

## No Title: Khabr ul-Aahaad ( Hadith reported by singular chains)

### INTRODUCTION:

Aqeedah (fundamental belief) is the most valuable idea that a human being holds. Aqeedah is the idea that the human being holds regarding everything that is around him, namely, man, life, and the universe, what is before life, after life, and the relationship between them. It is the intellectual basis on which the human bases his thought. It is a world view and the basis for action. Therefore, any matter that is related to the Aqeedah becomes of at most importance.

The issue of Khabr ul-Aahaad ( Hadith reported by singular chains) and whether it should be accepted in the Aqeedah or not, was discussed by the previous Scholars. Most of them were of the opinion that this type of report implies conjecture (Thunn) and therefore it should not be accepted in issues related to Aqeedah. Some Scholars went as far as saying that there was no disagreement among the Scholars in this issue as will be shown later. At the very most, this was known to be an debated issue. Anyone who is familiar of books of Usool ul-fiqh recognizes this. It is such a common topic of discussion that a secondary school text book addresses it. In an Usul ul-Fiqh textbook for the Secondary Institute of the Islamic University in Madina called Tas-heel Al-Wusul Ila Fahmi 'Ilm il-Usul (Paving the way Toward Understanding the Science of Usul), written by Abdul Muhsin bin al-'Abbad, on page 56, it states: "...there were differences regarding Akhbaar ul-Aahaad. Some Scholars said that it does not imply certainty (Ilm), neither by itself nor with other supports, and that it implies nothing but conjecture (Thunn). Others said that originally speaking, Khabr ul-Wahid implies conjecture, but it may imply certainty with additional supports, such as if it was reported in Sahih Bukhari and Muslim..." The author continues saying: "...this is what would be evaluated to be correct."

Lately this issue has surfaced again. Nonetheless, the discussion nowadays has two features: 1. It lacks true knowledge. Most arguments are concerned with repeating scholars statements without understanding their meaning. More emphasis is placed on who said what rather than the evidence involved. 2. Arguments are often accompanied by name calling and labeling, something that the previous scholars, may Allah have mercy on them, did not use in their discussions on this issue. Therefore, an objective study will be presented here that will cover this important issue with depth and objectivity. The conclusion that will be reached will be binding to us due to the strength of its evidence (Daleel) and nothing else. May Allah Ta'alah guide us to the truth.

#### 1. Aspects of Islam

The basic sources of Islam are the Quran and the Sunnah. A detailed survey of the texts of both, the Quran and the Sunnah, one finds that there are two aspects in Islam, namely: 1) Issues related to Aqeedah or Iman, such as believing in angels, previous Messengers, the Quran and its contents, the Day of Judgment, etc. 2) Issues related to actions (A'maal), such as orders to pray, fast, be honest, give Zakah, etc. Also orders obligating us to abstain from certain actions, such as abstaining from illegal sexual behavior (Zina), lying, cheating, etc. There are also actions that are recommended to perform such as documenting contracts, and making nafilah or supererogatory prayers. There are also other actions that are left up to the individual to perform or abstain from, like wearing either a jalabiyyah or a pair of pants and a shirt.

Regarding the issues of Iman, take for example, the story of Prophet Saleh (as), mentioned in the Quran, in Surah 91:11-14.

Arabic and English text??????????????

This story is exclusively an issue of Iman. In these Ayahs, it is mandatory to believe that Saleh was a Messenger who presented the miracle of the she-camel to his people, and that his people did not believe him. Instead of maintaining the camel, they slaughtered it. Since this is a story mentioned in the Quran, one must believe and acknowledge that there was indeed a Messenger named Saleh, and all one should do is to believe in the Ayahs and attempt to obtain lessons from them. It is clear that these Ayahs demand no action to be carried out. They merely state a story that must be believed in. They are devoid of any do or don'ts.

Similarly, Allah Ta'ala tells us about the birth of Prophet Isa (as). We have to believe in the Ayahs as a part of the Quran, and we have to believe that Isa was born without having a father. All of these things are related to our belief or Iman, and address no actions. Those who do not believe in the contents of these Ayahs are considered to be Kafirs i.e. non-believers.

On the other hand, Allah Ta'ala says:

arabic text?????????

"And give Zakah, "It is quite clear that this Ayah is different from that which addressed the story of Prophet Saleh. The Ayah of Zakah carries a command from Allah, so therefore we have to believe in it as part of the Quran i.e. speech of Allah Ta'ala, and implement the command by giving Zakah in the specific way given by Prophet Muhammad (saaws).

Similarly, Allah Ta'ala prescribes the performance of Hajj to Mecca for the one who is able. Allah Ta'ala says:

" Arabic and English text?????????"

This is a command from Allah to Muslims to perform Hajj. Hajj is a set of physical actions, comprised of many aspects. The one who performs Hajj goes to a specific place, performs specific actions at specific intervals, all of which are detailed by their respective rules. Thus we believe that the Ayah of Hajj is part of the Quran, and we implement the rules contained in it.

Consequently, there is a clear distinction between the Ayahs concerning Iman only, and those which address man's actions. This difference is not theoretical, rather it is of extreme relevance to our lives. In this life, he who denies the Prophethood of Salih, or the miraculous birth of Prophet Isa, or denies that the aforementioned Ayahs are a part of the Quran, then he is considered a Kafir. However, he who disobeys the rules related to Zakah and Hajj, is considered a Fasiq or Dtholim, as long as he admits and acknowledges the validity of these Ayahs. However, if disobedience is accompanied with disbelief in the rule or the Ayahs, then he is not merely a Fasiq but a Kafir. Additionally, the Islamic State, which implements the Islamic penal code, would deal with the issue of disobedience and the issue of denying a part or the whole of the Quran in separate manners. If a person violated the law, i.e. drank wine, then he will be flogged 80 lashes. If a person committed Zina, then he would be flogged 100 lashes, if he were unmarried, or stoned to death if he were married. However, such a person, who was stoned to death, would die as a Muslim. This is illustrated by the incident that occurred on the days of the Prophet (saaws) when a woman from the Juhaynah tribe came to the Prophet (saaws) confessing that she had committed Zina. Upon the order of the Prophet (saaws), the Sahaba stoned her to death. While executing the punishment, her blood splashed onto the clothes of one Sahabi, who then slandered and cursed her. Upon hearing this incident, Prophet Muhammad (saaws) said :

Arabic text????????????????????????????????

"Oh Khalid! I swear by the One in whose hands is my soul, she repented in such a way that if a man who imposes custom dues repented (from this sin) the way she did, then he would be forgiven." (Ahmad & Muslim)

On the contrary, if a Muslim rejected Iman in whole or in part, or rejected the Quran, the angels, an Ayah, or rejected the validity of the Islamic rules, then he would be Murtad (opastate). His disbilief would be discussed with him and if he still insisted on his falsehood, then such a person would be executed by the Khalifah. However, the point to note is that he would not die as a Muslim, unlike the woman in the above mentioned example who was stoned to death due to the mere disobedience of the rule.

It is obvious here, that Islam provides different punishments for both, i.e. for those who violate the law, whether a major or minor violation; and those who reject the law or the Iman in part or whole; or commit any action of Kufr, such as saying that Isa is the son of Allah Ta'ala, or putting a cross on his chest or ruling people by Kufr intentionally while believing in the Kufurs' validity.

Furthermore, distinguishing between the two types of Ayahs has an impact on the Day of Judgment, which is extremely important. Allah Ta'ala will look at each individual on the basis of his Iman and actions together.

On the Day of Judgment, if a person, who denies the story of Saleh or Isa, were presented to Allah Ta'ala along with another person who believes in Saleh and Isa but committed sins, such as drinking wine, their destinies would not be the same. It is obvious that their destinies would be different. The former individual is considered a Kafir, because of his rejection of a portion of the Iman, since believing in Saleh and the previous Messengers is a must, and one cannot claim to be a Muslim without believing in them.

The latter individual, who had no discrepancy in his Iman, but committed a sin, on the Day of Judgment Allah Ta'ala will not consider him as a Kafir. In other words, he would be punished for this sin but would not remain in Hellfire permanently, and eventually, by Allah's mercy, he would be admitted into Heaven. Consequently, the impact on the Day of Judgment is that the one who committed Kufr will not be forgiven, while the sinner may be forgiven by Allah's will.

However if a person drinks while denying that wine is Haram, meaning that he is denying the validity of the Ayah prohibiting wine, then such a person is committing two crimes. The first crime is the discrepancy in his Iman, which results in his ejection from Islam, i.e. he becomes a Kafir. The second crime is the violation of the law.

Therefore, the crime might be one of mere disobedience and thus requires punishment for the violation. The crime might also be one of rejection of the law or Iman, in part or in whole, and thus the person is considered a Kafir. Thus, there is a difference between these two examples, i.e. one who denounces Islam by rejecting a part of Iman, and another who violates the law while he believes in Islam and admits the validity of its rules. As a result, the first person is a Kafir, while the second person is a sinner. Herein lies the impact of the difference between the two examples.

Therefore, it should be clear now that Islam consists of two aspects, the first aspect related to belief or Iman, and the second related to the laws and regulations i.e. Ahkaam.

Regarding the issues of Iman, it is technically referred to as Iman, Creed, or Aqeedah, depending on the language used. In Arabic it is called Iman or Aqeedah. In English it is called Creed or the Fundamental Idea about life. The other aspect is called Ahkam Shar'iyah, Shari'ah, Legal or Divine Laws.

This classification is very natural in any system or ideology. The basis of any system or ideology is its Creed, while the laws that govern the society would emanate from that particular Creed. 2. DEFINITION OF AL-AQEEDAH

Al Aqeedah, is an Arabic word derived from the word 'aqada, which linguistically means: to tie things together in a very strong way. Some people claim that the term Aqeedah is not a Quranic term and that it was not used in the days of the Prophet (saaws). Even though this is the case, the word 'Uqood , which is a derivative word from the root verb 'aqada, is used in the Quran. Allah Ta'ala says in surat ul-Ma'idah 4:13Arabic text>﴿يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا أَوْفُوا بِالْعُقُودِ إِنَّكُمْ لَعِنْدَ اللَّهِ بَشِيرٌ أَوْفَاءٌ﴾" O you who believe! Fulfill your Uqood (contracts)." The word Uqood is a contract between two people which connects them in their transaction. Similarly, the Aqeedah ties and connects things together. Its usage as an Islamic term was not objected to by any Scholar of repute, including Imam Shaf'ee, Abu Haneefah, IbnTaymiyyah, etc. The Aqeedah was considered as such due to its meaning:

Arabic text﴿يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا أَوْفُوا بِالْعُقُودِ﴾

"whatever the heart is tied on."

This metaphorical definition is as if one is conducting an open heart surgery and removes the heart, opening it and implanting the concept or idea (i.e. the Aqeedah) in it. Then the heart would be stitched up again and returned back to the chest, thus, concluding the surgery. This implies a complete acceptance, absolute certainty, leaving no room for doubt. When we reach to a solution which convinces the mind and complies with the fitrah (man's nature), then tranquillity will exist in the heart. Such tranquillity would not be attained with any Aqeedah other than the correct one...the Islamic Aqeedah. Thus the Aqeedah is more than mere belief. It is a conclusive, and resolute conviction in something that the individual is satisfied with, and is absolutely assured of, and at the same time, the issue which is taken as Aqeedah, complies with the fitrah.

In the English language, there is no equivalent word that describes this level of conviction. One may say that a person believes or disbelieves, but in Arabic there are various levels describing this process. In the Arabic language, there is a difference between what is called Tasdeeq (belief) and Tasdeeq Jazim (the concrete and decisive belief). So Tasdeeq Jazim can be translated as the Iman or Conviction, whereas Tasdeeq would mean just Belief. Often, the words belief and Iman are used interchangeably, and this is not correct. What is meant by belief is just the Tasdeeq, however, the issues of Aqeedah or Iman can only be translated as Tasdeeq Jazim.

For example, if a trustworthy person informs you about a car accident he witnessed, then his report would be accepted. If another person reported the same incident, and a third and then a fourth repeats the same thing; then the level of belief increases until a conclusive belief is established. Only after a number of trustworthy persons attest that they witnessed the accident, would there be conviction that the car accident had taken place.

The Aqeedah is even stronger than this. It is the absolute, incontrovertible belief or conviction. This is because the information or ideas which the Aqeedah deals with are not mere minute or trivial issues, nor does it deal with minor issues in the universe. Rather, the Aqeedah deals with the existence of the universe, man, and life itself as a whole, where it came from, what is after it, what is the relationship that links us with what was before the universe and life, and what is after this life. The answer for such a fundamental and comprehensive question constitutes the basis of Aqeedah or Iman. Consequently, the nature of the answer for such a question determines that it cannot be handled in the same way as any other news or report.

For example, if a person was shown a book and told: "this is a book," there would be no argument over the definition and description of the book. Even those who did not know Arabic would say 'yes this is a book,' because the definition of a book is known to all people. Therefore, it could definitely be believed that the particular item was in fact a book. However this information is not stored in the same place as the information regarding the Aqeedah, i.e. La Ilaha illa-Allah (Allah (swt) is the Only Being worthy of Worship). Both statements, "this is a book" and "There is none worthy of worship but Allah" are 100% correct. However, the Kalima deals with the universe at large, with the source of our life, with the main problem that the human being faces, and it provides the only correct solution for it. On the other hand, the statement identifying the book deals with a minor issue. Consequently, we do not deal with both of them in the same way. We place the Kalima in the compartment of Iman i.e. in both the heart and the mind, while the information regarding the book is kept in our general list of information.

If a person wanted to read, then he/she would use a book for this purpose, while a blank piece of paper could not be used for reading because it is blank. However, if an individual wanted to write, then he/she would use this blank paper for writing. This is a concept and one would use it in his/her behavior, however, it still cannot be placed on the same level as the first statement (the Kalima). The Kalima is the Aqeedah, the belief that everything in the universe is Created by Allah (swt), that we have to submit to this Creator, that the Quran is from the Creator, that Muhammed (saaws) is

His Messenger, and that His (swt) words are those which are mentioned in the Quran. This is the Aqeedah which has the same meaning as the term Iman (Tasdeeq Jazim). 3

#### DEFINITION OF HUKM SHARI (DIVINE RULE)

The difference in meaning between the Aqeedah and the Hukm Shari' is quite apparent in the definition given by the Jurists to the Hukm Shari. The Hukm Shari or the Divine Rule is defined as:

"The address of the Legislator that is related to the actions of the people."

[Irshad ul-Fuhood by Ash-Shawkani p 6.] Thus if the speech of Allah (swt) is related to the actions, then it is considered as a Hukm Shari or Divine Rule, and if it is not related to the actions, then it is not called a Hukm Shari. Rather, it is related to the belief, e.g. the story of Saleh.

The same Jurists defined Jurisprudence (Fiqh) as:

"Having the knowledge in the practical Divine Rules (al-Masai'l al-Amaliyyah) which are derived from their detailed evidences."

The word Al-A'maliyah (practical) is added to the definition in order to emphasize that the Hukm is related to our A'mal, i.e. to our actions. In other words, anything that is not related to peoples actions is not considered as part of Fiqh (jurisprudence).

These definitions of Hukm Shari and Fiqh show that both Hukm Shari and Fiqh are related to our actions. Regarding the other Ayahs or parts of the Quran, which are not addressing our actions, we have to believe in them, but they are not considered to be part of Ayat ul-Ahkam (verses dealing with the rules and laws). That is why we see Scholars such as Imam Shaf'ee, Imam Abu Bakr ibn Al-Arabi, Al-Qurtubi, and Al Jassaas, writing books exclusively for the tafseer of Ayatul-Ahkam.5

#### RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN THE AQEEDAH AND THE HUKM SHARI

Consequently, in light of these two aspects of Islam, what is the relationship between the edah and the Hukm Shari? There are several differences. Some of them are:

a. The Aqeedah is considered to be the basic or Fundamental thought or principle, while the Hukm Shari are the rules which emanate from the Aqeedah. Thus, the Aqeedah exists primarily as the basis or foundation upon which everything else is built or established. This Aqeedah is like the roots of a tree from which the stem and branches spring or emanate, due to the presence of the roots. A similar parallel would be the foundation of a building and the structure of the building itself. The Aqeedah represents the roots or foundation while the Ahkam represent the branches or the structure. Therefore, the nature, color, or tinge of the Divine Rules are tainted and smeared by the nature, color, or tinge of the Islamic Aqeedah, and this is what makes the Divine Rules separate and distinct from any other ideology, or way of life. This is one relationship.

b. The second relationship is that the Ahkam or rules, by which the Muslim adheres or abides, must be derived from the Islamic Aqeedah, which means that we do not accept any rule if it does not have a Daleel (Divine reference). In other words, if there is no (Daleel), i.e. Ayah or Hadith, for a rule, then it would not be considered as a Divine Rule, and it is not allowed for any Muslim to implement such a legislation. We are obligated by Allah (swt) to take the rules that were only derived from the Islamic Aqeedah. This constitutes the second relationship between Aqeedah and the Hukm Shari.

c. The third relationship is that the Aqeedah produces the Hukm (action) in the life of the individual and the society. If an individual has the Iman, then he/she is supposed to obey. Thus, the action was undertaken as a result of the Iman. If a person has the right Hukm (action or rule) but not the Iman, even if he/she does actions which on the surface appear to be good, since the Iman was not Islamic, then he/she is not a Muslim. For example, if he/she pays charity, doesn't drink or

commit Zina, the action is not accepted because there is no foundation. So the Aqeedah and the Hukm together constitute Islam. The Aqeedah alone without any action is an empty and meaningless philosophy and the rules alone without the Aqeedah, have no meaning. So when we say we have to take Islam, this means that we have to take Islam as a whole package that includes the Iman and the rules.

Some people say that there is no difference between the Aqeedah and the Hukm claiming that the difference is only hypothetical. Moreover, they claim that Islam does not make a differentiation, nor did the Sahaba. Actually, this is not the case. Islam does differentiate between Aqeedah and Ahkaam. Allah's Messenger said: Arabic?????"I was ordered to fight the people till they say la ilaha illa Allah. If they say it, their lives and property is protected from me unless it is due." This is clear that Islam does differentiate between Aqeedah and Ahkaam, for the Hadith does not order to fight those who merely disobey without revolting against the state. Nevertheless, there is a punishment by the Islamic legal system but not fighting. This means that Islam does differentiate between Iman and complying by it's rules. The Sahaba did differentiate between the Aqeedah and the Ahkam as well. Even though they did not use these terms, it is very obvious that they treated the person who violated the law quite differently from the one who rejected the law.

The Khalifah Umar ibn ul-Khattab (raa), for example, used to order the governors that before establishing any punishment to ask the defendant whether he/she accepted or denied Islam. If he/she affirmed their Islam they would be punished for that crime. (Source must be mentioned?????????)Once a person drank wine, so the Khalifah Umar (raa) sent some people to apply the punishment related to that crime. He ordered them to ask the person whether he/she believes that wine is Haram or not before applying the punishment. If the person acknowledged that wine is Haram then he/her must be whipped 80 lashes. However, if he/she rejected this rule and argued that wine is Halal, then the individual should be killed. This mean that Umar ibn Khattab (raa) did in fact distinguish and separate between the two aspects. Furthermore, none of the Sahaba objected to Umar's order.

Another example was the incident between Abu Bakr as-Siddiq (raa) and Umar (raa), after the death of the Prophet (saaws), when some people rejected Islam, some denied that Muhammad (saaws) was a Prophet claiming themselves to be Prophets, while others refused to pay Zakah. Abu Bakr wanted to deal with all of these cases immediately, while Umar (raa) thought that they should not fight all of them at once. He suggested that they initially fight those who had rejected Islam and to leave the ones who refused to pay Zakah for later. This incident shows that those who didn't pay Zakah were not considered to be kuffar by either Umar (raa) or Abu Bakr (raa). Abu Bakr (raa) responded to Umar (raa) saying: 'I have to fight all of them.' When Umar (raa) asked about those who refused to pay Zakah and why he, Abu Bakr, was fighting them, Abu Bakr's (raa) response was that they had rebelled against the authority of the state. They used to pay Zakah to the Prophet (saaws), so since he was the Prophet's successor in administering the affairs of Muslims, the refusal to pay the Zakah to the State was seen as a rebellion against the Islamic State. This shows that the Sahabah (raa) did in fact differentiate between the two aspects, i.e. the Aqeedah (Iman) and the Ahkam (rules), and it shows that making this differentiation is of a practical nature and not a semantical or hypothetical one. 5. THE IMPACT OF NOT MAKING A DISTINCTION BETWEEN THE AQEEDAH AND THE AHKAAM.

Nonetheless, some people claim that the Sahabah (raa) did not differentiate between the two aspects. They claim that every rule (Hukm) must be believed in before one acts upon it. In other words, they pose the following questions: How would an individual do something without believing in it? How could someone pray two Raka's without believing in it?

In fact there is a difference. Regarding praying two Raka's, Allah (swt) did not order us to believe in praying them. He (swt) merely ordered us to pray two Raka's with a specific intention. Of course our prayer is not accepted if we reject any aspect of Iman. However, praying two Raka's of sunnah

after entering the Masjid, or after performing wudu is separate from believing in the concept of prayer itself. One may also argue about whipping those who commit Zina and whether or not they have to believe in the rule before implementing the punishment? Regarding this issue, there are two aspects that should be made clear:

The first is related to the Iman, i.e. we actually believe that this rule is from Allah Ta'ala since it was mentioned in the Quran, and we have to believe in the validity of the rule. The second aspect is the related to action i.e. implementing the rule. Disbelieving in the rule being from Allah or disbelieving in the validity of the rule is Kufr. However, none compliance with the rule, while believing in the first aspect of it is a sin that is punishable by Allah Ta'ala, but it is not Kufr.

Thus, if a ruler does not implement this rule, while believing that it is from Allah and believing in its validity, he will not be considered a Kafir.

Therefore, if a ruler does not implement the rule because he denies that it is from Allah or rejects its validity, then he is a Kafir. While a ruler who does not implement the rule while accepting the rule's validity, then he is either extremely disobedient, or oppressive. Allah Ta'ala says in Surat ul-Maidah: Arabic?????"And those who do not rule by what Allah has revealed are Kuffar."[5:44]Arabic?????" And those who do not rule by what Allah has revealed are Fasiqs (utmost disobedience)."[5:47]Arabic?????" And those who do not rule by what Allah has revealed are Thalims (oppressors)."[5:45]

One Ayah mentions the word Kufr, while the other two use both words 'Fasiqoon' and 'Dhalimuun,' in place of Kuffar. The difference between the three terms is: If a ruler does not rule according to Islam because he denounces Islam then he is a Kafir. However, if he accepts Islam but says he cannot rule by it due to any reason such as, being forced not to implement Islam, or he feels that the situation does not permit him to do so, then he is not a Kafir but a Thalim or a Fasiq. So there is a difference between ruling by Kufr and believing in the rule of Kufr. If the ruler does not believe in Islam, he is not just ruling by Kufr, he himself is a Kafir. Furthermore, if he does not believe that Islam is valid for this century or he does not believe that it provides a complete solution to contemporary problems, then he is also considered a Kafir. However, if a ruler does believe in Islam while not implementing its rules, he cannot be called a Kafir, rather he is considered by Allah Ta'ala to be a Fasiq or Thalim. So there is a difference between these two types of rulers. In order for the ruler to be considered a Muslim, or anyone for that matter, must believe in the validity of the rules of Islam. If anyone believes that any Islamic rule is invalid, he is immediately ejected from Islam. However, if a ruler, or any other Muslim, fails to implement an Islamic rule, he is not considered to be a Kafir, rather he is a sinner. Therefore, while actions and Iman are related from the perspective that they share the same source, they are two separate issues.

The second point is that when the people did not separate between these two aspects, they reached wrong a conclusion. Some people started saying that in the Hereafter, every sin will have the same punishment, which is: eternity in the Hellfire. This is obviously incorrect. Even the Khawaraj did not arrive at this conclusion. The Khawaraj merely said that he who commits major sins (Al-Kabirah) will live permanently in the Hellfire, but they did not say that every sin would result in a permanent stay in the Hellfire. In the book called Al-Talazum Baynal Aqeedah wash Shar'iyah (The inseparable relationship between the Aqeedah and the Sharia), Dr. Nasir Al-Akeel says on page 22; "...and therefore Allah predetermined that the person will live permanently in the Hell-fire for any disobedience of Allah (swt) and His messenger (saaws)."This illustrates that the author went far beyond the Khawaraj. This author reached to this conclusion only due to the fact that he made up his mind that there is no difference between one sin and another, nor between the Ahkam and the Aqeedah. Consequently, in order to reach to this twisted understanding, he had to twist some of the most basic issues of Islam (claiming that even disobedient Muslims will live permanently in the Hellfire).

We must realize that there are differences between the Aqeedah and Hukm Shari, and that we can not deal with them as one unit. However, this does not mean that we are undermining the Shar'iyah, because the Sharia is part of the Deen of Islam. Furthermore, the fact that the Aqeedah and the Ahkam are two aspects does not mean that there is a separation between the Deen and life. Islam exists as a whole and must be obeyed and implemented as such. One must believe in all of the issues of the Aqeedah and it is the firm and decisive belief in the Aqeedah that pushes the individual to obey all of the Divine Rules.

We do not say that one can do as he likes so long as he possesses a clean heart. This attitude is not Islamic. On the contrary, we say that one has to have the right Iman, a clean heart, and the correct actions. The correct actions must not be based on one's personal point of view, rather it should be based on the Halal and Haram of Islam.<sup>6</sup> ARRIVING AT THE IMAN IN THE ISLAMIC AQEEDAH

In many Ayahs, the Quran ordered us to think. These Ayahs order us to contemplate about the heavens, earth, skies, mountains, camels, ourselves, etc. Literally hundreds of Ayahs order us to use the thinking process as a means to arrive at the Iman.

Arabic????? "Indeed, in the Creation of the Heaven and earth and the alternation of the day and the night, there are signs for people with deep intellect." [3:190]

This Iman is not confined to the mere identification of Allah Ta'ala as the Creator, rather it extends to recognizing Him as the only one to be worshipped, comprehensively, without associating any partners with Him.

As stated earlier, the Quran orders us to attain this Iman via thought, pondering, and contemplation. However, this is merely one factor. The Aqeedah serves as the fundamental decisive belief in Islam and so must not be treated abstractly or hypothetically. The Aqeedah must be devoid of and free from any doubt. This requirement eliminates emotions, imitation, reaction, and blind faith as methods for acquiring Iman, since these methods are plagued with doubts and ambiguity. Regarding utilizing doubtful means in the aspects of the Aqeedah, Allah Ta'ala says: Arabic and English????? "When it is said to them: 'Follow what Allah has revealed' They say: 'No, we shall follow the ways of our fathers.' Even though their fathers were void of thinking and guidance?" [2:170] Arabic?????" and most of them follow nothing but doubt and conjecture. Indeed the doubt is of no avail to certified truth at all." [10:36] Arabic?????????" If you were to follow a lot of those on earth, they would misguide you from Allah's path. They follow nothing but doubt and conjecture, and they do nothing but lie." [6:116]

These are a few of many Ayahs where Allah Ta'ala warns against following doubt and imitation in issues dealing with the Aqeedah. When the Prophet (saaws) started the da'awah in Mecca, he started condemning the Kuffar of Mecca, their Aqeedah or their method of Iman, which was based on either imitation or conjecture (Thunn). When the Kuffar of Mecca said that the angels were the daughters of Allah Ta'ala and were female, Allah Ta'ala addressed them with these Ayahs. Arabic?????" These are nothing but names which you have devised, you and your fathers, for which Allah has sent down no authority. They follow nothing but conjecture and what their Nafs desire. Even though there has already come to them the Guidance from their Rabb" (53:23)

Arabic?????

Also, Allah Ta'ala says: "Do you have Ilm for that which you claim so that you provide us with? You follow nothing but Thunn." (6:148)

These Ayahs warn them from following their fathers, their desires, or conjecture. The word 'Thunn' and Ilm are used in the Qur'an in the address of this issue. Therefore, a definition of each will be given. Thunn is defined as: The conclusion that is reached from incomplete or uncertain information (Immarah), and it is contrasted with certainty (Yaqeen). [Mufradaat Alfaath ul-

Qur'anby, The Vocabulary of the Qur'an, by Al-Asfahaani p. 327.] Thunn is also used to denote" doubt (Shakk) and certainty (Yaqeen)." [Lisaan ul-Arab vol 13 p. 272] Imam Azzubayydi in his dictionary Taaj ul-Aroos vol. 9 pp 271-272 he states his definition as well as the definitions of other scholars of the Arabic language. He says: "Thunn is leaning toward one of two possibilities without certainty. Alminawi states that Thunn is the higher possibility of one of two opposites with the possibility of the opposite. And it is used to denote Yaqeen and doubt. Ar-Ragib stated that Thunn is the name of the result of a sign. Whenever the sign becomes stronger it goes toward Ilm and when it becomes weak, it becomes speculation." Therefore, it is incorrect, by definition, to say there is weak Thunn i.e. weak higher probability!! Thus it is the sign (Imarah) that takes the information from conjecture to Ilm and visa versa. However sometimes the word Thunn is used to mean certainty. This is the case when a Qareenah i.e. sign is present within a specific context that shows that the intended meaning is certainty not conjecture. For example, Allah Ta'ala says:Arabic????????" I "thought" [Thanantu] I was going to be questioned." 69:20

The fact that this honorable Ayah is addressing the issue of belief of that person is a lead that the word Thunn here is used to mean certainty. The above honorable Ayahs that condemn conjecture in Aqeedah used the word thunn in its actual meaning i.e. conjecture. This is because Allah Ta'ala used the words Thunn and Ilm in the same Ayah. Therefore, it is inconceivable that both words have the same meaning. For example, Allah Ta'ala says Arabic???" And if it is said to them: Allah's promises is the truth and the Hour has no doubt, you said: We know not what the Hour is. We merely follow Thunn [conjecture]and we have no Yaqeen [certainty]. 45:32

The above honorable Ayah, condemning conjecture in matters related to the Day of Judgment, does not apply to Quraysh alone. It applies to us as well. Thus our Iman must be definite and conclusive. This is a subject of agreement among all scholars. Ibn Hazm, for example, stated in his book Al-Muhalla vol 1 p. 2," The first requirement [to be a Muslim] and ones Islam would not be accepted from him unless he realizes in his heart with certainty and sincerity, and without any trace of doubt and must utter with his tongue that Laa Ilaaha Illa Allah...." Also Ash-Shaatibee stated in his book Al-Muwafqaat vol 1 p. 29 " The Usool of fiqh [basis of Islamic law] in the Deen are Qutie i.e. definite not Thunni or conjectural. The evidence for this is that they are part of the major guidelines (Kulliyyat ush-Sharee'ah) of Sharee'ah. Anything as such must be definite." Ilm on the other hand is defined by Al-Jarjaani in his book At-Ta'reefaati, the definitions, p. 67," the certain conviction that matches reality." Az-Zubaydi in the Arabic dictionary Taaj ul-Aroos vol 8 p 405, reports that Al-Minawi defines Ilm as," The established and definite conviction that matches reality. Or it is a case where it leads to a decision whose opposite is impossible." Lisan Al-Arab dictionary vol 12 p. 417 adds another meaning," opposite to ignorance." Therefore, Ilm means certainty i.e. no margin of error. This is different from Thunn where, by definition, it means conjecture. Conjecture does not constitute certainty.

Building belief on Thunn is unacceptable, and Allah Ta'ala warned the previous nations, as well as the Quraish, against utilizing this method. Allah Ta'ala's warning also applies to us, and we are not to imitate them. We are not permitted to follow conjecture (Thunn). Our Iman must be clear and definite. This is why Taqleed, imitation, in the Aqeedah is not permissible. All Scholars, including Ibn Taimiyyah, Imam Shawkanee and Ibn Hazm, have agreed unanimously on the fact that conjecture (Dthann) or imitation are prohibited in the Aqeedah.

Therefore, each and everyone has to establish his/her Aqeedah after reflection into things around him, in order to reach to a conclusive belief that complies with his intellect and his nature (fitrah). However, an argument may be posed that not all people have the capacity to think in the enlightened fashion, and that those who cannot think in this way will simply have to follow those who are capable of thinking. A book titled Al Adillato wa Shawahid Ala Wujoobil Akhdhi Khabrul Wahidi Fil Aqeedati wal Ahkaam (The evidences on the issue of accepting Khabr al-Ahaad in the Aqeedah and Ahkam), by Salim Hilali (vol.1, pg. 47), argues that imitation in the Aqeedah is

permissible. Then we ask about the many Ayahs that condemn conjecture and demand serenity in Aqeedah!! Furthermore, the author fails to recognize that the imitation in the Aqeedah implies doubt, which is unanimously unacceptable by all Scholars. The only reason this author made such a claim was just to reach the conclusion that certainty is not necessary in the Aqeedah. As their argument follows, if certainty is not a requirement in the Aqeedah then there is no problem in accepting Khabr al-Ahaad in the Aqeedah. If he had thought rationally, without any pre-judgment, he would not have reached to such a conclusion.

The Islamic Aqeedah is one that is global. It does not seclude itself to a specific region or people. In conveying this Aqeedah to humanity, one will find people who are atheists, agnostics, and the like. If any of these kinds of people are invited to Islam, no doubt he will ask for a proof. The Quran and its ayahs, such as: Arabic????? "Say: He Allah is One" (112:1) will not be accepted by an atheist or an agnostic as a proof or evidence for the existence of Allah, since they basically deny Allah and anything related to Allah will also be denied, i.e. Allah's speech. In order to address such a person, one would have to revert back to a starting point. Such a starting point must involve analyzing the universe, man, and life while utilizing the rational method, in order to reach to the inevitable and conclusive fact that man, life, and the universe are all the creation of The Creator, and could not have been the result of proverbial "Big Bang", or any other theoretical conclusion of creation or evolution that is carried by atheists and agnostics. An example of such a rational discussion took place between Prophet Ibrahim and a person who claimed that he was god. Prophet Ibrahim presented this heretic with clear, lucid, and indisputable arguments, and finally left the heretic speechless and dumbfounded with no countering argument. Allah Ta'ala relates the discussion in the Quran as follows: Arabic????? "Haven't you seen the one who disputed with Ibrahim about his Rabb, because Allah had given him some power? Ibrahim said: 'My Rabb is He Who gives life and causes death.' (His opponent) said: ' I give life and cause death.' (In return) Ibrahim said: Allah causes the sun to rise from the east, can you make it rise from the west?' (His opponent), who had become a Kafir, became confounded. Allah does not guide those who are oppressors." (2:258)

Prophet Ibrahim was able to confound his opponent after presenting one simple argument related to the laws of the universe. His opponent became bewildered after realizing rationally that he had no ability to alter the systematic laws of the universe, nor could he even utter a statement to support his arrogant position, and this arrogance kept him from admitting the fact that he was not the Creator. However, Prophet Ibrahim established a rational and irrefutable evidence that the universe and its laws were created by The Creator, Allah (swt) . This example should serve as a guideline for us when presenting the Islamic Aqeedah. Our arguments must be established only with ideas that leads to certainty and conviction, so much so that it leaves the adversary with no base with which to stand upon, even if they do not admit their error. This type of Iman cannot be established except by ideas which are based on certainty. How could anyone say that conclusive belief can be established by inconclusive evidence?! It is in the very nature of the Islamic Aqeedah to be conclusive. In addition, one need not be an 'Alim nor a professor of nuclear physics to be able to reach to this conclusion. As we have seen in the case of Prophet Ibrahim, even the most basic issue related to the laws of the universe (Sunrise and Sunset) can be utilized to reach to this conclusion. Therefore, anyone from the genius to the illiterate has the ability to reach to this conclusion, without the need for imitation.7. TYPES OF EVIDENCES ACCEPTED IN THE ISLAMIC AQEEDAH

With the realization that certainty is a must in the Aqeedah, one must determine the types of evidence which can be taken in the Aqeedah. It is very obvious that the evidences must be conclusive and incontrovertible, devoid of error or doubt. The evidence involved are of two types: Intellectual and divine texts. Intellect is used to believe in the existence of the Allah Ta'ala; Qur'an as Allah's book; the Prophethood of Muhammad and consequently intellect is used to prove the legitimacy of the divine texts. Once the legitimacy of the texts is established, the mind becomes nothing but a tool used to understand the text, not to pass a judgment on it. Thus the evidence

involved in establishing that there is a creator and that He is one is intellectual. This type of evidence must be based on what the Quran calls 'Tafakkur' or contemplative reflection. The Aql (mind) qualifies as a method to establish these aspects of the Aqeedah. An analysis of the universe, i.e. fire, earth, etc., yields a definite conclusion that they are creations, created by a Creator, Allah Ta'ala.

The Quran's validity must also be assessed by the mind. Muhammad (saw) presented this Quran and proved that it is not man-made. Since the Quran is in the Arabic language, there are only three possibilities of its source. It could only have been the product of the Arabs, Prophet Muhammad, or from Allah (swt). The challenge of the Quran to all mankind, to produce even one Surah similar to that of the Quran, has never been met. It has been proven that the Arabs, within that time frame and until today, have failed to meet the challenge. If there remains anyone who disputes this indisputable fact, then all he has to do is to produce a Surah on the same level of any of the Quranic surahs. Since the Arabs could not do it, then rationally we determine that the Quran is not from the Arabs. The Quran is also not from Muhammed (saaws) for many reasons, which exceed the scope of this topic. However, it is sufficient to add here that Muhammad (saaws) never claimed to be the source of the Quran, and explicitly emphasized this point on innumerable occasions. Therefore, rationally speaking, the Quran could only have come from Allah (swt), and so Muhammad's (saw) claim of Prophethood was indeed authentic. This verifies that he was a Messenger. So far we have established the foundation of the Islamic Aqeedah utilizing the rational thinking process. It was through this process that Abu Bakr (ra), Umar (ra), and the other Sahaba, became Muslims. They listened to the Quran and realized that it was a miracle. They then adhered to the Iman of Islam after they were imbued with a deep conviction in it. Others, like Abu Jahl, also knew that Islam was correct and that the Quran was from Allah, yet they rejected it.

Once the Quran is declared as an authority, the role of the mind shifts. The mind, prior to the Iman in Islam, was free to roam. After the mind established the Quran's authenticity the mind is then restricted to the understanding of the message as it came in the Quran. The mind no longer passes judgments on the text of the Quran, nor does it alter the revelation. The relevant issue here is that the Aqeedah must be definite and since the mind established the authenticity of the Quran to be only from Allah, any information included in the Quran would carry the same attribute of decisiveness and authenticity, i.e. anything contained in the Quran must be taken as part of the Aqeedah.

Regarding the Ahkam, it is allowed for there to be a measure of doubt in following the rules, providing the sources of the Ahkam are Islamic. This is due to the fact that Allah (SWT) ordered us to take the Shahaadah or testimony of one, two, and four individuals which is conjectural. Also, the Prophet (saaws) allowed the Sahaba to accept conjecture (Dthann) in the Ahkam. Another key factor is that in the process of ijtihaad, the Mujtahid derives rules to the best of his ability in understanding the legislative texts. This notion implies a level of doubt, one that is permissible in the Ahkam. Allah's Messenger (saaws) said, "Arabic????? "If the ruler does Ijtihaad and reaches the correct conclusion, then he is rewarded twice. If he makes a mistake, then he is rewarded once." (Al-Bukhari)

Regarding the texts of the hadiths and their chain of reporters, if they are to be taken as part of the Aqeedah, then they must also be conclusive and decisive, what is called qat'ee thuboot (decisive transference) and qat'ee dalalah (decisive connotation of the text). This is due to censuring of Allah (swt), in the Quran, of those who arrived at the Iman through speculative and conjectural means (refer to the ayats mentioned above). However, the hadiths which do not lead to certainty can be utilized in the Ahkam, providing that these hadiths are not defective in either their text or their chain of narrators. This is due to the fact that the Prophet allowed the usage of evidences that are more than likely to be true (ghalabat ul-thann) in the Ahkam.

## 8. CLASSIFICATION OF AHAADITH

The Scholars of Hadith have classified the hadiths into Hadith Mutawatir and Hadith Ahaad. The opinion is carried by scholars such as Ibn Hazm, Aamidi, Ghazali, Shawkani, Shirazi, al-Kamal bin al-Humaam, [al-Kamal bin al-Humaam, "Kitab-at-Tahrir", vol 3, pg. 30; ash-Shawkani, "Irshaadul-Fuhool" pg.46; al-Aamidi, "al-Ihkaam fi Usooli al-Ahkaam", vol.2 pg. 20; Ibn Hazm, "al-Ahkaam", vol.1 pg. 104-108; ash-Shirazi, "al-Lam'a fi Usooli Fiqh", pg. 71; al-Ghazali, "al-Mankhool Min Tabqaal al-Usool", pg. 235-245]

Some people claim that this classification of Hadith developed long after the time of the Sahabah. These go so far as to say that the classification into Hadith Mutawatir and Hadith Ahaad was unnecessary since there are so few Mutawatir Hadiths. The fact that such terminology came to existence after the time of Sahabah it does not invalidate this classification., In actuality many things developed after the era of the Sahabah, such as Usul ul-Fiqh, and the grammar of the Arabic Language. The claim that there are only a few Mutawatir hadiths, on the other hand, is due only to an ignorance of the Science of Hadith itself. HADITH MUTAWATIR

The Mutawatir Hadith is the Hadith reported to us through successive groups of people wherein it was impossible for them to have conspired to lie about any aspect of the hadith. A group of people heard a piece of news from the Prophet (saaws) and reported this to another group, who reported it to another group, who then reported it to another, until it reached the Hadith compilers, who then documented and compiled the hadith. This group of people must be trustworthy to such an extent that it would be impossible for one to say that they had conspired or fabricated a lie. It is this type of chain that the hadith Scholars referred to as Mutawatir. This definition implies certainty. This is an undisputed fact [refer to Al-Muwafaqaat by Ash-Shatibi, Irshaad ul-Fuhool by Ashwkani, Al-Baa'ith Al-Hathith by Ibn Kathir]. The quantity and quality of the reporters is such that a conspiracy would have been impossible. There is an ability to ascertain whether or not there were mistakes, lies, etc., simply due to the credibility of the reporters, and the accuracy of their reporting. They listened to A and then transmitted the report to B without adding anything to the report itself. Nowadays, news and information is conveyed with additions and interpretations. This was not even a possibility with the Mutawatir Hadiths. These hadiths are exact reports of what was said or what occurred. The reporter conveys the exact message, along with his credibility as a reporter, as well as a quantity of other reporters, each with credibility, and an identical report. These qualifications were met in each generation of the report, from the Sahaba until it reached the Muhadditheen who collected and compiled the reports. As is evident, such criteria eradicates any possibility of fabrication of the report. This is the type of hadith called Mutawatir.

An example of this type of hadith is when Muhammed (saaw) said: Arabic????? "He who lies about me intentionally, then he deserves a seat in the Hell fire."

The Scholars of Hadith determined that there were three types of Mutawatir reports; namely The Practical Tawatur, Tawatur by the Text (bil Laf-dh ), and Tawatur by the Meaning (bil-Ma'na ).Practical Tawatur (amali)

The Hadiths which report that the Prophet Muhammed (saaws) used to pray four Rak'as in the Dhur prayer, or three Rak'as in the Maghrib prayer, or that he stood on mount Arafat during the Hajj, are examples of Practical Mutawatir Hadiths. So today, we cannot change these rules, claiming that the reporters might have erred in the transmission, and suggesting a change in the number of rakahs. These Hadiths were reported by tawatur, and not just one, two, or even three persons, or even one hundred. All of the Sahaba who used to pray behind him (saaws) and they reported this to us. This type of Tawatur is called a Practical Tawatur. So it is beyond even a shadow of doubt that the Dhur prayer has four Rak'as. If a person claimed that the Dhur prayer is three Rak'as then he is a Kafir. Even if he accepted everything else in Islam but claims that in this issue he does not think that the Dhur prayer is 4 rakah, he is a Kafir. Tawatur by the Text (lafthi)

This type of Mutawatir hadith was narrated with the same text, from a group of the Sahaba, on down to groups of trustworthy and accurate reporters, until it reached the Muhadditheen, who compiled them. Examples of this type are the hadiths about the Prophet's Hawdh (basin or fountain in Jennah), the raising of the Prophet's hands in du'a, or the hadith which state: Arabic?????? "He who likes about me intentionally, then he deserves his seat in the Hellfire. "Tawatur by Meaning (ma'nawi)

This type of Tawatur deals with cases where the occurrence of certain topics, subject matters, or information, are overwhelmingly reported in various Hadiths. While each reported Hadith is not Mutawatir, the topic or information appear in so many Hadith that if these topics were taken together, they would reach to the level of Tawatur. Hence, the Scholars declared that the meaning of these topics are Tawatur. This category of Tawatur was debated amongst the Scholars of Hadith due to their definition of Tawatur. for example, some Scholars differed on the number of reports which met the level of Tawatur. An example of such Mutawatir-by-Meaning Hadiths talking about intercession.

However, the Practical Tawatur and the Tawatur by Text hadiths are undebated methods of narration and all Scholars agreed on these types of Tawatur. When differences would occur it would revolve around the number of reporters necessary to reach to certainty. They all agreed that it had to be reported by a number wherein it would be impossible for them to conspire to fabricate a lie, and when this number was reached, the Hadith would be considered as Tawatur. Nonetheless, most scholars agree that the number can not be less than five(5). Ibn Taymiyyah in Al-Fatawa Al-Kubra vol 5 p.81 stated," With regard to Al-Mutawatir: The correct opinion is that of the meajority (Jumhoor) [of scholars], which is that Al-Mutawatir has no set number. Rather, if certainty is established due to the report of the narrators, then it is Mutawatir." Abu At-Tayyb At-Tabari, As-Sabaki, Al-Kamal bin Al-Humaam and Abu Bakr al-Baqillani were of this opinion. [Ash-Shawkani, "Irshadul Fuhood" pg.47; Al-Ibhaaj fi Sharh Al-Mihaaj vol.2 pg. 290; Ibn Al-Humaam Kitab At-Tareer vol.3 pg.34; Al-Mankhool for Ghazali pg.240 ] Does One Who Rejects A Mutawatir Hadith Become A Kafir? Ash-Shaashi who is a Hanafi scholar said: - "The Mutawatir gives certainty. Rejecting it is Kufr." [Usoolu sha-Shashi pg.272].- Abu Hanifa said: "I hold the opinion of wiping on the Khuff because its evidence is as clear as the day light. I fear Kufr for the one who rejects it." [Fawaalih ar-Rahmoot fi Sharhi Muslim Ath-Thaboot vol.2 pg. 120]Ahaad Hadith (Khabar ul- Ahaad)

The other type of Hadith is called Al-Ahaad. If the Hadiths are reported by reporters less than the number required for Tawatur, then they are called Khabar ul-Ahaad (News of the ones) [ refer to Ibn Salah in Uloom ul-Hadith pg.10; Usool Ash-Shaashi pg.272; Ibn Hazm "al-Ihkaam' vol.1 pg.108]; Imam al-Qurafi defined it to be "the report of a singular or group of Adl reporters that gives conjecture (Thunn)." [Sharh Tanqeeh Al-Fusool fi Ikhtisaar al-Mahsool fi al-Usool pg.356]. Khabar ul-Ahaad could be Sahih (authentic), it could be Hassan (good) and it could be Da'eef (weak). Thus, there are three types of Ahaad Hadith. Conditions Of Using Ahaad Ahadith:

Scholars of Usool placed various conditions to use this type of Hadith. Some even placed it as a title. [Al-Aamidi in Al-Ihkaam vol.2 pg.100; Ash-Shawkaani in Irshad ul- Fuhood pg.50; As-Sabki Al-Ibhaaj fi Sharh Al-Minhaaj vol.2 pg.311; among others.]

Some of the conditions are: 1) To be accepted by the Ummah. [Ibn Taimiyyah in Al-Musawwadah, pg.243] 2) It should not be in contradiction with a definite text. Ash-Shawkaani said: "This point has its origin with the righteous predecessors. Ayshah rejected the Hadith that "the dead person gets punished if his family weep over him." [reported by Bukhari and Muslim] because it contradicted with Ayah 38-39 in Surat un- Najm. 3) The Hadith should not be addressing a subject that is very common. This is the opinion of the Hanafi Maslaha stated Sarkhasi, Buzdawi and al-Kamal bin al-Hamaam . An example is the Hadith reported by Bukhari "whoever touches his private part should not pray until he makes wudu." This hadith is rejected by the Hanafi Maslaha because touching

ones private part is a common matter therefore it should have more than Ahaad chains. Also it contradicts with the actions of Sahabah.4) It must not go against the actions of Medina residents. This opinion is held by the Makki Mathhab - for them the action of people of Medina takes precedence over the hadith Ahaad.5) It must not contradict with the facts proven by the mind. This opinion was held by Shawkani, Shatibi, Abdul Qaahir Baghdadi (Usool ud-Deen, pg.23).Therefore, all scholars agreed that Hadith of Ahaad is a source of legislation but each of them had his conditions for using it. Rejecting Ahaad Hadith as a source of law would lead to the denial of Sunnah as a whole. This mounts to Kufr. Their disagreement was over how and where to use it, not over using it. It is worth mentioning that such debate did not exist in Tawatur Hadith. How Did the Sahaba View Ahaad Report? Sahaba accepted wahid report in Ahkaam Shariyyah. This is well known. Examples are: a) Abu Bakr (ra) accepted the report "We Prophets do not get inherited. What ever we have (after death) is left as charity. [Bukhari]b) Umar (ra) accepted the report from Abdur Rehman bin Auf regarding the "Majooos" treat them as you treat the people of the book but do not eat their food or marry their woman." [Bukhari]

However, there is no report that the Sahaba (raa) accepted this type of report in the issues of Aqeedah. Does Khabar Ahaad give Certainty? As previously stated, Khabar Ahaad unlike Mutawatir contains a margin of error. This is the opinion of the bulk of the scholars.

Al-Kamal bin Al-Humaam: "Most Jurists and scholars of Hadith say that the Khabar of Wahid does not give certainty at all." [At-Tahrir vol.2 pg.368]

Ibn Hazm: "The Hanafies, Shafies, bulk of Malikies, all Mutazilal and Khawarij agree that Khabar al-Wahid does not give certainty." [Al-Ihkaam vol.1 pg.119]

Al-Aamidi: He stated that "The Ummah's scholars say that Khabar ul-Wahid gives conjecture (Thunn) with the exception of some of the Thaahiri people and Ahmad bin Hanbal Mathhab, in one of two narrations." [Al-Ihkaam vol.2 pg.49-50]

Ibn Taymiyah: He stated that "The majority (of scholars) Juwayni, Ibn al-Baqqilaani, Ash-Shaafi, and the majority of the people of thought and fiqh and Ibn Abdul Bir." [Al-Musawwadah pg. 236-244]

Al-Ansari: "Most scholars of Usool, including the three Imaams (Abu Hanifa, ash-Shafi and Malik) are of the opinion that Khabar al-Wahid implies conjecture (Thunn) only. This is whether the report is supported by signs or not (Qara'in)." [Fawatih ur-Rahmoot fi Sharhi Muslim Ath-Thaboot vol.2 pg.121]

Ash-Shawkani: "The majority (of the scholars) including al-Mawardi, Ibn Ulagah, Juwayni, ..... say it implies conjecture." [Irshaad Al-Fuhood pg.48-49] cont. 7. IMPACT OF HADITH CLASSIFICATION

If one refers to the books dealing with the Science of Hadith, one will find that they provided detailed information regarding the reporters, and regarding the texts of the hadiths. The concept is similar to that of credit agencies. At credit agencies one will find a record for anyone who engaged in credit activity, documenting these credit activities; Whether he/she has a credit history or not; Whether he/she has delinquencies in their credit payments or not; Whether his credit rating is A or B or C. Similarly, in the books which document the people who reported the Hadiths, one would find the names in alphabetical order, with his fathers name, his credibility and whether he is acceptable or not; Is he accurate in reporting the Ahaadith or not; Who reported Hadith(s) from him; From who did he get his Hadith(s); and a list of other related information.

The following questions arise: What is the impact of this differentiation? Why did the Scholars of Hadith have such this classification? Why did they spend decades of their lives writing books and establishing rules dealing with this classification? What were the reasons scholars did all of this?

First of all, some people started fabricating hadiths and as a result, the Scholars documented certain rules regarding the Hadith in order to distinguish the fabricated Hadith from the authentic ones. Such an objective was worth the great effort that was put into it.

Secondly, the scholars of Usul ul-Fiqh (Methodology of Fiqh) discussed this classification regarding the Mutawatir and stated that it implies Al-'Ilm and Al-'Amal. The word Al-'Ilm means Certainty, Conviction, Iman, while Al-'Amal dealt the Ahkam or the Law. So the Tawatur Hadiths would be used in both, the Iman and the Ahkam. When the scholars discussed the issue of Khabr ul-Ahaad Hadiths stating that it implies Al-'Amal but not Al-'Ilm (Iman). Therefore, Ahaad refers to only Al-'Amal, i.e. in deriving the laws. Thus, the Tawatur reports imply certainty and can be used in deriving the practical rules, while the Ahaad reports do not imply certainty and are only used to derive the rules. Therefore, this is the impact of the differentiation between Tawatur and Ahaad.

Some people would claim that such a classification is only theoretical, having no practical application. Some even say categorizing between Ahaad and Mutawatir, and separating the legislative rulings from certain issues of the belief, especially when these issues came in Ahaad Hadiths, is to categorize where there is no need for categorization.

This differentiation or categorization however, is extremely important. First of all, if we look at the definition of the Qur'an, we will find that the entire Muslim Ummah agreed upon the definition of the Qur'an. The definition of the Qur'an is: the speech of Allah Ta'ala revealed to Muhammad (saaws), and reported to us by Tawatur. So if there is any Ayah (verse) of the Qur'an that was not reported to us by Tawatur, then this 'so-called 'Ayah' is not considered to be a part of the Qur'an. Thus, this Qur'an which is reported to us through Tawatur, is the same Quran which Muhammed (saaws) received through revelation (Wahiy), and is the very same Qur'an which Abu Bakr (raa) and Uthman (raa) compiled.

An example of an Ayah which was not transmitted by Tawatur, but which is reported by Ahaad that a Sahabi used to read, revolves around Ayah 89 of Surah at-Tawbah. The Ayah is addressing the compensatory actions (Kaffaarah) for those who break their vows or oaths. According to Ahaad report, Abdullah ibn Mas'ood used to read: Arabic??????? " So fast three consecutive days. "However, the word mutatabiyaat 'consecutive' was not proven by Tawatur. It is reported through Ahaad report that Abdullah Bin Mas'ood (raa) used to read it., but is not considered to be part of the Qur'an. Thus, if you look to Al- Qur'an al-Kareem, it says:Arabic????? "Fast three days." (5:89)

The Qur'an does not talk about three consecutive days. So if one was to fast today and then a day the following week, and a day the following week, he/she would have fulfilled the requirements of the Ayah. The days do not have to be consecutive. So, here we find that the difference between the classification of Tawatur and Ahaad is not theoretical, rather it is extremely practical.

Abu Hanifa, however, said that even though this would not be considered as a part of the Quran, he would accept it as a part of the Sunnah. Other Scholars disagreed with him on this point stating that it was not reported as a Hadith and as such cannot be accepted as a Hadith since the reporter said that it was part of the Qur'an. Since it did not meet the criteria of the Qur'an it cannot be treated as a part of the Qur'an and therefore, it is neither part of the Qur'an, nor is it a Hadith. Thus, it has no legal value. On the other hand Abu Hanifa opined that it did have a legal value, but was not part of the Qur'an. However, the reason that all Scholars declined to accept this as part of the Qur'an was due to the fact that it had been proven by an Ahaad chain. There are other examples of such cases.

Later on when 'Ilm al Qira'ah (the science of recitation) was developed, a criterion was set to accept only recitations which were proven by Tawatur. Thus, the recitation would not be acceptable if it was proven by a Ahaad chain. However, later on, those who wanted to say that Ahaad was acceptable in the Aqeedah, began claiming that a recitation could be utilized if it had been proven by Ahaad, something that went against what was already accepted as a definite rule and standard to

Muslims. This was only done in order to maintain a consistency in their argument. This was mentioned in the book *Al Adilla Wa Al ShawaAhaad*, pg. 272 (31), where Salim al-Hilaly said that *Al-qira'ah Ash-shadhathah* (the abnormal or rejected recitation) is acceptable in the *Ahkam Sharia* (Divine Rules).

There is another practical impact of differentiating between *Tawatur* and *Ahaad* in the issue of *Al-Naasikh* and *Al-Mansookh* (The Abrogating and Abrogated *Ayahs* and *Ahadith*). It is well known to the scholars of *Usul ul-Fiqh* that the *Ahaad* *Hadith* does not abrogate the *Hadith Mutawatir*, because they are not of the same value. The *Hadith Mutawatir* can only be abrogated by another *Mutawatir*. The scholars of *Usul ul-Fiqh* said that the *Mutawatir* can abrogate the *Ahaad* since it is much stronger than the *Ahaad*, while the *Ahaad* cannot abrogate the *Tawatur*. Thus, it is a fact that *Mutawatir* is stronger than *Ahaad*.

The question that arises is that why accept the *Ahaad* in the *Ahkam* if it is not *Mutawatir*? Since Allah Ta'ala ordered us to follow the entire *Sunnah* of the Prophet (saaws), this *Sunnah* includes both the *Tawatur* and the *Ahaad*. Therefore, we take the *Ahaad* in the *Ahkam*. Furthermore, the *Sahabah* agreed to accept any report which was reported to them regarding what the Prophet (saaws) said, did, or approved of, as long as it dealt with the rules. So this means that we can accept *Ahaad* in the rules but we do not accept the *Ahaad* in the *Aqeedah*. After all, in the rules, one does not have to be 100 % sure, since all that is necessary in following the rules is what the person thinks is more than likely to be true, i.e. following the right understanding of the rule, as long as the rule was taken from the Islamic legislative sources.

To illustrate this concept, we need only to refer back to an incident that happened in the time of the Prophet (saaws). Once the Prophet (saaws) told the *Sahabah*: Arabic????? " He who believes in Allah and the Day of Judgment, let him not pray the *Asr* *Salat* until he reaches the land of *Banu Quraydah*." (Al-Bukhari)

Based on this single order, we find that the *Sahabah* had separated into two groups, based on their understanding of the order. Some of them prayed the *Asr* *Salah* in *Medina* because they understood from the order that the Prophet wanted them to waste no time in getting to *Banu Quraydhah's* territory, and so they prayed and then took off hastily. The second group understood the order literally, and set out for *Banu Quraydhah's* territory, where they made the *Asr* *Salah*. When the Prophet (saaws) was alerted to the two interpretations he approved both opinions and the application of whatever they understood. Moreover, none of them was 100% sure about this meaning simply because this *Hadith* can be interpreted in one of two meanings. This means that there is no certainty in the meaning or connotation (*Thunni ud-Dalalah*) of this *Hadith*.

Thus, it can be concluded that the conjecture (*Thunni*) is not acceptable in the *Aqeedah*, but is acceptable in the rules (*Ahkam*). There are many cases where one accepts the conjecture in the rules. For instance, when one enters the house of a Muslim and is offered a glass of liquid, he would drink it without asking whether it is wine or not. One would assume that since he is a Muslim who obeys Allah (swt), he should not have wine in his house, nor should he offer it to another Muslim. For the person who drinks from the glass of liquid, he is not absolutely convicted that the substance is not wine, rather to the best of what he knows he should not be offered wine by another Muslim, and so he drinks, asking no questions.

In other words, having the full conviction in every action is not necessary. Although the intention is essential in the actions that require *niyyah*, but the intention or the *niyyah* is different from the conviction or *I'tiqaad*. However, in the *Aqeedah*, the full conviction is absolutely necessary. This point is mentioned in many *Ayahs* of the *Quran*.

It is therefore quite evident that the scholars of Islam made a distinction between *Mutawatir* and *Ahaad*, and this distinction was not a theoretical one, rather it was done for practical purposes. In addition, the scholars of Islam determined that a *Ahaad* *Hadith* is not as strong as a *Mutawatir*

Hadith, and as a result they determined that Ahaad Hadiths cannot abrogate Mutawatir Hadiths. This strength of the Mutawatir Hadith allows it to be taken in the issues of the Aqeedah, since it connotes decisive incontrovertibility, whereas the Ahaad Hadith is used in the Ahkam since it is more than likely to be true (ghalabat uth-Thunn), but cannot be used in the Aqeedah because of its conjectural nature.

A person would ask about the status of the Sahih Hadith regarding the distinction between certainty and conjecture, and why the Scholars created a category called Sahih.

The point at hand is that the Qur'an ordered us to accept only the definitive and resolute evidences in the Aqeedah or Iman. Therefore, the Ahaad, although it could or could not be Sahih is not absolutely and resolutely authentic, as is the case with the Tawatur. It is more than likely to be authentic, but it is not 100% authentic. Since Allah Ta'ala requires only those proofs which are 100% definitive in the Iman, it is therefore very obvious that the Sahih Hadith would not fit in the category of Tasdeeq Jazim.

Additionally, it must be understood that delivering the message of Islam was the responsibility of the Messenger of Allah (saaws). He (saaws) used to address a group of people when the situation warranted, e.g. he never recited the Quran, as it was being revealed, in the presence of one person, rather he would recite it to a group of the Sahaba. This is because Allah's Messenger is ordered by definition to deliver the Message of Islam to a crowd where the absolute proof is established against them as well as those who will hear it from them. However, he would address only one individual when the situation warranted, e.g. teaching individuals certain du'as, etc. During the period of revelation, there was no need for categorization between Mutawatir and Ahaad. However, later on after his (saaws) death, and with the existence of weak and fabricated narrations, the emergence of untrustworthy people narrating hadiths, and the fact that Islam had spread to new territories where the people did not know the Arabic language, the Scholars of Islam perceived the necessity to document certain Islamic disciplines. Consequently, there arose the Sciences of Hadith, Tafseer of the Qur'an, and Arabic Language, to mention a few. In the Science of Hadith, there emerged unanimously agreed upon terms like Mutawatir and Ahaad. These categorizations, as have been already illustrated, did have practical impact and applications. These categorizations were made to weed out, and to categorize the types of Hadiths that were being narrated.

Furthermore, each of the reporters who narrated the hadith was not infallible. So there were possibilities that while a reporter would be trustworthy, in full command of his memory, etc., there was still a shade of doubt in his report, since he was not infallible. On the other hand, reports which were narrated by a group of reporters, in which the texts were identical, and where there was no way that these reporters could have conspired to fabricate the report, i.e. Mutawatir reports, had the shade of doubt removed. Herein lies the reason for this practical categorization and differentiation. To claim that there was no need for this categorization, is to jump to a conclusion without any basis. the opinion of Ibn Taymiyyah regarding khabr al-Ahaad (merge with scholars)

Let us refer to the writings of Ibn Taimiyyah in order to see what he said about Mutawatir and Khabar ul-Ahaad. In his book Al-Fatawa [Vol. 7; pg. 117-127], he addressed the subject of Imaan and says that Imaan is the Yaqeen (detailed and clarified conviction), and not just Tasdeeq (belief). He said that this is the Shari meaning of Imaan. Furthermore, he said about Mutawatir in Al Fatawa Vol. 18 pg. 16-22; that the Mutawatir Ahaadith imply the 'Ilm (certainty) and that one can resolutely and absolutely confirm that this is true because it is Mutawatir. Regarding the authentic Ahaad Ahaadith, he attached certain details to it before it would be able to imply the 'Ilm, unlike the case of the Mutawatir for which he gave only one rule. Regarding the Sahih (authentic) Ahaadith which could imply certainty, Ibn Taymiyyah placed two conditions, where if either one

existed then it would give 'Ilm.. The first condition is that it has to be acceptable by the whole Ummah, i.e. the whole Ummah made Ijmaa' on it, these can be confirmed that they are true. Therefore only those Hadiths in which the Ummah had made Ijmaa' on would be included in this category.

The second condition he placed on the Sahih Hadith that would make it give 'Ilm is that it should be accepted by the Scholars, and not necessarily by the Ummah, like the Ahaadith of Bukhari and Muslim together (Mutafaq Alayhi), would be considered as the Ijma of Scholars i.e. Ijmaa' ul-Ulamaa'.

So Ibn Taimiyyah considers those two kinds of Ahaad Hadith as definite, not by themselves, but rather because of the Ijmaa' Al-Ummah and Ijmaa' Al-Ulamaa'. Both of these types of Ijmaa' were used as sources of legislation for Ibn Taimiyyah. He even added that the Ijmaa' Al-Ummah is valid for every time.

Ibn Taimiyyah said that although the Khabar Ahaad by itself implies conjecture (Thunn), if it is supported by the Ijmaa' of the Scholars or Ummah, it would be considered as Ijmaa' and the Ijmaa' is a Daleel which is binding. Therefore, these Hadiths would become binding and certain and could be treated like the Mutawatir [see Al-Fatawa, Vol. 18 pg. 41-48].

So it is quite obvious that Ibn Taimiyyah did not consider the Mutawatir and Ahaad to be on the same level. He said that the Ahaad could be considered as binding and implying certainty if it was accompanied by Ijmaa'. Ijmaa' as a Daleel

Let us now consider the validity of Ijmaa' as a Daleel or a legislative source. As we mentioned before, Ibn Taimiyyah accepts Ijmaa' Al-Ummah and Ijmaa' Al-Ulamaa' as Daleels or legislative sources. Imam Ahmad Bin Hanbal, who is the Imam of Ibn Taimiyyah and founder of Hanbali Madthab, said: 'He who claims an Ijmaa' after Ijmaa' us-Sahabah has lied.' Here, he is referring to the idea of taking the Ijmaa' as a source of legislation. Therefore to Imam Hanbal, the Ijmaa', as a valid and binding source of Legislation, ended with the ending of the era of the Sahabahs. Consequently, to Imam Hanbal, the only valid Ijmaa' is that of the Sahabahs, and any Ijmaa' after them is not binding.

The various opinions of the Madthabs came after the era of the Sahabahs. Some Scholars of those Madthahib said that the only binding Ijmaa' is just the Ijmaa'us-Sahabah, like Ahmad Bin Hanbal. Some said that the Ijmaa' ul-Ummah in any generation, and in any century is binding. Some said it is the Ijmaa' of the Scholars, and not the Ummah which is binding, claiming that it was not necessary for the entire Ummah to agree on something if the Scholars had already agreed upon it.

The topic of Ijmaa' is not the focus of this article, however, it is necessary to make the following points:1. Allah Ta'ala says in the Qur'an: Arabic?????? "The Pioneers from the Muhajireen and the Ansars, and those who follow them in good deeds, Allah is pleased with them, and they with Him." [Surah at-Tawba:100]

In this Ayah, Allah Ta'ala praised the Sahabah for being Sahabah. The Qur'an praised no other group because of themselves except the Sahabah. Even their followers were praised only because they followed the Sahabah. Thus, the original praise is to the Sahabah.

The other point is that the Sahabah took the Qur'an from Prophet Muhammed (saaws), and as a group they preserved it and passed it down to the proceeding generations. So, for sure, the Sahabah would never agree upon something which was wrong since they lived with the Prophet (saaws). Therefore if it has been reported to us that they agreed on something, then they agreed on that thing because they got it from the Prophet (saaws). Consequently, their Ijmaa' (consensus and unanimous agreement) unveils the existence of a Sunnah which was not reported in the form of a hadith. Therefore, the Ijmaa' us-Sahabah is binding as a legislative source.

As for those who claim that Ijmaa' ul-Ummah is a source of legislation, they support their opinion with the following Hadith: Arabic?????/"My Ummah will never agree on Dhalalah."

This Hadith is authentic, but the Dhalalah means Kufr or misguidance, and not just an error or a mistake. There is a difference between Haqq and Baatil (Truth & Falsehood), Hudaa and Dhalaal (Guidance and Misguidance) and between Sahh and Khata' (Right and wrong). The Ummah or the Scholars could have made a mistake, but this does not necessarily mean that the person is a Dhaal or gone astray. So the Dhalalah, which the Ummah will not agree upon, is the Kufr.

Furthermore, the Ummah will never agree on every single issue, other than the issues in which there is not room for disputes or disagreement, i.e. the Islamic fundamentals. There is no way to get unanimous agreement of the Ummah, on every single issue, without the presence of some people who would disagree on that issue, and sometimes there would be no way to reach, or to know about those people who would disagree. It must be understood that the Ijmaa' does not simply mean the majority, rather it means unanimous agreement by the entire Ummah, which is impossible to achieve.

Some people recognized this impossibility and therefore claimed that the Ijmaa' should be that of the Scholars. Even this could not happen because when we say Ijmaa' Al Ulamaa' (Scholars), which Ulamaa' are we talking about? Who will get them together? Who will say that one person is an 'Alim and another is not? A person may be excluded just because he/she is not recognized as an 'Alim by those who call for such meeting, or may be a person would not be able to attend that meeting, or some may not have been informed about the meeting. Many questions would arise which would cast doubt on this kind of Ijmaa'. That is why Imam Ahmad Bin Hanbal said it very clearly: " He who claims any Ijmaa' (after the era of the Sahabah) has lied."

How is it possible to unite the Ummah without the Ijmaa'? While the unity is a must it is quite different from the Ijmaa'. This obligation of the unity of the Ummah found in many ayahs and Hadiths. Achieving this unity is not the scope of our discussion, however the Ummah can be united by the Qur'an and Sunnah, under the leadership of one Khalifah, while maintaining their various opinions, which must be based on the Islamic legislative sources.

Therefore, we find that Ibn Taymiyyah never said that Khabr ul-Ahaad by itself, without any addition supports, could imply certainty. It implies certainty only if the Hadith was supported by other evidences, such as the acceptance by the Ulamaa' of a particular Hadith which is considered as an Ijmaa' by Ibn Taymiyyah. Additionally, we found that this type of Ijmaa' is not valid as a legislative source. REFUTING ADDITIONAL ARGUMENTS REGARDING ACCEPTING KHABR AL-AHAAD IN THE AQEEDAH

Those who claim that Khabr ul-Ahaad is acceptable in the Aqeedah bring various arguments to support their position:1.) The Ayah where Allah Ta'ala says: Arabic??????? "It is not for the Believers to go out together (for Jihad). From every group of them, a Taifah should remain to study the Deen and admonish their people when they go back to them." [9:122]

In this Ayah, they claim that Taifah could mean one or more persons, and therefore, the Ayah requests from Muslims the basic requirement of one person to study Islam and to teach it to the people. Studying Islam means the Aqeedah and the rules, and consequently, Khabr ul-Ahaad is acceptable in the Aqeedah.

There are several points that must be taken into consideration. This Ayah is addressing the topic of Jihad. It requests from each group that goes to Jihad to leave some of them with the Prophet (saaws) to learn and teach those who went to Jihad upon their return. b. Those who remained with the prophet (saaws), in addition to the people who were residing in Medina will constitute a large number of people. Thus when the people who went to Jihad returned, they were not being taught by

one person, rather by the ones who remained as well as the residents of Medina.c. Linguistically, the word Ta'ifah means one or more. However, the Ayah referred to Ta'ifah in the plural form, therefore, Ta'ifah refers to more than one (see Tafseer Al-Qurtubi, vol. 8 p.294). This is supported by the fact that the Sahabah at that time who remained with the Prophet was a large group. d. The fact Allah Ta'ala orders us to accept the report of one or more, does not necessarily mean that their report gives certainty. This can be seen in the matter of testimony (Shahaadah). Allah Ta'ala orders us to accept the Shahaadah of one, two and four, even though the possibility of lie exists. Thus the most one can extract from the Ayah is that we must accept the report of Ahaad.e. Since the subject of accepting Khabr ul-Ahaad in Aqeedah is a subject of Usool ud-Deen, then the evidences involved must be decisive. The above honorable Ayah is not conclusive in meaning. Al-Aamidi in his book Al-Ihkaam pp. 292-293 states, "Someone may say: We do not agree that every Ta'ifah has the obligation of warning, as you say. And the word 'liyunthiroo,' to warn, is not in command form. Even if it were in command form, we disagree that it is an obligation. Even if we agree that it is an obligation, we do not agree that 'inthaar' or warning is the same as 'ikhbaar' or reporting news.... Even if we agree that the [Ayah] is addressing reporting, it could be done in fatwa in branches(furoo') and Usool (Fundamentals), and this is what we say. Even if we agree that it is the report from the Messenger in everything that we heard about him and from him, we do not agree that it is an obligation to take precaution (Hathar).... With the existence of possibilities, using this Ayah to show that Khabar ul-Wahid is a decisive evidence (Hujjah) in the Shar'i matters is a mere usage of conjecture in the Usool. The opponent proves it wrong."2) Allah says in Surah Hujuraat, 49:6:abic???????"O you who believe! If a Fasiq comes to you with any news, then verify it."

They say that if the person is not a Fasiq, i.e. he is not sinful, then he must be taken as trustworthy if he comes with any news. This would mean that we are ordered to accept any news from a person as long as he was trustworthy and so this implies that taking the news from one person (Khabr ul-Ahaad) is acceptable in the Aqeedah.

The occasion for the revelation revolved around an incident where the Prophet sent a Sahabi (whom we know for sure was not a Fasiq since he was from the Sahaba and chosen by Prophet. The Prophet would not choose a Fasiq for such a mission). This Sahabi reported certain occurrences to the Prophet, which were based on his estimation, without lying. The Prophet, however, sent another Sahabi to verify the situation, and then the Ayah was revealed. Although the ayah mentioned the word Fasiq, the occasion for the revelation widens the range of those whose news could be verified, and is not limited to only the Fasiq.

Imam Al-Jasas, in his book Ahkam ul-Quran, vol. 3 pg. 399, says: "claiming that restricting the verification to the news of the Fasiq, and that verifying the news of the trustworthy is not allowed is absurd because mentioning one item from a list of items does not mean that the other items were excluded from the rule".

However, some people claim that the Sahabah did not reject each others statements that were narrated by Ahaad. This is not true at all. If we review the actions of the Sahaba, we do find that there are cases where sometimes they would verify some of the reports and other times they would outright reject other reports. It is necessary to list some examples herein: i) It was reported that after the death of the Prophet (saaws), Umar ibn ul-Khattab verified what was related to him by the Sahabah, about the Prophet's death. This shows that the verification is not limited to the Fasiq alone. ii) ??????name/// once knocked Umar's door three times and returned. Umar asked him why he left before the door was answered and the Sahabi said he heard from the Prophet that one must leave if he knocks the door three times without it being answered. Umar ordered him to bring another person who heard this from the Prophet. iii) Aisha rejected the Hadith that was reported to her by a Sahabi that the deceased person will be punished in the grave due to the wailing and loud crying of his living family members. Aisha's point was that such a claim contradicted with a clear Ayah where Allah stated: Arabic???????

"No one will bear the burden of another."(6:164)iv) Umar rejected the report of Fatimah bintu Qays, who claimed that when she was divorced from her husband, the Prophet did not require her to get alimony or housing from her husband. Umar's rejection was based on the Ayah which establishes that divorced women must get alimony and housing from their husbands.

From this we find that being trustworthy is not enough for a report to be accepted. The Sahabas would not only question each other, they even rejected reports from each other, while knowing that each of them were trustworthy. After the era of the Sahaba, we find that even the Scholars of Hadith required the characteristic of Dhubb (accuracy and a good memory of the report) from the time he hears the report until he relates it to another, in addition to the character of trustworthiness.

So the ayah does not mean, in anyway, that Khabr ul-Ahaad is an authority in the Aqeedah. If the news of just one reporter has to be an authority, why did Islam specify various numbers to form a quorum in testimonies, i.e. 4 witnesses in Zina, 2 witnesses marriage, 1 witness for moon sightings, etc. It is obvious that there is a difference between the witness (shahadah), reporting (riwayah), and the conveying of news (tabligh). Each one has its own criteria and they should not be mixed or confused.<sup>3</sup>) In many incidents it was reported that either the Prophet would send one or more individuals to teach the people. Sometimes the request would be from the people who wanted to be taught, like the case of people of Madina who requested a person to teach them Islam, and Mus'ab bin Umayr was sent, or the case of Yemen when the Prophet sent Abu Ubaydah at their request; and other times the Prophet would initiate the sending of some individuals to teach others, such as the case of Malik ibn Al Huwayrith, who said:(arabic text!!!!!!!!!!!!!!) "We came to the Prophet, and we were youth of equal ages, and we stayed with him for twenty nights. Allah's Messenger (saaws) was very gentle and when he realized our longing for our families, he asked us about whom we left behind. When we informed him, he said, 'Go back to your families and stay with them and teach them and order them to do good deeds'." [Reported by Bukhari and Muslim]

None of these evidences mean that Khabr ul-Ahaad is acceptable in the Aqeedah, because of the following:

A) In some of those evidences the Prophet (saaws) would tell the people directly, to take whatever the person was telling them. So it is no longer Khabr ul-Ahaad.

B) In the other cases, such as Malik ibn Huwayrith there were more than one person, as the hadith explicitly states "we." How could this be interpreted as one person. 4) It is reported that some Muslims, who were praying outside of Medina, changed their Qiblah after being told by one person that the Qiblah was now changed. Therefore, those Muslims changed their Qiblah based on Khabr ul-Ahaad, or the news of one person.

This issue is not addressing the issue of Aqeedah, but rather the seemingly abrogation of a Qat'i rule by a Thunni one. This is a subject of debate among scholars. The truth of the matter is that it was the Ayah that abrogated the rule. The Hadith did not. The Sahabah were informed about a new rule by one or more persons. Also, the Hadith was reported with different texts. Some of them say that a person came to the Sahabah and informed them of the new rule at Fajr and another narration at Asr. In one narration it says, "Jaa'ahum Aat." In Arabic this could mean one or a group. Furthermore, this incident took place after a long period of anticipation by Muslims. Thus there were various signs that authenticated the report. Ibn Hjar said in Fath ul-Baari vol 1 p. 507, "...and in it [the Hadith] is the acceptance of Khabr ul-Wahid and the obligation of acting upon it. [It also contains] the obligation of what is established by 'Ilm, since their prayer toward Bayt ul-Maqdiss was established by certainty, for they witnessed the Prophet's prayer toward it. However they changed their direction due to Khabr ul-Wahid. This is answered [by saying] that the report was supported by various signs and introductions that made them certain of the truthfulness of the reporter. Thus certainty was only obligated by certainty for them." [For further information, refer to Ibn Daqeeq Al-Eid's book Ahkaam ul-Ahkaam fi Sharhi Umdat il-Ahkaam vol 1 pp 189-190.5) It

is reported that the Prophet sent individuals to the other rulers and tribes, inviting them to Islam. Since Islam includes the Aqeedah, then the news of the ones (Khabr ul-Ahaad) can be taken in the Aqeedah.

Actually, this situation is considered as a conveyance (tabligh), in which one reporter is enough. More important than this is that the delegate used to recite the Quran to them, which is the miracle of the Prophet, and so after this it would become the responsibility of the receiver of the message to think into the Ayahs being recited, or to verify the news being delivered to him by that individual. At that time, all people who received the delegates knew about Islam, since Islam was already known throughout Arabia and in territories outside of Arabia. Therefore this could not be considered as Khabr ul-Ahaad. The Prophet did not send them something new, rather he only invited them to Islam, which was already known. The authority here is not in the individual being one person, but rather in the content of the message itself. Al-Aamidi stated in his book *Al-Ihkaam fi Usool lil-Ahkaam* vol 2 p 296, "Sending the Aahaad to explain the Tawheed and the Message did not have to be accepted because it was Khabr ul-Wahid, rather it had to be accepted because of the content of the message i.e. the rational evidences and the definite proofs which their minds testify to their validity. This is different from the Khabar addressing the Ahkaam Shar'yyah, or divine laws." Al-Gazaali also addressed the necessity of accepting Khabr ul-Wahid said in his book *Al-Mustasfa* vol 1 p 151, "with regard to the foundation of the message, Iman, and Prophethood then no. How could the messenger of the Messenger of Allah (saaws) say: You have to believe me while they did not know his message?! [Only] after believing in him (saaws), it is possible that they listen to his messenger by him (saaws) obligating them to listen to them."6) Allah Ta'ala says, Arabic?????" We have revealed the Qur'an and we will indeed protect it "The word Thikr includes all that is revealed i.e. the Qur'an and the Sunnah. Since Allah Ta'ala protects them, then every Hadith, Mutawatir or Ahaad, is protected. Therefore, Khabar ul-Aahaad is Qat'i.

It is not true that Thikr includes the Sunnah due to several reasons: a. Allah Ta'ala says, "Arabic "And We have revealed the Thikr to you in order for you to explain to the people what was revealed to them." It is well known that the explanation is different from what is explained. Meaning, the Bayaan is different from the Mubayyan. The Qur'an is the Mubayyan while the Sunnah is the Bayaan. This is the opinion of most Mufassirs of Qur'an. b. Allah's Messenger said in the Hadith Mutawatir, "Who ever lies on my behalf let him see his place in hellfire." Thus the Hadith does inform us that there will be people who would lie and fabricate Hadith, while the Ayah informs us of the impossibility of fabrication in the Qur'an. This should not be confused with the protection of Sunnah as whole since it is the explanation of the Bayaan. c. Most scholars of Hadith permitted the narration of Hadith by meaning, not the exact wording. Many Hadiths, if not most Hadiths are reported in different wordings, so which one did the Messenger say?7) The who claim that Allah Ta'ala sent one Messenger to each nation, and Muhammad (saaws) alone was sent to all of mankind. So therefore Khabr ul-Ahaad is acceptable in the Aqeedah.

An extremely basic fact about Islam is that Allah (swt) supported each and every prophet with a miracle, and the miracle was used to prove the validity of the Prophets' claim. We also know that each and every Prophet was infallible (ma'soom). How would we dare to infer, or to deal with the Prophet (saw) in such a way that equates him with any other reporter? This would only be possible if we considered each and every reporter to also be infallible. Not even the Shiah made such a claim!8) Some people claim that the last two ayahs of Surah at-Tawbah were reported by Khabr ul-Ahaad, and therefore since the Quran is part of the Aqeedah, then Khabr ul-Ahaad is acceptable in the Aqeedah.

No person who studied the basics of the Uloom ul-Quran could ever make such a claim. There was never any debate regarding whether the Quran had to be narrated by Tawatur or not. Regarding the claim about Surat ut-Tawbah, it is reported by Imam Bukhari and others, that when Zayd ibn

Thabit began compiling the Quran at the instruction of Abu Bakr, and under the supervision of Umar ibn Al-Khattab, he set a criteria to accept each transcript. These criteria were:

A) The Ayah had to be memorized by others,

B) Two witnesses had to have seen the Ayah written in the presence of the Prophet. The two Ayahs of Surat ut-Tawbah were with Abu Khuzaymah, and so Zayd took it only after realizing that they met his criteria. Many other Sahabah had memorized these ayahs, such as Abu Bakr, Umar, Ali, and Uthman. Later on in the days of Uthman, he also instructed Zayd ibn Thabit, Abdullah ibn Zubayr, Sa'eed ibn Al-Aas, and Abdur-Rahman ibn Thabit, to make copies of the master copy, which had been compiled in the days of Abu Bakr. All of the Sahaba, including Ali and Abdullah ibn Mas'ood agreed upon this compiled copy. This is a basic fact, and a closed issue, and even the non-Muslims knew admitted that the method of compiling the Quran did not leave any room for doubt with regard to its authenticity. How would a person dare make such a claim that two of the Quran's Ayahs were transmitted by Khabr ul-Ahaad? This claim was made due to the fascination of the claimant for the acceptance of Khabr ul-Ahaad in the Aqeedah. Claiming that Ibn Hajar reported that this Ayah was reported by Ahaad is deceptive because Ibn Hajar says in Fath ul-Bari, vo.18, pg. 518: "...This indicates that Zayd never relied on the compilation, or on his own knowledge, and did not limit it to the memorization. However, there is an unclear issue because it would appear that Zayd was satisfied with Abu Khuzaymah alone (with whom the script was found after some research). Put in mind that the Quran is proven only by Tawatur..." Ibn Hajar continues, reconciling this seeming contradiction between what is known of the Quran, being transmitted by Tawatur, and the presence of the script in the possession of only one person, saying: "...So it seems, in answering this question, that Zayd was missing script, and not the memorized Ayah, since it was memorized by him, and by others."

To state that parts of the Qur'an are reported in the Aahaad method is to place the Qur'an as subject of debate, the least to say. The entire Muslim Ummah, with all of its various groups (Sunnah, Shi'ah, Khawarij, Mu'tazilah, and others), agreed that the Quran has to be transmitted by Tawatur!<sup>9</sup>) The claim that there is no difference between the Aqeedah and the Ahkam (rules), or the claim that such a distinction is only theoretical and a bid'ah (innovation).

It is obvious that there is a difference, and this difference has practical impacts and implications. Additionally, all Scholars, including Shafee, Malik, Ghazali, Al-Baghdadee, Al-Qarrafee, Ibn Hajar, An-Nawawi, and many others, made this distinction. Can we claim that all of them were Mu'tadi'een (Those who commit bid'ah or innovation in the Deen)? It apparently appears to some people that such a claim is justified.<sup>10</sup>) The claim that if Khabr ul-Ahaad is not taken in the Aqeedah, then we are rejecting an enormous part of the Aqeedah.

If it is agreed that the Aqeedah is decisive and leaves no room for doubt, and that its Daleel has to be decisive, then any issue which does not have a decisive Daleel cannot be utilized in the area of the Aqeedah. Therefore denying these issues would not be considered as denying the Aqeedah. A person would be considered as denying the Aqeedah only if he rejected a conclusive and decisive Daleel.<sup>11</sup>) Claiming that not accepting Khabr ul-Ahaad in the Aqeedah is an alien idea, and that the majority of the Jurist among the Salaf, or even all of the Salaf accepted it in the Aqeedah.

Regarding this point, Dr. Noorudine Atar says in his book *Manahij Al-Naqd Fi Uloom ul-Hadith* (Methodologies of Critical Study in the 'Ilm of Hadith), pg. 245: " A majority of the Scholars says that the Aqeedah need a definite Daleel, which includes the Qur'an and Mutawatir Hadiths only."

Similarly, Imam Taymiyya stated in his book *Al-Musawwada Fi Usul ul-Fiqh* pg. 240; "Khabr ul-Wahid implies amal (rules) and is more than likely to be true, but does not imply certainty, according to a majority of the Scholars."

Consequently, if we have two Scholars, one is old and the other is new, and both reported that the majority of the Scholars did not accept Khabr al-Ahaad in the Aqeedah, and that it implies conjecture, then why do we keep repeating that the majority of the Scholars considered it in the Aqeedah? There are people who claim that those who do not accept Khabr ul-Ahaad in the Aqeedah either reject or should reject certain issues, which in their view, are bases of the Islamic Aqeedah. These issues were listed in a book written by Nasir ud-Deen Al-Albanee, in 1974, in a book entitled Wujubul Akh-dhi Ahadeethil Ahaad fil Aqeedah (The obligation of taking Ahaad Hadiths in the Aqeedah). In his book, Albanee listed some thirty (30) issues of the Aqeedah which were reported to us via Ahaad reports. In 1994, an article appeared in the Friday Report magazine, Vol. V, No. 1 and 2, which shrank the list down to twenty three (23) issues. The interesting thing in the Friday Report article was that the author cited many Ayahs to support his claim that issues in question were reported by Ahaad reports. One wonders why the author cited the Qur'an while claiming that these issues were reported by Ahaad reports!

Let us now attempt to discuss some of these issues based on Al-Albanee's original list:1) Prophethood of Adam (as).

It is well known that the Quran mentioned and discussed the Prophethood of Adam. Allah Ta'ala says, 'Arabic???? "Then Allah chose him and forgave him" (20:122)The word "Ijtabahu" means He Ta'ala chose him for Prophethood." Also, Allah Ta'ala says," Arabic???? "And We said: O Adam live in the Jannah, you and your wife, and eat luxuriously wherever you wish, but come close not to this tree." (2:35) Commanding him and addressing him is an act of revelation to him. Since Adam revealed revelation, he is a Prophet.2) The superiority of Muhammad above all other Prophets.

This issue was also established by the Quran. Allah Ta'ala says?????????)The fact that Islam is the final and only accepted message, and that all Prophets were asked to believe in Muhammad establishes Prophet Muhammad's position among the Prophets.3) and 4) The Shafa'ah (intercession) of the Prophet.

The Prophet's Shafa'ah is proven by Tawatur, since the hadiths talking about it are so overwhelming.5) The Miracles of the Prophet, other than the miracle of the Quran, such as the splitting of the moon.

The article in the Friday Report lists this issue as follows: "His (saw) miracles-every one that is enumerated in the Qur'an-amongst which includes the miracle of splitting of the moon, as it is related in the Qur'an along with the explanation of the verses...".

The Ayah in question can be found in Surat ul-Qamar, Ayahs 1-2, where Allah says: Arabic???? "The Hour (As-Sa'ah) drew close when the moon was rent asunder (Inshaqqa). Regarding the meaning of the first Ayah of Surat ul-Qamar, Imam Qurtubi says: "Some people said this (Inshaqq) did not happen yet and Imam Maawardi says this is the opinion of the Jumhoor (majority of the Scholars)." [Tafseer Qurtubi, Vol. 17, pg. 126]

Additionally, the word "Inshaqqa" linguistically could mean "to split" and it could mean "to become more apparent". Therefore, at best, the meaning of these Ayahs is a debated issue, and will remain as such among the Muslims, since the word "Inshaqqa" connotes more than one meaning, and as Imam Mawaardi says, the Jumhoor are of the opinion that this "Inshaqqa" has not occurred yet.6) The Prophet's physical description and his moral characteristics.

While the Prophet's physical description is not a subject of debate, we find that it is of no relevance to the Aqeedah? If he was long or short, if he walked with his chest upright or not, and if his hair was curly or not, what does this have to do with the Aqeedah? As far as his (saaws) Khuluq (moral characteristics), we follow these as part of following his (saaws) Uswah (example), and this has an impact in the Ahkam (rules), but not the Aqeedah.7) The beginning of Creation, the characteristics

of the Angels and Jinns, how the Hellfire and Heaven are already created, and that the Black Stone is from Paradise.

Some of these items either have nothing to do with the Aqeedah or their evidences were established by the Qur'an. The Quran tells us that Allah created everything, including the heavens, and the earth, in six days, and so we take this as is. The Quran also told us that Allah has control and knowledge over every single thing. As for the Black Stone and whether it is from Jennah or not, there are some Hadiths which describe the water of the Nile and Euphrates as originating from Jennah. It is quite obvious that the Nile river originates from Abyssinia, and that the Euphrates originates from Turkey. Therefore the statement that these rivers originate from Jennah means that both rivers are blessed. The Black Stone maybe understood from this perspective.8) The ten people who were promised Jennah (Al-Ashura Al-Mubashiroon)

The Muslim Ummah has carried this news from generation to generation, and these Hadiths are more than Tawatur. However, they have nothing to do with Aqeedah.9) The Question in the grave by two angels

In this issue, the Friday Report quotes only two Ayahs (Surah 6:61 and Surah 39:42) as its evidence and did not list one Hadith. If the two Ayahs give the meaning then it cannot be denied. However, if the meaning of the Ayahs is not decisive, then it is left up to the Mujtahid to interpret the meaning of the Ayahs without twisting the meaning of the Ayah to conform to his desires or wishes.10) Punishment in the Grave

In this issue, the Friday Report lists five Ayahs, along with some Hadiths, so how would they claim that it is from an Ahaad report? This proves that the author of the article or the one who listed the list are inconsistent with themselves. If the punishment in the grave is mentioned in the Qur'an, then it is not Khabar ul-Aahaad. And if it is Khabar ul-Aahad, why mention the Ayahs?! As far as the Ayahs are concerned, their meaning need to be studied so as to determine if they definitely mean that there will be punishment in the grave or not. In reality, this issue has been a subject of a long debate among the scholars because of various factors. There is a debate over whether the punishment is done to the body or so spirit or both. Ibn Hajar Al-Asqalani in his book Fat ul-Bari vol 3 p 183 says, " The classifier [Bukhari] did not address whether the punishment will take place on the soul (Rooh) alone, or on it and the body. There is a famous disagreement among the people of Kalaam. It seems that he did not address it because the evidence which he accepts is not decisive on neither side." On page 182 of the same book, " Ibn Hazm ( who accepts Khabar ul-Ahaad in Aqeedah) and Ibn Hubayrah were of the opinion that questioning is done to the soul alone." Ibn Abd ul-Izz Al-Hanafi, in his book Sharh ul-Aqeedah At-Tahaawyyah (Explanation of the Tahhawi Aqeedah, documented as the Aqeedah of As-Salaf) pp 297-300, says, " We must believe in the punishment in the grave.... Questioning in the grave is not for the soul alone as Ibn Hazm and others say. Worse than their saying is that for the body without soul." The question that arises then is if believing in punishment in the grave is part of our Aqeedah, and the Aqeedah must be decisive, then which opinion should we believe in? And if we are convinced with one, how should we view the others with different understandings, keeping in mind that their understandings might be correct? Moreover, there are daleels in the Qur'an which state that the Adthaab (punishment) will take place after the questioning by Allah. There are also daleels from the Qur'an that even the Kafirs will wake up on the Day of Judgment thinking that they spent only a small period of time in the grave (Surah 10:45, Surah 30:55, Surah 36:52). So if there were punishment in the grave, why would they refuse to be resurrected? Jumping to conclusions about those who deny the punishment in the grave is to make a jump without a solid ground upon which to land.

Arguments presented above are not intended to negate the punishment in the grave. Rather they are merely mentioned to illustrate the indecisiveness nature of this subject. Since it is Thunni, the understanding one conclude with is taken as Tasdeeq, rather than Tasdeeq Jazim.

Furthermore, there are Hadiths that require us to make du'a to be protected from the punishment of the grave, so we make du'a as a mandoob action to get closer to Allah, and this is not related to the Aqeedah, i.e. Iman or Kufr.11) Iman in the contraction of the grave

This is a part of the Ghayb (unseen) and so if the Hadith is Ahaad then the issue of contraction will not be added to the framework of the Aqeedah. 12) Iman in the Meezan (Scales of Balance on the Day of Judgment)

Again the Friday Report lists five ayahs (Surah 6:160, Surah 18:105, Surah 21:47, Surah 23:102-103, Surah 99:7-8) to support their point. Enough said.13) Iman in the Sirat

These Hadiths are Tawatur14) Iman in the Hawdh (Pond or Fountain in Jennah)

These Hadiths are Tawatur15) The entrance of 70,000 of Prophet Muhammad's people into Jennah without being reckoned about their actions.

The Quran used the number 7, 70, 700, and a variety of its multiples, not to be taken as strict numbers, but rather for it to be used for illustrative purposes. For example, if we refer to Surah 9:80, Allah states: Arabic??? "If you ask for their forgiveness, or if you do not ask for their forgiveness, their sins are unforgivable: Even if you ask seventy (70) times, Allah will not forgive them..."Regarding this Ayah, the Prophet (saaws) said: "If I knew that Allah would forgive them after asking over than 70 times, I would ask that many times." This means that the Prophet (saaws) understood from the ayah that the number 70 was not a strict number, but that it was used to illustrate that no matter how many times he would have asked for their forgiveness, they would not be forgiven.

If we shift our attention to the hadith about the 70,000 of Prophet Muhammad's people who will enter Jennah without being questioned, this hadith is illustrating the importance of Tawakkul (trust and dependence) in Allah, in its real concept, however, the number could be more than this.16) Iman that the all Prophets will be asked about whether they delivered their respective messages or not.

This issue was dropped from Friday Report's list. The Quran mentions this point in many Ayat such as Surah 7:6, Arabic?????" We will question those to whom (the Messengers)were sent and we will ask the Messengers. "How would we ignore those many Ayat?17) Iman in everything mentioned in the Sahih Hadiths about the Gathering and Resurrection.

If these reports are already included in the Quran and Mutawatir Hadith this means that they are Tawatur reports, and if they are not then they would be taken as is without establishing conviction in them, providing that they do not contradict any conclusive Daleel. 18) Iman in Al-Qadaa and Al-Qadr

Although there are many ayahs mentioning Qadaa separately, and many ayahs mentioning Qadr separately, the term Al Qadaa and Al Qadr was never used together by the Quran, the Sunnah, or even the Sahabah. It was only after 'Ilm al-Kalaam that Muslims started using this term. Briefly speaking, Al Qadr refers to the fact that Allah knows everything before it happens, the way it will happen, and that Allah created everything with their respective characteristics (fire has the characteristic of burning, knife has the characteristic of cutting, paper has the characteristic of catching on fire, etc.). This issue is part of the Aqeedah.

The issue of Al Qadaa wal Qadr, however, discusses man's action, which we believe to fit under two categories. a) In the first category man has no control over his actions and things happen to him or from him without his will. Examples of this are rizq (sustenance), ajal (life span), height, hair or skin color, tornadoes, rain, the condensation and evaporation cycles, etc. This category also includes accidental occurrences such as aiming and shooting at a deer, missing and hitting a person, killing him. Man has no control in this category of actions, and only Allah has control, and as such man will not be held accountable for actions which fall in this category. This category of actions

and occurrences are called Al-Qadaab) The second category of actions is where man has control over his actions. Here he chooses what to eat, drink, what clothes to wear, whether to lie or tell the truth, etc. If he acts according to Allah's orders then he is expected, Insha Allah, to be rewarded, provided the action was done correctly and completely seeking Allah's pleasure. However, if man does an action which goes against Allah's orders, then he is disobedient, and deserving Allah's punishment, unless Allah forgives him, and Allah has promised to forgive whoever He wishes except Shirk and Kufr.

All actions, however, in both categories, happen with the previous knowledge of Allah Ta'ala. Allah Ta'ala knows about them, and they are within His will. Even the actions where man has control over still fall within Allah's knowledge and will.

From this definition of Al-Qadaa wal-Qadar, it is not conceivable that a Muslim could adopt an opinion other than this one.<sup>19</sup>) Iman in The Pen (Al-Qalam)

Allah Ta'ala mentioned in the Qur'an, and the Prophet (saaws) mentioned in the Hadiths that Allah knows everything and everything is well documented.<sup>20</sup>) Believing that the Qur'an is Allah's Book literally and not metaphorically

(This section need to be edited!!!!!!!!!!!!!!)This item was dropped from Friday Report's list. How would a Muslim believe in the Quran by Khabr ul-Ahaad? It is as if one can not believe in the Qur'an as being from Allah Ta'ala, brought by Muhammad (saaws), and therefore establishing Muhammad as a Messenger, without first believing in Muhammad's messengership and only thereafter believing in the Qur'an. Listing Aahaad Hadiths as the means to prove that the Qur'an is the speech Allah seems to infer that the Qur'an's validity depends upon Muhammad's Prophethood, which is quite misleading.

In fact the Prophet used to recite the Qur'an to the people so that they could sense its miracle and believe that it was a book from Allah, thereby validating him as a Messenger and Prophet. As for the Qur'an being the speech of Allah metaphorically, it is not only pure nonsense but also Kufr.<sup>21</sup>) Iman in the Throne (Al-'Arsh) and Al-Kurse in reality and not metaphorically.

This item was also dropped from Friday Report's list. The narrations about Al-'Arsh and Al-Kurse have nothing to do with Khabr ul-Ahaad, since there are no many Ayahs which mention it. So how could anyone claim that these are issues of Ahaad?!

Imam ibn Taymiyyah wrote in his book Al-Fatawa, vol. 6 p.584 that: "Ahl us-Salaf are divided into two groups regarding the interpretation of Al-Kurse." It is interesting to note here that Imam Taymiyyah did not exclude those whom he disagreed with on this issue from being Ahl us-Salaf.<sup>22</sup>) Iman that those who committed major sins will not be in the Hellfire forever.

Such belief is taken from the Qur'an. Allah Ta'ala says," Arabic????? "Allah forgives all sins except Shirk"

In addition to the above list, those who claim that Khabar ul-Ahaad in Aqeedah claim that the finality of Prophet Muhammad is established by Khabar ul-Ahaad. Consequently, those who reject Khabar ul-Ahaad in Aqeedah do not believe in the finality of Prophet Muhammad (saaws).Bringing this point reflects the great ignorance of Al-Qur'an Al-Kareem. It also raises doubt among the believers regarding something that is well known of Islam by necessity. Allah Ta'ala says in Qur'an," Arabic????? "But the Messenger of Allah and the seal of Prophets." (33:40)The word "Khatim" has one meaning only, namely the seal. It does not mean what the Kafir Qadianies falsely claim. Also Allah Ta'ala says," Arabic?????3:144Why would any Muslim bring this point up and thus give the Qadianies a point in their argument?! By Allah all this invalid point does is make this undisputed point among Muslims a subject of debate!!

THE OPINIONS OF SOME OF THE PREVIOUS IMAMS REGARDING THE AQEEDAH AND KHABR UL-AHAADIMAM NAWAWI

Imam Nawawi, in the introduction for his book *Sharh Saheeh Muslim*, vol. 1 pg. 20, responds to the opinion of a Scholar named Ibn al-Saleh, who said that the hadiths narrated by Bukhari and Muslim imply certainty. Thus, Imam Nawawi after discussing this statement of Ibn al-Saleh said:

"What Shaykh (Ibn al-Saleh) said in this issue is against what the Scholars said. Most of them said that the non-Mutawatir Hadiths of Bukhari and Muslim, imply conjecture (THan) since it is Ahaad, and the Ahaad implies nothing but the conjecture (THan). This is based on what was already known and agreed upon. This rule applies without distinguishing between Bukhari, Muslim or others. However, their hadiths are enough to be taken in the Ahkam (rule)." **IMAM BUKHARI**

Imam Bukhari assigned a chapter for *Khabr ul-Ahaad*, choosing the following title: "The Chapter of what is said regarding information given by one truthful person concerning adhan, prayer, fasting, and all other obligations, and rules." (Notice that Imam Bukhari chose a very specific title for this chapter). Imam Ibn Hajr al-Asqalani, said in his book *Fat-hul Baree*, (A commentary of *Saheeh Al-Bukhari*) vol. 13 pg. 233, said: "The reason why Imam Bukhari chose this chapter was to counter the claims of those who said that *Khabr ul-Wahid* is not acceptable unless it is reported by more than one reporter, which is similar to the situation in the testimony." Ibn Hajar continues, explaining why did Imam Bukhari choose all of those examples in the title, i.e. why did he mention issue relating only to the rules. He quotes al-Karamanee in an answer for this question "...This is to know that indeed it is (*Khabr ul-Ahaad*) in the *Amaleeya* (Rules) and not in the *Itiqaadeeya* (*Aqeedah*)."[*Fat-hul Baree*, vol.13, pg. 234]

So the point in this chapter is not whether to use *Khabr ul-Ahaad* in the *Aqeedah*, rather it is whether to use it in the rules or not. That is why Imam Al-Bukhari quoted many Hadiths implying that we have to take *Khabr ul-Ahaad* in the *Ahkam* (rules), something that no one should argue about. This is because rejecting *Khabr ul-Ahaad* in the rules is tantamount to rejecting the *Sunnah*, which is *Kufr*. However, sometimes Bukhari is misquoted saying that he accepted *Khabar ul-Ahaad* in the *Aqeedah*. Indeed, Imam Bukhari did not, and when he selected the title for this chapter he was very accurate. He said that the title for this chapter was to establish that *Khabar Ahaad* has to be accepted in those rules, i.e., the *Adhan*, *Salah*, *Sawm*, *Zakah*, *Haj*, and the other obligations and the rules. So from this we can conclude that Imam Bukhari restricted the authority of *Khabr ul-Ahaad* to the issues mentioned in the title of that chapter, i.e. *Adhan*, *Salah*, etc., and did not consider it acceptable in the issues relating to the *Aqeedah*. **IMAM AHMAD IBN HANBAL**

In his book, *Usulu Madh-hab Imam Ahmad* (The fundamentals of the *Madh-hab* of Imam Ahmad), Dr. Abdullah al-Turki summarized the issue of *Khabr ul-Ahaad* in the *Aqeedah*, after carefully discussing all reports mentioned in various Hanbali books. The following are some of his findings:

A) There are two reports on behalf of Imam Ahmad

i) a report which indicates that Imam Ahmad says that *Khabr al-Ahaad* does not imply certainty.

ii) another report which claims that it does imply certainty. B) Some Hanbali Scholars tried to reconcile between these two contradictory statements by saying that what Imam Ahmad means is that the *Khabr al-Ahaad* implies certainty only if it is supported by other indications. C) The majority of the Hanbali jurists say however, that *Khabr ul-Ahaad* does not imply certainty, and this is obvious in reviewing many Hanbali books in *Usul ul-Fiqh*. [see *Usulu Madthhab Imam Ahmad*, page 250]. **IMAM Ash-SHAF'E**

Imam Shaf'e considered the 'Ilm to be of two types. The first type is that which is well known by all the people, and which no sober and mature person should be ignorant of it, such as the five daily prayers, *Hajj*, paying *zakah*. This type is carried by the *Ummah*, generation after generation, and no one ever questions its narrations or its validity. This kind of 'Ilm tolerates no error in its narration nor in its interpretation, and it is not permissible to question it.

The second type consists of the Furu' (branches) in the duties and rules obligatory upon man, concerning where there exists neither a text from the Quran, nor regarding most of them, a Sunnah. Whenever a Sunnah exists in this case, it is of the kind related by few, and not by the majority, and is subject to different interpretations.[see Ar-Risala, Arabic edition pg. 357-358, English translation pg. 81-82 (with some corrections on the translation)]

In another chapter about Khabr ul-Ahaad, Imam Shaf'e said that Khabr ul-Ahaad cannot be established unless certain criteria are fulfilled. These include that the reporter has to be trustworthy, and has to comprehend what he transmits. [see Ar-Risalah, Arabic edition pg. 369-370, English edition pg. 239.]

In another location, Imam Shaf'e considers the Hujjah (proof) as one of two types. The first is the type where no one will be excused for discarding it, which came by a clear text from the Qur'an, or an unanimously agreed upon Sunnah (The sunnah which was agreed upon in his days, 140 years after the death of the Prophet (saaws) is Mutawatir). This kind has no doubt in it, and anyone who refuses to accept it, then he would be asked (by the Qadee) to repent.[see Ar Risalah, Arabic edition pg. 460, English edition pg. 278] This means that rejecting this type of Hujjah or Daleel is tantamount to Kufr.

The second type of proof is which was narrated by few reporters and where the text is open for different and varying interpretations, and it came originally from a single source. In this case it is binding upon only those who are informed about it and accepted it, for they cannot reject any thing mentioned in the text, in the same way that they should accept the testimony of the trustworthy. However, this acceptance should not be taken in the sense of the first category. That is why if a person were to cast doubt upon it (the second type), we would not ask him to repent, while in the case of the first type of proof the person would be asked, according to Shaf'e, to repent. [see Ar-Risalah, Arabic edition pg. 460-461, English edition 278]

It is obvious from this that Imam Shaf'e distinguished between the two kinds of reports, the first being Khabr Al-Aamah (a synonym, based on his definition, for Mutawatir) and the other being Khabr ul-Khaasah (which is called Khabr ul-Ahaad). By saying that he who denies the second type will not be asked to repent, means that Imam Shafee did not take it in the Aqeedah, otherwise the person would be asked to repent. The book of Imam Shaf'e was edited and printed under the supervision of a great contemporary Muhaddith, Ahmad Shakir. Based on what was quoted from Imam Shafee's Ar-Risala, we now know that Imam Shaf'e did not accept Khabr ul-Ahaad in the Aqeedah. IMAM AL-BAGHDADI

Al-Khateeb al Baghdadi, a well know faqih and muhaddith, said in his book, Al Kifayyah fee 'Ilm A- Riwayah, pg. 605:"Khabr ul-Ahaad cannot be taken in any issue where conclusive belief ('Ilm) is required. The reason is because it cannot be proven beyond a shadow of doubt that this is what the Prophet said. However, Khabr ul-Ahaad should be accept in the Ahkam, such as Hudood, moon sighting, Hajj, Zakah, inheritance, Salah, prohibiting the prohibited things, etc.).IMAM AL-GHAZALI

Imam Al-Ghazali says in Al-Mustasfa, pg. 145: "Khabr Al-Ahaad does not imply certainty. This is a basic fact of its definition." He goes on to say in Al Mankhool, edited by Dr. Muhammad Hassan Hito, pg. 252: "Some claim that Khabr ul-Ahaad imply certainty. This is impossible. "IMAM Ash-SHATIBEE

Imam Ash-Shatibee says in Al-Muwaafiqaat, vol. 1, pg. 29-31, "Anything related to Usul ud-Deen (Aqeedah) has to be conclusive." He says also: "The Daleel could be either Ahaad or Mutawatir. If it is Ahaad, then it obvious that it doesn't imply certainty." He continues making distinctions between Mutawatir and Ahaad in the Aqeedah and Usul ul-Fiqh. [vol. 1 pg. 35-36] In vol. 2 pg. 15 he says: "If any conclusive Daleel is conflicted by a conjectural (Thanni) Daleel, then the conclusive Daleel is binding."

What Al-Shatabee said, regarding the conflicting nature of the Mutawatir and Ahaad Daleels, is similar to the statement of Al-Jasaas, and which was shared by all Scholars of Usul ul-Fiqh. Shaykh Ibn Baz, in his book Al-Fatawa pg. 244, quoted from Imam Al-Jasaas's Tafseer, vol. 3 pg. 388 saying: "The Hadiths on behalf of the Prophet to wear gold, and the news about the Sahabah in this regard, are well know and more famous than the news which say that it is prohibited."

Al-Jasaas continued saying: "The news about women wearing gold, from the days of the Prophet up to now, is overwhelmingly known, without any objection, and such thing cannot be countered by Akhbar ul-Ahaad." Ibn Baz mentioned this point while he was discussing Shaykh Al-Albanee's fatwah, which states that wearing gold by women is Haram, due to some Hadiths which indicated this point. Since to Ibn Baz, the hadiths, which said that wearing of gold by women is Haram, are Khabr ul-Ahaad they are not be taken, for no reason but that they conflict with the Hadiths and overwhelming news from the Sahabah. So if this is the status of Khabr ul-Ahaad in the Ahkam, how would it be acceptable in the Aqeedah, which is the basis for the rules?

#### IMAM AL-JASAAS

Imam Al-Jasaas' says in his tafseer of the ayat 6 of Surah Hujurat: Arabic????? "If a Fasiq comes to you with new, then verify it..." "This Ayah means that Khabr ul-Wahid does not imply 'Ilm (certainty and conviction) because if it implied certainty, there is not need to verify the news of the trustworthy person. Some people said that this Ayah allows us to accept Khabr ul-Wahid in the 'Ilm, claiming that the mentioning of the Fasiq's news to be verified is an evidence that the verification of the trustworthy person is not allowed." Al-Jassas continues saying: "...This is absurd because mentioning one item, from a list of items, does not mean that the other items in the list are excluded from the rule."

Imam Al-Jasas also states: "Regarding the news which fall below the level of the 'Ilm, their contents have to be taken in issues related to the Deen(Ahkam), because the testimony of the witnesses does not imply certainty, and we are instructed to abide by those news, knowing that there is a possibility that the rule could be otherwise." [Ahkam ul-Quran vol. 1 pg. 509] IMAM Ash-SHAWKANEE

Imam Ash-Shawkanee says in his book Irshad ul-Fuhool, : "The other category is ul-Ahaad (whether it does not imply al-'Ilm at all or whether it implies the 'Ilm with additional external supports). This category does not imply certainty by itself, and this is the opinion of the majority [of Scholars]." After this explanation, Ash-Shawkanee moves to another point, saying: "The majority [of Scholars] agree that it is a must to utilize Khabr ul-Ahaad in the actions." [Irshad ul-Fuhool pg.48] SYED QUTB

Syed Qutb, may Allah be pleased with him, who was martyred by the Col. Nasser in Egypt, says many times in his famous book Fi Dhilaal al-Quran (In the Shade of the Quran), vol. 8 pg. 710, 7th edition, that: " Ahaadith al-Ahaad cannot be taken in the Aqeedah. The reference is the Quran and the Hadith Mutawatir, in the Aqeedah."

Many other contemporary Scholars, such as Shaykh Jalaludeen Al-Qaasimee, Dr. Muhammad Adeeab al-Salih, and Dr. Abdullah Azzam, all said that Khabr ul-Ahaad is not acceptable in the Aqeedah.

#### CONCLUSION

It is very apparent that the Aqeedah, by definition, tolerates no room for doubt. The Aqeedah serves as a basis for our thinking, and our behavior. No idea, rule, or concept should be carried by any Muslim without having the Aqeedah as it basis. Furthermore, no action should be undertaken without considering Islam as its reference. In other words, the Islamic Aqeedah is the basis in developing the Islamic Personality. If we keep viewing the Aqeedah as scattered bits of information, without being organized in such a way that the entire Aqeedah serves as a basis for

everything, and from which everything emanates, then the Aqeedah would have no impact on the life of the Muslim, or it would be treated as rituals or abstract ideas. This would result in a view towards Islam as a religious dogma, rather than considering Islam as a comprehensive way of life, or in other words, a political ideology which is based on the decisive belief that this universe is created by the Creator, Allah (swt), that Allah is the only one who sets the system and order for mankind, and that we will be asked, on the Day of Judgment, about all that we did in this life. The Sahabah adhered to this Aqeedah in the right way and it had a great impact on their lives. For example, they feared Allah, they always stood for the truth and never tolerated injustice, they never compromised, they never helped a tyrant in his tyranny, they maintained the sharp line which separates between Islam and Kufr, and they felt as if they were responsible for all mankind. When we look to the Muslim Ummah nowadays, we do not see the same impact that the Islamic Aqeedah had in the past. This can be attributed to many reasons, one of which is that the Muslim Ummah is not taking the Islamic Aqeedah the way it should be taken.

Therefore, it is very important to comprehend the Islamic Methodology in establishing the Aqeedah, and that such Aqeedah cannot be established by doubts, conjecture, or imitation. Rather, it has to be established through the Aql, such as believing in the existence of Allah or believing in the Quran; and through the revelation which was reported in a conclusive way, i.e. the Quran, and the Mutawatir Hadiths. Khabr ul-Ahaad, by its definition, is not conclusive, therefore, how would a person expect from such an indecisive Daleel to establish certainty?

This issue was well known by the previous Scholars, as was earlier demonstrated. The majority of them, in the past as well as in the present, established that Khabr ul-Ahaad cannot be a Daleel in the Aqeedah. Those who said otherwise did not see this issue as a problem, nor did they look to the majority who said that the Ahaad is not a Daleel, as their rivals. Neither party labeled the other. However nowadays, some of those who say that Khabr ul-Ahaad is acceptable in the Aqeedah, have begun an organized effort to attack those who do not agree with them. Indictments are now currently being made such as, " those who do not take Khabr ul-Ahaad in the Aqeedah are deviants," or " not accepting Khabr ul-Ahaad in the Aqeedah means that a person does not believe in the Aqeedah," or " they have problems in their Aqeedah who do not utilize Khabr ul-Ahaad in the Aqeedah," and so on.

It must be known to these people that if one was to turn the table, one could use the same arguments and the same labels, or even harsher indictments. However, such an exercise would distract Muslims from the correct course.

Consequently, we invite the Ummah to think into the Aqeedah, and into the way it should be established, and we invite our brothers who adopt the opinion of taking Khabr ul-Ahaad in the Aqeedah, to re-evaluate their position without being influenced by their desires, or by the imitation of others, and to correct their understanding, so as to get back to the correct understanding. May Allah Ta'ala guide all of us, help all of us, forgive all of our sins, and resurrect us on the Day of Judgment with the Prophet (saaws) drinking from his Hawdh (his fountain). He, and only He Sbbhanahu wa Ta'ala, is the one who responds to our du'a.