib ۞ in Delhi in *Muḥarram* 1260 A.H. He studied the *darsī* (syllabus) books by him. He studied *Ḥadīth* by Shāh ‘Abdul Ghanī Şāhib Mujaddadī Dehlawī ۞ and he took *bay‘ah* on the hands of Ḥājī Imdādullāh Muhājir Makkī ۞. He attained the pinnacle of excellence by acquiring *ḥayḍ* (spiritual influence and benefit) from his *Shaykh*. Ḥājī Şāhib ۞ considered him as his own tongue, and he said: “Such people were present in previous times. Now, for many years, there has not been anyone like that.”

After teaching, he began editing books in the publishing house Aḥmadī in Delhi which was established by *Muḥaddith* Aḥmad ‘Alī Sahāranpūrī ۞. *Muḥaddith* Sahāranpūrī ۞ began writing footnotes on *Şahīḥ Bukhārī*. He assigned the task of the footnotes of the last five *paras* to *Mawlānā* Nanotwī ۞. These parts were difficult especially those places where Imām Bukhārī ۞ made objections against Imām Abū Hanīfah ۞. However, *Mawlānā* Nanotwī ۞ edited the books thoroughly, wrote

excellent footnotes and he left no stone unturned in supporting the *Ḥanafī madh-hab* (school of thought). Until now, this *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* is published in India and Pakistan. He memorised the Qurʾān in the *Ramaḍān* of two years.

He was very simple and humble. Let alone writing *fatāwās* or endorsing them, he never explained the rulings himself to anyone; he would refer (that person) to others. He lived like a friend with his students and *murīds*. He had many debates with priests and Aryans (a Hindu sect) and established the reality and truth of Islām.

His Books

He wrote the following in support of the Ḥanafī *Madh-hab*:

- *Tawthīqul Kalām fī tarkil Qirāʿah Khalf Imām*
- *Dalīlul Muḥkam fī tarkil Qirāʿah lil Muʿtam*
- *Miṣbāḥut Tarāwīḥ* and others.

The following books are his memoirs regarding the reply he gave to those who opposed Islām:

- *Taqrīr dil Padhir*
- *Intiṣārul Islām*
- *Ḥujjatul Islām*
- *Milaʿ-e- Khudā Shanāsī*
- *Qiblah Numah*
- *Tuḥfa-e-Lamḥiyyah*
- *Mubāḥathah Shāh Jahān Pūr*

A unique book regarding the seal of the Prophet n’s prophethood is “*Taḥdhīrun Nās ‘an inkārī athari Ibn ‘Abbas*”. In reply to the objections made against this, he wrote, “*Ajwibah Arbaʿīn*”. “*Āb Ḥayāt*” is regarding the Prophet n’s life in the *barzakh*. He wrote unmatched books regarding the beliefs of the *Shīʿas*. Apart from these, he also has many other books and poems.

He participated in *jihād* Shāmīlī in 1273 A.H. (1857) against the British for the freedom of India. When the warrants to capture came, he remained hidden for just three days. He then came out and said that the Prophet ﷺ also remained hidden for three days.

He performed 3 *hajj*: 1277A.H. (1860), 1286 A.H. (1869), 1294 A.H. (1877).

For the protection of the *Dīn* of the Muslims, he was the driving force of the establishment of *Dārul ‘Ulūm* Deoband in 1283 A.H. (1867 C.E.) and he wrote its eight principles

Death: He passed away on Thursday, 4th *Jumādal-‘Ūlā* 1297 A.H. (1880 C.E.) in Deoband. The place where he was buried became known as Qāsmī’s Graveyard. It is in this same place that *Ḥazrat* Shaykhul Hind, *Ḥazrat Mawlānā* Ḥusayn Aḥmed Madnī etc. were buried. رحمه الله واسعة رحمة. (Extracted from *Bīs Bare Musalmān* (20 honourable Muslims), pg. 114 & *Al*

Ḥazrat Gangohī رحمته الله واسعة رحمة, one of the first patrons and spiritual reformers of *Mazāhirul ‘Ulūm*, gave the following advice and guidance.

“It is important for the principal to make a great effort to ensure that the students study *Ḥadīth* and *fiqh* with great attention and ponder upon it as this is the fundamental objective for which *madāris* are established. The other fields either surround and support these (i.e., *Ḥadīth* and *Fiqh*) such as Arabic grammar, literature, *uṣūl* or they negatively affect these such as philosophy”

The same request is being made to the teachers (of *Mazāhirul ‘Ulūm*); they should ensure to encourage students to pay attention in the *dars*. Additionally, during their *Dīnī* discourses, they should always encourage students to study and research with full concentration and understanding and that they should also pay great attention to the fields of *Dīn*, especially the field of *Ḥadīth*. *And I hope for the mercy of Allāh*. Rashīd Aḥmad Gangohī. *May he be forgiven*.

(Extracted from *Takhaṣṣuṣ Ḥadīth Sharīf* written by Mawlānā Muḥammad Shāhid Sahāranpūrī page7)

‘Anāqīdul Ghāliyah Mawlānā ‘Āshiq Ilahī Barnī Madnī pg. 39)



Imām Rabbānī Ḥazrat Mawlānā Rashīd Aḥmad Gangohī ؒ

1244 A.H. (1829 C.E.)

1323 A.H. (1905 C.E.)
years

Age: 79

Name and Lineage

His name is Rashīd Aḥmad ibn Hidāyah Aḥmad. He is of Anṣārī and Ayyūbī lineage.

Birth

Mawlānā ؒ was born on Monday, 6 *Dhul Qa‘dah*, 1244 A.H. (1829 C.E.) in Gangoh. He was only seven (7) years old when his father’s shadow was lifted from above him. He remained under the care of his mother. His great grandfather, *Qāḍī* Pīr Baksh Ṣāḥib became his guardian.

Studies

He first acquired knowledge from Miyānī Qutub Baksh and from his maternal uncle, *Mawlānā* Muḥammad Taqī ؒ. He studied Persian by *Mawlānā* Muḥammad Ghawth ؒ, and he studied beginner’s *Naḥw* and *Ṣarf* by *Mawlānā* Muḥammad Baksh Rāmpūrī ؒ. Thereafter, he went towards Delhi. This occurred in 1261 A.H. *Mawlānā* Muḥammad Qāsim ṣāḥib Nanotwī ؒ was there at that time.

He studied most of the books regarding *ma‘qūlāt*, *uṣūl fiqh*, *ma‘ānī* and *tafsīr* by the father of *Mawlānā* Yā‘qūb Nanotwī ؒ, *Mawlānā* Mamlūk ‘Alī Nanotwī ؒ (death:1267 A.H) who taught in Madrasah ‘Arabīyyah, i.e., in Delhi’s College. He studied some *ma‘qūlāt* books by *Ṣadruṣ Ṣudūr*, *Muftī* Ṣadrud Dīn ṣāḥib Āzardah ؒ. He studied some of the *Ṣiḥāḥ Sittah* books by Shāh ‘Abdul Ghanī Mujaddadī Dehlawī ؒ and he also studied some by his brother Shāh Aḥmed Sa‘īd Mujaddadī Dehlawī ؒ.

He stayed in Delhi for approximately four years. During this period, he perfected and mastered all the fields of knowledge. He then returned to

Gangoh, got married and memorised the *Qur'ān* in one year. Thereafter, he came to Gangoh in the service of Ḥājī Imdādullāh Muḥājir Makkī ∇ and after taking *bay'ah*, he spent forty days there and then departed. On his return, he obtained *khilāfah*. Ḥājī Ṣāhib ∇, while bidding him farewell said to him that if anyone requests *bay'ah*, accept it.

In 1273 A.H (1857C.E.), he participated with Ḥājī Ṣāhib ∇ in *jihād* against the British government. *Ḥazrat* Ḥājī Ṣāhib ∇ was the leader of the *mujāhidīn*. *Ḥazrat* Nanotwī ∇ was the commander and *Ḥazrat* Gangohī ∇, the judge. After the Shāmīlī battle, there was a command to capture all three of them. Ḥājī Ṣāhib ∇ secretly migrated. *Ḥazrat* Nanotwī ∇ hid for three (3) days and then emerged. However, he was not captured. *Ḥazrat* Gangohī ∇ remained in jail for approximately six (6) months. Then, he was freed.

Teaching

After being freed, along with *bay'ah* and *irshād* (spiritually guiding and reforming the people), he became preoccupied in teaching. He performed 3 *hajj*. The first one in 1280 A.H. and the second in 1294 A.H. On this journey, *Ḥazrat* Nanotwī, *Mawlānā* Muḥammad Maẓhar, *Mawlānā* Ya'qūb Nanotwī, *Mawlānā* Rafī'-ud-Dīn Ṣāhib Deobandī and *Ḥazrat* Shaykhul Hind رحمهم الله were all present as well with him. Until then, *Ḥazrat* Gangohī ∇ used to teach *tafsīr*, *ḥadīth*, *aqīdah* and *fiqh*. His third *hajj* was in 1299 A.H. He kept meeting Ḥājī Imdādullāh Muḥājir Makkī ∇ and Shāh 'Abdul Ghanī Muḥaddith ∇ in the *Ḥaramayn Sharīfayn*. Before this third journey, the *Muḥaddith* Shāh 'Abdul Ghanī ∇ passed away in 1296 A.H. After returning from this journey, he took it upon himself to complete the *Ṣiḥāḥ Sittah* in a one-year period. He taught from *Shawwāl* until *Sha'bān*. This continued until 1314 A.H. (*Bṭis Bare Musalman* pg. 169)

It is mentioned in "*Kawkabud Durri*" 1/13 that this continued until 1309 A.H. In about 30 years, approximately over eight hundred

scholars graduated. He was unable to teach *dorah Ḥadīth* for three years due to the occurrence of continuous tragic incidents. Then, he began teaching *dorah Ḥadīth* in *Dhul Qa'dah* 1311 A.H. upon the insistence of those connected to him (disciples). He completed this in *Sha'bān* 1313 A.H. *Mawlānā* Muḥammad Yaḥyā *ṣāḥib* Kandhelwī ؒ was also present in this class. Rather, it was because of him that this class took place. *Mawlānā* Muḥammad Yaḥyā *ṣāḥib* ؒ documented the lectures that he delivered during these years which was then published under the titles, "*Kawkabud Durri*" and "*Lāmi'-ud-Darārī*". Books have been written on his accomplishments and excellent attributes. He died in *Jamād-al-'Ukhrā* 1323 A.H. رحمه الله رحمة واسعة (Bīs Bare Musalmān, *Al 'Anāqid Al Ghāliyah* pg. 38, *Muqaddamah Lāmi'* pg. 2 and *Kawkab*, pg. 13 and other than this)

His Teaching Style

Ḥazrat Gangohī ؒ first taught *Tirmidhī Sharīf*. He would explain and discuss in full details regarding the *matn* (text) and *sanad* (chain) and also regarding removing contradictions and giving preference. Then, he taught the remaining books with less details. He only commented on the specialities of that book. (*Muqaddamah Lāmi'* pg. 3 & *'Anāqidul Ghāliyah* pg. 38)

Ḥazrat Gangohī ؒ had this special virtue and capability to relate a comprehensive discussion in a few words. He was naturally connected to the field of *Ḥadīth*. He was of sound nature. He passed verdicts in rulings with differences of opinion with great justice. He was free from being on any extreme. He maintained good thoughts and respect for the *salafuṣ ṣāliḥīn* and the *Imāms* of *Ḥadīth* and *fiqh*. He would mention such an interpretation for the narrations that the contradiction would be removed.

Specialities and Excellent Attributes

He was from amongst the leading living examples of *taqwā* and following the *Sunnah*. He despised innovations and customs. He fought

against this. He was not in the least bit lenient in this regard. Many examples of this have been mentioned in his biography. He clearly stated the truth. His purpose in life was to spread the *Sunnah* and the *Shar'iah*. He could not tolerate any evil and he had no fear for anyone's criticism.

Despite this, he had a gentle and humble nature. He remained firm on the truth. If the *haqq* (truth) became apparent, he would retract from his previous statement.

He left such *khulafā'* (successors) and students who continued his mission. They made endless efforts in spreading the *Shar'iah* and the *Sunnah* and in ending the evils and innovations. *Mawlānā* Khalīl Aḥmad Sahāranpūrī, *Ḥazrat* Shaykhul Hind and *Mawlānā* Muḥammad Ilyās Dehlawī رحمہم اللہ were very well-known in this regard.

Ḥazrat *Mawlānā* Muḥammad Ilyās *ṣāhib* ▽ said: “*Ḥazrat* Gangohī was the leading spiritual guide and revivalist of this era. However, it is not necessary for all the reformation to be conducted by the revivalist himself. Rather, the work done by those working with him is also connected to him just like how the work of the *Khulafā' Rāshidīn*, in particular Shaykhayn's work, is the work of *Rasūlullāh* ﷺ in reality.” (*Malḥūzāt Mawlānā Muḥammad Ilyās* pg. 123, *Martaba Mawlānā Muḥammad Mandhūr Nu'mānī*)

Books

Ḥazrat Gangohī ▽ left books as memoirs on various topics. Some of his most famous ones are as follows:

1. *Hidayatush Shī'a*- Replies to objections by against Hādī 'Alī Shī'ī.
2. *Zubadatul Manāsik*
3. *Ar-Rā'yul qabīḥ fī ithbātīt Tarāwīḥ*
4. *Awthaqul 'Urā* – In reply to *Jumu'ah fil Qurā*.
5. *Hidāyyatul Muqtadī*- Regarding the topic of *qirā'ah* behind the Imām.
6. *Sabīlur Rashād*- Refuting not doing *taqlīd*.

7. *Quṭūfe Dāniyah*- Regarding the *karāhah* of a second *jamā'ah* in the *masjid* of the locality.
8. *Radduṭ Ṭughyān*- Reply to those who claim that the stops in the Qur'ān are an innovation.
9. *Iḥtiyāṭuz Ṣuḥr*- Where there is *Jumu'ah Ṣalāh*, there is no need to read *Ṣuḥr* as a precaution.
10. *Fatāwā Rashīdiyyah* (See *Taḏkirah Rashīd* by *Ḥazrat Mawlānā 'Ashiq Ilāhī Mirthi* & *Bīs bare Musalmān* pg. 146 for details.)



Shaykh Shāh ‘Abdul Ghanī Mujaddidī Dehlawī, Muḥājīr Madanī ∇

1235 A.H

1296 A.H. (1846 C.E.)

Age: 61 years

His name is ‘Abdul Ghanī. His father’s name is Abū Sa‘īd Mujaddidī. His lineage reaches Mujaddid Alf Thānī, Ḥazrat Shaykh Aḥmad through some forefathers. It is for this reason that he and his father are also known as Mujaddadi.

Birth

Shāh ‘Abdul Ghanī was born in *Sha‘bān* 1235 A.H. in Delhi. He sought knowledge from his childhood. He studied Ḥanafī *fiqh* and memorised the Qur’ān. He studied majority of *aḥādīth* and other books by his father, *Shaykh* Abū Sa‘īd Mujaddidī ∇. Specifically, he also studied the *Ṣiḥāḥ Sittah*, *Muwatta‘* Imām Muḥammad and *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* by Ḥazrat Shāh Muḥammad Ishāq ∇. He studied *Mishkāṭ* by *Shaykh* Makhṣūṣullāh ibn Shāh Rafī‘uddīn ∇. He also studied *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* by *Shaykh* Muḥammad ‘Ābid Sindhī ∇ and also obtained *ijāzah* (authorisation) for other books. He also obtained *ijāzah* from *Shaykh* Abū Zāhid Ismā‘īl ibn Idrīs Rūmī (later known as Madnī) ∇. He obtained *ijāzah* in *silsilah Naqshbandī* from his father and he became his successor and worked as a spiritual guide.

He wrote an excellent and valuable *ḥāshiyah* (marginalia) on *Sunan Ibn Mājah*, “*Injāhul Ḥājah*” which is widely accepted.

He was always occupied in teaching, advising and guiding. When there was corruption in Delhi and the disbelievers gained power, he migrated to Ḥijāz with some of his people. He first went to Makkah and then he went to Madīnah and stayed there. He spent his days and nights in conducting *dars* (teaching) and in reciting *ad‘iyah* and *adhkār*. Here, many ‘ulamā’ benefitted from him.

Amongst his students are the following *akābir* (senior scholars) of India:

- Mullā Maḥmūd Deobandī ∇ (death:1304 A.H.)
- *Ḥazrat Mawlānā* Rashīd Aḥmad Gangohī ∇
- *Ḥazrat Mawlānā* Muḥammad Qāsim Nānotwī ∇
- *Mawlānā* ‘Abdul Ḥalīm Farangī Maḥallī ∇
- *Mawlānā* ‘Abdul Ḥay Farangī Maḥallī ∇
- *Mawlānā* Maḥmūd Ḥasan Deobandī *Shaykhul Hind* ∇
- *Mawlānā* Khalīl Aḥmed Sahāranpūrī ∇, the author of “*Badhlul Majhūd*”.
- *Mawlānā* Muḥammad Ya‘qūb Nānotwī ∇
- *Mawlānā* Raḥmatullāh Kīrānwī ∇, the founder of Madrasah Ṣālitiyyah Makkah Mukarramah.

His students from Ḥijāz are as follows:

- *Shaykh* Shihābud Dīn Aḥmad ibn Ismā‘īl Barzanjī ∇
- *Shaykh* Ḥasbullāh Makkī ∇
- *Shaykh* ‘Abdul Jalīl Barādah ∇
- *Sayyid* Amīn Riḍwān ∇
- *Shaykh* Fāliḥ ibn Muḥammad Ṣāḥirī ∇
- *Shaykh* ‘Uthmān Dāghistānī Madnī ∇

People from the west also took *ijāzah* from him.

After him, his daughter also gave *ijāzah* through him. *Mawlānā* Muḥammad Yūsuf Binnorī ∇ took *ijāzah* from her.

Death

He died in *Muḥarram* 1296 A.H. in Madīnah Munawwarah. *May Allāh be pleased with him and make him pleased and make Jannah his abode.* His father, *Shaykh* Abū Sa‘īd Mujaddidī ∇ and Shāh Muḥammad Ishāq ∇ acquired the knowledge of *aḥādīth* from Shāh ‘Azīz *muḥaddith* Dehlawī ∇. He, from his father until the end of the chain.

ʿAllāmah ʿAbdul Ḥay Kattānī ∇ states that there is no stronger and more reliable chain than his amongst the chains of the *mutaʿakh-khirīn* (later scholars). This is because coupled with it being a high chain, it is continuous with those *aʿimmah* of high status of that place and era. (Extracted from *Al ʿAnāʿid Al Ghāliyah* pg. 34,35)



Musnidul Hind Shāh Muḥammad Ishāq Dehlawī Makkī ∇

Date of Birth: 1197 A.H.

Date of Death: 1262 A.H.

Age: 65 years

Name: Muḥammad Ishāq

Kunyah (Teknonym): Abū Sulaymān

Lineage: Muḥammad Ishāq ibn Muḥammad Afḍal ibn Aḥmad Sulaymān ibn Manṣūr.... ‘Umrī Dehlawī

Birth: He was born on 8th *Dhul Hijjah* 1196 A.H. or 1197 A.H. in Delhi.

Education

He grew up under the care of his grandfather Shāh ‘Abdul ‘Azīz Dehlawī ∇. He learnt *ṣarf* and *naḥw*, up to “*Kāfiyah*” from *Shaykh* ‘Abdul Ḥayy ibn Hibatullāh Badhānwī ∇. He studied the remainder of the syllabus books from *Shaykh* ‘Abdul Qādir ibn Shāh Walīullāh ∇. He acquired the knowledge of *Ḥadīth* and its chains from Shāh ‘Abdul ‘Azīz ∇.

He was like a child to Shāh Ṣāḥib. Shāh ‘Abdul ‘Azīz ∇ made him his successor. He gifted all his wealth, books and house to him. After Shāh Ṣāḥib, he became his successor. He was of great benefit to the people.

Journey to Hījāz

In the year 1240 A.H., he travelled to the Ḥaramayn Sharīfayn. Here, he received the chain of *Ḥadīth* from *Shaykh* ‘Abdul Karīm ibn ‘Abdur Rasūl Makkī Shāfi‘ī ∇ (death: 1247 A.H.). Thereafter, he came to India and taught in Delhi for sixteen years.

Shaykh ‘Umar ibn ‘Abdul Karīm ∇ would say: “He inherited the blessings of his grandfather, *Shaykh* ‘Abdul ‘Azīz Dehlawī.” The aforementioned, *Shaykh* ‘Umar Makkī ∇ believed that he excelled in the science of *Ḥadīth* and its narrators.

He was famous for his knowledge, piety and other virtues. In his era, there was no other chain of narration of *Ḥadīth* in India. Many people acquired the knowledge of *Ḥadīth* from him until he became the centre of all *Ḥadīth* chains. This is what is meant by *Musnidul Hind*.

Migration

In the year 1258 A.H., he left to perform *hajj* again and after completing *Hajj*, he chose to stay in Makkah Mukarramah. All his children and his younger brother, Muḥammad Ya‘qūb were also with him.

Many of his students became great scholars. Amongst them are: Nawāb Quṭbud Dīn Dehlawī, the author of “*Mazāhir Ḥaq*” (died: 1279 A.H. in Makkah¹), *Shaykh* Aḥmad ‘Alī ibn Luṭfullāh Saḥāranpurī (died: 1297 A.H.), the *muḥasshī* of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. (In Makkah, he copied books with his own hands and read them to Shāh Muḥammad Ishāq.). *Mawlānā* Muḥammad Mazhar Nānotwī (died: 1302 A.H.), *Qarī* ‘Abdur Raḥmān Pānī-Pattī (died: 1314 A.H.), Shāh ‘Abdul Ghanī Mujddidī (died: 1296 A.H.) and others رحمهم الله.

¹ In “*Nuzhatul Khawāṭir*” (7/426) it is mentioned that his death occurred in the year 1289 A.H.

Shāh Muḥammad Ishāq √ also translated *Mishkāṭ*. He left behind a few other books. There are some writings which are attributed to him in which there are errors. It is farfetched that he made such errors. It is said that from amongst his companions there were some evil people. He kept good thoughts regarding them. They are the ones who inserted these things in his books. (Shaykh Muḥammad Zakariyyā √ mentioned this in the introduction of *Awjaz*.)

Death: He died on Monday 27th *Rajab* 1262 A.H. while fasting. He was buried close to *Sayyidatunā* Khadijatul Kubrā ∩ in Jannatul Ma'lāh. رحمه الله رحمة واسعة (Extracted from *Al-Anāqīd Al-Ghāliyah* pg. 28)



Sirājul Hind

Ḥazrat Shāh ‘Abdul ‘Azīz Muḥaddith Dehlawī ۞

Birth: 1159 A.H.

Death: 1239 A.H.

Age: 80

Shāh ‘Abdul ‘Azīz Muḥaddith Dehlawī’s birth name was Ghulām Ḥalīm. He was born on 25th *Ramaḍān* in the year 1159 A.H./1746 C.E. in Delhi. At the age of eleven, upon completing the Qur’ān and learning Persian, he began to learn the Arabic language. At the age of fifteen he completed all customary sciences. He studied *‘ulūm ‘aqliyyah* (rational sciences) from the students of his respected father, Shāh Waliullāh Dehlawī ۞. He studied *Ḥadīth* and *fiqh* from Shāh Ṣāhib directly. He was seventeen years old when his father passed away. Thus, he completed his studies by Shāh Ṣāhib’s special student Mawlānā Muḥammad ‘Āshiq Philtī ۞.

After Shāh Waliullāh Muḥaddith Dehlawī’s death, he became his successor and *khalīfah*. He was the eldest from amongst his brothers. He became fully preoccupied in teaching, writing and compiling books and advising and guiding the people. He became an expert in all the common fields of knowledge and in the rational and Prophetic fields. His memory was strong. His speech was meaningful, enchanting, structured and pleasant. All these excellent qualities and achievements made him someone who was approached by both the general public and the scholars. Shaykh Muḥammad Thānwī ۞ states that Shāh ‘Abdul ‘Azīz Muḥaddith Dehlawī ۞ knew the *matn* (text) of six thousand (6000) *aḥādīth* by heart.

Nawāb Ṣiddīq Ḥasan Khan *ṣāhib* ۞ has written that he was the seal of the *muḥaddithīn* and *mufasssīrīn* of India. He excelled amongst his contemporaries in memorization and knowledge, interpretation of

dreams, speeches, writing, conducting valuable and knowledgeable research, discourses and debating with opponents. He had a distinguished position among his contemporaries with regards to the beliefs which coincided with the correct ‘*aqīdah* and that which contradicted it.

He spent his entire life teaching, issuing *fatāwā*, passing judgments, giving lectures, training disciples and perfecting students. Coupled with these inner perfections and excellent attributes, he was also blessed with a dignified, honourable, reverent and respectful outward appearance. The leader of the *mujāhidīn*, *Sayyid* Aḥmed Shāhīd Barelwī ▽ pledged allegiance to him. His family was a family of *Ḥadīth* and *Ḥanafī fiqh*.

Mawlānā ‘Abdul Qādir ▽ stated that Shāh ‘Abdul ‘Azīz *ṣāhib* ▽ was renowned for being a person of knowledge in the fields of *tafsīr*, *Ḥadīth*, *fiqh*, *sīrah* and *tārikh* (history). There was no one in his era who was more knowledgeable than him in the following fields: astronomy, geometry¹, *Almagest* (a book on mathematics and astronomy)², the science of optics³, the astrolabe⁴, physics⁵, logic, debate, issues of consensus and differences of opinions, religious and philosophical views, physiognomy, interpretations, reconciliation of varying opinions and explanation of ambiguous statements.

He had a high rank in the field of literature and in understanding and interpreting every type of poem. In *manqūl* (Prophetic knowledge), he would present evidence from the *Qur’ān* and *Ḥadīth*. In *ma’qūl*

¹ هندسه: مص، الحد والقياس، علم يثبت فيه عن أحوال المقادير من حيث التقدير. المنجد.

² مجسطى: بكسر الميم والجيم (كشف الظنون ١٥٩٤/٢) علم يثبت اورفلكيات كى ايك قديم كتاب جسے مصر كے مشہور عالم بطليموس نے ۱۴۰ ہجری میں لکھا، حسین بن اسحق نے عہد مامون میں اس کا عربی ترجمہ کیا (كشف الظنون والقاموس الوحيد)

³ علم المناظر: علم تعرف به مقادير الأشياء باعتبار قربها أو بعدها من نظر الناظر. المنجد.

⁴ اسطرلاب: آلة يقيس بها الفلكيون ارتفاع الكواكب. المنجد.

⁵ طبيعيات: ما يثبت فيه عن طبائع الاشياء وما جعله البارئ فيه من الخصائص والقوى. منجد.

(rational knowledge), he would mention whichever evidence he found befitting. He never tried to justify and support the statements and opinions of the philosophers of Yunān (Greece) nor Rāzī, etc. (Extracted from *Faw'id Jāmi'ah* on '*Ujālah Nafi'ah* pg. 274)

He used to hold gatherings of advice twice a week. A great number of enthusiastic and faithful ones gathered and he would guide and advise them. (Extracted from *Faw'id Jāmi'ah* on '*Ujālah Nafi'ah*, pg. 275)

Death: He departed from this temporary world on Sunday, 9th *Shawwāl* in the year 1239 A.H.

Books:

In the field of *Ḥadīth*, two books of his are famous. One is titled "*Bustān ul Muḥaddithīn*", which comprises of the famous books of *Ḥadīth* and the biography of their authors. This book was originally written in Persian. Its Urdu translation has been published.

(2) The second book is "*Ujālah Nāfi'ah*" which is a reflection of Shāh Ṣāhib's knowledge of *Ḥadīth*. (Extracted from *Faw'id Jāmi'ah* on '*Ujālah Nafi'ah* pg. 275)

(3) *Tuhfah Ithnā 'Ashriyyah*: This is a unique book refuting the Shī'as.

(4) *Tafsīr 'Azīzī*: The commentary of *Sūrah Baqarah* and the last two parts. Its title is *Fatḥ ul 'Azīz*. If this was completed, there would have been no *tafsīr* as excellent as it.

(5) *Tahqīqur Ru'yah*

(6) *Risālah Fayd 'Ām*

(7) *Sirrush Shāhādātayn* (This is regarding the martyrdom of Ḥusayn z)

(8) *'Azīz ul Iktibās Fī Faḍā'il-e-Akhhbār-un- Nās*

(9) *Chahār Bāb*

(10) *Aḥsanul Ḥasanāt* (Extracted from the Muqaddamah of Awjaz pg. 72)

(11) *Fatāwā 'Azīzī*: A compilation of Shāh Ṣāhib's *fatāwā*.

Shāh Ṣāhib was a person upon whose hands *karāmāt* would occur. The first time he led *tarāwīḥ*, he saw in a dream that the Noble Messenger ﷺ was also present. Other than this, he also possessed many virtues. Allāh ﷻ blessed him with such students through which his knowledge was made widespread.

He was afflicted with many illnesses. For many days he did not eat.

رحمه الله رحمة واسعة

(For more regarding his biography, see *Al-Kalāmul Mufīd* by Shaykh Rūḥul Amīn Bangladesī, pg. 310 onwards.)



Ḥazrat Shāh Walīullāh Muḥaddith Dehlawī ۛ

Birth: 1114 A.H./ 1702 C.E.

Death: 1176 A.H./ 1763 C.E.

Age: 62 years

Name And Lineage:

Name: Aḥmad

Kunyah (teknonym): Abul Fayāḍ.

He was known as Walīullāh. His *bashāratī* name was Quṭbud Dīn. His historic name was ‘Adhīmud Dīn. He is a Fārūqī by lineage. His lineage from his mother’s side goes back to Mūsā p.

Birth: He was born on 4th *Shawwāl* 1114 A.H./1702 C.E., eighty years after the demise of Ḥazrat Mujaddid Alfe Thānī ۛ in Muḥaffarnagar, U.P. He was four years old when the King of Alamghīr Aurangzeb passed away.

His father, Shāh ‘Abdur Raḥīm ۛ was a great scholar of his era. He was a *faqīh* (jurist) and righteous *ṣūfī* (mystic). He also contributed towards the compilation of *Fatāwā Ālamghīrī*. He had a deep insight in the *juz’iyyāt* (subsidiary rulings) of the Ḥanafī *fiqh*.

Education And Upbringing

His father began teaching him at the age of five. He memorized the Qur'ān at the age of seven. Thereafter, he started to learn Persian and Arabic. At the age of ten he was proficient in *naḥw* (Arabic grammar). Thereafter, he turned his attention towards *ma'qūlāt* (rational knowledge). At the age of fifteen, he completed all the books on the syllabus and became a proficient scholar. He acquired most of his knowledge from his father. He received a *sanad* for *Ḥadīth* by participating in the lesson of Shaykh Muḥammad Afḍal Sayālkūtī v.

Marriage and Bay'ah

At the age of fourteen, he got married and at the age of fifteen, whilst studying "*Bayḍāwī Sharīf*" from his father, he took *bay'ah* (the oath of allegiance) on the hands of his father. Under his guidance, he became preoccupied in *Ṣūfism*. He specifically completed all the *adhkār* in the *Naqshbandī* order. As his father fell ill and prepared himself for the journey to the hereafter, he was granted *khilāfah* and was entrusted with the responsibility of Madrasah Raḥīmiyyah and Khānqāh Raḥīmiyyah at the tender age of seventeen.

Teaching

He started to teach at the age of seventeen. For twelve consecutive years, with lots of diligence and effort, he taught *naḥw*, *ma'qūlāt*, *ṣarf*, books of *fiqh*, *tafsīr* and *Ḥadīth*. He conducted a comparative study of the four *madhāhib*. From that time onwards, his heart became inclined to the methodology of the *muḥaddithīn* scholars. He abandoned the traditional way and opted a new method of teaching. Through this, a deep connection with the Qur'ān and *Ḥadīth* was built amongst the *fuḍalā'* (scholars). With the help of the '*ulūm 'aqliyyah* (rational sciences) the ability to refute all doubts was developed.

Journey to Ḥijāz

In the end of the year 1143 A.H./1731 C.E., he departed to perform *hajj*. After completing *hajj*, he stayed on for an extra year. He stayed for fourteen complete months. He performed two *hajj*. During this period, he acquired great benefit from great scholars. Coupled with this, he benefitted from the radiance of the *rawḍah* of Muḥammad ﷺ and the *Ka'bah*.

The spiritual observations he acquired from the *Ka'bah* and the *rawḍah aṭ-har* were compiled in *Fuyūḍul Ḥaramayn*.

While staying in Ḥijāz, he focused his attention on sourcing books. He bought those books which were rare to obtain in India at whichever price was offered.

During his stay in Ḥijāz, he developed the ability and excellence of being a *mujtahid* through the influence of knowledgeable companions, the study of books and spiritual atmosphere which widened the scope of his services.

Fayḍ Ḥadīth

Before him, Shāh ‘Abdul Ḥaq Muḥaddith Dehlawī √ (death: 1052 A.H.), made efforts to propagate the knowledge of *Ḥadīth* in India. To acquire this objective, he stayed three years in Ḥijāz to acquire the knowledge of *Ḥadīth*. Accordingly, knowledge of *aḥādīth* was disseminated through him and his descendants. However, this system was not maintained. However, the system which began through Shāh Waliullāh was blessed by Allāh ۱ in such a way that until today that system is not only established but it is developing, advancing and spreading considerably.¹

¹ وقال في كتابه "التفهيمات" لما تكلم على المجدد: وأقرب الناس الى المجددية المحدثون القدماء كالبخارى ومسلم واشباههم، ولما تمت بي دورة الحكمة ألبسني الله خلة المجددية فعلمت علم الجمع بين المختلفات، وعلمت أن الرأي في الشريعة تحريف وأشار الى رسول الله اشارة روحانية أن مراد الحق منك أن يجمع شملًا من شمل الأمة المحمدية بك هـ (الكلام المفيد ص ٣٠٣)

Shāh Ṣāhib's Service

In Shāh Ṣāhib's era, the condition of the Muslims in India was in turmoil. All the filth of disbelief and immorality were embedded in them. Their religious and moral condition had deteriorated considerably. The Muslims began opting the ways and customs of the Hindus. Lack of progress and blind following became customary for the scholars. Ignorant *ṣūfīs* had continued the business of robbing Muslims in the name of Peri-Muridi. Innovations were common. Ignorance was also common. In the *madāris*, a greater emphasis was given on *ma'qūlāt*. Attention was not focused on the primary knowledge of the Qur'ān and *Sunnah*. The Qur'ān was not part of the curriculum. In terms of *Ḥadīth*, "*Mishkātul Maṣābiḥ*" and "*Mashāriqul Anwār*" were taught for *barakah* purposes (to reap blessings).

Shāh Ṣāhib made such an effort to reform the Muslims through both writing and speech which can never be forgotten. The growth and development of the knowledge of the *Dīn* and the authentic form of Islām which is currently present in the Indo-Pak region is the result of Shāh Ṣāhib's efforts.

Shāh Ṣāhib adopted a new style of teaching in which the Qur'ān and *Ḥadīth* were established as the primary subjects. He compiled the translation of the Qur'ān with some useful points in Persian which was the common language of that time. This was the first translation which was compiled in India. It is titled: "*Faṭḥur Raḥmān Fī Tarjumatil Qur'ān*". He also wrote a brief *tafsīr* (commentary) in Arabic titled, "*Faṭḥul Kabīr bimālābudda min ḥifẓihi fī 'ilmit tafsīr*". He wrote two commentaries on *Muwatta' Imām Mālik*. One is titled, "*Muṣaffā*" which is in Persian and the other is titled, "*Musawwā*" which is written in Arabic. By reading these, you will become aware of the Shāh Ṣāhib's teaching method and his ocean of knowledge.

He purified the Islāmic *taṣawwuf* (spirituality) from unislāmic mysticism and its superstitions. He also wrote books on this topic.

He wrote a book titled, “*Izālatul Khifā’ ‘an khilāfatil khulafā’*” in refutation of the *Shias* in which he established the *khilāfah* of the *Khulafā’ Rāshidīn* from the *Qur’ān* and *Ḥadīth*. He presented such proofs from the commentaries and history which clarified all misconceptions. According to *Mawlānā* ‘Abdul Ḥay Farangī Maḥallī ∇: “There is no book similar to it in Islāmic literature.”

Ḥujjatullāh Bālighah

This is one of his Arabic compilations in which he explains the points and codes of Islāmic laws and the secrets of the *Sharī‘ah*. This is his most monumental compilation. Truthfully, he is the inventor of this subject. No such book has been written on this subject ever before or ever after. It has been well received and gained recognition from the entire academic world.

Al-Fawḍul Kabīr

This is a brief treatise on the principles of *tafsīr*. However, this book is very comprehensive. Shāh Ṣāḥib divided the sciences of the Qur’ān into five categories in a very unique and new style. He provided insightful information regarding the abrogated verses and the causes of revelation. It is also difficult to find a book like this. Ibn Taymiyyah’s introduction on *‘ilm tafsīr* is nothing in comparison to this [treatise].

In this manner, there are fifty compilations of Shāh Ṣāḥib in which pearls of unique knowledge and research are scattered.

Apart from his compilations, there were many students who benefitted from him. They maintained and expanded this reform movement of Shāh Ṣāḥib through teaching and writing. From amongst them was his son *Mawlānā* Shāh ‘Azīz Muḥaddith Dehlawī ∇ who became the successor of Shāh Ṣāḥib. Shāh Ṣāḥib had four sons. All four of them achieved excellence in both knowledge and virtue. They are the

substantiation of the Persian saying: این خانه همه آفتاب است (*Everyone in this family is a radiant sunshine, i.e., they all possess excellent qualities.*)

Shāh Ṣāhib's School of Thought

Shāh Ṣāhib was blessed with so many excellent qualities by Allāh ۱ such as: depth in knowledge, proficiency in deriving proofs, perseverance in thought and understanding, purity of heart and adherence to the *Sunnah*. Hence, it was not necessary for him to follow a single Imām. Yet, he received the spiritual attention of the Messenger of Allāh ۲ through which he was advised not to turn away from doing *taqlīd* of the four *madhāhib* (schools of thought). The Messenger of Allāh ۲ also outlined that the Ḥanafī jurisprudence is closer to the *Sunnah* and *Ḥadīth* than any other *madh-hab*. For this reason, Shāh Ṣāhib used to take the sayings of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah ۳ and Ṣāhibayn ۴ which he considered to be closest to the *Ḥadīth*, and he used to follow the opinions of those Ḥanafī jurists which had a closer connection to the *Ḥadīth*. Shāh Ṣāhib, while giving *ijāzah* (authorization) to one of his students for *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*, wrote that he was a follower of the *Ḥanafī madh-hab*.

In his final years, Najaf 'Alī Khan, a fanatical *Shi'ite* ruler ordered for his wrists to be cut off so that he would no longer be able to write any other book or article.

Death: He died in *Muḥarram* 1176 A.H/1763 C.E in Delhi. He was buried in Mehdiyan. رحمه الله واسعه (Extracted from *Fawā'id Jāmi'ah*, pg. 276-287, *Ẓafrul Muḥaṣalīn* pg. 5-68, *Al-'Anāqūdul Ghālīyah*, Imām Shāh Walīullāh and Mawlānā 'Abdul Qayyūm Mazāhirī)



Shaykh Abū Ṭāhir Kurdī Madnī ۞

Date of Birth: 1081 A.H.

Date of Death: 1145 A.H./1732 C.E.

Age: 64 years

Name and Lineage:

Name: Muḥammad ‘Abdūs Samī‘. His *kunya*h was Abū Ṭāhir and his title was Jamālud Dīn. His lineage: Kurdī Madnī.

Birth and Education

He was born in Madīnah Munawwarah on 21st *Rajab* 1081 A.H. He acquired ‘*aqliyyah*’ (rational) and *naqliyyah* (Prophetic) knowledge from his pious saintly father, *Shaykh* Ibrāhīm Kūrānī Madnī ۞ and also received the *khirqah* (mantle) of *khilāfah* from him. His respected father had received *ijāzah* (authorisation) of *Ḥadīth* and the *khirqah* (mantle) of *khilāfah* from *Shaykh* Muḥammad ibn Sulaymān Maghribī ۞. He studied *naḥw*, *adab*, *fiqh* and the *ma‘qūl* sciences from experienced teachers. After his father, he mainly acquired the knowledge of *Ḥadīth* from *Shaykh* Ḥasan ‘Ujaymī ۞. He also heard the *ṣiḥaḥ sittah* from him. After this, he studied by *Shaykh* Aḥmad Nakhli ۞ and *Shaykh* ‘Abdullāh Baṣrī ۞. He studied “*Shamā’il Nabawī*” from *Shaykh* ‘Abdullāh Baṣrī ۞ and heard “*Musnad Aḥmad*” from him in less than two months.

He also benefitted from those ‘*ulamā*’ who came to visit the Ḥaramayn Sharīf. Amongst them was *Shaykh* ‘Abdullāh Lāhorī ۞ from whom he narrated the books of Mullā ‘Abdul Ḥakīm Siyālkūtī ۞ on the authority of *Shaykh* ‘Abdullāh Labīb ۞ who narrated from Mullā ‘Abdul Ḥakīm Siyālkūtī ۞. He also narrated the books of Mullā ‘Abdul Ḥaq ۞ directly from ‘Abdul Ḥakīm, as ‘Abdul Ḥakīm was the student of *Shaykh* ‘Abdul Ḥaq ۞.

From amongst them is also Shaykh Saʿīd Kawkanī ۞, with whom he studied a few literature books and approximately a quarter of “*Faṭḥul Bārī*”.

Shaykh Abū Ṭāhir ۞ was adorned with the qualities of the pious predecessors. He was a man of *taqwā* (Allāh consciousness) who strove to obey Allāh. He remained occupied with knowledge and he was just and balanced in discussions and arguments. He had such a soft heart that when the *aḥādīth* of *riqāq* (heart-softening) were recited, his eyes would fill with tears. He did not entertain any formalities regarding his clothing etc. He was very humble towards his servants and students.

He attained a great portion of righteousness, *taqwā* and *taṣawwuf*. He was a distinguished scholar, but he was a master in the field of *ḥadīth*. He was an embodiment of all the various fields of knowledge such as *ṣarf*, *naḥw*, *maʿānī* and *bayān*, *badīʿ*, *manṭiq*, *farāʾid*, *jabr* wa *muqābalaḥ* (algebra) and others. He was very prompt and prepared in teaching his students. He exerted lots of effort into studying, teaching and publishing books. It is said that he wrote seventy books by hand. He performed his *wazāʾif*, *maʿmūlāt*, *taḥajjud* etc. during the night and would never neglect the recitation of the Qurʾān, whether at home or on a journey. He also carried out the responsibilities of *Iftāʿ*.

Shāh Waliullāh *ṣāhib* ۞ studied the entire *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* from him and solved the difficult areas of this science by him. Shāh Ṣāhib also heard the complete *Musnad Dārimī* from him and read to him the entire *ṣiḥāḥ sittah*. He gave Shāh *ṣāhib iijāzah* (authorisation) for all his narrations and he also granted him the *khirqah* (mantle) of *khilāfah*. He made him well acquainted with his chains of narration.

Death

He passed away in Madīnah Munawwarah on 9th *Ramaḍān* 1145 A.H. and is buried in Baqiʿ. رحمه الله رحمة واسعة (Extracted from *Fawāʾid Jāmiʿah* pg. 297-304)

It is written in A'lām Zarkalī on the authority of Salk Ad-Durar that he was born in 1081 A.H./1670 C.E. and he passed away in 1145 A.H./1733 C.E. (*A'lām Zarkalī* 5/195)



Shaykh Ibrāhīm Ibn Ḥasan Kurdī Kawrānī Madnī ∇

Date of Birth: 1025 A.H

Date of Death: 1101 A.H

Age: 76 years

Name and Lineage

Shaykh Ibrāhīm ibn Ḥasan ibn Shihābud Dīn Shāharzūrī Kurdī Kawrānī Shāfi'ī. His patronymic appellation is Abūl 'Irfān and title is Burhānud Dīn. Kawrān is a tribe of Kardūn. Shāharzūr is the name of a province. He was born in his hometown in 1025 A.H. He first studied with the 'ulamā' of his hometown. He completed all the sciences of 'aqliyyah, āliyah, tafsīr and fiqh in his hometown. He studied these sciences from Mullā Muḥammad Sharīf Kawrānī ∇.

After this, he departed with the intention of performing *hajj*. He stayed in Baghdād for approximately two years. He proceeded towards the shrine of Shaykh 'Abdul Qādir ∇ and it is here that his passion for *taṣawwuf* developed. He spent four years in Syria. While going to Egypt, he came to the Ḥaramayn. On arriving in Madīnah, he stayed in the company of *Shaykh* Qushāshī ∇. While passing through Egypt he met *Shaykh* Shihābud Dīn Khafajī, *Shaykh* Sulṭān Mazāḥī and others رحمهم الله. He married the daughter of *Shaykh* Qushāshī ∇.

Shaykh Qushāshī ∇ had a special connection with him, and he had a special connection with Qushāshī. He narrated *Ḥadīth* from Qushāshī and donned the mantle of *khilāfah*. He achieved a high status and acquired many excellences through his company. He attained a distinguished status in the fields of *uṣūl*, *kalām*, *fiqh*, *Ḥadīth* and *taṣawwuf*. He was a sign from among the signs of Allāh. Books of his are available in every field, through which his eloquence of speech and writing can be gauged.

He was ascribed with the qualities of intelligence, an ocean of knowledge, *zuhd* and *tawāḍuʿ* (asceticism and humility), patience and forbearance. In his era, all the Islāmic countries admired him regarding *taṣawwuf*, *fiqh* of the *Shāfiʿī* school of thought and knowledge of *Ḥadīth*. Questions would come to him from the East and West (from all corners of the world) to which he would reply. They were then compiled into a booklet. His gatherings were like a garden from the gardens of *Jannah*. Students of knowledge would hasten towards him from faraway places. He gave classes in *Masjid Nabawī* and he was an ocean of *maʿrifah* (recognition of Allāh). It is difficult to count his students, many of whom are renowned scholars. He knew Persian, Kurdi, Turkish and the Arabic language. He defended Ibn Taymiyyah √ and others. In a similar manner, he also gave answers to the statements uttered by the *ṣūfīs*.

Books

He authored more than fifty (50) books. From amongst them “*Al-Umam Li Iqāzīl Himan*” is very famous. This is a very extensive index on the chains of *Ḥadīth*. It is a very comprehensive collection of discussions regarding *Ḥadīth*, *tārikh* (history) and *kalām* (*aqīdah*) as well as points on *ṣūfism*. This book has been published by Dāʿiratul Maʿārif Hyderabad India. (We have it. **Fazl**12)

Death

He continued serving the *Dīn* until he departed for the next world after *ʿAṣr* of Wednesday 18th *Rabīʿ-ul-Awwal* 1101 A.H., he is buried in *Baqīʿ*. The year of his death can be taken from the following *ʿibārah*:
 وَاللّٰهُ اِنَّا عَلٰى فِرَاقِكَ يَا اِبْرَاهِيْمَ لَمَحْزُوْنُوْنَ (1101 A.H.).

Shaykh Muḥammad ʿĀbid Sindhī √ has written: “His books are worthy to be written with tears and in acquiring them one’s wealth or one’s family and children should not be a hindrance.” (Extracted from *Fawāʿid Jāmiʿah* pg. 305-314)

Shaykh Abūl Ḥasan Sindhī Al-Kabīr ∇, who wrote a marginalia for the *Ṣiḥaḥ Sittah* and gave lessons in the Ḥaram for some time, was from among his students. According to one opinion, he passed away in 1139 A.H.



Shaykh Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad Al-Qushashī Al-Mālikī Al-Madnī ∇

Date of Birth: 991 A.H.

Date of Death: 1071 A.H

Age: 81 years

Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Yūnus ibn Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī ibn Yūsuf ibn Ḥasan Al-Badrī Al- Qushāshī Al-Mālikī Al-Madnī. His lineage from his father’s side reaches back to *Sayyidunā* ‘Alī z and to *Sayyidunā* Tamīm Ad-Dārī z through his mother. He was born in 991 A.H. Initially, his father, Muḥammad ibn Yūnus Qushāshī ∇ taught him the Malikī *fiqh*, as he had chosen the Malikī school of thought following his *Shaykh*, Muḥammad ibn ‘Isā Tilmasānī ∇.

In 1011 A.H he happened to travel to Yemen with his father. From amongst the *‘ulamā’* in Yemen he benefitted from *Shaykh* Amīn Marāwahī, Muḥammad Ghurb, *Shaykh* Aḥmad Saṭīḥah Dhayla’ī and others رحمهم الله. Then, he travelled from Yemen to Makkah Mu‘azzamah and stayed there for a while. During this time, he benefitted from the company of *Shaykh* Abūl Ghayth Shajar ∇ and *Shaykh* Sulṭān Majdhūb ∇.

On arriving in Madīnah Munawwarah, he benefitted from *Shaykh* Aḥmad ibnul Faḍl, *Shaykh* Muḥammad ibn ‘Irāq, *Shaykh* ‘Umar ibn Quṭb and *Shaykh* Badr-ud-Dīn ‘Ādatī and others رحمهم الله. Eventually he chose the company of *Shaykh* Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī Shināwī ∇. He completed the study of *Ḥadīth* by him and married his daughter.

When *Shaykh* Shināwī ∇ passed away, he chose the company of his friend, *Sayyid* As‘ad Balkhī and benefitted from him. *Shaykh* Qushāshī ∇ obtained *ijāzah* (authorisation) of *dhikr* and *talqīn* from approximately 100 *Shuyūkh*. His great-grandfather, *Shaykh* Aḥmad Dijānī ∇ was also a saint of high status. *Shaykh* ‘Abdul Wahāb Sh‘arānī ∇ mentioned him in *Ṭabaqāt*. Dijānī is the name of a village in Baytul

Muqaddas. From this, it is known that the family of Qushāshī was originally the residents of Quds.

The reason why Qushāshī was called Qushāshī: in order to hide his lineage, he sold '*qushāshā*', which is old stock and old clothes etc.

He also received the mantle of *khilāfah* from his father and had the good fortune of attaining success and acceptance on the hands of *Shaykh* Shināwī ∇ and he ascribed himself to him.

He spoke and dealt with each person according to his status. He used to specifically honour the leaders of the tribe more. He enjoined good and forbade evil in the most soft and gentle manner and would not return anyone coming to him without advising him. *Shaykh* 'Isā *Maghribī* ∇ said: "Whenever I depart from Qushāshī, the world becomes the most despicable thing to me and I see myself disgraced, even though I did not go by him very often."

Students: from among his students *Sayyīd* 'Ārif *Billāh* 'Abdur Raḥmān *Maghribī* Idrīsī, *Shaykh* 'Isā *Maghribī* Ja'afarī, *Sayyīd* 'Abdullāh Bāfaqīh and *Shaykh* Ibrāhīm ibn Ḥasan Kawrānī رحمه الله are famous.

Books: He authored twelve (12) books. The most famous of them is "*As-Simṭul Majīd Fī Talqīnidh Dhikr wal Bay'atī wa Ibāsil Khirqati wa Salāsil Ahlit Tawḥīd*" which has been published in Hyderabad, India.

He passed away in 1071 A.H in Madīnah Munawwarah and is buried in Baqī' in the shrine of Ḥalimah Sā'diyyah. رحمه الله رحمة واسعة (Extracted from *Fawā'id Jāmi'ah* from '*Ujālah Nafī'ah*, pg. 314-319)



Shaykh Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī Ash Shināwī al Miṣrī Then Madnī ∇

Birth: 975 A.H.

Death: 1028 A.H.

Age: 53 years

He was born in Rawḥ, a village in Egypt in 975 A.H. His grandfather, Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad Quṭb ∇ was from among the giant *awliyā’*. He was the *Shaykh* of *Shaykh* Abdul Wahhāb Sha‘rānī ∇. He was buried in Rawḥ.

Shaykh Aḥmad Shināwī ∇ was educated within Egypt from his honourable father, *Shaykh* ‘Abdul Quddūs Shināwī ∇. He studied *Ḥadīth* and also received the *khirqah* (mantle) of *khilāfah*. He also benefitted from *Muḥaddith* Shamsuddīn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad Ramlī, *Sayyid* Ghaḍunfur ibn Ja‘far Bukhārī then Madnī, Quṭb-ud-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Abil Ḥasan Bakrī, *Shaykh* Ḥasan Wanjihī and *Shaykh* ‘Abdur Raḥmān ibn ‘Abdul Qādir ibn Fahd رَحْمَهُمُ اللهُ.

Thereafter, on arriving in Madīnah Munawwarah, he studied *taṣawwuf* from *Sayyid* Şibghatullāh ibn Rūḥullāh Sindī and he completed studying the knowledge of *ṭarīqah*. He also received the mantle of *khilāfah* from him and he reached a very lofty rank. He became his *khalīfah* in the upbringing of his students.

Shaykh Shināwī ∇ was a combination (of the knowledge) of both *sharī‘ah* and *ṭarīqah*. He was very famous in the Ḥaramayn Sharīfayn. His *khalīfahs* are in every province and they hold very high statuses.

Shināwī is ascribed to the village, Shinnū which is located in the western part of Egypt. He was born in Rawḥ, a neighbourhood of this village.

Students

The most famous from amongst his students who received his *sanad* and benefitted from him are: Sayyid Sālim ibn Aḥmad Shaykhān, Muḥammad ‘Umar ibn Ḥabshī Ghurābī, Shaykh Ṣafiyuddīn Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad Dijānī Qushāshī رَحْمَهُمُ اللّٰهُ.

Death

He passed away in Madīnah Munawwarah on 8th *Dhul Ḥijjah* 1028 A.H. He is buried in Baqī‘ Gharqad beside his *Shaykh* Ṣibghatullāh Sindī v.

Noteworthy point

The following is a very beneficial point of the aforementioned: According to the *muḥaddithīn*, a chain with the least links is classified as the highest chain. This is because when there are less narrators, the grading and investigating (of the *sanad*) becomes easier. However, having many narrators in the chain of *ṭarīqah* is a means for developing more *zuhd* (asceticism) and *taqwā* (Allāh consciousness) and indicates towards the greatness of this chain.

Books: Seventeen of his books have been mentioned in “*Fawā’id Makkiyah*”. (See: *Fawā’id Makkiyah* pg. 319-322)



Shaykh Shamsud Dīn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Ḥamzah Ar-Ramālī Al-Manūfī Al-Miṣrī Ash Shāfi'ī ۞

Birth: 919 A.H. *Jumād-al-'Ūlā*

Death: 1004 A.H. *Jumād-al-'Ūlā*

Age: 85 years

This respected *Shaykh* was born in *Jumād-al-'Ūlā* 919 A.H. in Menoufia, Egypt. Firstly, he memorized the Qur'ān and then he learnt Bihjaa – (a *fiqh* book) among other books. He acquired all his education from his honorable father, *Shaykh* Aḥmad Ramālī ۞. He also acquired a *sanad* in *Ḥadīth* (chain of narration) from *Shaykhul Islām* Zakariyyā Anṣārī ۞ and *Shaykh* Burhānuddīn ibn Abī Sharīf ۞. The historian, Najm Ghazī writes that he was also given *ijāzah* (authorisation) to narrate *Ḥadīth* from *Shaykhul Islām* Aḥmad ibn Najjār Ḥanbalī, *Shaykhul Islām* Yaḥyā Damirī Mālikī, *Shaykhul Islām* Ṭarābilisī Ḥanafī and *Shaykh* Sa'dud Dīn Dhahabī Shāfi'ī رحمه الله. Allāh ۞ had blessed him with a good memory, understanding, knowledge and the ability to practice on this knowledge.

Shaykh Abdul Wahāb Sha'rānī ۞ wrote in “*Ṭabaqātul Wusṭā*”: “I was with him from the time I would lift him on my shoulders, until the present. I never saw any such thing from him which would negatively affect his *Dīn*. Even as a child he would not play with the children, rather he grew up with *Dīn*, *taqwā*, care, chastity and purity. His father gave him the best of upbringing. When I took him in my lap, I was studying by his father at Madrasah Nāṣiriyyah. Signs of righteousness, *taqwā* and goodness could be seen in him since then. Allāh made his hopes and expectations a reality and cooled the eyes of those who loved him. Accordingly, currently (i.e., when ‘Abdul Wahāb was writing the biography of *Shaykh* Shamsud Dīn), he is the central figure in Egypt with regards to issuing *fatāwā*, and there is a consensus of the people

of Egypt regarding his religiosity. With the praises and blessings of Allāh, he is advancing further in this regard.”

After the death of his father, he continued teaching his classes and taught *Ḥadīth*, *fiqh* and *tafsīr*. The special students of his father, like Nāṣirud Dīn Ṭablāwī and Shihābud Dīn Aḥmad, who were considered the great ‘*ulamā*’ of that era, would participate in his class circles for the purpose of benefit.

He was the principal of a few *madāris* and was also appointed as the head of the *Shāfi’iyyah Dārul Iftā’*. Due to his great services, *Shaykh* Shallī ∇ included him among the *mujaddidīn*.

Death: Sunday 13th *Jumād-al-’Ūlā* 1004 A.H. in Egypt.

Ramlah: Ramlah is a small neighbourhood near Munyatul ‘Aṭār in Egypt. There is also a Ramlah in Syria¹ which is connected to Egypt. (*Fawā'id Jāmi'ah* pg. 326-328)

The leader of Ramlah, Syria selected [*aḥādīth*] from “*Sunan Kubrā*” and told Imām Nasā’ī ∇ to write the “*Sunan Ṣughrā- Muḥtabā*”, which Imām Nasā’ī ∇ completed. It is correct that the full “*Sunan Ṣughrā*” was completed by Imām Nasā’ī ∇, because the leader of Ramlah requested that only the *ṣaḥīḥ ḥadīth* be compiled.

¹ The Ramlah of Syria is in Palestine, near Lud. We visited it. The grave of Imām Nasā’ī ∇ is here. It is written with a glorious pen. *Fazl*.



Shaykhul Islām Zaynud Dīn Zakariyyā ibn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad Al Anṣārī Ash Shāfi‘ī ۞

Birth: 823 A.H.

Death: Around 924 or 926 A.H.

Age: 101 or 103 years

He was born in the year 823 A.H. in a small village in Egypt called Sunaykah where he acquired his early education. He memorized the Qur’ān Majīd and in terms of *fiqh*, he memorised “*Mukhtaṣar Tabrīzī*” and a few parts of “*Umdatul Ahkām*”. He went to Cairo in 841 A.H. He stayed there for some time and then departed. He thereafter returned and occupied himself with studying Islāmic knowledge in Jāmi‘ Azhar. He said: “I used to remain hungry for most of the time I spent in Jāmi‘ Azhar. I would come out at night and find watermelon skins, hide and eat them. A few years passed in this manner. Thereafter, Allāh[۞] sent a man to me who inquired of my condition. He became responsible for providing me with food and drink and he said: “You should not conceal your conditions from me. Whenever you call me, I will come.” A few years passed in this manner. One night he came to me, took hold of my hand and said: “Stand up and walk with me.” He took me to the stairs of Jāmi‘ Azhar and said: “Climb these stairs.” I climbed them. He told me to climb some more, and I continued to climb until I reached the top. Thereafter, he said come down, so I came down. He said: “Zakariyyā! You will die after all your companions. A time will come when you attain the position of *Shaykhul Islām* and your students will also become *Shaykhul Islām*. At this time, you will become blind.” Then, he went away and I never saw him again.”

He completed the study of *fiqh*, *Ḥadīth*, *uṣūl* and *adab* under the renowned scholars of his time. He received *ijāzah* (authorisation) to narrate *Ḥadīth* from approximately one hundred and fifty of his teachers and he kept count of them, name by name in his records. He

also received *ijāzah* to work in the field of *iftā'* and teaching from hundreds of scholars.

From amongst his teachers, there are also some famous ones such as Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar 'Asqalānī (death:852 A.H.) ∇ and Ibn Hummām Kamāl-ud-Dīn Ḥanafī (death: 861 AH) ∇.

After completing his Islāmic studies, he took up the occupation of teaching. He was appointed as the chief justice and would receive three thousand (3000) *dirhams* daily. After this, he was given many esteemed and distinguished positions. He was appointed to teach at the *madrasah* by the mausoleum of Imām Shāfi'ī ∇ which was regarded as the greatest accomplishment in that era. He was also appointed as the head teacher in Madrasah Rafī'ah and Madrasah Khānqāh Ṣūfiyyah. He was appointed as the chief justice in 886 A.H. and he remained in this position for twenty years. When his eyesight began to weaken, he was removed from these positions.

Allāh ۞ blessed him in everything: *‘ilm* and *‘amal* (knowledge and practice), wealth and age. Just as Allāh ۞ gave him generously, he also spent in the path of Allāh with an open heart. ‘Allāmah Sha‘rānī ∇ said: “I have never seen anyone who gave more charity than him. He would give it in such a hidden manner that those who were around him would not even be aware. There was a fixed amount which he used to give daily or monthly to some of the needy ones.”

Shaykh was older than a hundred years. However, even after reaching this age, there was no difference in his *ma‘mūlāt*. Even when sick, he would perform optional *ṣalāh* standing. Sha‘rānī ∇ said: “Whenever I would sit with him, I would feel that I am sitting with a pious, *‘ārif* (conscious) king. The greatest scholars of Egypt were like children in front of him.”

According to ‘Īd Rūsī, he passed away on 3rd *Dhul Qa‘dah* 926 A.H. Thousands of students benefited from him. Forty-two of his books has been mentioned in “*Fawā’id Jāmi‘ah*”.¹ (See *Fawā’id -Jāmi‘ah* pg. 343-349)



¹ If Shaykh Zakariyyā ۞ did pass away in 926 A.H., then at that time his student Shaykh Ramlī’s was only seven years old. If he passed away in 924 A.H., then Shaykh Ramlī was only five years old. فليحذر **Fazlur Rahman**

Hāfiz Abul Faḍl Shihābud Dīn Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Aḥmad Al Asqalānī then Al Qāhirī Ash Shāfi‘ī-

Hāfiz Ibn Hajar ▼

Birth: *Shā‘bān* 773 A.H.

Death: *Dhul Qa‘dah* 852 A.H.

Age: 79 years

He was born in *Shā‘bān* 773 AH. At the age of four, his father’s shadow was lifted. His mother had passed away before this. He started studying at the age of five, memorized the Qur’ān *Majīd* at the age of nine. He started reciting Qur’ān in *tarāwīḥ* from the age of twelve. During this same year, he went for *hajj* with his guardian who was a great Egyptian merchant. He stayed in the *Haram* for one year and heard *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* from Shaykh ‘Afīfuddīn Nashāwarī Musnid-e-Ḥijāz. He also took *ijāzah* (authorisation) to narrate his other narrations. After this, he started memorizing *Mukhtaṣarāt ‘Ulūm*. He then developed an interest in history and preoccupied himself in studying the conditions of the narrators.

In 792 A.H., he focused on studying the sciences of *adab* (literature) and wrote poems in praise of the Messenger of Allāh ﷺ. In 796 A.H., he met the Hāfiz of his time, Shaykh Zaynuddīn ‘Irāqī ▼, and benefited from staying in his company for ten years. Then, he became preoccupied in studying *Ḥadīth*, and he remained in this field until the end of his life. He compiled one hundred (100) *‘ushāriyyāt* with the *sanad* of his teacher, Musnad Qāhirah, Shaykh Abū Ishāq Tanūkhī ▼. Thereafter, he travelled to Alexandria and received *ijāzah* to narrate *Ḥadīth* from the scholars of this city. Thereafter, he also heard *Ḥadīth* in Makkah, Madīnah Munawwarah, Zabīd, Ta‘iz (a great fort from among the famous forts of Yemen) (*Mu‘jamul Buldān* 2/34) ‘Adnān etc. In Yemen, he benefited from the Imām of languages, Majd-ud-Dīn Fayroz Ābādī, the author of “*Qāmūs*” and other prominent scholars. He then returned to Cairo.

He then went to Syria and benefitted from the scholars of that era from Qūṭayyah, Gaza, Ramlah, Quds, and Damascus etc. He stayed one hundred days in Damascus and heard one thousand volumes [of *ḥadīth*]. Amongst them were *kitābs* like: “*Muʿjamul Awsaʿ*” by Ṭabarānī, “*Maʿrifatus Ṣaḥābah*” of Ibn Mundah and “*Musnad Abī Yaʿlā*”. On returning, he wrote “*Taghliqut Taʿlīq*” and he sought *ijāzah* by staying in the company of Bulqīnī v. Ḥāfiẓ ʿIrāqī v also gave him *ijāzah*. He therefore became occupied in writing and compiling. In 808 A.H., he conducted a dictation of “*Arbaʿīn Mutabāyinah*”. He dictated “*Ushāriyātus Ṣaḥābah*” in one hundred (100) sittings. He then started teaching and dictating in *Madrasah Jamāliyah*. He stopped teaching in 814 A.H., and he then busied himself with writing and compiling. He was appointed as the judge on 27th *Muḥarram* 827 A.H. and then in *Ṣafar* the sequence of dictation began. (This is extracted from the autobiography of Ḥāfiẓ.)

He was appointed as a lecturer in Jāmiʿ Azhar in 819 A.H. He heard *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*, *Sunan Nasāʾī*, *Jāmiʿ Tirmidhī*, *Muwattʿāʾ Mālik*, *Sunan Dārimī* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Hibbān* from Abū Ishāq Tanūkhī v. In this way, Ḥāfiẓ v reached such a rank in the science of *Ḥadīth* that even his teachers acknowledged it. Ḥāfiẓ ʿIrāqī v suggested three names to be his successors: “Ibn Hajar, my son Abū Zurʿah and then Haythamī.”

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Hajar v attained a very distinguished rank in the fields of *asmāʾ rijāl* and memorization of *Ḥadīth*, but not in the jurisprudence of the *Ḥadīth*. In the jurisprudence of the *Ḥadīth*, the position of Khaṭṭābī v and Nawawī v is higher. In this field, Ḥāfiẓ v simply quotes narrations. (Kashmīrī v mentions this.)

The ‘*ulamāʾ*’ complain that Ḥāfiẓ v did not act justly with the biographies of the ‘*ulamāʾ*’. Baqāʾī, Sakhāwī and Ḥājī Khalīfah رحمه الله made this complaint especially with regards to the *aḥnāf*.

Death: In *Dhul Hijjah* 852 A.H. after suffering from dysentery for one month, he passed away. رحمه الله رحمة واسعة. The journalists wrote very

highly regarding Ḥāfiẓ when paying tribute to him. (*Fawā'id-e-Jāmi'ah* pg. 437-443)

According to Suyūṭī ∇, Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar ∇ authored one hundred and eighty-six (186) books. (*Ẓufrul Muḥaṣṣilīn* pg. 186)



Shaykh Zayn-ud-Dīn Ibrāhīm ibn Aḥmad Tanūkhī
Abū Ishāq Burhān-ud-Dīn ۞

Birth: 709 A.H.

Death: 800 A.H.

Age: 91

Shaykh Burhān-ud Dīn Tanūkhī (Tanūkh is a tribe from Arab or Yemen – (*Lisānul ‘Arab* 3/10)) was born in 709 A.H. and was raised and educated in Damascus. He studied *qirā’ah*, *fiqh* and *Ḥadīth* with the scholars of his time. He studied *Ḥadīth* from more than four hundred teachers. He achieved such a high level of excellence in the field of *Ḥadīth* to the extent that some of his teachers even narrated from him. Even though Ḥāfiẓ Dhahabī ۞ was his teacher, he heard a portion (of *Ḥadīth*) from him. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar ۞ clarified this in “*Durare Kāminah*”. He also wrote that he was an accepted *imām* of *qirā’ah* and *asnād* amongst the people of Egypt. (*Durare Kāminah* 1/11)

In the end of his life, he became very blunt in his speech and his eyesight was also fading due to which he became known by the title, ‘Burhānush Shāmī uḍ Ḍarīr’.

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar ۞ has written: “I was very fortunate to stay with him for some time. I benefitted from him greatly. I heard many books, big and small from him. He also supplicated for me, the effects of which are still felt.”

Death: He passed away on 8th Jūmalad ‘Ūlā, 800 A.H. (*Fawā’id Jāmiah* pg. 443-445)



Shaykh Aḥmad ibn Abī Ṭālib al Ḥajjār Abul ‘Abbās, Shihābud Dīn Ibn Shaḥnah

Birth: Before 624 A.H.

Death: *Ṣafar* 730 A.H

Age: 106 years

He was born before 624 A.H. He heard *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* from *muḥaddith* Zabīdī ∇ who was in Damascus, Qādisiyyah in the year 630 A.H. He heard *Ḥadīth* from many prominent *muḥaddithīn* of that era such as Ibnul Latī, Qaṭī‘ī, Ibn Rawzbah and Ja‘far ibn ‘Alī رَحِمَهُمُ اللهُ. He then started teaching *Ḥadīth*. He lived for very long due to which grandsons were present alongside grandfathers in the *sanad*. He was also able to hear *Ḥadīth* from *muḥaddith* Ibn Latī ∇ in 706 A.H. His name is also found in the list of those who heard *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* from Ibn Zabīdī ∇. Thus, the *muḥaddithīn* became extraordinarily happy.

He taught *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* approximately seventy (70) times in Damascus, Cairo, Ḥamāt, Baalbek (Ba‘labakka), Ḥimṣ and other places. He earned lots of honour and respect throughout his life.

He was very religious, righteous, punctual in performing *ṣalāh* with *jamā‘ah* (congregation) and he would also observe optional fasts although he was one hundred (100) years old.

Ibn Kathīr ∇ said: “It is established that he heard from Zabīdī and Ibn Latī. He heard *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* from Zabīdī in 630 A.H. He narrated *Ḥadīth* in Jāmi‘ Damascus on 9th *Ṣafar* 730 A.H. and we heard from him during this period.”

Ibn Ḥajar ∇ said: “The *ḥuffāz* of *Ḥadīth* would rush and travel to him from city to city until they reached him. From 717 A.H. until his death, throngs of people gathered around him. When he passed away, the chains of the people became one level lower.”

Ibn Kathīr ∇ said: “For twenty-five years, he lived in Muqaddamul Ḥajjār. For this reason, he is known as Ḥajjār. In the end, he chose the profession of tailoring.”

Death: On Monday, 25th *Ṣafar* 730 A.H at *‘Aṣr* time, his soul flew from this worldly prison. His *janāzah ṣalāh* was performed in Muẓaffarī and he was buried in Khānqah Rūmī near Jāmi‘al Akhram. رحمه الله رحمة واسعة. (Fawā'id Jāmi'ah pg. 445-449)

Note: At the time of hearing from Zabīdī ∇, Ḥajjār was most probably more than six years old.¹



¹ Ḥajjār and Zabīdī رحمه الله are both Ḥanafīs. (Al-‘*Anūqīd Al-Ghāliyah* page 145) Zabīd is [pronounced] like *amīr*: (*Tājul ‘Urūs* 2/361)

Shaykh Sirājud Dīn Ḥusayn ibn Mubārak Zabīdī Baghdādī Ḥanafī ۞

Birth: 545 or 546 A.H.

Death: *Ṣafar* 631 A.H.

Age: 85 or 86 years

Name and Lineage

Ḥusaynul Mubārak ibn Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā ibn ‘Alī ibn Muslim ibn Mūsā ibn ‘Imrān Ar-Rabī‘ī. He was originally a Zabīdī. He later became a Baghdādī. (Zabīd is a city in Yemen on the seashore.)

He is the grandson of the famous ascetic, Shaykh Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā Zabīdī ۞. He was born in 545 or 546 A.H. At first, he learnt the Holy Qur’ān and its various modes of *qirā’ah*. Thereafter, he acquired knowledge in other fields. He studied *fiqh* and *Ḥadīth* from his grandfather, Shaykh Abul Waqt, Abu Zar‘ah and Abū Zayd Ḥumaydī ۞ and he developed a deep insight [in these subjects]. He thereafter began conducting classes of *Ḥadīth* in the *madrasah* of *Wazīr* Abul Muẓaffar Hubayrah ۞. He was a far-sighted scholar with regards to the different *fiqhī madhāhib* and was amongst the reliable scholars of narrations.

The aforementioned attained a high level of proficiency in *adab* (literature). He was a *faqīh*, an accomplished and virtuous scholar, religious, pious, humble and he had a good character. He conducted classes of *Ḥadīth* in Baghdād, Damāscus, Ḥalab and other cities. Many people heard [*Ḥadīth*] from him. Many *ḥuffaẓ* are also among them. For example: Dabīthī and Ḍiyā’-ud-Dīn. The last person to narrate from him was Ḥajjār Ṣāliḥī ۞ who heard *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* etc. from him. The names of his teachers have also been recorded. He passed away on 23rd *Ṣafar* 631 A.H. and is buried in Jāmi‘ Manṣūr, Baghdād. His book, “*Al-Balghah*” is famous in the field of *fiqh*. (*Fawā’id Jāmi‘ah* pg. 450)



Shaykh Abul Waqt ‘Abdul Awwal ibn ‘Īsā ibn Shu‘ayb Sijzī Harwī ∇

Birth: 458 A.H.

Death: 553 A.H.

Age: 95 years

This respected *Shaykh* was born in 458 A.H. and he was raised and educated in Hirāt. His father, Abū ‘Abdullāh ‘Īsā lived for over a hundred years and he was alone in narrating from *Muḥaddith* ‘Alī ibn Bishrī ∇. He would lift him on his shoulders and take him to Bowshanj where he heard *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*, *Musnad Dārimī*, *Muntakhab ‘Abd ibn Ḥumayd* etc. in 465 A.H. from *Muḥaddith* Jalālud Dīn Dāwudī ∇ and others. (Bowshanj is a city in the surrounding areas of Ḥirāt.)

Amongst the aforementioned teachers of *Ḥadīth*, Abū ‘Āṣim al Faḍl ∇ and Shaykhul Islām ‘Abdullāh Anṣārī’s ∇ names are at the top of the list. He remained in the company of Shaykhul Islām Abū Ismā‘īl ‘Abdullāh Anṣārī ∇ for more than twenty years.

He attained such authority in narrating *Ḥadīth* which was not attained by any of his contemporaries. He lived for a long time. Thus, the young and old were connected in the *sanad* through him. He was a person of sound opinions and presence of mind. He was very pious and humble. Upon reaching Baghdād, his physical health deteriorated.

He travelled to Baṣrah, ‘Irāq and Ḥijāz and he benefitted from the ‘*ulamā’* of these places. He was consistent in performing *tahajjud* and engaging in *dhikr*. He was a person who would weep and cry profusely and he was a remnant of the pious predecessors. He was consistent and steadfast with regards to *qirā‘ah* (i.e., the recitation of the Qur‘ān).

Sijzī: It refers to one who is related to Sijistān. It does not follow the rules of relative nouns (*ghayr qiyāsī*).

Death:

6th *Dhul Qa'dah* 553 A.H. at the age of 95 while he was preparing for the journey of *hajj*. He was reciting the following verse at the time of his death:

﴿يَا لَيْتَ قَوْمِي يَعْلَمُونَ بِمَا غَفَرَ لِي رَبِّي وَجَعَلَنِي مِنَ الْمُكْرَمِينَ﴾

I wish my people could know of how my Lord has forgiven me and included me amongst the honoured. (Fawā'id Jāmi'ah pg. 452)



Shaykh ‘Abdur Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad Al Bawshanjī Ad Dāwudī ∇

Birth: 374 A.H.

Death: 467 A.H.

Age: 94 years

He was born in *Rabī‘-ul-Awwal* 374 A.H. He studied literature from Abū ‘Alī Fajrawī ∇. He studied *fiqh* in Nayshāpūr, Baghdād and Bawshanj from Abū Bakr Qafāl Marwazī, Abū Ṭayyib Sahl Ṣa‘lūkī, Abū Ḥāmid Asfarā’inī and *Faqīh* Abū Sa‘īd Baḥr ibn Manṣūr رحمهم الله. He acquired the knowledge of *taṣawwuf* from Abū ‘Abdur Raḥmān Sulamī ∇ and benefitted greatly from his company.

He heard *Ḥadīth* from *Muḥaddith* Abul Ḥasan ibnuṣ Ṣalt ∇ in Baghdād, Abū ‘Abdullāh Al-Ḥāfiẓ ∇ in Nayshāpūr and Abū Muḥammad ibn Abī Shurayh ∇ and others in Bawshanj. He then busied himself in studying and teaching, writing, compiling and in advising and propagating the message of Islām to others. He was a great *dhākir* (one who engages in abundance of *dhikr*) and *shāghil* (constantly occupied in worship).

The aforementioned is called “Dāwudī” by being ascribed to his forefather, Dāwūd ibn Aḥmad ∇. He was the head of the scholars of Khurāsān. Let alone the surroundings of Bawshanj, amongst the people of Khurāsān, his virtue and excellence, character and *taqwā* was known. He attained a lofty rank in *taṣawwuf*. Abul Ḥasan Musāfir ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī Bustāmī Nayshāpūrī, Abū Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad Bustāmī Nayshāpūrī, Abul Waqt ‘Abdul Awwal ibn ‘Īsā Sijzī Harwī, Abul Muḥāsīn As‘ad ibn ‘Alī Ḥanafī and Ummul Faḍl ‘Ā’ishāh bint Abī Bakr ibn Baḥr Balkhī and others رحمهم الله were amongst his students. As‘ad ibn ‘Alī recited this poem regarding him:

وہن مذموم ومحمود	ائمة العلم جربتهم
فخير ورع ورع داود	سيرة داود وهم خيرهم

Dhahabī ∇ writes that there are many narrations from Shaykh Abū Muḥammad ibn Ḥammuwiyah ∇ and this is the last *muḥaddith* who narrated from him directly without any link.

One day, the governor came in his presence. So, the *Shaykh* advised him: “Allāh ۱ has given you authority over his slaves, so beware! How you will answer when He asks you about them.”

The following are two poems from amongst his excellent poetry:

كان في الاجتماع بالناس نور ذهب النور واُدْلَهَمَ الظلام
فسد الناس والزمان جميعا فعلى الناس والزمان سلام

It is narrated that from the time the Turks plundered Khurāsān, he did not eat meat for forty years (out of caution that perhaps it may be meat from a stolen animal). He lived on fish alone. Thereafter, when he was informed that their leaders ate food on the bank of the river where the fish were caught and they threw the remaining food into the river, he also stopped eating fish from this day.

He departed from this world in *Shawwāl* 467 A.H. at the age of ninety-four and is buried in Bawshanj. (*Fawā'id Jāmi'ah* pg. 453-456)

Shaykh ‘Abdullāh ibn Aḥmad ibn Ḥammuwiyah ibn Yūsuf ibn A‘yun As-Sarakhsī ∇

Birth: 293 A.H.

Death: 381 A.H.

Age: 88 years

He was born in 293 A.H. and he heard *Ḥadīth* from the senior *muḥaddithīn* of that era. He was from the distinguished students of Firabrī and was a famous narrator of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*. Dhahabī mentioned him with the title, Musnad Khurāsān.

He narrated *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* from Firabrī, *Kitāb Dārimī* from ‘Īsā ibn ‘Umar Samarqandī and *Musnad ‘Abdullāh ibn Ḥumayd* and *Tafsīr ‘Abd ibn Ḥumayd* from Ibrāhīm ibn Khuraym. He passed away at the age of eighty in the month of *Dhul Ḥijjah*. (According to this calculation the year of his death would be approximately 373 A.H.) (*Fawā'id Jāmi'ah* pg. 456)

However, Shaykh Muḥammad Zakariyyā ∇ recorded the year of death as 381 A.H. (*Muqaddamah Lāmi'* pg. 71 and *Tadrībūr Rāwī* 2/316 with the taḥqīq of Shaykh Muḥammad ‘Awwāmah)

He heard *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* from Firabrī in 316 A.H. (*Ibid*)



Shaykh Muḥammad Yūsuf ibn Maṭar ibn Ṣāliḥ ibn Bishr Firabrī Shāfi'ī ▽

Birth: 231 A.H.

Death: 320 A.H

Age: 89 years

This *Shaykh* was born in 231 A.H. He acquired the knowledge of *Dīn* and heard *Ḥadīth* from many excellent scholars. He heard *Ḥadīth* from ‘Alī ibn Khashram in Firabar. According to some, he heard *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* twice from Imām Bukhārī ▽ - once in Firabar in 248 A.H. and the second time in Bukhārā in 252 A.H.

Sam‘ānī ▽ mentioned that he heard *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* from Imām Bukhārī thrice: in 253, 254 and 255 A.H. Abū Zayd Qāshānī was the first to narrate *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* from Firabrī and the last narrator was Abū ‘Alī Ismā‘īl ibn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Ḥājib Kasā‘ī.

Ninety thousand ‘*ulamā*’ heard *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* from Imām Bukhārī, the last being Firabrī, as has been mentioned by Ibn Khallakān and Shaykh Muḥammad ibn Ṭāhir Patnī. (Ḥāfiẓ opposed this, as has been mentioned earlier on page 76.)

The famous narrators of *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī* from Firabrī, as has been mentioned by Sayyid Murtaḍā Balgharāmī are as follows: Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm ibn Aḥmad Mustalmī, Abū Muḥammad ‘Abdullāh ibn Aḥmad ibn Ḥamuwī Sarakhsī, Abul Haytham Muḥammad ibn Makkī Kushmīhinī, Shaykh Mu‘ammar Abū Luqmān Yaḥyā ibn ‘Ammār ibn Muqbil ibn Shāhān Khattalānī.

Death: He passed away at the age of eighty-nine on 3rd *Shawwāl*, 320 A.H. He was righteous, God fearing and reliable.

(Firabar: a small city, connected to Bukhārā on the banks of Jayḥūn.)
(*Fawā'id Jāmi'ah*)

It is narrated both ways: *fā* can have a *fatḥah* or a *kasrah*. Ibn Rushayd gave preference to the *fatḥah*. It is written that: “The most correct is with a *fatḥah* in terms of the place and lineage.”

(*Ifādatun Naṣīḥ bit Ta'rīf bisanadil Jāmi' Ṣaḥīḥ* pg. 11)



The Following Ḥanafī Narrators Mentioned in Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī

Are the students of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah

#	Names of narrators	Takhrīj of aḥādīth
1	Ibrāhīm ibn Sa'd ibn Ibrāhīm ∇ (183 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī	1/13,15,27
2	Ibrāhīm ibn Ṭahmān Al-Harawī An-Naysābūrī ∇ (168 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī	1/60,350
3	Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad Abū Ishāq Al-Fazārī Al-Kūfī ∇ (185 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of Bukhārī's Shaykh	1/128,292
4	Isbāt ibn Muḥammad Al-Qurashī Abū Muḥammad ∇ (200 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī	2/658
5	Ishāq ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Rāhwiyyah Al-Ḥanafī ∇ (238 A.H.). He narrated from Imām and from his students and he is the Shaykh of Bukhārī.	1/18,487, 501
6	Ishāq ibn Yūsuf Al-Azraq Al-Qurashī Al-Wāsiṭī ∇ (195 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/224,467
7	Isrā'īl ibn Yūnus As-Sabī'ī Abū Yūsuf Al-Kūfī ∇ (162 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/14,57,74

8	Ismā'īl ibn Abān Al-Warrāq Al-Azdī Al-Kūfī ∇ (261 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of Bukhārī.	1/127,224
9	Ismā'īl ibn Abī Khālid Al-Bajlī Al-Aḥmasī Al-Kūfī ∇ (145 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/13,17,19, 75
10	Ayyūb ibn Abī Tamīmah Sakhtiyānī Al-Baṣrī ⊕ (131 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/9,18,20
11	Bishr ibn Al-Mufaḍḍal Ar-Raqāshī Al-Baṣrī Al-Ābid ∇ (186 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/16,56,68
12	Jarīr ibn Ḥāzim Al-Azdī Al-Baṣrī ∇ (170 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/117,126,185
13	Jarīr ibn 'Abdul Ḥamīd Aḍ-Ḍabbī Al-Kūfī Muḥaddith Ar-Rai ∇ (188 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/16,186
14	Ja'far ibn 'Awn Al-Makhzūmī Al-Kūfī ∇ (206 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/11,88,264
15	Ḥātim ibn Ismā'īl Al-Kūfī Al-Madnī Al-Ḥārithī ∇ (186 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/31,214, 250
16	Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī Al-Ju'fī Al-Kūfī Az-Zāhid Al-Qudwah ∇ (203 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/93,469
17	Ḥafṣ ibn Ghiyāth An-Nakh'ī Al-Kūfī ∇ Qaḍī of Bagdād and Kūfah. (194 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/40,50

18	Ḥammād ibn Usāmah Abū Ishāq Al-Kūfī ∇ (201 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/123,126
19	Ḥammād ibn Zayd ibn Dirham Al-Azdī Al-Baṣrī Al-Azraq Aḍ-Ḍarīr ∇ (179 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/9,21
20	Ḥammād ibn Salamah ibn Dīnār Abū Salamah Al-Baṣrī Al-Bazzāz ∇ (167 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/102,232
21	Ḥanzalah ibn Abī Sufyān Al-Makkī Al-Ḥāfiẓ ∇ (151 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/6,119
22	Khālīd ibn ‘Abdullāh Aṭ-Ṭaḥḥān Al-Wāsiṭī Al-Muzanī ∇ (179 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/102,141
23	Khallād ibn Yaḥyā ibn Ṣafwān As-Sulamī Al-Kūfī ∇ (213 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/63,64 2/927
24	Dāwūd ibn Rushayd Al-Khawārizmī Al-Hāshmī Abūl Faḍl ∇ (239 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and his Aṣḥāb and the Shaykh of the Shaykh of Bukhārī.	2/993
25	Dāwūd ibn ‘Abdur Raḥmān Al-‘Aṭār Al-‘Abdī Al-Makkī Abū Sulaymān ∇ (174 A.H.) He is the Shaykh and student of Imām and the Shaykh of Bukhārī’s Shaykh.	1/100
26	Rawḥ ibn ‘Ubādah Al-Qaysī Al-Baṣrī Abū Muḥammad ∇ (205 A.H.) He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/12,52
27	Zā’idah ibn Qudāmah Ath-Thaqafī Al-Kūfī Abū Ṣult ∇ (161 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the	1/41,81

	Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	
28	Zakariyyā ibn Abī Zā'idah Al-Wādi'ī Al-Kūfī Abū Yaḥyā √ (148 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/13,33
29	Zuhayr ibn Mu'āwiyah Al-Ju'fī Al-Kūfī Abū Khaythamah Muḥaddith Al-Jazīrah √ (173 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/10,36
30	Sa'īd ibn Abī 'Arūbah Mihrān Al-Baṣrī Al-'Adwī Abū Naḍr √ (156 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/103,297
31	Sufyān ibn Sa'īd Al-Kūfī Abū 'Abdullāh Ath-Thawrī √ (161 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/119,122
32	Sufyān ibn 'Uyaynah Al-Hilālī Al-Kūfī Abū Muḥammad Muḥaddith of Al-Ḥaram √ (198 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/16,17,22
33	Salām ibn Salīm Al-Kūfī Abū Aḥwaṣ √ (179 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/104,134
34	Salām ibn Abī Muṭī' Al-Khuzā'ī Al-Baṣrī Abū Sa'īd √ (164 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	2/943,757
35	Sulaymān ibn Ḥayyān Al-Kūfī Abū Khālīd Al-Aḥmar √ (190 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/61,262
36	Sulaymān ibn Ṭarkhān At-Taymī Al-Baṣrī Abū Mu'tamar √ (143 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/75,87

37	Sulaymān ibn Fayrūz Al-Kūfī Ash-Shaybānī Abū Ishāq √ (138 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/44,74
38	Shabābah ibn Sawwār Al-Fazārī Al-Madā'inī Abū 'Umar √ (254 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/47,123
39	Shu'bah ibn Al-Ḥajjāj Al-Azdī Al-Wāsiṭī Muḥaddith of Baṣrah Abū Bustām √ (160 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/9,102
40	Shaybān ibn 'Abdur Raḥmān Abū Mu'āwiyah An-Naḥwī Nazīlul Kūfah √ (164 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/21,22,30
41	Ḍaḥḥāk ibn Makhlad Abū 'Āṣim An-Nabīl Al-Baṣrī √ (212 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of Bukhārī and his Shūyūkh.	1/6-125,250 and other than this
42	Ṭalaq ibn Ghunnām ibn Mu'āwiyah Al-Kūfī √ (211 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of Bukhārī.	2/686,702
43	'Abbād ibn 'Abbād ibn Ḥabīb Al-Baṣrī √ (181 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of Bukhārī and the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/75, 2/1090
44	'Abbād ibn Al-'Awwām Al-Kilābī Al-Wāsiṭī √ (185 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/29,291
45	'Abdul Hamid ibn Abdur Rahman Abū Yahya Al Ḥamānī Al-Kūfī √ (202 A.H.) He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	2/775

46	‘Abdur Raḥmān ibn Mahdī Al-Baṣrī Al-Lu’lu’ī Al-‘Anbarī ∇ (198 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/56,133
47	‘Abdur Razzāq ibn Hammām Aṣ-Ṣan‘ānī Al-Ḥumayrī ∇ (211 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/11,42
48	‘Abdul ‘Azīz ibn Abī Ḥāzim Al-Madnī ∇ (184 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/63,64,71
49	‘Abdul ‘Azīz ibn ‘Abdullāh ibn Abī Salamah Al-Mājishūn Al-Madnī ∇ (164 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/23,32
50	‘Abdullāh ibn Idrīs ibn Yazīd Al-Kūfī ∇ (192 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/426 2/625,567
51	‘Abdullāh ibn Dāwūd Al-Khuryabī Ash-Shu‘bī Al-Kūfī ∇ (312 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of Bukhārī.	1/24,66
52	‘Abdullāh ibn ‘Awn ibn Arṭabān Al-Muznī Al-Baṣrī ∇ (151 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/69,134
53	‘Abdullāh ibn Mubārak Al-Ḥanzalī Al-Marwazī At-Turkī Al-Ab Al-Khawārizmī Al-Um ∇. He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/2,33,36
54	‘Abdullāh ibn Numayr Al-Hamdānī Al-Kūfī Abū Hishām ∇ (199 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/48,66
55	‘Abdullāh ibn Yazīd Al-Muqrī Al-‘Adwī Al-‘Umrī Al-Makkī ∇	1/87,155

	(213 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	
56	‘Abdul Mālik ibn ‘Abdul ‘Azīz ibn Jurayj Al-Makkī √ (150 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/43,57
57	‘Abdul Wāḥid ibn Ziyād Al-Baṣrī √ (186 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/10,24,36
58	‘Abdul Wārith ibn Sa‘īd At-Taymī At-Tanūrī Al-Baṣrī √ (180 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/17,18,21
59	‘Abdah ibn Sulaymān Abū Muḥammad Al- Kūfī √ (180 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/62,83,192
60	‘Ubaydullāh ibn ‘Umar ibn Ḥaḥṣ Al-‘Umrī Al-‘Adwī Al-Madnī √ (147 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/62,63,68
61	‘Ubaydullāh ibn Mūsā Al-Muqrī Al-‘Ābid Al-Kūfī Al-‘Absī √ (213 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of Bukhārī and his Shaykh.	1/24,52
62	‘Ubaydah ibn Ḥumayd Aḍ-Ḍabbī At-Taymī Al-Kūfī √ (190 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/894,945
63	‘Alī ibn Ja‘d Al-Jawharī Al-Hāshimī √ (230 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and Imām Abū Yusuf and he is also Bukhārī’s Shaykh.	1/13,21

64	‘Alī ibn Mus-hir Qāḍī Al-Mawṣal Al-Kūfī √ (189 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/44,73,146
65	‘Umar ibn Ḥaṣṣ ibn Ghiyāth Al-Kūfī √ (222 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and he is also Bukhārī’s Shaykh.	1/40,50,73
66	‘Amr ibn Dinār Abū Muḥammad Al-Makkī ‘Ālimul Ḥaram √ (162 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/100,113,116
67	‘Isā ibn Yūnus As-Sabī’ī Al-Kūfī √ (187 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/117,160,487
68	Faḍl ibn Dukīn Al-Malā’ī At-Tājirul Kūfī Abū Nu‘aym √ (219 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and he is also Bukhārī’s Shaykh.	1/13,230,232
69	Faḍl ibn Mūsā As-Sīnānī (a village in Marw) Al Marwazī Abū ‘Abdullāh √ (192 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/41,87,100
70	Fuḍayl ibn Sulaymān An-Numayrī Al-Baṣrī √ (186 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/69,208, 233
71	Fuḍayl ibn ‘Iyāḍ Al-Yarbū’ī Al-Marwazī Shaykh ul Ḥaram √ (187 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	2/678,1100
72	Fuḍayl ibn Ghazwān Aḍ-Ḍabbī Al-Kūfī √ (140 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/63,234,2/72 5
73	Qāsim ibn Mālik Al-Muznī Abū Ja‘far Al-Kūfī √ (190 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of	1/250, 2/993

	Bukhārī.	
74	Qubayṣah ibn ‘Uqbah ibn Muḥammad Al-Kūfī ∇ (215 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and he is also Bukhārī’s Shaykh.	1/10,44, 2/999
75	Layth ibn Sa’d Al-Miṣrī ∇ Imām of Ḥadīth and Fiqh in Egypt (175 A.H.). He is the student of Imām, his Shaykh and also the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/33,42,53
76	Mālik ibn Maghwal Al-Kūfī Abū ‘Abdullāh ∇ (159 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/390,503, 2/602
77	Muḥammad ibn Bishr Al-‘Abdī Al-Kūfī ∇ (203 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/343,420, 520
78	Muḥammad ibn Al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Imrān Al-Muzanī Al-Wāsiṭī ∇ (222 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of Bukhārī’s Shaykh.	1/14
79	Muḥammad ibn Khāzim Abū Mu‘āwiyah Aḍ-Ḍarīr Al-Kūfī ∇ (195 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/24,35,36
80	Muḥammad ibn Sābiq At-Taymī Al-Kūfī, later as Baghdādī ∇ (213 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and he is also the Shaykh of Bukhārī and his Shūyūkh.	1/390,503
81	Muḥammad ibn Salām Al-Baykandī ∇ the Muḥaddith of Bukhārā (225 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and also Bukhārī’s Shaykh.	1/10,21,30
82	Muḥammad ibn Abī ‘Adī Al-Baṣrī Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm ∇ (194 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/98,210

83	Muḥammad ibn Fuḍayl ibn Ghazwān Al-Kūfī √ (195 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/10,63,83
84	Muḥammad ibn Maymūn Abū Ḥamzah As-Sakrī Al-Marwazī √ (167 or 168 A.H.) He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/41,65,175
85	Makhlad ibn Yazīd Al-Qurshī Al-Ḥarrānī Abū Yaḥyā √ (193 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/124,318,277
86	Marwān ibn Muʿāwiyah Al-Fazārī Al-Kūfī √ (193 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/78,122, 251
87	Misʿar ibn Kidām Al-Hilālī Al-Kūfī √ (153 or 155 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/33,63,106
88	Maʿāfi ibn ʿImrān Al-Mūṣilī Al-Azdī √ (185 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/138,531
89	Muʿallā ibn Manṣūr Rāzī √ -settled in Baghdād (211 A.H.) He is the student of Imām and his Aṣḥāb and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/292,705
90	Maʿmar ibn Rāshid Al-Baṣrī Al-Azdī √ the ʿĀlim of Yemen (153 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/3,11,22,37
91	Mughīrah ibn Maqṣam Aḍ-Ḍabbī Al-Kūfī Al-Aʿmā √ (136 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	2/755,931
92	Makkī ibn Ibrāhīm At-Tamīmī Al-Ḥanzalī Al-Balkhī √ (215 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of Bukahri.	1/21,71

	(Eleven of the twenty-two <i>thulāthiyyāt</i> have been narrated from him.)	
93	Naḍr ibn Shumayl Al-Māznī Al-Baṣrī Al-Lughwī √, the ‘Ālim of Marw (203 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/30,329, 473
94	Nu‘aym ibn Ḥammād Al-Khuzā‘ī Al-Marwazī Al-Farḍī Al-A‘war √ (228 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of Bukhārī.	1/56
95	Waḍḍāḥ ibn ‘Abdullāh Yashkurī Al-Wāsiṭī Al-Bazzār Abū ‘Awānah √ (176 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/3,14,20
96	Wakī‘ ibn Jarrāḥ Ar-Rawāsī Al-Kūfī Muḥaddith of ‘Irāq √ (196 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and issued fatāwā on his opinions and he is also the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/29,160
97	Walīd ibn Muslim Abū ‘Abbās Al-Amawī Al-Qurashī Ad-Dimashqī √ (194 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/79,127
98	Wahb ibn Jarīr Abū ‘Abbās Al-Azdī Al-Amawī √ (206 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/67,86
99	Wuhayb ibn Khālīd Al-Bāhilī Al-Baṣrī Al-Karābīsī √ (162 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/18,31
100	Hāshim ibn Al-Qāsim Abū Naḍr Al-Laythī Al-Khurāsānī Al-Baghdādī √ (207 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/451,2/997
101	Hishām ibn Yūsuf Abū ‘Abdur Raḥmān Aṣ-Ṣan‘ānī √ (197 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the	1/43,91

	Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	
102	Hushaym ibn Bashīr Al-Wāsiṭī- resident of Baghdād √ (186 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/48,58
103	Yahyā ibn Ādam Abū Zakariyyā Al-Qurashī Al-Aḥwal Al-Kūfī √ (203 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/424,451
104	Yahyā ibn Ayyūb Abūl ‘Abbās Al-Ghāfiqī Al-Miṣrī √ (168 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/90,114
105	Yahyā ibn Zakariyyā ibn Abī Zā’idah Al-Wādi’ī Al-Kūfī √ (182 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/424,577
106	Yahyā ibn Sa’īd Al-Qaṭṭān At-Taymī Al-Baṣrī √ (198 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and issued fatāwā according to his views and he is also the Shaykh of Bukhārī.	1/52,58,62
107	Yahyā ibn Sulaymān Al-Ju’fī Al-Kūfī Al-Muqrī √ who resided in Egypt (237 A.H.) He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of Bukhārī.	1/64,94,135
108	Yazīd ibn Zuray’ Abū Mu’āwiyah Al-Baṣrī Al-‘Ayshī √ (182 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/90,120, 106
109	Yazīd ibn Hārūn As-Sulmī Al-Wāsiṭī Abū Khālid √ (206 A.H.). He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/27,30,55
110	Yūnus ibn Yazīd Al-Ayḷī √ (152 A.H.) He is the student of Imām and the Shaykh of the Shūyūkh of Bukhārī.	1/3,16,22 (More than 101)



The Birth and Death Years of the Famous A'immaḥ and 'Ulamā' Kirām

The Famous A'immaḥ Mujtahidīn

NAME	BIRTH	DEATH
Imām A'zam Abū Ḥanīfah Nu'mān ibn Thābit √	80 A.H.	150 A.H.
Imām Abū Yūsuf Ya'qūb ibn Ibrāhīm √	93 or 113 A.H.	182 A.H.
Imām Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan Ash-Shaybānī √	132 A.H.	189 A.H.
Imām Zufar √	110 A.H.	185 A.H.
Imām Mālik ibn Anas √	93 A.H.	179 A.H.
Imām Shāfi'ī Muḥammad ibn Idrīs √	150 A.H.	204 A.H.
Imām Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal √	164 A.H.	241 A.H.



The Famous A`immah Muḥaddithīn

NAME	BIRTH	DEATH
Imām Bukhārī Muḥammad ibn Ismā`īl √	194 A.H.	256 A.H.
Imām Muslim ibn Al-Ḥajjaj Qushayrī √	204 A.H.	261 A.H.
Imām Abū Dāwūd Sulaymān ibn Ash`ath Sijistānī √	202 A.H.	275 A.H.
Imām Abū `Isā Muḥammad ibn `Isā Tirmidhī √	209 A.H.	279 A.H.
Imām Abū `Abdur Raḥmān Aḥmad ibn `Alī Nasā`ī √	215 A.H.	303 A.H.
Imām Muḥammad ibn Yazīd ibn Mājah Qazwīnī √	209 A.H.	273 A.H.
Imām Tahāwī Aḥmad ibn Salāmah √	229 A.H.	321 A.H.



Some Famous 'Ulamā'

NAME	BIRTH	DEATH
Ismā'īlī (Abū Bakr Aḥmad ibn Ibrāhīm) ∇	297 A.H.	371 A.H.
Ibn Ḥibban Muḥammad Abū Ḥātim Bastī ∇	270 A.H.	354 A.H.
Ibn Ḥajar 'Asqalānī (Aḥmad ibn 'Alī) ∇	773 A.H.	852 A.H.
Ibn 'Adī ('Abdullāh ibn 'Adī) ∇	277 A.H.	365 A.H.
Ibn 'Abdul Barr Mālikī Yūsuf Abū 'Umar ∇	368 A.H.	463 A.H.
Ibn Taymiyyah (Aḥmad ibn 'Abdus Salām) ∇	661 A.H.	728 A.H.
Ibn Daqīqul 'Īd (Muḥammad ibn 'Alī) ∇	625 A.H.	702 A.H.
Ibn Rajab Ḥanbalī (Zayn ud Dīn 'Abdur Raḥmān ibn Aḥmad) ∇	736 A.H.	795 A.H.
Ibn Mulaqqan 'Umar ibn 'Alī ∇	723 A.H.	804 A.H.
Ibn Rushayd Muḥammad ibn 'Umar ∇	657 A.H.	721 A.H.
Ibn Jamā'ah Badrud Dīn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm ∇	639 A.H.	733 A.H.
Ibn Sayyidun Nās Al-Ya'marī ∇	671 A.H.	734 A.H.
Ibn Kathīr 'Imādud Dīn Ismā'īl ibn 'Umar ∇	701 A.H.	774 A.H.
Ibnul 'Arabī Mālikī Muḥammad ibn 'Abdullāh ∇	478 A.H.	543 A.H.
Ibnul Jawzī ∇	508 A.H.	597 A.H.

Ibn Qaṭṭān Fāsī 'Alī ibn Muḥammad √	562 A.H	628 A.H.
Ibn Qayyim Al-Jawzī √	691 A.H.	751 A.H.
Ibnil Athīr Naṣrullāh Muḥammad Jazrī	558 A.H.	637 A.H.
Ibnil Athīr Jazrī Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad √ (Also known as Mubāarak)	544 A.H.	606 A.H.
Ibnil Athīr Jazarī 'Izzud Dīn 'Alī ibn Muḥammad √	555 A.H.	630 A.H.
Ibn Nuqṭah Muḥammad ibn 'Abdul Ghanī √	579 A.H.	629 A.H.
Ibn Ṣalāḥ Abū 'Umar & 'Uthmān √	577 A.H.	643 A.H.
Ibn Kamāl Pāshā √	873 A.H.	940 A.H.
Ibn 'Irāq Kinānī √	907 A.H.	963 A.H.
Ibn Mundah Muḥammad ibn 'Ishāq √	310 A.H.	395 A.H.
Ibn Mawwāq √	-----	642 A.H.
Ibn Humām Kamālud Dīn Muḥammad ibn 'Abdul Wāḥid √	790 A.H.	861 A.H.
Abūl Ḥasan Ash'arī 'Alī ibn Ismā'īl √	260 A.H.	324 A.H.
Abū Mansūr Māturīdī Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad √	-----	333 A.H.
Abū Ṭahir Silfī Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad √	476 A.H.	576 A.H.
Abū 'Ubaydah Ma'mar ibn Muthannā √ (Majāzul Qur'ān)	110 A.H.	209 A.H.

Abū 'Ubayd Qāsim ibn Sallām ∇ (Kitābul Amwāl)	157 A.H.	224 A.H.
Mawlānā Abūl Kalām Āzād ∇	1300 A.H.	1377 A.H.
Abū Nu'īm Aṣṣahānī Aḥmad ibn 'Abdullāh ∇	334 A.H.	430 A.H.
Bulqīnī 'Umar ibn Raslān ∇	724 A.H.	805 A.H.
Bayhaqī Aḥmad ibn Ḥusayn Abū Bakr ∇	384 A.H.	458 A.H.
Patnī Muḥammad Ṭāhir ∇	914 A.H.	986 A.H.
(Qāḍī) Thanā'ullāh Pānī Pattī ∇	1143 A.H.	1225 A.H.
Jazā'irī Ṭāhir ibn Ṣāliḥ ∇	1268 A.H.	1338 A.H.
Ḥāzmī Muḥammad ibn Mūsā ∇	548 A.H.	584 A.H.
Ḥākim Ibn Bayyī' (Muḥammad ibn 'Abdullāh) Nayshāpūrī ∇	321 A.H.	405 A.H.
Khaṭṭābī Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad Bustī ∇	319 A.H.	388 A.H.
Khaṭīb Baghdādī Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ∇	392 A.H.	463 A.H.
Khaṭīb Tabrizī Walīuddīn ∇ (Miskhātul Maṣābīḥ)		After 737A.H.
Dārquṭnī 'Alī ibn 'Umar Baghdādī ∇	306 A.H.	385 A.H.
Damantī 'Alī ibn Sulaymān Mālikī ∇		1298 A.H.
Dhahabī Shamsuddīn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ∇	673 A.H.	748 A.H.
Zarkashī Badrud Dīn ∇	745 A.H.	794 A.H.

Zayla'ī Fakhrud Dīn 'Uthmān ibn 'Alī Abū Muḥammad ∇ (Tabyīnul Ḥaqā'iq Sharḥ Kanzud Daqā'iq)	-----	743 A.H.
Zayla'ī Jamālud Dīn 'Abdullāh ibn Yūsuf ∇ (Naşbur Rāyah)	-----	762 A.H.
Subkī Taqīud Dīn ∇	683 A.H.	756 A.H.
Subkī Tājud Dīn ∇ Şāhibuṭ Ṭabqāt	727 A.H.	771 A.H.
Sakhāwī Muḥammad ibn 'Abdur Raḥmān ∇	831 A.H.	902 A.H.
Sarakhsī Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ∇	-----	490 A.H.
As-Sam'ānī Abū Sa'ad 'Abdul Karīm ibn Muḥammad ∇	506 A.H.	562 A.H.
Sindī Abūṭ Ṭayyīb Muḥammad ∇	-----	1109 A.H.
Sindī Muḥammad ibn 'Abdul Hādī ∇1	-----	1139 A.H.
Suyūṭī Jalālud Dīn 'Abdur Raḥmān ∇ (Jalālayn Part 1)	849 A.H.	911 A.H.
Shāmī Muḥammad ibn 'Ābidīn ∇	1198 A.H.	1252 A.H.
Shawkānī (Muḥammad ibn 'Alī) ∇	1173 A.H.	1250 A.H.
Ṭabrī ibn Jarīr ∇	224 A.H.	310 A.H.
'Abdul Wahhāb ibn Aḥmad Sha'rānī ∇	899 A.H.	973 A.H.
Ajlūnī ∇	1087 A.H.	1163 A.H.
'Irāqī Zaynud Dīn 'Abdur Raḥīm ∇	725 A.H.	806 A.H.
'Ūqaylī Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn 'Amr Makkī ∇	-----	322 A.H.

‘Abdullāh ibn Mubārak √	118 A.H.	181 A.H.
‘Umar ibn ‘Abdul ‘Azīz √	61 A.H.	101 A.H.
‘Alī Murghīnānī, Author of Hidāyah √	511 A.H.	593 A.H.
‘Aynī Badrud Dīn Maḥmūd √	762 A.H.	855 A.H.
Ghazālī Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad √	450 A.H.	505 A.H.
Mawlānā Faḍlur Raḥmān Ghanj Murādabādī √	1208 A.H.	1313 A.H.
Qāḍī ‘Iyāḍ ibn Mūsā √	476 A.H.	544 A.H.
Qurashī ‘Abdul Qādir √	696 A.H.	775 A.H.
Kāsānī ‘Alā’ud Dīn, author of Badā’ī Ṣanā’i √	-----	587 A.H.
Kawtharī Muḥammad Zāhid √	1296 A.H.	1371 A.H.
Mubārakpūrī ‘Abdur Raḥmān √	1283 A.H.	1353 A.H.
Mujaddid Alf-Thānī Shaykh Aḥmad Sarhindī √	972 A.H.	1035 A.H.
Maḥallī Jalālud Dīn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad √	791 A.H.	864 A.H.
The Teacher of Suyūṭī (Jalalayn Part 2)		
Khājah Mu’īnud Dīn Chishtī √	537 A.H.	633 A.H.
Muḥammad ibn Sa’īd Sunbul Makkī √ (Risālatul Awā’īl)	-----	1175 A.H.
Muḥammad ibn Qāsim √, conqueror of India	-----	96 A.H.
Maḥmūd Ghaznawī Sulṭān √	360 A.H.	421 A.H.

Mīzzī Jamālud Dīn Yūsuf √	645 A.H.	724 A.H.
Mughlaṭā’ī ibn Qalīj √	689 A.H.	762 A.H.
Maqdisī Muḥammad ibn Ṭāhir √	448 A.H.	507 A.H.
Mullā ‘Alī Qārī ‘Alī ibn Sulṭān √	930 A.H.	1014 A.H.
Mullā Kātib Chalpī Ḥājī Khalīfah √	1018 A.H.	1067 A.H.
Muwaffiq ibn Qudāmah ‘Abdullāh Ibn Aḥmad √	541 A.H.	620 A.H.
Ḥazrat Nizāmud Dīn Awliyā’ √	636 A.H.	725 A.H.
Mullā Nizāmud Dīn ibn Quṭbud Dīn Sihālwi √	-----	1161 A.H.
(Dars-e-Nizāmī)		
Haythamī Nūrud Dīn ‘Alī √	735 A.H.	807 A.H.
Nawawī Muḥiyyud Dīn Yahyā ibn Sharf √	631 A.H.	676 A.H.
Wāqidī Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar √	130 A.H.	207 A.H.
Yahyā ibn Ma‘īn √	158 A.H.	233 A.H.



Birth and Death Years of the Famous ‘Ulamā’ of Deoband

NAME	BIRTH	DEATH
‘Allāmah Ibrāhīm Balyāwī √	1304 A.H.	1387 A.H.
Mawlānā Aḥmad ‘Alī Sahāranpūrī √ Muḥashhī of Bukhārī	1225 A.H.	1297 A.H.
Mawlānā Muḥammad Aḥmad Nānotwī Deobandī √, Principal of Dārul ‘Ulūm Deoband	1279 A.H.	1347 A.H.
Mawlānā Idrīs Kāndhalwī √	1318 A.H.	1394 A.H.
Mawlānā Ashraf ‘Alī Thānwī √	1280 A.H.	1362 A.H.
Mawlānā Aṣghar Ḥusayn Deobandī √	1292 A.H.	1364 A.H.
Mawlānā A‘zāz ‘Alī Deobandī √	1299 A.H.	1374 A.H.
Ḥajī Imdādullāh Thānwī Muḥājir Madnī √	1233 A.H.	1317 A.H.
Mawlānā In‘āmul Ḥasan Kāndhalwī √	1336 A.H.	1415 A.H.
‘Allamāh Anwar Shāh Kashmīrī √	1292 A.H.	1352 A.H.
Mawlānā Badr-e-‘Ālam Mīrthī √	1316 A.H.	1385 A.H.
Mawlānā Ḥabībūr Raḥmān A‘ẓmī √	1319 A.H.	1412 A.H.
Mawlānā Ḥusayn Aḥmad Madnī √	1296 A.H.	1377 A.H.
Mawlānā Khalīl Aḥmad Sahāranpūrī √	1269 A.H.	1346 A.H.
Mawlānā Rashīd Ḥasan Deobandī √ Author of Kitābul Īmān	-----	1969 C.E.

Muftī Zaynul ‘Ābidīn Fayṣal Ābādī √	-----	1425 A.H.
Mawlānā Sa‘īd Aḥmad Khān Ṣāḥib √	1903 C.E.	1419 A.H.
Mawlānā Rashīd Aḥmad Gangohī √	1244 A.H.	1323 A.H.
‘Allāmah Shabbīr Aḥmad ‘Uthmānī √	1305 A.H.	1369 A.H.
Mawlānā Ṣafar Aḥmad ‘Uthmānī √	1308 A.H.	1394 A.H.
Mawlānā ‘Abdur Raḥmān Kāmilpurī √	1882 C.E.	1385 A.H.
Shāh ‘Abdul ‘Azīz Muḥaddith Dehlawī √	1159 A.H.	1239 A.H.
Shāh ‘Abdul Ghanī Mujadidī Dehlawī √	1235 A.H.	1296 A.H.
Mawlānā ‘Abdul Qādir Rā’ypūrī √	?	1382 A.H.
Mawlānā ‘Abdul Laṭīf N‘umānī A‘ẓmī √	approx. 1320 A.H.	1392 A.H.
Muftī ‘Azīzur Raḥmān ‘Uthmānī √	1275 A.H.	1347 A.H.
Mawlānā ‘Aṭā’ullāh Shāh Bukhārī √	1310 A.H.	1381 A.H.
Mawlānā Fakhrud Dīn Aḥmad Murādabādī √	1307 A.H.	1392 A.H.
Muftī Kifāyatullāh Dehlawī (Shāhjahānpūrī) √	1292 A.H.	1372 A.H.
Shāh Muḥammad Ishāq Dehlawī Madnī √	1197 A.H.	1262 A.H.
Mawlānā Muḥammad Ilyās Kāndhalwī √	1303 A.H.	1363 A.H.
Muftī Muḥammad Shafi‘ ‘Uthmānī √	1314 A.H.	1396 A.H.
Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim Nānotawī √	1238 A.H.	1297 A.H.

Mullā Maḥmūd Deobandī Mu‘alim Awwal √	-----	1304 A.H.
Mawlānā Maḥmūd Ḥasan Deobandī Shaykhul Hind √	1268 A.H.	1339 A.H.
Muftī Maḥmūd Ḥasan Ghangohī √	1325 A.H.	1417 A.H.
Qārī Muḥammad Ṭayyib Šāḥib √	1315 A.H.	1403 A.H.
Mawlānā Shaykh Muḥammad Zakariyyā Kāndhalwī √	1315 A.H.	1402 A.H.
Mawlānā Muḥammad ‘Umar Pālanpūrī √	1348 A.H.	1418 A.H.
Mawlānā Muḥammad Miyā √	1321 A.H.	1395 A.H.
Mawlānā Muḥammad Yaḥyā Kāndhalwī (Father of Shaykh Zakariyyā) √	1287 A.H.	1334 A.H.
Mawlānā Maḥammad Ya‘qūb Nānotawī √	1249 A.H.	1302 A.H.
Mawlānā Muḥammad Yūsuf Binorī √	1326 A.H.	1397 A.H.
Mawlānā Muḥammad Yūsuf Kāndhalwī √	1335 A.H.	1384 A.H.
Mawlānā Masīhullāh Khān Jalāl Ābādī √	1330 A.H.	1413 A.H.
Mawlānā Manāẓir Aḥsan Gaylānī √	1310 A.H.	1375 A.H.
Mawlānā Muḥammad Manẓūr Nū‘mānī √	1323 A.H.	1417 A.H.
Muftī Mahdī Ḥasan Shāhjahānpūrī √	1300 A.H.	1396 A.H.
Muftī Nizāmuddīn ‘A‘zmī √	1328 A.H.	1420 A.H.
Mawlānā Shāh Waṣīyullāh Fataḥpūrī ‘A‘zmī √	1310 A.H.	1387 A.H.

Shāh Walīullāh Muḥaddith Dehlawī ∇

1114 A.H.

1176 A.H.

Mawlānā Ya‘qūb Nanotwī ∇

1249 A.H.

1302 A.H.



Sources and References

1	Ibn Mājah aur ‘Ilm Ḥadīth- Mawlānā Muḥammad ‘Abdur Rashīd Nu‘mānī √ Publisher: Mīr Muḥammad Kutub Khānah, Karāchī
2	Ikhtisār ‘Ulūm-ul-Ḥadīth- Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Kathīr with his Sharḥ, Al-Bāḥithul Ḥathīth by Aḥmad Muḥammad Shākir Al-Miṣrī √
3	Irshād-us-Sārī Sharḥ Bukhārī – Abul ‘Abbās Aḥmad Qasṭalānī √ (death: 923 A.H.)
4	Aqwamul Masālik fi Baḥthi Riwayāt Mālik ‘An Abī Ḥanīfah wa Riwayātu Abī Ḥanīfah ‘an Mālik- ‘Allāmah Muḥammad Zāhid Kawtharī √
5	Al-Intisār wat Tarjīḥ by Sibṭ Ibn Jawzī √
6	Bulūghul Amānī fi Sirati Imām Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan Ash-Shaybānī- Kawtharī √ 1371 A.H.
7	Tārīkh Baghdād- Khaṭīb Baghdādī √
8	Tabyīḍuṣ Ṣaḥīfah- Imām Suyūṭī √ (death: 911 A.H.) Publisher: Mīr Muḥammad, Karāchī
9	Tadribur Rāwī fi Sharḥ Taqrībun Nawawī- Imām Suyūṭī √ (death: 911 A.H.) Publisher: Mīr Muḥammad Karāchī
10	Tadhkiratul Ḥuffāẓ- Ḥāfiẓ Dhahabī √ (death: 748 A.H.)
11	Tarjumān-us-Sunnah- Mawlānā Badre ‘Ālam Mirtī Muhājir Madnī √ Publisher: Nadwatul Muṣannifin, Delhi
12	Taqrīr Bukhārī - ‘Allamāh Shabbīr Aḥmad ‘Uthmānī √. Published by Jamī‘ah Islāmiyyah Dabhel, Gujarat India
13	Tawjīhun Naẓr ilā Usūl-ul-Athar by Ṭāhir ibn Ṣāliḥ ibn Aḥmad Al-Jazā‘irī

	Damashkī ∇ (death: 1338 A.H.) Beirut
14	Tahdhībūt Tahdhīb-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar ‘Asqalānī ∇ (death: 852 A.H.)
15	Jamī‘ Bayānūl ‘Ilm wa Faḍlihi-Ibn ‘Abdul Bar Mālīkī ∇ (death: 463 A.H.) 1398 A.H.
16	Jamī‘-ud-Darārī Sharḥ Bukhārī, Taqrīr Bukhārī - Mawlānā ‘Abdul Jabbār A‘ẓmī t Publisher: Maktabah Ḥaram Murādabad, India.
17	Al-Jawāhirul Muḍīyyah fī Ṭabaqātīl Ḥanafīyyah- Shaykh ‘Abdul Qādir Qurashī ∇ (death: 775 A.H.) Publisher: Dārul Kitāb Al-‘Arbī, Beirut
18	Ar-Raf‘u wat Takmīl Fil Jarḥ wat Ta‘dīl- Imām ‘Abdul Ḥay Lucknawī Hindī ∇ (death: 1304 A.H.) Publisher: Thālithahu Ḥalb, Beirut
19	Zahrur Rabī, Ḥāshiyah of Muḥtabā by Nasā‘ī – Suyūṭī ∇
20	Shurūṭul A‘immah Khamsah- Ḥāfiẓ Muḥammad ibn Mūsā Ḥāzmī ∇ (death: 584 A.H.) Published with Ibn Mājah in Karāchī
21	Shurūṭul A‘immah Sittah- Ḥāfiẓ Muḥammad ibn Ṭāhir Maqdisī ∇ (death: 507 A.H.) with Ta‘līq of Kawtharī, Karāchī.
22	Ẓafarūl Muḥaṣṣilīn bi Aḥwālil Muṣannifīn- Mawlānā Muḥammad Ḥanīf Gangohī ∇ with Qurratul ‘Uyūn fī Tadhkiratil funūn.
23	‘Ujālatun Nāfi‘ah- Ḥazrat Shāh ‘Abdul ‘Azīz Muḥaddith Dehlawī ∇ (death: 1239 A.H.)
24	Faṭḥul Mughīth Sharḥ Alfiyyatul Ḥadīth by ‘Irāqī- Shaykh Shamsud Dīn Sakhāwī ∇ (death: 902 A.H.) Publisher: Maktabtus Salafiyyah, Madīnah Munawwarah
25	Al-Fawā‘idul Bahiyyah fī Tarājimil Ḥanafīyyah- Imām ‘Abdul Ḥay Lukhnawī Hindī ∇ (death: 1304 A.H.)
26	Fawā‘id Jāmi‘ah on ‘Ujālah Nāfi‘ah- Mawlānā ‘Abdul Halīm Chashtī ∇

27	Faḍlul Bārī Taqrīr e Bukhārī - Mawlānā Shabbīr Aḥmad ‘Uthmānī ∇ (death: 1369 A.H.) with additions by Qāḍī ‘Abdur Raḥmān ∇
28	Fayḍul Bārī Taqrīr e Bukhārī of ‘Allāmah Anwar Shāh Kashmīrī ∇ compiled by Mawlānā Badre Ālam Mīrtī ∇
29	Mā Tamassu Ilayhil Ḥājah liman yuṭālī‘u Sunan Ibn Mājah- Mawlānā Muḥammad ‘Abdur Rashīd Nu‘mānī ∇ Publisher: Mīr Muḥammad, Karāchī
30	Muqaddamah Awjazul Masālik of Mu‘waṭṭā Imām Mālik- Shaykhul Ḥadīth Mawlānā Muḥammad Zakariyyā Kandhelwī ∇ (death: 1402 A.H.)
31	Muqaddamah Anwārul Bārī, Sharḥ Bukhārī - Mawlānā Sayyid Aḥmad Raḍā Aḥmad Bijnūrī ∇
32	Muqaddamah Irshādus Sārī- Abū ‘Abbās Aḥmad Qasṭalānī ∇ (death: 923 A.H. in Egypt)
33	Muqaddamah Faṭḥul Mulhim, Sharḥ of Saḥīḥ Muslim- ‘Allāmah Shabbīr Aḥmad ‘Uthmānī ∇ (death: 1369 A.H., 1949 C.E.)
34	Muqaddamah Nawawī, Sharḥ Bukhārī (death: 676 A.H.) (Mā tamassu ilayhil Ḥājatul Qārī Saḥīḥ Imām Bukhārī with taḥqīq by Ḥasan ‘Alī ‘Abdul Hamīd ∇), Beirut
35	Muqaddamah Lāmi‘ Darārī- Shaykh Muḥammad Zakariyyā Kandhelwī ∇ (death: 1402 A.H.) Published: 1379 A.H. Publisher: Maktabah Yaḥyawiyah, Sahāranpūr (hand-written) The other nuskha (copy) of Lāmi‘ published is type-written. Many pages of this copy which have been mentioned are more than the pages taken from the hand-written copy.
36	Hadyus Sārī Muqaddamah Faṭḥul Bārī- Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar ‘Asqalānī ∇ (death: 852 A.H.). It has been published with Ibn Bāz’s Ḥāshiyah by Quṣay Muḥibbud Dīn Al-Khāṭīb and Maktabah Yūsufī, Deoband, India.
37	Muqaddamah I’lā us Sunan (Qawā‘id fi ‘Ulūm e Ḥadīth)- Mawlānā Zafar Aḥmad ‘Uthmānī ∇ (death:1394 A.H.) with the Ta’līq of Shaykh ‘Abdul Fattāḥ Abū

	Ghuddah v. Publisher: Idāratul Qur'ān, Karāchī.
--	---

وصلی اللہ علی خیر خلقہ محمد وعلی آلہ وصحبہ اجمعین
وآخر دعوانا ان الحمد لله رب العالمین.



A Brief Biography of The Compiler

(May Allāh 1 extend his shadow)

Birth and Studies

Hazrat حفظه الله was born on 14 *Ṣafar*, 1366 A.H. (7 January, 1947 C.E.) in Mawnath Bhanjan, U.P. He began and completed his studies in Mau. After graduating from Miftaḥul ‘Ulūm in 1386, he studied extra books in various fields. He studied the books of *fatāwā* under the supervision of *Muḥaddith Kabīr* ‘Allāmah Ḥabībūr Raḥmān A‘ẓmī ∇ and he practised writing and issuing *fatāwā*. He studied the *Qirā’ah Sab‘ah ‘Asharah* (seven and ten modes of Qur’ān recitation) in Dārul ‘Ulūm Mau. Some of his teachers are: *Muḥaddith* A‘ẓmī, *Mawlānā* ‘Abdul Laṭīf Nu‘mānī, *Hazrat Mawlānā* ‘Abdul Jabbār A‘ẓmī and his respected father, *Qārī* Ḥafīẓūr Raḥmān رحمهم الله. His teacher, *Hazrat* Mawlānā ‘Abdur Rashīd Ḥusaynī ∇ gifted him his personal copy of his book, “*Tuḥfatul Aḥwadhī*”.

Service

After three or four years, he went to Maẓharul ‘Ulūm, Banaras and taught *Jāmi‘ Tirmidhī*, *Mishkāṭ* and other books. He also issued *fatāwā*. After four years, in 1394 A.H., he went to Jāmi‘ah Islāmiyyah Dabhel. Here, he also taught *Ṭaḥāwī*, *Sunan Nasā’ī*, *Sunan Ibn Mājah*, *Muwattā’ Imām Mālik*, *Mishkāṭ*, *Jalālayn*, *Hidāyah*, *Mutanabbī*, *Himāsah*, *Sharḥ Jāmi‘*, *Ibn Aqīl* among other books. He also taught *Sab‘ah ‘Asharah* (*Qirā’ah*). He wrote an introduction regarding the knowledge of *qirā’ah* and biographies of the *qurā’*. He also wrote a history on Jāmi‘ah which was published in India and Pakistan.

In 1406 A.H., he went to Azaadville, South Africa. Here, he also taught *Ṣaḥīḥ Bukhārī*, *Jāmi‘ Tirmidhī*, *Mishkāṭ*, *Al-Ashbāḥ wan Naẓā’ir* among other books. Apart from this, he also taught *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, *Sunan Abū Dāwūd*, *Sunan Ibn Mājah*, *Muqaddamah Ibn Ṣalāḥ* and the *Musalsalāt* etc.

Other Services

Dārul ‘Ulūm Nu‘māniyyah, Chatsworth-Durban KwaZulu-Natal which was established in 2001 began with five students. Under his leadership, it has advanced to the extent that currently, there are one hundred and twenty (120) students. There is a full time *Ḥifẓ* class and also a part time class for those who go to school. Arabic is also taught until the *Ṣiḥāḥ Sittah*. *Qirā’ah* is also taught and the students are also involved in *da’wah*. Other organizations also operate under this institution in many other places. Madrasah Raḥmāniyyah, Laudium also offers many services under his leadership. In 2002, he also established Madrasa Da’watul Ḥaq in Azaadville in which there are currently one hundred and sixty (160) students studying both academic and secular knowledge. Many of the students are orphans. There are also such students whose parents are or one of them is non-Muslim. The *madrasah* maintains their living, learning and food costs. Currently, on the outskirts of Azaadville, a new land has been obtained and a structure is also ready. He is also the head of and assists many organizations other than the afore mentioned. He also has a deep connection with *da’wah* and *tablīgh*. He also travels to various countries.

He is also connected to *taṣawwuf* and the *khānqah*. He first took *bay’ah* (pledge of allegiance) on the hands of *Ḥazrat Mawlānā Zakariyyā ṣāḥib* v. Then, by his command, he connected to *Ḥazrat Muftī Maḥmūd Ḥasan ṣāḥib* v. He then built a connection with *Ḥazrat Mawlānā Ḥakīm Muḥammad Akhtar Ṣāḥib* v and received the honour of *khilāfah*. Thus, his *iṣlāḥī silsilah* (path to rectification) continued.

Books

He has approximately fifty published books and articles. Some of them are:

1. *Tārīkh Jāmi’ah Dabhel, Gujarat India*
2. *Muqaddamah Bukhārī*
3. *Muqaddamah Tirmidhī*
4. *Muqaddamah Ṭaḥāwī*
5. *Qawmah Jalsah mein Iṭminān kā Wujūb aur un mayn Adhkār kā Thubūt*

6. *Shab-e-Barā'ah Kī Ḥaqīqat*
7. *‘Amāmah Topī Kurtā*
8. *Ṣaḥīḥ aur Munasib Tar Musāfate Qaṣr*
9. *Sawānikh Imām Abū Ḥanīfah*
10. *Sawānikh Imām Abū Yūsuf*
11. *Sawānikh Imām Muḥammad*
12. *Maqālāt ‘A‘zmī- (In Arabic)*
13. *Maqālāt ‘A‘zmī - (In Urdu)*
14. *Muqaddamah ‘Ilmul Qirā’ah*
15. *Tadhkirah ‘Aimmah ‘Asharah aur Unke Ruwāt*

Many books regarding *da‘wah* and *tablīgh* have also been published.

The Impressions (Ta-athhurāt) and Statements of the ‘Ulamā’

When he went in the presence of *‘Ārif billāh, Ḥazrat Mawlānā Muḥammad Ahmad Partabghdhi* ∇, *Mawlānā* was lying down. He went and sat by his feet out of respect. *Mawlānā* immediately folded his feet in and gifted him a new 10 Rupee note when he was leaving.

His *Shaykh, Ḥazrat Shāh Ḥakīm Muḥammad Akhtar ṣāḥib* (May Allāh enlighten and fill his grave with light) mentioned regarding him: “Your beloved letter has delighted the heart and has caused the soul to experience a state of ecstasy. Congratulations are due for your loving enthusiasm...” At the time of taking *bay‘ah* (the pledge of allegiance) from him, he (*Ḥazrat Shāh Ḥakīm Muḥammad Akhtar ṣāḥib*) said: “We have received *biryani* which has been prepared already today.”

The *khalifah* of *Ḥazrat Muftī Maḥmūd Ḥasan Gangohī* ∇, *Ḥazrat Muftī Muḥammad Fārūq Mirthī* ∇ said: “Amongst the teachers, worthy of a special mention is *Ḥazrat Mawlānā Fazlur Rahman ṣāḥib Azmi* who teaches *Bukharī Sharīf* and was a teacher in *Jāmi‘ah Islāmiyyah Tālimuddīn Dabhel*. It is befitting to call him a mountain of knowledge.” (*Afrīqah aur Khidmate Faqīhul Ummah* 1/161)

After the famous *muballigh, Mawlānā Farūqī Makkī ṣāḥib* ∇ participated in his *dars* (class), he expressed his impression of *Ḥazrat* in the following words: “Such informative and interesting classes were conducted by *Mawlānā Binnorī*. A *dars* like that is difficult to find in

these times. Your being is a great blessing for the people of South Africa. If you were not here, perhaps there would not have been such an atmosphere of *Dīn* and knowledge. May Allāh ﷻ grant the people of South Africa the ability to appreciate you.” (For details, see his biography which is available in both Urdu and English.)

A Glad-Tiding

Shaykh Zuhayr Nāṣirun Nāṣir Ḥalabī Ḥanafī (resident of Madīnah) studied and obtained *ijāzah* (authorisation) for the *Ḥadīth* of *Risālatul Awā'il* for himself, his daughter and son-in-law. He then said to his students: “The likes of this *Shaykh* is very rare.” He also said: “Hold fast to him. Firstly, due to his *īmān*, then due to his love for Nabī n, then, due to his knowledge.” On one occasion, *Shaykh* and some other companions, were in the *dars* of *Ḥadīth* conducted by him in Masjid Nabawī on the side of the blessed feet of Nabī n. The *Shaykh's* son heard Nabī n saying in a dream: “The *dars* of *Ḥadīth* is being conducted in my Masjid and you are sleeping?” On awakening, when he entered Masjid Nabawī, he saw that *Ḥazrat's dars* was taking place.....(‘Atīq)



Alḥamdulillāh, only through Allāh's infinite Mercy and Grace, the first review of this translation was completed on Friday, 3rd Rabī'uth Thānī 1444 (28th October 2022) before Maghrib ṣalāh in the blessed sanctuary of Masjid Nabawī, Madīnah Munawwarah.

وَالْحَمْدُ لِلَّهِ وَحْدَهُ وَصَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيَّ مَنْ لَا نَبِيَّ بَعْدَهُ.

رَبَّنَا تَقَبَّلْ مِنَّا إِنَّكَ أَنْتَ السَّمِيعُ الْعَلِيمُ

وَتُبَّ عَلَيْنَا إِنَّكَ أَنْتَ التَّوَّابُ الرَّحِيمُ.