

CORRECTING HAJJI AND DR YASIR QADHI ON THE ASCRIPTION OF SHARH US-SUNNAH TO AL-BARBAHĀRĪ¹

In the Name of Allāh, the Most Beneficent, Most Merciful

Indeed all praise is due to Allāh, we praise Him, we seek His Aid and ask for His forgiveness, whomsoever Allāh guides there is none to misguide and whomsoever Allāh misguides there is none to guide. I bear witness that there is no god worthy of worship except Allāh and I bear witness that Muhammad is His Messenger, to proceed:

It has come to our attention that two individuals have risen to the occasion to throw doubt on the ascription of *Sharh us-Sunnah* to Imām Abū Muhammad al-Hasan bin 'Ali al-Barbahārī. The only book which is perfect is Allāh's Book and any other book after it does not have to be accepted as if on par with the words of Allāh as only the Qur'ān and the words of the Prophet (*sallAllaahu 'alayhi wassallam*) as relayed in the verified Sunnah are the sources which are distinguished with the status of being *Thābitah* [verified], *Shāmilah* [comprehensive], *Hākimah* [legislatively authoritative], being *'Āmilah* [practical to follow] and possessing *'Ismah* [infallibility]. This has been noted in the lessons of our Shaykh Mashhūr Hasan Āl Salmān in his lessons on Qawā'id ul-Fiqhiyyah. The statements of scholars therefore can never be placed on par with that of the Islamic texts as is committed today by many.

¹ Written by 'AbdulHaq al-Ashanti (BA, MA and former PhD student, SOAS, University of London). Dated Tuesday 29th September 2020 CE/12th Safar 1442H.

The approach to the book *Sharh us-Sunnah* is one of excess and neglect. From those who try to blindly implement it on modern UK shores with *jahl* [ignorance], *ghulū* [extremism] and *tatarruf* [fanaticism] to those who assert that it is a book of ‘unsound doctrine’,² and those who are now exclaiming, with an air of arrogance, pomp and academic dishonesty that *Sharh us-Sunnah* was in fact written by a fabricator of hadeeth and they have now uncovered this for the people – even though some Ash’ari-Sūfīs have also posited this argument over the years.

This will be the topic of this paper:

ONE

An individual from Birmingham called ‘Hajji’, and also Dr Yasir Qadhi, in continuing with his track record of academic dishonesty and intellectual denial,³ have argued recently that *Sharh us-Sunnah* was in fact written by a fabricator of hadeeth named Ghulām Khaleel al-Bāhili. This was also posited over the last few years by ‘AbdurRa’ūf al-Bahraynī al-Azharī and also the Naqshbandī Sūfī Ash’arī GF Haddad.

However, Qadhi has not mentioned that this topic has been discussed in detail by the editors of the two most detailed critical editions of *Sharh us-Sunnah*, Shaykh Khālīd bin Qāsīm ar-Radādī, may Allāh preserve him and also Shaykh ‘AbdurRahmān bin Ahmad al-Jumayzī. Shaykh Khālīd ar-Radādī published his annotated commentary and critical edition in 1414AH/1993 CE and was published by Maktabat ul-Ghurabā’ al-Athariyyah in Madeenah.⁴ On pages 25-28 and 42-45 Shaykh Khālīd addresses the issue with Ghulām Khaleel in some detail. ‘AbdurRahmān bin Ahmad al-Jumayzī’s annotated commentary and critical edition was published in 1434 AH/2013 CE by Dār ul-Minhāj in Riyadh, KSA.⁵

² As is also claimed by the GF Haddād, the ghost writer for the Naqshabandī Sūfī Haqqānī Tareeqah in the English language and who asserted this in a book supposedly on ‘correct Islamic doctrine’!?

³ Refer to: <http://salafimanhaj.com/did-muhammad-ibn-abdulwahhab-revolt-against-the-ottomans-after-making-takfir>

<http://salafimanhaj.com/did-modern-salafi-scholars-invent-the-notion-of-istihlal>

<http://salafimanhaj.com/8-salafi-scholars-speak-on-dr-yasir-qadhis-theory>

⁴ This was the edition utilised by Dawud Burbank (*rahimahullāh*) for his famous translation.

⁵ I used the copy which was available at the Brixton Mosque library which brother ‘Umar al-Jamaykī informed of on Monday 28th September 2020 CE.

Yet all of this is apparently totally unbeknown to Dr Yasir Qadhi!? Well this is surprising, in light of Qadhi's recent assertion that theology is his area of specialisation and that he is aware of Shaykh Khālid's critical edition!? Shaykh Badr bin 'Ali bin Tāmī al-'Utaybī also has a paper on this topic of the ascription to Ghulām Khaleel rather than Imām al-Barbahārī.⁶

Qadhi also asserts, in a troubling statement which has sentiments of elitism, pomp and possibly even racism, that *Sharh us-Sunnah* attracts **“those of a certain socio-economic demographic of society”**, and that it appeals to **“them”**. It is upon the Dr to clarify this statement. Although it has been noticed of late that in some communities in the UK and US, sin, immorality and ignorance have been justified with notions of **“as long as he is not a Muṭtadī' akh”** and this is ignorance, playing down sin and an incorrect understanding of Sunnah and Salafīyyah. Yet this is a particular strain and a modern manifestation which has other deeper and complex factors than just pinning the blame on *Sharh us-Sunnah* of al-Barbahārī.

TWO

Both Shaykhs Khalid and al-Jumayzī state that the beginning of the manuscript of *Sharh us-Sunnah* contains a distortion and possible tampering, as it states that the book is ascribed to other than al-Barbahārī, i.e. ascribed to a Abū 'Abdullāh Ahmad bin Muhammad bin Ghālib bin Khālid bin Mirdās al-Bāhili al-Basrī, well known as 'Ghulām Khaleel'.

THREE

The chain of narration is: “Kitāb *Sharh us-Sunnah* from Abū Abdullāh Ahmad bin Muhammad bin Ghālib al-Bāhili Ghulām Khaleel (*rahimahullāh*), the narration of Abū Bakr Ahmad bin Kamil bin Khalaf bin Shajarah al-Qādī,⁷ the narration from Abū Ishāq Ibrāheem bin 'Umar bin Ahmad al-Barmakī al-Faqeeh,⁸ with an Ijāzah from Abu'l-Hasan Muhammad bin al-'Abbās bin Ahmad bin al-Furāt⁹ from Ibn Kāmil.”

⁶ Which can be found on islamancient.com entitled *Haqeeqat Nisbat Kitāb “Sharh us-Sunnah” li Imām al-Barbahārī* [The Reality of the Ascription of the Book *Sharh us-Sunnah* to Imām al-Barbahārī].

⁷ Ibn Kāmil was trustworthy, born in 260 AH, he was 15 when Ghulām Khaleel died but was a contemporary of al-Barbahārī. Ad-Dāraqutnī said that he was Mutasāhil and used to relay from his memory which caused errors. More on this will be discussed later.

⁸ He was born in Ramadān in 361 AH and died in 445 AH, both al-Khateeb al-Baghdādī and as-Sam'ānī say that he was sudūq and thiqaḥ.

⁹ He died in 384 AH, al-Khateeb al-Baghdādī said that he was a hujjah and thiqaḥ.

FOUR

The first folio of the manuscript states: “Bismillāhi ir-Rahmān ir-Raheem, from Shaykh, al-Imām, ath-Thiqah Abu’l-Husayn ‘AbdulHaq bin ‘AbdulKhāliq,¹⁰ it was said to him: Abū Tālib ‘AbdulQādir bin Muhammad bin ‘AbdulQādir bin Muhammad bin Yūsuf¹¹ informed you in the Jāmi’ Masjid while he was listening, that it was said to him: Shaykh Abū Ishāq Ibrāheem bin ‘Umar bin Ahmad al-Barmakī informed you: “what were granted permission to narrate from him and granted for you an Ijāzah of it?” He admitted and said: “yes, he said: Abu’l-Hasan Muhammad bin al-‘Abbās bin Ahmad bin Furāt informed us: about his book and he read from the book saying: Abū Bakr Ahmad bin Kāmil bin Khalaf bin Shajarah al-Qādi informed us of a reading of it saying: Abū ‘Abdullāh Ahmad bin Muhammad bin Ghālīb al-Bāhilī gave it to me and he said to me: narrate this book from me, from beginning to end...”

FIVE

So according to the manuscript in the Dhāhiriyyah Library, *Sharb us-Sunnah* is ascribed to Ghulām Khaleel, and not al-Barbahārī.

SIX

Ghulām Khaleel was a known liar and fabricator of hadeeth. Abū Dāwūd said about him: **“I fear that he will be a Dajjāl of Baghdad.”** Abū Hātim said: **“He narrates munkar hadeeth from unknown Shaykhs and I hold that he had no business in hadeeth, he was [merely] a righteous man.”** Ad-Dāraqutnī said: **“Matrūk.”** Ibn ‘Adiyy said: “I heard Abū Abdullāh an-Nahawandī say: ‘I said to Ghulām Khaleel: what is with all these heart-softeners which you relay?’ He replied: **‘I fabricated them to soften the hearts of the common people.’**” He died in 275 AH [888 CE], but *Sharb us-Sunnah* says:

¹⁰ Born in 494 AH, adh-Dhahabī in *Siyar*, vol. 20, p.552 says that he was thiqah and from a home of virtue. Ibn ul-Jawzī also said that he was thiqah. He died in Jumāda al-Awwal 575 AH.

¹¹ Born in 435 AH, thiqah and as-Sam’ānī said about him **“a righteous Shaykh, thiqah and strong in narration, he heard much and his narrations became widespread throughout the lands.”** He died in 516 AH.

Everything which I have described to you in this book is from Allāh, Allāh’s Messenger, from his companions, from the Tābi’een and from the 3rd and 4th centuries AH.

So Ghulām Khaleel could not be the author as he died during the last quarter of the 3rd century AH and did not witness the 4th century AH!

SEVEN

Barbahārī died in 329 AH [941 CE] and therefore witnessed the 4th century AH.

EIGHT

Let’s look at Ibn Kāmil, a narrator of the book *Sharh us-Sunnah*. Al-Khateeb al-Baghdādī says about him:

He was of the ’Ulama of ahkām, the sciences of the Qur’ān grammar, poetry, people’s days [i.e. history], biographies of the people of hadeeth and he has classifications in far more than that.

Adh-Dhahabī said about him: “the Imām, al-’Allāmah, al-Hāfidh...” Ad-Dāraqutnī said about him:

He was Mutasāhil, he may have narrated from his memory that which was not in the actual text.

This is an interesting point which was touched upon by Shaykh Badr al-’Utaybī, which is that Ibn Kāmil could have relayed the book and intended al-Barbahārī yet instead relayed al-Bāhilī. Allāhu Alim. Moreover, when he was young could have possibly narrated from Ghulām Khaleel as he was born in 260 AH, 15 years before the death of Ghulām Khaleel. It was more likely however that Ibn Kāmil narrated from al-Barbahārī as they were contemporaries. Al-Barbahārī died in 329 AH and Ibn Kāmil died in 350 AH [961 CE].

NINE

The fitnah and controversy which al-Barbahārī and his students faced when they fell out of favour with the new Abbasid ruler (ar-Rādī, who came into power in 323 AH/935 CE) may have led some copyists and transcribers to interpolate and tamper with documents and hence omit his name totally from the manuscript copy of the book which is currently extant so that it not be associated with al-Barbahārī. This is the core factor which is not being addressed by the opposers, although those involved with manuscript preservation, academic analysis and textual criticism always highlight that this can be an issue with manuscripts. This is even

more the case with Imām al-Barbahārī and the enemies he had and the controversies. This is noted also by al-Jumayzī on page 26 of his critical edit of Sharh us-Sunnah. That when ar-Rādī came to power some of the common people and the people of innovation incited ar-Rādī against al-Barbahārī and his students due to what they felt was harsh treatment. Indeed, to the extent that ar-Rādī ordered that no two students of al-Barbahārī could congregate! Al-Barbahārī had to go into hiding therefore at the end of his life.

There may have been copies of *Sharh us-Sunnah* which are no longer extant but were in circulation during the time of scholars Ibn Abī Ya'lā, Ibn ul-'Imād, Ibn Muflīh, Ibn Taymiyyah, adh-Dhahabī and al-'Ulaymī. Hence, Ibn Abī Ya'lā (d. 526 AH) in *Tabaqāt ul-Hanābilah* adds two additional pages to *Sharh us-Sunnah* which are not in the manuscript which is in the Dhāhiriyyah Library, as does al-'Ulaymī (d. 928 AH) in *al-Minhaj al-Ahmad*. For more on this see page 22 of the *tahqeeq* [critical edit] of 'AbdurRahmān bin Ahmad al-Jumayzī.

Al-Bārbahārī and his students were supported by the Abbasid rulers al-Muqtadir (ruled from 908-932 CE) and then al-Qāhir (ruled from 932-934 CE), and were strong and established which is evident from the tone of *Sharh us-Sunnah*. Imām Ibn Jarreer at-Tabarī even had to be buried in secret as it was feared that the students of al-Barbahārī would desecrate his grave as while he was alive his house was pelted by some of the students, as is said. Al-Bārbahārī and his students also used to openly command the good and forbid the evil, sometimes even by going into homes and removing apparent evils. But when ar-Rādī came into power in 323 AH/935 CE all of this was put to an end.

TEN

Ghulām Khaleel was famed for lying on hadeeth, so it is not far-fetched to think that later copyists adequately used to his name on plagiarised books and then ascribed them to him. Although it is unlikely that he himself directly plagiarised *Sharh us-Sunnah* as he died many years before al-Barbahārī. In saying that, if al-Barbahārī was born in 233 AH, as mentioned by al-'Ulaymī, he would have been 43 years of age, so it could have been possible for Ghulām Khaleel to have plagiarised the book.

ELEVEN

Most of those who have written biographies of al-Barbahārī mention that he authored a book entitled '*Sharh us-Sunnah*':

- ❖ Ibn Muflīh in *al-Furū'*, vol. 2, p.149.

- ❖ Ibn Muflih, *al-Ādāb ash-Shar'iyyah*, vol.1, pp.223-224
- ❖ Ibn Abī Ya'lā in *Tabaqāt ul-Hanābilah*, vol.3, pp.36-80 (critical edit of Dr 'AbdurRahmān bin Sulaymān al-'Uthaymeen)
- ❖ Shaykh ul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah in *Bughyat ul-Murtād*, p.258.
- ❖ Abu'l-Yameen al-'Ulaymī in *al-Minhaj al-Ahmad fī Tarājim As-hab il-Imām Ahmad*, vol.2, pp.27-37
- ❖ Ibn ul-'Imād al-Hanbalī in *ash-Shadharāt*, vol.2, pp.319-322
- ❖ Adh-Dhahabī in *al-'Ulum*, p.244 under issue no.13.
- ❖ Adh-Dhahabī in *Tārikh ul-Islām*, p.258 under 'Events of the Years 321-330 AH'.
- ❖ Adh-Dhahabī in *Sīyar A'lām un-Nubalā'*, vol.15, p.91.
- ❖ Majduddeen Ibn Taymiyyah, the grandfather of Shaykh ul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah, in *al-Musanwadab*, when he transmits his view on al-'Aql and Naql.
- ❖ Ibn 'AbdulHādī al-Hanbalī.
- ❖ As-Safadī in *al-Wāfi bi'l-Wafayāt*
- ❖ Ibn ul-Ghazzī in *Dīwān ul-Islām*.
- ❖ Ibn Rajab al-Hanbalī, wherein he relays in regards to not repeating the prayer which was intentionally abandoned.
- ❖ Ibn Hajar al-'Asqalānī in *Fath ul-Bārī*, vol.11, p.276.

Thus, it is likely that there were copies of *Sharh us-Sunnah*, which are no longer extant, but were in circulation during the time of the scholars mentioned above. Allāhu Alim.

TWELVE

Another point, is that if Ghulām Khaleel was famed for fabricating Raqā'iq, then *Sharh us-Sunnah* would be the last book he would write for the people!!? Barbahārī was, according to adh-Dhahabī in *Tārikh ul-Islām*, vol.5, p.487 **“shadeed [strong] against the innovators and had a reputation and nobility with the Sultan and knew the Madhhab in terms of Usūl and furū’.”** Ibn Katheer also says that al-Barbahārī was **“shadeed [strong] against the people of innovation and sin.”**

Qadhi objects to the way it is written, especially about the harshness against Ahl ul-Bida'. Although Qadhi totally neglects the fact this harsh position is also evident with Imāms Ahmad (d. 241 AH/855 CE) in *Usūl us-Sunnah*, al-Muzanī (d. 264 AH/877 CE) in his *Sharh us-Sunnah*, ar-Rāzi'ayn in their creed (Abū Hātim dying in 264 AH/878 CE and Abū Zur'ah in 277 AH/890 CE), Harb bin Ismā'il al-Handhalī al-Kirmānī (d. 280 AH/893 CE) in his *Masā'il*, 'Abdullāh bin al-

Imām Ahmad bin Hanbal (d. 290 AH/903 CE) in *Kitāb us-Sunnah*, Abū Bakr al-Khallāl (d. 311 AH/923 CE) in *as-Sunnah*,¹² Ibn Khuzaymah (d. 311 AH/923 CE) in *Kitāb ut-Tamheed*, Abū Bakr al-Ismāʿīlī (d. 371 AH/981 CE) in *ʿItiqād Abl us-Sunnah*, Ibn Abī Zayd al-Qayrawānī (d. 386 AH/996 CE) in his *Risālah*, Ibn Battah al-ʿUkbarī (d. 387 AH/997 CE) in *al-Ibānah*,¹³ al-Lālikāʿī (d. 418 AH/1027 CE) in *Sharh ʿItiqād Abl us-Sunnah*, as-Sābūnī (d. 449 AH/1057 CE) in *ʿAqīdat us-Salaf wa As-hāb ul-Hadeeth*, Ibn ul-Banāʿa al-Hanbalī (d. 471 AH/CE) in *ar-Radd ʿalaʾl-Mubtadiʿah* and as-Samʿānī (d. 489AH/1096 CE) in *Intisār li As-hāb il-Hadeeth*. May Allāh have mercy on all of them. His logic on this issue would necessitate throwing doubt on an entire corpus of Islamic creed and theology and a complete review of these works – and indeed, this is the aim of the likes of Qadhi. To expunge the classical corpus of early Islamic creed entirely of any difficult notions on the grounds of “not being in conformity with modernity” and “too harsh” and to relegate it to the realm of obscurantism, which ironically is where his own views ought to be neatly placed.

THIRTEEN

Another point, which was also noted by Shaykhs al-ʿUtaybī and al-Jumayzī, is that no one in history has ever ever come and said that *Sharh us-Sunnah* is ascribed to Ghulām Khaleel!? Only assorted Sūfīs over the years and then ‘Bro Hajji’ and Dr Yasir Qadhi have said this in 2020!!? Now if that is not enough to throw considerable doubt on their argument, then I don’t know what is! Allāhu Alim.

CONCLUSION

All of this indicates the veracity of the ascription of the book entitled *Sharh us-Sunnah* to Imām al-Bārbahārī. Issues to do with **implementation, contextualisation and application** are all addressed by qualified scholars when they explain the book, such as al-ʿAllāmah Fawzān, Shaykh Sālīh as-Suhaymī and others. And let us say for argument’s sake that the book is not authentically ascribed to Imām al-Barbahārī, for argument’s sake, that Qādī Abū Yaʿlā, Ibn Abī Yaʿlā, Ibn ul-

¹² There is a superb *tahqeeq* [critical edition] of this by Shaykh Abū ʿAbdullāh ʿĀdil bin ʿAbdullāh Āl Hamdān. He compares, contrasts and analyses five different manuscripts along with verification of text and clarification of any textual discrepancies.

¹³ Shaykh ʿĀdil Āl Hamdān also conducted a *tahqeeq* of this in 1432 AH published by Dār ul-Hijāz. He provides an excellent assessment of the manuscript located at the Dhāhiriyah Library.

ʿImād, Ibn Muflih, Majduddeen Ibn Taymiyyah, Shaykh ul-Islām Ibn Taymiyyah, adh-Dhahabī, al-ʿUlaymī, as-Safadī, Ibn Rajab al-Hanbalī, al-Ghazzī and Ibn Hajar al-ʿAsqalānī were all totally incorrect in their ascription of the book to al-Barbahārī – then so what!!? As the books of Sunnah are still plentiful as are an entire corpus of works which concur on the *core themes* of the book!

As for Dr Qadhi's objection to al-Barbahārī bringing matters of fiqh in *Sharh us-Sunnah* then this another example of his academic dishonesty as many of the early scholars did likewise in their books on theology and creed. For instance, Imāms Ahmad (d. 241 AH/855 CE) in *Usūl us-Sunnah*, al-Muzanī (d. 264 AH/877 CE) in his *Sharh us-Sunnah*, ar-Rāzī'ayn in their creed (Abū Hātim dying in 264 AH/878 CE and Abū Zur'ah in 277 AH/890 CE), Harb bin Ismā'īl al-Handhalī al-Kirmānī (d. 280 AH/893 CE) in his *Masā'il*, 'Abdullāh bin al-Imām Ahmad bin Hanbal (d. 290 AH/903 CE) in *Kitāb us-Sunnah*, Abū Bakr al-Khallāl (d. 311 AH/923 CE) in *as-Sunnah*, Ibn Khuzaymah (d. 311 AH/923 CE) in *Kitāb ut-Tawbeed*, Abū Bakr al-Ismā'īlī (d. 371 AH/981 CE) in *T'itiqād Ahl us-Sunnah*, Ibn Battah al-'Ukbarī (d. 387 AH/997 CE) in *al-Ibānah*, al-Lālikā'ī (d. 418 AH/1027 CE) in *Sharh T'itiqād Ahl us-Sunnah*, as-Sābūnī (d. 449 AH/1057 CE) in *'Aqīdat us-Salaf wa As-hāb ul-Hadeeth*, Ibn ul-Banā'a al-Hanbalī (d. 471 AH/CE) in *ar-Radd 'ala'l-Mubtadi'ah* and Imām at-Tahawī in his *'Aqeedah at-Tahawīyyah* – mention the *fiqh issue* of wiping over *Khuffayn* [leather socks], not fighting against the tyrannical leaders, or other fiqh issues which demarcated Ahl us-Sunnah from the Rāfidah and the Khawārij. Highlighting the importance of following the Sunnah of the Prophet Muhammad (*sallAllāhu 'alayhi wassallam*), and emphasising the Qur'ān, Sunnah and Ijmā' on the matter and therefore the authority of those sources in Sunni tradition. Furthermore, Abū Hanīfah's book *Fiqh ul-Akbar* [The Greatest Jurisprudence] which contains Islamic jurisprudence also contains core matters of Allāh's Names and Attributes and creed. Also 'AbdulQādir al-Jīlānī in his work *al-Ghunyah* mentioned *'aqeedah* issues along with *fiqh* matters, indicating that the matters were regarded comprehensively. This demonstrates that certain *fiqh* views were *inextricably linked* to creed.

Just because some issues may not fit one's modern sensibilities, does not mean that this book *in particular* should somehow be picked out as an issue. As within the entire corpus of classical texts are issues, indeed texts, with far more problematic notions than that which can be levelled at *Sharh us-Sunnah*. Yet the likes of Yasir Qadhi and Hajji, with their selective perception, do not say a word on those matters.

In any case, we advise 'Bro Hajji' and Dr Yasir Qadhi to suffice us with academic dishonesty and intellectual denial and they must be impartial if they want to relay details or discuss issues. This lack of impartiality may not be surprising in the writings of those who oppose Salafīyyah, as this impartiality, which has been relayed with an unbroken chain over the centuries within *actual*

mainstream traditional Sunni Islam (!!), is regarded as the preserve of the scholars of Ahl us-Sunnah wa'l-Hadeeth, for:

أهل العلم يكتبون ما لهم وما عليهم ، وأهل الأهواء لا يكتبون إلا ما لهم .

The People of Knowledge write what is for them and what is against them; while the People of Desires do not write except for what is for them.¹⁴

The Mujaddid of the era, Imām al-Albānī (*rahimahullāh*), noted:

لأن هذا هو الذي عليه أهل الحديث أن يذكروا الحقائق سواء كانت لهم أو عليهم, خلافا لأهل الأهواء, كما

يذكر ذلك ابن تيمية كثيرا في رده عليهم

...as this is what the People of Hadeeth are upon, that they mention the realities whether they are for them or against them; as opposed to the People of Desires as Ibn Taymiyyah has mentioned many times in his refutations against them.¹⁵

While Dr Muhammad Rashād Khaleel (Professor of Islamic Heritage at the University of Riyadh) stated in his book *al-Manhaj al-Islāmī li-Dirāsāt it-Tārikh wa Tafseeribi* [The Islamic Method for Studying and Interpreting History] some conditions which have to be maintained for a Muslim researcher. Of these conditions is '*al-Ikhlās wa't-Tajarrud*' [Sincerity and Impartiality], Dr Muhammad Rashād Khaleel states about this condition:

...that is because the goal of the researcher has to be to search for the truth wherever it is and not seek proofs and evidences which merely support his own personal view or preconceived idea; or supports a particular Madhhab, belief or genus [of people]. Much distortion has thus entered Islamic history past and present from this door. In the past those who hated Islām corrupted reports and fabricated them so as to plot against Islām and defame its

¹⁴ Ibn Taymiyyah ascribes this statement to 'AbdurRahmān bin Mahdī in *al-Jawāb as-Saheeh*, vol.6, p.343; it has also been ascribed to Wakī' ibn al-Jarrāh (the trustworthy Hāfidh and pious worshipper) by ad-Dāraqutnī, See Imām 'Ali bin 'Umar ad-Dāraqutnī, *Sunan ad-Dāraqutnī* (Beirut: Dār ul-Ma'rifah, 1422 AH/2001 CE, 1st Print, eds. Shaykhs 'Ali Ahmad 'AbdulMajūd and 'Ali Muhammad Mu'awwidh), vol.1, p.26, no.32, p.77-78.

Ad-Dāraqutnī's sanad is as follows: Ahmad bin Muhammad bin Sa'eed narrated to us: Ibrāheem bin 'Abdullāh bin Muhammad bin Sālim as-Sulūlī, Abū Sālim said: I heard my father say: I heard Wakī' say... – the narration.

¹⁵ Imām Muhammad Nāsiruddeen al-Albānī, *Silsilah Ahādeeth ad-Da'eefah wa Mawdū'ah wa Atharahā as-Say'i fi'l-Ummah* (Riyadh: Maktabat ul-Mā'rif, 1425 AH/2004 CE), vol.12, p.551.

adherents. While presently the same thing has occurred from people of innovation and desires and the people of fanatical bias to Madhhabs, politics and racism in a similar way to which we presented prior from the words of al-Qādī Abū Bakr Ibn al-'Arabī.¹⁶

Moreover, Bro Hajji and Dr Yasir Qadhi should refer to the Salafi scholars to elucidate any issues for them and they should not seek to sideline, mock or denigrate them, or their works, as doing so is a cause for humiliation.

And may peace and blessings be upon Muhammad, his family and all of his companions

Written by the one in need of Allāh's Aid,

'AbdulHaq ibn Kofi ibn Kwesi al-Ashanti

London

Tuesday 29th September 2020/12th Safar 1442 AH

¹⁶ Dr Muhammad Rashād Khaleel, *al-Manhaj al-Islāmī li-Dirāsāt it-Tārīkh wa Tafsiṛihi* [The Islamic Method for Studying and Interpreting History]. Casablanca: Dār uth-Thaqāfah, 1406 AH/1986 CE, pp.122-123.