

# Taa'eed Rabbaanee & Ibn Farqad ash-Shaybaanee

Author: *Fadheelat ush-Shaykh al-Haafidh Zubayr Alee Za'ee*

Translator: *Raza Hassan*

*All perfect praise be to Allaah, The Lord of the Worlds. I testify that there is none worthy of worship except Allaah, and that Muhammad (peace be upon him), is His Slave and Messenger.*

## **Muhammad bin al-Hasan bin Farqad ash-Shaybaani and Muhadditheen-e-Karaam:**

Following are the testimonies of Muhadditheen-e-Karaam along with their Tahqeeq concerning the famous Imaam of Fiqh-Hanafi and the student of Imaam Abu Haneefah, "Abu Abdullah Muhammad bin al-Hasan bin Farqad ash-Shaybaani al-Faqeeh (D. 189 H)"

1- Imaam Abu Zakariyyah Yahya bin Ma'een bin Awn al-Baghdadi rahimahullah (D. 233) said:

"جهمي كذاب"

**"He is Jahmi Kadh-dhaab (Habitual Liar)"**

[Ref: Kitaab ad-Du'afa of al-Ukaylee (4/52 Chain Saheeh), Lisaan al-Meezaan (5/122)]

- This Jarh from Imaam Yahya ibn Ma'een is narrated by Abbaas bin Muhammad al-Basari (D. 306). People like Abu Bakr Ahmed bin

Muhammad bin Abdullah bin Sadaqah al-Haafidh, Al-Hasan bin Rasheeq, Imaam Tabaraani, Abu Ali al-Hasan bin Ali al-Mutarriz, Abu Sa'eed bin Yoonus al-Misri, and Husayn bin Muhammad bin Saalim etc have narrated narrations from Abbaas bin Muhammad bin Abbaas al-Basari al-Misri al-Fazaari Abu al-Fadl. The student of this Abbaas, Abu Sa'eed bin Yoonus al-Misri said (in Taareekh Misr/Akhbaar Misr wa Rijaaluha):

"ما رأيت أحدا قط أثبت منه"

**"I have never seen anyone more established (Thiqah) than him"**

[Siyar A'laam al-Nabula: 14/230]

Haafidh Dhahabi said: **"He is al-Haafidh al-Mujawwid al-Naaqid"**

[Al-Nabula: 14/229]

Haafidh Haythami declared him Thiqah by saying: **"And the remaining narrators are Thiqaat"**

[See: Majma az-Zawaa'id (7/3), and Al-Mu'jam al-Kabeer of Tabaraani (12/115 H. 12637)]

The Mutaabi'ah of Abbaas bin Muhammad al-Basari is done by the following people:

Muhammad bin Ahmed al-Asfari [? /Al-Majroheen of Ibn Hibbaan (2/276)]

Muhammad bin Sa'd al-Awfee [who is Da'eef and the chain up him is also Da'eef – Taareekh Baghdaad (2/180), Al-Kaamil of Ibn Adee (6/2193)]

Nasr bin Muhammad al-Baghdaadi [Taareekh Baghdaad (133/449 Chain Saheeh; See, Al-Tankeel: 1/490)]

And Ad-Daaraqutni [He did not meet Imaam Yahya ibn Ma'een – Sawalaat al-Barqaani (468); Taareekh Baghdaad (2/181 Chain Saheeh)]

However, we have no need of these Mutaabi'at in the presence of Saheeh chain

- This Jarh from Abbaas bin Muhammad al-Basari is narrated by, “Abu Bakr Ahmed bin Muhammad bin Sadaqah al-Baghdaadi”.

The student of Ibn Sadaqah, Imaam Abu al-Husayn ibn al-Munaadi said in his book “Afwaaj al-Qurra”:

”كان من الحذق والضبط علي نهاية ترضي بين أهل الحديث كأبي القاسم ابن الجبلي ونظرائه“

**“He was extremely skillful and precise; the people of Hadeeth like Abu al-Qaasim (Ishaaq bin Ibraaheem) Ibn al-Jabbuli (his biography is found in Taareekh Baghdaad: 6/378 & Siyar: 13/343) were very pleased with him”**

[Taareekh Baghdaad: 5/41 T. 2395]

Imaam Abu ash-Shaykh al-Asbahaani called him **“Al-Haafidh”**. Imaam Ibn al-Munaadi led his funeral prayer. Imaam Daaraqutni said: **“Thiqah Thiqah (twice)”**

[Su'alaat al-Haakim li'd-Daaraqutni (38); Taareekh Dimashq by Ibn Asaakir (5/372), Chain Saheeh]

Haafidh Dhahabi said: **“Al-Imaam al-Haafidh al-Mutqin al-Faqeeh”**

[Al-Nabula: 14/83]

He also said: **“He was described as being proficient (Itqaan) and precise (Thabat)”**

[Same: 14/83]

Ibn Asaakir said: **“Al-Haafidh al-Baghdaadi”**

[Taareekh Dimashq: 5/371]

Khateeb Baghdaadi said: **“He is Thiqah”**

[Taareekh Dimashq by Ibn Asaakir: 5/372, Chain Saheeh]

This proves that Ibn Sadaqah al-Haafidh is unanimously agreed upon to be Thiqah.

**Note:** It is not necessary for an Imaam of Jarh and Ta’deel to be the contemporary of that narrator; rather in the era of Tadween-e-Hadeeth, the Jarh and Ta’deel of a later Thiqah wa Sudooq Imaam will also be accepted, unless it goes against the Jamhoor Aimmah and Muhadditheen. If there is agreement of Scholars in Jarh or Ta’deel (on a certain narrator) and there is no dispute, then it is certainly and without a doubt Maqbool (accepted); and if there is a dispute then in case of clear contradiction and Adm-e-Tatbeeq, Jamhoor Muhadditheen (and Mutaqaddimeen over Muta’khireen) will always be given preference.

**Conclusion:** The above mentioned Jarh is absolutely proven from Imaam Yahya ibn Ma’een with an authentic chain.

**Note:** The Jahmiyyah sect is a misguided sect which is out of Ahl us-Sunnah wal Jama’ah

Imaam Ibn Ma’een further said:

## “(Muhammad bin al-Hasan) is nothing”

[Taareekh Ibn Ma’een, narrated by ad-Dauri (1770); Al-Jarh wat Ta’deel (7/227), Chain Saheeh]

- The narrator of this Nuskha of Taareekh Ibn Ma’een, Abu al-Fadl Abbaas bin Muhammad ad-Dauri is Thiqah Haafidh. [See, Al-Kaashif by Dhahabi (2/61 T. 2634)]

There is the unanimous agreement of Scholars on him being Thiqah. This narration from Abbaas ad-Dauri is narrated by: Imaam Abu al-Abbaas Muhammad bin Ya’qoob bin Yoosuf Al-Asam [the narrator of Al-Taareekh from him/ Thiqah], Imaam Abu Muhammad Abdur Rahmaan bin Abi Haatim ar-Raazi [Al-Jarh wat Ta’deel: 7/227], and Ibn Hamaad ad-Dolaabi al-Hanafi [al-Kaamil by Ibn Adee (6/2183), and Ad-Dolaabi is Da’eef according to the raajih opinion]

This proves that the above mentioned Jarh of Imaam Yahya ibn Ma’een narrated by Abbaas ad-Dauri is proven from him with an authentic chain.

**Note:** The narrator concerning whom Imaam Yahya ibn Ma’een says “He is nothing” has three conditions:

1. The Jamhoor Muhadditheen have done the Tawtheeq of that narrator.

In this condition, the Jarh of Imaam Yahya ibn Ma’een will be rejected because of being against the Jamhoor.

2. The narrator is Qaleel ul-Hadeeth

In this condition, the meaning of this Jarh will be that: This narrator has a very less number of narrations. Now whether

this narrator is Thiqah or Da'eef? The Jamhoor Muhadditheen will be given preference concerning him.

3. The Jamhoor Muhadditheen have done Jarh on that narrator. In this condition, the Jarh of Imaam Ibn Ma'een will be accepted, and it will be decided based on qaraain whether he meant by it the normal Jarh or severe type of Jarh.

The opinion of Abdul Hay Lakhnawi and other people who say that the Jarh "He is nothing" of Imaam Ibn Ma'een is deemed Mutlaqan on that narrator having less narrations, is Mardood because of many reasons, for example:

1. Imaam Yahya ibn Ma'een said concerning a Da'eef narrator according to the Jamhoor, Sharjeel bin Sa'd al-Khatmi al-Ansaari that: **"He is nothing, he is Da'eef"**  
[Taareekh Ibn Ma'een, narrated by Ad-Dauri (1046), Al-Jarh wat Ta'deel (4/339), Chain Saheeh]

This proves that Imaam Ibn Ma'een meant "Da'eef" with his saying "He is nothing".

2. Imaam Yahya ibn Ma'een said concerning Ishaq bin Idrees al-Basari: **"He is nothing, he fabricates narrations"**  
[Taareekh Ibn Ma'een, narrated by ad-Dauri (4213), Ad-Du'afa al-Ukaylee (1/101), Al-Kaamil by Ibn Adee (1/327)]
3. Imaam Ibn Ma'een said concerning Husayn (bin Abdullah) bin Dumayrah: **"Kadh-dhaab, he is nothing"**  
[Taareekh Ibn Ma'een, narrated by Ad-Dauri (1108), Al-Kaamil by Ibn Adee (2/767)]
4. Abdul Fattaah Abu Ghuddah al-Kawthaari (Hanafi Taqleedi) has proven with thirty (30) examples under the footnotes of

the book “Al-Rafa’ wal Takmeel (P. 213-220)” that the saying of Imaam Yahya ibn Ma’een “He is nothing” is (normally) meant for the tad’eef of a narrator.

[With reference to Mu’jam Uloom al-Hadeeth al-Nabawi by Abdur Rahmaan bin Ibraheem al-Khameesi: P. 188]

One reference of Abu Ghuddah is coming ahead, In-shaa-Allaah.

**5. Imaam Ibn Ma’een said: “He is nothing and do not write his narrations”**

[Al-Kaamil by Ibn Adee (6/2183)] As is coming ahead, in-shaa-Allaah

This proves that the Jarh “He is nothing” by Imaam Yahya ibn Ma’een is (normally) a severe type of Jarh.

Imaam Yahya ibn Ma’een also said concerning Muhammad bin al-Hasan ash-Shaybaani that:

"ليس بشئ ولا يكتب حديثه"

**“He (i.e. Muhammad bin Hasan ash-Shaybaani) is nothing, and do not write his narrations”**

[Taareekh Baghdaad: 2/180-181, Chain Hasan]

- This Jarh from Imaam Ibn Ma’een is narrated by “Abu Ja’far Ahmed bin Sa’d (bin al-Hakam) bin Abi Maryam al-Misri”.

Imaam Dhahabi said concerning him: **“Al-Imaam al-Haafidh”**  
[Al-Nabula: 12/311]

Haafidh Ibn Hajar al-Asqalaani said: **“He is Sadooq”**  
[Taqreeb at-Tahdheeb: 36]

The Authors of Tahreer Taqreeb at-Tahdheeb said: **“Rather, he is Thiqah”**  
[1/62]

**Note:** Instead of Ahmed bin Sa’d bin Abi Maryam, in Taareekh Baghdaad “Ahmed bin Sa’eed bin Abi Maryam” has incorrectly been printed; which we have corrected through the books of Rijaal.

- The narrator of this Jarh from Ibn Abi Maryam is “Ali bin Ahmed bin Sulemaan al-Misri, famous as: Allaan”.

Ibn Yoonus al-Misri said concerning him: **“He is Thiqah...”**  
[Siyar A’laam al-Nabula: 14/496]

Haafidh Dhahabi said: **“He is al-Imaam al-Muhaddith al-Adl”**  
[Al-Nabula: 14/496]

Haakim and Dhahabi both authenticated his hadeeth [Al-Mustasrak and its Talkhees (1/552 H. 2027)]

Tahaawi Hanafi said: **“Our neighbor, Ali bin Ahmed bin Sulemaan: Allaan narrated to us”**  
[Sharh Mushkil ul-Athaar: 4/41 H. 1413]

Therefore, after the Tawtheeq of Jamhoor, the criticism on him of being harsh and ill-mannered does not have any effect on his narration of hadeeth.

- From Ali bin Ahmed (Allaan), this Jarh is narrated by “Muhammad bin al-Mudhaffar al-Haafidh al-Bazzaaz” who is declared Thiqah Ma’moon by Ateeqi and Muhammad bin Abi al-Fawaaris; Khateeb declared him **“Haafidh, Intelligent, truthful, and narrator of many**

narrations”; and Dhahabi declared him “**Al-Haafidh al-Imaam al-Thiqah**”

[Taareekh Baghdaad (3/264, 263), Tadhkirat ul-Huffaadh (3/980 T. 916)]

Imaam Daaraqutni used to respect him a lot.

[Taareekh Baghdaad: 3/263, Chain Saheeh]

After the tawtheeq of Jamhoor, the Jarh of Abu al-Waleed al-Baaji on him that “**He is an obvious Shi’aa**” is rejected. Haafidh Ibn Hajar al-Asqalaani (rahimahullah) has pointed towards this Jarh being Mardood [See, Lisaan al-Meezaan (5/383)]

- The student of Muhammad bin al-Mudhaffar who narrated this Jarh from him is “Abu al-Hasan Ahmed bin Abdullah bin Muhammad bin Abdullah al-Anmaati, famous as: Al-Laa’ib”.

Khateeb said concerning him: “**I have written narrations from him and his Samaa’ is Saheeh; and I was told that he was a Raafidi**”

[Taareekh Baghdaad: 4/238, 239 T. 1963]

The Jarh of being a Raafidi is rejected because the one who told him is unknown; and even Khateeb has rejected this Jarh by saying “His Samaa was Saheeh”.

This Hasan narration is an excellent Shaahid of the authentic narration of Imaam Abbaas ad-Dauri. And it is the evidence of the fact that the Jarh of “He is nothing” by Imaam Ibn Ma’een here is meant to be the strict type of Jarh.

**Note:** The narrator concerning whom Imaam Ibn Ma’een says “He is nothing” is normally meant to be the severe type of Jarh. See:

Haashiah Abd al-Fattaah Abu Ghuddah al-Hanafi Ala I'laa us-Sunan (19/263, 264)

- **Note:** If someone says that Imaam Yahya ibn Ma'een rahimahullah was Mutashaddid and Muta'annit, then the answer to this claim is that: There are two conditions of the Jarh of a Jaarih:

1. It is against the Jamhoor.

In this condition, the Jarh is Mardood, no matter if it is from Imaam Yahya ibn Ma'een or any other Imaam.

2. It is not against the Jamhoor.

In this condition, the Jarh is Maqbool, no matter if it is the Jarh of Mutashaddid and Muta'annit or Mu'tadal and Munsif

Since the Jarh of Imaam Ibn Ma'een concerning Ash-Shaybaani is not against the Jamhoor rather in accordance of Jamhoor, so in this condition it will be accepted here.

- If someone says that Imaam Ibn Ma'een has also criticized the narrators of Saheeh al-Bukhaari like: Imaam Ahmed bin Saalih al-Misri and Ahmed bin Eesa al-Misri etc, why don't you accept his Jarh there? So the answer to this claim is that since the Jarh on Imaam Ahmed bin Saalih and Ahmed bin Eesa etc is against the Jamhoor, therefore it is rejected.
- If someone says that the Jarh of Imaam Ibn Ma'een is against his own praise, because he wrote the book Kitaab al-Jaami from Muhammad bin al-Hasan ash-Shaybaani. The answer to this claim is that: Writing a book or narrations from someone is different and narrating that book or narrations to others is something different. Imaam Abu Haatim ar-Raazi said: **“When you write then write from everyone, but when you narrate then you must investigate”**

[Al-Jaami Li-Akhlaaq ar-Raawi wa Aadaab as-Saami by Khateeb (2/220 H. 1670), Chain Hasan Lidhaatih]

Haafidh Ibn Hajar said that al-Khaleeli narrated with an authentic chain in (his book) al-Irshaad that Imaam Yahya ibn Ma'een was once writing the Nuskha of a narrator "Abaan bin Abi Ayyaash" (Severely weak and Matrook)..... to the end.

[Tahdheeb at-Tahdheeb: 1/101 T. Abaan bin Abi Ayyaash]

Writing is different while narrating is something different. The narration of al-Jaami al-Sagheer or any other narration from Muhammad bin al-Hasan by Imaam Ibn Ma'een is not proven with an authentic chain from Imaam Ibn Ma'een. Therefore, making the absolute writing of a book to be a Ta'deel from Imaam Ibn Ma'een is wrong, when there is explicit and clear criticism proven on the contrary.

- 2- Imaam Abu Abdullah Ahmed bin Muhammad bin Hanbal Ash-Shaybaani al-Baghdaadi rahimahullah (D. 241) said concerning Muhammad bin al-Hasan that:

"ليس بشيء ولا يكتب حديثه"

**"He is nothing and do not write his narrations"**

[Al-Kaamil by Ibn Adee: 6/2183, Chain Saheeh]

- The narrator of this Jarh "Ahmed bin Sa'd bin Abi Maryam al-Misri" is Thiqah and Truthful as has been passed under the explanation of Jarh # 1. And Ali bin Ahmed bin Sulemaan al-Misri is also Thiqah, as passed before [Under Jarh # 1].
- On contrary to this Jarh, there is no tawtheeq of Shaybaani proven from Imaam Ahmed. In fact, besides all his other criticisms, it is also a proven fact that Imaam Ahmed did not narrate a single

narration from Muhammad bin al-Hasan ash-Shaybaani in his gigantic book “Musnad Ahmed”.

- If someone says that Sulemaan bin Abdul Qawi bin Abdul Kareem at-Taufi al-Sarsari al-Baghdaadi al-Hanbali, who was born in 657 H, said: **“The last thing narrated from Imaam Ahmed is that he started having good opinion about him and he used to praise him. This is narrated by Abu al-Wird among our companions in the book Usool ud-Deen”**

[Mukhtasar ar-Raudah fi Usool al-Hanaabilah with reference to Haashiah ad-Du’afa al-Kabeer by al-Ukaylee: 1/241]

We say who is this Abu al-Wird? There is no record of him anywhere. Therefore, this chain-less claim of withdrawal of Imaam Ahmed is rejected.

- If someone says that Imaam Ahmed bin Hanbal rahimahullah took the deep and insightful masaail from the books of Muhammad bin al-Hasan with reference to Taareekh Baghdaad [2/177]

We say that one of the narrators of this narration, Abu Bakr Muhammad bin Bishr bin Moosa bin Marwaan al-Qaraateesi is Majhool ul-Haal. He is mentioned in Taareekh Baghdaad (2/177) and Taareekh Dimashq (55/110) without any Jarh or Ta’deel.

If someone says that two thiqah narrators narrate from this narrator (Abu Bakr); and Sakhaawi has said that: Daaraqutni said: If two thiqah narrators narrate from a narrator then his Jahaalah is raised and his Adaalah gets proven [with reference to Fath ul-Mugheeth]

We say that this narration of Sakhaawi is Mardood due to three reasons:

1. The words **“And his Adaalah gets proven”** are not proven authentically from Imaam Daaraqutni.
2. A narrator named “Baab bin Umayr” who had two Thiqah students (Imaam Awzaa’ee and Yahya ibn Abi Katheer), Imaam Daaraqutni said about him: **“He is Majhool”**  
[Ad-Du’afa al-Matrokeen by Daaraqutni: P. 164 T. 135]
3. While mentioning a narrator, “Khishf bin Maalik”, Imaam Daaraqutni said: **“If two narrators narrate from a person, his Jahaalah (being unknown) is raised...”**  
[See, Sunan Ad-Daaraqutni (3/174 H. 3333)]

Imaam Daaraqutni did not mention Adaalah in this saying. As for the issue of Jahaalah being raised then it means that such a narrator no longer remains “Majhool ul-Ayn” and it is a separate thing that if there is no Tawtheeq then he remains “Majhool ul-Haal”. We must differentiate between Jahaalat-e-Ayn and Jahaalat-e-Haal as is the view and Manhaaj of Muhadditheen-e-Karaam.

**Note:** If a Muhaddith or Imaam announces to abandon narrating from a certain narrator and there is no tawtheeq proven from him concerning that narrator, then this announcement or the abandonment will be considered a Jarh on that narrator from this Muhaddith or Imaam, unless a Qareenah Saarifah makes the exception of a certain narrator. However, it should be remembered that it does not mean at all that if a Muhaddith or Imaam abandons narrating from a narrator then he will become Matrook; rather in this condition also, we will look at the decision of Jamhoor Muhadditheen as to what their tahqeeq is? If they do his Tawtheeq, then his abandonment from narrating will become Marjooh and Mardood; and if the Jamhoor have criticized him then he will be counted among the Jaariheen.

And Imaam Ahmed has said about Ash-Shaybaani that:

"لا أروي عنه شيئاً"

**"I do not narrate anything from him"**

[Kitaab al-Illal wa Ma'rifat ur-Rijaal (2/258 T. 1862); Al-Jarh wat Ta'deel (7/227), Chain Saheeh]

- Along with the Jarh of Jamhoor Muhadditheen, this announcement of Imaam Ahmed that I do not narrate from him is a Jarh by him on Ash-Shaybaani.

Imaam Ahmed further said:

"كان يذهب مذهب جهنم"

**"The Madhab of Muhammad bin al-Hasan ash-Shaybaani was the Madhab of Jahm (a very big misguided person)"**

[Taareekh Baghdaad: 2/179, Chain Hasan]

- If Jamhoor Muhadditheen have done Jarh on a narrator then his being a Jahmi, Raafidi, Naasibi, Qadari, and Shee'ah etc counts against him; and if Jamhoor Muhadditheen have done his Tawtheeq then his being a Jahmi, Raafidi, Naasibi, Qadari, and Shee'ah etc does not effect him. Therefore, the narration of Mawthaq Ind al-Jamhoor will be Saheeh or Hasan.
- Since the narrators of Saheehayn in Usool are Thiqah and Sudoq according to the Jamhoor; therefore, the criticisms of Bid'ah etc on them are rejected.

Imaam Ahmed also said:

"فأما.... ومحمد بن الحسن فكانا مخالفين للأثر وهاذان لهما رأي سوء"

**"As for.... And Muhammad bin al-Hasan, then they both were against the (Hadeeth and) Athaar, and the opinion of both of them is weak"**

[Taareekh Baghdaad: 2/179, Chain Saheeh]

- The first narrator of this Jarh, Hanbal bin Ishaq bin Hanbal was Thiqah Thabat.

[Taareekh Baghdaad: 8/287 T. 4386]

Haafidh Dhahabi said: **"He is al-Imaam al-Haafidh al-Muhaddith al-Sadooq al-Musannif...."**

[Al-Nabula: 13/51]

- The student of Hanbal, Abdullah bin Ishaq al-Madaaini was Thiqah  
[Taareekh Baghdaad: 9/414 T. 5025]
- The student of al-Madaaini, Ishaq bin Muhammad bin Ishaq an-Ni'aali was Sadooq, Thiqah Ma'moon.  
[Taareekh Baghdaad: 6/401 T. 3457]
- The student of al-Ni'aali, Imaam Barqaani was **"Al-Imaam al-Allaamah al-Faqeeh al-Haafidh al-Thabat, Shaykh ul-Fuqaha wal Muhadditheen.... Saahib al-Tasaaneef"**  
[See, Siyar A'laam al-Nabula: 17/464]

This proves that this chain is Saheeh. In this narration, while explaining "opposers of Athar", Haafidh Dhahabi said:

**"It means, he used to oppose ahadeeth and take from the Umoom of Qur'aan"**

[Taareekh al-Islam: 12/361]

This proves that “Athar” here, refers to both Athaar and Ahadeeth.

- 3- Imaam Abu Hafs Amr bin Ali bin Bahr al-Fallaas al-Basari rahimahullah (D. 249) said:

"محمد بن الحسن صاحب الرأي ضعيف"

**“Muhammad bin al-Hasan, the man of rayi (opinions and qiyaas), is Da’eef”**

[Taareekh Baghdaad: 2/181, Chain Saheeh]

- Imaam Abu Hafs Amr bin Ali bin Bahr bin Kaneez al-Baahli al-Basari as-Seerfi al-Fallaas al-Haafidh is the narrator of Saheehayn and Sunan Arba’ah and he is Thiqah Haafidh.  
[See, Taqreeb at-Tahdheeb: 5081]

Haafidh Dhahabi said: **“He is al-Haafidh al-Imaam al-Mujawwid al-Naaqid”**

[Al-Nabula: 11/470]

- The student of al-Fallaas, Abu al-Abbaas Sahl bin Ahmed al-Waasiti is Thiqah.  
[Taareekh Baghdaad: 9/119 T. 4731]

Zaya al-Maqdisi has narrated narration from him in al-Mukhtaarah  
[2/388 H. 774]

And Abu Ali al-Neesaaboori [al-Mustadrak: 1/116 H. 396] etc have narrated narrations from him.

- The student of al-Waasiti, Uthmaan bin Ahmed bin as-Sammaak ad-Daqqaq was Thiqah  
[Al-Mu'talaf wal Mukhtalaf by Daaraqutni: 3/1245]

Khateeb Baghdaadi, Ibn Shaaheen, and Muhammad bin al-Husayn bin al-Fadl al-Qattaan etc have declared him Thiqah. Haakim Neesaaboori said: **"He is Thiqah Ma'moon"**  
[Al-Mustadrak: 1/300 H. 674]

After the tawtheeq of Jamhoor, the Jarh of Haafidh Dhahabi on him is rejected.  
[See, Lisaan al-Meezaan (4/131)]

Haafidh Dhahabi himself has declared one of his ahadeeth in al-Mustadrak to be Saheeh.  
[3/36 H. 4336]

And he said: **"Ash-Shaykh al-Imaam al-Mukaththir al-Saadiq Musnad al-Iraq"**  
[Al-Nabula: 15/444]

- The student of ad-Daqqaq, Muhammad bin al-Husayn bin al-Fadl al-Qattaan is Thiqah.  
[Taareekh Baghdaad (2/249), Al-Muntazim (8/20/41), Shadhrat adh-Dhahab (3/203)]

This proves that this chain is Saheeh.

- 4- Abu Ishaq Ibraaheem bin Ya'qoob al-Juzjaani (D. 259) said in his specific tone:

"أسد بن عمرو ومحمد بن الحسن والؤلؤي قد فرغ الله منهم"

**“Allaah has finished with Asad bin Amr, Muhammad bin al-Hasan and (Hasan bin Ziyaad) al-Lu’luwi”**

[Ahwaal ur-Rijaal: P. 76-77 T. 96-99]

- Haafidh Ibn Hajar said concerning Ibraaheem bin Ya’qoob bin Ishaq al-Juzjaani: **“He is Thiqah Haafidh, mild towards Nasb”**  
[Taqreeb at-Tahdheeb: 273]

It has been explained under Jarh # 2, that the criticism of being Naasibi etc on a Thiqah ‘Ind al-Jamhoor narrator is rejected.

Haafidh Dhahabi said concerning him: **“He is al-Haafidh, the man of Jarh and Ta’deel”**

[Taareekh al-Islam: 19/72; also see, Tadhkirat ul-Huffaadh: 2/549 T. 568]

**“Allaah is finished with them”** is a special style of the criticism of Juzjaani. As if he used to point towards the Ayah # 31 of Soorah Rahman. Wallahu a’lam

It could mean that Allaah saved us from them. See, Monthly al-Hadeeth: 16 P. 36.

- 5- Imaam Abu Zur’ah Ubaydullah bin Abdul Kareem ar-Raazi rahimahullah (D. 264) said:

"وكان محمد بن الحسن جهميا"

**“And Muhammad bin al-Hasan was a Jahmi”**

[Kitaab ad-Du’afa (P. 570); Taareekh Baghdaad (2/179, Chain Saheeh)]

- The narrator of this Jarh from Imaam Abu Zur’ah is, “Abu Uthmaan Sa’eed bin Amr bin Ammaar al-Azdi al-Barza’ee”.

Haafidh Dhahabi said concerning him: **“Al-Imaam al-Haafidh.... Explorer, Nomad, Author”**  
[Al-Nabula: 14/77]

And said: **“Al-Haafidh al-Naaqid”**  
[Tadhkirat ul-Huffaadh: 2/743 T. 742]

Abu Ya’la al-Khaleeli said: **“He is the Scholar of this field. He is agreed upon. He was a student of Abu Zur’ah.... And his books are liked among the Scholars”**  
[Al-Irshaad: 2/782]

- From Sa’eed bin Amr al-Barza’ee, it is narrated by “Abu Abdullah Ahmed bin Taahir bin al-Najm al-Mayaanaji”.

Haafidh Dhahabi said concerning him: **“Al-Haafidh al-Mutqin”**  
[Tadhkirat ul-Huffaadh: 3/931 T. 885]

And he also said: **“Al-Imaam Al-Haafidh Al-Mujawwid”**  
[Al-Nabula: 16/171]

- From al-Mayaanaji, it is narrated by “Abu al-Husayn Ya’qoob bin Moosa al-Ardabeeli”, who was Thiqah  
[See, Taareekh Baghdaad (14/295 T. 7605)]
- From al-Ardabeeli, it is narrated by Imaam Barqaani, who was a Thiqah Mutqin Imaam, as passed under Jarh # 2.

From al-Barqaani, it is narrated by Khateeb Baghdaadi, Abu al-Fadl Ahmed bin al-Hasan bin Khayroon bin Ibraaheem al-Asdi, and Thaabit bin Ibraaheem bin Bandaar etc.

In short, this chain is Saheeh.

6- Imaam Abu Abdur Rahmaan Ahmed bin Shu'ayb bin Ali al-Nasaa'ee rahimahullah (D. 303) said:

"ومحمد بن الحسن ضعيف"

**"And Muhammad bin al-Hasan is Da'eef"**

[Juzz fi Aakhir Kitaab ad-Du'afa wal Matrokeen: P. 266]

- If someone says that Imaam Nasaa'ee was a Mutashaddid then the answer to this claim is that: This objection could only work if there was the tawtheeq of Jamhooor on the contrary. If there is the Jarh of Jamhooor then this objection is worthless and rejected. And it is established that the Jamhooor has done Jarh on Shaybaani

7- Abu Ja'far Muhammad bin Amr bin Moosa bin Hamaad al-Ukaylee (D. 322) mentioned Muhammad bin al-Hasan in his Kitaab ad-Du'afa [2/52-55] and did not defend him at all.

- If someone says that Imaam Ukaylee etc have also done Jarh on the narrators of Saheehayn, so the answer to this claim is that it is not an absolute principle that every saying of every Muhaddith must be accepted, rather if there is the Tawtheeq of Jamhooor on the contrary then the Jarh will be rejected; and if there is the Jarh of Jamhooor on the contrary then the Tawtheeq will be rejected. What is there to worry about?

8- The Author of Saheeh Ibn Hibbaan, Abu Haatim Muhammad bin Hibbaan bin Ahmed at-Tameemi al-Busti rahimahullah (D. 364) said:

"وكان مرجئا داعيا إليه... وكان عاقلا، ليس في الحديث شيء، كان يروي عن الثقات ويهم فيها فلما فحش ذلك منه استحق تركه من أجل كثرة خطئه، لأنه كان داعيا إلي مذهبهم"

**"And he (Muhammad bin al-Hasan ash-Shaybaani) was a Murj'i and he used to call towards it (Irjaa).... He was an intelligent person, but he was nothing in Hadeeth. He used to narrate narrations from Thiqah narrators and he would err in them. When he started making a lot of such mistakes, he became worth abandoning due to his abundance in mistakes, because he used to call towards their Madhab."**

[Kitaab al-Majroheen: 2/275, 276]

- If someone, while bragging, presents another opinion and says that Ibn Hibbaan has also done Jarh on so-and-so narrator, why don't you accept it there?

The answer to this is that why won't you understand what we are trying to say? In Jarh and Ta'deel, Jamhoor is always given preference; therefore, since the Jarh of Ibn Hibbaan here is in accordance to the Jamhoor, it is accepted. And if it is against the Jamhoor in some place else, then it will be rejected.

9- Abu Ahmed Abdullah bin Adee al-Jarjaani rahimahullah (D. 365) said:

"ومحمد بن الحسن هذا ليس هو من أهل الحديث....والإشتغال بحديثه شغل لا يحتاج إليه... وقد استغني أهل الحديث عما يرويه محمد ابن الحسن وأمثاله."

**"And this Muhammad bin al-Hasan is not among the people of Hadeeth.... Having an interest in his hadeeth is something which is not needed.... Ahl al-Hadeeth are not bothered by what Muhammad bin al-Hasan and his likes narrate."**

[Al-Kaamil fi ad-Du'afa ar-Rijaal: 6/2184]

- If someone says that there is a long distance between Haafidh Ibn Adee and ash-Shaybaani, then the answer to this claim is that contemporariness or being in the same era is not necessary between the criticizer or Admirer and Criticized or Admired, rather any Thiqah and Aarif bil Asbaab Imaam can do Jarh and Ta'deel even if he was born a long time after the death of Criticized or Praised. The base of this Jarh and Ta'deel are the narrations of that narrator and the testimonies of Muhadditheen concerning him, not that he must have met him. If someone is persistent on the condition of contemporariness then we say that like this, all the books of Asmaa ur-Rijaal would become worthless, the knowledge of Jarh wa Ta'deel would become meaningless and you will not still be able to prove the tawtheeq or Jarh of your favorite narrators and Imaams!  
Can anyone prove the tawtheeq of Imaam Abu Haneefah, Qaadhi Abu Yoosuf, Muhammad bin al-Hasan ash-Shaybaani, or Hasan bin Ziyaad al-Lu'luwi on this principle??

**10-** Imaam Abu Hafs Umar bin Ahmed bin Shaaheen al-Baghdaadi rahimahullah (D. 385) mentioned Muhammad bin al-Hasan ash-Shaybaani in his famous book **“Taareekh Asmaa ud-Du’afa wal Matrokeen”** (P. 163 T. 536) and did not defend him at all.

- If Ibn Shaaheen or Ukaylee etc mention someone in their books of weak narrators then it does not mean at all that every single narrator mentioned in these books must be Da'eef and Majrooh, rather the correct tahqeeq is that the one who is declared Thiqah by the Jamhoor, he remains Thiqah even though he may be mentioned in these books of Du'afa; and the one who is declared Da'eef by the Jamhoor, he remains Da'eef even though he may be mentioned in some of the books of Thiqaat.

At the end we say that, Zayla'ee Hanafi has claimed that Daaraqutni mentioned Muhammad bin al-Hasan ash-Shaybaani etc in "Gharaaib Maalik" among the Thiqah Haafidh narrators.

[Nasb ur-Rayaa: 1/408, 409]

This reference is rejected due to many reasons:

1. It is against the Jarh of Jamhoor.
2. The original book "Gharaaib Maalik" is not present today, with which we could affirm the claim of Zayla'ee.
3. Daaraqutni said concerning Qaadhi Abu Yoosuf: **"A Squinter among the blinds"**

[Taareekh Baghdaad: 14/260, Chain Saheeh]

And he further said: **"He (Abu Yoosuf) is stronger than Muhammad bin al-Hasan"**

[Sawalaat al-Barqaani: 567]

This proves that according to Imaam Daaraqutni, Muhammad bin al-Hasan was one of the blinds. At one place, Imaam Daaraqutni said: **"And he (Ash-Shaybaani) does not deserve to be called Matrook according to me"**

[Sawalaat al-Barqaani: 568]

**Note:** Some narrator not deserving to be called Matrook according to Imaam Daaraqutni does not mean at all that he won't be Da'eef according to Imaam Daaraqutni, or he is not Matrook according to the other Muhadditheen.

From this detailed Tahqeeq, it is proven that the following Muhadditheen have done Jarh on Muhammad bin al-Hasan ash-Shaybaani:

1. Yahya ibn Ma'een

2. Ahmed bin Hanbal
3. Amr bin Ali al-Fallaas
4. Juzjaani
5. Abu Zur'ah ar-Raazi
6. Nasaa'ee
7. Ukaylee
8. Ibn Hibbaan
9. Ibn Adee
10. Ibn Shaaheen (rahimahumullaahu ajma'een)

Imaam Nu'aym bin Hamaad al-Sudooq rahimahullah said: **“A young boy in Madeenah said to Muhammad bin al-Hasan: What do you think of one date in exchange for two dates? He replied: There is nothing wrong in it. That young boy said: O Uncle! You are ignorant about Hadeeth and Sunnah and you talk about difficult matters (which you don't know)!?”**

[Kitaab al-Ma'rifah wal Taareekh: 2/791, Chain Saheeh]

### **Conclusion:**

Muhammad bin al-Hasan ash-Shaybaani is Majrooh and Da'eef according to the Jamhoor Muhadditheen. On contrary to the Jamhoor, the tawtheeq of Ibn Farqad ash-Shaybaani is only proven from Haakim Neesaaboori and Haafidh Haythami of 8<sup>th</sup> century Hijri, which is not hujjah due to being against the Jamhoor.

### **Some Fawaaid (Benefits):**

- 1- If someone says that “Isn't being a Faqeeh a Ta'deel?” The answer to this claim is that if the Jamhoor Muhadditheen have done Jarh then being a Faqeeh is not a Ta'deel; and if Jamhoor Muhadditheen have done Tawtheeq then being a Faqeeh can be presented as a support of Ta'deel.

[Also see, Al-Badar al-Muneer by Ibn al-Mulaqqin (5/755)]

If there is a narrator after third century hijri on whom there is no Jarh proven then his Tawtheeq can be extracted from the words like Faqeeh, Imaam etc after looking at the qaraain. But it should be remembered that these words are not at all the words of Tawtheeq as compared to the Jarh of Jamhoor. Following are two examples for right now:

**Example # 1:** Imaam Daaraqutni said concerning, Abu Bishr Ahmed bin Muhammad bin Amr bin Mus'ab bin Bishr bin Fadaalah al-Marwazi **al-Faqeeh** that: **"He used to fabricate narrations"**  
[Ad-Du'afa wal Matrokeen (60); Lisaan al-Meezaan (1/290)]

**Example # 2:** Haafidh Dhahabi said concerning, Ibraaheem bin Ali al-Aamdi ibn al-Faraa **al-Faqeeh** that: **"He used to lie in his stories"**  
[Meezaan ul-I'tidaal (1/50); Lisaan al-Meezaan (1/86)]

2- Even though Imaam Shaafi'ee has written narrations from Muhammad bin al-Hasan, but he has also done his refutation. For example, see: Manaaqib ash-Shaafi'ee by Bayhaqi (1/186, Chain Saheeh)

Imaam Shaafi'ee said: **"I debated with Muhammad bin al-Hasan; he was wearing thin clothes, then his veins started bulging (due to anger) and he started screaming"**  
[Taareekh Baghdaad: 2/177, Chain Saheeh]

3- The student of Imaam Abu Haneefah, Qaadhi Abu Yoosuf Ya'qoob bin Ibraaheem said concerning Muhammad bin al-Hasan: **"Say to this Kadhdhaab (Habitual Liar) i.e. Muhammad bin al-Hasan. The narrations that he narrates from me, has he heard them from me?"**  
[Taareekh Baghdaad: 2/180, Chain Hasan]

The tawtheeq of the narrators of this narration is as follows:

1. Haafidh Dhahabi said concerning Bishr bin al-Waleed bin Khaalid al-Kindi al-Hanafi: **“He is al-Imaam al-Allaamah al-Muhaddith al-Saadiq, Qaadhi of Iraaq”**  
[Al-Nabula: 10/673]

Khateeb Baghdaadi has praised him.  
[See, Taareekh Baghdaad (7/81 T. 3518)]

Haafidh Ibn Hibbaan mentioned him Kitaab ath-Thiqaat (8/143). Abu Awaanah in Saheeh Abi Awaanah [4/7 H. 5617] and Zaya al-Maqdisi in al-Mukhtaarah [1/479 H. 353] have narrated narrations from him. Ibn al-Jawzee said: **“He is a Scholar, Devout, Faqeeh, Thiqah”**  
[Al-Muntazim: 11/260]

On contrary to these praises, the criticisms of Abu Ali Saalih bin Muhammad al-Baghdaadi and Abu Dawood as-Sijistaani on Bishr are not proven. Haafidh Dhahabi wrote the sign of “Sahha” next to the name of Bishr bin al-Waleed al-Kindi al-Faqeeh which means that the Jarh on him is Marjooh according to Imaam Dhahabi.  
[See, Meezaan ul-I’tidaal: 1/326]

Haafidh Ibn Hajar has said in the biography of Haarith bin Muhammad bin Abi Usaamah that the meaning of the sign “Sahha” in Meezaan ul-I’tidaal of (Haafidh) Dhahabi means that the ruling is on the tawtheeq of that narrator.  
[Lisaan al-Meezaan (2/159)]

2. The student of Bishr bin al-Waleed, Ahmed bin al-Qaasim bin Muhammad bin Sulemaan Abu al-Hasan at-Taa’ee al-Barqi was Thiqah.  
[Taareekh Baghdaad: 4/350 T. 2191]
3. The student of Ahmed bin al-Qaasim, Ahmed bin Kaamil bin Shajrah al-Qaadhi al-Baghdaadi is Sudooq Hasan ul-Hadeeth because of being

praised by the Jamhoor. Ibn Razquwayh has done an excellent Ta'deel of him; while Al-Haakim and Dhahabi have declared his hadeeth to be Saheeh [Al-Mustadrak with its Talkhees: 4/524 H. 8598]. Therefore, the Jarh of Imaam Daaraqutni on him is Marjooh.

**Note:** All the places where I (Shaykh Zubayr) have written the words like "Da'eef" etc concerning Ahmed bin Kaamil [for example see: Al-Hadeeth (19, P. 46); Tahqeeqi Maqalaat (1/535)] are Mansookh according to the latest tahqeeq. And now the ruling about Ahmed bin Kaamil is that he is Hasan ul-Hadeeth, wa lillaahi il-Hamd!

4. In the above mentioned narration, the student of Ahmed bin Kaamil, "Al-Hasan bin Abi Bakr: Ibraaheem bin Ahmed bin al-Hasan bin Muhammad bin Shaazaan bin Harb bin Mihraan al-Bazaar" is Thiqah. [See, Taareekh Baghdaad (7/279 T. 3772)]

In short, this chain is Hasan. For the biography of Qaadhi Abu Yoosuf, see: Monthly Al-Hadeeth Hazro: 19 P. 45-55; and Tahqeeqi Maqaalaat Vol. 1 P. 533-548.

Now what remains after the Jarh of Qaadhi Abu Yoosuf al-Hanafi, Imaam Yahya ibn Ma'een, Imaam Ahmed bin Hanbal and others? But still we present the reality of some claimed Manaaqib as follows:

### **Baab al-Manaaqib:**

The Praise of Muhammad bin al-Hasan is proven from Haafidh Dhahabi etc, but this is rejected due to three reasons:

1. It is against the Jamhoor.
2. It is against the Kibaar Ulama like Imaam Ahmed, and Imaam Yahya ibn Ma'een etc.
3. In this praise itself, there is no explicit Tawtheeq mentioned.

If someone says that Haafidh Dhahabi has narrated from Imaam Abu Ubayd rahimahullah that: **“I have not seen anyone a bigger Scholar of Qur’aan than Muhammad bin al-Hasan”**

[Manaaqib al-Imaam wa Saahibayhi by Dhahabi P. 50]

The answer to this is that this saying is mentioned without any chain here. And in Taareekh Baghdaad (2/175) and Manaaqib as-Saymree (P. 123), it is narrated with the chain of Ahmed bin Muhammad bin As-Salt bin al-Mughallis al-Hammaani al-Baghdaadi.

Imaam Ibn Adee said concerning: Ibn al-Mughallis al-Hammaani famous as: Ibn Atiyyah that: **“I have not seen anyone more shameless liar than him”**

[Al-Kaamil by Ibn Adee: 1/202]

Haafidh Ibn Hibbaan said: **“He used to fabricate ahadeeth on the people of Iraaq”**

[Al-Majroheen: 1/153]

Ad-Daaraqutni said: **“He fabricates ahadeeth”**

[Ad-Du’afa wal Matrokeen: 59; Taareekh Baghdaad: 5/34, Chain Saheeh]

Muhammad bin Abi al-Fawaaris said: **“He used to narrate many Baatil narrations after fabricating them by himself”**

[Taareekh Baghdaad: 4/207]

Haakim Neesaaboori said: **“He narrated ahadeeth which he had fabricated”**

[Al-Madkhal Ila as-Saheeh: P. 121 T. 19]

And Abu Nu’aym al-Asbahaani etc have also done Jarh on him. The narration of such a fabricator and Liar is Mawdoo (Fabricated); and only

those people can dare to present such narrations as a proof who themselves are fabricators, Liars, or huge ignorant.

- If someone says that Imaam ash-Shaafi'ee has written and narrated narrations from Ash-Shaybaani

So the answer is this is not a Tawtheeq after the Jarh of Jamhoor, because Imaam ash-Shaafi'ee has also narrated narrations from Ibraaheem bin Muhammad bin Abi Yahya al-Aslami (Matrook), Mutarrif bin Maazin as-Sana'aani (Severely Weak), and Yoosuf bin Khaalid as-Samtee (Kadh-dhaab).

- If someone says that Imaam ash-Shaafi'ee said concerning Ash-Shaybaani: **"I have not seen a person more intelligent, Faqeeh, Zaahid, and austere than him"**  
[Manaaqib Abi Haneefah and Saahibayhi by Dhahabi: P. 52]

This narration is rejected due to two reasons:

1. The Muttasil chain up to Ibn Kaas an-Nakha'ee is not known
2. Haafidh Dhahabi has declared it "Qaul Munkar" and it is established that a narrator knows his narration better than others. Therefore, the refutation of Al-Kawthaari on Adh-Dhahabi is rejected.

It should be remembered that Imaam ash-Shaafi'ee is not proven to have taken evidence from the hadeeth of ash-Shaybaani.

- If someone says that (among the Muta'khireen), Qaadhi Ahmed bin Kaamil al-Baghdaadi has praised Muhammad bin al-Hasan.

So the answer to this is that, this praise is rejected due to three reasons:

1. The one who narrated this praise from Ahmed bin Kaamil is, Abu Ubaydullah Muhammad bin Imraan bin Moosa al-Marzubaani. Al-Ateeqi said concerning him: **“He was Thiqah”**. Al-Azhari said: **“He was not Thiqah”** and said: **“He did not used to lie according to us”**. Abu Ubaydullah bin al-Kaatib said: **“I have seen his matter after which I came to know that he is a Kadh-dhaab”**. Muhammad bin Abi al-Fawaaris said: **“There was I’tizaaal and Tashee’ in him”**. Adhud ud-Daulah [A Raafidi/ See, Al-Nabula (16/249)] used to respect him a lot. [See, Taareekh Baghdaad: 3/135, 136]. From the Jarh of Jamhoor we come to know that this Al-Marzubaani is a Da’eef narrator.
  2. This praise is against the Jamhoor.
  3. This praise is rejected due to being against the Kibaar Muhadditheen.
- If someone says that Imaam Ali ibn al-Madeeni has declared Muhammad bin al-Hasan to be **“Sudooq (Truthful)”** [Taareekh Baghdaad: 2/181]

The answer to this claim is that the narrator of this saying from Ibn al-Madeeni is, Abdullah bin Ali bin Abdullah al-Madeeni, who is Majhool ul-Haal. His clear tawtheeq is not proven from any Muhaddith. In fact, a saying of Imaam ad-Daaraqutni points towards his being Da’eef. See, Sawalaat as-Sulami (387) and Al-Hadeeth Hazro (16 P. 31).

If someone says that “He is famous with Ibn al-Madeeni” so the answer is that it is not a Tawtheeq. For example, Haafidh Dhahabi said concerning a narrator named Baqaa that: **“He is Kadh-dhaab... famous with Ibn al-Ullayq”** [Meezaan ul-I’tidaal: 1/339]

If someone still persists to consider the son of Imaam Ibn al-Madeeni to be Thiqah and Sudooq due to stubbornness then we say that the same

son once asked his Father (Imaam Ali ibn al-Madeeni rahimahullah) about Imaam Abu Haneefah, the son said that he (Ibn al-Madeeni) replied: **“He is a Man of Raaye (opinions and Qiyaas)”, and he declared him a severely weak person, and said: “If he (Abu Haneefah) had been in front of me then I would not have asked him about anything. He has erred in fifty narrations”**

[Taareekh Baghdaad: 13/450]

And this is same chain in which Hasan bin Ziyaad al-Lu’luwi etc have been declared Severely Weak. So what do you think, should we include Imaam Ibn al-Madeeni among the Jaariheen of Imaam Abu Haneefah and Hasan bin Ziyaad!?

If someone has a clear proof for the trustworthiness or truthfulness of the son of Imaam Ibn al-Madeeni, then he should present it to us, otherwise, there is no way except to agree that he is Majhool ul-Haal.

- If someone says that Haakim has authenticated the hadeeth of Muhammad bin al-Hasan

So the answer is that this authentication is rejected due to three reasons:

1. Haafidh Dhahabi refuted Al-Haakim under the Talkhees of this hadeeth saying: **“I say: Bil-Daboos”**

[Talkhees al-Mustadrak: 4/341 H. 7990]

While commenting on this saying of Dhahabi, Abdur Rauf al-Manaawi said: **“And Dhahabi refuted him and said while criticizing him: ‘I says: Bil-Daboos’”**

[Faydh ul-Qadeer Sharh al-Jaami as-Sagheer: 6/489 H. 9688]

This proves that this authentication is rejected according to Dhahabi.

2. It is against the Jamhoor.
3. The people of Taqleed Criticize some narrators like: Muhammad bin Ishaq bin Yasaar, Mu'ammal bin Ismaa'eel, and Abul Humayd bin Ja'far etc. Whereas, Haakim and Dhahabi both have authenticated their ahadeeth.

For example see, Al-Mustadrak [Hadeeth Ibn Ishaq (4/380 H. 8147) Haakim said: Saheeh, and Dhahabi followed him; Hadeeth Mu'ammal (1/384 H. 1418) Authenticated upon the conditions of Shaykhayn and Dhahabi followed him; Hadeeth Abdul Humayd bin Ja'far (1/500 H. 1842) Authenticated by Al-Haakim and Dhahabi followed him]

At these places, these people don't accept the Tasheeh of Haakim in accordance to Jamhoor; while in case of Ash-Shaybaani, they would accept his Tasheeh against the Jamhoor. What a Justice. Subhaan-Allaah!

- If someone says that the word "Imaam" is also counted among one of the excellent forms of Ta'deel.

Then we say that it can be taken as a Ta'deel if the narrator's Tawtheeq is done by Jamhoor; but it is not at all a Ta'deel concerning a narrator who is criticized by Jamhoor.

Haafidh Dhahabi said concerning a famous Hanbali Imaam, Ubaydullah bin Muhammad bin Battah al-Ukburi that: **"He is an Imaam but he is Layyin (weak) and a man of Mistakes"**  
[Al-Mughni fi ad-Du'afa: 2/31 T. 3944]

For the Jarh on Hafs bin Umar bin Abi Hafs al-Waasiti al-Najjaar al-Imaam, See Lisaan al-Meezaan (2/327, 328)

Haafidh Dhahabi said concerning Muhammad bin Ishaq bin Yasaar that: **"Al-Madani al-Imaam, he saw Anas"**  
[Al-Kaashif: 3/18 T. 4789]

But many people of Taqleed do not consider this to be a Tawtheeq for Ibn Ishaq, and make him their target of severe criticism and Jarh in the issue of Faatihah Khalf al-Imaam. For example, A Braylwee Ghulaam Mustafa Noori wrote: **“Then its chain contain Muhammad bin Ishaq, who is a Kadh-dhaab. Thus it is clear that this chain is severely criticized and not a Hujjah”**

[Kitaab: Tark-e-Raf’ ul-Yadayn, P. 419]

Whereas, Haafidh Dhahabi has declared Ibn Ishaq to be an Imaam and Jamhoor Muhadditheen have done his Tawtheeq.

See My Book “Al-Kawaakib al-Durriyah fi Wujoob il-Faatihah Khalf al-Imaam fil Jahriyyah (P. 60)”

In fact, the “Imaam” of Braylwiiyyah, Ahmad Raza Khaan has also written: **“According to our Scholars also, the authentic saying is that Muhammad bin Ishaq is Thiqah”**

[Muneer ul-Ayn fi Hukm Taqbeel al-Abhaamayn P. 145; Fatawa Rizwiyah: 5/596]

Declaring the word ‘Imaam’ to be a Tawtheeq at one place and rejecting it at another place by declaring the narrator, labeled with the word Imaam, to be a Kadh-dhaab; what kind of justice is this?

- If someone says that Haafidh Noor ud-Deen al-Haythami has declared the Hadeeth of Ash-Shaybaani to be Hasan  
[Majma az-Zawaaid: 6/146; Al-Mu’jam al-Kabeer by Tabaraani: 7/101 H. 6496]

The answer is that, on the very same page, Haythami has mentioned the narration of Muhammad bin Ishaq and said: **“All its narrators are Thiqaat”**. So why do you people get annoyed by this?

Secondly, Haafidh Haythami is from the Muta'khireen and this Tahseen of his against the Jamhoor Muhadditheen and Akaabir Ulama, thus rejected.

- No one denies that Muhammad bin al-Hasan ash-Shaybaani has authored Al-Muwatta and other books but the chains of the manuscripts of these books that the people of Taqleed have right now, are not Saheeh.

If someone says that Ibn Adee, Daaraqutni, and Ibn Abdil Barr etc have testified to the authorship of these books by Ash-Shaybaani then we say that these ancient testimonies only give the proof of the existence of these books, but these do not prove that the present Nuskhahs of Aal-e-Taqleed are also proven with an authentic chain.

If someone says that Abdul Qaadir al-Qurashi has provided the chain for Muwatta of Ash-Shaybaani in al-Jawaahir al-Mudiyah, so the answer is that firstly this chain is weak due to the weakness of Abdul Ghaffaar al-Mu'addab and other defects, and even if it is proven to be Saheeh then the present Nuskhahs are not written or narrated by Abdul Qaadir.

**Note:** The following books are attributed to Muhammad bin al-Hasan bin Farqad ash-Shaybaani:

1. Kitaab al-Hujjah Ala Ahl al-Madeenah
2. Al-Muwatta
3. Al-Athaar
4. Al-Jaami as-Sagheer
5. As-Siyar as-Sagheer
6. As-Siyar al-Kabeer etc.

Among these books, Al-Muwatta and Al-Athaar are not proven from Ibn Farqad with an authentic chain.

[See, Al-Hadeeth Hazro (7 P. 19, 20)]

**Tasdeeq Taa'eed Rabbaani fi Jawaab: Mazmoon Fadl  
Rabbaani Ibtal Mazaa'im Tawtheeqat Ibn Farqad  
ash-Shaybaani:**

This is the article in which Shaykh Zubayr Alee Za'ee answered the arguments of a Deobandi Scholar which he wrote in refutation of Taa'eed Rabbaani. In this article, he has unsuccessfully tried to prove the Tawtheeq of Ash-Shaybaani. In the following article, Shaykh Zubayr Alee Za'ee has answered all his claims of tawtheeq.

**Note:** I will only be translating the contents which have not been discussed in the previous article (Taa'eed Rabbaani).

**1-** Abu Yoosuf said concerning Muhammad ash-Shaybaani: **“Hold firm to him, because he (Ash-Shaybaanbi) is the most knowledgeable of all people”**

[See, Fadhaail Abi Haneefah wa Akhbaaruhu by Ibn Abi al-Awwaam, P. 120; & Buloogh al-Amaani by Al-Kawthaari: P. 57, 36 etc]

**Answer:**

The chain of this narration is mentioned by a Muta'assib Taqleedi Abu al-Wafa al-Afghaani under the footnote of Manaaqib al-Imaam Abi Haneefah wa Saahibayhi Abi Yoosuf wa Muhammad bin al-Hasan by Adh-Dhahabi:

"كتاب ابن أبي العوام... قال: حدثني أحمد بن محمد بن سلامة قال: حدثني أحمد بن أبي عمران قال: حدثني محمد بن عبدالرحمن بن بكر الطبري قال: سمعت معلي بن منصور يقول: لقيني أبو يوسف بهيئة القضاء...."

This narration is Mardood due to two reasons:

1. Its narrator, Muhammad bin Abdur Rahman bin Bakr at-Tabari is unknown and Ghayr-Mawthaq
2. Ibn Abi al-Awwaam is also Ghayr-Mawthaq (i.e. Majhool ul-Haal) [See, Talee'ah al-Tankeel by Shaykh al-Mu'allami al-Yamaani rahimahullah (P. 27, al-Tankeel: 1/27)]

**Benefit:** On the contrary to this Da'eef and Mardood narration, it is proven that Qaadhi Abu Yoosuf has declared Ibn Farqad to be Kadh-dhaab

[Taareekh Baghdaad: 2/180; Also See P. 25 Point # 3 above]

2- It is narrated from Imaam ash-Shaafi'ee rahimahullah: **"I have not seen a bigger Aalim of the book of Allaah than Muhammad bin al-Hasan, as if Qur'aan was revealed on him... I have written (books) from him equal to the weight of a camel"**

**Answer:**

Although this saying is not a tawtheeq but still even if someone is persistent in declaring it a Tawtheeq then we say that it is Mansookh. Imaam ash-Shaafi'ee said concerning the book "Ar-Radd Ala Ahl al-Madeenah" of Ash-Shaybaani that: **"I looked at it in the beginning then he put it away or threw it away"**

[Manaaqib ash-Shaafi'ee by Bayhaqi: 1/121, Chain Saheeh]

Imaam ash-Shaafi'ee said to Ibn Farqad: **"I looked at this book of yours, thus after 'Bismillaah ir-Rahmaan ir-Raheem' everything in it is wrong"**

[Manaaqib ash-Shaafi'ee: 1/122, Chain Hasan]

There are many other evidences for Naskh, such as the Jarh of Imaam ash-Shaafi'ee on the teacher of Ibn Farqad etc.

- 3- Some people narrated from Abu Hafs al-Kabeer al-Bukhaari (D. 217) with reference from As-Sama'aani in Al-Ansaab and Manaajib Abi Haneefah by Al-Kardari that: **"Whoever saw Muhammad (bin al-Hasan ash-Shaybaani) thus he recognized that he was born for knowledge, and many righteous, protectors of their tongue, good mannered, beloved, out-classed, sincere natured, and Kaamil ul-Aql were born with him"**

[Same]

**Answer:**

This narration is Mardood due to many reasons:

1. The chain from Kardari Bazzaazi (D. 827) to As-Sama'aani is unknown.
2. As-Sama'aani is not clarified.
3. If by Sama'aani, Abu Sa'd Abdul Kareem bin Muhammad bin Mansoor as-Sama'aani Saahib ul-Ansaab (D. 562) is meant then this narration is neither proven from any of his books, nor is it proven from anywhere with an authentic chain from him.

In short, this chain-less narration is Mardood.

- 4- There was a man named Abu Muhammad Eesa bin Abaan bin Sadaqah al-Qaadhi, who used to consider Qur'aan to be a creation and used to call towards it.

[See, Lisaan al-Meezaan: 4/391]

Some people narrated with reference from Kardari from Sahl bin Sahl al-Asfaraaini from Sa'd bin Mu'aadh Abi Asmah that Eesa bin Abaan was asked: **"Abu Yoosuf is a bigger Faqeeh or Muhammad bin al-Hassan is a bigger Faqeeh?"** So he replied: **"The books of**

**both of them are to be looked i.e. Muhammad bin al-Hasan is a bigger Faqeeh”**

[Manaaqib Kardari: 2/159; Al-Naafi' al-Kabeer: P. 37]

**Answer:**

This narration is Mardood and Baatil due to many reasons:

1. The chain from Kardari (D. 827) to Sahl bin Sahl al-Asfaraaini is not known.
  2. Al-Asfaraaini himself is unknown.
  3. The chain from Al-Asfaraaini to Sa'd bin Mu'aadh is unknown.
  4. Haafidh Dhahabi said concerning, Abu Asmah Sa'd bin Mu'aadh al-Marwazi that: **“He is Majhool and his Hadeeth is Baatil”**  
[Meezaan al-I'tidaal: 2/125]
- 5- There is a Sudooq Hasan ul-Hadeeth and Thiqah (according to the Jamhoor) narrator named Yahya bin Saalih al-Wuhaazi; but Thiqah Thabat Imaam Ishaq bin Mansoor al-Kausaj rahimahullah said: **“Yahya bin Saalih narrated to us, and he is a Murji'i Khabeeth, he used to call (towards Irjaa), leave him, he does not deserve to be narrated from”**  
[Kitaab ad-Du'afa by al-Ukaylee: 4/409, Chain Saheeh]

The narration of such a Bid'ati narrator can be accepted only on the condition that his tawtheeq is proven from Jamhoor Muhadditheen. However, his rayi (opinion) would be considered Mardood.

**Benefit:** After the Jarh of Jamhoor, declaring a narrator to be Faqeeh or a bigger Faqeeh is not tawtheeq, rather it has no benefit, for example, Ahmed bin Muhammad bin Amr bin Mus'ab bin Bishr bin Fadaalah Abu Bishr al-Marwazi was a Faqeeh but besides that, he was also a Kadh-dhaab and a Fabricator.

[See, Meezaan al-I'tidaal (1/149), and Lisaan al-Meezaan (1/290-291)]

- 6- Some people have narrated with reference from Fadhaail Abi Haneefah wa Akhbaaruhu by Ibn Abi al-Awwaam that Imaam Maalik said, while the people of hadeeth were sitting next to him, that: **“No one has come to us from the East who knows and understands the meanings”** and Muhammad bin al-Hasan was also in that group. Imaam Maalik looked at him and said: **“Except this young-man”** [P. 125]

**Answer:**

This narration is Mardood due to two reasons:

1. Ibn Abi al-Awwaam is Majhool and Ghayr-Mawthaq.  
[See, This article: #1 Point # 2 of the answer]
2. The chain from Ibn Abi al-Awwaam to Imaam Maalik rahimahullah is not known.

- 7- Some people narrated from Thiqah and Sudooq person, Hasan bin Abi Maalik that: **“The depth at which Muhammad bin al-Hasan has reached, was not even reached by Abu Yoosuf”** [Fadhaail Abi Haneefah by Ibn Abi al-Awwaam: P. 22]

**Answer:**

This narration is weak due to several reasons for example:

1. Ibn Abi al-Awwaam is Majhool [See, Point # 1]
2. The chain from Ibn Abi al-Awwaam to Hasan bin Abi Maalik is not known.

- 8- Some people narrated from Abu Muqaatil as-Samarqandi Hafs bin Salm that: **“I have not seen a bigger Faqeeh than him (Muhammad bin al-Hasan ash-Shaybaani)”**.  
[As-Sama’aani with reference from Manaajib Kardari: 2/155]

**Answer:**

This narration is Mardood due to many reasons, for example:

1. The chain from Kardari to As-Sama’aani is not known.
2. If Saahib al-Ansaab is meant by Sama’aani then this narration is not even proven from him.
3. The chain from Sama’aani to Abu Muqaatil is not known.
4. Abu Muqaatil as-Samarqandi himself is severely weak and Majrooh.

[See, Monthly al-Hadeeth Hazro: 71 P. 44-47]

- 9- Some people have narrated from Imaam Abu Ubayd Al-Qaasim bin Salaam rahimahullah (D. 224) that: **“I have not seen a bigger Scholar of the book of Allaah than Muhammad bin al-Hasan”**  
[Akhbaar Abi Haneefah by as-Saymree: P. 124; Manaajib Kardari: 2/153, 156]

**Answer:**

In Manaajib Kardari (2/156), this narration is mentioned without any chain from some person named “Al-Halabi (?)”, and chain-less narrations are Mardood. The chain from Halabi (?) to Abu Ubayd is also unknown. Kardari has narrated it in other words, without any chain, from some As-Sama’aani and Asfaraaini. The chain from As-Sama’aani to Al-Asfaraaini is unknown; i.e. Full of Darkness after Darkness.

Since Akhbaar Abi Haneefah of Saymree is a book with chains, therefore, the chain for this narration is present there, the comments on which are as follows:

It contains the narrator, Ibn al-Mughallis (Ahmed bin Muhammad bin as-Salt bin al-Mughallis, famous as: Ibn Atiyyah al-Hammaani) who is severely weak and Kadh-dhaab, as has passed above.

Moreover, the teacher of Saymree, Abu al-Qasim Abdullah bin Muhammad al-Halwaani al-Bazzaaz was also a Kadh-dhaab.  
[See, Taareekh Baghdaad: 10/137 T. 5277]

Meaning, this chain is fabricated; and it also proves that chain-less narrations can, many a times, also include Mawdoo and Mardood narrations.

**10-** Imaam Ibn Sa'd (Kaatib al-Waaqidi) mentioned Ibn Farqad in Tabaqaat al-Kubra and said that he was raised in Koofah, sought knowledge, and heard a lot of narrations from Mis'ar, Maalik bin Maghool, Umar bin Dhar, Sufyaan ath-Thawree... and others. He adopted the company of Abu Haneefah and heard from him. When he looked into Raye', so it dominated him, and he became famous with it (i.e. raye), and became an expert in it.  
[Tabaqaat al-Kubra: 7/336]

**Answer:**

This saying does not contain any kind of Tawtheeq or praise, rather it points towards Jarh by mentioning the domination of raye in him. Ibn Sa'd said about a famous teacher of Ibn Farqad that: **“And he is a man of raye... and he is Da'eef in hadeeth”**

[Tabaqaat Ibn Sa'd: 6/368-369]

**11-** Some people have narrated from Asad bin al-Faraat (D. 213) through Shadhraat adh-Dhahab (2/17) that: **“Muhammad bin Hasan (bin Farqad) is Imaam Rabbaani...”**  
[See, Shadhraat adh-Dhahab: 1/322]

**Answer:**

The author of Shadhraat adh-Dhahab, Abdul Hayy Ibn al-Ammaad al-Hanbali was born in 1032 H and died in 1089 H. The chain from him to Ibn al-Faraat is unknown. Therefore, this narration is Mardood and Baatil.

**12-** Some people have narrated from Muhammad bin Samaa’ah al-Koofi (D. 213) that: **“Muhammad bin al-Hasan ash-Shaybaani and Hasan bin Ziyaad both are the Faqeeh of the world”**  
[Fadhaail Abi Haneefah: P. 121; Akhbaar Abi Haneefah wa Ashaabih: P. 126]

**Answer:**

The author of Fadhaail Abi Haneefah, Ibn Abi al-Awwaam is Majhool [See, Point # 1] whose tawtheeq is not proven from any Muhaddith. Moreover, the chain of Ibn Abi al-Awwaam is also unknown.

The narration of Akhbaar Abi Haneefah is Mardood due to two reasons:

**First:** If by “Ahmed bin Ubaydullah ath-Thaqafi” Hammaar al-Azeez is meant, then he was a Shi’aa Qadari (Misguided).

[See, Lisaan al-Meezaan: 1/219]

And if he is some other person then his tawtheeq and ta’ayyun is not done.

**Second:** The tawtheeq of Bakr bin Khalf al-Amami or Bakr bin Muhammad al-Amami is not known.

13- Some people have narrated from Imaam Yahya ibn Ma'een that: **"I have written al-Jaami al-Sagheer from Muhammad bin al-Hasan"**  
[Taareekh Baghdaad: 2/175-176; Akhbaar Abi Haneefah lil Saymree: P. 125 etc]

**Answer:**

This is not any Tawtheeq. On the contrary, Imaam Yahya ibn Ma'een said about Ibn Farqad that: **"He is Jahmi Kadh-dhaab"**  
[Ad-Du'afa lil Ukaylee: 4/52, Chain Saheeh]

Imaam ad-Daaraqutni has also narrated this Jarh from Imaam Yahya ibn Ma'een.  
[See, Taareekh Baghdaad: 2/181, Chain Saheeh up to ad-Daaraqutni]

Imaam Yahya ibn Ma'een further said: **"He is nothing, so do not write his hadeeth"**  
[Taareekh Baghdaad: 2/181, Chain Hasan; al-Kaamil by Ibn Adee: 6/2183 with a little difference, Chain Saheeh]

14- Some people have narrated the saying of Imaam Ali bin al-Madeeni from Taareekh Baghdaad [2/11] that **"Muhammad bin al-Hasan was Sadooq"**

**Answer:**

The central narrator of this saying is, Abdullah bin Ali bin al-Madeeni, who is Majhool due to being Ghayr Mawthaq. Therefore, this narration is Mardood.

15- Some people have narrated from Imaam Ahmed bin Hanbal that: **"I have received these difficult and detailed masaail from Muhammad bin al-Hasan ash-Shaybaani"**

[Akhbaar Abi Haneefah: P. 125; Taareekh Baghdaad: 2/18 etc]

**Answer:**

Its narrator “Abu Bakr Muhammad bin Bishr bin Moosa bin Marwaan al-Qaraateesi” is Majhool ul-Haal. Therefore, this narration is Mardood.  
[Also see, Ilmi Maqalaat: 2/348]

On the contrary, Imaam Ahmed bin Hanbal was weakened Ibn Farqad as proven above.

- 16-** Some people have narrated from Hishaam bin Ubaydullah ar-Raazi that: **“When the death time of Muhammad bin al-Hasan came close, he was crying out of the fear of meeting Allaah”**  
[As-Sama’aani with reference from Manaaqib Kardari: 2/149]

**Answer:**

This narration is Da’eef and Mardood because of many reasons:

**First:** The chain from Kardari to as-Sama’aani is unknown.

**Second:** The chain from As-Sama’aani to Hishaam bin Ubaydullah is unknown.

**Third:** Hishaam ar-Raazi himself is Weak.

- 17-** Some people have narrated from Muhammad bin Salaam al-Baykandi that: **“Muhammad bin al-Hasan is a pious person”**  
[Sama’aani with reference from Manaaqib Kardari: 2/153]

**Answer:**

This narration is Mardood due to two reasons:

**First:** The chain from Kardari to Sama’aani is unknown.

**Second:** The chain from As-Sama'aani to Muhammad bin Salaam is unknown.

One should be ashamed of presenting chain-less narrations!

**18-** Some people have narrated from Muhammad bin Kaamil al-Marwazi that: **"I... have not seen anyone more handsome than Muhammad, nor (have I seen) more lofty Majlis than his Majlis, and a better dictator (of hadeeth and Fiqh) than him; and he was the most frequent presenter of Hujjah and Dalaail, and he was most god-fearing person"**

[Abu al-'Alaa with reference from Manaaqib Kardari: 2/162]

**Answer:**

This narration is Mardood due to many reasons:

**First:** The chain from Kardari to Abu al-'Alaa al-Hamdaani is unknown.

**Second:** The chain from Abu al-'Alaa to Muhammad bin Kaamil is unknown.

**Third:** The tawtheeq of Abu al-'Alaa is unknown.

**19-** Some people have narrated from Ahl al-Hadeeth Imaam Qutaybah bin Sa'eed al-Baghlaani that: **"I adopted the studentship of Muhammad bin Hasan... I have written a lot of books from his books, and I did not see anyone more frequent in Ibaadah than him."**

[Sama'aani with reference from Manaaqib Kardari: 2/153]

**Answer:**

This narration is Mardood and Baatil due to many reasons:

**First:** The chain from Kardari to Sama'aani is unknown.

**Second:** The chain from As-Sama'aani to Qutaybah bin Sa'eed is unknown.

**Third:** There is also dispute about the ta'ayyun of Sama'aani.

**Dear Readers!** As you saw, some people have presented 19 references to prove the tawtheeq of Ibn Farqad, out of which 15 references are not proven, and the remaining 4 references (2, 5, 10, and 13) are not a Tawtheeq.

This proves that as compared to 10 Muhadditheen and the proven references of Qaadhi Abu Yoosuf, these poor people have no evidence, but still they scream the tawtheeq of Ibn Farqad ash-Shaybaani due to Stubbornness, Ta'assub, and Obstinacy.

---