

The Ḥanafīs and Their Attack on the Ṣaḥābah

PART 2

Compiled, Translated and Annotated

Abū Ḥibbān Malak

Abū Khuzaimah Anṣārī



SALAFI RESEARCH INSTITUTE

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

كامل التوثيق
محمولة

© Copyright 2018 Salafi Research Institute

THE HANAFIS AND THEIR ATTACK ON THE SAHABAH

Compiled, Translated & Annotated
Abū Ḥibbān & Abū Khuzaimah Anṣārī

1st Edn. © [SRI] Salafi Research Institute
Jumada al-'Ula 1439H / February 2018

All rights reserved No part of this book may be reprinted or reproduced or utilized in any form or by any electronic, mechanical, or other means, No known or hereafter invented, including photocopying and recording, without prior Permission from the publishers or authors.

www.salafiri.com



IN DEFENCE OF THE SUNNĪ CREED AND MANHAJ

The Ḥanafīs and Their Attack on the Ṣaḥābah

www.salafiri.com

Compiled, Translated and Annotated

Abū Ḥibbān

Abū Khuzaimah Anṣārī

SALAFI RESEARCH INSTITUTE
LONDON - BIRMINGHAM - LAHORE



‘Audhu Billāhi min ash-Shayṭān al-Rajīm
Bismillāh al-Rahman al-Rahīm

*Alhamdullilahi Rabbil A‘lamīn, Waṣalatu Wasalam Ala Rasūlillahil Karīm, Wa Ala
Alihi Wa Ashabi Wa Man Tabiahum Bi-Ehsan Ila Yaum al-Din; Wa Ba’d*

*All Praise belongs and is directed to the Rabb of everthing
that exists, Praise and Salutations be upon His
Final beloved Messenger, his revered family
and his noble Companions and upon
those who follow them in good
until the end of times,
To proceed*

The 'reality' of the position the Deobandīs toward the Ṣaḥābah and their riwāyāt, including their abuse and attacks on the Ṣaḥābah.

In fact, we say that the Ḥanafīs-Deobandīs have been at the forefront of speaking ill of the Ṣaḥābah, and thus not only resembling the Shī‘ah but effectively being a support of the Shī‘ah. They did this all to safeguard their Maḍhab as the Ṣaḥābī's riwāyah may have opposed it.

1. The Deobandī Maḥmūd al-Ḥasan, writes in this book Taqārīr Shaykh al-Hind, page: 133, that the Ḥanafīs say concerning Fātimah that:

"She was a woman who was argumentative and lose with her tongue."

2. The Hanafi books of usul Nūr al-Anwār, page: 183 and Uṣūl al-Shāshī page: 85, state:

“Abū Hurāirah رضي الله عنه that he was not a Faqīh, and that his riwāyah should be abandoned if it's in contradiction to qiyās”

The Ḥanafīs have hurled this abuse at Abū Hurāirah رضي الله عنه due to the ḥadīth narrated by him known as the ḥadīth of Muṣarrā. This ḥadīth is muttafaq ‘alāhi and in essence states that a person when selling an animal should not stop its milk so to make it seem to the buyer that its udders shall produce more milk than its true reality. Should this have been done once the buyer has milked the animal then the buyer has a right to return the animal together with a saah of dates or he can keep the animal.

For the Ḥanafīs for well over a thousand years they could not see the logic or analogical reasoning behind Abū Hurāirah رضي الله عنه stating that along with giving back the animal one should also give a saa of dates to the seller. Thus they had to find an avenue to abandon his authentic ḥadīth and this could only be done by attacking the being and person of the Imām of ḥadīth and Ṣaḥābī Abū Hurāirah رضي الله عنه so that there Maḍhabs position could be safeguarded.

They forget that Ibn Masūd رضي الله عنه also gave the same verdict as Abū Hurāirah رضي الله عنه. Read this in line the hoodwinking they performed as stated above. Dare we ask if Abū Hurāirah رضي الله عنه was not a faqīh

and would speak in opposition to sound logical reasoning and qiyās then how can Imām Abū Ḥanīfa رَحِمَهُ اللهُ or anyone else be a faqīh?

It is for this reason that these principles in the books of the Ḥanafī Maḍhab and jurisprudence, remain till today in edition after edition reprints and continue to be taught in their universities and colleges to those who are learning the Maḍhab of the Ḥanafīs. There has been no omission or retraction from such statements which have been made hundreds of years ago.

Our Shaykh, Ḥāfiẓ Sana' Allāh Zāhidī ibn Imām al-Dīn حَفِظَهُ اللهُ in his naqd and critique of Nūr al-Anwār has made detailed footnotes upon the text, and in page: 245-246, volume: 3, he has quoted around eighteen 'Ā'immaḥ and Fuqahā of the aḥanāf who held this opinion concerning the Ṣaḥābī Abū Hurāirah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ not being a Faqīh, walī 'A'ūdhubillāh.

Furthermore, one can refer to our Shaykh Zubāir 'Alī Za'ī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d.1435 Ah) writings where he has gathered in one place at least forty-one statements of the Ṣaḥābah where the Deobandīs have clearly opposed the Ṣaḥābah, just to defend their own Maḍhab, that is, the Maḍhab of Imām Abū Ḥanīfa رَحِمَهُ اللهُ. We hope to record some such instances in a later part to this paper.

3. The aḥanāf have not stopped in criticising Abū Hurāirah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ they've criticised others alongside him also for example, concerning the riwāyah of joining foot to foot, ankle to ankle which

is narrated by Anas ibn Mālik رضي الله عنه then ḤAmīn Ṣaftar Okarvī Deobandī (d.1421 Ah) writes in his book, Ḥāshyah [حاشية] Tafhīm al-Bukhārī ‘ala Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, page: 380, volume: 1, that:

"Anas in the time of Rasūlullāh ﷺ was a boy who have not reached puberty and would stand in the back rows".

ḤAmīn Okarvī further writes:

"Anas رضي الله عنه and that which he done was in his infant age with the other children he has simply just narrated, however when he became older than the other Ṣaḥābah and the Tābi‘īn were upset at the actions of Anas of when he was a infant".

Comment: Here, we see once again that a riwāyah in Bukhārī from a Ṣaḥābī which no other Ṣaḥābah challenged is being explained away and belittled by saying that the rawī is a child, thus to be rejected. Yet, this riwāyah and those similar to it have been narrated by other than Anas رضي الله عنه including the Ṣaḥābī Abū ‘Abd Allāh Nu‘mān ibn Bashīr رضي الله عنهما in Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī.

Therefore, once again the precision and trustworthiness, Ḍabṭ and ‘Adālah of the Ṣaḥābah is being attacked as their position is ‘supposedly’ against the Maḍhab of Abū Ḥanīfa رحمه الله. The hoodwinking continues to be unravelled.

4. The ḥadīth which is narrated by ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar رضي الله عنه in Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī concerning the raf‘ al-yadayn, the raising of the hands of Rasūlullāh ﷺ in rukū‘ and out of rukū‘, then in relation to this ‘Amīn Okarvī, once again writes in Ḥāshyah Tafhīm al-Bukhārī ‘ala Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, page 385, volume 1, that:

"However, Imām Bukhārī under this chapter has not brought a ḥadīth from any Muhājir or Anṣārī. He has brought a riwāyah from ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar رضي الله عنه who was a young child, or a ṣighār Ṣahābī, a small Ṣahābī and would stand in the back rows. And he had brought a riwāyah from Mālīk ibn al-Khuwayrith who had only spent twenty nights with Rasūlullāh ﷺ ."

Furthermore Okarvī writes in his book Tajalliyāt -e- Ṣaftar [تجليات صفر], page: 94, volume: 7, that:

"Likewise, Imām Bukhārī has not narrated anything from any Badrī Ṣahābī, a Ṣahābah who had participated at the battle of Badr rather he narrates from a childlike ibn ‘Umar and from who only spent twenty nights as a guest [Mālīk ibn al-Khuwayrith] who narrates the Ḥadīth of raf‘ al-yadayn at nine different places, incomplete".

This is concerning Wā‘il ibn Ḥujr رضي الله عنه ‘Amīn Okarvī writes in his book Tajalliyāt -e- Ṣaftar, page: 94, volume: 7, that:

"Imām Muslim went one step further and with these two (Mālik ibn al-Khuwayrith and ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar) he also added a third Ṣaḥābī who was just a traveller by the name of Wā’il ibn Ḥujr.

This shows the hatred of the Deobandī Imām, not only for Imām Bukhārī رحمه الله and his Jāmi’ al-Ṣaḥīḥ, but the Ṣaḥābah, he mocks them, he talks about them being merely children, he talks about them not reporting correctly and accurately, and for him the fact that the Muḥaddithīn such as Imām al-Bukhārī and Imām Muslim رحمه الله were just picking and choosing aḥādīth from youngsters, walī ‘A‘ūdhubillāh.

We ask, if the Ṣaḥābah did not report correctly, or were merely travellers who spent little time with Rasūlullāh رحمه الله then did Imām Abū Ḥanīfa رضي الله عنه spend any more time with the Nabī these very same ,Further? رضي الله عنه Ṣaḥābah maintained their positions in adulthood and taught their students the raf‘ al-yadayn whilst continuing to act upon it, what will the blind following Ḥanafīs do with these facts?

Furthermore, what were the ages of the 'golden committee' of the forty scholars which the Ḥanafīs claim formed the backbone of the Ḥanafī Maḍhab? Some were around three and some five yet they are taken as giving verdicts at that age as well as formulating a Maḍhab!

Were Abū Ḥanīfa رحمه الله or his students 'Badrī Ṣaḥābah'?

5. Concerning Anas ibn Mālik رضي الله عنه, the Ḥanafī Imām Badr al-Dīn ‘Aynī (d.855 Ah) the explainer of Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī writes in his book ‘Umdat al-Qāri Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī [البخاري صحيح شرح القاري عمدة] chapter: What should be said after the takbir, page: 291, volume: 5, that:

"ويحتمل يكون أنس نسي في تلك الحال لكبر سنه وقد وقع مثل هذا كثيرا".

"There is a possibility that Anas رضي الله عنه in this condition became old and because of his old age he forgot, and such things have happened many times".

Comment: So it should be noted that for the Deobandīs to explain away the riwāyāt authentically reported from the Ṣaḥābah they not only call them children, the ones who stood in the back rows but the memory of Ṣaḥābah is challenged by calling them forgetful. Yet Imām Muḥammad Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Albānī رحمه الله (d.1420 Ah) is attacked for critiquing a rawī in the isnād to a ḥadīth in Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, Yaḥya ibn Sulāim, who was not a Ṣaḥābah but from Aḥmad Ibn Ḥanbals رحمه الله (d.241 Ah) period!

6. The Barelwī Shaykh al-Ḥadīth Ghulām Rasūl Sa‘īdī writes in his book, Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, page: 1154, volume: 1 that:

"It is possible that Imām Dāraqūṭnī رحمه الله (d.385 Ah) brought the narration from Anas ibn Mālik رضي الله عنه when Anas was in his old age and no doubt a person in his old age is prone to forget fullness".

So in order to refute the ḥadīth from Anas رضي الله عنه which goes against the Ḥanafī Maḍhab. The Ḥanafī ‘ulama’ are not only challenging their ‘Adālah but also challenging their Dabṭ of the Ṣaḥābah just to preserve their own Maḍhab. If this is not the abuse of the Ṣaḥābah then what is?

7. Again, concerning Anas ibn Mālik رضي الله عنه, the famous personality from Ahl al-Bid‘ah, Zāhid Ḥasan al-Kawtharī (d.1371 Ah) writes in his book, Ta‘nīb al-Khatīb, page: 80, and also in the book, The upright defence of Abū Ḥanīfa by ‘Abd Allāh Quddūs Khān Qārān Deobandī, page: 213 that:

"Furthermore concerning the narration of the head being squashed then the rawī is Anas ibn Mālik رضي الله عنه alone and he narrated this when he was in his old age, similarly the narration of the Ṣaḥābah drinking the urine of the camels is narrated by him alone, and it is the position of Abū Ḥanīfa رحمه الله that no doubt the Ṣaḥābah are Just [‘Ādl (عادل)], however despite this they are human beings and general laymen and sometimes because of old age they fell short in their precision of what they had heard and from this angle they are not free from mistake. In an instance where their narration contradicts the scholars of Fiqh then the scholar of Fiqh will be given preference and similarly in a instance where we have to remove the misunderstanding of that person when he narrated when

he was in his old age then we take the narration of the one who contradicts him and who is younger".

So here we have the Ḥanafī not only attacking the precision of the Ṣaḥābah who gave us our Dīn but they go further in saying that the Ṣaḥābah saying will be abandoned if it 'contradicts a scholar of fiqh'. There is not much more to say on this point as it speaks volumes.

8. The Ḥanafī Imām of jurisprudence Mulla Jīwan (d.1130 Ah) writes and quoted by ʿAmīn Ṣaftar Okarvī in his book, Futuhāt -e- Ṣaftar, page: 382, volume: 3, that:

Concerning Anas ibn Mālik رضي الله عنه

"غير معرف ولا جهاد"

"He Anas رضي الله عنه was not known for his Fiqh his understanding of the dīn or his ijtihād". walī ʿAʿūdhu billāh.

The irony of Mulla Jīwan quote as referenced by ʿAmīn Ṣaftar Okarvī Deobandī is after quoting this even though he it's from his own books of jurisprudence he says that:

"This quote has been utilised by those who advocate that the Nabī ﷺ has passed away and cannot hear us and by a certain Mawlānā Yunus Nuʿmānī Deobandī (d.1434 Ah) would he himself stand on the minbar and announce he has no Fiqh

or call himself a person who is not upright or has no ijtihād then why would you say that about a Ṣaḥābī."

The irony continues further where Younus Nu‘mānī who advocated the Nabī ﷺ passed away and does not hear responses to his Deobandī contemporary ‘Amīn Ṣaftar Okarvī Ḥayātī who believed the Nabī ﷺ is alive and can hear, in Futuhāt -e- Ṣaftar, page: 382-383, volume: 3, the following words that:

"Dear brothers in this speech Mawlānā [Ṣaftar Okarvī] has done a great wrong. He has ascribed to me that I have said a Ṣaḥābī is not ‘ādī rather a Fāsiq. I have merely quoted from the book Nūr al-Anwār and Uṣūl al-Shāshī, I have pointed what they have written, what Mawlānā should have done was asked me where these are written and I would have shown him but instead he has tried to beguile and fool the masses by ascribing these sayings to me, the irony is that if a ghair muqallid, salafī had done this then it would be a different thing but this is being done by someone who ascribe himself to Ḥanafīyyah and is a clear to the Ḥanafī Maḍhab, and he has said I have said about this Ṣaḥābī that he was not known for his Fiqh and ijtihād, then I ask are these books of Ḥanafī Fiqh not also accepted by you? Then let it be known if this is written in there that if the narration of Anas [ibn Mālik] contradicts qiyās then the analogy will be given precedence this is written clearly in our books Nūr al-Anwār and Uṣūl al-Shāshī, so why am I being blamed?"

Subḥān Allāh, pay close attention to teh above spat between the two Ḥanafī-Deobandīs scholars and see how they have abused the Ṣaḥābah. In fact, pay heed to how their books of the madhab abuse the Ṣaḥābah!!

So, one can see the internal fighting and the abuse that the Ḥanafī-Deobandīs have levied towards the Ṣaḥābah. Then they accuse the Ahl al-Ḥadīth of being the worst perpetrators of abuse against the Sunnah by allegedly weakening reports in Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī?

Yet they themselves not only have they put aside many aḥādīth from Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī as has been mentioned above, they have criticised the actual Ṣaḥābah رضوان الله عليهم أجمعين who are the narrators of the aḥādīth of Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī and furthermore they have ridiculed both Imām al-Bukhārī and Imām Muslim رحمهما الله as scholars of ḥadīth. So this is the case of the Deobandīs not being honest with the public about their reality.

How one can attack the likes of Imām Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Albānī رحمه الله after such nonsense is beyond comprehension!! A lot more can be said but it will turn into a large book rather than a short and brief paper. Further, evidences shall follow on how the Deobandīs truly see the Ṣaḥābah, رضوان الله عليهم أجمعين, Allāhu ʿAlam.

Whilst the Ḥanafīs are putting up a smoke screen and attacking the likes of Imām Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Albānī رحمه الله for making certain non marfūʿ muallaq riwāyāt in Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī daʿif, then much can be said in regards to this. However, this short treatise is designed as a response to show the actuality of the Ḥanafī Maḍhab and what they say about the aḥādīth of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and those that reported them and carried them to us, that is the Ṣaḥābah. Why al-Albānī رحمه الله felt that certain riwāyāt where not connected back to Rasūlullāh ﷺ in Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī then this

is a different a discussion for which he had a Salaf whether we agree or disagree with that.

Many of our ‘ulama’ have disagreed with Imām al-Albānī رحمه الله on his position concerning this. But why is it that the Deobandīs have decided highlighted this now? We say it is only because the reality of what the Deobandīs believe concerning Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī and other than that is hidden from the people and it is becoming apparent to them only now what they actually believe about Bukhārī and the aḥādīth that go back to Rasūlullāh ﷺ and the Ṣaḥābah in order to hide this they've now decided to counter attack by attacking Imām al-Albānī رحمه الله.

So, what is it that the Ḥanafīs believe about the Ṣaḥābah? Below are just a few quotes concerning the Ḥanafīs and the belief concerning the Ṣaḥābah.

The author Pīr Syed Mushtāq ‘Alī Shāh Deobandī writes in his book, Tarjamah al-Aḥanāf, page: 119, says concerning the female Ṣaḥābī, Fāṭmah bint Qay that:

"Allāh knows whether she was truthful in her speech or she was lying".

’A‘ūdhubillāh.

If this is not attack on the ‘Adālah and trustworthiness of the Ṣaḥābah in favour of the likes of the Shī‘ah, the Qādiyānī and other than that what else can it be seen as? The scholar of Ḥadīth and master debater of the Deobandīs ṢAmīn Ṣaftar Okarvī Deobandī, writes in his book, Tajalliyāt -

e- Şaftar, page: 152, volume: 3, which has been published by Ishāt al-‘ulūm al-Ḥanafīyyah in Faisalabad, Pakistan, and also in his book, Juz al-Qirra‘at bī Ḥāshyah, with the Ḥāshyah of ‘Amīn Okarvī, page: 131, he said:

"And this ‘Ubādah is majhūl al-ḥāl, Mīzān al-I‘tidāl "

Comment: ‘AmīnOkarvī is referring to ‘Ubādah ibn al-Ṣāmit RadiAllahu Anhu the Ṣahābī who narrates the riwāyah, there is no Ṣalāh without the Fātiḥah in Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī.

Here ‘Amīn Okarvī is calling a Ṣahābī of Rasūlullāh ﷺ unknown whereas the Ahl al-Sunnah have Ijmā‘ that every single Ṣahābah is upright and just.

أَهْلُ السُّنَّةِ وَالْجَمَاعَةِ عَلَى أَنَّهُمْ كُلُّهُمْ عُدُولٌ

Whether the condition (حال) is known to us or not it is irrelevant and does not matter whatsoever, because they are assumed and presumed to be all upright and just, but here in order to explain the ḥadīth in a way as it contradicts the Ḥanafī Maḍhab this individual has called the Ṣahābī ‘Ubādah ibn al-Ṣāmit majhūl al-ḥāl, we do not know his biography to the extent we do not know about him and his trustworthiness, ‘A‘ūdhubillāh.

Our Shaykh Zubāir‘Alī Za‘ī رحمه الله writes in his book, Masā‘alah Fātiḥah Khalf al-Imām, page: 26, whilst commenting on this quote of the Deobandī‘AmīnŞaftarOkarvī, he says the following:

"It should be noted that the reference which this Deobandī, 'AmīnOkarvī has given concerning the Ṣaḥābī, 'Ubādah ibn al-Ṣāmit being majhūl al-ḥāl from Mizān al-I'tidāl is a complete and utter fabrication and lie, we can say without a doubt that there is no reference in Mizān al-I'tidāl of 'Ubādah ibn al-Ṣāmit being called majhūl al-ḥāl and All Praise belongs to Allāh ﷻ."

Another particularly famous Deobandī, Ḥussain Aḥmad Tāndwī Deobandī writes in his book, Tawḍīḥ al-Tirmidhī page: 436, printed by Madanī mission book depot in Madanī Nagar, Calcutta, India, he writes:

"And this 'Ubādah ibn al-Ṣāmit is making an'ana and he is a mudallis and the an'ana of a mudallis not accepted."

Walī'A'ūdhubillāh, this ignoramus Deobandī is calling a Ṣaḥābī a mudallis and no one on the face of this earth has ever said anything about the Ṣaḥābah from amongst the Muslims except that all of them upright and just and their 'Adālah and Ḍabṭ of the Dīn and relaying it is unquestionable.

Here he is calling him a mudallis meaning effectively a man would narrate from the Nabī ﷺ put not in the correct manner and it's from principles of ḥadīth that the an'anah of a mudallis is not accepted unless he shows he's heard directly from the one that he narrates from. This station cannot be levied upon 'Ubādah the Ṣaḥābī for he was a Ṣaḥābī of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and we cannot question the uprightness of any Ṣaḥābī let alone 'Ubādah ibn al-Ṣāmit who was from the major Ṣaḥāba.

We therefore say as it was by our teacher that this is not only a abuse of the Ṣahābī ‘Ubādah ibn al-Ṣāmit but a clear fabrication and lie concerning him so that the Maḍhab of the Ḥanafī can be preserved in not praying Fātiḥah behind the Imām. Will the muqallid not stop at nothing even the abuse of the Ṣaḥābahin order to safe guard and preserve his Maḍhab?

The scholar of the Deobandīs, Faz al-Raḥman Ganj Murādabādī (d.1323 Ah), writes in his book, Malfūzat -e- Thānwī, page: 254, volume: 24, that:

"In the night in my dream I met Fāṭima and she hugged me close, next to her chest and I became better".

So, this Deobandī scholar claimed to have met Fāṭima and claims she hugged him, walī’A‘ūdhubillāh, can you imagine if someone said to this Deobandī scholar that I met your sister or mother in my dream and she hugged me, what would he say?

In fact, the Deobandī Imām Taqī ‘Uthmānī, writes in his book, Dars -e- Tirmidhī Maktabah Dar al-‘ulūm Karachi, page: 455, volume: 1, whilst talking about a statement in the classical Ḥanafī book Hidāyah, that:

"However, the author of hidāyah has alluded to the fact that he believed Abū Maḥḍhūrah that his understanding was weak and based upon suspicion, then this is not something that is correct".

Hence Taqī’ Uthmānī is accepting that the author of hidāyah which is a classical text taught to every Ḥanafī student of knowledge, authored by

Mulla Murghainān iḤanafī is talking ill of Sayyīd Abū Maḥḍhūra and this is something which is incorrect.

We know the ḥadīth of Anas ibn Mālīk from Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, Book: Call to prayer, Ḥadīth: 725,

Imām al-Bukhārī titled the chapter heading as:

إِلْزَاقِ الْمُنْكَبِ بِالْمُنْكَبِ وَالْقَدَمِ بِالْقَدَمِ فِي الصَّفِّ

"And we joined in the rows our shoulders to each other's shoulders and our foot to foot in a row"

Then making fun and levelling fun and mocking this riwāyah, the Deobandī² Amīn Okarvī writes in this book, Ḥāshyah Tafhīm al-Bukhārī³ ala Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, page: 380, volume: 1, published by: Maktabah Madīna, Lahore, he states that:

"Imām al-Bukhārī رحمه الله quotes the riwāyah from Anas, and Anas had not reached the age of puberty at the time of the Rasūlullāh ﷺ and would stand in the back rows. And Bukhārī has not even quoted the entire quote from Anas. Anas's teacher Abū Bakr ibn Abī Shaybah (d.235 Ah) says that:

"It was said to Anas that you will see that if today you join your feet like you have previously been doing, then the people, meaning the Ṣaḥābah and the Tābi⁴in will run away from you like wild mules. Therefore, it is apparent that when a person becomes older he begins to develop some intellect and leaves off what he was doing when he was young. That which Anas done when he was young he done

whilst he was around children however when he became older the Ṣaḥābah and the Tābi‘īn became upset at this habit of Anas. Therefore, it is clear that to him the feet is not the Sunnah of the Rasūlullāh ﷺ nor the Sunnah of the Ṣaḥābah and if it was a Sunnah or recommended to do this then the Ṣaḥābah and the Tābi‘īn would never be upset from such a habit or a Sunnah."

However, we know what ‘Amīn Okarvī has said has opposed by Anas ibn Mālīk myself in Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, Book: The book of drinks, Chapter: It is recommended to pass water and milk etc, to the right of the one who drinks first, Ḥadīth: 2029(b), who said:

"قَدِمَ النَّبِيُّ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ الْمَدِينَةَ وَأَنَا ابْنُ عَشْرٍ وَمَاتَ وَأَنَا ابْنُ عَشْرِينَ"

"When the Nabī ﷺ came to Medina when I was ten years old and he died when I was twenty years old.

Therefore, Okarvī calling Anas a young infant child who hadn't reach puberty in the time of Rasūlullāh ﷺ is a utter fabrication and lie because we know at the death of Rasūlullāh ﷺ he was a twenty year old man, and Okarvī has lied upon him [Anas ibn Mālīk] and opposed the aḥādīth in Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim and he has only done this so he can preserve his own Maḍhab of keeping the space of four handspans between each people in ṣalāh, as stipulated in the Ḥanafī Maḍhab without any bases whatsoever.

This is what he is saying in the previous quote that the Ṣaḥābah if it was done in his time, Anas was told by the other Ṣaḥābah and the Tābi‘īn if you do this today, meaning if you do this now after the death of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and now that you've grown up we'd run away from you

like mules runaway from each other than this is without evidence and there is not authentic riwāyah going back to Anas ibn Mālīk or other than that for this.

One can also refer to the acceptance of ʿAmīn Okarvī, who writes in his book, Tajalliyāt -e- Ṣaftar, page: 466, volume: 3, and, Futuhāt -e- Ṣaftar, page: 80, volume: 2, he states that:

"Nūr al-Anwār the famous book Ḥanafī of jurisprudence has called the Ṣaḥābī Muʿāwiya ignorant".

There will be a lot more said about the Ṣaḥābah and the Ḥanafīs but it suffices at this stage just to know that the Ḥanafīs have not left the Ṣaḥābah unscathed in order to defend their own Maḍhab yet they attack the Ahl al-Ḥadīth scholars for talking about the aḥādīth concerning Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī.

by the two weak slaves of Allāh
Abū Khuzaimah Anṣārī & Abū Ḥibbān
Jumāda al-ʿUla /February 2018
Birmingham
England