

**Shaykh Abū 'AbdurRahmān Muhammad ath-Thānī bin 'Umar
bin Mūsā**

(hafidhahullāh)

RULES FOR JARH WA'T-TA'DEEL ACCORDING TO AL-HĀFIDH ADH-DHAHABĪ¹

PART 3

NO ATTENTION IS TO BE GIVEN TO A JARH IF IT CONTRADICTS A CREDIBLE DECLARATION OF TRUSTWORTHINESS

Examples of this:

FIRST EXAMPLE

Adh-Dhahabī stated in the biography of al-Fudayl bin 'Iyyād bin Mas'ood bin Bishr at-Tamīmī al-Yarbū'ī al-Khurasānī, and then al-Makkī (d. 187 AH):

He was a Hujjah, of lofty estimation, no consideration is to be given to what Ahmad bin Abī Khaythamah transmitted: I heard Qutbah bin al-'Alā' say: I abandoned the hadeeth of Fudayl bin 'Iyyād because he relays ahādeeth in which 'Uthmān bin 'Affān is defamed.

Then adh-Dhahabī stated:

We do not listen to what Qutbah stated, would that he would be preoccupied with his own situation, al-Bukhārī stated: “there is an issue with him”² and an-Nasā'ī and other said: “da'eef”. Also, the man is a person of Sunnah and emulation [of the Prophet]. Ahmad bin

¹ Summarised from Abu 'AbdurRahmān Muhammad ath-Thānī bin 'Umar bin Mūsā, *Dawābit Jarh wa't-Ta'deel 'inda'l-Hāfidh adh-Dhahabī* [Rules of Jarh wa't-Ta'deel According to al-Hāfidh adh-Dhahabī]. Leeds, United Kingdom: al-Hikmah, 1421 AH/2000 CE), vol.2, pp.643-648.

² See *ad-Du'afā as-Sagheer*, p.100; his actual words were: “he is not strong, there is an issue with him, his hadeeth are not authentic.” In *at-Tārīkh ul-Kabeer*, vol.7, p.191 he summarised what he said by saying: “he is not strong”. Al-Hāfidh Ibn 'Adiyy mentioned the hadeeth which al-Bukhārī alluded to, refer to *al-Kāmil*, vol6, p.53.

Abī Khaythamah said: 'AbdusSamad bin Yazeed as-Sā'igh narrated to us saying: the Sahābah were mentioned in front of al-Fudayl, and I heard, he said: 'follow and that is sufficient, Abū Bakr, 'Umar, 'Uthmān and 'Ali, may Allāh be pleased with them.'³

Adh-Dhahabī stated in *Mīzān ul-I'tidāl*:

Shaykh ul-Harām, one of the verified trustworthy ones about whom there is agreement [as to his credibility] and nobility. No consideration is to be given to what Ahmad bin Abī Khaythamah relayed...who is Qutbah anyway?! What is Qutbah for him to make Jarh when he himself is destroyed!? Al-Fudayl is of the Mashāayikh of Islām and salām.⁴

Adh-Dhahabī also stated in *ar-Rūwāt utb-Thiqāt*:

The statement of Qutbah is not accepted and who is Qutbah anyway for us to listen to his word and ijihād?! Al-Fudayl narrated what he heard and did not intend any disregard or contempt of the leader of the believers 'Uthmān bin 'Affān, may Allāh be pleased with him. He performed his required duty, so to the likes of this do is it to be said: 'I have abandoned his hadeeth'? It is as is said, 'she accused me of her sickness and then she slipped away.'⁵ As for Qutbah, then al-Bukhārī said about him: "there are some issues with him"⁶ and an-Nasā'ī⁷ and others deemed him as being weak. As for al-Fudayl then his precision and trustworthiness does not need the statements of praise mentioned for him to be accompanied with it, for indeed he is at the head of knowledge and action, may Allāh have mercy on him.

Ibn Hajar stated: "None have paid any attention to Qutbah in this issue."⁸

SECOND EXAMPLE

In the biography of Ahmad bin al-Furāt Khālid ad-Dabbī ar-Rāzī, the resident of Asbahān (d. 258 AH), Abū Ahmad bin 'Adiyy said: I heard Ahmad bin Muhammad bin Sa'eed say: I heard Ibn Khirāsh swear by Allāh that Abū Mas'ood Ahmad bin al-Furāt intentionally lies. Ibn 'Adiyy said: "This is what Ibn Khirāsh and is due to bias [Tahāmul], for I do not know that Abū Mas'ood has any rejected narrations and he is from the people of sidq and hifdh."⁹ Al-Hāfidh

³ *Siyar A'lām un-Nubalā'*, vol.8, p.448

⁴ *Mīzān ul-I'tidāl*, vol.3, p.361

⁵ *Ar-Rūwāt ath-Thiqāt*, pp.27-28

⁶ Quoted prior

⁷ *Ad-Du'afā'*, p.228

⁸ *Tahdheeb ut-Tahdheeb*, vol.8, p.296

⁹ *Al-Kāmil*, vol.1, p.190

adh-Dhahabī (*rahimabullāh*) commented on this saying: “Who believes what that Rāfidī Ibn Khirāsh has to say?!”¹⁰ He said in *Mizān ul-I'tidāl*:

Ibn 'Adiyy mentioned him and spoke ill of him as he did not bring anything except that Ibn 'Uqdah [Ahmad bin Muhammad bin Sa'eed] reported from Ibn Khirāsh, who himself has Rafd and bida', said: “Ibn ul-Furāt lies intentionally” and Ibn 'Adiyy said: “I do not know any rejected narrations from him [Ibn ul-Furāt].”¹¹

Then adh-Dhahabī said: “this invalidates what Ibn Khirāsh says.” Ibn Khirāsh is: 'AbdurRahmān bin Yūsuf bin Sa'eed bin Khirāsh al-Marwazī, then al-Baghdādī (d. 283 AH) and despite his vast memory¹² he was accused of Rafd. Abū Zur'ah Muhammad bin Yūsuf al-Jurjānī said: “He used to report defamation of the Two Shaykhs and he was a Rāfidī.”¹³ Abdullāh bin Ahmad al-Jawālīqī ascribed Ibn Khirāsh as being weak.¹⁴ Al-Hāfidh adh-Dhahabī said about him: “This stumbling languid individual, his knowledge was evil and his efforts were exerted in misguidance, we seek refuge in Allāh from such misfortune.”¹⁵ Adh-Dhahabī stated in *Mizān ul-I'tidāl*:

By Allāh, this stumbling Shaykh who exerted his efforts to misguide, was a Hāfidh of his time and made some extensive journeys [for hadeeth] and came across much and encompassed a lot. After this however he did not benefit from his knowledge, so do not reprimand the donkey of the Rāfidah of Jizeen¹⁶ and Mashgharā¹⁷.¹⁸

¹⁰ *Siyar A'lām un-Nubalā'*, vol.12, p.487

¹¹ *Mizān ul-I'tidāl*, vol.1, p.128

¹² *Al-Kāmil*, vol.4, p.321

¹³ *Su'alāt us-Sahmī*, p.241

¹⁴ *Al-Kāmil*, vol.4, p.321

¹⁵ *Siyar A'lām un-Nubalā'*, vol.13, p.510

¹⁶ Jizeen is a large village of Asbahān; Juzeen however is a village in Naysaboor. See *Mu'jam ul-Buldān*, vol.2, p.140.

¹⁷ Mashgharā: a village in Damascus, lying at the edge of the Baqā'a Valley. See *Mu'jam ul-Buldān*, vol.5, p.134.

Translator's note [AbdulHaq]: Mashgharā [or 'Machghara'] it is now located in Southern Lebanon, while the al-Baqā'a Valley ['Beka'a Valley'] is also now considered as part of Lebanon. The inhabitants of this area are now predominantly Shi'a with some Christian communities also residing there. As for 'Jizeen' then there is also a Jizeen ['Jezzine'] also found in southern Lebanon not too distant from Mashgharā, Allāh knows best as to whether the 'Jizeen' adh-Dhahabī mentions refers to this village in Southern Lebanon as opposed to what 'AbdurRahmān Muhammad ath-Thānī mentions in the footnote about it referring to a village of Asbhān.

¹⁸ *Mizān ul-I'tidāl*, vol.2, p.600; *Shadharāt udh-Dhahab*, vol.2, p.184.

There are many instances where adh-Dhahabī rejects the Jarh of Ibn Khirāsh, in *Mizān ul-I'tidāl*, vol.4, p.200 in the biography of Mūsā bin Ismā'eel Abī Salamah al-Manqarī (d. 223 AH), he says:

THIRD EXAMPLE

Adh-Dhahabī stated in the biography of Zakariyā bin Yahyā bin Asad al-Marwazī, the resident of Baghdād and well-known by the name 'Zakrawayh' (d. 270 AH):

Ad-Dāraqutnī said about him: "there is no problem with him" and Abu'l-Fath al-Azdī mentioned him in the book *ad-Du'afā* yet was inaccurate in much of what he said in his comments about him, such as saying 'he claimed to hear from Sufyān' this is a cold defamation. He also mentioned that he went by the sobriquet 'Jūdhābah'.¹⁹

Adh-Dhahabī also said in *Tārīkh ul-Islām*:

Abu'l-Fath al-Mawsilī mentioned him in his book *ad-Du'afā* and was unable to comment on him with anything more than just saying: 'he claimed to hear from Sufyān ibn 'Uyaynah – and this shows a lack of Wara'. Rather, Abu'l-Fath has been spoken about himself.²⁰

Adh-Dhahabī also stated in *Mizān ul-I'tidāl*: "What I have mentioned about him is what al-Azdī mentioned about him."²¹ Abu'l-Fath al-Azdī is: Muhammad bin al-Husayn bin Ahmad bin 'Abdullāh al-Azdī al-Mawsilī, the author of the book *ad-Du'afā*, he died in the year 374 AH. Abu'n-Najeeb 'AbdulGhaffār bin 'AbdulWāhid al-Armawī stated:

I saw the people of Mawsil [Mosul] often regard him as very weak, they did not deem him to be anything.²²

Al-Khateeb al-Baghdādī said:

I asked Abū Bakr al-Burqānī about Abu'l-Fath al-Azdī and he indicated that he was weak, he said: 'I saw him in the Congregational Mosque of the city and the people of hadeeth did not even raise their heads to him, they stay away from him.'²³

Al-Khateeb also said:

"I have not mentioned Abū Salamah as possessing any weakness, as for the statement of Ibn Khirāsh: 'he is Sudūq, yet some people spoke about him', then yes, they spoke about him as possessing trustworthiness and reliability O you Rāfidī!"

Also in *Mizān ul-I'tidāl*, vol.1, p.118, in the biography of Ahmad bin 'Abdah ad-Dabbī (d. 245 AH): "Ibn Khirāsh said: 'the people spoke about him', Ibn Khirāsh however is not to be trusted in his words, Ahmad bin 'Abdah ad-Dabbī is a Hujjah. "

¹⁹ *Siyar A'lām un-Nubalā*, vol.12, p.348

²⁰ *Hawādith wa Wafayāt Sanat [Events and Obituaries of the Years] 261-270 AH*

²¹ *Mizān ul-I'tidāl*, vol.2, p.80

²² *Tārīkh Baghdād*, vol.2, p.244

²³ *Ibid.*

There are some oddities within his hadeeth, along with rejected reports [Manākeer]. He was a Hāfidh and classified books in the science of hadeeth.²⁴

Al-Hāfidh adh-Dhahabī said:

Based on this, in his book ad-Du'afā' there are some observations, as he weakened a large group of narrators without any daleel, rather other than him deemed them as trustworthy.²⁵

Abu'l-Fath al-Azdī was excessive in his Jarh of people and other than him deemed them as trustworthy, this will be clarified later.

FOURTH EXAMPLE

In the biography of al-Hārith bin Muhammad bin Abī Usāmah at-Tamīmī, their client being al-Baghdādī (d. 280 AH), Ibrāheem al-Harbī deemed him as being trustworthy²⁶ and ad-Dāraqutnī said: 'he is Sudūq',²⁷ and al-Khateeb al-Baghdādī also deemed him as trustworthy²⁸ and Ibn Hibbān also mentioned him in *ath-Thiqāt*.²⁹ Abu'l-Fath al-Azdī stated about al-Hārith bin Muhammad: "he is weak, I did not see within our Shaykhs anyone who narrated from him."³⁰

Al-Hāfidh adh-Dhahabī commented on this saying:

²⁴ Ibid.

²⁵ *Siyar A'lām un-Nubalā'*, vol.16, p.348

Dr 'Abdullāh Marhūl as-Sawālimah composed a study on Abu'l-Fath al-Azdī entitled: *al-Hāfidh Abu'l-Fath al-Azdī Bayna'l-Jarh wa't-Ta'deel* which was published in the Journal of King Saud University in the year 1412 AH, pp.429-476. He concluded the following:

- ❖ Al-Hāfidh al-Azdī's innocence from what he was accused of regarding adherence to a vile Madhhab and his freedom from being a Shi'ī or Rāfidī.
- ❖ Al-Hāfidh al-Azdī's complete innocence from the accusation of fabricating hadeeth.
- ❖ The error of describing him as being absolutely weak, the statements about him could conclude that he has a restricted weakness but not an absolute weakness.
- ❖ His statements about narrators are generally to be accepted with the exception of those statements of his which have been correctly and truly commented upon. For only about 5% of his total comments were criticised and this is a percentage which can be possibly inaccurate especially considering the fact that he is of the Mujtahid Critics in the science of Jarh wa't-Ta'deel.

²⁶ *Tārīkh Baghdād*, vol.8, p.219

²⁷ Ibid.

²⁸ Ibid., vo.8, p.219

²⁹ Vol.8, p.183

³⁰ *Siyar A'lām un-Nubalā'*, vol.13, p.389

This is an exaggeration [Mujāzafah], would that al-Azdī knew the weakness of his own self! Al-Burqānī said: ‘ad-Dāraqutnī instructed us to report the hadeeth of al-Hārith in the Saheeh.’³¹

Adh-Dhahabī said the like of this in *Tārīkh ul-Islām*³²:

This is an exaggeration [Mujāzafah], would that al-Azdī knew the weakness of his own self! Al-Burqānī said: ‘ad-Dāraqutnī instructed us to report the hadeeth of al-Hārith in the Saheeh.’³³

³¹ Ibid.

³² Hawādith wa Wafayāt Sanat [Events and Obituaries of the Years] 281-290 AH

³³ There are other examples of this rule from al-Hāfidh adh-Dhahabī:

- ❖ In *Mizān ul-Itidāl*, vol.1, p.294, in the biography of Ayyūb bin Mūsā bin ‘Amru al-Ashdaq (d. 133 AH): “al-Azdī said: ‘The isnād of his hadeeth are not established’, no consideration is to be given to his words as he has been authenticated by Ahmad, Yahyā and the group [of scholars of hadeeth].”
- ❖ In *Mizān ul-Itidāl*, vol.1, p.420, in the biography of Ju’eed [or Ja’d] bin ‘AbdurRahmān (d. 144 AH): “the Shaykh of Makkī bin Ibrāheem, Sudūq. Al-Azdī held an irregular view by saying that ‘there is an issue with him’.”
- ❖ In *Mizān ul-Itidāl*, vol.1, p.5, in the biography of Abān bin Ishāq al-Madanī: “**...Abu’l-Fath al-Azdī said that he is Matrūk, and ad-Dāraqutnī said that he is not be abandoned, Ahmad and al-’Ijlī deemed him as being trustworthy. Abu’l-Fath goes off the mark in Jarh, he has a major work regarding the Majrūheen which he compiled yet he makes jarh of many who have not been criticised or spoken about prior to him, rather he has been spoken about.**”
- ❖ In *Mizān ul-Itidāl*, vol.1, p.208, in the biography of Isrā’eel bin Mūsā al-Basrī, the resident of Sind: “Abū Hātīm and Ibn Ma’een deemed him as trustworthy, while al-Azdī held an irregular view saying that he is weak.”
- ❖ In *Mizān ul-Itidāl*, vol.2, p.118, in the biography of as-Sirrī bin Yahyā bin Iyās bin Harmalah ash-Shaybānī al-Basrī (d. 167 AH): “Ahmad said ‘thiqa, thiqa’ and Abu’l-Fath al-Azdī said that his hadeeth are Munkar!? Abu’l-Fath harmed his own self, and when Abū ‘Umar bin ‘AbdulBarr came across these words he was angered and said: ‘as-Sirrī bin Yahyā is more trustworthy than the author of the book (i.e. al-Azdī) a hundred times over!’”