



# The Nullifiers of Ablution

*WRITTEN BY: ASH SHAIKH ABDUL KAREEM AL  
HASANEE*

*Translated by Majid Jawed Al Afghane*

# بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

الحمد لله والصلاة والسلام على رسول الله وعلى آله وصحبه ومن والاه

Indeed Allah has made easy for me to compile this summarized summary in regards to the matters and rulings of the ablution. In consideration of its importance and the need of the people for it, I have tried to the best of my ability in regards to the matters which are of differing, whilst mentioning the correct stance along with being keen upon making it summarized. Allah is the one who guides to that which is correct and all praise belongs to Allah.

## *The Nullifiers of Ablution:*

### *Chapter: Defecation*

Defecation is a nullifier of ablution according to the Quran, Sunnah and consensus.

The proof from the Qur'an is the statement of Allah:

أَوْ جَاءَ أَحَدٌ مِنْكُمْ مِنَ الْغَائِطِ أَوْ لَامَسْتُمُ النِّسَاءَ فَلَمْ تَجِدُوا مَاءً فَتَيَمَّمُوا

“Or one of you comes after answering the call of nature, or you have been in contact with women (by sexual relations) and you find no water, perform Tayammum with clean earth and rub therewith your faces and hands (Tayammum)” [An Nisaa: 43]

The proof from the Sunnah is the narration of Safwaan Ibn Assaal رضي الله عنه

لَكِنْ مِنْ غَائِطٍ وَبَوْلٍ وَنَوْمٍ

"Whether we had to answer the call of nature or slept"

At Tirmithi reported it with a Hassan (good) chain and it is in As-Saheeh Al Musnad of our Shaykh Muqbil (1/427)

And the narration of Abu Huraira رضي الله عنه The Prophet (ﷺ) said,

لَا يَقْبَلُ اللَّهُ صَلَاةَ أَحَدِكُمْ إِذَا أَحْدَثَ حَتَّى يَتَوَضَّأَ

"Allah does not accept prayer of anyone of you if he does Hadath (passes wind) until he performs the ablution (anew).

Al Bukhari 135 and Muslim 225 reported it

Along with other proofs which indicate that. More than one from the people of knowledge have relayed a consensus (upon that). From them: Ibnul Munthir, an Nawawi, and other than them.

Ibnul Munthir said: "the people of knowledge agreed that the exiting of feces from the back is a Hadath (emission) that nullifies the ablution".

Al Awsat 1/113 Al Majmoo 2/4 Ash Sharhul Mumtia 1/220

### *Chapter: The Passing of Wind*

Passing wind is a nullifier of ablution due to the narration of Abdullah Ibn Zayd

رضي الله عنه

شُكِيَ إِلَى النَّبِيِّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ الرَّجُلُ يُخَيَّلُ إِلَيْهِ أَنَّهُ يَجِدُ الشَّيْءَ فِي الصَّلَاةِ؟ قَالَ:

«لَا يَنْصَرَفُ حَتَّى يَسْمَعَ صَوْتًا أَوْ يَجِدَ رِيحًا»

A man complained to the Messenger of Allah (blessings and peace of Allah be upon him) about when a man thinks that something has happened (i.e the passing of wind) during the prayer. He said: "Do not leave from the prayer unless you hear a sound or notice a smell."

Al Bukhari 137 and Muslim 361 reported it

And the narration of Abu Huraira رضي الله عنه that Allah's Messenger (ﷺ) said,

لَا تُقْبَلُ صَلَاةٌ مَنْ أَحْدَثَ حَتَّى يَتَوَضَّأَ

"The prayer of a person who does Hadath (passes urine, stool or wind) is not accepted till he performs the ablution."

A person from Hadramaut asked Abu Huraira, "What is 'Hadath'?" Abu Huraira replied, " 'Hadath' means the passing of wind."

Al Bukhari 135 Muslim 225

And the consensus is established upon that. Ibnul Munthir said: “The people of knowledge agreed that the passing of wind from the behind is a Hadath (emission) which nullifies the ablution”.

Al Awsat 1/136 Al Majmoo 2/4

It is not a condition to hear a sound or the gas to be present in order to be certain of the hadath (emission of wind).

Imam An Nawawi said: It is known with the presence of one of them and it is not a condition that it be heard or smelt by the consensus of the Muslims.

Sudden doubt does not harm because he who has doubt in regards to that which breaks ablution, whilst certain about purity, remains upon purity.

As for the narration of Abdullah Ibn Zayd it is mentioned that: “he should not leave from the prayer until he heard a noise or notices a smell,” meaning he knows and is certain about its emission. The intent is not that he [has to] hear it.

Sharh Muslim 361 Al Majmoo 2/4

Does this ruling include while being inside the prayer and outside of it?

The majority from the Salaf and those who came later on took the opinion that there is no difference between this doubt occurring in the prayer itself or outside of the prayer. That (the person) remains upon his purity because the origin is purity and it doesn't cease with the passing of doubt.

In one report, Maalik took the opinion that this ruling is specific to while being inside the prayer. As for outside of the prayer it is necessary for him to make ablution.

And it was reported from Al Hasan al Basri and some of the Shaafiyah: An Nawawi said: “and it is an irregular view quoted from our Companions”. The first statement is that which is correct and Allah knows best.

*Chapter: The wind which comes out from the vagina of a female and the penis of a man*

Maalik, Ash Shafiee, and Muhammad Ibn Al Hasan took the opinion that the gas which comes out from the front passages of the male and female nullify the ablution.

Abu Haneefah held the opinion that it is not a nullifier of ablution, and this is the correct view. Ibn Hazm deemed it correct, Ibn Baaz and Al Lajnah Daimah passed a verdict with this opinion.

Note: In regards to the gas which is emitted from the front passage, this is something which occurs and is found with women. As for emission of gas from a man's penis then this does not exist, because the bladder does not have an opening to the abdomen. Some of them have said its presence is known by a person feeling a tingle in his penis. This does not occur by certainty and purity is not nullified by doubt.

Al Majmoo' 2/8 Al Mughni 1/230 Al Muhalla 160

### *Chapter: The emission of Urine*

Urine is a nullifier of ablution according to the Sunnah and consensus.

From the Sunnah the narration of Safwaan ibn Asaal رضي الله عنه

أَنْ لَا نَنْزِعَ خِفَافَنَا ثَلَاثَةَ أَيَّامٍ وَلَيَالِيهِنَّ، إِلَّا مِنْ جَنَابَةٍ، وَلَكِنْ مِنْ غَائِطٍ وَبَوْلٍ وَنَوْمٍ يَأْمُرُنَا إِذَا كُنَّا سَفَرًا

When we were on a journey, the Prophet (ﷺ) used to command us to wear our leather socks for three days and three nights, whether from feces, urine or sleep.

At Tirmidhi reported it (96) With a Hasan chain, and it has preceded.

The scholars have a consensus that urine is a nullifier from the nullifiers of ablution.

Al Awsat 1/32

### *Chapter: Urine and feces coming out from other their natural exits.*

The majority of the scholars took the opinion that if urine and feces come out from other than their natural passages that it nullifies the ablution, whether the two passages are closed or open passages. This applies regardless of the amount emitted, and whether it be above the stomach or from below that.

That is the correct stance due to the generality of His Ta'ala statement

(أَوْ جَاءَ أَحَدٌ مِنْكُم مِّنَ الْغَائِطِ)

“Or one of you comes after answering the call of nature,”

And the narration of Safwaan that has preceded

Al Majmoo 2/8 Al Mughni 1/233

*Chapter: That which rarely comes out from the front and rear passages*

That which rarely comes out from the front and rear passages such as worms, pebbles, or hair (Is from that which) nullifies the ablution according to Ataa', al Hassan, Abu Mijlaz, Al Hakam Ibn Utbah, Al Awzaai, Sufyaan, Ibnul Mubaarak, Ash Shafiee, Abu Hanifah and his companions, Ahmad, Ishaq and was ascribed to the majority.

An Nakhai, Qataadah, and Maalik took the opinion that it does not nullify the ablution, and does not obligate it because it is rare and is similar to that which comes out from other than the two passages.

The majority used as evidence that it is from that which comes out from the two passages and is similar to Mathi (prostatic fluid) and it is not free from the moisture which is attached to it.

Ibnul Munthir said: if it wasn't that worms do not come out except with moistness from urine, then the more correct of the two statements after examination would have been the statement of the one who sees that ablution is not obligated in regards to that. Thus, whichever of that comes out and it contains moistness from stool or urine then the ruling is (that one does) ablution, because ablution becomes obligatory whether a small or large amount of stool or urine is emitted.

Al Awsat 1/19 Al Majmoo 2/7 Al Mughni 1/233

*Chapter: The Emission of Hemorrhoid blood*

Imam An Nawawi said: If the blood from a hemorrhoid comes out from inside the anus, ablution is nullified. If the hemorrhoid is outside the anus then it does not nullify the ablution.

Al Majmoo 2/10

*Chapter: Non-Menstrual vaginal bleeding*

An Nawawi said:

Non-menstrual vaginal bleeding nullifies the ablution according to the statement of majority of the people of knowledge.

Using as evidence that it is from that which comes out from the two passages, and that which comes out from the two passages nullifies the ablution. Similarly, with that which has been reported from the narrations which in it are the command of her doing ablution due to it for every prayer.

Imam Maalik, Rabeeah, and Ibnul Munthir took the opinion that it is not a nullifier (of ablution). Shaykhul Islaam, Al Allamah Ash Shawkaani deemed it to be the correct opinion. And it is not upon her to do ablution for every prayer except if she is afflicted with an emission in which she renews her ablution in terms of urine or gas or that which is similar to that from that which nullifies the ablution. Thus she re does her ablution. Because the narrations in which have come in regards to the command of doing ablution for every prayer have defects and nothing from it is authentic. And because there is no difference between the blood which comes out before ablution, that which comes out during the ablution, and that which comes out after the ablution.

If that from the blood which comes out during the ablution and prayer doesn't nullify the ablution then similarly that which comes out after the prayer doesn't nullify the ablution.

Al Awsat 1/163 Al Majmoo 2/6 Al Ikhtiyaaraat Pg. 15

*Chapter: Urine incontinence*

The differing in regards to the ruling of the one with urine incontinence is like the differing in regards to non-menstrual vaginal bleeding.

That which is correct in regards to it, and Allah knows best, is that if the incontinence is continuous, with drops always coming out, and it is almost as if it won't stop, then there is no ablution upon him. Except if he purposely urinates or nullifies his ablution with a different nullifier, then ablution is obligatory upon him. Maalik, and Ibnul Munthir took this opinion and it is the

appropriate statement of Rabeeah [based on the issue of] non-menstrual vaginal bleeding.

Al Awsat 1/165

*Chapter: Wetness that comes from the woman's vagina*

Al Allamah Al Uthaymeen said: “As for that which comes out from the urinal passage then it nullifies the ablution, because what is apparent is that it is from bladder. As for that which comes out from the passage of the uterus then the majority are upon (the opinion) that it nullifies the ablution.”

Ibn Hazm said: It doesn't nullify the ablution and he said it is not urine nor semen.

He who says that it nullifies (ablution) must present the (to bring) proof. Rather, it is like that which comes out from the rest of the body from the other excretions. [To say it] nullifies the ablution is easier than the statement that it is impurity. If it is continuous then it does not nullify the ablution and its ruling is that of the one with urine incontinence.

If it stops at a certain time before the exiting of the time of prayer, then it is obligatory upon her to wait till that time comes in which it stops (to make ablution), because this is the ruling of the one with urine incontinence. End

I say that which is apparent is that the statement of Ibn Hazm is strong from the angle of evidence, and making ablution is more befitting but not by way of obligation.

Ash Sharhul Mumtia 1/392 and Al Muhallaa

*Chapter: Prostatic fluid*

It is a white thin sticky liquid that comes out whilst (thinking) about desires. [It is not accompanied] by feelings of pleasure nor does it gush out, and it is not followed by fatigue. It can occur with the man and the woman, but is found more in the woman.

Al Mathiy (Prostatic fluid) is a nullifier of the ablution according to the Sunnah and consensus. From the Sunnah the narration of Ali رضي الله عنه

كُنْتُ رَجُلًا مَدَّاءً، وَكُنْتُ أَسْتَحْيِي أَنْ أَسْأَلَ النَّبِيَّ صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ لِمَكَانِ ابْنَتِهِ، فَأَمَرْتُ الْمُفْدَادَ بْنَ الْأَسْوَدِ فَسَأَلَهُ

فَقَالَ يَغْسِلُ ذَكَرَهُ وَيَتَوَضَّأُ

I was one whose prostatic fluid flowed readily and I was ashamed to ask the prophet (ﷺ) about it, because of the position of his daughter. I, therefore, asked Miqdad. bin al-Asad and he asked him (the Holy Prophet). He (the prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم) said: He should wash his private part and perform ablution.

As for the consensus then Ibnul Munthir said: we have reported from Umar, Ibn Umar, Ibn Abbas and a group from the Tabieen that they obligated ablution due to Mathiy. It is also what was said by Maalik, the people of Madeenah, Al Awzaai, the people of Ash Shaam, Sufyaan Ath Thawri, and the people of Iraaq. Similarly Ash Shafiee and his companions said it. I don't know of any differing in regards to the obligation of doing ablution due to it between the people of knowledge.

Al Awsaat 1/133 Al Majmoo 2/7 Al Mughni 1/232

#### *Chapter: Al Wadi*

Al Wadi is Thick white fluid which comes out after urine in drops.

Ibn Qudaamah said: there is not regarding it nor the remaining emissions other than ablution. Al Athram reported with his chain to Ibn Abbas he said: Al Mani (semen) al Mathi, and Al Wadi. As for Al Mani then in regards to it one does Ghysl, as for Mathi and Wadi then in regards to them he performs the purification well (doing ablution well)

The previous source and Al Mughni 1/233

#### *Chapter: What obligates Ghysl*

The emission of Semen due to intercourse or other than it, for it is a nullifier of ablution and obligates Ghysl by consensus of the Scholars due to the abundant proofs regarding that. Also due to it being from that which comes out from one of the two passages, and Al Hayd (Menstruation) and Nifaas (Blood of childbirth) are nullifiers for ablution and obligate Ghysl by consensus of the scholars due to the proofs which indicate that from the book and the Sunnah.

*Chapter: Deep sleep*

The scholars differed in regards to the one sleeping: Is his ablution nullified and thus obligate him to do ablution or not?

A group from the scholars took the opinion that if he sleeps lying on his back his ablution is nullified and if he sleeps sitting establishing his buttocks firmly on the ground, then his ablution is not nullified because he is safe from that the exiting of emissions.

Those who said this opinion are: Ibn Umar, Abu Umaamah, An Nakhaai, Ibn Sireen, Salim Ibn Abdullah, Muhammad Ibn Ali, and Naafi' and it was reported from Ibn Al Mubarak and the companions of Opinion

A group from the scholars took the stance that sleep is a nullifier of ablution and it is the deep sleep, not the light sleep, whether he is laying, sitting, in a state of Rukoo or Sujood.

Due to the generality of the narration of Safwan Ibn Assaal رضي الله عنه

لَكِنْ مِنْ غَائِطٍ وَبَوْلٍ وَنَوْمٍ

“...however from feces, urine, and sleep”

At Tirmithi (96) reported it with a good chain

Ibnul Munthir reported this statement from Abu Hurairah, Ibn Abbas, Anas, al Hassan Al Basri, Saeed Jbn Al Musaayib, Ataa, Tawoos, Mujaahid, Qaasim Ibn Salaam, Al Awzaai, Rabeah, Maalik, Ahmad in a report and Ibn Munthir (himself) and this is the correct opinion

Al Awsat 1/142 Al Majmoo 2/15 Al Mughni 1/235 Al Insaaf 1/195

What is the extent of deep sleep?

There is no specific evidence regarding what is considered to be deep or light sleep. Consequently, whenever a man finds that which indicates deeper sleep such as the falling of the one who is firmly fixed or his appearance changing or other than it, then his ablution becomes nullified.

As for drowsiness which is the beginning of sleep then it does not nullify ablution.

Due to the narration of Anas Ibn Maalik رضي الله عنه said

قامت مع النبي صلى الله عليه وعلى آله وسلم في صلاة الليل، فكان رأسي يخفق، فيأخذ الرسول بأذني،  
فصلى ثلاث عشر ركعة

I stood with the prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم in the night prayer, my head would go down and the messenger would take me by the ears, he prayed 13 Rakats

Reported by Muslim 763

And the narration of Anas Ibn Maalik رضي الله عنه said

كان أصحاب رسول الله ينامون ثم يصلون ولا يتوضؤون

The companions of the messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم would sleep then pray and wouldn't make ablution

Muslim reported it 376

Al Majmoo 2/18 Al Mughni 1/237

#### *Chapter: Sleep of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم*

An Nawawi said: Our companions said: From that which is specific to the messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم is that his ablution wouldn't be nullified with sleeping lying down

Due to the narration of Ibn Abbas رضي الله عنه he said

نام رسول الله صلى الله عليه وعلى آله وسلم حتى سمعت غطيظه، ثم صلى ولم يتوضأ :

The messenger صلى الله عليه وسلم slept until his snoring could be heard then he prayed and didn't do ablution

Muslim reported it 763

And the narration of Aisha رضي الله عنها That the messenger صلى الله عليه وسلم said:

إِنَّمَا تَنَامُ عَيْنِي وَلَا يَنَامُ قَلْبِي

My eyes only sleep but not my heart

Sharh Muslim 376 Al Insaaf 1/196

### Chapter: Loss of Intellect

The loss of intellect due to insanity, fainting, or overflowing sugar (in the case of the diabetic) is a nullifier for the ablution.

Whether it be little or a lot Ibnul Munthir said:

The people of knowledge are agreed upon the obligation of ablution upon the one who loses his intellect by becoming insane or fainting due to a sickness once he recovers upon whichever condition it was.

Due to the narration Aisha رضي الله عنها

The Prophet صلى الله عليه وعلى آله وسلم became seriously ill and asked whether the people had prayed. We replied, 'No. O Allah's Apostle! They are waiting for you.' He added, 'Put water for me in a trough.' `Aisha added, "We did so. He took a bath and tried to get up but fainted. When he recovered, he again asked whether the people had prayed. We said, 'No, they are waiting for you. O Allah's Messenger (ﷺ),' He again said, 'Put water in a trough for me.' He sat down and took a bath and tried to get up but fainted again. Then he recovered and said, 'Have the people prayed?' We replied, 'No, they are waiting for you. O Allah's Apostle.' He said, 'Put water for me in the trough.' Then he sat down and washed himself and tried to get up but he fainted. When he recovered, he asked, 'Have the people prayed?' We said, 'No, they are waiting for you. O Allah's Messenger (ﷺ)! The people were in the mosque waiting for the Prophet (ﷺ) for the `Isha prayer... Till the end of the narration.

Al Bukhari 687 Muslim 418

Al Awsat 1/144 Al Majmoo 2/21 Al Mughni 1/234 Sharh Muslim 376 Al Insaaf 1/195

### *Chapter: Eating camel meat*

A group from the people of knowledge took the opinion that ablution is nullified due to eating camel meat

From them Jaabir Ibn Samurah the companion, Muhammad Ibn Ishaq the companions of Al Maghaazi (the prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم military campaigns), Ahmad Ibn Hanbal, Ishaq, Abu Khaythamah, Yahya Ibn Yahya, Ibnul Munthir, Ibn Khuzaymah, and was reported from the companions of hadeeth unrestrictedly and Al Bayhaqi and An Nawawi Deemed it the correct stance.

Due to that which Muslim (360) relayed from Jaabir Ibn Samurah رضي الله عنه he said:

أَتَوَضَّأُ مِنْ لُحُومِ الْإِبِلِ؟ قَالَ:

نَعَمْ، فَتَوَضَّأُ مِنْ لُحُومِ الْإِبِلِ

That a man asked the prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم “Should I perform ablution due to eating camel meat?” He (ﷺ) said: “Yes, perform ablution due to eating camel meat”

A similar narration was relayed from Al Baraa Ibn Aazib, Abu Dawood (184) and At Tirmithi (81) and other than them reported it with an authentic chain.

It is in As Saheeh Al Musnad (1/25) of our Shaykh Muqbil Al Waadiee May Allah have mercy upon him.

Malik, Sufyan Ath Thawri, Ash Shafiee and the companions of opinion, and it was ascribed to the majority that camel meat is not a nullifier of ablution.

The first opinion is that which is correct due to the affirmed narrations in regards to that, whether it be raw or cooked, or whether the person be knowledgeable about it or ignorant

Clarification: the statement that it does not nullify (ablution) has been reported from the rightly guided Khulafa, and this report while it being popular and having many reporters, is a mistake as Shaykhul Islaam clarified in Al Qawaaid An Nuraaniyah page 31 print Al Maarif.

He (May Allah have mercy upon him) said: As for he who reports from the rightly guided Khulafa or majority of the companions in opposition to these

matters, and that they would not make ablution from camel meat, then he is mistaken in regards to them.

That was only thought due to that which is reported from them that they would not make ablution from that which touched fire (cooked meat), the only intent is that, eating that which is cooked in using fire is a reason according to them for the absence of the obligation of ablution. That which the messenger صلى الله عليه وسلم commanded with from making ablution due to camel meat, then its reason is not because it is cooked using fire.

Al Alwsat 1/138 Al Majmoo 2/57 Al Mughni 1/250 Sharh Muslim 360 An Nayl 2/242

*Chapter: Is other than meat included from the other parts of the camel*

That which is other than meat, from the parts of the camel such as broth, its liver, spleen, hump, oil, stomach, and its intestines. There are two views with the scholars of the Hanbali Fiqh, in regards to it

That which is correct is the absence of obligation because the text doesn't include it.

An Nawawi said: the opinion taken by us and the majority is that it does not nullify the ablution.

I say except for broth for majority of the time a small piece of meat is found in it, and making ablution from it is more pious and safer, and it is that which Al Allamah Al Uthaymeen deemed correct.

Al Majmoo 2/60 Al Mugni 1/254 Sharhul Mumtia

*Chapter: Camel milk isn't a nullifier*

An Nawawi said: Ahmad has a report that camel milk nullifies (the ablution), and I don't know of anyone who agreed with him upon that. Our view and that of all the scholars is that there is no ablution accompanied with the consumption of camel milk.

No authentic text has been reported in regards to this and the mentioned text doesn't include it.

Al Majmoo 2/60 Al Mughni 1/254

*Chapter: Ablution from that which has touched fire (cooked meat)*

None of the foods which are cooked are a nullifier for ablution other than camel meat according to the majority of the people of knowledge. This stance was reported from the rightly guided Khulafa, Ubay Ibn Kaab, Ibn Masooud, Ibn Abbas, Aamir Ibn Rabeeah, Abu Dardaa, Abu Umaamah, and majority of the scholars of jurisprudence.

Ibn Qudaaamah said: Today, we don't know of any differing in regards to it due to the narration of Jaabir. He said the last practice of the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) was that he did not perform ablution due to eating anything that fire touched (cooked meat).

Abu Dawood reported it 192 and Al Allamah Albani declared it authentic in Saheeh Abi Dawood

The narration of Ibn Abbas that:

The prophet صلى الله عليه و سلم went out to prayer and a gift of bread and meat were brought to him. He ate three bites then prayed and did not make ablution.

Muslim reported it (359)

Al Majmoo 2/57 Al Mughni 1/255

*Chapter: Touching the private part*

Touching the private part is from the nullifiers of ablution due to the narration of Busrah Bint Safwaan رضي الله عنها that the messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه و سلم said:

مَنْ مَسَّ ذَكَرَهُ فَلَا يُصَلِّ حَتَّى يَتَوَضَّأَ

He who touches his private part then let him not pray until he makes ablution.

Ahmad 6/406 and Abu Dawood 181 reported it,

And other than them with an authentic chain. Our Shaykh Muqbil Rahimahullah mentioned it in As Saheeh Al Musnad 2/467 and said it is authentic upon the condition of the two Shaykhs (Bukhari and Muslim) and

Urwah made clear with hearing it from Busrah in Musnad Ahmad and made us feel safe from the intermediary of Marwaan.

This was said by: Umar Ibn Al Khattab, Saad Ibn Abi Waqqas, Abu Huraira, Ibn Abbas, Ibn Umar, Ataa, Saeed Ibn Musayib, Abaan Ibn Uthman, Urwah Ibn Az Zubayr, Sulayman Ibn Yasaar, Az Zuhree. It was reported from Abu Aaliyah, Mujaahid, Al Awzaai, Ash Shafiee, Ahmad, Ishaahq, and Abi Thawr, and it is popular from Maalik

Al Hassan, Qatadah, Saaeed Ibn Jubayr, Sufyan Ath Thawri, and the companions of opinion, and a report from Ahmad which isn't popular from him went towards it not nullifying ablution

Due to the narration of Talq رضي الله عنه that the messenger صلى الله عليه وسلم said

إِنَّمَا هُوَ بَضْعَةٌ مِنْكَ

it is only a body part from you

Abu Dawood 182 and At Tirmithi 85 reported it

The first statement is stronger, because the narration of Talq is considered weak by a group from the scholars such as Ash Shafiee. Al Bayhaqee said in Al Kubraa 1/135 Ash Shafiee said we asked regarding Qays and we didn't find he who knows him with that which would make us accept his narration. Indeed one whom we described as trustworthy, being put forth in Hadeeth, and its firmness has opposed him.

Similarly, Abu Haatim and Abu Zurah said: Qays Ibn Talq isn't from those whom evidence is established with, and they considered him weak. Al Ilal matter 111

The narration of Busrah is more authentic than it, Al Bukhari said the most authentic thing with me in regards to the touching of the private part is the narration of Busrah. Ilal Al Kabeer of At Tirmithi 1/156

Similarly the narration of Talq is earlier (then the narration of Basrah) and the narration of Busrah is later. Talq came to the prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم when he was building the Masjid or at the time of Migration as for Busrah her Islaam was later on, and Allah knows best.

Al Awsaat 1/207 Al Majmoo 2/35 Al Mughni 1/240

*Chapter: Touching the private part forgetfully*

Touching the private part forgetfully or unintentionally then it nullifies the ablution.

Similar to if he touched it purposely due to the generality of the aforementioned narration of Busrah. Al Awzaai, Ash Shafiee, Ishaq, Ahmad and Abu Thawr said that and it is correct due to the generality of the narration.

Al Awsaat 1/193 Al Majmoo 2/34 Al Mughni 1/242 Al Insaaf 1/99

There is no difference between touching the private part with the back of the hand or the palm in regards to the touching of the private part and it is a nullifier of ablution due to the generality of the narration of Busrah and Ataa, Al Awzaai and Ahmad have said that. Malik, Ash Shafiee, and Ishaq specified it to the palm. The first statement is that which is correct and it is that which the companion of Insaaf and Al Uthaymeen deemed correct.

Al Awsaat 1/207 Al Majmoo 2/41 Al Mughni 1/242 Al Insaaf 1/299 Ash Sharhul Mumtia 1/320

Touching the private part with the elbow isn't a nullifier of ablution and it is the statement of Maalik, Al Layth, Ash Shafiee, and Ahmad. It was reported from Umar, Saad Ibn Abi Waqqas, Ibn Abbas, Ibn Umar, Abi Huraira, Aisha, Saeed Ibn Musayib, Abaan, Urwah, Mujahid, and Az Zuhri, and was ascribed to the majority, Ibn Qudaamah, An Nawawi and al Uthaymeen deemed it correct.

Because the ruling is connected to the absolute hand in the legislation, and doesn't extend to the elbow, with the proof of cutting the hand of the thief, washing the hand from the night sleep, washing the elbow is only obligated in ablution because he restricted it to the elbow.

Al Awsat 1/208 Al Majmoo 2/41 Al Mughni 1/243 Al Insaaf 1/200 Ash Sharhul Mumtia 1/320

Touching the private part behind a cover is not a nullifier of ablution because it is not considered touching, the companion of Al Insaaf and al Uthaymeen deemed it the correct opinion.

Touching someone else's private part is not a nullifier whether that (be a private part) of an adult or a young one, dead or alive, towards this stance Maalik, and Dawood went. Ibn Hazm and Ibn Abdul Barr deemed it the correct stance because the reported evidence is in regards to he who touches his own private part.

As for the narration: “Whoever touches a private part then let him make ablution” An Nasaee 1/100 reported it, with a weak chain, in it is Marwaan Ibn Al Hakam

Al Awsat 1/210-211 Al Majmoo 2/37 Al Mughni 1/243 At Tamheed 2/274 Al Insaaf 1/206

The one whose private part is touched then his ablution is not nullified with that upon the correct view because the touching didn't occur from and it is the statement of ash Shafiee and Ahmad. This is because the evidence is regarding the one who touches and doesn't include the one whose private part is touched.

Al Insaaf 1/200-209 Al Majmoo 2/41

Ablution is not obligated upon the one who touches the testicles and it is the statement of Ataa, ash-Shaabiee, and Ishaaq, and it is correct because the apparent narration doesn't include it and it is that which Ibnul Munthir and al Uthaymeen deemed correct. Ibnul Munthir said it is the statement of majority of the people of knowledge

Al Awsat 1/212 Al Majmoo 2/43 Al Mughni 1/246

A woman touching her private part nullifies the ablution due to the generality of the narration of Busrah and due to the narration of Amr Ibn Shuayb from his father from his grandfather from the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم he said:

“Whichever woman touches her private part then let her make ablution”

Ahmad reported it and its chain is Hassan, Ash Shawkani deemed it the correct stance

Touching the backside passage isn't a nullifier of ablution and this is the opinion of Maalik, the companions of Opinion, a narration from ahmad, Sufyan Ath Thawri and Qatadah, and it is that which is correct due to the non-existence

of evidence which indicates that. As for the narration of he who touches his private part then it is clarified with the narration: “Who touches his penis”

Al Awsat 1/212 Al Majmoo 2/43 Al Mughni 1/244 Al Insaaf 1/204 Ash Sharhul Mumtia 1/336

Majority of the scholars are of the opinion that touching the private part of the animal isn't a nullifier of ablution whether that animal be pure or impure due to the absence of evidence which indicates that. An-Nawawi said: “The one who touches the private part of an animal his ablution doesn't nullify according to us and with all the scholars except Ataa and Layth.

Al Awsat 1/211 Al Majmoo 2/43 Al Mughni 1/246

### *Chapter: The Hermaphrodite*

If the hermaphrodite touches his private part, meaning he touches the private part of the male and female then it nullifies his ablution. If he touches one of them then it does not nullify his ablution, with the probability that the part touched may be an increased body part and the certainty of purification is not ceased except with certainty.

If he touches one of them then touches the second one, then his ablution becomes nullified. If he is doubtful whether or not he touched the second private part, or if the touched body part is a private part, then his ablution isn't nullified, although it is recommended to make ablution. This is if he is a hermaphrodite.

If he touches the organ which is clear that it is not an increased body part, then his ablution is broken, and if he touches the other organ then his ablution is not broken because it is equivalent to an increased organ (that if he touches he doesn't have to make ablution due to it) Allah knows best

Al Majmoo 2/46 Al Mughni 1/245

### *Chapter: Touching a Woman*

Ibnul Munthr said: The People of knowledge have consensus that coming in contact (with a woman) is a ritual impurity which nullifies the ablution due to the statement of Allah:

أَوْ لَامَسْتُمُ النِّسَاءَ فَلَمْ تَجِدُوا مَاءً فَتَيَمَّمُوا ﴿٤٣﴾

“Or you have been in contact with women (by sexual relations) and you find no water, then do Tayamum” [4:43]

Al Awsat 1/114

What is the intent by contact (with a woman?)

A group from the scholars took the opinion that contact (mentioned) in the verse is intercourse, and from those who said with it is Abdullah Ibn Abbas, Ali, Ataa, and al Hassan

Ibnul Munthir considered it the correct stance because Allah referred to contact (الملامسة) in the Quran as intercourse in more than one verse in his noble book from it his statement:

وَإِنْ طَلَّقْتُمُوهُنَّ مِنْ قَبْلِ أَنْ تَمْسُوهُنَّ وَقَدْ فَرَضْتُمْ لَهُنَّ فَرِيضَةً

“And if you divorce them before you have touched (had a sexual relation with) them, and you have appointed unto them the Mahr (bridal money given by the husbands to his wife at the time of marriage)” [2: 237]

So upon this, contact with a woman with that which is known and is not intercourse is not a nullifier for ablution due to the non-existence of evidence which indicates that. And from that which supports this statement is that which al Bukhari and Muslim reported from Aisha رضي الله عنها She said:

I used to stretch my legs towards the Qibla of the Prophet (ﷺ) while he was praying; whenever he prostrated he touched me, and I would withdraw my legs, and whenever he stood up, I would stretch out my legs again.

And the narration of Abu Qatadah Al Ansaari رضي الله عنه that Allah's Messenger (ﷺ) used to pray whilst he was carrying Umama the daughter of Zainab, the daughter of Allah's Messenger (ﷺ). When he prostrated, he put her down and when he stood, he carried her.

Also that which Muslim reported from Aisha رضي الله عنها

"I noticed that the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم was missing from his bed one night, so when I sought him my hand touched the soles of his feet; he was in the Masjid with his feet upright (prostrating), and he was saying:

اللَّهُمَّ أَعُوذُ بِرِضَاكَ مِنْ سَخَطِكَ، وَبِمُعَافَاتِكَ مِنْ عُقُوبَتِكَ، وَأَعُوذُ بِكَ مِنْكَ، لَا أَحْصِي ثَنَاءً عَلَيْكَ، أَنْتَ كَمَا «أَنْتَيْتَ عَلَيَّ نَفْسِكَ».

'Allahumma inni a'udhu biridaka min sakhatika wa bimu'afatika 'an 'uqubatika, wa a'udhu bika minka, la uhsi thana'an 'alayka, Anta kama athnayta 'ala nafsika (O Allah, I seek refuge in Your pleasure from Your wrath, and in Your forgiveness from Your punishment. I seek refuge in You from You. I cannot praise you enough; You are as You have praised Yourself).'"

Thus these evidences indicate that contact (touching) with a woman isn't a nullifier of ablution, whether that woman is old or young, a Mahram (a woman unlawful to marry due to a close blood relationship) or non-Mahram, with desires or without desires, alive or dead, except if something emits from him which nullifies the ablution, not just by mere contact, rather due to that which emitted. With it Ibn Abbas, Ataa, Tawoos, Masrooq, Al Hasaan, Sufyan, Abu Haneefah, and Al Allamah Al Uthaymeen considered it the correct

Al Awsat 1/123-129 Al Majmoo 1/24-28 Al Mughni 1/257-260 Ash Sharhul Muntia 1/334

A woman's ablution isn't nullified if she touches a man

A woman touching a man doesn't nullify her ablution, whether it be with desires or without desires, non-Mahram or Mahram, except if something emits from her then her ablution becomes nullified due to that which emitted. This is the opinion of Ash Shafiee and other than him, and it is that which is correct due to the absence of proof which indicates it nullifying (ablution).

Al Mughni 1/261

The kiss doesn't nullify the ablution

Kissing isn't a nullifier for ablution, except if Mathi or similar to it comes out due to it, and with that Ataa, Masrooq, Tawoos, and al Hassan said. It was relayed from Ibn Abbas, and is the Mathab of Abu Hanifa, Yaqoob, and Muhammad Ibn Al Hassan and is that which is correct due to the absence of proof in regards to that from the book nor Sunnah nor consensus

Al Awsat 1/122

*Chapter: Apostasy is not a nullifier of Ablution*

The majority of the scholars, from them Abu Haneefa, Maalik, and Ash Shafiee, took the opinion that apostasy is not from the nullifiers of ablution due to the absence of clear proof in regards to that

As for his statement Ta'ala:

وَمَنْ يَرْتَدِدْ مِنْكُمْ عَنْ دِينِهِ فَيَمُتْ وَهُوَ كَافِرٌ فَأُولَئِكَ حَبِطَتْ أَعْمَالُهُمْ

“And whosoever of you turns back from his religion and dies as a disbeliever, then his deeds will be lost in this life and in the Hereafter, and they will be the dwellers of the Fire. They will abide therein forever” [2:217]

Then the loss of actions is restricted to the one who dies upon that.

And the Prophet صلى الله عليه و سلم said:

أَسْلَمْتُمْ عَلَى مَا أَسْلَفْتُمْ مِنْ خَيْرٍ

You accepted Islam upon that which preceded from good

Reported by Muslim (123)

And this is what is correct

Al Awsat 1/237 Al Majmoo 2/61 Al Mughni 1/238

*Chapter: Washing the dead*

Ibn Qudaamah said: “Abul Hasaan at Tameemi said that ablution is not obligated in regards to it and this is the statement of majority of the scholars of jurisprudence, and it is correct because obligation is from the legislation, and no text has come in regards to this nor in its meaning. Thus it remains upon the origin and because it is the washing of a human thus is similar to washing the one alive”

As for the narration

“...he who washes a dead one then let him do Ghusl,

At Tirmidhi reported it and al Bayhaqi deemed that which is correct is that it stops at Abu Huraira (i.e. it is not raised to the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم)

Al Mughni 1/256 An Nayl 2/359

### *Chapter: Vomiting*

A group from the scholars took the opinion that vomiting is a nullifier of ablution, from them Al Awzai, Ataa, Abh Hanifa, and a narration from Ahmad.

They relied upon a narration of Abu Dardaa that the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم vomited, broke his fast and then made ablution

This wording is irregular, the narration is in the Sunan and this addition is not in it. Rather it is only found in some of the manuscripts of At Tirmithi as Ahmad Shaakir mentioned that.

And they used the narration of Aisha رضي الله عنها which is raised to the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم

مَنْ أَصَابَهُ قَيْءٌ أَوْ رُعَافٌ أَوْ قَلَسٌ أَوْ مَذْيٌ فَلْيُنْصِرْفْ فَلْيَتَوَضَّأْ

“Whoever vomits, bleeds through the nose, or released Madhi (urethral discharge) should go perform ablution.

Reported by Ibn Maajah and other than him, Ismaeel Ibn Iyaash raised it from Ibn Jurayj and he is a Hijaazi

The narrations of Ismaeel from the Hijaazi narrators are Munkar (rejected) and what is correct is its Irsaal (being from that which a Tabiee mentioned as the statement of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم), Adh-Dhuhli, Abu Haatim, Ad Daraqutni, Al Bayhaqi and other then them considered that correct as in At Talkhees

For this reason Ash Shafiee, Maalik, Abu Thawr, and Rabeeah held the opinion that it isn't a nullifier of ablution and that is correct due to the proofs not being affirmed in regards to that.

Al Awsat 1/184 Al Majmoo 2/55 Al Mughni 1/247

### *Chapter: Regurgitation*

Regurgitation is not a nullifier of ablution and that was the opinion of Al Hassan, Maalik, Ash Shafiee, Abu Thawr, and it was reported from Az Zuhri and Amr Ibn Dinar

Some of the scholars took the opinion that it is a nullifier, from them Ataa, Qataadah, An Nakhaai, Ash Shabee, Al Hakam and Hamaad, they used as evidence the previous narration from Abu Dardaa and Aishaa, and it preceded that evidence is not established with them due to the severe weakness in them

The correct statement is the first one and it is that which Ibn Al Munthir and other than him deemed the prominent stance

Al Awsat 1/186 Al Majmoo 2/56 Al Mughni 1/247

#### *Chapter: The Nosebleed*

The nosebleed is not a nullifier of ablution, whether it be a lot or little, and Tawoos, Ataa took that view and with that Abu Jaafar, Saalim Ibn Abdillah, Makhool, Rabeeah, Yahya

al Ansaari, Maalik, Ash Shafiee and Abu Thawr said with it.

Ibnul Mussayb, Ibraheem, Qataadah, the companions of opinion, and Ahmad took the opinion of the obligation of ablution due to the nosebleed. The prominent statement is the first one, because obligations are not obligated except by the book, Sunnah or consensus.

There is no proof with those who obligate ablution due to a nosebleed from that which we have mentioned, rather the scholars agreed upon that the one who purifies himself then he is pure, and they differed in regards to that purity being nullified after the occurrence of the nosebleed.

Thus it's not permissible that it nullifies the purification which is agreed upon except with a consensus similar to it or news from the Messenger there is no opposition to it, that is how Ibnul Munthir mentioned, and it is considered. The ruling for Hijaamah and the nosebleed is one.

Al Awsat 1/167 Al Majmoo 1/53 Al Mughni 1/247

#### *Chapter: The emission of Pus*

There is no ablution in regards to the emission of Pus. Al Hassan, Ataa, Abi Mijlaz, Al Awzaee and Ahmad took that opinion and it is that which is correct due to that which preceded and Allah knows best.

Ibnul Munthir considered it the prominent stance

Al Awsat 1/181 Al Majmoo 1/53 Al Mughni 1/249

*Chapter: The emission of Milk from the woman's breast, regurgitation and similar to it*

Ibnul Munthir said: The people of knowledge have agreed that the emission of Milk from the woman's breast doesn't nullify the ablution.

Similarly, spit, sputum, tears which flows from the eye, sweat which emits from the body, the variable burping which emits from the mouth, the air which emits from the nose, and the worms which fallout from the wound do not nullify the purity, and do not obligate ablution.

Al Awsat 1/157

*Chapter: Laughing in the prayer*

Ibnul Munthir said:

The scholars agreed that laughing, so long as there is no loud audible sound, doesn't nullify the ablution.

If a loud audible sound is made while laughing, then An Nawawi said: Our view and the view of the majority of the scholars is that his ablution does not become nullified. Ibn Masooud, Jaabir, Abu Musa, the majority of the Tabieen and those after them held this opinion.

Al Hassan, Ibraheem An Nakhaee, Sufyan At Thawri and Abu Haneefah took the opinion that it is a nullifier of ablution.

The statement of the Majority is more correct due to the weakness of the reported evidences in regards to the nullification of ablution due to laughter during the prayer. Also if it were to be a nullifier it would have been general, whether inside or outside the prayer. The nullifiers of ablution are restricted

and known, it is not increased except with a proof from the book, Sunnah, or consensus.

Al Awsat 1/226 Al Majmoo 2/60

*Chapter: Lying, Backbiting and Harming a Muslim*

Ibnul Munthir said: Everyone whom we have preserved his statement from the scholars of the different lands agreed upon that slandering, the statement of falsehood, lying and backbiting, do not nullify the purification, nor obligate ablution. Similar is the view of the people of Madina, and the people of Kufa from the companions of Opinion and other than them and it is the statement of ash Shafiee, Ahmad, Ishaq. Similarly to this is stealing and deception.

Al Awsat 1/230 Al Majmoo 2/60-61 Al Mughni 1/239

وصلی اللہ وسلم علی نبینا