

# ***Muqaam-e-Hadith*** (The Actual Status of Hadith)

by [G. A. Parwez](#)

translated by Aboo B. Rana

## **Introduction**

[Chapter 1:](#) Actual Position of Hadith

[Chapter 2:](#) Saga of Hadith

[Chapter 3:](#) Formalism in Hadith

[Chapter 4:](#) Explanation of the Quran through Hadith

[Chapter 5:](#) Mut'a (*Temporary Marriage*) and Ahadith

Chapter 6:

Chapter 7:

Chapter 8:

Chapter 9:

Chapter 10:

Chapter 11:

[Home](#)      ***Muqaam-e-Hadith*** (*The Actual Status of Hadith*)

by [G. A. Parwez](#)

translated by [Aboo B. Rana](#)

The human mind has proved itself effete and tardy. Very careful scrutiny and ransacking of the mind is required to reach the heart of any matter, but it eschews and cuts corners at every possible opportunity. As the world turns, new discoveries and laws are made in social circles and all the more so in the realm of religion, where some incidences have become standard clichés or myths of wisdom over the passage of years. No one deems it necessary to think twice as to how most of these parables or folklore became the criteria of wisdom and faith although, these doctrines of wisdom might have been twisted through the generations.

The insurmountable impediment while examining, scrutinizing or giving our serious thought on any religious myth or cliché is the righteous halo we have woven around it. We consider ourselves of a blasphemy, a sin of the highest intensity or committing a blunder of the superlative degree, to question the origins of any religious myth or cliché. No matter how much we make the person realize the importance of cogent rationale on these standard religious clichés, nonetheless, his level of thought hesitates to enter into broader horizons. It is commonly observed that a person is more inclined towards finding a justification of the religious cliché one adheres to, rather than having an open and an unbiased mind. More formidable than the inner turmoil are the fears of wrath from ones religious connoisseurs. The derogatory opinion and threats of being outcaste by these demigods, do not allow an individual to muster courage enough to give ones serious thoughts on these myths or stories attributed towards the bulwarks with unshakable faith.

### ***The Need for Research***

On the other hand, if we agree and are of the opinion, that only 'reality' must have value, that has been through the process of our rational sifting and only that 'faith' carries weight which has been acquired after our thorough speculation and cognitive experiences, then it becomes incumbent upon us to weigh the pros and cons of any religious issue. No matter how many treacherous peaks we may have to climb. At this point, it is advised to refrain from our personal conflicting religious experiences and do away with all external fears. In this connection we shall endeavour to consider a common religious doctrine, that in our subconscious, appears as part and parcel of the core of our religious set of beliefs.

You question any Muslim today as to how would he define the system or 'DEEN' of Islam. Without any hesitation we are replied that, 'Islam is a compound of the Holy Quran and Hadith.' The indoctrination of this reply is so deep down in our hearts, we do not have the faintest notion of doubt about it when answering, no matter how glaringly self-contradictory the myth may appear to us. The important question is, the myth or story we take so much for granted, the sentence we speak everyday with so much confidence and strong conviction; has it ever been brought to our personal scrutiny and examined by rationale, before being accepted by us? Or do we accept, merely because it has traveled down to us through many, many generations. If that does not happen to be the case, then let us have the courage to face the culmination of the ancestral paths we have chosen.

By rationalizing our belief we are obtaining dual advantage. If the myth or cliché stands the scrutiny of our cognizance, then it shall become more profound and ingrained in our minds and close to our heart beats, otherwise we will know, we relinquished a myth that was nothing else but a rigmarole of someone's fantasy. Even more so, it will open our eyes to the fact that our belief was based on sheer custom. The process of cogent reasoning when accepting any statement is also reaffirmed by the Holy Quran that characterizes momins as:

And those who do not fall (forsaketh reason) for these ayats (Allah's words) like the dumb and deaf. 25:73  
Reasoning also coincides with one of the postulates of the Holy Quran, wherein is said:

Do not follow that of which you knoweth not; remember, your sense of sight, hearing and cognitive capabilities will

be questioned. 17:36

## ***DEEN***

It is hoped we are of no two opinions over the fact, that Deen in reality is one that is invincible, in other words which is not based on fantasy or illusion. So it is said in Quran:

Most of these (people) are prone to fantasy and hearsay. In actuality 'illusion' will have no benefit in comparison with 'reality.' And Allah knoweth everyone as to what they do. 10:36

It becomes mandatory for us, when it is said, 'Islam is a composition of the Holy Quran and Hadith,' to determine whether in actuality it happens to be the case or not. Is it in reality true that both of the above mentioned books have been revealed as Deen in Islam through MuhammadPBUH? The Holy Book reiterates numerous times, that this Book is nothing else but the 'Truth.'

"What we have revealed unto you is truth....." 35:31

The opening words of this book of wisdom are... . There is absolutely no doubt about this book. In other words, it is factual and not based on fantasy or illusion. This is as far as the spirit of the Book is concerned. Now how was it revealed and compiled and in what capacity is it going to exist, Quran further says:

Verily, unto us is the compilation and transmission of its knowledge. 75:17

It goes beyond compilation and explicitly asserts that we hold its responsibility as far as its preservation is concerned. Till the Day of Judgment not a single letter will be changed. It augurs:

Verily! We have revealed, unto us lies its preservation. 15:9

To give this notion of preservation a practical shape, it further commands:

O Muhammad! Deliver it to the people, what is being revealed unto you. 5:67

## ***QURAN***

What did the Messenger MuhammadPBUH do to implement this command of Almighty, we nearly all of us are aware of it. Whatever was revealed unto the Messenger, he had each and every letter of the revelation dictated to his disciples or followers. Thousands were made to memorize the revelations on MuhammadPBUH by heart. Not only that, MuhammadPBUH himself listened to those verses who had learnt them by heart and then cast his seal of approval upon them.

Messenger MuhammadPBUH before taking his last breath, ascertained and made sure that whatever had been revealed unto him, had been delivered to the humankind in its complete form. In his famous sermon of last Friday of the last Ramadan, before his soul departed from this world he bore Allah as his witness and confirmed from his audience, that he had delivered all revelations to them in its complete form. In the caliphate period, after the unbearable demise of MuhammadPBUH, the four caliphs made it obligatory upon themselves, the sacred duty of preserving the Holy Quran. Henceforth, these holy scriptures, which are in the hearts of myriad of Muslims and also on paper, are coming down through the years in its original and true shape. Even foreign religious scholars do not question its verity.

## ***HADITH***

However moved we may be, by the uniformity of our religious liturgy, the case with our Hadith somehow, does not

seem to hold water. We must not omit the fact that nowhere has Allah held the responsibility of hadith, as it has done in the case of the Holy Quran. That is of utmost significance, since the hadith consists of parables and sayings of Messenger Muhammad PBUH and nothing else, we must consider Muhammad's attitude towards hadith. If Hadith is part of Deen, then the procedures Messenger adopted for Quran are not implemented in the case of hadith. Like having it memorized, then listening to his followers for any errors or that he satisfactorily approved what had been dictated and written, that over and above all, it was in its pure and authentic form. Though the mind questions, if hadith is all that significant, why the Messenger did not take the same measures as he did in the case of Holy Quran? On the contrary, we find in that very hadith, Muhammad PBUH clearly says:

Do not have anything else dictated from me, save the Quran. If anyone of you has written any word other than the Quran, erase it!

We are also told that this was a temporary mandate from the Messenger. That at another time, it is observed, upon the request of Hazrat Abdullah bin Omar R, the Messenger permitted them to write down his sayings. As is noticed, the Messenger only permitted his followers, he did not make it mandatory for them to write, as we find he did, in the compilation of the Holy Quran. Moreover, he did not at anytime, ask as to what they had written or heard or question the verity of their writings. Neither we find Muhammad PBUH adopting measures to safeguard or preserve those hadiths as he had done with Quran. It is usually said and believed that in those days the Arabs had stupendous memory and also those sayings were very dear to the hearts of the disciples. Now the mind again questions, if memory was enough of a viable resource to be depended upon, why then was the need felt to have the Holy Quran dictated and written on paper, then recited again to remove any possibility of errors or mistakes during the process of its dictation. If any disciple of the Messenger had learnt those hadiths or sayings of the Messenger by heart, we still are not in a position to vouch for it. Until and unless those sayings were not verified, and the seal of approval cast on them by the Messenger Muhammad PBUH himself, we cannot depend on them. We also have no knowledge of the Messenger ever giving to the Muslims the Hadith in the form of a book and coming down to us through the generations. We observe the Messenger Muhammad PBUH did not take any of the precautions in the case of hadith, as he did for the Holy Quran.

What we have gathered from the historical resources, is that we do find documents other than the Quran, that were written under the orders of Muhammad PBUH. For example, contracts, treatises and letters that he sent to other tribes. What in this matter, has come to our knowledge and what we have been able to gather, at the time of Messenger's demise, are the following:

- A register containing the list of names of 1500 holy disciples or followers of Muhammad **PBUH**.
- The letters Muhammad PBUH wrote to various kings and rulers of that age or time.
- Documents of treatise and other obligatory rules.
- Hadiths from Hazrat Abdullah bin Omar, Hazrat Ali and Hazrat Uuns who wrote them on their own.

No one knows if these sayings written down were ever verified by the Messenger himself or not and whether they have come down to us in its original version. We have no knowledge of any collected works or hadith that Messenger himself gave to the Muslims before his departure from this world. We do in fact find in the Hadith of Bukhari, that someone asked Hazrat Ibn e Abbass R as to what Muhammad PBUH had left behind for the Muslims. He said, 'The Messenger left behind nothing, save the Quran.' (Bukhari, Vol. III, Fuzail ul Quran.) ([Sahih Bukhari: Virtues of the Quran](#))

### ***The Deeds of Disciples***

As we glance through the names of Islam's historic personalities, we notice that after Muhammad's lifetime, the caliphate period is also worthy of being looked into. In the Musnad of Imam Ahmad we find the disciples saying,

"Whatever utterances we heard from Muhammad PBUH we noted them down in writing. One day it so happened the Messenger appeared and asked us about the subject of our writings. We replied that

whatsoever we hear from his Majesty's lips we transform it into writing. To which he said,

"What! Are you compiling another book along with the book of Allah?"

Meaning in other words that this cannot be made possible. He then insisted and commanded us that we ought to keep Allah's words pure and that we must not amalgamate them with any kind of ambiguities. So we made a bonfire of our notes and parables in an open field." (*Quoted from Tudween e Hadith, page 249*)

At another instance we find Imam Zuhbi mentioning Hazrat Abu Bakr who gathering the disciples of the Messenger, after his passing away said,

'You people have so much self-contradictory gossip about MuhammadPBUH that you squabble among yourselves. The future generations will become more rigid than you all and quarrel more. You must not feign sayings of Holy Messenger that are fallacious. If anyone inquires you can always say that we have the Holy Quran between us. Whatsoever has been granted must be made permissible and whatsoever has been prohibited must be relinquished.' (*Quoted in Tazkara tul Hifaaz e Zuhby, page 321*)

Then Imam Zuhbi quotes another parable of the Messenger's wife Hazrat Aisha and writes:

"The wife of the Messenger mentions that her father (Hazrat Abu Bakr) had collected the Hadiths of the Messenger which were five hundred in number. She says,

'One night I noticed that my father was restless in his bed and was very perturbed. I asked him if he was in some bodily pain or was this condition due to any bad news that he might have heard? He did not answer my question. In the morning he asked me to bring him the collection of Hadiths and then he made a bonfire of them all.' (*Quoted in Tudween e Hadith, page 285-88*)

As far as Hazrat Omar's caliphate is concerned, Allama Ibne Abdulbur has mentioned him in his famous book **Jama e Biyaan ul ilm**, wherein he says:

"OmarR wanted to compile the sayings and parables of the Messenger. He asked from the companions of Messenger MuhammadPBUH to grant him a decree, to which they faithfully conceded.

Inspite of the companions consent Hazrat OmarR was not convinced. For complete one month Hazrat OmarR performed Istekhara. Then one morning when Allah calmed his body and mind and he was able to concentrate on the issue at hand in serenity, he talked to his people about his decision to compile the hadiths. But then he said I thought about the generations that have passed before us, who wrote books and adhered to those books so strongly that they forgot the Book of Allah. I swear upon Allah, I will not let the word of Allah be amalgamated with other words." (*Quoted in Tadween e Hadith, page 394*)

This was decided because the Messenger had ordered every companion not to ask him to dictate anything else besides the Quran. Whosoever has written anything else besides Quran must erase it. Omar did not finish the matter here. He not only prohibited and banned the collection of ahadith, he went a step ahead and as is written in Tubqaat ibn Sa'ad:

"During Hazrat Omar's caliphate the ahadith were in abundance. He made sure by putting the people under oath that whatever hadith the people had in their possession ought to be brought before him. As ordered, the public submitted whatever they possessed. He then ordered to make a public bonfire of those hadiths." (*vol.5, page 141*)

This was the third incident of igniting the hadith collection. The first ignition took place when the Messenger commanded. The second instance was when Hazrat Abu BakrR did the same with his own collection and the third

time Hazrat OmarR took all the collections from the people under oath and publicly ignited them. All this took place in the capital city. As to what happened afterwards we get a glimpse of it in Hafiz Ibne Abdulbur's Jama e Biyaan wherein he states:

"Hazrat Omar ibn KhattaabR first expressed his desire to compile the ahadith, it dawned upon him later that it will not be appropriate. So he sent a circular in the districts and cantonments to destroy whichever hadith anybody was in possession of." (*Tadween e Hadith, Vol.1, page 400*)

He writes further and gives us a detailed account, of how elaborate and precautionary measures were taken for the compilation of the Holy Quran. If the government wanted, what possibly could have come in the way of adopting the same policy towards the compilation of the Hadith. He states that the government of that time did not adopt the same policy towards the Hadith with a specific purpose. This was the situation at the time of the Messenger and his companions, of hadith.

### ***Recapitulation:***

1. The Messenger ordered his companions not to ask him to dictate anything else besides the Quran.
2. Whatever Hadith collection was present among the companions, it was ordered to be ignited.
3. Hazrat Abu Bakr made a bonfire of his own collection and banned others from quoting any hadith.
4. Hazrat Omar after giving his best thought for one month, reached the conclusion to ban the compilation and collection of ahadith.
5. Hazrat Omar also asked to submit all ahadith in possession of the public who were under oath and then ignited them all.
6. He also sent a circular in all cities to destroy any evidence of hadith.

This did not happen by chance, according to Maulana Munazar Ahsin Gilani this policy was adopted with a definite purpose in mind.

### ***More Strict Measures:***

Day after day Hazrat OmarR became more strict on this issue of transmission of hadith. According to Qaza bin Qa'ab, " When Caliph Omar sent us to Iraq he emphatically drummed it into our heads, that Iraq was a place where sounds of Quran echo like wild bees and we must exercise extreme precaution as not to distract their minds with all kinds of ahadith." It was asked from Abu HurairaR if during Hazrat Omar's caliphate he ever remembered stating the hadith in the same way as he was doing now. To that he replied, if he had done so Hazrat OmarR would have physically scolded him. It has also come down to us that Hazrat OmarR had imprisoned Hazrat Abdullah bin Ma'soodR, Abu DurdaR and Abu Ma'sood AnsariR for illegally in possession of ahadith.

It is quite possible these ahadith may have been weeded out because of ambiguity, although according to the author of this book they are closer to being true, as they were according to the principles of Quran and also parallel to the desire of MuhammadPBUH. We however, are not interested in debating on this point. Even if we do not have the above quoted hadiths, we still are in possession of another historical fact that cannot be denied. We observe that by the end of the caliphate period, there isn't a single copy of Hadith that was compiled and completed under the supervision of any Caliph of that period. From these historical facts it can easily be determined, if those Caliphs or the Holy Messenger had ever considered the hadith to be a part of the Deen of Islam, they would have adopted the same measures as were taken towards the Holy Quran. Hence after the demise of the Messenger no steps were taken towards collection of Hadith.

### ***Hamam Ibn Mamba's Manuscript***

What the religious scholars of hadith, after much struggle, have succeeded in discovering, has come down to us under the title of Hamam ibne Mamba's manuscript. This was published by Dr. Hameed ullah several years ago from Hyderabad (India). It is believed that Hamam ibne Mamba was the student of Abu HurairaR who died in hijra 131. In

this manuscript there are 138 ahadith in total, which its author states were compiled before his teacher Abu Huraira. His teacher is believed to have departed from us in hijra 58. By other means we can say that this manuscript was compiled before hijra 58. We also notice that Imam Mamba writes these hadiths before hijra 58 in Medina and is able to obtain only 138 ahadith. Whereas in hijra 300 when Imam Bokhari decides to collect ahadith he gathers six hundred thousand. (*Imam Humal found 1,000,000 ahadith and Imam Yahya bin Moeen found 1,200,000 hadiths*) Another fact we observe that those ahadith that have been conferred upon Abu HurairaR amount to thousands, though his student was able to write only 138 ahadith. However, in the first century of the Islamic calendar, the sum total of all individual collection is Imam Mamba's 138 ahadith. There are no other written records of Holy Messenger's gospel belonging to that period of Islamic history.

### ***Imam Zuhri***

At the close of hijra100 we notice that Caliph Omar bin Abdul AzizR on his own, had some work done on Hadith. After him was Imam Ibne Shahab ZuhryR who at the order of Caliph Bannu Umayya compiled a concise edition of Hadith and that also according to its author was against his desire. At present we neither have any copy or manuscript of hadith of Hazrat Omar bin Abdul AzizR nor the concise edition of Shahab Zuhry. Although ahadith conferred in their names are mentioned at a later period, when the need was felt to bring into record the historical events of Holy Messenger's life. The material for the historical records was a conglomerate of all that had been coming down to them through the generations. Some writers narrowed their research to only those records that refer to the parables, gospels or sayings of the Messenger MuhammadR. This collection is titled Hadith (the very word hadith means conversations).

The first compilation of Hadith that is present today belongs to Imam Malik (died hijra179) and is called Muta. In it we find three to five hundred various ahadith, it further informs us about the activities of Messenger's companions in Medina. After Imam Malik we find various other scholars venturing on this subject and compiling several different editions of Hadith.

During the Abbasids period we observe spectacular progress in the field of Islamic arts and sciences and along with that the number of hadith compilations also increased. The most famous of all compilations that has come down to us is known as the 'Sahiheen,' these books are authored by Imam BokhariR and Imam MuslimR. Imam BukhariR who died in hijra 256 had made a collection of 600,000 ahadith. After sifting through various ahadith he finally decided to retain 2,630 and produced them in book form under the title of 'Us'hal Kitab baaduz Kitab e Allah' (The most pure book after the book of Allah).

This Hadith is now being pronounced as inseparable part of the Deen of Islam. Six different editions of Hadith are considered to be the most authentic by the Sunniites and are called 'Sahaa Sitaa.' The Shiites have their own collections that are different from Sunniites. Those six editions come under the following titles:

1. Sahih Bukhari
2. Sahih Muslim
3. Trimzi
4. Abu Dawood
5. Ibne Maja
6. Nisaayee

The introduction to the authors of the above listed collections is as follows:

- **IMAM BUKHARI:** He was born in Bukhari in hijra 256 and some believe the date to be hijra 260 but we all know that he died in Samarkand. It is said that after wandering through different cities and villages he collected close to six hundred thousand hadiths and after sifting through he found 7,300 ahadith that he considered close to being authentic. Some have been repeated in various chapters. If we do not count the repetitions, the total figures we get are 2,630 or 2,762.

- **IMAM MUSLIM:** Muslim bin Hajaj belonged to a city in Iran called Nishapur. He was born in hijra 204 and died in hijra 261.
- **TRIMZI:** Imam Abu Isa Muhammad Trimzi was from the city called Trimz in Iran. He was born in hijra 209 and died in hijra 279.
- **ABU DAWOOD:** He comes from Seestan in Iran. He was born in hijra 202 and died in hijra 275.
- **IBNE MAJA:** Abu Abdullah Muhammad bin Zaid ibne Maja came from northern Iran, a city that goes by the name of Kazdin. His year of birth is hijra 209 and he died in hijra 273.
- **IMAM NISAAYEE:** Imam Abdur Rahman Nisaayee came from a city called Nisa in Iran's eastern province of Khorasan. He died in hijra 303.

After a brief introduction of these religious scholars one can easily infer that (a) they all came from Iran. (b) None of these scholars was from Arab descent. We also notice that none of the Arabs were prepared to do what these scholars have done. (c) All of them were born in the third century. (d) Whatever ahadith were collected, were all hearsay, (e) there were no written records of hadith before their collections.

From these thousands of ahadith that were gathered, they chose some and discarded others. The criterion of selection was their personal judgment. For these gospels, their authors had no decree of any kind from God (revealing to them as to which hadith to choose and which ones to discard). Nor we find they had the consent or approval of the Holy Messenger (proving that the selected ahadith were the true parables or sayings of the Messenger). Again, there were no previous records that they could have borrowed the material for their collections. All the sayings were just word of the mouth they gathered from various cities and villages. After giving their own judgment or approval these religious scholars selected some and discredited others on their own. Hence the denouncement of Hadith.

(After having assessed the long chase of the departed Messenger MuhammadPBUH, it appears as though Allah was no more an important Being in the life of Muslims. Which was quite contrary to what Muhammad was trying to teach.)

How can anyone vouch for these kinds of ahadith based on hearsay or prove, that in actuality these were the original words of the Messenger? Keeping in mind that, after two or two and a half centuries, not a single word could be guaranteed that it belonged to the Messenger, or has been conveyed from father to son or teacher to student by memorizing. These were garbled words of previous centuries.

(In as much as I would want to hear the exact words of the last of the Great Messengers; at the same time to accept a version that is not first hand, second hand or even third, fourth or fifth hand, does not make any sense at all. On the contrary, we are defeating our very purpose for which the Ahadith were written i.e., to seek the Truth. And by accepting a clone, we are corroding our own system of thought.)

### ***Discredited Ahadith***

It would not be futile to know the number of ahadith that have been discredited.

<b>Ahadith Compiler</b>	<b>Found Ahadith</b>	<b>Selected Ahadith for the book</b>
Imam Bukhari	600,000	2,762 (after repetitions)
Imam Muslim	300,000	4,348
Imam Trimzi	300,000	3,115
Imam Abu Dawood	500,000	4,800
Imam Ibn Maja	400,000	4,000

Imam Nisai	200,000	4,321
------------	---------	-------

What comes to mind again, after the sifting was done by the authors of hadith, who can say for sure the authors did not relegate the actual sayings or parables of the Messenger. Many of those ahadith that these authors have included in their collection, also go against the Messenger. This discussion will be taken later on in this book.

From the above research, it is determined, the collection of parables and teachings of the Messenger was an individual effort without any warranty from Allah or any kind of consent from the Messenger. These findings also invite one to ponder as to what would have been the condition of the DEEN (Quran), if it was thrown at the mercy of humankind.

It is widely discussed, we were fortunate that Imam BukhariR and various other religious scholars were able to make a collection, otherwise we would have been (God forbid) robbed of our Islamic treasure. Some scholars go so far as to exclaim that only one tenth of the knowledge is in the Quran and the rest of nine tenths of the treasure is in the Hadiths. (No wonder nine tenths of the time the world is at war with each other). Please give your serious attention to this. A God who explicitly proclaims in the Quran that 'the system of DEEN is now complete,' and after hearing that can we even for a moment imagine, that the last of the Messengers will leave so gargantuan amount of other knowledge about it at the mercy of fate? I have grave doubts if that will make any sense!

### ***INTERPRETED HADITH***

It could have been possible, as we had seen with the preserving of the Holy Quran, that the words of the Messenger be made to travel from heart to heart until they were compiled in the form of a book. Their authenticity could have been, to quite an extent vouched for. As we all know now, even this was not the story. The Hadith books that are present today, do not contain the original sayings of the MuhammadPBUH. These are interpretations of his gospel or sayings. As in common conversation and literature we find sentences with 'in other words.....' For example the Messenger's companion heard him say or utter something and reached his own conclusion and delivered it to another companion in a different tone, then the second one tried to understand and conveyed it to another companion. Now imagine this going on, not for one day or two days, one or two months, not even one year or two years, this went on for a crucial period of two or two and a half centuries. And these centuries, mind you, were full of conspiracies and intrigues against the Islamic ideology. How much truth is left, when sentences have been moving from one mind to another for this prolonged period of time, I shall leave it for you to imagine?

### ***BENEFIT OF DOUBT***

It would be worthwhile to mention Maulana Abul A. Maudoodi's criticism here. In order to thoroughly understand the genius of the Messenger, (what to talk about the late comers in Hadith writing) he gives his critique on the pioneer Abu Huraira as follows:

"Apparently, it seems that either Abu HurairaR was unable to comprehend Muhammad's statement or he did not hear him completely.....These kinds of misinterpretations are not uncommon in our Hadith literature, sometimes a saying has been clarified by another saying while there are others that are still more ambiguous." (*Quoted from Tasneem, Ahadith number, Oct. 14, 1959*)

This was his viewpoint on the interpretation of the first compiler on Hadith. As far as transferring these interpretations to others is concerned, the same author narrates in his book (**Tafheemaat, volume, 1**) as follows:

"Let us say for example, I am giving a speech today and many thousands are listening to me. Few hours later, after I have finished my speech (not months or years, but only a few hours later), just ask the people as to what I was saying. It will be observed that all translations will be different from each other. Everyone will emphasize a different portion of the speech. Somebody will take down word for word whereas another will interpret that sentence according to his own understanding. One person will

have a better mind and will give the correct meaning of it, whereas another with limited intellectual capacity, may garble the true meanings. One person maybe having a good memory and may give you a word for word translation, whereas another with a weak memory will make mistakes conveying the meaning to others."

### ***SAYINGS ATTRIBUTED TO THE MESSENGER***

This was in fact the way in which the statements and parables of the Messenger traveled through two or two and a half centuries. That is absolutely the reason when one reads the Quran we say it in all belief, (*qalallahwatallah*) "which Allah promulgates." When we begin to narrate any statement of Hadith we say 'The Messenger of Allah said...' And at the end we say (*oqamaqala'rasoolallah*) meaning 'otherwise or as the Messenger might have said.' That is also why the statements in Hadith are not considered the original words of the Messenger. The statements in hadith are believed to be those that are referenced to Messenger's statements. And are not his exact words.

### ***Narrators of Ahadith***

It is obvious, in the conventional parables, we come across numerous names of writers, on a single statement of the Messenger. After the compilation of Hadith, question arose as to the moral health and conduct of those who have referred these statements. For that we must take each and every hadith and check for the morals and character of its author. This is one of those arts, of which we can proudly boast and which is little known anywhere else. We do not have the faintest bit of doubt on the intention of narrators. Again the important question is, can we by this approach arrive at Truth? You can vouch for the individual's character who is saying the hadith to you, how can you say with authority that all the people who carried the words of Messenger were sincere at heart or could be depended on. It is not the question of having confidence in those writers, the most important aspect is, were they capable of thoroughly understanding a statement and giving the correct interpretation of it. If we can prove, that in two or two and a half centuries the words are capable of remaining in their original form, then I think we have solved the greatest mystery of our times..... It is impossible!

Maulana Abul A. Maudoodi has also something to say on this:

"These people (who believe the Hadith to be a part of Deen), crushed the limits of justice. Now we should rank the Hadith according to the degree they have been granted. If for example when we read a stronger version, we must let go of its weaker counterpart. No doubt the material that is provided about the pioneers is of immense value for future narrators of Hadith. The only question is how far are these people completely trustworthy. After all they were all but human and we must not expect them to go beyond the scope of human limits. Nor can we guarantee they can compensate for the human lacuna. How are you to say for sure, that whatever they are relating is fool proof, when the writers themselves are not sure about it?" (*Tafheemat, part I, page 318*)

He further writes:

"The respectful Hadith writers have provided gargantuan volumes of worthy treasure, but how can we say that it is absolutely beyond doubt. (*page 319*)

He is not commenting on inadvertent mistakes, when he says:

"There is an evil in each one of us, and there lies a strong possibility, when forming an opinion, that it shall interdict."

He further argues:

"By these examples we are not, by any means, connoting that their research is abracadabra. Our

purpose is only to bring to surface the fact that the narrators were but only human. They were not above human imperfections. Is it then mandatory that whosoever they claim to be worthy of respect ought to be taken with respect." (*page 321*)

And:

"All the elements of Hadith have been excavated as far as the human factor could take us. But it is not essential that in their researches they have succeeded in reaching the truth. There is every likelihood that the saying they claim to be true, may not in fact exist. This and other similar factors restrain us from drawing conclusions from the art of rational gleaning. Their research provides great material for the Messenger's lifetime and in researching the relics of the Messenger's companions, but they are not fool proof." (*page 321-22*)

### ***Verdict on Reliability***

As far as personal inclinations are concerned we are entering a region where even the angels fear to tread. When a person passes a judgement on another whether he/she qualifies the morality standard or not, there is every bit of likelihood of involving our personal propensities. And these inclinations are founded and based on our set of beliefs. Imam BukhariR was in disagreement with Imam Abu HanifaR on the issue of fluctuations in faith in a person's lifetime. Consequently, he never considered the great Imam very honorably. Not only that, as the great Imam had his roots in Kufa, thenceforth all the citizens of Kufa were not considered to be trustworthy and incapable of transmitting the hadith. As Kufa was in Iraq, so all Iraqis were chips of the same block and he reached the decision that 99 out of 100 Iraqi hadiths ought to be counted as ambiguous. In the same way on a frivolous difference two great Imams, Imam Abu Hatim and Imam Abu Zra'a decreed Imam BukhariR of being untrustworthy, and ceased all communications on hadith with him. Let us not forget that Bukhari and Muslim are the most trustworthy in the Islamic world and their works are called 'Sahiheen' (the most perfect ones). In Hadith literature, we observe quite a bit of friction and conflict between these two narrators. This division in hadith, based on the conflict of belief can easily be observed by the existence of Shia and Sunni factions. As mentioned before, the Sunnis have their own collection of Hadith and claim their source coming from TabaeenR and the Messenger's companionsR. The teachings we gather from this resource are disparate from the Shiite hadith. The Shiites also claim their hadith origins in TabaeenR and companionsR of Messenger MuhammadPBUH.

It cannot even be imagined (at least by Sunnis) that those honorable narrators and writers of Hadith that are included in Shia hadiths are all (God forgive) liars. As the Holy Messengers companions were neither Sunni nor Shia - to which these hadiths are attributed. So they have no other choice left, expect to include the hadith from every sect in order to get the correct biography of the Messenger MuhammadPBUH. The present situation happens to be, that from a respectable source we get hadiths that are deemed correct in the Shia circles - yet both these hadiths of two different sects contradict each other. You tell us, as to which hadith ought to be considered genuine and true to the life of Messenger MuhammadPBUH. It is all the more difficult when we have to include the condition that the writer of hadith has to be honorable, trustworthy and sincere. This way no one can vouch for the authenticity of any hadith, gospel or parable. We may call it by any other name, sheer bigotry, party politics or whatever, except the true and authentic words of MuhammadPBUH. The great BukhariR includes material for Hadith from sources which he himself considers to be untrustworthy. (*refer to Mezaan ul Aitadaal az Allama Zuhby au Tadreeb al Ravi*)

These were the external sources by means of which we reach the conclusion, that neither MuhammadPBUH anywhere mentions hadith to be part of DEEN nor his companions believed it to be so. The collection of Hadiths that we possess today are also not the original words of MuhammadPBUH. The most cutting evidence that goes against these hadiths are its contents. Our spirit freezes and the pen shakes when we read what is narrated. We realize that the latter sentence of ours must have astonished the readers - it ought to do so too. As the Hadith is almost as sacred, respectable and close to the hearts as the Holy Quran. Obviously this kind of critical perusal from us ought to bamboozle and baffle you. You must neither listen to us nor anybody else and read what is written in Bukhari's collection and decide for yourself as to how far, what we have written, is correct. We also know and are sure that you are going to be persuaded by others. You may also be told to take into consideration the magnitude of respect that has

been granted to authors like Imam Bukhari, whose book has been placed almost next to Quran. You will be condescendingly asked and urged not to believe in any kind of undermining or vile conversation. We sincerely plead to you again, the respects to the cadre and caliber of our ancestors is very close to our hearts also. When Imam Bukhari is there and available, why not read and confirm it for yourself, as to how far we are justified in writing about the Bukhari's Hadith. You will read words and sentences, that no one in his right frame of mind, will ever have the audacity to attribute towards the Holy Messenger. Especially to a personality whose vision and insight has no parallel and who is suppose to lead the humanity and be a symbol of peace to them. A person's blood freezes in the veins when we read those kind of words attributed to such a great and noble man as MuhammadPBUH.

That is why Maulana Abul A. Maudoodi felt compelled to write:

"It shall not be appropriate to claim, that all the hadiths that are in Bukhari must be accepted as they are, without any critical revision. (*Quoted from Tarjuman ul Quran, Oct., Nov. 1952*)

The late Maulana Abul K. Azad gives us his opinion on Bukhari's Hadith, wherein it is said that 3 times in his lifetime, Messenger Abraham was forced to tell lies:

"From the various hadiths that we read, no matter how close it may seem to the truth, the innocence of the hadith cannot go further than the innocence of the mind of its narrator. Neither must the hadith be taken to go beyond our belief. We must admit that this hadith cannot be the words of the Holy Messenger. Definitely, somewhere the narrator of this hadith has made a mistake. And in admitting this fact neither the sky is going to fall nor the ground will break apart." (*Quoted from Tafsir Tarjuman ul Quran, Volume 2, published by Zamzam Co, Lahore pg 499-500*)

Maulana Ubaid Ullah Sindhi goes even further and says,

'I feel embarrassed to ask a Neo-Muslim European to read Bukhari's Hadith.' (*Risala al'Furqan, Shah Waliullah number, page # 286*)

These were criticisms of individuals. The whole of the Hanafi sect does not believe in the two hundred or so hadiths present in Muslim and Bukhari.

It is usually asserted, that let us suppose the Hadith collection is not totally authentic, that it does contain a figment of writers' or narrators' imagination. And what is wrong with that? After all our whole business and commercial lifestyle is based on imagination too. Don't we believe in historical events, whether from a journalist's pen or read them in newspapers? How can we say those stories are in fact true? So why do we have to dishonor the hadiths if they have been slightly modified?

Apparently these seem to be cogent arguments. When we dig deeper, we will find how big the difference is, the curtain falls down and we become familiar with 'reality.' Newspapers or history is not a matter of belief for us. If I want I may accept a certain event, if I have arguments against it, without any second thoughts or hesitation I can relinquish. On the contrary, hadith we know has to do with our beliefs. That means it is beyond critique. Even the slightest doubt on hadith will shake our faith. Let us say, that we find in history the king, at such and such an event or at such and such a date told a lie. It is totally up to me to accept or reject it. I am not bound by any means to believe in it, neither does my accepting it or not, will have any affect on my faith.

On the other side when Bukhari's hadith is put in front of me, in which it is written that "Messenger Abraham spoke 3 lies in his lifetime," and because hadith is part of my faith, it becomes my duty to believe in it. If I don't believe in this hadith, it would mean I am doubting the verdict of the Messenger. And if I believe in this hadith then I am alleging a respectable and an honorable Messenger of God (God forgive me) a liar.

Or say, you read in the newspapers that one man cut off another's nose. You are under no obligation to believe in it or not. And then you read Bukhari's hadith, wherein it is narrated, "When the angel of death arrived in front of the

Messenger Moses, he slapped the angel so hard that the angel lost one eye." It becomes mandatory upon you to believe in this parable. If one doubts the story then you are doubting Islam. Now we must be confident after having discussed the vast difference. It is also hoped now that the difference has been adequately revealed, as to a belief that is part of our faith and a belief that involves our business or commercial lifestyle.

## ***CONSEQUENCES OF A BELIEF***

Let us take you on an insight of the practical implications of taking the hadith lightly. When we bring forth a Quranic ayat (sentence) linked to an issue in our daily life, it is quite possible the debating parties may not agree on the Quran's translation, or maybe hesitant to agree on its interpretation. However the case maybe, no one will ever deny that this ayat is not from the Quran. In our hadiths it is altogether a different story. Whenever someone quotes a hadith, the first question that comes to our minds is whether that hadith is true or not. Consequently, Maulana Abul A. Maudoodi writes:

"In actuality, any hadith attributed towards MuhammadPBUH, is always a controversial issue. It may be mandatory for you (or any other party) to believe in a hadith, that is approved by the narrators. This does not happen to be the case with us. We are not obligated to the narrator's approval in order to believe in the hadith to be true." (*Risayal au Masayal, part one, page 290*)

We were discussing that in order to have a belief in a certain statement, it is indispensable for that statement or verdict to be truthful. When it is proclaimed that what we call DEEN, that is made of the Holy Quran and the Hadith, then it becomes incumbent upon both of these to be genuine and true. Whenever we say that Allah has proclaimed in Quran, then there does not exist the slightest bit of doubt about the verity of that statement. On the contrary, when we produce a hadith, the first reflection that comes in our minds is, as to wherefrom this hadith has been quoted and how far is the hadith honorable.

The altercations among the Muslims are all due to this question of hadiths verity. One faction in Islam claims a hold on a certain belief and brings the hadith as its witness, while another sect plainly dishonours and brushes it aside, as not being the true words of the Messenger. These frictions among various sects are a thousand years old and there seems no immediate panacea for it. This is so because in the whole of Muslim world, we do not have any means to substantiate, that the hadith being quoted has the original words of the Messenger.

Also bear in mind, that nobody will ever say that we do believe in any one of these ayats to be from the Quran, or that some words have weakened in value over the passage of years. Quran's every ayat is as strong as it was the day it was revealed. There is no question about it. On the contrary, when a hadith is submitted to anyone, the party may relinquish the hadith as a piece of gossip. Since there are various kinds of Hadith books - and that also is the basis of all the squabbles between these different sects. At present there seems to be no cure in sight..... No! That is not so. We are told there is an answer, there is a panacea and there is a remedy available. There is one standard or measure that can tell whether a certain hadith is viable or not, and whether the Holy Messenger could have uttered those words or not. Not only that, even if there does not exist a hadith on a certain matter, we still can know what possibly the Holy Messenger could have said on that subject. Of course! it would be a subject of highest metaphysical interest to know of a source thirteen or fourteen hundred years after the departing of the Messenger.

Again Maulana Maudoodi's views on this are:

"The person who is bestowed the honor by Allah, develops by the study of Quran and the character of the Messenger, a certain kind of sense. This sense is analogous to the experience of an old jeweler, that is capable of recognizing the finer characteristics in a diamond. That person can realize the temperament of the whole Islamic system, by casting a bird's eye view. When the time comes to craft the details of this system, his developed sense guides him to discern the difference between Islamic and non-Islamic elements. The same sense becomes a rule and standard in the case of hadith also, that lets him decide the viability of a hadith. The culture and ethos of Islam can be realized in the life of the Messenger. A person who understands the distinguishing character of Islam and has done a thorough study of Quran and the character of MuhammadPBUH becomes capable of sensing the finer sentiments

of the character of the Messenger. (As I am translating this quote, thoughts are flashing in my mind, if ever there can be a man/woman who can sense the finer sentiments of the Messenger, then what is hampering or coming in the way to adopt the Messenger's way of life. Muhammad's character is a balance of forgiveness, justice and sacrifice. How many of these authors have that balance in them. If they are capable of sensing those Messengeric qualities, then why do they not act upon them. Perhaps they have not reached those heights of character and are just talking about it. If they want to be righteous that is their choice, but why impose a righteous attitude if someone does not want it.) His insight is able to sense which words his Holy Majesty the Messenger of Allah could have uttered in a certain hadith, while dishonoring others that he does not sense, belong to the Messenger.

Not only that, those matters about which he cannot find any reference in the Quran, can also be explained by that person, as he knows what could have been the Messenger's verdict. And this becomes possible as his spirit has become lost in the spirit of MuhammadPBUH and his insight is one with the vision of Messenger. After reaching that heightened stage an individual needs no warrants to check the viability of any hadith. There are times when he can pick up an old, outcasted, discontinued or dishonoured hadith, as he has that sense to make Messengeric decisions. At other times a hadith that is near to being credible, more popular and socially accepted may find no value according to him. As he finds no meaning to this golden drink of Islam that is in accordance with the sentiments of Islam and the Messenger." (*Tafheemaat, vol. 1, page 323-24*)

Let us scrutinize and examine rationally what has just been quoted above. What it actually means is:

1. You all ought to have faith in Imam Bukhari and Imam Muslim (and various other hadith scholars). The words 'have faith in' are not brought in for nothing. You have to have faith that what these above mentioned authors have written in hadith are the true statements of the Messenger of Islam. If you renounce, in that case you become a non-believer of hadith, heretic and therefore exiled from the sphere of Islam.
2. And if you renounce faith in the authorities on hadith then you ought to have faith in the vision of that individual who recognizes the Messenger's character. It means that you must believe in whatever he says, that those are the true words of the Messenger, inspite of the fact whether that statement is nowhere under the sun or is present in the hadith books. If you do not comply, you are considered a non-believer in Hadith, an agnostic and a pagan.
3. More correctly, the quote means if you all have faith in the collectors of Hadith (book's authorities) and do not have faith in the vision of one who has insight into the temperament of the Messenger, then in his eyes you are a non-believer in hadith and thus a pagan. Again if you do not have faith in Imam BukhariR and Imam MuslimR and deny them, then again according to 'Ahl e Hadith' sect you are denying Hadith and therefore a heretic.

In other words, God wanted you all to have faith in the messages sent through the holy Messenger, in order for you to be a true Muslim. Now the scenario that is made to prevail is, if you do not have faith in the above mentioned human beings, you cannot be called a Muslim.

## ***BELIEF IN HADITH***

This remains the status quo as far as hadith is concerned. Are you aware, what is being discussed in our religious circles? Please peruse carefully, and think again that if our belief in these hadiths is not the actual cause of confusion in DEEN (Islamic system) what else is? Late Maulana M. Ismail (former president, 'Jamiat e Ahl e Hadith) writes in his periodical '*Jamaat e Islami ka Nazariya Hadith.*'

"The correct rank of hadith, after research, remains equivalent to the Holy Quran. In fact its denial will have the same consequences as the denial of Quran...Those hadiths that are proven perfect by the value standards and are chosen according to the choice of Sunnis cannot be denied. Otherwise you are an agnostic and an outcast from the Islamic community." (*page 48*)

Meaning that not even one hadith, that has been proven true can be denied (to say, that it does not belong to the Holy Messenger). Otherwise it is tantamount to agnosticism and you are an alien in the sphere of Islam. According to the above mentioned sect, the Bukhari and Muslim books are considered 'Sahiheen' (meaning it is the truth), therefore if whosoever denies any of these books is a 'Kafir' (agnostic). It is written:

"The Muslims are united on Bukhari and Muslim...These hadiths are the absolute." (*Page 55*)

The word 'Muslims' is meant for all those who belong to the Ahl e Hadith sect. This is because, the Hanafi sect that is considered the majority in the Muslim world, deny at least two hundred hadiths of Imam BukhariPBUH and Imam Muslim.

## ***HADITH IS REVELATION***

As to why it is heresy to deny these hadiths, the late Maulana Ismail writes:

"The archangel Gabriel brought the revelations of "Quran" and "Sunnat" (the lifestyle of the Messenger) together. The angel taught 'sunnat' to the Messenger just like the "Quran." That is why we do not differentiate in these 'revelations.' (*Page 60*)

## ***TWO KINDS OF REVELATION***

Meaning to say, that Quran and the Hadith, both are revelations of God and there is no difference between them. That is why a hadith was later on crafted, according to which the Holy Messenger told his disciples that I get revelations of Quran and Masla Ma'a (along with it similar and something else). Another concept was brought into use, that 'revelations' are of two kinds.

- The revelation called 'Jalli' (that means Quran)
- and the other revelation is 'Khaffe' (meaning the Hadith).

The 'Jalli' revelation is also named 'Multoo' (which means a revelation that is recitable) and the other kind is 'Ghair Multoo' that cannot be recited. Please be advised here, that we have found no mention in the Quran and there is no clue of it even in the primary literature of hadith. This idea of two revelations actually belonged to the Jews. These writers have borrowed it from the Jews who believed in a revelation that could be written and the other that is not written (which means it was transferred through traditions). We do not want to involve ourselves here, as to how this concept is contrary to Quran and how it shatters its foundations. All we want to know is, that if God accepted the responsibility of the 'Holy Quran,' what came in his way, from taking the responsibility of the Hadith? The Messenger neither gave it to the Muslims, in any book form nor did the following Caliphs consider it essential to do so. Nor did any of the disciples of the Messenger bring it into writing. Whosoever had written the hadith had either publicly burnt it himself or had it burnt. If 'Quran' and 'Hadith' both were revelations, then why so much favoritism, care, and protection of one and no care at all for the other revelation? Can we by any means understand what this connotes? (Or where these concepts are leading us to?)

## ***Why Ahadith were not Written***

It would not be a bad idea at all to listen to the answers to our question. Maulana Maudoodi writes that if Hadith had also been preserved as the Quran, then:

"The Quran would have at least become as big as Encyclopedia Britannica in volume."(*Tafsheemaat. Vol 1,page 236*)

Because its volume would have increased so God did not include this part of revelation in the Quran. If we accept this argument, that the volume would be huge, then why was this revelation not written in a separate volume. To this

the answer is:

"In those times there was paucity of literacy, and almost little means to have it written." (*Tarjuman ul Quran, March 1954*)

This was Maulana Maudoodi's answer. Dr. Hameed Ullah who is at present settled in Paris, has something else to say on this topic. He writes in one of his articles that was printed in the Karachi periodical '*Al Islam*,' in its January 1-15, 1959 issue:

"The Messenger proved to be a man of modest and careful deeds. In the capacity of a Messenger of God, he had taken all possible and necessary steps to ensure that the message of God, not only was it delivered correctly to the people, but also that it was preserved. If he had adopted the same steps for his own deeds, he would have been taken for an egoist. That is why the Hadith story is different from the Quran."

This is the story of that Hadith, which is being placed next to Quran and which was revealed by archangel Gabriel just like the Quran. And by renouncing it we become heretics, in the same way we become a heretic by not believing in the Quran.

### ***HADITH IS BEYOND QURAN***

Uptil now we have noticed that it is being mentioned that Hadith is an example of the Holy Quran, meaning in other words, it is equivalent to the Quran. Now let us move a bit further Imam Ozai states:

"Quran is more dependent on the Hadith books as compared with Hadith depending on the Holy Quran." (*Muktasir Jama e Biyaan ul Ilm, page 223*)

### ***HADITH CAN NEGATE QURAN***

What this means is, that whenever there is a deadlock between Quran and Hadith, the hadith will over rule the Quran's verdict. Some hadith authorities even go beyond and proclaim that hadith can negate the tenets of Quran. The late Maulana Hafiz Muhammad Ayub ventures on this topic in his pamphlet, '**Fitna Inkar e Hadith**' that:

"It is not imperative for the Messenger's statements to go according to the Quran. Referring to Quran wherein is stated 2:180 (page 29). It is mandatory to willeth your riches to your parents, when you have wealth and are to die. Whereas the Holy Messenger said, 'It is not necessary for the heir to willeth.' Circumstances prove that the Holy Messenger's verdict has prevailed. Thus the hadith has negated the Holy Quran, as the Holy Messenger's statement has been enacted." (*page 85*)

Those of us who are comparatively less fiendish, are of the opinion that hadith is in fact an elucidation or explanation of the Quran. Actually these people only say this to please others. Their beliefs are very different from what they actually say. What they say is that hadith is an example of the Holy Quran, and they do not deny the consequences of this statement. They do not believe the hadith to be an explanation of the Quran, instead they believe the Hadith of being the actual DEEN (Islamic system). Hence Maulana Maudoodi (the same Maudoodi who was criticizing the hadiths a while ago) writes on this issue:

"If the negation of the permanence of Hadith means that it only explains the issues and topics of the Quran, and by itself the hadith is of no significance, then this proclamation is denying the facts... .. Hadith has its own permanent place, concerning mandates and issues. (*Tarjuman ul Quran, July-August 1950*)

### ***RECAPITULATION OF HADITH:***

1. Hadith and the Holy Quran both have been revealed by God.
2. Hadith is an example of the Quran.
3. Hadith is not as dependent on the Quran as the Holy Quran is dependent on the Hadith.
4. Hadith over rules the tenets of the Quran.
5. Hadith is not an explanation of the Holy Quran, actually Hadith has its own place.
6. Hadith negates the Holy Quran.

And,

7. Anyone who does not have a belief in the above is denying the hadith, hence he is a heretic and an outcast from the sphere of Islam.

## ***EXPLANATION OF QURAN***

It is stated that the Quran was revealed to the Messenger MuhammadPBUH. Hence there can be no explanation of the Quran better than that of the Messenger. If someone extradites some other kind of meaning than the one explained by the Messenger, then he is not correct.

Apparently, this seems a very logical argument. Who would be audacious enough to contradict the Messenger, the question does not arise here - the important aspect to this argument is, whether the given data in the hadith is in fact the true and authentic statement of the Messenger? Concerning this issue it must be made to understand, that Hadith does not explain the whole of the Holy Quran. Only a few ayats of the Quran have been explained. In the Bukhari Hadith there is only one chapter devoted to the explanation of the Quran and that too of a few significant ayats from the Quran.

I repeat again what I wrote before, who would have the audacity, as not to bow his head before the verdict of the Messenger of Islam? In the present situation, where we cannot prove the verity of any hadith, if a person says that a hadith is not the true words of the Holy Messenger, it must not be construed that he is denying the Holy Messenger's explanation of Quran. What actually he is trying to convey is, what is being explained and attributed towards the Messenger, does not ipso facto, belong to MuhammadPBUH.

Consider this, when Imam Bukhari discards 594,000 hadiths that he does not think to have been the words or deeds of the Messenger, then no one calls him to be a disbeliever. Why then a person, who has negated only one hadith, which is not according to his own study of the Quran, is exiled from the sphere of Islam and called a non-believer and a heretic. He actually is simply refusing to believe in the decision of the narrator of that hadith, that it is not the true statement of the Messenger. He is only negating the authenticity of that hadith which has been attributed towards the Messenger. (Perhaps that is why the Messenger prohibited the writing of hadith, to his companions).

## ***HOW MUST WE PRAY WITHOUT HADITH***

Let us examine another issue that seems very powerful and is the cause of frustration to many believers. It is usually said that if we do not believe in the Hadith, how are we to apply the tenets of the Holy Quran on ourselves. For example, it is mandatory to pray. Now nowhere does the Quran explain, as to how must we pray or what ought to be the manner and text in our prayers etc, etc. All we know, the Holy Messenger enacted on this mandate from God and we must follow in his foot-steps.

First of all it is absolutely incorrect to say, 'what if we do not believe in Hadith...' Noone is denying the deeds or words of the Messenger. Hadith books are available from every where. Actually the question ought to be rephrased that, "If we do not believe in the verity of Hadith, then how are we supposed to pray?"

We all know that Shia's way of praying is different from that of a Sunni. And both claim to be following in the foot-steps of the Messenger. When we look at Sunnis, their 'Ahl e Hadith' sect's way of praying is different from the 'Hannafi' sect. And everyone knows that. Again both of these sects claim to be in the foot-steps of the Messenger. The question is, whose way of praying ought we to consider as a true and a genuine version of the Messenger, when

various different hadiths stand witness to every sect's way of praying. Our important question to you all is, are there any means existing today, by means of which we may know the exact manner, how the Messenger offered his prayers?

The answer to this question that these people give is, besides the Shiites, the differences in various factions of Sunni Muslims are flimsy and of no significance. Otherwise the procedures and manner of praying in all are the same. First of all it is all bunkum to say that these are flimsy differences and have no significance. The followers of one sect, leave alone the fact that they do not pray together, if by any chance a soft tone Quran reciter enters into the mosque of a high volume reciter, if they will not refurbish the floor of that mosque, it will at least be washed ten times and blessed ten times more.

What we read and listen now and then, to the riots in the mosques and between various sect members..... what does that mean? Or when we come to know that a certain Imam (headpriest) has been murdered, members getting at each others throats, the interference of police and the government locking up and sealing the mosques..... are these all due to trivial differences? And when these fanatics say that these differences are of no significance, it is sheer escapism from actual facts and an excuse to avoid the real meanings of a prayer.

It must be observed when a command or law is promulgated by the God (or His messenger), then the principle and its corollaries both are given their due importance; no way are these supposed to differ, by any means. For example, let us take the principle of Wadhu (ablutions) which is stated in the Quran that, we must wash our face and our hands upto the elbows. Now, if a person washes his hands upto the wrists and another upto the elbows, would you say that both of them are correct in doing so? As it is a trivial difference, is not the principle the same? It would certainly be incorrect to say that! Only he/she will be correct whose deed is according to the Quran. So to say that if anyone lifted his hands upto the ears or not, folded his arms on his chest or below the belly button, the space between his/her feet while standing for prayers, was too little or too much? Whether he recited to himself the sura 'fatiha' from the Quran after the Imam or not, and what phrases were uttered in a prayer? During the Ramadan, did he recite the 'Tarawi' eight or twenty times? How many was the number of 'Takbeers' in Eid prayers, so on and so forth, you are insinuating, are all matters of no significance? It is nothing else except escapism. If these people really believe that these trivialities are of no consequence, then just ask a staunch member of Ahl e Hadith sect to offer his prayers like the Hannafi sect does... He will not do so!

Can we who believe in Hadith, in all honesty say that our way of prayers is the genuine and true method of the Messenger MuhammadPBUH? Yet, each and every one of these sects claim that their way was the only way of the Messenger. And it does not make sense that all sects are correct. Are you prepared to believe that? Are you sure that during the times of the Messenger, some disciples offered their prayers like the Sunnis while other disciples offered their prayers like the Shiites do? Or that some prayed like 'Ahl e Hadith,' while others prayed like 'Hannafis'? Or that the Messenger himself offered his prayers like the Sunnis at one time, while at another time he offered like the Shiites? Or sometimes like 'Ahl e Hadith' and sometimes like 'Hannafis'? Obviously, we all know that it could not have been possible or behooving of the Messenger to adopt different manners at various times. There must have been one and only one way of praying by the Messenger and all his disciples must be offering prayers in one manner also. In Quran's language difference between sects means the wrath of God and bifurcation in the DEEN of Islam. If that was the state of affairs in those times of the Messenger, is it possible that we in anyway, again can unite the Muslim brotherhood and see them praying in unison? Unfortunately, we think this shall not be possible, as long as you all will believe in the hadiths to be the true and authentic words of the Messenger. Until then it is not possible to achieve this unanimity. As every sect in Islam has his own hadiths and every one of them claims to be in the foot-steps of the Messenger. Leaving aside the question of uniting these Muslims, in the present scenario, we are faced with an even bigger dilemma, of which there is no panacea at all.

### ***NEO-MUSLIM'S PLIGHT***

Let us assume, that a Neo-Muslim embraces Islam today. And the Maulana who takes the oath and baptizes him/her, happens to belong to a Dayobundi sect. After embracing Islam he is told that the first and foremost requirement of Islam - that distinguishes a believer from a disbeliever - is a prayer. So he learns the wordings and manner of praying

from that Maulana. Later on, a person from 'Ahl e Hadith' sect sees this individual praying and tells him that his prayers are not done. Now if his prayers are not accepted by the God, how can he remain a Muslim. As he was taught that a prayer divides a Muslim from a non-Muslim. Our question remains, can anyone of you give us a solution to resolve this innocent man's plight, who has embraced Islam? Please do not escape this issue and kindly give your serious consideration. The Hadith will not be able to resolve this matter as initially, this issue was created by the Hadith. We will discuss this matter later in the book.

## ***WHAT IS SUNNAH***

Besides hadith there is another term that is prevalent by the name of 'Sunnah.' And this term impinges upon the finer sentiments of our being. 'Deen' it is said, 'is complying with the Sunnah of the Messenger.' You all must have heard these words buzzing everywhere. At the same time it will be amazing to know, that they have more than one opinion when it comes to defining this term called 'Sunnah.'

Several years from now, the president of Jamiat e Ahl e Hadith, the late Maulana Muhammad Ismail, published a magazine by the title, "**Jamaat e Islami ka Nazariya Hadith**" In that he had written a critique on Maulana Maudoodi's view of hadith. He explained that Maulana Maudoodi's views on hadith are close to a non-believer of hadith. So in his entries of hadith non-believers, the names of religious personalities included, besides others, were those of Sir Syed, Maulana Shibly, Maulana Hameed uddeen Farahi, Maulana Maudoodi and Maulana Aameem Ehson Islahi.

Although he did not fire at them directly, he did say:

"These personalities are not disbelievers of Hadith. However, from their way of thinking, one sees a rebellious attitude towards hadith, that leaves the back doors open for non-believers."

## ***MAULANA MAUDOUDI***

The late Maulana Ismail also mentioned that 'Hadith' and 'Sunnah' compliment each other. Meaning that hadith and Sunnah are one and the same. According to his belief, the terms 'Book and Sunnah' (Kitab aur Sunnah) means 'Quran and Hadith' (Quran aur Hadith). And Maulana Maudoodi has his own interpretation of Sunnah. He narrates in his book '**Risayal aur Masayal**' **volume 1**, that:

"Sunnah are those actions and deeds for which God sent his Messenger to teach us in order to be implemented. The deeds that he performed in the capacity of a human being or those acts that he performed as a personality in history, are excluded from the Messenger's life. At times there have been deeds and actions that have become so indistinguishable, whether it was a habit or a sunnah of the Messenger, that these actions can only be determined by those who have thoroughly understood the temperament or spirit of Islam....In the social and cultural issues there is a thing called ethical principles, for which the Messenger came to introduce them in the lives of the people. The other thing is the implementation factor of these principles that he himself adopted in his life. The implementation was based on his own temperament, while some were based on the traditions of the times he was born in and some on the ethos of the culture. None of these was meant to be applied on all people, all nations or all human beings as a 'Sunnah.'" (*page 311, page 317*)

He further writes in the same chapter:

"We find a few characteristics that are bonded to the Messenger's personal habits and social customs of those times. Those were not, according to the hadith literature, intended for 'Sunnah,' nor it is argued that these principles, of the social customs of a certain culture at a certain period in history, were sent to be applied to the whole of human kind for all times. If this definition of Sunnah is kept in mind, then it becomes very clear that those acts or deeds that do not come within the jurisprudence terminology, ought not to be forced as a 'Sunnah,' as this will be dividing the Deen." (*page 314*)

In short, according to the late Maulana Ismail, 'Sunnah' is all and everything that is contained in the ahadith, and renouncing them is considered heresy. Whereas where Maulana Maudoodi is concerned, the actions, words and deeds of the Messenger performed in the capacity of a human being or as a habit, cannot be considered viable hadith. If anyone includes these acts also in the sphere of hadith, then he says:

"I am in the belief, that to call these acts and deeds the 'Sunnah' of the Messenger and insist on it is a conspiracy against Deen; it has had adverse effects in the past and shall prove dangerous in future also." (*page 308*)

Before this he wrote:

"To call those deeds, that he performed as a matter of habit and have them applied on all humankind, was not the intention of Allah and his Messenger. This is a bifurcation of Islam." (*page 300*)

In the light of the above excerpts, let us see a practical shape. There is an amendment in the Pakistan constitution, wherein is stated, that there shall be no law passed that goes against the 'Quran and Sunnah.' Now a law is legislated and Maulana Ismail defies that law, as he considers it against the 'Sunnah' and brings forth a hadith as his witness. Maulana Maudoodi confronts him and gives his verdict that it is not against the 'Sunnah.' The former Maulana inquires whether the hadith that has been produced is authentic or not? Maulana Maudoodi argues that the hadith incidence is correct, though it was not performed in the capacity of a Messenger. The Maulana questions him again, as to what proof does he have and how can he be a judge as to the capacity of MuhammadPBUH. Maulana Maudoodi states that these matters are not qualified by authority or reason. These are decided by an individual who has an insight into Messenger's habits and temperament. Maulana Ismail answers:

"If a group of people, because of their obedient nature, decide to make one of its elderly members a Messengersic visionary and invest powers in him to annul or accept any hadith. We will, Inshallah, fight to the bitter end and defend the 'Sunnah' of the Messenger from such kinds of fluke attacks." (*Jamaat e Islami ka Nazariya Hadith, page 63*)

What Maulana Maudoodi claims as 'Sunnah' of the Messenger, the 'Ahl e Hadith' sect calls it fluke attacks. And who also consider it their duty to defend the 'Sunnah' from these type of attacks; until now we have discussed the views of Maulana Maudoodi and Maulana Ismail. Let us see another **Maulana Islahi**, who also has something to say on this issue:

"Hadith is every act, speech or deed that is referenced to the Messenger. Sunnah on the other hand is only that proven and known manner on which the Messenger has acted repeatedly, protected and to which he usually remained duty bound." (*page 25*)

To which the late Maulana Ismail retorted and answered:

"Maulana (Islahi) has shrunk the definition of Sunnah so much that it is only concerned with a few actions, for example as the 'fundamentals' in the prayers. It must be repeated a thousand times that, 'if a person does not believe the 'Sunnah' to have been derived from 'Deen,' he must not be acknowledged as a Muslim.' The question is how are we to apply, a Sunnah that does not go beyond a few acts or deeds, to the whole of Islam. In that case then, Islam will have to be defined from somewhere else. Why decree on something that does not make sense?" (*page 26*)

This was the definition of 'Sunnah' (deeds of Messenger) about which the late Maulana Ismail said:

"In my opinion the ideas of Maulana Maudoodi and Maulana Islahi are not only against 'Ahl e Hadith,' in fact these ideas are against all hadith believers. The ideas carry the potential germs of modern justification." (*page 110*)

From these above controversial reviews, the united stand of 'Book and Sunnah' believers, it can be inferred that they have yet to search for a common definition of 'Sunnah.' What one sect considers a 'Sunnah,' is thought as a division of Islam by another.

When the clergy demanded to include in the Pakistan constitution a clause, whereby no law shall be passed that is against the 'Book and Sunnah.', we wrote, it will not be possible according to this condition, for all the diverse factions, to unanimously declare any amendment in its constitution to be Islamic. For this statement of ours the reason we provided was, that 'Quran' no doubt is the highest common factor among the various Islamic sects (in this we did not argue on Shiite idiosyncrasy), but each one of them has its own 'Sunnah.' For saying this our Tolu-e-Islam organization was put in the melting pot and there was a pandemonium. It was decreed that we were non-believers of Hadith, disbelievers in his Great Holiness Messenger MuhammadPBUH, that we were agnostics and heretics etc., etc. This propaganda against us was prolonged for a period of twenty years. On the other hand, the consequences remained the same. None of those hooters were able to pass any law, that could unanimously be agreed upon by these various sects. It was not possible then and neither has it become possible now.

Finally Maulana Maudoodi had no choice left but to say:

"There is no such element in the 'Kitab aur Sunnah' (the Book and the Sunnah) that can resolve the legal issues of Hannafis, Shiites and Ahl e Hadith on a common basis." (*Asia, August 23, 1970*)

It is hence obvious that, as long as Islam is divided in various sections, every section according to its own idiosyncrasies shall act upon the 'Sunnah.' And as soon as you shall endeavour to unite these divided sections on a single platform, the status quo of 'Sunnah' (according to the present definition of it) will be transformed.

### ***HOW SHOULD WE FOLLOW MUHAMMAD?***

The above moot brings us to a phase that is the core of our arguments. That it is the law of Allah - and He has reiterated in his command - to follow His Messenger. Whosoever follows the Messenger has indirectly followed Allah, and whosoever renounced the Messenger has reached the gates of hellfire. Again the same question occurs, that if we do not believe in the present ahadith, how is it possible to follow the life of the Messenger? This is the question, the most important and the basic one that is usually put forward; they prove it through Quran, that one ought to believe in the words and deeds of the Messenger and that hadith is the indispensable need of Islam. We do not have the slightest doubt that this question, is in fact very important, and that it does need our serious attention.

Before we attempt to answer the question, we think it is necessary to straighten its kink first. It is said:

- According to the Holy Quran it is compulsory to follow the Messenger Muhammad.
- And there are no other means apart from the Hadith books to follow the Messenger.
- It is therefore indispensable to believe the words or deeds of Messenger written in Hadith books as true and authentic, inspite of the facts that state the contrary. It is insisted that without hadith it would not be possible to fulfill the duty of following the Messenger. It is thus compulsory to believe in ahadith. The kink of this argument is very glaring.

Allow me to tackle the real question. Actually the root of all problems is hadith; rather we must say, in the spirit of Islam, the Quran's command 'to follow Allah and the Messenger,' has been completely misunderstood. The common meanings that are extracted or the interpretations are usually put forth, that we are supposed to 'follow Allah and His Messenger' separately. Also that Allah is followed from the Quran, while the Messenger can be chased by means of the ahadith. (Then the way for us becomes clear to the Heavens! Easy isn't it?) From the start we have to say, the basic understanding we have, to 'follow Allah and Messenger' separately, is incorrect. The intrinsic point of departure of Quran's system is, that we must only serve God. Worshipping or following any other Entity or Being is totally out

of question.

If on the other hand, Hadith was the only source by which we could follow the Messenger, then it was the emergent and primary need of Islam, just like the Quran, to preserve the Hadith with God's warranty, so that each one of us would have been able to follow the life of Messenger in all certainty. The 'following of God' does not by any way mean, that we may follow our own wishful thinking of God. To follow God means to follow His law revealed in the Book. The preservation of which HE took upon His Ownself. By virtue of this, the Messenger became capable of delivering it in concrete book form to the whole of Muslim ummah.

In the same vein, 'to follow the Messenger' will not mean that a person or group makes his own cliches of Messenger's teachings and starts to follow them. It is absolutely necessary, that in order to follow, we must have an objective standard. By this we can conclude, God did not put any seal of His authority nor did the Messenger deliver it to his disciples in any concrete form with his approval; that it was neither in God's programme nor the aim of the Messenger, to preserve the hadith.

We again come to the same question, that if Hadith is not the source, then what else are we suppose to believe to follow the Messenger's life?

## ***ISLAM IS A COLLECTIVE SYSTEM***

The reality is that Islam is not (as is commonly believed) a religion, in which each one of us can worship the God of our own wishful concepts. Islam is a collective system for life, in which we are collectively subservient to the Law of Quran. Islamic republic or system..... is responsible for legislating and imposing God's Laws and having them implemented in the nation. The first Islamic nation was established by the Messenger, the purpose and aim of which was to abide by God's Law. In Quran's terminology, 'to follow Allah and Messenger' does not mean to follow ones wishful thinking of our own make-belief world. It meant to follow the system that the Messenger had established. God's commands were present in the Quran, the Messenger with powers bestowed upon him by Allah, according to the needs and ethos of that culture, made the public abide by those laws.

## ***DETAILS OF PRINCIPLES***

The second emphatic reality that we observe is that Quran is in possession of some laws. In most matters we find that it provides us with only the basic Shari'at laws (Ahkam). The duty of that Islamic Republic was to legislate the clauses and sub-clauses of Quran's basic Shari'at laws or principles, according to the social, cultural and geo-political conditions of the times, by democratic means (in consultation with other Muslims). It is precisely because of this, the Messenger was commanded to consult his disciples and followers. That is how the Messenger was able to legislate the clauses of the basic Shari'at laws or principles given in the Quran. For example, the command of Zakat is given numerous times in the Quran. In spite of it, we cannot find a single instance, where the amount has been fixed or any detail of Zakat command frozen by any given amount. It means, Zakat was a basic Shari'at law, to provide growth to the Islamic System and consequently to the civilians to nurture their personalities. What will be the infrastructure, how much will be the amount of Zakat collected from each capable person, or what is going to be the mode of expenditure of this revenue, all these details were supposed to be formulated by the Islamic Republic. When the Messenger promulgated the Zakat ordinance, he must have fixed two and a half percent for its amount. It is quite possible in those days, that with this small amount the government was able to cater to its needs. Now from this, we must refrain from jumping to the conclusion that we have fulfilled our responsibility of Quran's command 'to follow Allah and the Messenger.' That by giving Zakat we served Allah and by giving two and a half percent we fulfilled our duty and followed the Messenger's command. The Quran's command 'to follow Allah and His Messenger' was fulfilled in those days, by giving two and a half percent of Zakat to that Islamic system.

## ***THE GROWTH OF THE SYSTEM***

The Islamic republic was not established to cease, as soon as the Messenger departed from this world - It was established to remain till the end of times. However this system, after the demise of the Messenger, continued in the

shape of Caliphate. Now to 'follow Allah and the Messenger' meant to follow the commands of Allah through the system, whose top official was the Caliph of Messenger. In those days the same measures were taken, to implement and impose the Shari'at laws of God as in the days of the Messenger. As these laws or commands were permanent and unchangeable, no human had the right to make any amendments or modify these laws. As far as the sub-clauses were concerned (that were legislated during the days of the Messenger), only those sub-laws were modified that were no more applicable to the changed conditions, otherwise the remaining clauses were left intact, as they were. If the need was felt, new clause was added to the Shari'at law. History of those times does reveal, that new clauses were added later on and those that were amended, in the details of Messenger's legislature.

From the above queries, we must be able to comprehend why the Quran did not give us the details of clauses and sub-clauses of its basic principles or Shari'at laws. And also this should answer our question, as to why the Messenger did not give us in concrete shape, the corollaries of the laws of Allah, that he had imposed in his system of government. The statements and principal laws of Quran were meant to remain permanent and absolute for all times. That is why those laws were preserved forever. In the light of these laws, whatever clauses were approved by the assembly of those times were not preserved, as it was not necessary. The disciples of the Messenger were very much conscious of this too, that is why they also did not feel the need to preserve the hadith. On the contrary, they strictly prohibited anyone from doing so also. If the ahadith had been preserved, it is quite possible that in later ages these ahadith, like the Quran would have been thought permanent and unchangeable.

As long as God's system of Caliphate survived, this reality prevailed and shone through. The 'following of Allah and the Messenger' was very much existing without the hadith. Unfortunately, after sometime this system could not continue as Caliphate changed into monarchy. The infrastructure of Deen disintegrated, the dual standards of church and state entered in its system. The dictators took the political affairs in their own hands, while the religious matters (belief, worship or marriage and divorce type of personal laws) were given to the priestcrafts. The concept 'to follow Allah and the Messenger' also changed with the passage of time. As the government did not deem it necessary to analyze or examine the laws of Allah, so the public did not feel the need to follow any human or group of human beings. (Perhaps Allah gave us this law of being subservient only to Him, because it is the natural need of a human being to feel free. Or, as the times have proved that no human is capable of governing another human being satisfactorily)

### ***THEN WHAT HAPPENED***

The same question was put in those days, as to how can 'the following of Allah and the Messenger' be instantiated. There was no way out, but to assume that to follow the Quran means following Allah and by obeying the statements of the Messenger we would be following Him. And so the need for hadith was created. Since those days we have yet to see another Caliphate of God's system. Because of it we are unable to understand the real meanings and procedures of 'following Allah and the Messenger'. Since Quran possessed only a few basic Shari'at laws and life matters demanded more elaboration, these elaborate details were supposed to be provided by that Caliphate. Since we are devoid of it now, the eyes keep looking towards the Ahadith. In all this time, that is the main reason why the ahadith have remained the centre of Islamic learnings. When the exhausted ahadith could not fulfill the needs of the changed environment, authors and priests began to fabricate new ones. New sects came into being, that brought their own self-made ahadith to the surface. When centuries passed, these idiosyncrasies acquired the form of a belief that to follow the Messenger, one must follow the hadith and those who renounce the ahadith are nonbelievers and heretics.

### ***SOLUTION***

This is the blatant notion that is the root cause of all problems in matters of Deen. There is one and only one remedy to deal with this monster of a problem and that would be to re-establish once again the Caliphate of God's system. It means, that government of the Muslims and by the Muslims must decide that it shall be governing by the laws and principles in the Quran. The government must impose Quran's Laws and also examine what Quran says about other departments of life and how can Quran fulfill those legal needs. The government must also take advantage from the hadith treasure that has come to us through the ages, find in them those laws that synchronize with Quran's teachings and fulfill our requirements also, thus making them a part of the constitution. If and when the government does not find any laws in the hadith, in that case in the light of the principles of Quran, the government must make new laws.

The basic Shari'at laws of Quran shall remain permanent in the constitution of the government. Those by-laws, whether they have already been formulated or newly made, in the light of the principles of Quran, can be amended according to the changing needs. These laws shall be imposed or enacted, without any discrimination of any faction or sect, on all Muslims equally. This is how the state will begin to create solidarity in the Islamic world. Over a period of time and gradually we should be able to emboss an environment similar to that, which existed during the days of his Great Holiness Messenger Muhammad PBUH.

To summarize on what we have just mentioned, that the basic laws of Quran will be perpetually permanent. The procedures to execute these laws and making of its sub-clauses according to the changing circumstances of the times, shall remain open to amendment. It shall be of benefit to consider, what Dr. Allama Iqbal had to say concerning this, in his famous work entitled, '**Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam.**' He writes:

".....The ultimate spiritual basis of all life, as conceived by Islam, is eternal and reveals itself in variety and change. A society based on such a conception of Reality must reconcile, in its life, the categories of permanence and change. It must possess eternal principles to regulate its collective life; for the eternal gives us a foothold in the world of perpetual change. But eternal principles when they are understood to exclude all possibilities of change which, according to the Quran, is one of the greatest 'signs' of God, tend to immobilize what is essentially mobile in its nature. The failure of Europe in political and social science illustrates the former principle, the immobility of Islam during the last 500 years illustrates the latter. What then is the principle of movement in the structure of Islam? This is known as 'Ijtihad'." (*Page 147*)

Concerning his views on Hadith he says in the same book:

"For our present purpose, however, we must distinguish traditions of a purely legal import from those which are of a non-legal character. With regard to the former, there arises a very important question as to how far they embody the pre-Islamic usages of Arabia which were in some cases left intact, and in others modified by the Prophet. It is difficult to make this discovery, for our early writers do not always refer to pre-Islamic usages. Nor is it possible to discover that the usages, left intact by express or tacit approval of the Prophet, were intended to be universal in their application. Shah Wali Ullah has a very illuminating discussion on the point. I reproduce here the substance of his view. The Prophet method of teaching, according to Shah Wali Ullah is that, generally speaking, the law revealed by a Prophet takes special notice of the habits, ways and peculiarities of the people to whom he is specifically sent. The Prophet who aims at all-embracing principles, however, can neither reveal different principles for different peoples, nor leaves them to work out their own rules of conduct. His method is to train one particular people, and to use them as a nucleus for the building up of a universal Shari'at. In doing so he accentuates the principles underlying the social life of all mankind, and applies them to concrete cases in the light of the specific habits of the people immediately before him. The Shari'at values (Ahkam) resulting from this application (e.g. rules relating to penalties for crimes) are in a sense specific to that people; and since their observance is not an end in itself they cannot be strictly enforced in the case of future generations. It was perhaps in view of this that Abu Hanifa, who had a keen insight into the universal character of Islam, made practically no use of these traditions. The fact that he introduced the principles of 'Istihsan' i.e., juristic preference, which necessitates a careful study of actual conditions in legal thinking, throws further light on the motives which determined his attitude towards this source of Mohammadan Law. It is said that Abu Hanifa made no use of traditions because there were no regular collections in his day. In the first place, it is not true to say that there were no collections in his day, as the collections of Abdul Malik and Zuhri were made not less than thirty years before the death of Abu Hanifa. But even if we suppose that these collections never reached him, or that they did not contain traditions of a legal import, Abu Hanifa like Malik and Ahmad Ibn e Hambal after him, could have easily made his own collection if he had deemed such a thing necessary. On the whole then, the attitude of Abu Hanifa towards the traditions of a purely legal import is to my mind perfectly sound; and if modern Liberalism considers it safer not to make any indiscriminate use of them as a source of law, it will be only following one of the greatest exponents of Mohammadan Law in Sunni Islam." (*Pages 171-173*)

Of the changing environment during the days of the Messenger, Maulana Maudoodi says:

"It is an undeniable fact that the Lawmaker after administering the highest degree of wisdom and the finest knowledge, has suggested those principal laws that are applicable and fulfill the needs of all times and all conditions. In spite of all this, majority of sub-clauses in the details of principal laws need amendments because of the changing environment. The conditions that prevailed during the times of the Messenger in Arabia, cannot necessarily prevail in the rest of the world and through different ages. It would be traditional or conventional to give a permanent status to those sub-clauses of Islamic laws that fulfilled the requirements of those times and that has nothing to do with Islamic spirit..... It is known a person must, in every matter keep a keen eye on the aims and objectives of the Lawmaker, so that the changes in the details may correspond with the basic principles." (**Tufheemaat, vol II, page 327**)

At another place he speaks on the same issue that:

"When we speak of gaining similarity with Medina, we do not by any means want to be similar in the outward appearance. We do not want to regress, from where the world stands today, into those times of thirteen centuries before. This is a completely wrong notion of 'following the Messenger' principle, but mostly the religious community takes the same meaning. According to them, to follow in the footsteps of the forefathers of disciples means to keep a fossilized version of their culture till the end of times, whatever is happening outside our culture and the changes that are taking place must not be cared for. To construct a wall around our own lives, whereby the movement of time and changing of the times are not allowed to enter. This concept of survival that has been instilled in the minds by religious Muslims belongs to a decadent age and negates the spirit of Islam. Islam does not teach us to become an exhibit of our ancestral past and make a drama of our lives, of the past. It does not teach us a monastic way of living. Islam does not want to produce a nation that tries to impede the progressive stages of life. On the contrary, it wants to produce a nation that ceases the progressive process from taking wrong directions and wants to guide in the correct direction. It does not give us a heart, it gives us the spirit. It desires, that the hearts produced from the changing environment, must be filled till doomsday with this spirit.

"The real character that shines of the Messenger and his disciples, which we must follow, is that they controlled the physical laws by Islamic laws and thereby fulfilled their sacred duty. They imbued a fresh spirit in the culture of their times. Thus, the real followers of the Messenger and his disciples are those who try to enslave the resources of the discoveries caused by physical laws and cultural evolution and bring them under Islamic culture, as was done by the pioneers of Islam." (**Nishan e Rah page 55**)

Maulana Ameen A. Islahi is of the opinion, that not only Quran, the Hadith also mostly contains principles, and their corollaries are left upto the Muslim Ummah to decide for themselves. He says:

"In the Quran and Hadith we find only the basics. Both the books have avoided the details and explanations. To replenish this void, they leave it for the Ummah, according to their standards to make Islamic laws, for their collective and political matters." (**Tarjuman ul Quran, April 1954**)

We also mentioned, wherever the Quran speaks 'to follow Allah and Messenger' it means a system which has been established to implement God's laws. Let us see what Maulana Maudoodi has to say about this. In sura, Al-Ma'aida's ayat 33 it is said: "*And those of you who fight against Allah and His Messenger are given the punishment of...*" Endorsing the above ayat Maulana Maudoodi writes in Tafheemul Quran:

"To fight against Allah and His Messenger means waging war against the leading system which the Islamic government has established." (**Tafheemul Quran, vol. I, page 465**)

Thus 'to follow Allah and Messenger' does not mean to follow the 'Quran and the Hadith' according to our own

personal standards. It is abiding by the laws of God imposed by the central authority. It is the duty of the central authority to carry out and implement these laws of God. This is the actual meaning of 'to follow Allah and the Messenger.' Insubordination to these laws is not only immanent, the person is practically involved in a crime of treason. Without this central authority 'to follow Allah and Messenger' means worshipping individually, in which a coterie or a single person enacts according to his/her own standards. After the establishment of an Islamic system, to follow 'Allah and the Messenger' have an altogether different meanings i.e., to abide by the decisions of the central authority. This is the purpose of Deen and by means of this we gain solidarity.

In our hadith collection we also have a portion that is concerned with the character traits of the Messenger. The character of His Holiness Messenger MuhammadPBUH is a paragon of humanity. Unfortunately, we also have some, among our Ahadith, that blemish and stain his character. For this purpose it is advised, the biography of His Holiness Messenger MuhammadPBUH ought to be rewritten in the light of the Quran, concentrating on his character alone. Only those essentials be borrowed from the Hadith books that correspond with the teachings of the Quran. Those traditions that do not tally with the Holy Quran or those that fantasize the Messenger's character must be discarded.

This is the correct scenario of Hadith. Unless and until we are not prepared to give our treasure of Hadith its proper place, we shall not be able to find our way out of this imbroglio or solve the enigmas in which the Muslim ummah is surrounded and going hay-wire for the past several centuries. We also hope that you will give your serious thoughts to these matters of Hadith with a cool mind. Then only shall we abate this ancient chronic aberration.

[Home](#)      ***Muqaam-e-Hadith*** (The Actual Status of Hadith)

by [G. A. Parwez](#)

translated by Aboo B. Rana

## **SAGA OF HADITH**

*Ahadith*, meaning those sayings, deeds, ethos, *et cetera*, that are attributed to the Messenger Muhammad<sup>PBUH</sup>, have been orally transmitted and are now compiled in book form. Concerning these traditions, discussions were initiated from the beginning that they do not, at all belong to *Deen*, and are only of historical value. Their attribution towards the Holy Messenger is ambiguous. As far as news or oral news is concerned, the morning news is completely changed in the evening. The bigger the personality on its agenda, the faster is the modification done of its news, and the messenger happens to be the biggest personality in the world for Muslims. However, from the very beginning of first century *hijra*, the *Ummah* was incised into sects, and these sects for their own selfish motives of survival, made and concocted *Ahadith* and attributed it to the Messenger. Numerous translations of narrators and fibsters on *Ahadith* issues are present in compiled forms. They all stand witness to the fact, that none of these compiled books on *Ahadith*, were written in the times of the Messenger or in the era of his conferees. The publication of *Muta* by Imam Malik comes closest to the Messenger's times and that also was written in second century *hijra*. All the remaining books on *Ahadith*, that is to include *Saha Sita*, were compiled in third century *hijra*.

The hadithists and authors who acknowledged these *Ahadith* of being a part of *Deen* and because of their influence, the *Ummah* took these *Ahadith* as *Deen* itself. Fortunately, there was one group among the scholars, who had always believed *hadith* as history of *Deen* and the Quran as *Deen* itself. I therefore thought it necessary, to bring in the limelight those chapters of the history of *Ahadith*, so as to project the real position of these traditions in history.

## **THE CUSTOM OF HADITH**

The writing of traditions had commenced in the lifetime of the Messenger of Allah<sup>SWT</sup>. The times when his conferees were not privileged to have his company, they asked and listened to others, who were present in his respected company, It has it from Hazrat Omar<sup>R</sup>, who said, 'Me and my neighbor took turns every day, to have the august company of the Messenger of Allah<sup>SWT</sup> (they lived in an area called Banu Umayya bin Zaid, a little distance from Masjid e Nabvi). Then we narrated to each other, whatever we went through each day. (*Sahih Bokhari*) As there were also hypocrites among them, so the conferees<sup>R</sup> listened to those whom they considered trustworthy. These hypocrites spread rumors about Messenger, and indulged in prate and gossip and also mixed with Muslims. It was difficult to distinguish them in the early years. Apparently it seems, that even God was compelled to warn and address His Messenger:

“Some people in Medina are bent on splitting you, you knoweth not,  
we knoweth!” (9/101)

However, the Messenger himself had emphatically said, as to not to write about his sayings and deeds. That is why, during the lifetime of Messenger we find very few traditions and those that we do have, are of little significance. As for his followers, since they had been deprived of their most beloved leader, so during leisure time when three or four of them got together, they recalled the Messenger's activities and refreshed their memories. Later we find contradictory statements among his disciples<sup>R</sup>, because of which, the first Caliph, Hazrat Abu Bakr<sup>R</sup> imposed

a complete ban on the writing of *Ahadith*. He called them together and said:

“You squabble among yourselves over *hadith*, this habit will increase as time goes by. Do not, therefore, narrate any saying of Messenger. If anyone wants to know, you can tell him the Quran is there between you and him. Whatever is allowed ought to be done, and refrain from what has been prohibited in the Quran.” (*T'zakar tul Hifaaz*)

In spite of this prohibition, we find people continued with *hadith*, it was not considered... as a crime! The second Caliph also tried to put a ban on *hadith* writing—Qarza bin Ka'ab has it that once they commenced their journey for Iraq. Hazrat Omar<sup>R</sup> accompanied them till a place called Sira'ar, upon reaching there he inquired from them, “Do you know why I have come with you this far?” We replied, “For our welfare and in our honor!” He said, “Yes! And also that you are going, where the voice of Quran echoes like honeybees. Do not involve those people in *Ahadith*, and stop them from the Quran or narrate any traditions to them.” Qarza says, after that day, they did not remember narrating any *hadith* again. (*Jama ul Biyaan*)

*Farooq e Azam* (title of Hazrat Omar<sup>R</sup>) was so strict when it came to *hadith*, when he saw Abi bin Qa'ab narrating *Ahadith*, he went after him with his big cane. (*T'zakar tul Hifaaz*) Once Abu Salma asked Abu Huraira<sup>R</sup> who was famous for telling *hadith*, “Did you narrate *Ahadith* in the same way, during the reign of Hazrat Omar<sup>R</sup>.” He replied, “If I had done so, he would have physically scolded me.” (Quoted by *Al Sheikh Zahir bin Saleh*) Hazrat Omar<sup>R</sup> had no reservations at all, in matters of *hadith*, even for Messenger's conferees. He reprimanded Hazrat Abdullah bin Masood<sup>R</sup>, Abul Durda<sup>R</sup> and Abu Zahry<sup>R</sup>, as to why they narrated the traditions of Muhammad<sup>PBUH</sup>? He then put all three under house arrest in Medina and did not let them out for as long as he lived. The third Caliph, Hazrat Othman<sup>R</sup> did not pay any heed to *hadith* or traditions. Once Hazrat Ali's son came to Hazrat Othman<sup>R</sup> with a script of command by Muhammad<sup>PBUH</sup>, about *zakat*. Hazrat Othman<sup>R</sup>, asked to be excused! (*quoted by Al Sheikh Azhir bin Saleh*).

The fourth Caliph, Hazrat Ali<sup>R</sup> also forbade people from *hadith*. And if anyone, narrated a *hadith* in front of him, he took an oath from that person, as to what he was saying was true. He often advised as not to narrate any *hadith* of which they did not know. As this habit of *hadith* would lead to disregarding the Messenger, which surely they all did not want.

Just like the Caliphs, in matters of traditions, they were extremely cautious, some of them completely looked the other way. It has it in Sahih Bokhari, Hazrat Abdullah asked his father Hazrat Zubair, "I have never heard you explaining *ahadith* like other conferees<sup>R</sup> of Messenger do?" His father replied, "I have remained very close to the Messenger and I heard him say, that whosoever spoke dishonestly about him, he must prepare himself for hellfire.

He further said, "I am noticing, people have purposely added \_\_\_\_\_ in the sentence; God is my witness, I have not heard that word from the lips of Messenger. (*Al Sheikh Zahir bin Saleh*) It appears people have made an addition to amend the tradition. Otherwise the fact remains, whether purposely or without purpose, to attribute incorrect traditions to Messenger, is tantamount to inviting Hell. Hazrat Ans<sup>R</sup> also has it, the same statement quoted above, that it ceases me from explaining *hadith*.

Sunun Ibne Majah has it, Abdur Rahman bin abi Laila requested Hazrat Zaid bin Arqain<sup>R</sup> to narrate any *hadith* of Messenger Muhammad<sup>PBUH</sup>. He replied, “I have become old and have forgotten. Moreover, it is extremely hard to speak on this issue.” Saaib bin Yazid states, he went with Saad bin Malik to Medina, but did not hear anything from him on *hadith*. In the same way Imama Shay'bee said, he remained in the company of Hazrat Omar<sup>R</sup> for full one year, but did not hear any *hadith* from him. The followers or conferees of Messenger, not only refrained from narrating *ahadith*, they did not accept these parables even from others very easily and were very

reluctant also.

Hazrat Abdullah Ibne Abbas<sup>R</sup> did not accept Abu Huraira<sup>R</sup>, when he narrated the tradition, that *wadhu* is annulled when anybody comes in contact with anything that has touched fire. He said, “That way, we must then not *wadhu* with hot water, as it has been touched by fire.” Hazrat Abdullah ibne Omar<sup>R</sup> also heard the tradition of field dog from Abu Huraira<sup>R</sup> and said, “I know Abu Huraira<sup>R</sup> has some fields!”

When Hazrat Mahmood Ansari<sup>R</sup>, who was a conferees of Messenger, narrated this *hadith*, “Whoever says \_\_\_\_\_ will never be thrown into hell.” Hazrat Ayub Ansari<sup>R</sup> replied, “In the name of Allah! I do not think Messenger could ever have uttered these words.” (*Sahih Bokhari—Chapter Salaat ul Nawafil*)

Taking certain traditions to be against the Holy Quran, some of the conferees of Messenger refused to even acknowledge them. For example, the tradition of Fatima bint-e-Qais, that when the divorce is completed, the woman owes nothing to her husband. It was not accepted by Hazrat Omar<sup>R</sup>, who said, “How can I accept a woman’s statement, as opposed to Quran, who I do not know, has even remembered it correctly or not?”

When Hazrat ibne Omar<sup>R</sup>, narrated the tradition of Kaleeb-e-Badar, that even the dead can listen, *Umm ul Momineen* Hazrat Aisha said, “May Allah bless ibne Omar. What I read in Quran is:

In the same way, another tradition, that the mourning of relatives is torture for the dead, was brought to the knowledge of *Ummul Momineen*, she said, “This tradition goes against the teachings of Quran. It is written therein:

‘No human shall lift another’s burden in afterlife.’

From the above examples, it appears that conferees<sup>R</sup> did not give much significance to traditions. They refused to accept them, either because they were against the Quran or against common sense. Because of these reasons the treasure of traditions was meager among the conferees. Besides that the conferees<sup>R</sup> were more involved in practical life. The holy wars, discussions and explanations on Quran and all these practical matters, kept them so busy, they hardly had any time left to sit down and gossip idly among themselves. From these observations, there is every likelihood, all those traditions attributed to names of conferees<sup>R</sup>, belong to Post-Muhammadan era, when *ahadith* narrating had developed into an art. It was not possible, at a later period, to access the activities and sayings of Messenger directly, so every *hadith* had to be verified from one of his conferees first, before being considered as authentic. Among the conferees<sup>R</sup> of Messenger, Abu Huraira<sup>R</sup> is the leading name, with whom the maximum number of *ahadith* are associated; the total figure is five thousand three hundred and seventy four—although he embraced Islam in Khyber. He had the privilege to benefit from the life of Messenger for only three years. So how come, for *ahadith* associated with Abu Huraria<sup>R</sup>, we have such a big figure. Even then, many of these *ahadith* cannot be captured by knowledge or common sense. Therefore, our conscience is not inclined to accept that these traditions could have belonged to Abu Huraria<sup>R</sup>.

After the conferees<sup>R</sup> of Messenger, we enter the period of *tabaeen*<sup>R</sup>, this includes the Caliphs of Banu Umayyad whose impact had been stamped on *Ummah* by now. Instead of every living Muslim, having volition of being unique and emancipated, he was one completely tied and shackled to personalized Umayyan government. The whole of Muslim Community was under compulsion and force, turned into a subject race. Anyone could observe an outstanding change in mental attitudes. The intensity of conviction, which existed during the conferees of

Messenger's period, was no more visible. The church and state having been divided, the leadership was now with the priests. Therefore, the art of traditions gained in momentum, but that reluctance to accept them, was still to be obliterated. Gradually, over the passage of years, by early second century *hijra*, the compilation of *ahadith* began to take shape; *hadith* narration by now was an established art. The students of *ahadith*, now started to gather around these recognized religious priests to acquire knowledge of *hadith*. When we reach the *Abbasid* period, which began in a hundred and thirty two *hijra*, there was stupendous influx of *ahadith*. All the Muslim states were flooded with *ahadith* propaganda. This was happening, since the *Caliphs* and *Ameers* became indifferent towards *Deen* and were exhibiting propensities towards being worldly wise. Having no choice, all seekers of truth were pushed towards *hadith* narrators, consequently their authority was glorified. Hence the students of glamour and glitter, began to acquire the profession of *hadith* and by narrating all kinds of *ahadith*, right or wrong, they established their authority on public. The figures of *ahadith*, now ran into hundreds and thousands. Imam Ahmed bin Hanbal<sup>R</sup> has it, the figure for correct *hadith* is over seven hundred thousands (*Tog'hee ul Nazr*) Imam Yahya bin Moeen<sup>R</sup> who is known as *Ameer ul Momineen* of *ahadith*, had twelve hundred thousand *ahadith* in his possession. In the introduction, *Sahih Bokhari* has it, out of six hundred thousand *ahadith* that Imama Bokhari<sup>R</sup> had in his possession, he has gleaned seven thousand, two hundred and seventy *ahadith* that he surmised as being genuine.

In these very *hadith* scholars, who were occupied with *ahadith* day and night, there emerged some who came to abhor this profession and believed it against their faith. I am narrating a few extracts from Hafiz ibn Abdul bur's (died *hijra* 463) concise edition of *Jama-e-Biyaan ul Ilm-o-Fazal* that states:

“Zhaq ibn Muza'hm (died *hijra* 105) harbingered, that Quran will be hung on top, until it will be covered with cobwebs. No need for it shall be required and people will act upon traditions and *ahadith*. Sulaiman bin Hya'an Azvi (died *hijra* 196) who is descendant of Abu Khalid-al-Ehmr, also says a time will come when, the manuscripts of Quran will be considered futile and people will completely indulge in *hadith* and *fiqa*. Imam Dawood Thai had quit *hadith*, somebody asked as to how long was he going to sit in the house and run away from *hadith*. He replied that he was not in favor of walking even one step that is against truth.

“When a group of *hadith* students called on Abid ul Harmain, Hazrat Fazeel bin Ayaz (died *hijra* 187), he did not allow them to enter his house. He just stuck his head out of the window, when the students after wishing greetings inquired about his welfare, he replied, “I am very well by the grace of Allah, but in big trouble from you all. Your profession is beginning to corrode religion. You people have done away with Quran. If you had begotten that Book, you would have had your peace of mind.” The students replied that they had studied and gone through the whole Book. He again advised them, “It is a kind of Book, that will keep you and your coming generations occupied.” And then recited the following *ayat*, from the Quran:

(10/57-58)

"O People! Among you, is bestoweth by your Rab, advice and peace of mind. It is guidance and mercy for *Momineen*. Tell them to rejoice on this blessing, it is far better than what you are hoarding.”

“Imam Sufyan Sauri<sup>R</sup> (died *hijra* 161) says with pathos and sadness, as to what use is this kind of knowledge. If only we could have broken even, getting neither hell or heaven. Once he also mentions, if *hadith* was good then why was it not progressing.

“Imam Sha’by said, that before he was pleased to see a *hadith* narrator, and now there is nothing more vile than his face. Once he vociferated to a group of *hadith* narrators:

Will you quit? As *hadith* stops from remembering Allah and offering our prayers. The interesting part is, besides the rest of the sentence is a translation from Quran.

“Imam Saf’yan bin Ain’iyya (died *hijra* 198) often use to say, “I wish, this *hadith* was a basket of broken glasses on my head and fell on the floor to smithereens. At least I would have finished with its dealers. Once he mentioned, whoever wants to have enmity with me, I wish Allah would make him a *hadith* narrator. At another time, he said to a group of *hadith* seekers, if Hazrat Omar<sup>R</sup> had seen us, he would have scolded everyone. Just like Imam Shay’bee, he also detested the faces of *hadith* narrators. He lived in a town called Meel Akhzar, away from the crowd of *hadith* seekers. He said if *hadith* had been good, it would have decreased instead of spreading.”

A famous poet of that period has also expressed similar views, when he said:

1. The pen is now dry after writing the fate of all creatures, that have been destined to fortune and ill-fate.
2. The time is fleeting and Allah is creating His creatures one by one.
3. I descry good things are diminishing and *hadith* is on the rise.
4. If it was good it would have diminished like other good things also. I think good is beyond it.

These are the views and opinions of *hadith* Imams and the wise of those days, who had descried the miracle and enigma of Quran. They came to know, *Hadith* was not God revealed. Most of the *hadith* scholars were so overwhelmed by the concept of *hadith* as divinely revealed, it was extremely difficult to get this out of their minds. Therefore to obliterate the thoughts of the few enlightened Imams, they spread the ideas of the blessings and greatness of *hadith*. They also fabricated pseudo *ahadith* to oppose these enlightened minds. Although *Siddique-e-Akbar* (title of Hazrat Abu Bakr<sup>R</sup>), as we have written before, while prohibiting *ahadith* had said that if anybody questions, just tell him, there is the Quran between you and me. Whatsoever it has revoked must be eschewed and whatever it permits, must be consumed. *Farooq-e-Azam* said, “The Book of Allah<sup>SWT</sup> is enough for us!” This tradition opposes those traditions that are against Quran and proves them bogus.

It was because of these contradictory traditions, the Mo’tazilla inundated upon the *hadith* writers and rightly accused them of destroying *Deen* by psuedo-ahadith. They began to call each other atehist, and so the Muslim *Ummah* was being incised into sects. Imam ibne Qutaiba wrote a book on contradicting *ahadith* and attempted to solve this issue.

The edifice of *hadith* that had been shaken by these few scholars was not difficult to bring down for the *hadith* writers. However, *hadith* became so gigantic and powerful that it was now being declared above the Quran. Imam Au’za’ee said that Quran is more dependent on *ahadith* as vice versa. Imam Yahya bin Kaseer said, that *hadith* overcomes Quran and that Quran does not prevail upon *hadith*. When the same thing was mentioned to Imam Ahmed bin Hanbal<sup>R</sup>, he replied, “I do not have the audacity to say that, although *ahadith* do explain the Quran. (quoted from *Jama e Biyaan*)

## **COMPILATION OF HADITH**

The Messenger Muhammad<sup>PBUH</sup> had clearly vociferated: “Do not have anything else dictated from me, save the Quran. If anyone of you has written any word other than Quran, you must erase it!” The *hadith* writers could not ostracize this *hadith* of Messenger, at the same time it was uprooting their foundations. Hence *hadithists* came up with a justifying rationale, saying the purpose of prohibition was meant to save Quran from being amalgamated with other literature. They reasoned, when there is no fear of Quran being merged, then narration of *hadith* is permitted. This was how, *hadith* was vindicated and the Messenger’s mandate to cease writing was prevailed upon. In spite of the fact, the Messenger had made it imperative and had given no cause for prohibition. Messenger could also have said—do not mingle Quran with *hadith* when writing the two. We do not think this reasoning of *hadithists* is cogent enough. The factual cause was what his conferees had understood, that previous civilizations, deviated from correct paths by writing biographies of their prophets.

Writing of the activities of messengers of God and especially the *ahadith* of Messenger, could have been extremely beneficial and interesting work. Since this entails a psychological dilemma, as after compiling the sayings and deeds of monumental personalities, cultures have granted these human works with divine authority and regressed the significance of actual Divine Books. This was the reason why the Messenger invoked preventive measures.

*Hadithists* have attempted to bring other traditions in support of their justificatory reasoning. For example, the tradition of Abu Huraira<sup>R</sup> that whatever he listened from the Messenger, he wrote it down. Then Abdullah bin Umru bin Aas is also said to have written down what he heard from the Messenger. In the same way, another *hadith* is quoted of a person called Abu Shah who requested the Holy Messenger if he could write down his sermon of Yemen and the Messenger conceded. But these are included in exceptions. As a general rule, the mandate was not to write down anything else besides Quran; his conferees<sup>R</sup> obeyed his words to their mettle. We also have another *hadith*, when calligrapher of revelations, Zaid bin Sabit had to go to Amir Mua’wiyya. He asked him for a *hadith*, which Zaid explained. The Amir asked a person to write it. Zaid took it from the person who had written the *hadith* and erased it. He said, it was Messenger’s orders not to write anything about him. This tradition is present in Abu Daweed’s *kitabb ul Ilm*.

In *T’zakr tul Hifaaz*, Imam Zay’bee has written Hazrat Abu Bakr<sup>R</sup> had a collection of 500 *ahadith*. One night he was very perturbed. So he had it brought out in the morning and incinerated them. Obviously, what could have been more close to truth. Actually the thought of any incorrect tradition being included in this collection, prevented his faith from preserving this collection.

In *Jama e Biyaan ul Ilm* it is written of Arwah bin Zubair, who says that Hazrat Omer<sup>R</sup> once thought of compiling the sayings and deeds of Messenger. He even consulted with the conferees about it. After their consent, he prayed to Allah<sup>SWT</sup> and performed *Istekhara* for one month. Finally he decided and told, that previous civilizations destroyed themselves, by adhering to *ahadith* of their holy prophets and forgot the Book of Allah<sup>SWT</sup>.

Caliph Hazrat Omar<sup>R</sup> was as much strict in writing *hadith* as he was in narrating it. When *ahadith*, during his caliphate gained in volume, he asked everyone to bring them to him. After incinerating all *ahadith*, he proclaimed, ‘Are you trying to make the like of Quran?’ (*quoted from Tb’qaat*) The Jews collection of their Prophet’s sayings is called Misnaath

Of the activities of various disciples<sup>R</sup>, I am writing from *Jama e Biyaan ul Ilm*, page 33:

“Abdullah bin Ye’saar said, “In a sermon Hazrat Ali<sup>R</sup> told that he took everyone present under oath, to obliterate whosoever has any *hadith*, as previous civilizations, had been annihilated, because they followed the traditions of their learned and forgot about the book of Allah<sup>SWT</sup>!”

Abu Nzra asked Hazrat Abu Saeed Khudri<sup>R</sup> if he could write the *ahadith* that he heard from his lips? He replied, “Do you intend to make manuscripts?”

Caliph Mur’waan once called Hazrat Zaid bin Sabit<sup>R</sup>. When he saw some persons writing down *ahadith*, he said it is quite possible, the tradition may not have been explained to you, in the same way as it has been written.

A collection was brought before Hazrat Abdullah bin Masood<sup>R</sup>, that contained *ahadith*. He incinerated them and said, “I beg you for the sake of Allah, whoever has any knowledge of any person in possession of *hadith*, must let me know, so that I may reach him. Those before you with Divine Books, have been annihilated because of this habit. They forgot about the Book of Allah<sup>SWT</sup>.”

Hazrat Abdullah bin Abbas<sup>R</sup> also prevented others from writing of *hadith*. He warned them that previous nations were destroyed due to these causes. The same was the situation with Hazrat Abdullah bin Omar<sup>R</sup>.

After the conferees, the *tabaeen*, for example Allqa, Musrooq, Qasim S’bee, Mansoor, Mugheera and Umsh and others, also did not consider it permissible to write *hadith*. ”

Imam Au’zaee use to say, “As long as knowledge of *hadith* was oral, it was respected. Ever since it is being written, it has lost its enlightenment and gone in the hands of ignorant.” That was precisely why, until the period of *tabaeen* there is no sign of compilation of *hadith* and besides Holy Quran, there was no other book in possession of *Ummah*. Certain things were written only for the sake of knowledge. For example, Hazrat Omar<sup>R</sup> during his caliphate period from *hijra* 99 to 11, had *ahadith* written down from Saeed bin Ibrahim and sent a formal note to Qazi Abu Bakr Khurram of Medina to write the traditions of Umruh, as I fear after her death, this knowledge will go waste. Umruh was in possession of *Um ul Momineen*, Hazrat Aisha’s traditions.

The first compiler of *hadith*, according to *Hadithists*, is Imam ibne Shahab Zuhri (died *hijra* 124). It was under their orders that he wrote the *ahadith*. He himself was not in favor of writing *ahadith*, had it not been for the compulsory orders of these caliphs. (*quoted in Jama e Biyaan ul Ilm*).

Following Imam Zuhri was Jareej from Mecca, Muhammad bin Is’haaq and Malik bin Ans from Medina, Rabi bin Sabeeh and Hamad bin Slma from Basra, Saf’yan Sauri from Kufa, Au’zaee from Syria, Ma’amir from Yemen, Hai’sm from Wasat, Jareer from Rai and Ibn ul Mubarik from Khorasan. All of them who were contemporaries, compiled books of *ahadith*. All these writers belong to second century *hijra*. As far as we know, out of all their books, there is only one book *Muta* of Imam Malik (died *hijra* 179) that is extant. Even in this book, we have three to five hundred *ahadith* in various manuscripts. It has been written, as long as Imam Malik was alive, he froze a few *ahadith* every year. (*Tog’hee ul Nazr*) That is the reason why we observe the difference in the number of *ahadith*, in its various manuscripts.

In early publications, we find the *ahadith* of the Messenger, the sayings of conferees<sup>R</sup> and declarations of *tabaeen*<sup>R</sup> are all together. The later generations began to compile the *ahadith* of Messenger separately. These compilations are named Musnid e Hind. The first Musnid was written in early third century by Abdullah bin Moosa. After him followed, Musdood Basri, Asad bin Moosa, Naeem bin hamad and others. These were followed by the next generations. For

example, Imam Ahmed bin Hanbal, Is'haaq bin Rahu'via, Uthman bin abi Shay'ba and others. In the fourth category comes Imam Bokhari<sup>R</sup> (died *hijra* 252), who attempted to compile only the genuine *ahadith*. After him, followed his student Imam Muslim Nishapuri (died *hijra* 261). Both of these scholar's books are named '*Sahiheen*.' Following these books, the writing of *ahadith* became a popular occupation among *hadithists*.

All kinds of *ahadith*, of which there is no number now, came to be written. What needs to be investigated here, is the fact, if *ahadith* were divinely ordained, then Messenger himself and his conferees, would not have categorically prohibited the writing of it. On the contrary they would have made every attempt to preserve the *ahadith*.

## **HADITH NARRATION**

No doubt the Messenger had repeatedly and emphatically stated, "Whosoever tells lies about me, is inviting hellfire." And this saying has been confirmed by so many conferees<sup>R</sup> of Messenger and only for this reason, this *hadith* has been declared authentic (*Muta'watir*). In spite of saying this, there were some people around at the time who began fabricating false *ahadith*. We read in *Tog'hee ul Nazr* (page 246), people told lies about Holy Messenger even during his lifetime. Even during the days of his conferees (after his soul departed from this earth), we find many hypocrites and atheists.

Besides the presence of hypocrites and atheists, when *ahadith* began to spread, during the times of conferees of Messenger, we do observe a mixture of doubt and falsification in them already. As is written in Sahih Muslim, "Basheer bin Ka'ab began to narrate *ahadith* in front of Hazrat ibne Abbas. He did not pay any attention. Basheer asked as to why he did not listen to him? To which he replied, "There was a time when anybody mentioned or talked about the deeds of Messenger we became all ears; ever since people have begun to prattle, we have given up listening to *hadith*."

After the period of conferees of Messenger, psuedo-narrators and narrators increased in abundance. During the times of Banu Umayyah, because of the division between the church and the state, there was no authority over *ahadith* writers. Therefore to concoct and fabricate traditions was now an open field. The Caliphs of *Umayyad* period took *ahadith* more to their advantage for power, as compared with Quran. It was they, who put in vogue the custom to vilify Hazrat Ali openly. Hundreds of counterfeit *ahadith* were written to eulogize Caliph Ameer Mu'awiyya. In the times of Abbasids, every Caliph's prediction was written in *hadith* and eulogized. So much so, they fabricated a *hadith*, that no person has any faith until and unless he does not love Hazrat Abbas and his family. (**quoted from *Tog'hee ul Nazr***) During this period *ahadith* were being produced like hot cakes and thousands adopted *hadith* writing and fabricating as their profession. Their only occupation, day and night, was to concoct *ahadith*.<sup>2</sup>

Most of these narrators, because of their oration and story-telling expertise, commanded influence on the public and were looked upon as elderly and august. The Imams of *ahadith* were no comparison to them at all. Zuhby has, in *Meezan ul Ait'adaal*, copied a statement of Shay'bee, who was in Kufa the biggest Imam of *hadith* from among *tabaeen*, where it is said,

"I was in a mosque one day for my prayers. There was a *hadith* orator in there who was delivering a sermon and saying, 'Allah<sup>SWT</sup> has created two trumpets. Each of them shall be sounded twice.' I quickly finished my prayers and told the orator to have fear of Allah<sup>SWT</sup> and cease to narrate fabricated *ahadith*. There is only the mention of one trumpet, in the Quran. He felt onerous and was angry at me, for contradicting him. Soon after everybody there jumped on me and started beating me. Until they did not make me say that Allah has created three

trumpets, they did not leave me.”

**Mulla Ali Qari** has written in '*Mauzoo'aat e Kabir*, ' there was someone telling the story of Mahmood, that he shall sit next to Messenger on a throne in the skies. Imam ibne Jareer Tibri opposed this story-teller and on the door of his house, he wrote the words, 'no one shares the throne with Allah.' The people of Baghdad, stoned his house, until his whole entrance to the door was covered with stones.

Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal<sup>R</sup> and Yahya bin Moeen<sup>R</sup>, both of them being the most honored as *hadith* Imams, once went to R'safa block in Baghdad to say their prayers. An orator in a mosque began delivering a speech that he had heard it from Ahmad bin Hanbal and Yahya bin Moeen, who heard from Ma'amr, he heard from Fut'ada, he in turn heard it from Hazrat Ans<sup>R</sup>, who heard it from the Messenger, when any man says then Allah<sup>SWT</sup> creates a bird from every word that he utters. These birds have golden beaks and wings made of Zammurad. (This story is in twenty pages) After hearing the long story, both of them looked at each other, then Moeen called the orator and asked, as to wherefrom did he hear this *hadith*? He named Yahya bin Moeen and Ahmad bin Hanbal! He told him that he was Yahya and his partner was Ahmad, and that neither of them had ever heard this tradition before. If you had to fabricate, why did you not take somebody else's name. To which he replied, he had heard that Yahya was stupid. They asked him why so? The orator said there are seventeen Ahmad Bin Hanbals and seventeen Yahya bin Moeens. What makes you think, you two are the only ones in this world? After hearing that, both of them walked away!

These speakers and orators were so influential that democrats (meaning government) took them as their leaders and listened to them. It is said, once mother of Imam Abu Hanifa<sup>R</sup> inquired from him about a *hadith* problem. When the Imam provided her with an answer, she simply refused to accept his answer, until the Imam of Kufa mosque did not confirm. After the Imam of mosque confirmed, she believed in his answer.

It has it in Meezan ul Ait'adaal, that Imam Zuhby has copied it from Jaffer bin Hajjaj, that on reaching Mosel, Muhammad bin Abdullah was explaining weird and strange *ahadith*. When scholars came to know about him, a few of them decided to go and check him. He was delivering his heated oratorios, when he saw the scholars coming towards him, he understood the purpose. Abruptly he changed the topic and concocted a tradition from Jabar and said, 'Quran is poetry of Allah, and non-creative.' (As was the custom in those days, it was a blind understanding, whosoever admitted that Quran was non-creative, became very famous and after that he was considered beyond critique) Now from the dread of people, the scholars could not dare to question him.

That is why, Dawood also gave up traditions, he said, "I am pained that when I dictate something, people come to me only to find faults in it." Ibne Mz'ra use to say, whenever you see a Sheikh running, it must be understood that *hadith* scholars are after him.

There were hundreds of *hadith* orators who were potential *hadith* fabricators and who spread those *ahadith* in their group. When these orators became less influential, they used the names of trustworthy *hadith* narrators. Some of them considered it a blessing to make *ahadith*. Some of these people went so far out, they compiled books and books, of counterfeit *ahadith*. The names of some of these books are given in *T'zagr tul Mau'zooaat*. The following are some of the causes of these falsifications, given by Allama ibne Jauzy:

1. Some people because of their carelessness, distorted the version.
2. Some scholars lost their memory after taxing their minds, they spike whatever came in their minds.
3. Many trustworthy narrators, because of old age and mental

deficiency, spoke of incorrect traditions.

4. Among them were also some, who inadvertently told incorrect traditions. When their mistakes were brought to their knowledge, these people considered it beyond their dignity to do anything about those wrong traditions.

5. The *Ujh'meez* (those people who became Muslims, although inwardly they were against Islam. Their number was not any less during the Abbasid period) made numerous counterfeit and fake *ahadith* that proved destructive to laws of Islam. In their ostensible eulogy, they were proving the *Sha'riah* incorrect, deleting the *ayat* of Quran and showing the character of Messenger as weak.

6. When religious bifurcation commenced, new sects came into existence, like Shiites, Sunnis, Qadris, Jehemy, Muz'jiya, Mo'tzilla et all. Each one of these made-up *ahadith*, that praised their own sect and was against all others.

7. Many good people also made *ahadith* with a good and holy moral in it.

8. Many thought, it was granted to attribute wise adages to Messenger and then have these traditions attested. They practically carried it through. It is written in *Tz'kara tul Mau'zoo'aat* that one *hadithist* gave up this profession in his old age and asked others to scrutinize *ahadith* before accepting them, as people include everything in *Deen* that which suits their temperament.

9. The favourites of Caliphs and Ameer, made traditions and used them as means of getting closer to top officials.

10. Professional orators and story-tellers, attributed various stories to Holy Messenger and made capitol on it.

These above mentioned are the ten main causes, because of which counterfeit and false traditions spread in the *Ummah*. Above all these were those false *ahadith*, that were made by different political parties to capture the hearts of public. These *ahadith* were then spread from East to West, sometimes openly and sometimes in a concealed manner. Because of these *ahadith* fabricators and orators, the *hadith* suffered a calamity like nobody's business. They left no department and no stone unturned where they did no fabricate *ahadith* in tune with their own desires. Imam Hanbal<sup>R</sup> says three types of books are totally useless. *Mula'hym* (predictions), *Mughazi* (warfares) and *Tuf'seer* (explanations) {*quoted from Tz'kara tul Mau'zoo'aat*} How many *ahadith* exist in these books, can be imagined from a book by one of the close associates of Imam Hanbal, Abu Zr'a, he had 140,000 *ahadith* in just his *Tuf'seer*. The height of falsification was reached when, leaving aside traditions, even fake conferees of Messenger were devised. In *Tz'kara tul Mau'zoo'aat* on page 102 we read about some of them:

- ◆ Jabeer bin Harab—Hafiz Ibne Hajar writes, it was known that he had participated in Khun'dk holy war. Amir Abdul Karim said that along with Imam Nasir, he had the privilege of seeing him in *hijra* 573.
- ◆ Abu Abdul Saqli belongs to fifth century *hijra*. It is known about him, he had the privilege of shaking hands with Holy Messenger. Hence people went only to shake hands with him too.
- ◆ Qais bin Yatm Gilani—he had a mark on his forehead, they say it was due to a kick he received from Hazrat Ali's mule. *Ahadith* are narrated about him in the beginning of sixth century *hijra*.
- ◆ Baba Rattan Hindi—It is known about him, that he participated in Hazrat Fatima's marriage. He lived in Hindustan (India) and died in *hijra* 632. (the actual

word used is *rukhsati*, I am not sure, it means marriage or departing of soul).

These alive conferees were made to stand in the open, and all kinds of traditions were spread in the *Ummah*, from their lips, It has in *Ta'kara tul Mau'zoo'aat* on page 102, Allama Afaq Shehri said, 'Although we do not trust the 'rattaniat,' nevertheless it is a cause of blessing. 'Many people, took the traditions of these fake conferees, and listed them in the source of blessing, in their compilations,' Imam Zuhby revoked all traditions of Baba Rattan, which annoyed Allama Mujjadad ud deen. Allama Safdi put his foot down and stood up against Hafiz Ibne Hijr when he refuted these conversations.

This synopsis must have given you an idea of how powerful and authoritative was the influence of fake *hadith* writers and orators. It is strange to decry, an *Ummah* that was in possession of such an enlightening book like Quran, threw itself in the dark abyss of lies and deceptions.

## **CRITIQUE ON HADITH**

When collectors compiled, they wrote whatever they could gather from the treasure of *ahadith* that was at their disposal. Only a handful of traditions were revoked, those that seemed glaringly false. (quoted from *Tog'hee ul Nazar*) These *ahadith* were testified before being compiled; in other words, they were written along with the names of all those, through which these *ahadith* had traveled to them. After this the system of critique began and also of sifting between right and false *ahadith*.

In this critique *hadith* scholars had two things in mind. The first was its title or preamble and second was the content of *hadith*. To recognize false titles of *ahadith*, these scholars formulated the following principles:

1. That is against reason or common sense.
2. That is against natural laws.
3. That is against circumstances.
4. That goes against the Holy Quran.
5. That goes against history.
6. Any traditions are attributed to Rafzis (dissenters) and Kharijites (those who drifted away from the main stream) against the Ahl-e-Bait (Family members of the Messenger)
7. That promised big rewards for minor deeds or big punishments for filmsy or negligible sins.
8. Many people are explaining the circumstances, but the tradition goes by only one name.

By these conditions, only a few *ahadith* could be sifted. Since those who fabricated *ahadith*, took care of every aspect, so as to give it genuine look. However, the door was left wide open for accommodating all types of *ahadith*. If any *hadith* was found to go against reason or Quran, it was modified and accepted.

Hence these formulations, to put a check on right or wrong *ahadith*, proved futile. The critics therefore, depended more on the contents of *ahadith*. It is also apparent, these critics were not prophets. It was not possible to sift from thousands of *hadith* narrators and counterfeits that were being produced for the last hundred or hundred and fifty years. Neither did these critics have any magic wand by means of which they could detect fake *ahadith*, that exercised tremendous influence on the power holders of those times. The source of detecting counterfeit

*ahadith* was *hadith* itself. The criterion of correct and incorrect *hadith*, was based on that tradition, that was received from different sources. During the days of conferees of Messenger, and during the period of *tabaeen*, there were very few counterfeits and fakes. For this reason, there is not much literature on it. Only Imam Shay'bee, Ibne Sireen and Saeed bin Al maseeb have argued about some conferees.

In the midst of second century *hijra*, Imam Umsh and Malik and others did begin a search on these fakes. Then the following, Mu'mr, Hasham, Wst'awhi, Au'zaee, Sufian Sauri, Ibnul Majshoon and Hamad bin Salma, after them Yahya bin Saeed ul Ktaan (died *hijra* 198) and Ibne Mehdi were confirmed Imams. But until their times the knowledge was only oral. In the third century the compilation began, and every narrator was reviewed and their biographical sketches were also collected. During this period we find two famous names, that of Imam Yahya bin Moeen<sup>R</sup> (died *hijra* 23) and Ahmad bin Hanbal<sup>R</sup> (died *hijra* 241). After these personalities this system began to spread and formed into an art, that had hundreds of Imams and thousands of books written on this topic. (*Tog'hee ul Nazr*) As these were all man made written pages, on which there can be no divine witness, hence the contents of *ahadith* came under controversy.

The *hadithists* had hard knocks, as far as outward rituals were concerned. Imam Yahya bin Saeed al Ktaan said, in matters of *ahadith*, one will find no bigger liar than these righteous scholars. Imam Muslim, writes in the introduction of his *Sahih*, that righteous are liable to speak lies inadvertently. It has it in *Tuj'hee ul Nazr*, that Ayub Sukhtiani appreciated knowledge and erudition of his neighbor and his worshipping habits; at the same time he said he would not trust him, even if he stood witness to a single seed of date. For these reasons the criterion of judgement of *ahadith* was based on its fame and popularity. Fame and popularity of even a designated Imam, by the way was questioned in those days. When we read about any Imam, from his contemporaries, we begin to have doubts in our minds. I am copying some sayings from hafiz Ibne Abdul Bur's, *Jama e Biyaan ul Ilm*, on page 196:

“When Abu Hanifa's teacher Imam Hamad bin abi Sulaiman returned from his Meccan journey, to Iraq, he told those people surrounding him, ‘O Iraqis! Thanks to Allah<sup>SWT</sup> that I met with scholars of Hijaz. Your children, and your childrens' children have more knowledge than them.’ And who were these Hijaz scholars? They were Ataa bin abi Rabah, Ta'aoos, Ak'rma, Mujahida and others were recognized scholars of Islam.

When Hamad's teacher Ibraheem Nukh'ee was mentioned in front of Imam Shay'bee, he said, ‘He asks from us at night and in the morning he grants decrees on those statements.’ When Imam Ibraheem was told as to what was being said about him, he said, ‘Shay'bee is a liar, he narrates borrowed traditions, although he did not hear a word of it.’

Imam Mughazi Muhammad bin Is'haaq has mentioned about Imam Malik. He asked for his traditions to be produced. When Imam Malik came to know about it, he said Ibne Is'haaq was a Dj'aal. Somebody inquired about the scholars of Iraq, from Imam Malik. He said, ‘They are equal to people of the Book, neither confirm them nor criticize them.’ If you want to know as to who were these scholars of Iraq, one should ask Hanifa!

Imam Hanifa once visited Imam Umsh to ask his welfare. When leaving he said, “If my coming to your house, had not been a burden on you, I would have stayed longer.” He replied, “Your living in your own house, is also a burden to me!” Imam Hanifa stepped out and said that neither his prayers nor his fasting will be accepted.

The *Hadithists*' opinions of these contemporary scholars were looked upon as mutual rivalries. For this reason there was much difference in their narrators. I do not want to involve myself in this. My sole purpose of mentioning this was, if controversies could prevail upon these contemporary Imams, then why can't we say that, other feelings and inclinations could also prevail upon these Imams. The contents of any *hadith*, we clearly observe, were not endorsed merely upon their approval. It was also based upon student teacher relationships and harmony of thoughts. Whenever there arose any controversy, even the most trustworthy was made a target of scrutiny and debate. Harris Humdani had earned a tremendous trust, who was never proved a liar; since he expressed his love for Hazrat Ali<sup>R</sup>, just for that reason, Imam Shy'bee calls him a liar. (quoted from *Jama e Biyaan ul Ilm*) And was then included with previous narrators. Many people wrote on contradictions of Imam Abu Hanifa<sup>R</sup>. Ibne abi Zoib and Abdul Aziz bin Salma, argued on Imam Malik on certain specific issues. Yahya bin Moeen himself declared Imam Sha'afi as untrustworthy. In the same way hundreds of Imams were bruised for their difference of opinions. A famous poet, named Abul Attahiya, who belonged to the period of Caliph Haroon ur Rashed, gives condolences of this state of affairs. He said:

“Islam was in tears, from the pathetic state of his scholars. The scholars still did not pay any attention to it. Majorities among these scholars are those, who declare any truth of opponent as a lie and consider their own lie, as all good. How can we expect any good about *Deen* from these and whose opinion should we trust?” In short the art of reason and arguments is all based on speculations..... It says in *Tz'kara tul Mau'zoo'aat*:

“Imam Hanbal, Ibne Mehdi and Ibne Mubarik all three declared that concerning matters in *ahadith*, they were extremely strict in distinguishing between what is permissible and prohibited in Islam. And have a soft corner in their hearts concerning *ahadith* of blessings.” *Mullah Ali Qari writes in Mau'zoo'aat e Kabir, on page 16:*

“The condition of all these *ahadith* is because of its being comprehensive; when *hadithists* examined their qualifiers, otherwise they cannot be trusted at all. As mind thinks, what was considered correct by qualifiers must be taken as intrinsically weak, and what is basically weak must be taken as true.”

For these reasons we cannot trust the contents of any *hadith*, whether it does or does not belong to the Messenger. All we can say, it is a saying the origin of which has been attributed to the Holy Messenger, which may or may not be the case, no one knows. Imam Malik often recited these words:

“We can only speculate, we do not have faith.”

The question arises, why is it necessary for the contents of any *hadith* to be correct, if the narrator of that *hadith* has been proved trustworthy. As we now know, *hadith* narrators attached trustworthy names with their names, so that it may not be called incorrect. As mentioned before, these orators had seventeen Yahya bin Moeen and seventeen Ahmad bin Hanbal. It ought to be, that first of all the contents of *hadith* must be examined, and secondly, when it becomes known, if anybody is falsely attributing a saying towards a trustworthy personality, he should never be accepted again. As will be described, with this approach we shall be involving many famous scholars and Imams in this crime. The likes of which could be Imam Hassan Basri, Mq'bool Shami, Safyan ibne Ainiyya, Ibraheem Nukhee, Malik, Ans, Dar Katni and others. So this method of critical analysis of any *hadith* has also proved futile.

All factors aside, it is against faith and against rationale. When the *Ummah* possesses the Divine Quran, in which, it clearly says (Allah completed the *Deen* of Islam

for mankind). It does not behoove that in search of a perfect system and in order to examine the extent of truth in it, we must dig the dead bodies of bygone scholars and their traditions, and bring them in the courts of arguments and rationale. Not forgetting this scrutiny is also being based on gossip and hearsay.

When Imam Yahya bin Moeen<sup>R</sup> wrote the first history of mankind, along with numerous trustworthy and authentic *ahadith*, he mentioned hundreds of traditions that were completely bogus. The scholars of those days became onerous, fired up and expressed grave annoyance. A poet of those times, Bakr bin Hamad says:

“Ibne Moeen has gossiped about other people. For which Allah<sup>SWT</sup> is going to question him. If that gossip proves incorrect, he will be heavily punished, otherwise he shall be rewarded.”

It is also said, contrary to the poet, a *hadithist* saw a dream, after Moeen had expired. In his dream he asks him as to his whereabouts. Moeen replies that Allah<sup>SWT</sup> granted him with four hundred beautiful angels (*quoted from Kitaab ul Aswah, vol. I, page 158*). In order to prove the viability of any *hadith*, it was necessary to have a standard. For that matter, no one cared for it and elongated their abracadabra into an established art. Today, they are proud to quote Dr. Sprenger On this topic, who said, “Muslims are unique for having preserved the biographies of their 500,000 Imams.” (*translation of this quote is from Urdu*).

The actual fact remains, out of these five hundred thousand names, excluding those who instantiated the principles of Islam, all the rest were busy destroying the verity of traditions. Now to do research on their names, their genealogies, who were their teachers or students, and how many of those are incorrect, is not any useful historical knowledge at all. You may say, by all means, that it is brain torture or *hadith* worship which the *Ummah* has been given in heritage.

## **PRINCIPLES OF HADITH**

When I say principles of *hadith*, I certainly do not mean its terminology or conditions. What are being communicated are its limitations, which the *ahadithist* conceal in their traditions. These limitations or laws, nearly all of them are superficial and corroded, because of these factors, *ahadith* are very weak. In this discussion, I shall only take those laws that enable us to highlight *hadith*.

The first principle is of interpreted *hadith*. In other ways, it means traditions that are attributed to Messenger are not word for word; instead these interpret only the meanings of a tradition. Words for words are not possible. As the confreres that were present in the company of Messenger, neither were they permitted to write nor did they indulge in idle gossip, whenever Holy Messenger was recollected. Actually the time to talk about Messenger came at a much later period. For this reason they were virtually helpless to write down the exact words of statements which the Messenger made. Therefore, they began to interpret his statements. The *ahadithist* did not censor, so interpreted *hadith* came in vogue (*quoted from Tuj'hee ul Nazr*). Although his certain confreres, for example Hazrat Omar was against *ahadith*. He either kept his lips closed or only uttered those words that he was sure about. We all know, that meanings change when words are substituted. This tradition of *hadith* is completely opposed to faith. Hazrat Imran bin Hazain said that if he wanted, he could also, like others, explain and talk continuously on traditions for two nights and two days. I have also heard from the Messenger Muhammad, just as they have. I am afraid I will make those mistakes, that I observe others are making (*Tuj'hee ul Nazr*).” It appears, from the very beginning, that substitute words were changing the meanings, and differences had started to creep in. The seers and reformers were

getting some lessons from this too.

With a few exceptions in the scholars of *tabaeen*, like Ibne Sreen, Malik, F'tawa and Abu Bakr Raazi, all the rest of hadithists were writing, interpreted traditions. Imam Safyan Sauri says, "If I tell you that the contents of my tradition, are the same what Holy Messenger Muhammad<sup>PBUH</sup> stated, then you must not trust me. I am only interpreting traditions (*Tuj'hee ul Nazr*)."

This statement has been given by other *hadithists* also. Qazi Badr ud deen said to his teacher Ibn e Malik, that traditions are mostly non-Arabic while the *ahadith* which are explained in his own words, are interpreted. So by what means, can we find the actual meanings of Holy Messenger's words. He just listened and said nothing. (*Tuj'hee ul Nazr*).

Abu Hayan says that it is for this reason that the grammarians, while producing the evidence have referred to the *ayats* (verses) rather the traditions. This was so because he was not sure these traditions were actually the Messenger's own words. If any tradition does preserve the same and exact words, it is only a matter of chance. (*Tuj'hee ul Nazr*).

When traditions came to be accepted as interpretations, its position and standing among sayings also changed. As it was only associated with Messenger in its meanings, it cannot be said with any certainty, how far the words went along with the meanings of that tradition. Since with only one word, the whole picture of the statement changes. Under these circumstances, it is very plain and simple, to extract any reasonable meaning from the words of a tradition is baseless, since we do not know the exact words of that tradition.

The second principle is the popularity of 'individual news.' The *ahadithist* declare it popular, once they have judged the purity and authenticity of any *hadith*, by their own standards. Provided the tradition contains only a single narrator in its history. Scholars and researchers made a pandemonium and opposed this principle. Ibraheem bin Ishmael said, *hadith* is just like presenting witness, unless it does not contain at least two narrators, it cannot be accepted. Mo'tzilla and specifically Abu Ali Jabbace also admonished seriously. *Ahadithist* did not care for all these cacophonous criticisms, otherwise that would mean slicing off a huge chunk of *hadith* treasure. Perhaps that was why, inspite of rational and philosophic orientations, Imam Ghazali<sup>R</sup> and Raazi<sup>R</sup> did not compromise with them. Although when Quran demands two witnesses on mundane commercial deals, why cannot we have the same in other matters of *Deen* also.

Their traditions speak for themselves, when Caliphs demanded witnesses on conflicting issues. Kabeesa explains that a woman called on Hazrat Abu Bakr<sup>R</sup>, asking for a share in her grandson's inheritance. He told her, he did not find any share for her in the scriptures of Allah<sup>SWT</sup> (*Tuj'hee ul Nazr*) He then asked her if she had any witness. Muhammad bin Muslma spoke up and became her witness, and enjoined her to give one-sixth of the share.

In the same way, as was the custom in those days, Abu Musa came to the door of Hazrat Omar's house and shouted. When he did not get any answer, he retreated. Meanwhile, *Farooq e Azam* came out of the house, and asked why was he going away. Abu replied that, the Holy Messenger has said, if one does not get any reply after calling three times, the visitor must retreat. Hazrat Omar<sup>R</sup> told him to bring a witness to his statement, otherwise he would be inviting trouble for himself. Abu Musa ran towards the mosque and asked a few confreres, if any of them had heard these words of Messenger, he must accompany him. One confreres countered and became Musa's witness, who was then able to get Hazrat Omar<sup>R</sup> off his back. (*Tuj'hee ul Nazr*).

In the period of confreres of Holy Messenger, it was very possible to find an eye witness. In the later phase, the status of *hadith* narrator was no more that of an eye witness. If he desired to invoke a certain belief or an act, in the *Ummah* of His Holiness Muhammad, whose figures could go into thousands or perhaps millions. And his statement had been travelling from

one confreres to another, the narrator comes under obligation to produce two witnesses, who could testify, that he was present when this tradition was being narrated. So this procedure continues, that two witnesses must be produced whenever any *hadithist* wants to write a *hadith*. Without these witnesses, by the law of court and Shar'iat, the *hadithists'* words shall not be accepted.

Now it will be interesting to observe, the huge volumes of *ahadith* treasure that is among us, there is not a single tradition that has been proven by this procedure or can it be proved? Hence, all traditions are uncertain. There could have been one kind of tradition, that one may state with certainty, and that is called '*Mutawaater.*' Hafiz ibne Hijr writes a definition of this kind of tradition in '*Tukhba tul Fiqr,*' that:

“An enormous number (of narrators), who narrate a tradition that is from starting to finish, also in huge number and it can also be felt, and it cannot be believed as a habitual lie. And that it touches the core of listeners' hearts and satisfies.”

In order for the tradition to be '*Mutawaater,*' it has to go through four conditions:

- ◆ The quantity of a tradition's different narrators has to be so enormous, it becomes impossible to accept it as a habitual lie.
- ◆ From starting till its end, the number of its narrators at every stage has to be equally enormous. If the figure decreases, even at any stage, it cannot be called '*Mutawaater.*'
- ◆ This kind of tradition has to be concrete in its foundations. The tradition cannot be in abstraction. For example, Mecca is a city. Even if the narrators of this news, are just a thousand; this news is declared convincing and *mutawaater*. On the contrary, if millions believe that Jesus is son of God, this news cannot be called *mutawaater*, as it is based on abstract conceptions.
- ◆ The moment *it is voiced, the listener becomes convinced and does not need any argument to prove its verity.*

Any *hadith* that fulfills all of these four conditions shall become *Mutawaater*. The scholars believe it cogent, and logicians have included it in convictions. But this *mutawaater hadith* does not exist. Allama ibne Salah, who inspite of being very relaxed in these matters of *hadith*, has written, that according to the above definition it is difficult to find a *mutawaater hadith*. Hafiz ibne Hijr after copying the later statement, writes it is possible to find these kind of *ahadith*. The fact is, the four *ahadith* that have been pointed at as *mutawaater*, by hadithists, are the ones that are interpreted and not word for word. (*Tog'hee ul Nazr*). Leaving aside all, they have changed the meanings of *Tawaater* and have attempted to name all popular *ahadith* as *mutawaater*. And these *ahadith* cannot be declared as authentic. If any companion or Hadithiest related a tradition which was repeated by innumerable individuals, then it no longer remains '*Mutawater*' (uninterrupted and continuous) because the number of narrators from beginning to end is no longer uniform. Those who attempt to regard the narrations of '*Sahihain*' (The two authentic books of Hadith) as uninterrupted and continuous with a sense of tremendous dedicated attachment, for example Imam Tamiyah or ibn-e-Sallah, we can go along with them as far as the continuity of their own compilers is concerned. But the period of two hundred and fifty years which elapsed between them and the Messenger (taking us back to the times of the Messenger) there were *khbr-e-wahid* only. More explicitly it may be stated that the continuous narration (*Mutawater*) is the one which is self-evidentory and which is independent of any pre-supposition, proof and precedent. There, however, is no such tradition, rather most of the

traditions are infact the ones known as *khabr-e-wahid* which according to the experts on the subject are not reliable.

## **RATIONALE OF HADITH**

*Ahadithist* have attempted to rationalize *ahadith* as part of *Deen*, and brought the *ayat* of Quran in support of it. It is necessary to answer, in order for these facts to come out in the open. Imama Shaafi (died *hijra* 204) writes:

“In the responsibilities of *Ummah*, imposed in the canons of Quran, we differentiate between those that are mundane and those that are outstanding. Some laws are considered compulsory while others are optional. You must not make these decisions, based on traditions that have been narrated by those people, most of whom you have neither met nor seen. In spite of being impressed by their confidence and being legitimate, you do not believe them of being beyond error, misunderstanding, discrepancy or mistake. Regardless of that, you take their traditions of being so true and authentic, that you divide and cut the commands of Allah<sup>SWT</sup> on the basis of those traditions.”

The answer given by Imam in short means, that it is because of these traditions, the truth and purity of *sunnat* reaches us. And *sunnat* is wise knowledge in the words of Quran ( ). At another place it quotes:

“You taketh what Rusul giveth you, and abstain from what he stops you from.” (59:7) This *ayat* of Quran, according to them, proves that *sunnat* is part of *Deen*.

The truth is, we think it's the charisma of Imam Shaafi that convinces the denial, by rationalizations. Otherwise it is hard to answer, even a portion of the question. The objection, of negater of *ahadith* as part of *Deen*, is aimed at the source of *hadith* and existence of *hadith*, that the *hadith* is ambiguous in comparison to Quran's *ayat*. However, the Quran's word of wisdom, which has been taken to mean *hadith*, is not correct. The Arabic word for wisdom , means god-like conversations. One of the characteristics of Quran is also called '*hakeem*' in Arabic, meaning that which consists of wise contents. As is scattered in various *ayat*:

“And Allah sent upon you, book and wisdom.” (4:113)

In the chapter of Bani Israel, where in Quran, in contrast with ten commandments of Torah, Allah proclaims after promulgating thirteen commandments:

“It is this wisdom, which your Rab has revealed unto you.” (17:29)

The negater, himself had objected, the wives of Messenger have been commanded in the Quran:

“Those *ayat* of Allah and wisdom, that are being recited in your houses, ought to be recalled.” (33:34)

From this we understand that wisdom is included in Quran. Otherwise who cares about reciting *ahadith*? It seems, the Imam did not care to concentrate on this, although he does believe that *ahadith* are not divinely revealed. (It is due to this reason, the term '*Ghair Mutloo*' was coined for *ahadith*. *Ghair Mutloo* means, that revelation which cannot be recited.) Moreover, when we are certain, of the wisdom that has been sent from Allah, then how can it be made part of

*hadith*? When the Holy Quran says, “ And we granted wisdom to Luqman!” Does that by any way mean, Luqman was given the *ahadith* of the Last of Messengers?

The second *ayat* that is brought in proof is: Because of this *ayat* the religious scholars, even until today say, that Quran supports *hadith*. This *ayat* has absolutely nothing, whatsoever, to do with *hadith*. It is talking about the distribution of items among *Ummah*, in peaceful times. Here the word \_\_\_\_\_ as opposed to \_\_\_\_\_ has been used by the Quran. People have misconstrued this word completely, although Quran has used this word numerous times in the book. At every place, wherever \_\_\_\_\_ appears, its meaning is ‘to give.’ Hence this reasoning is also not correct.

The third argument, according to some, comes from the chapter of *Najm*, wherein is said,

“*Rusul* does not speak on his own; it is revelation that is being sent upon him.” (53:3-4)

It is being construed from this, that each and every word that His Holiness, the Messenger uttered was revelation. Again this justification is far removed from reality. In the later *ayat*, in contrast to the denial of atheists, Quran is saying, that these scriptures came into existence through revelations that we sent. And that is Quran. When His Holiness the Great Messenger, discussed family matters with his wives, or other mundane matters that he spoke about those have nothing to do with revelations. These common conversations have never been declared as ‘revelations.’ The purpose of all opposition was Quran, it was this, that had been sent down via revelation, called ‘*Wahi*’ in Arabic. The following *ayat* throws more light,

“And this Quran has been sent upon me, through this I may aware you and also those to whom it reaches. (6:19)

At another instance it says,

“Say it! I aware you by means of this revelation.” (21:45)

Some people have divided revelation into two kinds. One is *mutloo* and the other is *ghair mutloo* or *jalee* or *khafee*. One kind is called Quran, while the other is called *hadith*. These terms are only figments of their imagination that have nothing to do with Quran. If *ahadith* were also revelation, why then were they not written as the Quran?

The fourth reason is vociferated with the following explanation. In plenty of *ayat*, they say, Allah<sup>SWT</sup> has commanded us to follow the Messenger. How can we follow, unless *ahadith* are not made part of *Deen*? Actually, this is the biggest and supreme mistake, because of which *ahadith* are claimed as *Deen*. (*This has been discussed in chapter one of this book. Tolu e Islam*) for the present, I thought it necessary to point out, that Messenger had two capacities:

- ◆ **Messenger:** To deliver the letters of Allah<sup>SWT</sup> to the people, in all honesty. It is made mandatory to have faith in Messenger and confirm him in this capacity. This messengership was terminated with his personality.
- ◆ **Leader:** To run the affairs of *Ummah* according to Quran. Conduct the affairs of administration, take decisions on legal matters, follow through on schemes, execution of collective matters like war and peace, and leading the people through on these. In all these issues, subordination and obedience to Messenger is compulsory.

The splendor of *Ummah*, that unfolded by the character and personality of Muhammad<sup>PBUH</sup>, was established for the development of all humankind. It has to remain for all times to come and

will be kept alive by the dynamic vicegerents of Holy Messenger. The canons in Quran for the obedience of Holy Messenger, are not confined to his life and times only. Those are meant for leadership, in which are included all those Caliphs who will follow Messenger Muhammad. To obey the Messenger, means obeying Allah<sup>SWT</sup>. Wherever Quran mentions or commands to follow Allah<sup>SWT</sup> and His Holy Messenger or obey Allah<sup>SWT</sup>, it means to obey the Imam of the times or obey the *Markaz e Millat* (central governing authority).

As long as Muhammad was present in the *Ummah*, it was mandatory to obey him, as that would mean obeying Allah and His Messenger (and this *Ummah* shall remain faithful to him, as to have cast its faith in him). After the Messenger, to obey his live representatives, will mean obeying Allah and His Messenger. That does not mean, that any Zaid or Bakr, whoever refers to his name, can stand up and command submission from us. This type of submission or mental attitude emerged when there was no faithful Caliph left in Islam. Usurpers grabbed the throne and enslaved the *Ummah*. The leadership of *Deen* was taken over by traditions and professional priests. Since that time, the *Ummah* has involved itself in religious conflagrations and disintegration. Otherwise the mandates of *Deen* are fulfilled by abiding by the canons of Quran and Imam of the time. The Imam shall be covered by a group of chosen executives from the *Ummah*, with whose consent and counsel, he shall run the affairs of *Ummah*. He shall be responsible for maintaining solidarity and unity in the *Ummah*.

It is necessary, at this place to clarify, that Allah<sup>SWT</sup> in Quran, has addressed the human mind. The mind has been granted the instinctive powers to conceive and perceive. The light needed for its guidance, has been preserved in this book, for all spatio-temporal dimensions. It cannot be limited to any specific time period, in contrast with traditions, that only take us back to historical periods.

Quran is an explanatory book and the revealing light. It was understood informally by its pioneer audience, meaning the confreres<sup>R</sup> of Holy Messenger. The Messenger felt very little need to explore and explain the meaning of Quran. The questions about Quran, asked by confreres<sup>R</sup> from Muhammad<sup>PBUH</sup>, according to Imam Raazi's calculation are fourteen in number, and in the tradition of Hazrat Abdullah bin Abbas<sup>R</sup>, they are twelve in number. The answers to these are present in Quran, that are narrated one by one in the *Ite'kan* of Seyyuti<sup>R</sup> and in the concluding pages of *Mukhasar Jama e Biyaan ul Ilm*. In fact anybody can count these from the Quran that are contained in the words \_\_\_\_\_ and \_\_\_\_\_.

## **QURAN AND HADITH**

Quran is the only book of faith proclaimed by Allah.

“The Messenger put his faith in, that was revealed by his Rab, and also did the *momineen*.” (2:285)

The Holy Messenger and his *Ummah* have been directed to have faith in this book.

“Say! We put our faith in Allah and that which He hath revealed to us.” (2:135)

“Say ye! I put my faith in the book, that which Allah hath revealed.” (42:15)

These kind of *ayat* in Quran are countless in number. Also, in the whole of Quran, there is no mention of any *hadith* or book other than Quran. As a matter of fact, *hadith* has been explicitly censored:

“And are those people who are buying the occupation of *hadith*, so they may deviate others from the path of Allah. And make it ludicrous. Hellfire is awaiting them.” (31:6)

This *ayat* explains three characteristics of *hadith*:

- ◆ It is used to deviate people.
- ◆ It is not based on knowledge or conviction.
- ◆ It makes Allah’s path or *Deen* ludicrous.

That is why those who associate it with music, they are not right or correct, because music implies joy and happiness, and is not a misleading phenomenon. Nor is it ridiculing Allah’s ways, neither does it has anything to do with knowledge and conviction. They are merely part of stories and narrations.

Just as Quran demands conviction, it also has practical constitutional mandates. And is written therein to follow them:

“Follow that which your Allah hath revealeth unto ye!” (6:106)

And the Messenger is directed to announce:

“Say! Follow I only that, which my Allah hath revealeth to me.” (7:203)

And it has been mandated for *Ummah* that:

“Follow which your Allah hath revealeth for ye, and follow not the knowledge hoarders.” (7:3)

The center meaning the Imam, is directed to rule according to this book:

“And make decisions based on the revelation of Allah!” (5:48)

He who does not abide by the Book is a transgressor.

“And those people, who do not decide from the Book of Allah are the transgressors” (5:47)

It is the duty of Messenger to deliver and spread the word of Quran:

“O Messenger! That which your Allah hath revealeth unto you, ye must deliver it to people. And if ye did not do so, you did not spread the message.” (5:67)

Even to those who have received the message, it says:

“Say! I warn ye by that which hath been revealeth unto me.” (21:45)

In short, the Messenger himself walks in the light of the Quran. And then runs his affairs of public. It was this light of truth that enlightened the core of his heart and has been bedazzling humanity ever since. It is only this knowledge that he spreads and warns others with, that he has, and which comforts human souls, by bringing them out of their darkness of sinful deeds.

“The marvelous Book that we have revealeth unto ye, so that ye may bring people out into light from their darkness.” (14:1)

He judged matters in public according to this:

“We hath sent unto ye the Book of Truth, as ye may understand and decide among them.” (4:105)

And this book is perfection:

“This Book hath no doubts in it!” (2:2)

It is forbidden to follow ambiguous things in *Deen*:

“Do not follow of which ye knoweth not; your sight, hearing and cognitive capabilities will be questioned.” (17:36)

As for speculations it says:

“Speculations cannot replace truth.” (53:28)

“On this earth are mostly those, that shall deviate ye from Allah’s path, if ye listen to them. They only follow illusions!”

The Jews had made a collection of their messenger’s *ahadith*. And in their belief, they shall not remain in hellfire for more than a few days. Quran says about them:

“These gossips that they have included in Deen, shall deceive them.” (3:24)

## **HADITH AND INTELLECT**

When examined rationally, we are unable to provide any kind of divine proof, on *hadith*. As they have travelled orally to us through numerous lips. For example, I heard it from Zaid, who heard it from Omar, he got it from Bakr, he listened it from Khalid, he listened it from Asghar, who listened from Akbar. So any statement, having been through so many channels will neither be knowledge nor witness, nor can it become conviction.

Let us say an individual, with whom I am acquainted, illustrates a story to me. I can decide, on the basis of my opinions that I formed about him, whether what he decided is correct or not. But he says that he heard it from Zaid, in that case, since Zaid is not known to me, I am devoid of any standard by which I could decide, how far and to what extent it is correct. Now when he says that Zaid heard it from Imran, then he also, having no standards to judge from, cannot measure the truth in the story. Therefore statements that have been transmitted orally, through so many individuals, shall lose their verity between the teller and the trusted. We can only say, those through whom the statement travelled orally were very authoritative. The confidence and trust, is not based on statements, but rather on the views of contemporaries of its narrators. The trust has now become historical in essence. We can build history, but not the structure of *Deen* upon these statements. History is only speculation, but *Deen* demands conviction, which is rarely to be found in traditions, except in cases of *mutawaater*. We just discussed about *mutawaater* traditions, that they are nowhere to be found. In fact all present *ahadith*, have travelled from one narrator to another, that is why they are called ‘*khabr e wahid*,’ or ‘individual news,’ that have yet to come to the level of conviction. Imam Ghazali<sup>R</sup> writes in his famous work on principles, on page 145, vol. I, called ‘*Al Mustasfa*,’ that:

“Individual news does not give us the benefit of conviction!”

Now individual news, is also explained on the same page:

“At this state, by individual news we mean a *hadith*, that even after touching the limits of *tawatir*, is still not convincing. For example, a *hadith* that has been explained to a group, by five or six narrators is called ‘individual news.’”

Five or six narrators have just been said as an example. Actually, until any *hadith* fulfills all the four conditions of *tawaatir* discussed above, even if it has been narrated by hundreds of people, will remain an alien to individual news traditions or *tawaatir*.

We detailed an account of *hadith*, that it was compiled in second century *hijra*, when Banu Umayyads had enslaved the Muslims. The total collections that we have with us now, cannot stand the test of verity. The *saha sitaa* or the famous six *ahadith* books, were compiled in third century *hijra*. As the Caliphs, during the Umayyads’ period, had abandoned the leadership of

true Islam that started evolving with Holy Messenger. Hence, those *ahadith* were now in the hands of different kinds of narrators, that worshipped splendor and grandeur. This in turn influenced hundreds of other worldly wise narrators of *hadith*, who began to adopt them as their profession. Out of these, disparate factions, for their own purpose, fabricated and made many *ahadith* and spread them among the *Ummah*. Much later, when critics or connoisseurs on *ahadith* took their stand, they were at a loss to find any criterion, except the words from peoples' mouths and their own opinions, to sift between good and better *ahadith*. Even those *ahadith* that have been screened by these critics, are not beyond ambiguity. Therefore, those non-Muslim scholars and critics on Islam, actually are quoting and forwarding these ambiguous *ahadith*, that in fact have all proven bogus. As we know, that all statements of *Deen* are beyond criticism and doubt. That is why, *hadith* scholars explained, in matters of *ahadith*, one must refrain from speculating. It therefore becomes incumbent upon us to measure and gauge them. As *hadith* is news, and being so, is liable of being true or false.

Moreover scholars themselves have attempted to question their verity. This makes for the dominating fact that *ahadith* are being examined by knowledge, and are therefore not counted in the values of *Deen*. So that no human may doubt His message, Allah<sup>SWT</sup> has commanded to have faith in His messengers. On the contrary, it is nowhere written in the Quran, to have faith in tradition narrators. Leaving aside traditions, there are thousands of narrators who are called trustworthy by some, while others are filing non-confidence motions against them. Since everybody is at liberty when voicing his conscience, so traditions are being criticized by knowledge, and have only historical significance. They shall never achieve the status of *Deen*.

### **THE RANK OF HADITH**

The preceding pages have revealed to us, the following facts:

- ◆ *Ahadith* came into existence, against the desires of Messenger and his confreres<sup>R</sup>. As Muhammad<sup>PBUH</sup> had emphatically stated, not to narrate traditions about him and his followers, the Caliphs<sup>R</sup> also made continuous attempts to stop the pens of *hadith* writers.
- ◆ The same was the situation of its calligraphy. The Holy Messenger strongly prohibited the writing of it. His confreres<sup>R</sup> and Caliphs<sup>R</sup> kept on incinerating and erasing the manuscripts of *Ummah* and attempted to arrest the menace of *hadith*.
- ◆ The criterion of judging right from wrong *ahadith* is also based on surmise and speculation. The scholars of rationale and criticism had no other means besides hearsay or their own speculation, by which to distinguish between true or false *hadith*. Therefore these testified *ahadith* are also based on speculations. In their books, an authentic *hadith*, has the following words in it:

“opinions prevail, the Holy Messenger must have said.....”

Nowhere, have these narrators been able to talk with conviction. As Mullah Ali Qari has said in his work called *Mau'zoo'aat*, that:

“The extent of verity in *hadith*, is understood by *ahadithist*, after looking into its narrators. Otherwise none of them are based on conviction. It appears what *ahadithist* believe to be true, is in fact false and vice versa.”

However, these *ahadith* that are declared true, are in their books ‘interpreted *hadith*,’ that have given way to numerous contradictions. And giving these *ahadith* any place next to *Deen*, disintegrated the solidarity in Muslim brotherhood and divided the *Ummah* in numerous factions. The Sunnis and Shiites both have their own kinds of *ahadith*. Every faction or sect has decorated its religion, according to traditions of his inclinations. Every sect takes the traditions of other sects to be false and its own traditions as authentic. Let me say, in the spirit of Quran, to make divisions in Islam is *shirk* (placing another god besides God):

“And do not be among *msh'reqeens*, those who divided their *Deen*.” (30:31-32)

There is every possibility of misconstruing the meanings of Quran. These misunderstandings or conflict are not about the verity of the words in Quran, but are due to non-comprehension. And these conflicts can be eradicated by further concentrating on the words of Quran, eventually

blocking those ways that bifurcate Islam.

However, the correct stature of *hadith* happens to be as history of *Deen*. It can prove beneficial to history, but to present it forward to rationalize *Deen*, will carry little meanings. The most damaging aspect of placing *hadith* next to *Deen*, caused Quran, that is full of life, to go into eclipse. Furthermore, from the days of Holy Messenger till today, the landmarks of *ahadithist*, that have remained debatable, are those that have no link with practical matters of the social fabric of *Ummah*. For example, who is greater of the two, Hazrat Abu Bakr<sup>R</sup> or Hazrat Ali<sup>R</sup>? Is Quran animate or inanimate? How does Allah descend to the lowest heavens in the later part of the night. While standing for prayers, must we fold our arms? Is it necessary, while praying in congregation, to recite 'Fatiha,' after the mullah? Should we say 'Amin,' in high volume or low? So on and so forth, they go on with these and similar kinds of questions. On the contrary if Quran had been the focus of attraction, *then Muslim Ummah would have concentrated on matters, as to how we can consolidate and fortify the central governing authority and make it more practical?* How can we search for ways and means to bring Muslim brotherhood closer to each other and the application of Quran more popular in the milieu? The natural universe, which Quran states, can all be harnessed by man. How can we possibly control its potential energies, to serve in the development and emancipation of humanity. How can we turn our faith and virtuous deeds into life giving reality, so that each individual in the *Ummah* can become a vicegerent on earth, for which the human being is being evolved and so on and so forth.

---

<sup>2</sup>Translator's Note:- (Perhaps because *hadith* was ready made material, and to concentrate on Quran needs taxing one's mind, time, energy and fear of rejection)

[Home](#)      ***Muqaam-e-Hadith*** (The Actual Status of Hadith)

by [G. A. Parwez](#)

translated by Aboo B. Rana

### **FORMALISM IN HADITH**

The Messenger of Allah, had repeatedly asserted and stressed, “Whosoever, on purpose (some say the words, ‘on purpose’, are a later addition in this tradition. Tolu-e-Islam) falsifies my statements, is inviting hellfire for himself.” This tradition has been narrated by ever so many a disciple that because of it some *hadith* authorities have declared it *Muta’water*. In spite of this warning from the Messenger, we descry there existed some who distorted and falsified *hadith* in the lifetime of the Messenger. Mulla Ali Qari, we find in ‘*Mau’zoo’at e Kabeer*’ has written:

“In a distance of two miles from Medina, someone by the name of Hyye Bani Lace, sent a matrimonial message to a woman. Mentors of the woman accepted this wedding invitation. This person wore a *hullah* (garment in Islamic folklore worn in paradise) similar to that of the Messenger, and went there, claiming the Messenger had bestowed the *hullah* to him, and he also had granted him the authority to say whatever he may please, about their women. On learning that Muhammad<sup>PBUH</sup> the Messenger had given the folks of the locality, these orders, they bowed their heads in submission. They gave this person a place to stay, and in the meantime, sent two of their men to verify, on what this man claimed himself to be. When the Messenger came to know about it, he was very displeased and extremely annoyed. He ordered the fellow to be executed and then incinerated. Upon reaching there, the Messenger’s soldiers found the guy had already died of snake bite and so they burnt his body and came back.”

Sheikh Zahir Jazai’ri writes in his book ‘*Tau’jeeh ul Nzarali ul Asul ul Asar*,’ on page 246:

“The Messenger was falsified in his very lifetime, and that there were hypocrites and heretics present in the period of his confreres.”

### **DAYS OF DISCIPLES:**

The Messenger had categorically stated:

“Do not have me dictate anything save the Quran, whosoever has written anything other than the Quran, must erase it.”

The rationale behind this, given by the scholars of religion was, the Messenger said these words, so the Quran may not become a conglomerate. But this cannot be true, as the Messenger could also have said, to write the ahadith and Quran separately. The actual purpose of his having said thus, was because people may not involve themselves in traditions. As we know, when traditions begin to prevail, there remains no discrimination between true or false.

We observe, during the reign of the first Caliph Hazrat Abu Bakr Siddiq<sup>R</sup>, there began a controversy among people, over the traditions. When it came in the knowledge of Caliph, he said after making them assemble,

“Today you all contradict the traditions, there will come a time when you all will contradict each

other even more fanatically. Therefore, do not quote the Messenger.” (*refer to Tz’kara tul Hif’aaz by Imam Zuhby*)

Hazrat Abu Bakr<sup>R</sup> also had a personal collection of 500 ahadith in Hazrat Aisha<sup>R</sup>’s possession. Thinking later, he may have inadvertently confirmed a false statement of the Messenger, he got the collection back from her and made a bonfire of it. (Ibid)

We cannot say for sure, if his whole collection was based on hearsay; as he was Messenger’s personal companion, and so had the privilege of listening to him personally. There could therefore be no doubt in his personal ahadith. Just because he had observed, the arguments over traditions with his own eyes, in his capacity as a Caliph, having forbidden everybody from writing the traditions, he did not assume it safe to leave behind any collection of traditions.

We also read in Sahih Bokhari from Abu Huraira<sup>R</sup>, that Amru bin Aas also had a collection of sayings of Messenger in his possession. We have no knowledge of it today with us, whether it vanished in thin air or was it also incinerated, like Hazrat Abu Bakr<sup>R</sup> did. All these precautions were taken due to the menace of hypocrites. What they explained, was absolutely different from what they had heard. In the period of the disciples, after the passing away of Messenger, there were also agnostics along with hypocrites in existence. It was also because of this reason, Abu Bakr<sup>R</sup> laid a prohibition on traditions. While those traditions, which he listened from the disciples, he demanded guarantors or witnesses. Later Caliph Hazrat Omar<sup>R</sup> was more strict; he banned anyone from involving themselves in traditions. In spite of these preventive measures and precautions, these traditions could not be ceased from spreading. We find that where on the one hand, we get authentic explanations, we also on the other hand get those traditions that have been fabricated. Thus, we read in Sahih Muslim, when Basheer bin Ka’ab began to explain *ahadith* in front of Hazrat Ibne Abbas<sup>R</sup>, he paid no attention to him. Basheer asked the reason for his not paying him any attention. Hazrat Abbas<sup>R</sup> replied, there was a time when they were all ears at the mention of Muhammad’s name. Ever since people began to fabricate tales and stories, they have given up on *Hadith*.

This was also the reason, the respected disciples had given up narrating *ahadith*. Ibne abi Laila asked Zaid bin Arqa’an to narrate any *hadith* he was in knowledge of. Zaid replied that he had grown old and had forgotten. Abdullah requested his father Hazrat Zubair<sup>R</sup>, to tell him of any saying of the Messenger that he knew. He also gave the same reply. Sa’ib bin Yazid says that he journeyed from Medina to Mecca with Hazrat Sa’ad bin Malik, he did not hear a single tradition from him. Imam Saabi says that he lived for one year with Hazrat Omar<sup>R</sup>. In that period he never heard any *hadith* from his lips.

### **POST DISCIPLES ERA:**

After the era of disciples, we notice a huge increase in the number of *hadith* narrators as well as fabricators. Allama Ibn Joz’ee states the following causes for the indiscriminate spread of *hadith*:

1. Some people because of their carelessness distorted the version.
2. Some scholars lost their memory with age; after taxing their minds, they spoke whatever they could remember.
3. Many trustworthy narrators, because of old age mental deficiency, spoke of incorrect traditions.
4. Among them were also some, who inadvertently told incorrect traditions. When their mistakes were brought to their knowledge, these people considered it beyond their dignity to do anything about these wrong traditions.
5. The *Aj’mees* (Those who became Muslims, though inwardly they were against Islam. Their number was not any less during the Abbasid period) made numerous counterfeit and fake *ahadith*, that proved destructive to the principles of Islam. In their ostensible eulogy, they were proving the Shar’iah incorrect, deleting the *ayaat* of Quran and portraying the character of Muhammad<sup>PBUH</sup> as weak.

6. Religious bifurcations commenced and new sects came into existence. Like Shi'ites, Sunnis, Qadris, Jehemy, Muz'jiya, Mo'tzilla et al. Each one of these made up their own *hadith*, that praised their own sect and was against all others.
7. Many good people also made *ahadith* with a good and a holy morale in it.
8. Many thought it was granted to attribute wise adages to the Messenger and then have them attested as traditions. It is written in *Tz'kara tul Mau'zoo'at* that one *hadithist* gave up this profession in his old age and cautioned others to scrutinize *ahadith* before accepting them, as people were in the habit of including everything, that which suited their temperament, in *Deen*.
9. The favorites of later Caliphs and Ameer, made traditions and used them as means of getting closer to top officials.
10. Professional orators and storytellers, attributed various stories to Messenger and made capitol on it.

These were the ten causes because of which false and fabricated *ahadith* spread among the Muslims. Above and beyond all these, the damage caused by political groups, who wanted to win the hearts of voters, by using Islam was also devastating. They made and concocted *ahadith* and spread it from east to west. And much more damage came from those who fabricated *ahadith*, to emboss their knowledge and tried to force respect, from the hearts of their people.

Sheikh Muhammad Tahir Gujrati writes in his book '*Tz'kara tul Mau'zoo'at*,' a narrator gave up *ahadith* writing in his later years of life. He also now cautioned others from accepting any *hadith* or parable. As mentioned before, they made *hadith* on every subject, that was in accord with their wishes and they could lay their hands on. In other words, making *hadith* meant to attribute the story or gospel to Muhammad<sup>PBUH</sup>.

There were others who falsified *ahadith* in broad daylight. Some made *hadith* to gain fame, and some were so naive, they actually thought, to fabricate *hadith* was an act of faith and *jihad*. We read in Biyazwi's explanations and other books, Noah bin abi Maryam eulogized and made *ahadith* on every verse of the Quran. When the authorities of those times on *hadith*, demanded verification of those gospels, he admitted and said that he had fabricated *ahadith* to attract and persuade people towards Quran. The storytellers and orators were more daring and much more blunt. (*After this the author, late Allama Jirajpuri, has copied those ahadith that were told by these orators and storytellers. Since these have been mentioned in the earlier chapter, we are therefore deleting the text here.*)

### **SUBJECTS OF AHADITH:**

The volume of narrators became so huge, that many a times their translations occupied twelve volumes. We can very well imagine the diversity of subjects that were covered by these narrators, in all these *ahadith*. Sheikh Muhammad Tahir Gujrati writes in *Tz'kara tul Mau'zoo'at*, that Jonbari, Ibne Akkasha and Muhammad bin Tameem Farabi together had made ten thousand *ahadith*. He writes about Ibne abi ul Au'jaa, when they went to execute him, he admitted of having fabricated four thousand *ahadith*. In those *ahadith* he gave religious sanctions on prohibited things and abjured those that were allowed or *hallaal*.

Leaving aside the question of traditions, we find at times, these pseudo-narrators, that are from beginning to the end, full of totally fabricated *ahadith*, have authored complete books. On page #8 in *Tz'kara tul Hifaaz* it states:

“In *Hadith* books we come across some, that contain totally fabricated *ahadith*. Among these books is one by Al Qadha'ee, and another is called *Arba'uun au Da'aniya*. We do not find a single correct *hadith* in any of them. In another book called *Wasaya Ali*, apart from its first *hadith* all the rest are concocted and homemade. The *musnid* of Ans Basri is a collection of three hundred *ahadith* that are all false and fabricated. Ibne Addi writes about Musa bin Jaffer, who wrote a book about his ancestors that was brought in the knowledge of Hazrat Ali<sup>R</sup>. It was a collection of one thousand *ahadith*. After going through the whole collection, Dar Katni declared the book as concocted, totally false and

disgraceful. He has attributed to Hazrat Ali<sup>R</sup>, traditions, on coitus and methods of copulation in the book.”

Wilmy states about Abul Fazal Jaffer bin Muhammad Hussain’s book called ‘*Al Uroos*’, as irrelevant and blasphemous. And Imam Zuhby is of the opinion, the collection of traditions of Ibne As’haaq bin Ibrahim, do not deserve any attention.

### **FALSE BOOKS ON HADITH:**

When verifications began on *ahadith*, the scholars with critical acumen, sifted through the traditions. They compiled a collection of weak *ahadith*. The famous collections among these are called:

- *Kt’aab ul Abat’eel*, by Abu Abdullah al Hussain Humadani, (died 546 hijra).
- *Al Mau’zoo’at ul Kibra*, in four volumes, by Abul Frig Abdul Hama’an Jozee, (died 597 hijra).
- *Fil Ahadith ul Mau’zooah* and \_\_\_\_\_, by Jalal uddin Sayyuti.
- *Tz’kara tul Mau’zoo’at*, by Sheikh M. Tahir, famous hadithist from Gujrat, Pakpattan, Pakistan, (died 986 hijra).
- *Risalat’aan fil Mau’zoo’at*, by Razi uddin Sa’naee, (died 652 hijra).
- *Al Fawa’yat al Majmu’ah*, by Sheikh Abu Allah Muhammad Shami (died 942 hijra).
- *Fil Ahadith ul Mau’zoo’ah*, by Imam Shaukani Yemeni, (died 1255 hijra).
- *Kt’aab ul Mughani*, by Hafiz Zia uddin Moosali (died 623 hijra).
- *Al Mau’zoo’at tul Sariyya*, by Omar bin Badar.
- *Al Kashif ul Ilahi*, by Muhammad Sandarussi, (died 1177 hijra).
- *Tz’kara tul Mau’zoo’at*, by Mulla Ali Qari (died 1014 hijra).
- *Al Lulu al Mar’sooah*, by Muhammad bin Khalil Qauqchi, (died 1305 hijra).

*Hadith* suffered so much in the hands of these narrators, that it cannot even be imagined. The *ahadith* that were attributed to Muhammad<sup>PBUH</sup>, ninety-nine percent belonged to his life in Medina that spans a length of ten years. The army of fake *hadith* makers had grown very large, they had nothing else to do but fabricate *ahadith* day in and day out. Most of these fabricators had adopted *hadith* making as their profession.

Thousands of these fake *hadith* makers made innumerable *ahadith* and spread them across continents. In this cyclone of fabrications and concoctions, we did have a few authentic *ahadith*, but it became impossible for the critics, or rather we can say, it was like looking for a needle in a haystack, to bring these genuine pearls in the limelight.

### **CRITIQUE ON HADITH:**

When the scholars on *hadith* began to sift the conglomerate of right and wrong, they had two things on their minds. The first thing was the content of *hadith* and secondly, it was its preamble. To recognize false *ahadith*, these scholars formulated the following principles:

1. That the *hadith* has false historical dates.
2. Any traditions attributed to Rafzis (dissenters) against the Messengers companions, and Kharijites (those who drifted away from the mainstream) against the Ahle-bait (family members of the Messenger.)

3. That many narrators are explaining the circumstances of this *hadith*, but in reality the tradition goes only by one name.
4. That it goes against the Quran.
5. That it is against reason or common sense.
6. That it promises huge rewards for minor deeds and huge punishments for negligible sins.
7. That it is against circumstantial evidence.

Very few fake *ahadith* could be encircled or sifted by applying these later principles. As those fabricators who made minor or small *ahadith*, always made sure, all aspects were taken care of, that could lead others to believe in its fake appearance. Just as we observe in our own times, that in spite of powerful arguments by attorneys, false witnesses get away with their fake statements. Sometimes these false witnesses have a more telling effect as compared to genuine witnesses. Therefore, these above mentioned principles, for weeding out fake *ahadith* have proved futile. The religious critics tried to work out other ways of sifting right from wrong *ahadith*, but nothing seemed to produce any concrete results. Yahya bin Saeed al Kattaan, who is considered as the father of critical acumen or arguments, is of the opinion, there can be no bigger liars than the well wishers of *ahadith*. Imam Muslim says, mistakes can be made by even the most experienced *hadithist*.

Ayub Sukhtian'ee had formed an excellent opinion about his neighbour, on his knowledge, purity and worship habits. At the same time, he was not prepared to believe in his neighbour's verdict, even on a thing as small as a date palm tree (quoted from *Tou'gee ul Nazr*, page 25). Hence the criterion for judging *hadith* was its sheer popularity or fame. Meaning, only those *ahadith* were considered authentic, that had been narrated by recognized or popular *hadithists*.

In actuality, *ahadith* entered in book form, on a mandate from Omar bin Abdul Aziz, in the beginning of second century *hijra*. Although, we do find *hadith* criticism in that period, but actual criticism, to determine fake *ahadith*, began in third century *hijra*. The critics of this later period were not without mistakes. It has it in *Tz'kara tul Mau'zoo'at* that:

“All this material can only be comprehended by *hadithists* by glancing over the deeds or credentials; otherwise nothing comes close to conviction. As to what the critics judge as accurate, may perhaps be false in its spirit and what they determine as false, could turn out to be absolutely true.”

The critical religious scholars are not prepared to consider even the most authentic of *ahadith* with conviction, they take them only as speculations. The way these critics have categorized *ahadith*, for example as solid, true, popular or weak, fake, etc., etc., it seems they can not decide with any finality. As *hadith* can only belong to two categories—it can either be true or it can be false!

However, it seems the critiques that have come down to us on *hadith*, still need to be re-evaluated. A very intensive, hard line, *hadithist*, Allama ibne Jo'zee in his book entitled, *Al Mau'zoo'at ul Kubra*, has negated most of *ahadith* of Bokhari, Muslim and Snun Ara'biah. Hafiz Ibne Hajr, who is very lenient, or we can say, has a soft corner in his heart for *ahadith*, is also doubtful on Ibne Jo'zee. He writes that Jo'zee has so many fake *ahadith* in his four volumes that a separate book on it could easily be compiled.

### **GRAVE CONSEQUENCES:**

In spite of the fact, *hadith* scholars did make an earnest attempt on saving the Muslim *ummah* from fake *ahadith*, it appears to have done little good. The influence of fictitious *ahadith* had such a strong impact on the minds and was so deep rooted that even till today, these fake *ahadith* are taken as a treasure of *Deen* of Islam. In the history of *Hadith*, we cannot find a single book that is written without counterfeit gospels, sayings and traditions. Some books, if

not completely, will mostly contain fictitious *ahadith*. For example:

- a. *Sal'aat ul Ts'beeh*—does not contain a single authentic *hadith*.
- b. *Sal'aat ul Ha'jaat*—does not contain a single authentic *hadith*.
- c. *Sal; 'aat ul Fi'heeh*—does not contain a single authentic *hadith*.

It is stated in *Tz'kara tul Mau'zoo'at*, that in some Sufi books, for example *Quwat ul Kaloob*, by Abu Talib and in the explanatory books of Salb'ee, it has been incorrectly mentioned, that 'night of values' (*Shub e Kadr*), falls in the middle of the month of *Sha'baan*. People began to read *Sal'aat ul Fi'heeh* in this night of the year. They divided themselves in groups of ten and began reciting hundred of verses each, on this night. This Night of Values (or *Shub e Bar'aat*) was given more importance, than the annual Eed day, which happens to fall after ramadaan, every year. This night was now being celebrated as an annual fair, in which they practiced and spoke so much blasphemy, that saints took to going into wilderness fearing the wrath of Allah may not happen. It was first of all practiced in 448 *hijra* in *Bait ul Muqdas*. This practice then covered the whole of Egypt and Syria. This wrong practice was impeded by righteous scholars, nevertheless, we do find it being practiced till the eight century *hijra*. Sheikh Ali bin Ibrahim wrote in one of his periodicals, the practice of bringing lights or lighting up on *Shub e Bar'aat* was initiated by Bramka, a convert into Islam. He found an alternative to appeasing his need of his former practice of fire worship. This practice later on gradually acquired the form of fire works, that eventually spread from east to west. The list of famous fake *ahadith* books, of Sufis is as following:

- I. *Zia'rat Kubr e Nabi*—not even one *hadith* is correct in it.
- II. *Fooza'yat e A'ema Ar'biah*—not even one *hadith* is correct in it.
- III. *Fooza'yat e Arab au Zu'baan e Arabi*—"ditto".
- IV. *Mau'zoo'at e Ajam au Zu'baan e Ajami*—"ditto".
- V. *Fooza'yat e Abdul e Autaar e Kutb au Ghaus*—"ditto".

We can hardly find any authentic *hadith*, in the scholars of *Mut'kalafeen* also. For example:

- I. *Fooza'yat e Sahabaa*—Mostly fake *ahadith*.
- II. *Mna'kub e Ahil'e Bait*—Mostly fake *ahadith*.
- III. *Hud'yah aur Toofah ki Fazi'lat*—Mostly fake *ahadith*.
- IV. *Nikah ki Fazi'lat aur Aurtoon ki Mu'daah*—Mostly fake *ahadith*.
- V. *Fooza'yat e Dr'ood*—Mostly fake *ahadith*.
- VI. *Mu'daah e Nabi (Salalah alay'heeh Ws'salam)*—Mostly fake *ahadith*.

Imam Ahmed bin Hanbal writes, three kinds of books have no value at all. Those are *Mughazi*, *Mulla'him* and *Tuf'seer*. Although scholars have raised objection to this statement of Hanbal, nonetheless, his statement is not dependent on any objection. Any reader shall see, that if a handful of *ahadith* do prove to be correct, we can easily count them as exceptions. All *ahadith* about the separation of *ummah* are weak in essence. For example, we read the Jews and An'sars will be divided into 72 sects. The Messenger says, his *ummah* shall be divided into 73 sects, only one among them will enter the gates of Heaven. The discrepancy of this *hadith* is very obvious, when seen in context with the historical period. That is, the 73 sects of Muslims were declared by the religious scholars already in the fourth and fifth centuries *hijra*. After that numerous sects came into existence and more sects are being created.

### **FAKE DISCIPLES:**

Although *hadith* scholars and historians together are in complete accord over the fact, the last remaining disciple of Muhammad<sup>PBUH</sup> was Hazrat Abul Fiel Amir bin Da'ilah. He passed away in 102 *hijra* in Mecca. But what we observe from the writings of fabricators is very different. They introduced new disciples, long after the first century.

These disciples were:

- I. Jabeer bin Harab—Hafiz Ibn Hajr writes about this fake disciple, that he participated in the Holy War of Khun'daq. Ameer Abdul Kareem bin N'sar says that he saw him with his own eyes in 573 *hijra* with Imam Nasir.
- II. Abu Abdulah bin Muhammad Saqli—He lived in fifth century *hijra*. He was famous for having shook hands with Messenger Muhammad<sup>PBUH</sup>. People considered it sacred to shake hands with him.
- III. Kais bin Tameem—He had a scar on his forehead. It was said about him, Hazrat Ali's mule kicked him. He lived in Gheelon. We find traditions written about him in the beginning of sixth century *hijra* (about 517 *hijra*)
- IV. Rattan Baba Hindi—He died in 632 *hijra*. It is said about him that he participated in Hazrat Fatimah's marriage. He lived in India.

They created these fake disciples of Muhammad<sup>PBUH</sup> and narrated numerous *ahadith* through them. Some considered these *ahadith* as roots and quoted them as deeds of authority. The mental state of these religious scholars was so frozen and stagnant, that when authorities on *ahadith* denied these stories, people became annoyed with them. For example, when Imam Zuh'bee declared the traditions of Baba Rattan as weak or fake, Allama Mujad Uddin Kamoos was annoyed and upset. By the same token, Allama Safdi opposed Hafiz ibn Hajr, when the latter contested these stories.

by [G. A. Parwez](#)

translated by Aboo B. Rana

## EXPLANATIONS OF QURAN THROUGH AHADITH

The utmost need for *Ahadith*, we are given to understand, is because without them, we cannot grasp the correct interpretation of Quran. The argument given in favour of this statement is so powerful that every person is convinced. The argument is, can anyone's explanation of any *ayaat* of Quran, be more correct than the explanation given by the Messenger Muhammad.... No doubt! We agree that no one's explanation of Quran can go beyond that of the Messenger. The question we must ask ourselves: (the explanation of Quran that is present in our *ahadith*) is it the actual and true rendering of Messenger's word? I am confident you will not be able to answer this question nor will you accept that it is not the explanation given by Muhammad<sup>PBUH</sup>, until and unless you do not read it with your own eyes, as to what is real *hadith*. For just this purpose we will copy from the most respected *ahadith* books, a few examples of the explanation of *ayaat* from Quran. After reading, you all can decide for yourself, whether we should attribute it to the Messenger Muhammad or not?

In the chapter of *Ah'zaab* in Quran, it is stated:

**(33:9)** *“O Believers! Do not become like those who became callous with Moses.”*

### MOSES AND ISRAELITES:

The different ways, in which the Israelites mistreated Moses<sup>PBUH</sup>, has been explained in the Quran in detail. If nothing else, the devotion and perpetual struggle of Moses<sup>PBUH</sup>, ought to have been enough reason for Israelites to be grateful to him all their lives. On the contrary, we observe, they blatantly told Moses<sup>PBUH</sup>.

(7:129)

*“We were in miserable condition before you came and we are miserable after your arrival.”*

Torah maintains a detailed account. When the Israelites saw the Egyptians following them, it states them telling Moses<sup>PBUH</sup>.

*“Was there not enough place to bury us in Egypt, that you have brought us in this deserted place? What are you doing with us? Did we not mention, while in Egypt, to let go off us, So that we may serve the Egyptians? It would have been better for us to serve the Egyptians than die in wilderness.” (Exodus 14:10-12)*

In the plains of Sinai, The Israelites got healthy victuals, still they complained to Moses<sup>PBUH</sup>:

(2:61)

*“Do we have to eat the same food every day!”*

Torrah has it:

*“The whole coterie of Israelites in this wilderness fretted and fumed on Moses<sup>PBUH</sup> and Aaron<sup>PBUH</sup>. They said, ‘we wish to God, we died in Egypt, when we were having our fill, out of pots of meat!’ (Exodus 16:3-11)*

When they were faced with a little shortage of water, they began to scream: “Why did you bring us out of Egypt, so that our children and animals may die of thirst.” (*Exodus, 7:1-3*)

While passing through a valley, these Israelites saw some people prostrating in front of a statue. They went berserk and demanded from Moses<sup>PBUH</sup> and made importunate pleas, to erect for them a similar statue. As is narrated in Quran:

(7:128)

Moses<sup>PBUH</sup> had to climb mount Sinai and did not return for quite some time. Meanwhile, the Israelites made a model of a calf and began to worship it. (20:86).

Upon entering a village, they were asked to adopt certain measures; whereas we read, that on purpose they acted on the contrary. (2:58-59).

When Moses<sup>PBUH</sup> asked them to have faith in one God, they replied:

(2:55)

*“We will not listen to what you say, until we do not see God, with our own eyes!”*

When they were asked to slaughter a cow, they made plenty of excuses, the details of which are in chapter *Baq'ra* of Quran. (Refer to 2:67). Moses<sup>PBUH</sup> told them, the sacred land has been destined for them, they only have to rise and take it. The Israelites replied, that until its inhabitants do not leave, they were not prepared to walk a single step in that direction.

(5:24)

*“You and your God can go and fight with those people. While we will wait here till then.”*

This was the attitude of Israelites towards Moses<sup>PBUH</sup>, because of which he was impelled to tell them:

(61:5)

*“O my people! Why are you so cruel to me? You know very well. I am your Messenger sent from Allah.”*

Moses<sup>PBUH</sup> was so exhausted by all this, he requested God almighty:

“My God! I have no control over anything besides my brother and my own self. So you must decide between us and these arrogant people.”

Because of these happenings among Israelites, the Quran warns the *Momineen*, as not to follow in their footsteps:

“Do not behave like Israelites. The Messenger loses nothing by your merciless acts, on the contrary, that community becomes worthless which disregards the Messenger and annoys him.”

Please take into consideration the explanations of Quran and see for yourself, how the meanings of the above mentioned *ayaat* unfold. In comparison, let us observe how our *ahadith* explain the same *ayaat*. It has in Bokhari:

1. “Abu Huraira<sup>R</sup>, while quoting the Messenger Muhammad<sup>PBUH</sup> narrates, the Messenger said, “Israelites had the custom of bathing naked in front of each other, while Moses<sup>PBUH</sup> took his baths in isolation. The Israelites gossiped among themselves, the reason Moses<sup>PBUH</sup> bathes in isolation is because he suffers from the disease of *fituk*. One day it so happened, Moses<sup>PBUH</sup> went to take a bath and put his garments on a nearby stone. The stone took away with his clothes and Moses<sup>PBUH</sup> ran after the stone saying

( ) ‘O Stone! Give me my garments, O Stone! Give me my garments.’ In the meantime, Israelites were able to take a good look at Moses<sup>PBUH</sup> and said that he did not suffer from any disease. The stone stopped moving and Moses<sup>PBUH</sup> after taking his garments, began to beat the stone.” Abu Huraira<sup>R</sup> says—The stone, by God, still has six or seven marks from the beating of Moses<sup>PBUH</sup>. (*Bokhari, Vol. I, page 76*). ([Sahih Bukhari: Kitab'ul Gusal \(Bathing\)](#))

Please peruse the above commentary carefully, think for a moment, if this can possibly be the explanation given by the Messenger, of the *ayaat* from Quran?

2. It has it in *Trimidhi*, Hazrat Ibne Abbas<sup>R</sup> while quoting Muhammad<sup>PBUH</sup> writes, “Archangel Gabriel told me, the pharaoh, when dying desired to believe in the God of Moses<sup>PBUH</sup>. And that, “I should have seen him, how he shoved mud of the ocean in pharaoh’s mouth, so that he may not announce his belief.”

First of all, let us see, if it is the duty of Gabriel to stuff mud into anybody’s mouth when the person desires to believe in God? Or someone who only wants to be blessed? We ought to know, it is written in Quran about angels:

(16:50)

“*The angels can do nothing on their own. They only obey the orders or commands of Allah.*”

It can be inferred, the act of angel Gabriel (stuffing of ocean’s mud in the mouth of pharaoh) was ordained by God. We also know from Quran the pharaoh had embraced the faith of Moses<sup>PBUH</sup>.

(10:90)

Saideth pharaoh, “I believe there is no allah, except the Allah of Israelites and I am a Muslim.”

### **PHARAOH EMBRACES THE FAITH OF ALLAH:**

According to the above-mentioned parable, God did not want that pharaoh should believe in him. In order to fulfill his desire. God appointed Gabriel to stuff the mouth of pharaoh with mud. As we read, inspite of it, pharaoh succeeded in declaring his faith in Allah. In other words (God forgive us), Allah’s plan was defeated and became a horse of another color.

Can you, even for a moment imagine, if the above explanation could belong to the Messenger?

3. Quran defines Allah as:

(57:3)

“*God is beyond the limitations of time.*”

These words are so clear and explicit, one does not have any problem in understanding them—

“He is the first and he is the last!” whereas we find in the collection of *Trimidhi*, A lengthy explanation of this *ayaat* by Abu Huraira<sup>R</sup>, the concise summary of which is:

“The Holy Messenger said that the distance between earth and sky is five hundred years of journey. And the distance between two skies is also the same. Now there are seven skies in all, the distance between the seventh sky and heaven is also five hundred years of journey. In the same way there is an earth beneath this earth, which is also five hundred years of journey. And there are seven earths. The distance between every two is also the same... After that the Messenger said, *‘He is the first and he is the last!’*”

We ask you to first read the Arabic *ayaat* and then peruse its commentary. Can it, by any means be claimed as the words of Messenger Muhammad<sup>PBUH</sup>?

In the same collection of *Trimidhi*, we read from Abu Huraira<sup>R</sup>,

“The Messenger said, ‘the distance between one sky and the other is 71 or 72 or 73 years of journey. And there are seven skies in all. The distance between any two skies is also the same number of years. On top of the seventh sky is an ocean. That is also the same number of years deep. On the ocean are seven ibexes. The distance from their hoofs to their knees is also the same number of years. On the backs of these ibexes is heaven, that is also the same amount of years in height.’”

In the first gospel of Abu Huraira<sup>R</sup>, we read in *Trimidhi*, the path from one sky to the other is five hundred years. In the same *Trimidhi* it is stated, the Messenger saying, the distance between two skies is 71 or 72 or 73 years. The glaring contradiction is very clearly obvious!

The later story, that there are seven skies, on top of the seventh sky is an ocean; on the ocean are seven ibexes. And on the backs of these ibexes is the heaven. This is an explanation of the following *ayaat* from Quran, wherein is stated:

(11:7)

In fact these words are very profound. The Quran says:

(21:30)

“*We have created every living creature from water.*”

Meaning, life initiated from water and is dependent on water also. Life cannot sustain itself without water. The intrinsic resource of life is water. The later *ayaat* therefore means, that God has absolute control over water. In other words, God has complete authority and control on the primary source of life.

This was the truth that has been explained in Quran. And we also read, narrated in *Trimidhi*, its explanation attributed to Muhammad<sup>PBUH</sup>.

Now you can decide for your self, can it be claimed, in any way, as the explanation given by the Messenger?

4. In context with ‘the story of Adam,’ it is narrated in the chapter of *Baq’ra* in Quran:

(2:31)

“*And Man was taught the knowledge of all names.*”

It is very obvious. The Arabic word ‘Adam’ symbolizes ‘mankind’ or ‘humankind.’ Humankind has been granted the capacity to grasp the knowledge of universe. Human being has also been given the freedom of choice, which is impossible to exercise without knowledge. Freedom to choose and knowledge go hand in hand.

## **EXPLANATION OF BOKHARI:**

Now let us read what Bokhari’s collection of *ahadith* has to say about this. It is written:

“Hazrat Uns<sup>R</sup> quotes the Messenger, who said, ‘On the day of judgement all Muslims will gather together and consult, as to whom they must appoint on this day, as their leader. They all will approach prophet Adam and say, he is their father. All angels were ordered to prostrate before him, he was taught the knowledge of all names. They all

will then beseech him to ask God for his mercy, so they can be saved from the torture of hell. He shall show his helplessness and bemoan his first sin (when he ate the forbidden fruit); he will shy away from Allah and direct these people to Messenger Noah<sup>PBUH</sup>. As he was the first Messenger who came from Allah, on this earth, all men will then approach him. The Messenger will show his helplessness and remembering his first sin, shall guide these people to Messenger Abraham<sup>PBUH</sup>. They all will then approach Abraham<sup>PBUH</sup>, he shall say the same and guide these people to Messenger Moses<sup>PBUH</sup>. As Allah had personally talked with Moses<sup>PBUH</sup> and had given him his commandments. Moses<sup>PBUH</sup> will also be helpless on this day and will shy away after recalling his sin. He will then direct these people to Jesus<sup>PBUH</sup>, as he is the word, the spirit and the Messenger of Allah. But he will also say the same and direct these people towards Muhammad<sup>PBUH</sup>, whose every sin has been forgiven. I shall then take all of them to Allah<sup>SWT</sup> to beseech his forgiveness and mercy. I shall request permission from Allah<sup>SWT</sup> to enter in his presence, which I shall be granted. Upon seeing Allah<sup>SWT</sup> I will go into prostration and say whatever Allah<sup>SWT</sup> puts into my head. At that time, a command (from Allah<sup>SWT</sup>) will come—O Muhammad! Lift your head and plead your case, so that your wish be granted.’ I will then lift my head and obey his command and beseech his mercy. At that moment one group will be pardoned (migrants, martyrs, pious and saintly personalities). I shall again approach Allah<sup>SWT</sup> and go into prostration and beseech his mercy. Again this time another group will be pardoned. Then the third and forth time I shall ask for mercy, until none shall remain, except those who have been forbidden by Quran and granted inferno forever.” ([Sahih Bukhari: Kitabul Tafsir](#))

In this *conte* that has been attributed towards Muhammad<sup>PBUH</sup>, there is not a single word mentioned about the knowledge of Adam. Secondly, we must notice that all prophets are repentant for their sins and do not have the courage to face God. Can this be the attitude of the Messengers of Allah<sup>SWT</sup>?

### **YOUR WIVES ARE LIKE YOUR FIELDS:**

5. It is narrated in chapter *Baq'ra* in Quran:

(2:223)

*“Your wives are similar to your fields. You can go to them as you go to your fields.”*

Again it is very obvious, the purpose of going to your wives is, when you want to sow your seed or want off springs. For this, just as a farmer sows seeds in the proper seasons, so you must also conjoin with your wives at proper time periods. The explanation of this *ayaat* in Imam ***Bokhari's Kitab ul Tafseer***, is as follows:

### **Explanation:**

***Nafi*** reports that while reading Quran, Abdullah Ibne Omar<sup>R</sup> never spoke with anybody. One day I approached him when he was reading Quran. When he reached the words \_\_\_\_\_ in chapter *Baq'ra* in Quran, he asked me if I knew as to when this *ayaat* was revealed. I replied in the negative. He then explained the glory of its revelation and resumed his recitation of Quran again. Abdul Samad has said that we receive a tradition from Ibne Omar<sup>R</sup> that says this *ayaat* was revealed, because some men were copulating with women. ***Jabar<sup>R</sup>*** narrates the Jews, who said; whosoever copulates with his wife from backside shall have cross-eyed progeny. It is in those days this *ayaat* was revealed, proving the Jews of being wrong. Meaning, women can be engaged in any way one wants, in matters of copulation.” ([Sahih Bukhari: Kitab'ul Tafsir](#))

This was taken from the collection of Imam Bokhari. Let us read, what Allama Badr ud Din Ainee and

Hafiz Ibne Hijr Asqalani have to say on this topic.

### **Explanation of This Hadith:**

Allama Ainee has first copied the hadith from Bokhari in the following manner:

[1]

God's order on the subject \_\_\_\_\_ was explained to us by Isaee, who was told by Nadr Bin Shameel, who in turn was told by Aun to tell Nafay that, 'until Omar<sup>R</sup> did not finish reading Quran he never spoke with anybody. One day I sat with him with a Quran, when he was reading chapter *Baq'ra*. He then asked me, if I knew at what period in time, this *ayaat* was revealed? When I replied in the negative, he then explained its context to me. The narrator then moves on and quotes Abdul Samad, that he was told by his father, who was told by Ayub (Sukhtiani), who was told by Nafay, who was told by Ibn Omar<sup>R</sup> that the explanation of \_\_\_\_\_ is that you can copulate in.... with your wife. This has also been explained by Muhammad Bin Yahya Ibn Saeed, from his father, who got it from Obaidullah, who got it from Nafay, who got it from Ibn Omar<sup>R</sup>.

After all this Allama Ainee further writes:

In the original book of Bokhari, there is a blank space. Then he goes on to indicate that it means the private part of your wife, but this is not correct.

This tradition is explained by Ibn Jareer, who is told by Abu Qulaba?, who has copied from Abdul Samad Bin Abdul Warris, who was told by his father, who uses the word \_\_\_\_\_ (To copulate with your wife in Anus) in his explanation. (*Umdah Tul Qari*).

### **COPULATION IN ANUS:**

This was the elucidation given by Allama Ainee. Now let us read what ***Hafiz Ibn Hajr Asqalani***, has to say about this tradition:

"Ibnul Arabi has copied in Siraj ul Mureed, that Bokhari has copied this *hadith* in Tafseer and said \_\_\_\_\_ after these words. A blank space has been left. This problem is very famous. Muhammad Bin Shaban has authored a complete book on this topic. And Muhammad Bin Shahnoon? Has proved it in his article, the *hadith* of Ibn Omar<sup>R</sup> is about copulating with woman in the Anus.

Mazri says, that priests are divided on this issue. Those who believe this tradition as being *Halal*. Have taken the above-mentioned *ayaat* for their support. Those who are against it say the concerned *ayaat* was revealed to defeat the statement of Jews. As has been quoted by Jabar."

### **FAITH UL BARI:**

As can be noticed, Hafiz Ibn Hajr proves the contradiction about sex with woman from the anul side. Some narrators believe in this tradition while others do not.

Now let us read what Allama Ainee further says on this topic. He writes:

### **NOTION OF IMAM MALIK:**

“Ibnul Arabi has written in his book entitled, *Ahkaam ul Quran* that majority agrees with this tradition. All statements on this subject have been collected by Ibn e Shaban in his book called, *Jamma ul Niswan*, in which he has attributed its justifications towards majority of disciples of the Messenger and *Tabaeen*. He has found justifications from many traditions that are attributed to Imam Malik<sup>R</sup>. But Malik’s followers deny this tradition, because of its evil and perverted habit. Imam Malik is also adamant that this tradition cannot be proved wrong, just because people do not believe in it.

Muhammad Bin Sa’ad who got it from Abu Sulaiman, who copied from *Zajafi*?, that he was present in the company of Imam Malik Bin Uns<sup>R</sup>. When he was questioned about sex with woman by Anus, he thumped his hand on his head, saying that he had just finished his bath, after getting over with it. In the same book Ibnul Qasim has copied that Imam Malik was unable to find any human, whom he could claim as his mentor, concerning this tradition. After that he quotes this *ayaat* read by Imam Malik<sup>R</sup>:

Malik<sup>R</sup> said, “What more can be said on this, as it is already very obvious.” He did not doubt in the least. As far as Imam Sha’afi’s religion was concerned, we heard Imam Tahawi<sup>R</sup> saying, that he got it from Muhammad Ibnul Hukaam, who heard it from Imam Sha’afi saying that there is no *hadith* from Messenger that goes for or against this notion. It is therefore speculated, that it is allowed (*Umda’tul Qari fi Sharah’ Bukhari, Ainee: Hadith # 1634: bab # 601*).

In other words, Imam Malik<sup>R</sup> was convinced of its being true and he himself practiced it also and Imam Sha’afi was speculating in favour of it. **Haifz Ibn Hajr** has also copied a polemical dialogue of Imam Sha’afi on this topic, with Imam Azam’s student named Imam Muhammad<sup>R</sup>.

He writes:

Imam Hakim has written about Imam Sha’afi<sup>R</sup>, in the manner of Ibn Hakum, of his famous polemical dialogues with Imam Muhammad Ibnul Hassan<sup>R</sup> on this topic. Ibnul Hassan<sup>R</sup> reasoned against Imam Sha’afi, saying that the word-cultivating field can only mean the vagina. Imam Sha’afi said that this means, besides vagina, all other places are forbidden. Ibnul Hassan accepted this rationale, that besides vagina all other places are not allowed. Imam Sha’afi further questioned, what if someone had sex between the ankles of his wife or between her elbows, would that be considered a fertile field? Imam Muhammad<sup>R</sup> said, those areas cannot be fertile field—Imam Sha’afi then asks the Imam, if he considered that type of sex as *‘haraam’*? Imam Muhammad<sup>R</sup> said, “No.” Imam Sha’afi then asked his opponent, as to how can he rationalize about something, of which he himself is not convinced? Imam Hakum states that perhaps Imam Sha’afi may have believed in this tradition in his early years, as we notice, that he gave clarifications against it in his later years. (*Fatih ul Bari fi Sharah Bukhari, Ibn Hajr: Hadith # 1634, Bab # 601*).

You all have read the concerning *ayaat* of Quran. You have also gone through the (inhuman and degrading) explanations of this *ayaat* as they exist unfortunately in Bokhari’s collection. You have even glanced on the commentaries by different religious scholars, about this *hadith*. Now we leave it to you to decide if these could be considered the words coming from an honorable Messenger of Allah<sup>SWT</sup>? And if Quran could be, by any ways, understood from these kinds of *ahadith*?

### **DO NOT FORBID WHAT HAS BEEN MADE HALAL:**

It is narrated in chapter Mu’aida of Quran:

(5:87)

“O ye believers! Those things that have been made halal by Allah; do not waste them.”

It clearly means, not to restrict your self of self-imposed limitations imitations. Only those boundaries must remain, that has been demarcated by God only. Let us read, what is written in *Kitab ul Tafseer* of Bokhari on this. It says:

“Abdullah Bin Masood states that they accompanied the Messenger in *Jihad* (Holy war) and we did not have women with us. As we could not tolerate this separation from women because of gusto and heat. They asked the Messenger’s permission if they could castrate themselves. The Messenger at first forbade them, then later on he permitted them to enter into temporary matrimony with the consent of a woman. So they could be saved from castration and also because no one will be able to cast an evil glance. After granting permission, the Messenger read the above mentioned *ayaat* of Quran.” ([Sahih Bukhari: Kitab'ul Tafsir](#))

### **MUTA:**

By this above tradition we observe, the convention of Muta because permissible. In *Kitab ul Nikha* of Bokhari we read:

“Salma Bin Akku says, they were on a Holy war path accompanying the Messenger (on the war of Hunain). Messenger, one day, came to them and said that *Muta* was permitted. They could do *Muta*.” (*Translation, Vol.III, page 61*) ([Sahih Muslim: Kitab'ul Nikah](#))

Another tradition has it:

“Salma Bin Akku quotes the Messenger saying, “Whichever man and woman feels comfortable with each other can indulge in liberties for three nights. They are free to increase or decrease their time limit.” (ibid) ([Sahih Bukhari: Kitab'ul Nikah](#))

### **DETAILS OF MUTA:**

Let us read more on this, as narrated in Sahih Muslim:

A tradition comes from *Subra Jehny?*, when his holiness gave permission to do *Muta*. “Me and another person went to a woman in *Bani Amir* together. When we disclosed our desire, she wanted to know her compensation. We both said that we would give our shawls. My partner’s shawl was better than mine, But I looked younger than him. When the woman looked at our shawls, she was inclined towards him, and when she looked at our bodies, she came towards me. Finally she decided that me and my shawl would be good enough for her. And so I stayed with her for three days.” ([Sahih Muslim: Kitab'ul Nikah](#))

Again, you must decide, if these stories can ever come from the honorable lips of Messenger Muhammad<sup>PBUH</sup>.

6. In chapter Ma’aida of Quran, it is written, on the day of judgment, Allah<sup>SWT</sup> shall ask Messenger Jesus<sup>PBUH</sup>, if he said to his people to worship him and his mother? Jesus<sup>PBUH</sup> will reply, “Heaven forbid! How can I dare say such a thing. I only advised and urged the people to believe in one God.

(5:117)

*“As long as I was among them, I supervised their activities (so they may not take wrong paths). But when I left them, then the responsibility fell upon you. Whatever they did in my absence, I cannot be held responsible for it.”*

### **Companions of the Messenger became Murted:**

Every word of it is so obvious and clear, but the tradition being brought forward from Bokhari’s collection cannot be overlooked also:

Ibne Abbas<sup>R</sup> has it that the Messenger delivered a sermon, “O people! You all will be risen towards Allah naked feet, naked body and without circumcision.” Messenger then recited the following *ayaat*:

(2:104)

*“We shall bring you up in the same condition, on doomsday, in which you were born. This is our promise, and it is up to us to complete this task.”*

Messenger then said, “Abraham will be the first one to be covered with clothes. Be warned few people from my *Ummat* shall be brought forth and escorted by angels towards hell. At that moment I shall say to Allah that they are my companions. And a voice will boom (from Allah), telling that I do not know, what they did after I left them. At that moment I shall also repeat the words of Jesus<sup>PBUH</sup>.

The voice from Allah will boom again, saying that these people became infidels, soon after you separated from them.” ([Sahih Bukhari: Kitab'ul Tafsir](#))

This is being written about those (God forgive us) disciples, who fought wars and gave every ounce of their blood for the sake of Allah. It cannot even be imagined, the above story can ever be the words of the Messenger!

7. It has it in the chapter of Joseph in Quran, when the reigning king heard the interpretation of his dream by Joseph<sup>PBUH</sup>, he was very enthralled by his knowledge. And so he sent for Joseph<sup>PBUH</sup>.

### **JOSEPH’S CHARACTER:**

First of all, who does not want to get out of jail cells? All the more reason, when the captive individual happens to be innocent and the king desires to reward him/her. Under normal circumstances anybody would fall for such a call. But the characters of prophets and Messengers are above and beyond all these small temptations. Joseph’s reply to the king’s courier was, that he had no desire to come out of the cell in this manner. Joseph told the courier to go back to the king and ask, if the case in which he was involved, has been investigated into and finalized. If the king, only after re-investigation, concludes that he was innocent, only in that case will he be eager to come out of jail:

(12:50)

This was the demonstration of the high and mighty character of prophets. But what we read in the explanation of Bokhari is:

Looking at the time period of Joseph<sup>PBUH</sup> in jail, the Messenger said, “If I was in his place, I would have opted to come out of the cell!” ([Sahih Bukhari: Book of Prophets](#))

It is brazenly obvious that this tradition is a blatant outcry of some Jew, who only wanted to elevate the character of their prophet (Joseph<sup>PBUH</sup>) above and beyond that of (God forgive us) Muhammad<sup>PBUH</sup>.

And this tradition is also attributed to the Messenger.

Numerous amount of these kind of *ahadith* can be provided from *Saha Sitta* (the six most honored *ahadith* collections). But we shall suffice with only the above mentioned few examples, so that you all may surmise as to what is written in our *ahadith* books. At the same time our archaic believers are adamant, that we must believe these books as the most authentic and true words of the Messenger.

We will conclude this discussion with a tradition from the famous Trimidhi. After examining this heart rending tradition, just think, if we can lift our eyes up with dignity and honour. It has it in the chapter of *Hijr*:

(15:24-25)

*“We know those who came before and those who will come after you. Your god will gather them together. He is wise, He is knowledge.”*

It is absolutely clear, that God will bring together all those people who have gone by and those that belong to future. Another *ayaat* having a similar meaning is narrated:

(56:48-51)

*“Say! Those that came before and those who came after, on the appointed day, shall be together.”*

Now let us read the commentary of the above *ayaat* of chapter *Hijr*:

It has it in *Trimidhi*, that Ibne Abbas<sup>R</sup> narrates,

*“In the Mosque, there came a fair belle every day to pray after the Messenger. Among the disciples, some of them moved behind her, so as not to be distracted. While others moved ahead, and when bent forward in prayers, took a peek at her through their armpits.*

*Because of this, Allah<sup>SWT</sup> brought down this revelation, that he was aware of those ahead and those who were behind.”*

We do not think, any kind of comments are necessary on this. Traditions of this sort, speak out for themselves, that these are nothing but fabricated lies. These traditions have been concocted by conspirators of Islam and attributed to Muhammad<sup>PBUH</sup>. Unfortunately, our clergymen are obstinate, as not only we have to believe in these myths, we also must believe, these were revelations brought by archangel Gabriel upon Muhammad<sup>PBUH</sup>.

These clergymen are in the strong notion that:

*“Gabriel came with Quran and Sunnah both. And taught Messenger the Sunnah just like the Quran.” (Quoted from Jamaat-e-Islami ka Nazariya-e-Hadith. Page 60 from Sheikh-ul-Hadith, Maulana Muhammad Ismail.)*

Meaning these traditions were God sent to Messenger through archangel Gabriel.

[1]

[This *ayaat* is usually translated that your women are your fields. You can go to them however way you please. Whereas the correct translation is that your women are your fields, you can go to them whenever you place] (Bokhari, Kitab ul Tafseer, page 649, Mujtabae).

[Home](#)      ***Muqaam-e-Hadith*** (The Actual Status of Hadith)

by [G. A. Parwez](#)

translated by [Aboo B. Rana](#)

## Mut'a and Ahadith

Among the shiites, is a panacea to one of the most difficult predicaments, that goes by the name of “mut’aa.” It is a nuptial agreement between a consenting male and a female for the purpose of sexual gratification – for which the female is reimbursed afterwards. Even if it is only a one time sexual indulgence, the contract is automatically abrogated after the agreed time period. The adherents of sunni sect do not believe in mut’aa.

In our ideation of sunnis or shiites, it is made explicit that formation of sects is considered shirk (belief in gods other than one God). When the Holy Messenger of Allah established the system of Islam based on pure principles of Quran, there was no existence of any sect at all. Therefore we do not belong to any sect per se. Be it known to our respected reader, we are not concerned here nor are we debating on the issue of sunni or shiite belief on this subject. Our purpose for bringing up the issue of mut’aa here is, that we said the sunnis do not believe in mut’aa as for them the difference between this contract and promiscuity is only in language. In reality, both from our point of view are indulging in illicit sex. The sunni can never even imagine that the Holy Messenger (God forgive us) would pass orders on mut’aa or that his disciples would indulge in these kinds of acts.

At the same time we want you to read what the sunni explanations of Quran and ahadith collections have to say on this issue. Shiite activist, respected Ali Naqvi authors a periodical called ‘Mut’aa and Islam.’ In that he has quoted sunni ahadith from the beginning to the end, only to prove that mut’aa was sanctioned by the Holy Messenger MuhammadPBUH himself. The cohorts of the Holy Messenger indulged in this activity along with the ‘tabaen’; the learned scholars of Mecca have been permissive on this issue. We want to make it clear, that we do not believe in these ahadith, not because they go against the ideation of sunnis but in our erudition it goes against the teachings of Islam. As the Holy Messenger shall never act or say anything that goes against Quran, so this hadith is not tangible as far as we are concerned. Nevertheless, these parables are very much present in the sunni ahadith books which they deem as almost the last word. Let us read these, in which the Holy Messenger himself (Allah forgive us) has given permission to his august cohortsR.

The most acknowledged book among the sunnis is the respected Bukhari Hadith. It is called the most pure book after the book of Allah. It is written in the publication of Curzon Gazette Press Delhi, that:

“It is narrated by 'Abdullah bin Mas'ud that when they went with the Holy Messenger on warpaths they were not equipped with anything to gratify their concupiscence. We enquired from the Holy Messenger, would it not be better if we could castrate ourselves? But the Messenger prohibited us from doing so. Later on he permitted us to make mut’aa (nuptial contract) and reimburse with cloth afterwards.” (vol. II, page 759 and Egyptian edition vol. III, page 146)

After Bukhari Hadith, the second most known hadith is Muslim. This hadith has adopted three methods in Muslim. At the first time, it uses the words .

Meaning the Holy Messenger, for a limited time period, in lieu of cloth, permitted to enter into this nuptial contract. On another occasion, this permission was not exclusive only for war times. (Sahih Muslim, Mujtabai Delhi, vol.I)

Juma ul Fawahid, by Sheikh Muhammad bin Muhammad Sulaiman Soosy Maliki, (Merat Publication, page 222) has the same hadith. The only difference was Hazrat Ibne Masood said that when we went on wars we were not accompanied by women. Hence the Holy Messenger permitted us to enter into mut’aa for a limited time period.

{The question here comes to mind, if there were no women in the battle field or war days, then who were those women, and where did they appear from, for mut'aa in the deserts? And secondly who were those respectable wives, who were taking care of the injured, like giving them water, and other aids, during war times? How can the hadith writers say there were no women?}

This parable on the same topic will be found in Imam Abi Abdullah bin Idrees Shaafi's, Egypt edition, page 145. And also in Sheikh ul Islam, Imam Ibe Tameema's 'Muntaki ul Alakhbar' where this hadith is unanimously agreed. Kanzul Am'aal (Geem #8, page295) wrote that Imam Tibri has excluded this in 'Tahzeeb ul Asaar.'

In Sahih Bokhari (Delhi edition, vol II, page 767 and Egypt edition vol. III page 150) it is written:

It is stated by Jaabar bin Abdullah and Salma bin Alakuu That we were in a platoon, when the Holy Messenger's special officer came to us and informed us that we are given the permission of mut'aa (nuptial contract). ([Sahih Muslim: Kitab'ul Nikah](#))

Sahih Muslim states the words of this tradition that the speaker of Holy Messenger came and announced that we were permitted to enter into mut'aa (nuptial contract).(page #450). In another hadith (page #451) it is written that the Holy Messenger himself came and gave his permission to enter into mut'aa. The third hadith of Bukhari (Delhi edition, vol. I, page #767 and in Egyptian edition, page #150) states as such:

“Salma bin Akku Says that the Holy Messenger said, we could make a nuptial contract upto three evenings with a female. If it is so desired, one can extend this period or revoke the agreement.” ([Sahih Bukhari: Kitab'ul Nikah](#))

In Sahih Muslim it is written (Delhi edition, page 451) that the Holy Messenger permitted three days period for mut'aa, in the year of Autaas war. This same hadith is also in Juma ul Fuwahid, Sunun, Daar Katni and Kanzul Am'aal Let us read its explanation in Sahih Muslim wherein it is said,

“Sabra Jehny says, when the Holy Messenger granted permission for mut'aa, I went with another person Bani Amir to a woman and disclosed our desire. She enquired about her reimbursement. I told her that I am willing to give my chaddar (cloth for wrapping around the body). Bani Amir told her the same. His cloth was better than mine, but I was younger than him. When that woman looked at his cloth she advanced towards him but when she looked at me she became inclined towards me. Finally she decided that me and my cloth will be enough for her. So I stayed with her for three days.” (*Delhi edition, page 151*). ([Sahih Muslim: Kitab'ul Nikah](#))

Now, you just picture in your mind, the character traits of cohorts of the Holy Messenger as are being described by Imam Nishapuri (Allah save us and keep us away from this evil).”

Subra's tradition in Kanzul Am'aal states that on the auspicious occasion of Hajj:

“When we made our holy circulations around Ka'aba and made our runs between Suff'aa and Mur'waa, then the Holy Messenger gave us permission of mut'aa with women. We had to go back to the Messenger to let him know that women were not prepared for mut'aa until there was a time limit agreed upon. So the Holy Messenger told us to decide on a time limit before making mut'aa.” (*Kanz ul Am'aal: vol. 8, page #295, published Haiderabad*)

It is hoped these bizarre ahadith have not corroded your thoughts. I am writing this in the hope that you are still capable of deciding on how our ahadith narrators are telling us of the teachings of MuhammadPBUH, on the occasion of his last Hajj before he passed away.

The staunch upholders of sunnah do say in their defence, that Holy Messenger did give permission for this nuptial

agreement, but later on imposed a ban on it. And by saying so, they think they have removed the cancer that is eating up Islam. These naïve hearts fail to understand the simple fact, that what kind of an opinion is being formed of such a great and Holy Messenger MuhammadPBUH, who in his last days of life is permitting this kind of nuptial agreement?

This is another interesting dilemma that where we find numerous ahadith on the abandoning of mut'aa, we also see so much of an addle, of a thinking mind that is dragged deeper in this perplexed state of affairs. For example we read in *Kanz ul Am'aal (vol. 8, page #295)* the same narrator Subra Jehny That we have quoted above, about Holy Messenger's permission on mut'aa, on the occasion of Last Good Friday, states three opposite ahadith. In one of these is, that the Holy Messenger imposed a ban on mut'aa on the day of Khyber. In the second hadith it says, he prohibited mut'aa on the day of victory over Mecca and in the last tradition, a ban is put on mut'aa on the Last Good Friday of Ramadan of the Holy Messenger's life.

We also come across the Holy Messenger's prohibition on mut'aa in *Muslim Nawawi (Vol. I, page #450)* by Is'haaq bin Rashid, in the war days of Tabuuk. I hope the respected reader is noticing how this peaceful dream is being smashed to smithereens. Mut'aa that has been banned more than once and allowed one too many times, was even included by Imam Muslim in his titles such as:

(The matrimony chapter has details on the permission of mut'aa and its abrogation. Permitting again before being revoked. Finally it was revoked for all times, so as to maintain some human respect.)

At least! We should be thankful for that, when it was revoked for the last and the final time by the Holy Messenger and forever... No! Hold on! In the same *Sahih Muslim* (in which it is written the final abandoning of mut'aa), when we flip ahead through the pages, we read:

“At'aa has it that when Jaabar bin Abdullah came to Mecca to perform Umrah, we went to greet him. Different people put various questions to him. When there was a question put to him on mut'aa, he told us, ‘Ah Yes! During Holy Messenger's days, Hazrat Abu Bakr's and Hazrat Omar's caliphate we entered into mut'aa (nuptial contracts).” ([Sahih Muslim: Kitab'ul Nikah](#))

The same mut'aa that was banned forever by the holy Messenger, is now being continued by his faithful cohorts even until the days of OmarR. (O Allah forgive us) In the same *Muslim* book there is another quote that:

“Abul Zubair explains that I have heard Jaabir bin Abdullah saying, that they made a nuptial agreement in lieu of a handful of flour, during the days of the Holy Messenger and Abu BakrR. We continued upto the times of Hazrat OmarR when he put a ban after the incident of Omar bin Hareece.” ([Sahih Muslim: Kitab'ul Nikah](#))

In *Kanzul Amaal* we find, that mut'aa was reimbursed for a cup of sut'too (substance extracted from wheat or barley). This is also confirmed in *Shar e Bukhari*, (vol.9, page 138). *Kanzul Am'aal* also gives details on this and states:

“Ummay Abdullah binnat e Fatiha has it that a man came from Syria and stayed at their residence. He said that he was having trouble without a woman and requested us to search a woman for him, with which he could enter into mut'aa. She says that she gave him an address of a woman with whom he made this nuptial contract in front of two witnesses. He stayed with her for a long time, after which he went back to Syria. Someone brought it to the notice of Hazrat OmarR. After enquiring, OmarR sent for me. I told Hazrat OmarR that this was a true incident. He said to inform him when the man comes the next time. When he arrived, I informed Hazrat OmarR about him. OmarR called for him and questioned as to what had he done? He stated that he had done mut'aa in the times of Holy Messenger, and nobody checked him from this. After Holy Messenger passed away I did the same in the days of Abu BakrR. He also did not stop me. Now, it has been going on in his times also and he was not stopped by him. Then Hazrat OmarR replied, “I swear upon that God, in whose possession is my soul, if I had imposed a ban earlier I would have stoned you to death by now. Now I order you to separate,

so that a marriage contract could be distinguished from concupiscence.”

Uptil now we have been reading about the male cohorts of Messenger MuhammadPBUH. In the above ahadith, we also read a female disciple of the Messenger, and how she has proved helpful in this ‘grateful deed’ of mut’aa(O my Allah, forgive me). Before reading further, I want to ask my respectful reader to close his chaste eyes and tell his honour to go away. As we open the life of one of our jewels, who was daughter of Abu BakrR, wife of Hazrat ZubairR and sister of Hazrat Aysha Siddiqar.... She remains Hazrat AasmaR (razi ullah tallah unha). It is written therein: (copying of blasphemy, is blasphemy itself. O Allah! forgive us for our sins)

Hazrat AasmaR says that during the times of Messenger of Allah, mut’aa was made to them.

That is the reason Hazrat Aasma’s son Arwa told Hazrat Ibne Abbas, “Do you not fear Allah, when you permit mut’aa.” And Hazrat AbbasR replied, “Why do you not ask your mother.” (*Zad ul Muad Ibn Keem, vol.1, page 219*)

Anyhow, whether the Holy Messenger, as we now know, had imposed a ban or not, but Hazrat OmarR did impose one finally. Hence in *Zad ul Muad* (Ibne Keem, vol.1, page 243) it states that Hazrat OmarR said, “There were two mut’aa that were legal during the days of the Messenger. One was of Hajj (this T’mut’aa of Hajj we could not understand. Tolu e Islam) and the other mut’aa was with women. And I am imposing a ban on both.” This must have relieved everyone that after all, as they say, better late than never, this filth has been brought to an end. We also know, that a conspiracy that is not a success cannot be called a conspiracy! So this episode had to continue, in order to succeed. In *Fatih ul Bari* (Shar e Bukhari, vol.9, page 138) it states:

Ibne Abdul Bar says that all followers of Ibne AbbasR were from Yemen and Mecca and consented to mut’aa. Ibne Hazim says that the whole group of ‘tabaeen’, including Ta’uus, Saeed bin Jaabar, At’aa and the elite of Mecca were in accord with mut’aa.

These are those sacred ahadith and the famous quotes are of religious scholars about (according to the ahadith quoted above) mut’aa that Caliph OmarR proclaimed was nothing short of addictive sexual gratification. We do not want to involve ourselves in debates and petty squabbles here.

What we are reading, is that all traditions and their explanations are given in sunni ahadith books, these books which they take to be ghair multoo (unrecitable) revelations of Messenger of Allah. And these books are placed next to Quran. By the teachings of these our religious scholars are granted certified testimonials. Everyone, after prayers in the mosque, takes lessons from these books and feels privileged and proud. The Muslims keep them close to their hearts, as these books give them an aura of being righteous and a distinct radiation of being the blessed. What we have gone over with you, was only in ahadith books – the Quran has not yet been glanced into. Now we will discuss how, attempts are being made to wrap the Quran also into this plethora of ahadith muddle. Imam Tibri’s explanations of Quran are taken as the ‘mother of explanations’ among the sunni. It is the first tufseer (compiled explanation) of Quran. The later explanations, nearly all of them have been copied from this. Let us read, how Imam Tibri attempted to extract the meaning of mut’aa from Quran. He writes:

“Abu Sabit states that Ibne AbbasR gave me a manuscript and told me that it belonged to the like of Abi bin Ka’ab. Yahya bin Isa who has written this hadith says that according to Naseer bin Abi al Asha’ace this manuscript belonged to him. In that it was written (meaning that you enter into mut’aa with women, for a limited time period).”

Abu Nazra says that he inquired from Ibne AbbasR about mut’aa. He asked him if he had ever recited the chapter of Nis’aa. Abu replied, “Why not?” He asked him had he come across the following words in it. To which Abu said, “No, I did not!” If I had read these words, then why would I be asking you.” He then said to Abu, “You must know that this in reality is the actual ayat.” In Abdul Allah’s hadith, that has been taken from Abu Nazra, we find the same story. He read this very ayat in front of Ibne AbbasR. Ibne AbbasR said. I said that I had not read this anywhere in the Holy Quran. He said it three times, “I swear upon Allah, this is the way it was revealed. (This has been explained further in this book, in the chapter of ‘Holy Quran and its traditions’)

Abu Is'haaq has it that Ibne AbbasR recited . The fifth tradition is of Shabay, and he has also taken from Abu Is'haaq. Qatawa also explains that the manuscript of Abu bin Ka'ab contains . Umra bin Murah has it that he heard Saeed bin Jaber reciting.

These excerpts have not been taken from any shiite book. They have been taken from the well-known, honoured and respected explanation of Imam Tibri. This hadith incident is being attributed towards the most respected and august companion of Holy Messenger, who is swearing upon Allah, that this ayat was not revealed as it is written in the Quran. In reality, he is saying, it was revealed with words that justify mut'aa. You can imagine the deep rootedness of this conspiracy.

The discussion that went above, shows us the sort of pictures painted and character descriptions of Allah, His Messenger, cohorts, 'tabaeen', etc, in the most honoured book of sunnis. According to these traditions they have tried to prove that:

1. What we find in the Quran are not the words that were revealed. According to the various manuscripts of Quran in possession of disciples of the Holy Messenger, this form of revelation is from somewhere else.
2. The Holy Messenger himself had permitted mut'aa in lieu of a handful of flour or barley. This permission continued till his last days of life.
3. During the days of Holy Messenger and during the times of his cohorts and disciples, we find that mut'aa was very common without any inhibitions.
4. Albeit the Holy Messenger had imposed a ban on mut'aa in his later days of life; inspite of his orders we see it was continued in the times of Hazrat Abu BakrR and earlier part of Hazrat Omar's caliphate.
5. Hazrat OmarR had invoked a ban on mut'aa. Inspite of it we read it was exercised freely among the disciples and followers of Holy Messenger and the learned of Mecca.
6. Those who were reluctant to accept the ban imposed on mut'aa even they also conceded to the fact that mut'aa was an evil in disguise.

We observe that Qazi Sana'ullah Panipatti writes in his explanation of Quran (that went with the title of "Muzhari"), that:

“The hadith writer Abdul Razzaque has it from Ibne Jareej Who had it from At'aa that Ibne Abbas usually said, permission of mut'aa was a blessing from Allah. No one would have indulged in sexual acts, had OmarR put a ban on it.” (Page #572)


Are you prepared to accept by any means, if these could have been the allowances made, as stated in the ahadith, by the Messenger of Allah? It must also be clarified, that these ahadith have not been taken from any shiite source. These belong to the most honored and respected ahadith books of sunnis. Whosoever shows courage enough to refuse any one of these myths, is labelled a “non-believer in hadith,” and is thrown out of the sphere of Islam.

## [Home](#) ALLAMA GHULAM AHMAD PARWEZ

### The Man Behind The Tolu-e-Islam Movement

( A LIFE SKETCH )

The founder of the Tolu-e-Islam movement, Allama Ghulam Ahmad Parwez s/o Chaudhary Fazal Din, was born in a Sunni ( Hanafi ) family of Batala, Dist. Gurdaspur, on the 9th of July, 1903. Batala, a town now in the Punjab Province of India, was at that time a very prominent seat of Islamic learning, philosophy and culture where his grand-father Hakim Maulvi Raheem Bakhsh enjoyed the status of a celebrated scholar and eminent Sufi of the Chishtia Nizamia discipline of mysticism.



Allama Parwez studied the Quran and the classics of Islam under the sole guidance of his grandfather. His other early teachers were Khateeb Jamia Masjid Batala Maulana Mohammad Ibrahim and his younger brother Maulana Zafrul Haq, two celebrities of the time. He completed his high school studies from "A Lady of England" High School Batala in 1921 and graduated from the Punjab University in 1934.

At an early age, he acquired a thorough understanding of the traditions, beliefs and practices of conventional Islam including the once widespread discipline of *Tasawwaf* (Muslim mysticism) along with its arduous practical course of esoteric meditation and solitary "spiritual" exercises. This thorough grounding in the entire system of ideas which has traditionally passed under the name of religion in the Muslim society, formed the basis of Mr. Parwez's critical study in the all pervading light of the Holy Quran, of not only the history of Islam and Muslims, of the beliefs and practices of the pre-Islamic religions of humanity but also of the total area of human thought and socio-ideological movements throughout the ages.

He joined the Central Secretariat of the Government of India in 1927 and soon became an important figure in the Home Deptt: (Establishment Division). On the emergence of Pakistan he occupied the same seat in the Central Government and took pre-mature retirement as Assistant Secretary (Class I gazetted Officer) in 1955 in order to devote his entire time towards his mission.

In "twenties" during his stay in Lahore, he came into close association with **Mufakkar-e-Pakistan, the late Allama Iqbal** who inspired him and gave his specific guide-lines on the understanding of the Quran. It was the Allama who infused in him the spirit of being a pioneer worker for Pakistan Movement. The Allama also led him to one of the greatest Muslim Scholars of the sub- continent **Hafiz Mohammad Aslam Jairajpuri**, for higher

studies in Arabic literature, in whose company Allama Ghulam Ahmad Parwez stayed and benefited from the vast knowledge he possessed, till independence in 1947, though close contacts between them were maintained till Hafiz Sahib s death in 1955.

In 1938, at the instance of **Allama Mohammad Iqbal** and under the instructions of the **Quaid-e-Azam Mohammad Ali Jinnah**, Allama Parwez started publishing monthly **Tolu-e-Islam** Its primary object was to tell the people that according to the Quran, ideology and not geographical boundary, was the basis for the formation of nation, and that a politically independent state was pre-requisite to live in Islam. For this it has to face not only the British and Hindu opposition but also the fanatic nationalism of Muslim individuals and groups such as represented by the Jamiat-ul-Ulema, Ahrar-e-Islam, Jamaat-e-Islami, etc.

After the emergence of Pakistan, the chief objective before Tolu-e-Islam was to propagate the implementation of the principle which had inspired the demand for separate Muslim State that is, to help transform the live force of Islamic Ideology into the Constitution of Pakistan.

During the Pakistan Movement, Allama Parwez had been a gratifying counselor to the **Quaid-e-Azam** in the matters pertaining to the Quranic values and principles.

He had been a member of the **Law Commission** formed under the 1956 Constitution of Pakistan. He was the founder Chairman of the Quranic Education Society and the Director of the Quranic Research Center established under his guidance at 25-B Gulberg-2, Lahore.

His life long research produced many valuable [books](#) on Quranic teachings, the most celebrated of them being **Ma arif-ul-Quran** in eight volumes, **Lughat-ul-Quran** in four volumes, [Mafhoom-ul-Quran](#) in three volumes, **Tabweeb-ul-Quran** in three volumes, **Nizam-e-Rabubiyat**, [Islam A Challenge to Religion](#), **Insaan Ne Kiya Socha** (History of human thought), **Tasawwaf Ki Haqiqat**, [Saleem Ke Naam](#) in three volumes, [Tahira Ke Naam](#), [Qurani Faislay](#) in five volumes and **Shahkar-e-Risalat** (the biography of the second Caliph Hazrat Omar - may God be pleased with him).

Since he owed a gratitude to Allama Mohammad Iqbal for his guiding principles on the understanding of Quran, he delivered many important lectures on Iqbal s viewpoint of implementing the Quranic injunctions, which were later compiled and published as an unequalled presentation on Iqbal s philosophy under the title "**IQBAL AUR QURAN**". He was among pioneers who started **Bazme-Iqbal**.

He started weekly lectures on exposition of the Holy Quran at Karachi which feat he continued (even after shifting to Lahore in 1958) till October 1984 when he was taken ill and expired subsequently on 02-24-1985. This was in addition to his innumerable lectures on the Quranic teachings to college and university students, scholars and

general public at various occasions.

He organized a country-wide network of spreading the pristine Quranic teachings called [Bazm-e-Tolu-e-Islam](#). Such organizations have now been formed by the followers of the Holy Quran in a number of foreign countries as well.

He left behind a widow and a brother (both now deceased) and a sister. He himself was issue-less in the conventional sense but [Idara-Tolu-e-Islam](#), **The Tolu-e-Islam Trust**, **The Quranic Research Centre**, the **Quranic Education Society**, the **Parwez Memorial (Research Scholars) Library** and world over spread **Bazms** and his **audio** and **video** Dars-e-Quran are ample means of carrying his name to immortality. (May Allah s blessings be upon him)

***Compiled by: Sh. Allah Ditta and Late Mohammad Omar Draz***

**Published by Tolu-e-Islam Trust, 25-B, Gulberg-2, Lahore-11**

## [Home](#) Books & Articles

### Books

by [G. A. Parwez](#)

- [Exposition of the Holy Qur'an](#)
- [Quranic Laws](#)
- [Islam: A Challenge to Religion \(Danish\)](#)
- [Muqaam-e-Hadith](#)
- [Kitab-ul-Taqdeer](#)
- [Letters to Saleem](#)
- [Letters to Tahira](#)
- [Quranic Decisions \(Selected Chapters\)](#)
- [Quranic Permanent Values](#)

### Articles

- [Why is Islam the Only True Deen?](#)
- [The Basis of Legislation in an Islamic State](#)
- [Pause and Reflect](#)
- [Islamic Ideology](#)
- [Is Islam a Failure?](#)
- [Only One Question](#)
- [Genesis & Ideology of Pakistan](#)
- [Woman: In the Light of Quran](#)
- [The Ulema-Who Are They?](#)
- [ILL Gotton Earning](#)
- [Why Do We Lack Character?](#)
- [Why Do We Celebrate Eid?](#)
- [Awliya, Peer-o-Murshid, Waseelah](#)
- [The One Who is Coming](#)
- [An Interview with G.A. Parwez by Michael O'Neill](#)
- [India Mirage and Reality by Peter Schimad](#)

### Additional Literature

**Dr. Allama Muhammad Iqbal**

- [The Reconstruction of Religious Thought in Islam](#)
- [Allama Iqbal on Ahmadism](#)
- [Allama Muhammad Iqbal's 1930 Presidential Address](#)
- The Development of Metaphysics in Persia

**Dr. Abdul Wadud**

- [Conspiracies Against the Quran](#)
- [Quranocracy](#)
- [Food and Hygiene in Islam](#)
- [Islamic Way of Living](#)
- [Gateway to the Quran](#)
- [Concept of 'Jihad' in Islam](#)

## Selected Articles

### **Dr. Mansoor Alam**

- [What is Iman? \(Part I\)](#)
- [What is Iman? \(Part II\)](#)
- [Concept of God \(Part I\)](#)
- [Concept of God \(Part II\)](#)
- [Obedience to the Prophet \(Part I\)](#)
- [Obedience to the Prophet \(Part II\)](#)
- [Obedience to the Prophet \(s\) \(Part III\)](#)
- [God's Mercy and Forgiveness \(Part I\)](#)
- [God's Mercy and Forgiveness \(Part II\)](#)
- [Meaning and Essence of Prayer \(Part I\)](#)
- [Muslims and the Purpose of Prayers \(Part II\)](#)
- [Zakah – Its Concept and Purpose in Islam \(Part I\)](#)
- [Zakah – Its Concept and Purpose in Islam \(Part II\)](#)
- [Zakah – Its Concept and Purpose in Islam \(Part III\)](#)
- [The Purpose of Fasting in Islam – Part 1](#)
- [Ramadan, Quran, and Muslims](#)
- [Iqbal and Taqdir \(Part I\)](#)
- [Iqbal and Taqdir \(Part II\)](#)
- [Islamic History 1: The Death of the Prophet \(S\)](#)
- [Islamic History 2: The](#)

### **Dr. Manzoor'ul Haque**

#### **The Quran**

- [Understanding The Quran: Pre-requisites](#)
- [Conflicts and Contradictions in Human Thought and Approach to the Quran](#)
- [Need of the Quran Today](#)
- [Globalization, Networking, Radiation and the Approach of the Quran](#)
- [The Quran: The Last, the Complete and the Unabrogated Book](#)
- [Quran's Concept of Governance](#)

#### **System of Education**

- [Values Education Program and Operational Mechanism for Strategic Educationists of the New Millennium](#)
- [Investment for Teaching, Proselytizing, and Establishing A Social System Based on Quranic Values](#)
- [The Quranic Model of Education](#)
- [A Major Hurdle in The Quran's System of Education](#)
- [Education, Pakistan and Process of Change](#)
- [A New Dimension of Education: Original and Genuine](#)
- [Quranic Values System:](#)

[Missing Link](#)

- [Islamic History 3: Compilation of the Quran](#)
- [Islamic History 4: Islam and Science](#)
- [Islamic History 5: Reclaiming Our Knowledge Base](#)
- [Islamic History 6: Reclaiming Our Knowledge Base and Beyond](#)
- [Islamic History 7: Early Division in Islam](#)
- [Islamic History 8: Early division in Islam \(Contd.\)](#)
- [God's Will](#)
- [Does Allah Misguide Anyone?](#)
- [Iqbal, Quran and Muslim Unity](#)
- [Why Pakistan?](#)
- [Quaid-e-Azam, Islam, and Pakistan](#)
- [Message of Light and Hope](#)
- [Moving Thoughts and Moving Hearts](#)
- [A Message to Muslim Youth \(on New Year\)](#)
- [Arabs and US Policy](#)
- [Time of Test](#)
- [The Truth about Islam](#)

[Underpinnings of the Curriculum Offerings](#)

- [Idealism](#)
- [Realism](#)
- [Experimentalism and Pragmatism](#)
- [Secrets of Student's Success](#)

**Human Personality/Self**

- [The Quran's Concept of Self Integration: The Motive-Valance For Learning, Slamming New Intrusions, Old Obsessions](#)
- [The Quranic Concept of Self - Part I](#)
- [The Quran's Concept of Self - Part II](#)
- [Life After Death](#)

**Hadith**

- [Historical Perspectives and Implications of Hadith in Islam \(Part I\)](#)
- [The Paradigm of Permanence and Change in Islam \(Part II\)](#)

**Nourishment System and Related Aspects**

- [Establishment of Nourishment System: Implementational Strategies Slamming New Intrusions and Old Obsessions](#)
- [Various Aspects of Salaat for Social Transformation](#)
- [Etekaaf](#)
- [Taraweeh](#)

## Miscellaneous

- [Pakistan ki Kahani](#) by *Mansoor Hussain*
- [The Bible: Word of God or Word of Man?](#) by A.S.K *Joommal*
- [The Holy Quran and Our Daily Life](#) by Dr. Mir Mustafa Hussain (Ph.d)
- [Woman Recreated](#) by Shamim Anwar
- [The Pakistan Idea: A Challenge to Geographical, Racial and Lingual Nationalism](#) by Shamim Anwar
- [Muslims Successful in turning Precious Gold into Worthless Dust](#) by *Muhammad Iqbal Khawaja*

- [Lailat'ul-Qadar: The Night of Manifestation of a New World](#)
- [Eid'ul-Fitr: The Celebration of the Festival of Quran's Revelation](#)
- [Zikr](#)

## Reflect, Think and Grasp

- [How The Sects Can Be Dissolved?](#)
- [Where Do We Stand? Pause and Reflect](#)
- [Marxism and Islam: Failure and Success](#)
- [Unanswered Questions!](#)
- [Smirking at the impasse of American Body Politic](#)
- [So-called Holy Men and Faith of Leaders](#)
- [An Intriguing Question!](#)
- [Birth of First Genetic Baby Free of an Incurable Disease: Liver Disease](#)
- [Who am I?](#)
- [How the Man Think in the Absence of Divine Guidance: Just an Analysis](#)
- [What Happens When Mean Becomes End](#)

## Traps

- [Words and Meanings: A Dangerous Trap we are in, No. 1](#)
- [Intolerant Approach to History: A Trap, No. 2](#)
- [Iblees and Shaitan: Thwarting Forces in man](#)

**and Implications -A Trap,  
No. 3**

- **Modern Trends and Change:  
A Trap No. 4**
- **Masses, the Source of All-  
Power: A Trap No. 5**
- **Our Youth, Social Malaise  
and Mental Illness: A Trap  
No. 6**
- **Islam as Religion, A  
Misconception and its  
Devastation: A Trap No. 7**
- **Shackles of Our Subjectivity**

**Modern Thwarting Forces**

- **A Cataclysmic Change And  
A Lesson**
- **Ahmed bin Muhammad Ali  
Maskawaih (d. 421 A. H.):  
His Theory of Life as an  
Evolutionary Movement**