

International Institute for Islamic Studies
Objective Jurisprudential Research Papers



Ruling on Raising Dogs in Islam

Author

Dr. Khālid Naṣr

Dean of International Institute for Islamic Studies

Translated by

'Aḥmad Khālid

issued by the institute
and distributed for free



First Edition
1444 AH – 2024 AD

Introduction

In the name of Allāh, and peace and blessings be upon the Messenger of Allāh.

This concise research paper is an extension of the original fatwa (i.e., verdict) that I wrote on my website in the section of fatwa. Due to the increasing inquiries about this issue (which is dog keeping), especially in Western countries where owning dogs of various types is prevalent, to the extent that they have enacted specific laws for them, this matter has concerned some members of the Muslim community in general. Consequently, some children requested their parents' permission to raise dogs in their homes. This led to a discussion on various issues related to the matter of raising dogs in homes, such as the purity and impurity of dogs, the impact of such impurity on clothing and furnishings, the ruling on buying and selling dogs, using them as a means of play and amusement, having multiple dogs in one house, and other related matters.

The research paper addresses the issue from several perspectives, as follows:

First Section: What is mentioned about dogs in the Qur'ān and Sunnah.

Second Section: The opinions of jurists regarding the impurity of dogs and the ruling on their sale. This section addresses the following factors:

- **Firstly:** The purity and impurity of dogs.

- **Secondly:** The price of dogs.

Third Section: The ruling on owning dogs for purposes other than the three permissible ones (hunting, herding, and farming).

Conclusion: Our opinion on the matter.

First Section:

What is mentioned about dogs in the Qur'ān and Sunnah

First: The explicit mentions of dogs in the Qur'ān are found in two surahs, and their implicit mention is found in one surah. In Sūrat al-'A'rāf, Allāh likened the state of the misguiding scholar to that of a dog. He said: "The example of him is like that of the dog: if you chase him away, he pants; and if you leave him alone, he pants." [Al-'A'rāf 7:176]. In Sūrat al-Kahf, dogs are mentioned several times, for instance: "while their dog stretched his forelegs at the entrance." [Al-Kahf: 18:18].

As for the third mention of dogs, it is mentioned implicitly in Sūrat al-Mā'idah, describing the state of hunting using hunting animals. Allāh says: "... and what you have trained of trained [in Arabic: mukallibīn] hunting animals." [Al-Mā'idah 5:4]. Aṭ-Ṭāhir ibn 'Aāshūr stated: "The term 'trained' (mukallibīn) is an adjective derived from the [Arabic] unchanged noun, which is the name of the dog [in Arabic: kalb], because the dog was typically used in hunting. Therefore, this description of how the pronoun in 'you have trained' has done the act does not specify the general meaning understood of "what you have trained." This generality [which is understood from using the relative pronoun 'what'] includes animals other than dogs, such as leopards and hawks."¹

Second: The mention of dogs in the Sunnah comes in different

¹ At-Tahrīr wa at-Tanwīr [Verification and Enlightenment] by Aṭ-Ṭāhir ibn 'Aāshūr (6/114-115).

occasions:

- An occasion indicating that dogs are not prohibited:

It is narrated from 'Abdullah ibn 'Umar that he said: "I used to sleep in the mosque in the lifetime of the Messenger of Allah (blessings and peace be upon him) when I was young and bachelor. The dogs would urinate frequently and visit the mosque, and no one would sprinkle over it [i.e., the urine]." ¹

- An occasion regarding the purification of what dogs touch or lick, such as:

1. It is narrated from Abī Hurayrah (may Allāh be pleased with him) that he said: The Messenger of Allāh (blessings and peace be upon him) said: " When a dog licks a utensil belonging to any one of you, (the thing contained in it) should be thrown away and then (the utensil) should be washed seven times." Narrated by Muslim². Al-Bukhāriy also narrated it in his wording as follows: " If a dog drinks from the utensil of anyone of you, it is essential to wash it seven times." ³

2. It is narrated from Abī Hurayrah (may Allāh be pleased with him) that he said: The Messenger of Allāh (blessings and peace be upon him) said: "The purification of the utensil belonging to any one of you, after it is licked by a dog, lies in washing it seven times, using

¹ Documented by Al-Bukhāriy (174), Abī Dawūd in his Sunan (382), and 'Aḥmad in his Musnad (5489).

² Muslim (674).

³ Al-Bukhāriy (172).

sand for the first time." Narrated by Muslim¹, and Muslim also says in another narration: "When the dog licks the utensil, wash it seven times, and rub it with earth the eighth time."²

- An occasion about killing the dogs:

For example, Muslim narrated from Nāfi' from 'Abdullāh who said: "Allah's Messenger (blessings and peace be upon him) ordered the killing of dogs and we would send (men) in Medina and its corners and we did not spare any dog that we did not kill, so much so that we killed the dog that accompanied the wet she-camel belonging to the people of the desert."³

- An occasion indicating the permissibility of keeping dogs for certain purposes:

Al-Bukhāriy and Muslim documented a narration from 'Abadullāh ibn 'Umar from the Prophet (blessings and peace be upon him) who said: "Whoever keeps a dog. Except a dog for hunting or herding livestock, two Qirats will be deducted from his reward each day."⁴

- An occasion for preventing the presence of the angels of mercy by dogs:

There is a narration mentioned in the Two Ṣaḥīḥ (authentic) Collections of Ḥadīth and others that is narrated from Abī Ṭalḥah (may Allāh be pleased with him) from the Prophet (blessings and

¹ Muslim (677).

² Muslim (679).

³ Muslim (4101).

⁴ Al-Bukhāriy (5539) and Muslim (4107).

peace be upon him) who said: "The angels do not enter a house in which there is a dog or a picture."¹

This is a brief presentation of the narrations mentioned in the Sunnah while there are other narrations that we have not mention for brevity.

¹ Al-Bukhāriy (3261) and Muslim (5636).

Second section:
The opinions of jurists regarding the impurity of dogs
and the ruling on their sale

First: The purity and impurity of dogs:

The scholars of various schools of Islamic thought differ regarding the purity and impurity of dogs, and we can categorize their views into two extremes and a middle ground:

The two extremes are: those who assert the absolute impurity of dogs, namely the Shāfi'iys¹ and Ḥanbaliys² in one narration, and those who assert absolute purity of dogs, namely the Mālikiys³ and Zāhiriys⁴. The middle ground argues that dogs are pure except for their saliva, and those who represent this view are the Ḥanafiys⁵.

Ibn Taymiyyah states: "As for dogs, the scholars have three well-known opinions about them. The first: that they are entirely impure,

¹ See: Al-'Umm (The Mother) by Ash-Shāfi'iy (1/18), and Al-Ḥāwiy al-Kabīr (The Grand Container) by Al-Māwardiy (1/56).

² See: Al-'Irshād 'ilā Sabīl ar-Rashād (Direction to the Way of Guidance) by Abī 'Aliy al-Baghdādiy (p. 529), Al-Hidāya 'alā Madhhab al-'Imām 'Aḥmad (Guidance Based on Imām 'Aḥmad's School) by Al-Kalwadhādiy (1/66), and Al-Mughniy (The Enricher) by Ibn Qudāmah (1/35,34).

³ See: Al-'Ishrāf 'alā Nukat Masā'il al-Khilāf (Overseeing the Quips of Points of Disagreement) by Al-Qādiy 'Abd al-Wahhāb al-Baghdādiy al-Mālikiy (1/177), and Al-Kāfiy fī Fiqh 'Ahl al-Madīnah (The Sufficient Jurisprudence of the People of Medina) by Ibn 'Abd al-Barr (1/161).

⁴ See: Nayl al-'Awṭār (Achievement of Ambitions) by Ash-Shawkāniy (1/73).

⁵ See: Al-Mabsūṭ (The Simplified) by As-Sarakhsiy (1/48), and Ḥāshiyat Ibn 'Abidīn (Commentary of Ibn 'Abidīn) by Ibn 'Abidīn (1/204).

including their fur, as stated by al-Shāfi'iy and 'Aḥmad in one of the two narrations from him. The second: that they are pure, including their saliva, as stated by Mālik in the well-known view attributed to him. The third: that their saliva is impure while their fur is pure, and this is the famous opinion of Abī Ḥanīfah, widely accepted by most of his followers. It is also the other narration from 'Aḥmad, and this is the most probable opinion."¹

¹ Majmū' al-Fatāwā (Collection of Fatwas) by Ibn Taymiyah (21/616).

Second: The price of dogs:

Many narrations of Ḥadīth have been mentioned regarding this point:

- Al-Bukhāriy and Muslim narrated from Abī Mas'ūd al-'Anṣāriy (may Allāh be pleased with him) who said that the Messenger of Allāh (blessings and peace be upon him) forbade the price paid for a dog, the hire paid to a prostitute, and the gift given to a soothsayer¹.

Therefore, the majority of scholars are of the opinion that it is not permissible to buy or sell a dog under any circumstances. This is the view of the Shāfi'iys², the Ḥanbaliys³, and others.

Some of the Mālikiys, however, differentiate between a dog that is permitted for specific purposes and others. They permit the sale of the former but have varying opinions on the latter⁴.

On the other hand, the Ḥānafiys hold the view that it is permissible to buy and sell a dog that is allowed by Islamic law for guarding, herding, farming, and similar purposes⁵.

¹ Al-Bukhāriy (2277), and Muslim (4092).

² See: Al-'Umm (The Mother) by Ash-Shāfi'iy (2/253), and Al-Ḥāwīy al-Kabīr (The Grand Container) by Al-Māwardiy (5/375).

³ See: Al-Mughniy (The Enricher) by Ibn Qudāmah (4/189), and Al-'Inṣāf (Impartiality) by Al-Mirdāwiy (4/280).

⁴ See: An-Nawādir wa az-Ziyādāt (Peculiarities and Additions) by 'Abdullāh ibn Abī Zayd al-Qayrawāniy (4/384), Bidāyat al-Mujtahid (The Starting Point of the Beginner Scholar) by Ibn Rushd (3/146), and Al-Bayān wa at-Taḥṣīl (Explanation and Comprehension) by Ibn Rushd (2/599, 8/82).

⁵ See: Al-Ḥujjah 'alā 'Ahl al-Madīnah (Proof against The People of Medina) by

Third section:

The ruling on owning dogs for purposes other than the three permissible ones (hunting, herding, and farming)

The majority of jurists prohibited owning dogs for purposes other than the ones mentioned in the Ḥadīth narrations. Thus, they prohibited owning dogs for companionship or amusement for both adults and children. They even prohibited raising them out of compassion. Therefore, they limited the permissibility of owning dogs to the purposes mentioned in the text only.

They based their view on some pieces of evidence which they thought that they are prohibitive and confirmative to the impurity of dogs. However, I will discuss such pieces of evidence reasonably:

The first evidence:

Al-Bukhāriy and Muslim narrated from Abī Hurayrah that the Messenger of Allāh (blessing and peace be upon him) said: “Whoever holds (amsak) a dog, one Qirat of the reward of his good deeds is deducted daily, unless the dog is used for guarding a farm or cattle.”¹

In addition, ‘Abdullāh ibn Mughaffal (may Allāh be pleased with him) said that the Messenger of Allāh (blessings and peace be upon him) said: “Whoever owns (ittakhadh) a dog for any purpose other than the purpose of hunting, herding or farming, two Qirat of the reward of his good deeds are deducted daily.” [Narrated and rendered

Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ash-Shaybāniy (2/754), At-Tajrīd (Abstraction) by Al-Qudūriy (5/2621), and Al-Mabsūṭ (The Simplified) by As-Sarakhsiy (11/234).

¹ Previously documented.

Ḥasan (good) by At-Tirmidhiy¹, and narrated by An-Nasā'iy² and Ibn Mājah³ as well]. This Ḥadīth has also other narrations mentioned by Imam 'Aḥmad, Muslim, An-Nasā'iy and others. All the narrations have been narrated by a group of companions including Abū Hurayrah, Abū Salamah, 'Amr ibn Dinār, and Abī Khāzim.

Therefore, this Ḥadīth is Ṣaḥīḥ (authentic) in terms of chain of transmission and narration, not only because it is narrated by Al-Bukhāriy and Muslim, but because it has many confirming narrations. However, we notice that the wordings of the previous narrations of the Ḥadīth are not consistent and differ in some matters, such as:

1. The wording of the Ḥadīth narrations varies in using different expressions such as “taking,” “owning,” “holding,” and “tying.”

Although these expressions are close in meaning and some can be interpreted as others, each expression has a unique connotation that can be exclusively inferred from it.

The expression “owning” implies possession, which in some of its connotations involves luxury, the desire for accumulation, and hoarding without reason or necessity.

¹ Sunan at-Tirmidhiy (1566) in the following wording: "No family attaches itself to a dog without a *qirat* of their good deeds being deducted daily, except in the case of a hunting dog, a farm dog, or a sheepdog."

² Sunan an-Nasā'iy (4305) in the following wording: "Whoever keeps a dog, except a dog for hunting, herding livestock or farming, one Qurat will be deducted from his reward each day."

³ Sunan Ibn Mājah (3348) in the following wording: "There are no people who keep a dog, except for dogs used for herding livestock, hunting or farming, but two Qirat will be deducted from their reward each day."

The word “tying” implies confinement, sometimes coupled with neglect and lack of care, which is also sensed in the word “holding.”

2. The narrations of the Ḥadīth differ in the excuses that exempt from the loss of reward or good deeds, as some mention two excuses, while others mention three. Those narrators who mentioned two excuses included farming or hunting, and hunting or herding. Those who mentioned three excuses included hunting, farming, and herding. Was this mentioned by the Prophet (blessings and peace be upon him) in different variations, or is it a single source of information and the difference is due to variations in the narrations according to the memory of the narrators? Some narrators mentioned it in its entirety, while others limited it to some of the excuses.

3. The narrations also differ in the type of good deeds that are diminished, whether it is the action itself or the reward for it. The two expressions (action and reward) have different connotations of course. Likewise, the narrations do not clarify whether the loss occurs in the past action or reward, or the future action or reward.

4. The narrations also differ in the amount of good deeds that is diminished.:

While most of the narrations mention the loss of two Qirats, some mention only one Qirat. Additionally, the expression “Qirat” is a general term, and it is not known from the text what amount it refers to. Is it the same as the Qirat mentioned in the funeral prayer (Ṣalāt al-Janāzah) or is it a different amount?

Similarly, it is not clear from the Ḥadīth whether the dog

mentioned here applies to the species of dogs itself or to a particular type of dogs. If it applies to the a particular type of dogs, does the loss increase with the number of dogs owned? For example, if someone has several dogs or a family of dogs that are not used for the mentioned excuses, is their reward or good deeds diminished by the number of dogs they own, or is it reduced once for all the dogs owned?

Similarly, it is not clear from the texts of the Ḥadīth whether the loss of reward occurs simply by owning the dog or by the absence of an excuse for owning it. For example, if someone buys a dog with the intention of hunting but never goes hunting due to being occupied by something, sick or other reasons, is the intention enough here, or is it necessary to actually engage in the action of hunting?

These are some of the issues we have noticed in the narrations of the mentioned Ḥadīth, and some of the scholars who specialized in Ḥadīth commentary, such as Ibn Ḥajar¹ and An-Nawawiy², have realized some of these issues and attempted to answer them, while remaining silent on others. I mentioned these issues to indicate that even though the Ḥadīth is direct, it is not clear-cut evidence for prohibition, and it is not suitable to be relied upon as the sole evidence. Ultimately, it can be used as an additional proof, as we will explain, God willing.

¹ See: Fath al-Bāriy (Grant of the Creator), (4/426-427, 5/5-7).

² See: Sharḥ an-Nawawiy 'alā Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim (Commentary of An-Nawawiy on Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim), (10/235-240).

Commentary on the narrations:

Firstly, does the loss of reward or good deeds mean prohibition?

This is an important issue that we must pay attention to, and we should look at what has been mentioned in similar cases where the loss of reward is implied. Then, we should see if we can understand from it the meaning of prohibition.

– Al-Bukhāriy narrated a Ḥadīth with his chain of transmission from Abī Hurayrah that the Messenger of Allāh (blessings and peace be upon him) said: “Any person who takes a bath on Friday like the bath of Janaba (i.e., ritual impurity) and then goes for the prayer (in the first hour i.e., early), it is as if he had sacrificed a camel (in Allāh’s cause); and whoever goes in the second hour it is as if he had sacrificed a cow; and whoever goes in the third hour, then it is as if he had sacrificed a horned ram; and if one goes in the fourth hour, then it is as if he had sacrificed a hen; and whoever goes in the fifth hour then it is as if he had offered an egg. When the Imām comes out (i.e., starts delivering the Khuṭbah (speech)), the angels present themselves to listen to remembrance (i.e., the Khuṭbah).”¹

Muslim narrates in his wording the following: “and when the Imām sits (on the pulpit) they fold up their scrolls and get ready to listen to the remembrance (i.e., the Khuṭbah).”²

This Ḥadīth indicates the difference in the rewards of those who attend Friday prayers, either with an increase or a decrease. Whoever

¹ Al-Bukhāriy (889).

² Muslim (2021).

comes early and attends the prayer first earns the greatest reward, while whoever comes late loses some of their reward compared to the first group. Whoever comes even later than that loses even more of their reward, which continues to decrease until the reward for coming early is exhausted, and there is no more virtue left for the general public.

Does this Ḥadīth imply that coming second is prohibited or disliked due to the loss of reward compared to the first group who come early? Does it also imply that those who do not come early, even if they do not receive a reward equivalent to that of an egg, are sinful for not rushing to attend the Friday prayer although they performed it?

– Al-Bukhāriy and Muslim from Abī Hurayrah that the Messenger of Allāh (blessings and peace be upon him) said: “He who attends the funeral till the prayer is offered for (the dead), for him is the reward of one Qirat, and he who attends (and stays) till he is buried, for him is the reward of two Qirats. It was said: What are the two Qirats? He said: They are equivalent to two huge mountains... Sālim ibn ‘Abdullāh ibn ‘Umar added: Ibn ‘Umar used to pray and then depart (without waiting for the burial of the dead). When the narration of Abī Hurayrah reached him, he said: “We have lost many Qirats.”¹

The basis for inference here is that whoever does not attend the funeral or perform the funeral prayer at all will lose two Qirats, and whoever only attends the prayer without attending the burial will lose one Qirat. Does this mean that someone who does not attend either the

¹ Al-Bukhāriy (1338), and Muslim (2222). The mentioned wording is Muslim's.

funeral or the prayer is sinful or doing so is disliked? Is the same said for someone who only loses one Qirat by not attending the burial?

– Muslim and Sunan compilers narrated that the Prophet (blessings and peace be upon him) said: “If anyone prays the evening prayer in company, it is as though he had remained awake in prayer half the night; but if anyone prays the Morning Prayer in company, it is as though he had prayed the whole night.”¹

This Ḥadīth indicates that the complete reward for performing night prayer is obtained by performing both prayers, and whoever misses one of them will lose some of their reward, and whoever misses both will lose the reward for performing night prayer altogether. Does this mean that someone who does not pray in company is sinful, with the possibility of having an excuse? Does the loss of reward here imply dislike or prohibition?

Therefore, relying on the issue of the loss of reward or good deeds alone is not suitable evidence, nor does it indicate prohibition or dislike. The principle is that whoever leaves the recommended acts (Sunnah) will lose some of their reward, but we do not say they are sinful, and whoever leaves the optional acts (Mandūb) will lose some of their reward, but we do not say they are sinful.

Secondly, does the mentioned loss of reward occur merely by owning a dog, with the absence of the excuses mentioned in the narrations, or are there other reasons for the loss of reward for owning

¹ Muslim (1523), Abū Dawūd (555), At-Tirmidhiy (221), Muwaṭṭā’ Mālik (Well-trodden Path) (296), and Ad-Dāramiy (1273).

a dog?

Here I will quote a text from Imām Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr who said: “The reason for the loss of reward mentioned in this Ḥadīth, in my view and Allāh knows best, is related to the religiously scrupulous practices related to dogs, such as washing a container seven times if a dog licks it. These practices are difficult to implement and difficult to avoid because the person who owns a dog cannot be certain that the dog has not licked the container... By neglecting these practices, the person commits a sin and disobeys God, leading to a decrease in their reward... Alternatively, the loss of reward may be due to the person not treating dogs kindly, as it is known that any act of kindness towards living creatures is rewarded.”¹

What Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr mentioned is a probable explanation for the loss of reward, not merely by owning a dog. Another possibility is that the loss of reward may be due to dogs barking, biting, or causing fear², as the Prophet (blessings and peace be upon him) forbade causing fear.

However, a dog trained for hunting, farming, or herding is friendly and does not imply this meaning. The Prophet (blessings and peace be upon him) warned us of this possibility as a precaution. This also means that the loss of reward is not absolute due to owning dogs, but rather depends on the particular circumstances, which is different from the previous interpretation.

Thirdly, the permissible excuses mentioned are hunting, herding,

¹ At-Tamhīd (The Preamble) by Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr (14/222).

² See: Faṭḥ al-Bāriy (5/6).

and farming.

The question is: are these things intended for their own sake, or did the Prophet use them as examples to be a reference measurement of people's needs and circumstances?

Those who look at the Sunnah of the Prophet (blessings and peace be upon him) in similar cases find that the Prophet (blessings and peace be upon him) used to mention things not for their own sake, but for giving examples, with the possibility of analogy if the need arises. I will give only two examples for this reasoning:

The first example is the prohibition of the six categories of ribā al-faḍl (surplus usury), which are gold, silver, dates, salt, wheat, and barley.

Are these things mentioned in the Ḥadīth intended for their own sake, or did the Prophet (blessings and peace be upon him) use them because of their popularity at that time? For example, is excessive difference permissible in exchanging iron, copper, sapphires, pearls, and platinum, which are more valuable than gold?

The majority of scholars from the four schools of Islamic thought have concluded that all of these items should be analogous to the six mentioned categories of surplus usury, and that ribā al-faḍl applies to other things as well, even though the wording of the Ḥadīth only mentions the six¹.

¹ See: Tabyīn al-Ḥaqā'iq Sharḥ Kanz ad-Daqā'iq (Clarification of Truth by Commentary on Treasure of Details) by Az-Zayla'iy (4/85), Al-Qawānīn al-Fiqhiyyah (Jurisprudential Laws) by Abī al-Qāsim al-Ghirmāṭiy (p. 168), Al-

The second example is the obligation of Zakāt al-Fiṭr (fast-breaking charity):

The Prophet (blessings and peace be upon him) made it mandatory as a sā' [a unit of measurement] of dates, barley, raisins, or dried milk. Can we work out analogy and pay it from corn, wheat, rice, or fruit, which are a common part of people's daily sustenance but are not mentioned in the Ḥadīth?

The majority of scholars argue that we can use analogy for Zakāt al-Fiṭr. Ibn al-Qayyim said in 'I'lām al-Muwaqqi'īn (Informing Those who are Authorized): "If their daily sustenance is not from grains, such as milk, meat, and fish, they should pay Zakāt al-Fiṭr from their daily sustenance, whatever it may be. This is the view of the majority of scholars, and this is the correct opinion that cannot be disputed."¹

Therefore, if analogy is permissible regarding the specification that is mentioned in the text for sharing an underlying cause with other cases, then there is no harm in expanding the analogy to cover excuses other than what is mentioned in the Ḥadīth. An-Nawawiy said in Sharḥ Muslim (Commentary on Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim):

"It is permissible to own it (i.e., the dog) for hunting, herding and farming. However, is it permissible to own it for guarding houses and roads? There are two views: one that it is not permissible due to the

Majmū' Sharḥ al-Muhadhdhab (The Collection on Commentary of the Refined) (11/230), Al-Mughniy (The Enricher) by Ibn Qudāmah (4/135), and Al-Fiqh 'alā al-Madhāhib al-'Arba'ah (Jurisprudence based on the Four Schools of Islamic Thought) by Al-Jaziriy (2/226).

¹ 'I'lām al-Muwaqqi'īn (Informing Those who are Authorized) (3/12).

explicit meaning understood from the Ḥadīth narration which indicate prohibition except for farming, hunting or herding. The current view is that it is permissible based on analogy with the three mentioned excuses, depending on the underlying cause understood from the narrations which is the necessity.”¹

Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr said in *At-Tamhīd* (The Preamble): “I believe that owning dogs is permissible for all useful purposes and to prevent harm if a person needs it.”²

Ibn Ḥajar said: “The correct view according to the Shāfi‘iy school of Islamic thought is that it is permissible to own dogs for guarding roads and for other purposes that serve the same purpose as mentioned in the text.”³

Therefore, we would conclude the following:

- There is no harm in owning a dog to guide a blind person on the road.
- It is not prohibited to use it to recognize criminals and smugglings for police work,
- It is not prohibited to be used by an old woman or man who is left alone in the house and has no one to talk to or keep them company except their dog.
- It is also not prohibited to use dogs in war against enemies, as the Russians did with the Germans in World War II.

¹ *Sharḥ an-Nawawiy ‘alā Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* (10/236).

² *At-Tamhīd* (14/219) by Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr.

³ *Fath al-Bāriy* (5/7) by Ibn Ḥajar.

These things and others that have an excuse that can be assessed based on what is mentioned in the text. This relates to the first evidence, which is the loss of reward and good deeds.

The second evidence:

The opponents, who hold the view of prohibition, rely on what is mentioned in the Sunnah regarding the angels not entering a house where there is a dog. I will now elaborate on this claim from two perspectives:

First: From the perspective of narration:

Several narrations have been mentioned in the authentic books that state that angels do not enter a house in which there is a dog, such as:

– Al-Bukhāriy narrated with his chain of transmission from Sālim ibn ‘Abdullāh from his father who said: “Once Gabriel promised to visit the Prophet (blessings and peace be upon him) but he delayed and the Prophet (blessings and peace be upon him) got worried about that. At last, he came out and found Gabriel and complained to him of his grief (for his delay). Gabriel said to him, “We do not enter a place in which there is a picture or a dog.””¹

In Muslim’s wording, it is mentioned as follows: “You promised me and I waited for you, but you did not come, whereupon he said: It was the dog in your house which prevented me (to come).”²

– ‘Aḥmad narrated with his chain of transmission from Abī Ṭalḥah al-’Anṣāriy that the Messenger of Allāh (blessings and peace be upon

¹ Al-Bukhāriy (6026).

² Muslim (5633).

him) said: “Angels do not enter a house in which there is a dog or a picture.”¹

– Ibn Mājah narrated with his chain of transmission from ‘Aliy ibn Abī Ṭālib that the Prophet (blessings and peace be upon him) said: “Angels do not enter a house in which there is a dog or a picture.”²

These are some narrations of the Ḥadīth, and we can understand from their apparent meaning the following:

- 1- Some narrations specifically mentioned Jibrīl among the angels.
- 2- Others referred generally to all those who are called by this name (angels).

Second: From the perspective of the jurisprudence of Ḥadīth, I would say:

1-The issue of angels not entering a particular house or refraining from accompanying a group of people has been mentioned in various contexts in the Sunnah, including:

– Abū Dawūd, An-Nasā’iy and ‘Aḥmad narrated from ‘Aliy ibn Abī Ṭālib that the Prophet (blessings and peace be upon him) said: “The angels do not enter a house in which there is a picture, a dog, or a Junub (i.e., a person who is sexually impure).”³

Although some scholars have weakened this Ḥadīth, others have considered it good (Ḥasan)⁴, and it has an addition which is sexual

¹ Musnad al-Imām ‘Aḥmad (Collection of Related Narrations) (16606).

² Sunan Ibn Mājah (3803).

³ Sunan Abī Dawūd (227), Sunan an-Nasā’iy (263), and Musnad ‘Aḥmad (642).

⁴ See Naṣb ar-Rāyah (lit. Establishment of the Flag) by Az-Zayla’iy (2/98).

impurity (janabah).

– Abū Dawūd narrated with his good chain of transmission from ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir (may Allāh be pleased with them) that the Messenger of Allah (blessings and peace be upon him) said: “There are three whom the angels do not approach, the dead body of an infidel, one who is smeared with khalūq (yellow or red perfume mostly composed of saffron), and one who is sexually defiled unless he performs ablution.”¹

This narration adds the dead body of an infidel and smearing with khalūq.

– Muslim narrated with his chain of transmission from Abī Hurayrah that the Messenger of Allah (blessings and peace be upon him) said: “The angels do not go along with a travelling company in which there is a dog or a bell.”²

This narration mentions the bell, which is what is hung on the neck of a camel and produces a sound.

– Abū Dawūd narrated from Bunanah, female client of ‘Abd ar-Raḥmān b. Ḥassān al-’Anṣāriy said that when she was with ‘Aā’ishah, a girl wearing little tinkling bells was brought in to her. She ordered that they were not to bring her in where she was unless they cut off her little bells. She (‘Aā’ishah) said: I heard the Messenger of Allah (blessings and peace be upon him) say: The angels do not enter a house in which there is a bell.”

¹ Sunan Abī Dawūd (4182).

² Muslim (5668).

This Ḥadīth is also mentioned by ‘Abd ar-Razzāq in his Muṣannaf (The Classification)¹, and Ibn Abī Shaybah in his Muṣannaf as well².

– Aṭ-Ṭabarāniy also narrated in Al-’Awsaṭ (The Most Moderate) from ‘Abdullāh ibn Yazīd that the Prophet (blessings and peace be upon him) said: “No urine should be left in a container in the house, for verily the angels do not enter a house in which there is urine in a container, and do not urinate in a bathing container.”³

This narration mentions urine -I apologize for the explicitness- and this means that angels do not enter places of urination, such as bathrooms and toilets.

Therefore, we are facing several reasons that prevent angels from entering houses:

(Images – Dogs – Sexual impurity (janabah) – The corpse of a disbeliever – khalūq- The sound of bells and anklets – Urine).

The question here is: Do these narrations align with what has been established in the authentic Sunnah, which permits some of the aforementioned actions that prevent angels from entering houses?

For example, if we take sexual impurity (janabah), could the Prophet (blessings and peace be upon him) remain in a state of janabah while knowing that angels refrain from entering his house, which makes staying in such a state forbidden?

Sexual impurity (janabah) can occur for two reasons:

¹ Muṣannaf ‘Abd ar-Razzāq (19699).

² Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah (25446).

³ Al-Mu’jam al-’Awsaṭ (The Most Moderate Compilation) by Aṭ-Ṭabarāniy (2077).

- Wet dreams and their equivalents.
- Sexual intercourse, whether from a man or a woman.

The Two Shaykhs (i.e., Al-Bukhāriy and Muslim) narrated from 'Aā'ishah that she said: "The dawn broke upon the Messenger of Allah (blessings and peace be upon him) during the Ramaḍān in a state of junub not because of sexual dream (but on account of intercourse) and he washed himself and observed fast."¹

Muslim narrated from 'Umm Salamah that she said: "The Messenger of Allah (blessings and peace be upon him) (was at times) junub on account of intercourse and not due to sexual dream, but he neither broke the fast nor recompensed."²

At-Tirmidhiy, An-Nasā'iy, Abū Dawūd, Ibn Mājah and 'Aḥmad narrated from 'Aā'ishah that she said: "Allah's Messenger (blessings and peace be upon him) used to sleep in the state of sexual impurity without touching water."³

These narrations indicate, in their wording, that the Prophet (blessings and peace be upon him) sometimes did not rush to perform ghusl (full ablution) from sexual impurity (janabah). So, can we say that the Prophet (blessings and peace be upon him) committed a forbidden act because his delay in performing ghusl prevented angels from entering his house? Is this valid in our minds?

Does a person commit a sin by delaying ghusl as long as they do

¹ Al-Bukhāriy (1964), and Muslim (2646).

² Muslim (2647).

³ Abū Dawūd (228), At-Tirmidhiy (118), Ibn Mājah (634), and 'Aḥmad (24795).

not miss a prayer just because angels do not enter their house?

So, what do we say about Ḥanzalah, who was called “the one washed by the angels”? His story is well-known: he responded to the call of jihād without performing ghusl from sexual impurity (janabah), and he was a newlywed. After he was martyred, the angels washed him.

So why did not the angels turn away from him?

3- What is said about sexual impurity (janabah) also applies to dogs. This is because the Prophet (blessings and peace be upon him) allowed people to keep dogs if there was a reason such as hunting, guarding, or herding. We have worked out analogy for other reasons. So, is it reasonable that the Prophet (blessings and peace be upon him) allowed us to keep dogs and then prevented us from taking the means to do so, and therefore, he allowed us to keep dogs and then prevented us from doing so by stating that the angels refrain from entering houses in which there are dogs?

This is like someone saying, “You should engage in jihād, but it is not permissible for you to buy a sword.” Perhaps someone might claim, “The narration about angels not entering the houses is general, but the narration allowing the keeping of dogs is specific to certain reasons.”

We would say: Yes, this is a valid understanding, and it is what Imām al-Khattābiy concluded when he said, “Angels do not enter a house in which there is a dog or an image that is prohibited to be kept. As for dogs and images that are not prohibited to be kept, such as dogs

that are used for hunting, herding, or guarding and images that are used for decoration rugs, cushions, and the like, angels are not prevented from entering because of them.”¹

Nevertheless, we say that this specification should not be limited to the reasons mentioned in the Ḥadīth as we have previously established that they are for representation or for inclusive restriction, not for exclusive restriction.

3- This Ḥadīth cannot be applied in a general sense because its generality contradicts the established fact, meaning that the word “angels” does not include all angels, but rather certain types must be exempted. This is because we know that every person has two angels who record his good deeds and bad deeds, and they never leave him. Allāh Almighty says: “Man does not utter any word except that with him is an observer prepared [to record].” [Qāf 50:18], “No! But you deny the Recompense. And indeed, [appointed] over you are keepers, Noble and recording;” [Al-’Infiṭār 82:9-11], and “There is no soul but that it has over it a protector.” [Aṭ-Ṭāriq 86:4]. Ibn ‘Abbās said regarding the verse: "There is no soul but that it has over it a protector." [Aṭ-Ṭāriq 86:4], “It has a protector from the angels.” In *At-Tashīl li ‘Ulūm at-Tanzīl* (Facilitation of Sciences of Revelation) by Ibn Juzayy, it is stated: “The meaning according to the majority is that every soul of the children of Adam has a protector who records its deeds, meaning the protective (recording) angels.”²

¹ See: *Sharḥ an-Nawawiy ‘alā Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* (14/84).

² *At-Tashīl fī ‘Ulūm at-Tanzīl* (Facilitation of Sciences of Revelation) (2/559).

So, can we say that the recording angels do not enter a house because there is a dog in it? Or can we say that the Angel of Death refuses to enter a house because there is a dog in it? This implies that people would evade death by keeping dogs!!!

Therefore, the angels mentioned in the Ḥadīth cannot include all types of angels. Rather, they are a specific type, and scholars have differed in identifying them.

Ibn Ḥibbān mentioned that the Ḥadīth refers to the angel of revelation¹ and he cited the narrations that speak of Jibrīl, and the meaning is that revelation is suspended from descending upon the Prophet in the presence of a dog, as a way of honoring revelation. This also applies to other things such as sexual impurity, the sound of bells, and urine, as each of them prevents the descent of revelation. Perhaps the angels mentioned in the Ḥadīth may be the angels of blessing and mercy, not the angels in general, as the majority of scholars have suggested².

However, the apparent meaning is that the general sense is not intended.

4- The refusal of angels from entering houses does not mean that the cause, which is owning a dog, is forbidden as some may think. This is because angels are special creatures that are affected by some

¹ Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān (13/167).

² See Sharḥ an-Nawawiy 'alā Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim (14/84), An-Nahr al-Fā'iq Sharḥ Kanz ad-Daqa'iq (The Major River for Commentary on The Treasure of Details) (1/284), and Ḥashiyat ibn 'Aābdīn (1/649).

things, and this is to honor angels, not to forbid such things. The evidence for this is:

– Muslim, An-Nāsā’iy, and ’Aḥmad narrated on the authority of Jābir ibn ’Abdullāh that the Prophet (blessings and peace be upon him) said: “He who eats of this (offensive) plant, i.e, garlic, and sometimes he said: He who eats onion and garlic and leek, should not approach our mosque for the angels are harmed by the same things as the children of Adam.”¹

Therefore, shall we consider eating onion forbidden because angels are affected by it? Perhaps someone might reply in affirmation. To such person I reply with the Ḥadīth that is narrated by Muslim that the Prophet (blessings and peace be upon him) said: “O people, I cannot forbid (the use of a thing) which Allāh has made lawful, but (this garlic) is a plant the odor of which is repugnant to me.”²

This is the greatest Prophet, who is more honored than angels, dislikes something but does not consider it forbidden for merely personal dislike. So how can we forbid something just because it hurts some types of angels?!

The question to those who use the Ḥadīth as evidence for prohibition is: Is it permissible for us (people) to enter a house that has a dog or a picture in it?

Ibn Qudāmah answered this when he said: “Ibn ’Aā’idh narrated in Futūḥ ash-Shām (Conquests of Sham) that when the Christians

¹ Muslim (1282), An-Nasā’iy (715), and Musnad ’Aḥmad (15245).

² Muslim (1284).

prepared food for ‘Umar (may Allāh be pleased with him) upon his arrival in Sham (Syria), they invited him. He asked, “Where is it?” They replied, “In the church.” He refused to go and said to ‘Aliy, “Go with the people and let them eat.” So ‘Aliy went with the people, entered the church, and ate with the Muslims. ‘Aliy looked at the pictures and said, “There is no harm for the Commander of the Believers if he entered and ate.” This is a consensus among them on the permissibility of entering and eating in a place with pictures (like a church). Since entering churches is not forbidden, likewise, entering houses with pictures where angels do not enter does not make it forbidden for us, as if there were a dog in it. It is not forbidden for us to be in the company of someone with a bell, even though angels do not accompany them. Rather, leaving the invitation for the sake of avoiding those things is a punishment for the doer and a warning to him. Allāh knows best.”¹

This is the end of Ibn Qudāmah’s words in *Al-Mughniy*, which need no further comments.

5- Angels have their own unique actions, and we are not commanded to imitate them. They do not eat, drink, marry, or disobey Allāh, and they only have one way which is obedience. Therefore, it is impossible to compare them to those who engage in all of these actions.

6- The reason why angels do not enter a house where there is a dog is not because of the dog itself, as dogs are present everywhere just

¹ *Al-Mughniy* (7/283).

like angels. Rather, the reason, as mentioned by Imām An-Nawawiy, is due to the impurities, bad odor, insects, and other such things that may be associated with the dog¹.

Therefore, I would like to say:

1. The Ḥadīth cannot be applied to all dogs because some dogs are permitted, and the Prophet (blessings and peace be upon him) would not permit something that is forbidden.

2. The mention of angels in the Ḥadīth does not include all angels without exception.

3. The fact that angels dislike something or abstain from it does not mean that this thing is forbidden.

4. We should not look at the actions of angels as a model of worship since these actions are beyond our capability, and we are not commanded to imitate them in their affairs.

5. The reason for the angels' abstention from entering houses wherein dogs is probable and not specific to dogs themselves since they are present everywhere.

6. The angels abstain from entering houses for reasons other than the dog, and yet we do not say that such reasons are forbidden.

In general, this Ḥadīth is not suitable to be used as evidence for prohibition.

The third evidence:

Those who oppose owning dogs support their claim by the narration that establishes that the Prophet (blessings and peace be

¹ See: Sharḥ an-Nawawiy (14/84).

upon him) ordered the killing of dogs, and they said: If they were not forbidden, killing them would not have been allowed.

I would like to comment on this argument in the same way I used earlier:

Firstly, from the perspective of narration:

The order to kill dogs is mentioned in more than one Ḥadīth, including:

– Al-Bukhāriy and Muslim narrated with his chain of transmission from Mālik from Nāfi' from Ibn 'Umar that the Messenger of Allāh (blessings and peace be upon him) ordered dogs to be killed¹.

– In another narration, it is narrated that the Prophet (blessings and peace be upon him) ordered dogs to be killed, and he sent (men) to the corners of Medina that they should be killed².

– In another narration, it is narrated that the Prophet (blessings and peace be upon him) ordered the killing of dogs and we (Ibn 'Umar is narrating) would send (men) in Medina and its corners and we did not spare any dog that we did not kill, so much so that we killed the dog that accompanied the wet she-camel belonging to the people of the desert³.

– In another narration, it is narrated that the Prophet (blessings and peace be upon him) ordered the killing of dogs except the dog tamed for hunting, or watching of the herd of sheep or other domestic

¹ Al-Bukhāriy (3358), and Muslim (4099).

² Muslim (4100).

³ Muslim (4101).

animals. It was said to Ibn ‘Umar (may Allāh be pleased with them) that Abu Hurayrah (may Allāh be pleased with him) talks of (exception) about the dog for watching the field, whereupon he said: Since Abū Hurayrah (may Allāh be pleased with him) possessed a field¹.

– Jābir narrated that the Messenger of Allāh (blessings and peace be upon him) ordered us to kill dogs, and we were even killing a dog which a woman brought with her from the desert. Afterwards God’s messenger forbade us to kill dogs, saying, “Confine yourselves to the type which is pure black and has two spots, for it is a devil.”²

– ‘Abdullāh ibn Mughaffal said: “The Messenger of Allāh (blessings and peace be upon him) ordered the killing of dogs and then said: what is the trouble with them (the people of Medina)? How dogs are nuisance to them (the citizens of Medina)? He then permitted keeping of dogs for hunting and (the protection of) herds.”³

– In another narration by ‘Abdullāh ibn Mughaffal, the following is said: “He permitted the keeping of dogs for (the protection of) herds, for hunting and (the protection of) cultivated land.”⁴

Therefore, the previous authentic narrations state the following:

1- The Prophet (blessings and peace be upon him) ordered the killing of dogs, and this is general for all dogs.

¹ Muslim (4102).

² Muslim (4103).

³ Muslim (679, 4104).

⁴ Muslim (680, 4105).

2- He excluded from killing the hunting, farming, and grazing dogs at a certain stage.

3- At another stage, he excluded all dogs except for the black dog, because devil transforms in its shape.

4- At a later stage, he forbade his companions from killing dogs and said: “What is the matter with them and the dogs?” meaning, why have they gone too far in killing them.

Secondly, from the perspective of the jurisprudence of Ḥadīth:

One who contemplates over these narrations finds that killing dogs was not due to the reason that owning them is prohibited. This is because the Prophet ordered their killing for a specific reason, and when that reason was no longer present, he prohibited them from killing dogs except for the rabid dog. This is mentioned in the Ḥadīth of killing vicious and harmful animals¹.

If killing dogs was due to their prohibition, the Prophet (blessings and peace be upon him) would not have forbidden his companions from going too far in killing them.

Abū Dawūd and others narrated from Al-Ḥasan from ‘Abdullāh ibn Mughaffal who said: the Messenger of Allāh (blessings and peace be upon him) said: “Were dogs not a species of creature I should have commanded that they all be killed; but kill every pure black one.”²

Therefore, dogs, like other animals, are part of Allah’s creation and

¹ Narrated by Muslim (2928), An-Nasā’iy (2900), and ‘Aḥmad (5227).

² Abū Dawūd (2847), At-Tirmidhiy (1563), An-Nasā’iy (4297), and Ibn Mājah (3348).

it is not appropriate to eliminate them from the earth.

Thirdly, Imām An-Nawawiy said in his commentary on Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim: “They (scholars) differed regarding killing that which causes no harm. Imām al-Ḥaramayn among our companions said: The Prophet (blessings and peace be upon him) initially ordered the killing of all dogs, then he abrogated that and prohibited killing them except for the black dog, then the ruling of Sharīʿah settled on prohibiting the killing of all dogs that do not cause harm, whether black or otherwise. This is supported by what is mentioned in the Ḥadīth of Ibn al-Mughaffal.”¹

This opinion viewed by Al-Nawawi concludes that the Prophet abrogated his first order with the second and that the ruling settled on the latter.

However, what is meant here is not to say that there was abrogation, but rather to say that there was ʿijtihād (personal reasoning) by the Prophet (blessings and peace be upon him) to protect the interests of the people who were ordered to kill dogs for reasons that may have included the spread of a large number of dogs in Medina, their aggression towards people, or the mixing of rabid dogs with others, which required a generalization. Killing was a ruling based on the ruler’s ʿijtihād on purpose, and when the purpose disappeared, the Prophet (blessings and peace be upon him) eliminated the ruling.

This approach is more preferable than the view of abrogation, as it

¹ Sharḥ an-Nawawiy (10/235).

opens the door to 'ijtihād (personal reasoning) when the necessity reappears again. So, if dogs become too numerous and breed excessively, which is known as an epidemic, then there is no harm in killing them and limiting their numbers. If dogs become a danger and rabies spreads among them, it is permissible to kill them to prevent harm and prioritize human life. Al-Qāḍiy 'Iyāḍ mentioned the difference of opinion among scholars regarding this matter between abrogation and other justifications, and he said: "Many scholars have concluded that the Ḥadīth should be taken into account in killing dogs, except for hunting dogs and others. This is the view of Mālik and his companions. Those who hold this view differed whether the ruling of hunting dogs and the like is abrogated in light of the first general ruling on killing dogs, or whether killing was general for all dogs except for those exceptions. Others have concluded that it is permissible to keep all dogs. The ruling of killing and prohibiting owning them was abrogated, except for the black dog."¹

Therefore, I would like to say that the order of the Prophet (blessings and peace be upon him) to kill dogs, whether it was 'ijtihād or an abrogated ruling, does not indicate the prohibition of owning them in the presence of permissive texts. The ultimate view that can be inferred from it is the dislike of having too many dogs and their widespread presence, and this is what we tend to hold.

¹ 'Ikmāl al-Mu'allim bi Fawā'id Muslim (Providing the Teacher with Knowledge of Muslim) by Al-Qāḍiy 'Iyāḍ (5/242).

Conclusion:

Our opinion on the matter

Owning a dog for a predominant benefit is permissible, whether for the purposes that are mentioned in the Sunnah or for other purposes, such as using them to track criminals, guide the blind, alert of guests' arrival, and other similar purposes.

We also incline towards the opinion of the Mālikiy school of Islamic thought and those who agree with them regarding the purity of dogs as a whole, and this is based on the following reasons:

-The permission to hunt with dogs, which requires biting and mixing of their saliva with the prey, and nothing that is prohibited can be used in something that is permissible.

– The Ḥadīth narrated by Ibn 'Umar regarding the dogs passing through the mosque and not washing what they have touched.

– In (Sunan ad-Dāraquṭniy), it is narrated from Abī Hurayrah that the Messenger of Allāh (blessings and peace be upon him) was asked about cisterns that are placed between Macca and Medina from which dogs and wild animals drink. He replied: “They have in their bellies what they have taken, and what remains is pure for us and drinkable.”¹

– The Two Shaykhs narrated from Abī Hurayrah that the Prophet (blessings and peace be upon him) said: “A man saw a dog eating mud from (the severity of) thirst. So, that man took a shoe (and filled it) with water and kept on pouring the water for the dog till it quenched its thirst. So, Allah approved of his deed and made him to enter

¹ Sunan ad-Dāraquṭniy (58).

Paradise.”¹

If dogs were impure, there would not be any reward for them.

Therefore, there is no objection to buying and raising dogs, and they are not impure. However, it is precautionarily recommended to wash the container in which they drink.

Likewise, there is evidence indicates the permissibility of keeping dogs for children: Narrated from Abū Hurayrah: The Messenger of Allāh (blessings and peace be upon him) said: “Gabriel (peace be upon him) came to me and said: I came to you last night and was prevented from entering simply because there were images at the door, for there was a decorated curtain with images on it in the house, and there was a dog in the house. So, order the head of the image which is in the house to be cut off so that it resembles the form of a tree; order the curtain to be cut up and made into two cushions spread out on which people may tread; and order the dog to be turned out. The Messenger of Allāh (blessings and peace be upon him) then did so. The dog belonged to Al-Ḥasan or Al-Ḥusayn and was under a couch.”²

In *Nayl al-ʿAwṭār* (Achievement of Ambitions), Ash-Shawkāniy said: “His saying: “The dog belonged to Al-Ḥasan or Al-Ḥusayn,” refers to the permissibility of raising a puppy for a young child.”³

¹ Al-Bukhāriy (173), and Muslim (5996).

² Narrated by Abī Dawūd (4160), At-Tirmidhiy (3036) who rendered it Ḥasan, An-Nasāʿiy (5382), and ʿAḥmad (8160).

³ *Nayl al-ʿAwṭār* (Achievement of Ambitions) (2/121).

In summary, I would like to say:

1. The evidence presented by those who prohibit owning dogs does not serve, in my view, as proof for the claim of prohibition. Rather, it can only be taken to indicate dislike.

2. There is evidence available that permits owning dogs for benefit and need, which vary based on time and place.

3. It is permissible to use analogy based on the excuses mentioned in authentic narrations, which are farming, grazing, and hunting, and there is a difference of opinion among scholars regarding the extent of similar excuses.

4. The evidence that indicates the purity of dogs is strong and consistent with the widespread use of dogs throughout Islamic history, in the presence of Imams and scholars.

5. If we did not apply abrogation to the narration about the puppy of Al-Ḥasan or Al-Ḥusayn being raised, it would still be evidence for the permissibility of owning a puppy for children without observing any of the excuses mentioned.

6. This matter is subject to disagreement, and there is no definitive evidence to the extent that those who differ are criticized for opposing the correct view.

7. Arab and Islamic heritage has shown great tolerance towards the issue of dogs, with some tribes even being named after dogs like Banī Kalb, the tribe of Kalb (dog), and Banī Kilāb, the tribe of Kilāb (dogs).

Dogs are also mentioned in Arabic poetry without any negative connotations.

Can all this be applied to an impure, prohibited thing?

Dr. Khālid Naṣr

Boston 2017

International Institute for Islamic Studies
Objective Jurisprudential Research Papers



Ruling on Raising Dogs in Islam

Author

Dr. Khalid Naşr

Dean of International Institute for Islamic Studies

Translated by

Aḥmad Khālid

issued by the institute
and distributed for free

