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Abstract
The authority of Prophetic narrations definitely have been one of the most central problem discussed among scholars, even for mutawātir ḥadīth, not to mention aḥad ḥadīth which not fulfil the requirments to be considered as mutawātir. This study mainly discussing about the authority of aḥad ḥadīth based on perspectives from Mustafā Al-Sibā‘ī, a prominent figure of Islamic scholars in one of his well-known book, Al-Sunnah wa-Makānātuhā fī Al-Tashrī’ Al-Islāmī. This book mainly written to rebut lies and arguments from the enemies of Sunnah. Hence this study seeks to analyse views, opinions and discussions regarding aḥad ḥadīth which mostly pointed out by Al-Sibā‘ī in order to refute arguments from enemies of Sunnah, or to be exact, from those who reject the validity of aḥad ḥadīth. Thus, by using descriptive-analytical method, this article will firstly provide brief descriptions about Mustafā Al-Sibā‘ī and his book before discussing throughout his writing about aḥad ḥadīth. The result of this study hopefully may clears any misunderstanding created by Sunnah’s enemies regarding aḥad ḥadīth.
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INTRODUCTION

Mustafā Al-Sibā‘ī defines aḥad ḥadīth as a category of ḥadīth describing narrations that are related by one or two narrators who in turn related it from one or two narrators until the chain ends at the Prophet SAW or a narration that is related by a group of narrators who constitute a number that is still fewer than the minimum requirement for the mutawātir ḥadīth narration.¹ Same goes in many others ‘Ulūm al-Ḥadīth or Muṣṭalaḥ al-Ḥadīth books, aḥad ḥadīth defined as any narration which did not fulfill the requirements of mutawātir. Since this type of narration did not have large number of narrators in the isnād (chains of narrators), not as much as in tawātur narrations, hence aḥad ḥadīth been accused to have weaker isnād and exposed to criticism and rejection towards its reliability. Although the major principle of being faithful with Prophetic ḥadīth is to accept both mutawātir and aḥad narrations, but there exists certain group of people or sects who are against it and do not hold on to this principle.² As a result, lots of narrations are rejected by them and caused many to have gone astray in process of understanding the perfect teachings of Islām.

Large number of Muslim scholars especially in the field of ḥadīth rose to defend the authority of Prophetic ḥadīth including aḥad narrations. Great figures appeared with their masterpieces such as Muṣṭafā al-A‘ẓamī with his book, Dirāṣāt fī al-Ḥadīth al-Nabawī wa-Tārīkh Tadwīnīh, ‘Ajjāj al-Khaṭīb with his book, Al-Sunnah Qabla al-Tadwīn and the book which will be discussed in this study, written by Mustafā al-Sibā‘ī entitled Al-Sunnah wa-Makānātuhā fī al-Tashrī’ al-Islāmī. In one of the chapter

¹ Defined by Al-Sibaie as narrations that are related by a group of upright and trustworthy narrators who also related from a group of upright and trustworthy narrators, and so on, until the narration ends at the Prophet.
in this book, Al-Sibā‘ī discusses about groups of enemies who have attacked the Sunnah and its narrators for so long. Begins with the Shi‘ah and Khawārīj, then Mu‘tazilah and the Mutakallimīn which some of them rejected only aḥād hadīth while some rejected both muṭawātīr and aḥād hadīth. There is also specific sub-chapters on ‘Those who Reject the Validity of Aḥād Narrations’. In the discussions, after Al-Sibā‘ī states their allegations, he proceeds to present irrefutable arguments to answer and prove their lies. Thus, this article will study on these discussions to gather Al-Sibā‘ī views and opinions through his writings regarding aḥād hadīth.

**BIOGRAPHY OF MUSTAFĀ AL-SIBĀ‘Ī**

Mustafā al-Sibā‘ī or Mustafā bin Husnī Abū Hasan al-Sibā‘ī was born in 1915 AD / 1333 AH in Homs, a city located in Syria. He began to learn basic knowledge especially about Islām from his own father, Shaykh Husnī Abū Hasan al-Sibā‘ī who was a well known scholar in his state. He completed his primary and tertiary education at Madrasa Mas‘ūdiyya, a leading Islamic educational institution in Damascus at that time. Apart from getting a formal education, he also did not miss the opportunity to seek knowledge from great Muslim scholars in Syria. Among his teachers were Shaykh Tāhir al-Atasi, Shaykh Zahid al-Atasi, Shaykh Muḥammad al-Yasīn, Shaykh Anis Kalalib and several great scholars in Damascus. He grew up well in an honourable Muslim family. At a young age he has been able to memorize the Qur’ān and performed great in his study as he often gets the top position in the class and has a strong memorization. He also had a talent in giving speech or preaching and often fill-in his father’s position if his father had something else came up.

In 1933 AD, Al-Sibā‘ī who already 18 years old traveled to Egypt to further his studies in the PhD level at Al-Azhar University in the field of Fiqh, Usul and History of Islamic Law. He began to join Ikhwanul Muslimin, together with Hasan al-Banna and later became the Murāqib ‘Am of the Ikhwanul Muslimin of Syrian. He actively continued with Ikhwanul Muslimin in Egypt by participating in various demonstrations against British colonialism in 1941 AD as well as supporting Rashid Ali Kailani’s revolution in Iraq to fight against British colonialism. Al-Sibā‘ī also arrested by the Egyptian government at that time under the command of British colonialists. With him were his colleagues such as Masyhur al-Ḍamin, Ibrahim al-Qaṭṭān, Hasyim al-Khazandar, Faris Hamdani, Ali al-Duwaik and Yusuf al-Masyarı. They were in detention for about three months before being transferred to the Șarfanda prison in Palestine and arrested for four months. Then at last they were released with parole. After his release, Mustafā al-Sibā‘ī was not at all intimidated but became more steadfast in defending the truth.

Al-Sibā‘ī led the movement to defend Qur’ān in parliamentary sessions and led demonstrations in Damascus to uphold Islamic law. He and his colleagues then succeeded in suppressing elements of secular thought in the legal system and injecting Islamic thought into most of the jurisprudence in 1950 AD. In the same year, Al-Sibā‘ī was appointed as Dean of the Islamic Law Faculty at the University of Damascus. He continued to be active as a lecturer in Islamic institutions and Higher Education Institutions as well as spreading knowledge through the publishing world. In 1951 AD, he attended the general Muktamar of Islām in Pakistan which was attended by representatives of Islamic countries from all over the world. The following year, Al-Sibā‘ī and his comrades demanded permission from Syrian government to allow them to fight the British in Suez Canal. But Syrian ruler at that time, Adib al-Syaisyakali, not only resisted but continued to order disbandment toward Ikhwanul Muslimin, as well

---

as imprisonment of its leaders including Al-Sibā‘ī. He was later removed from his department at the University of Damascus and deported to Lebanon.9

In 1953 AD, once again general Muktamar of Islām was held in Al-Quds and was attended by representatives of Ikhwānul Muslimin from all Islamic countries. In the same year, Al-Sibā‘ī visited Egypt and for the first time he met Yusuf al-Qardawi, Ahmad al-Assal and Muhammad al-Damardasy. The following year, Al-Sibā‘ī attended the Christian Islamic Congress which aimed to counter the argument against the allegations of the enemies of Islām among orientalists and Christians. He also attended a meeting in Lebanon by the invitation of Hasan al-Hudhaibi, the second Mursyid ‘Am of the Ikhwānul Muslimin in Arab countries. The Egyptian delegation that accompanied Hasan al-Hudhaibi was Abdul Hakim Abidin, Said Ramadhan, Shalih Abu Raqiq, and Munir Dallah. While from Syria, Mustafā al-Sibā‘ī, from Jordan, Muhammad Abdur Rahman Khalifah, from Sudan, Ali Thalibullah, from Iraq, Muhammad Mahmud al-Shawwaf, and from Kuwait, Abdul Aziz al-Muthawwi’.10

These are the summary of Mustafā al-Sibā‘ī’s life and struggle before he died on October 3, 1964 AD in his homeland after eight years of illness.11 His name is well known not only in the political world but also in the world of Islamic scholarship. He is known as a person who has a high fighting spirit and a loud speaking style that frightens the opponents. Many of his works continue to be used as a reference by Muslim around the world until today. Among the books written by him are Aḥkām al-Šiyām wa Falsafatuḥu, Akhlāqunā al-Ijtima‘īyyah, al-Istishhraq wa al-Mustashriqūn, al-Sīrah al-Nabawiyyah, ‘Aẓamūnā fī al-Tārikh, al-Ma‘r’atu Bayna al-Fiqh wa al-Qānūn, Min Rawā‘i ʿ Ḥadāratinā, Hādhā Huwa al-Islām, al-Qalāād min Farā‘ id al-Fawā‘ id, al-Waṣāyya wa Farā‘ id,12 as well as the book that will be discussed here, Al-Sunnah wa-Makānatuhā fī al-Tashrī‘ al-Islāmī.

AL-SUNNAH WA-MAKĀNATUHĀ FĪ AL-TASHRĪ‘ AL-İSLĀMĪ

This book is one of the most important works by Mustafā al-Sibā‘ī besides his other books. The book of Al-Sunnah wa-Makānatuhā fī al-Tashrī‘ al-Islāmī, or its translation, ‘The Sunnah and Its Role in Islamic Legislation’ has received various positive reactions. This book not only well received by scholars and academic students, but also by the Muslim community in general. This is not only because of its universal message, but because the author takes into account every level of readers in writing his book. For scholars, Al-Sibā‘ī approaches by presenting input in an orderly, detailed, and comprehensive manner. As for the students, they can easily find the evidence and discussion they need to improve their understanding about the topics discussed. While for Muslims in general, it is easy for them to read and understand the contents of this book because difficult topics conveyed in simplified way clearly.

Before reading this work, there may be doubts or questions about the possibility that the information contained in it is outdated and irrelevant. Yet the discussion turns out to be still relevant and timely as the orientalists and enemies of Islām today still follow and put forward the same arguments as those of their predecessors. The rest of the book explores issues that have never outdated and remain suitable as reference and reading material until today.13 Al-Sibā‘ī covers all aspects of Sunnah and presents a detailed study on various issues revolving around Sunnah. Overall, the content of this book is very much in line with its title. In this book, Al-Sibā‘ī refutes the lies and doubts raised about hadith by explaining how details and thorough the scholars of ḥadith are in assessing the authenticity of ḥadith. Every thoughtful idea put forward is attached with clear arguments and evidence. There are also some of the topics in this book that are probably not discussed in depth. This is because the topic is not closely
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9 Ibid.
related to the main thrust of some subjects in this work and Al-Sibā’ī discusses it only because it is related to the main theme of this book.  

Referring to the contents of this book, Al-Sibā’ī divides his book into three section and concludes with a biographical appendix section. The first section of his book entitled ‘The Meaning of the Sunnah and how it was Transmitted and Recorded’. In this first part, he outlines clearly and concisely, the various development stages of the Sunnah in the early Islamic century, from the time it was transmitted through oral speech until the hadith was officially documented. Then he explains the factors that have led to the spread of hadith falsification activities for so long. After that, he detailed the history of great achievements from hadith scholars in maintaining the authenticity of each narrated hadith. He explains how Sunnah was purified from all kinds of falsifications and lies through the contributions of the scholars. Al-Sibā’ī then lists various branches of the field in hadith knowledge as a result from the studies and efforts of the hadith scholars.

In the second section, ‘Various Doubts Raised Concerning the Sunnah Over the Centuries’, Al-Sibā’ī discusses about the group of enemies of Islām who have been attacked the Sunnah and its narrators. After he states their allegations, he proceeds to present irrefutable arguments to answer and prove their lies. In the last part, the third section entitled ‘The Ranking of the Sunnah in Islamic Legislation’, Al-Sibā’ī discusses in more detail the position between Sunnah and Qur’ān, also the relationship between these two sources of law. Finally, he concludes his writing with a very useful appendix in which he discusses about the Imām of four major sects and the six Imām of Kutub al-Sittah. Al-Sibā’ī not only focuses on their biographies, but also discusses the approach they use in inferring the law from hadith. The methodology of each Imām is discussed separately, thus making its easier for students to see why there are differences of opinions in some chapters of fiqh.

PERSPECTIVES OF AL-SIBĀ’Ī ABOUT AḤAD ḤADĪTH

Applying Aḥad Ḥadīth On Religion Matters

Based on these verses from Qur’ān;

[36]  ﴿وَلََ ت َقۡفُ مَا لَيۡسَ لَكَ بِهِۦ عِلۡمٞ…﴾  [Al-Isrā’: 36]
«And do not pursue that of which you have no knowledge...(36)” [Al-Isrā’: 36]

[28]  ﴿وَإِنَّ ٱلظَّنَّ لََ قَشِي َّتَيۡ َشَيۡ يُغۡنِِ مِنَ ٱلۡۡۡا﴾  [An-Najm: 28]
«...and indeed, assumption avails not against the truth at all(28)” [An-Najm: 28]

When applying aḥad ḥadīth on religion matters, those who reject the validity of aḥad ḥadīth use these Quranic verses to create an argument. Their argument is since aḥad ḥadīth considered as a form of zann (guesswork) or impart nazarī (preconception) knowledge, thus this type of narration exposed to mistakes or flaws from the narrators. Therefore, it does not necessitate absolute knowledge, thus cannot be used as proof.  

Al-Sibā’ī refutes this argument by mentioning that those verses applied to fundamental issues and universal principles of Islām. While for the details and the secondary matters in the religion, it is compulsory to act based on narrations that impart less than one hundred percent, sure knowledge because it is almost impossible to arrive at a ruling except through those narrations. In other words, the universal principles of Islām can be established, and indeed are established, through narrations that necessitate darūrī or definite knowledge, while secondary matters and the details of the religion can realistically only be established through narrations that impart preconception knowledge. Al-Sibā’ī then

14 Ibid.
16 Ibid.
adds his arguments to prove that ahad ḥadīth applied based on one hundred percent, sure knowledge. He makes a comparison with ijma’ as it dictates that it is compulsory for mujtahid to act based on his ijtihad although not a single of them claim that he is one hundred percent sure of his ijtihad. Furthermore, since ijma’ dictates that ahad ḥadīth must be applied and since ijma’ imparts absolute knowledge, then ahad ḥadīth also can be said as applied based on absolute knowledge.\footnote{\textsuperscript{17} Aḥī Ibn Ahmad Ibn Ḥazm. (1984). \textit{Al-Ihkām fī Usūl al-Āḥkām}. Al-Qāhirah: Dār al-Ḥadīth. 114.}

As regards mutawātīr ḥadīth, the scholars agree that this type of ḥadīth imparts definite knowledge that must be applied and for sure is a binding proof.\footnote{\textsuperscript{18} Şuḥbī al-Ṣāliḥī. (2003). \textit{Ulūm al-Ḥadīth wa-Muṣṭalaḥah}. Bāyırāt: Dār al-‘Īlm lil-Malāyīn. 151.} However, Al-Sibā’ī states that majority of scholars agree that ahad ḥadīth are binding proofs which must be applied, even though an individual ahad ḥadīth might not impart definite knowledge. He quotes Al-Raḍī who declares that majority of the scholars agree that ahad ḥadīth might not impart absolute knowledge but still valid as binding proofs. He also mentions that there is another group of scholars who hold that ahad ḥadīth do indeed impart absolute knowledge which must be applied. Al-Sibā’ī then concludes that whether ahad ḥadīth impart absolute knowledge or close to absolute knowledge, the most important point is all scholars agree in the end that ahad ḥadīth are valid proofs that must be applied.\footnote{\textsuperscript{19} Ibn Ḥazm. (1984). \textit{op.cit.}, 107.}

### The Prophet and Companions Accepted Khabar from Single Narrator

Those who reject the validity of ahad ḥadīth arguing the authority of this type of narration by presenting an occasion where the Prophet SAW hesitated with the statement from a single narrator. In the occasion, when the Prophet SAW completed the night prayer after only two raka’at whereas he normally completed it after four raka’at, Dhul-Yādayn asked either the Prophet SAW shorten the prayer or forgot the raka’at. However, the Prophet SAW did not immediately accepts his words, but rather get confirmation by Abū Bakr RA and ‘Umar RA, as well as others who were in the first row. Only then the Prophet SAW complete his prayer and perform the prostration for forgetfulness.\footnote{\textsuperscript{20} Mustafā al-Sibā’ī. (2003). \textit{op.cit.}, 162} Hence, if ahad ḥadīth considered as a valid proof, the Prophet SAW would has completed his prayer immediately without hesitation and without asking confirmation from others.

Al-Sibā’ī refutes this argument by explaining that Dhul-Yādayn spoke because of the possibility that he erred, for it was highly unlikely that he alone among the congregation should have noticed a matter that many more among them should also have noticed. So when there is an indication that an ahad ḥadīth contains a mistake, one must hesitate and scrutinize it before accepting it. When the others confirmed his statement, it became clear that Dhul-Yādayn had not imagined that the Prophet SAW had shortened the prayer. Moreover, even with Abū Bakr RA, ‘Umar RA, and those in the first row, all of them together do not amount to a number of narrators that satisfies the conditions of mutawātīr ḥadīth, so the example given does not even enter into the sphere of the discussion.\footnote{\textsuperscript{21} Ibid, 163.}

Al-Sibā’ī presents few events showing that Şahāba RA accepted khabar from single narrator. One of them is when some of the Şahāba whose are Anas Ibn Mālik RA, Abū Ṭalḥah RA, Abū ‘Ubaydah Ibn al-Jaraḥ RA, and Ubay Ibn Ka’b RA used to share an alcoholic drink made from dates but then someone came to them and said that alcohol has just been made forbidden. Thus Abū Ṭalḥah RA ordered Anas Ibn Mālik RA, to break those jars without hesitation. Although at the time of the narration, the Şahāba had full knowledge that alcohol was permissible, but when a single man came, informing them that it had just been made forbidden, they accepted what the man said. They did not even suggest to wait until they meet the Prophet SAW by themselves as he is nearby and easily accessible, nor wait until the news of the prohibition becomes more widespread. If they have not been convinced by the narration of a
single truthful narrator, they would not have spilled the alcohol because it would have been considered as wasteful act.  

It is authentically narrated in mutawātir ḥadīth that the Ṣaḥāba RA would act on aḥad ḥadīth. However, the enemies of Sunnah pointed out a few narrations indicate that they hesitated in accepting aḥad ḥadīth in specific situations. For example, Abū Bakr RA rejected narration from Al-Mughirah RA when a woman whose grandchild had died came to him, demanding her share of inheritance, and he only accepted Al-Mughirah’s statement once it had been corroborated by Muhammad Ibn Maslamah RA. ‘Umar RA also rejected narration from Abū Mūsā RA regarding the issue of first seeking permission before entering another man’s house, and then only accepted Abū Mūsā’s statement after Abū Sa’īd RA confirmed it. ‘Ali RA would only accept a narration from someone after that person first made an oath, and the only exception he made to that rule was with Abū Bakr RA. Finally, ‘A’isha RA rejected narration from Ibn ‘Umar RA regarding the deceased being punished on account of his family weeping for him.

However Al-Sibā’i argues those does not prove their overall opinion to reject aḥad ḥadīth. In those isolated instances, they either hesitated because of external factors, because they wanted to make sure that the narrator was correct in his report, or because they wanted to instruct Muslims about the importance of making sure that a narration is authentic. For example, Abū Bakr RA hesitated to accept Al-Mughirah’s narration simply to make sure that what he was relating was correct. As mentioned earlier, the Qur’ān mentions in detail rulings related to inheritance, and since a grandmother is not mentioned in the Qur’ān as an inheritor, Abū Bakr RA needed to make sure that she had a right to one sixth of the estate. When Muḥammad Ibn Maslamah RA confirmed that he had heard the same narration as Al-Mughirah RA, Abū Bakr RA did not hesitate to apply Al-Mughirah’s narration.

The same can be said for ‘Umar RA when he rejected Abū Mūsā’s narration, for in reality, he was teaching an important lesson to other Ṣaḥāba as well as to Muslim who had only recently accepted Islām, warning them all to be careful when relating a ḥadīth from the Prophet SAW. That is why ‘Umar RA said to Abū Mūsā RA that he did not accuse him, but it is hadith from the Prophet SAW. Same goes for any other similar narrations. Hence the previous examples go nowhere to prove the claims of those who reject aḥad ḥadīth, for both Abū Bakr RA and ‘Umar RA accepted the narration when a second witness corroborated it, and two narrators are hardly enough to constitute a mutawātir ḥadīth. Al-Sibā’i then concludes his argument by quoting Al-‘Āmidī who stated that whenever the Ṣaḥāba hesitated to accept an aḥad ḥadīth, it was because of external factors or internal factors within the narration itself that caused them to reject it, and not because they outright rejected aḥad ḥadīth.

**Further Proofs On The Validity Of Aḥad Ḥadīth**

Al-Sibā’i claims there are further proofs to establish the validity of aḥad ḥadīth either from the Qur’ān or ḥadīth. To begin with, he quotes Imām al-Shāfi‘ī who mentions that those verses that speak of Prophets Ibrāhīm, Ismā‘īl, Nūh, Hūd, Śālēh, Shu‘ayb, Luṭ, and Muḥammad SAW, all being sent to their nations. Single prophet for each nation clearly indicates that one person is enough to establish a binding proof. Same goes to the way of the khulafā’ (caliphs) and governors after the lifetime of the Prophet SAW. The Muslims agreed that there should be a single khālaṣa, a single qāḏī, and a single imām. Therefore, they chose Abu Bakr RA for the khālaṣa, who in turn chose ‘Umar RA, who commissioned a council to choose the khālaṣa after him, and they chose ‘Uthmān. Besides, when a qāḏī or imām issues a ruling in any given matter, that ruling must be executed. In such cases, a single individual is in reality
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22 Ibid, 166-167.


24 Ibid, 177.

25 Ibid.

relating from the Prophet SAW for his ruling is based on the Prophet’s legislations, either through an exact precedent or through derivation.27

Similarly, the Prophet SAW sent some of his Ṣaḥāba to lead military expeditions. It was the duty of those Ṣaḥāba to spread Islām to other nations and then to fight them if necessary. In one instance, he ordered that Zayd Ibn Ḥārithah RA should lead the army, and that if he was killed, Ja’far RA should replace him, and if Ja’far RA was killed, that Ibn Rawāḥah RA should replace him. It was possible for the Prophet SAW to have sent a number of leaders for a single expedition, however, he deemed that the proof will established upon a nation even with a single truthful person invited them to Islām. Besides, during the Prophet’s lifetime, he would send envoys to convey commands to the governors of various Muslim regions. It did not occur nor never occur that any of those governors hesitate to apply or execute his commands because the Prophet SAW only sent one truthful envoy.28

Al-Sibā’ī again quotes Imām al-Shāfi’ī who said that he knew of no dissent among Islamic jurists regarding the validity of āḥad ḥadīth. Imām al-Shāfi’ī briefly mentioned a few reasons why a scholar might not apply a narration that is presented before him. The scholar must be excused in those instances because of following reasons:29

a) The scholar perhaps is aware of a hadith that is in conflict with the new one.

b) The narrator might not have a strong enough memory.

c) The narrator is accused of not fulfilling the requisite qualities of an upright and truthful narrator.

d) The hadith bears two interpretations.

One should not think that a scholar would abandon applying a hadith without valid interpretation or excuse. Thus with established irrefutable proofs from the Qur’ān, the Sunnah, the practice of the Ṣaḥāba, the Tābi’īn, those who came after the Tābi’īn, and Muslim jurists, all showing that it is compulsory upon Muslims to accept and apply āḥad ḥadīth. There are lots more ḥadīth that confirm the authority and the validity of āḥad ḥadīth discussed by Al-Sibā’ī, but the few that mentioned are enough to serve the purpose here.

**CONCLUSION**

In most of ḥadīth books, various perspectives among the scholars could be gather about āḥad ḥadīth especially on the topic regarding the knowledge created by this type of narration. However as mentioned before, the most important point is all scholars agree in the end that āḥad ḥadīth are valid proofs that must be applied. Above all, a true Muslim is required to accept the teachings brought by the Prophet Muhammad SAW as his acceptance of the Qur’ān. One is not allowed to only accept the teachings in the Qur’ān while rejecting the teachings of the Prophet Muhammad SAW.30 As stated in Qur’ān from Sūrah al-Nūr;

«The believers are only those who believe in Allah and His Messenger and, when they are with him for a matter of common interest, do not depart until they have asked his permission. Indeed, those who ask your permission [Muhammad] those are the ones who believe in Allah and His Messenger. So when they ask your permission for something of their affairs, then give permission to whom you will among them and ask forgiveness for them of Allah. Indeed, Allah is Forgiving and Merciful» [Al-Nūr: 62]
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30 Basir, A., et. al. (2012), op.cit., 705.
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