

Naşb and the Nawāşib

A doctrinal study in light of the position of the Ahl al-Sunnah

By:

Badr ibn Nāşir ibn Muḥammad al-‘Awwād

WWW.MAHAJJAH.COM

Transliteration key

أ- 'ā	ض - ḍ
آ - ā	ط - ṭ
ب - b	ظ - ṣ
ت - t	ع - 'c
ث - th	غ - gh
ج - j	ف - f
ح - ḥ	ق - q
خ - kh	ك - k
د - d	ل - l
ذ - dh	م - m
ر - r	ن - n
ز - z	و - w, ū
س - s	ه - h
ش - sh	ي - y, ī
ص - ṣ	

Contents

Introduction	7
The Reason for Choosing the Topic	9
The Objectives of the Study	10
The Structure of the Study	10
The procedure of the study	12
The Ṣaḥābah and their Status according to the Ahl al-Sunnah	16
The literal meaning of a Ṣaḥābī:	16
The Technical Definition of a Ṣaḥābī:	16
The First Position	17
The Second Position	20
The Third Position	22
The Fourth Position	24
The Fifth Position	25
The Status of the Ṣaḥābah <small>رضي الله عنهم</small> , their Integrity and their Rights	28
The integrity of the Ṣaḥābah <small>رضي الله عنهم</small>	34
Their Rights	36
The Ahl al-Bayt and their Status according to the Ahl al-Sunnah	49
The Root Letters of the word Āl:	49
The first view	49
The second view	49
The Technical Meaning of Āl	50
The First View	51
The Second View	54
The Third View	60
The Fourth View	63
The Fifth View	66
Conclusion	69
The Status of the Ahl al-Bayt according to the Ahl al-Sunnah	69
The First Chapter - The Concept of Naṣb, its History and the Stances of the Umayyad and the Abbasid Rulers regarding it	81
The First sub-chapter	81

The concept of Naṣb between the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Twelver Shī'ah	81
The First Discussion	83
The Concept of Naṣb according to the Ahl al-Sunnah	83
The Two phases of Naṣb	90
The First Phase	90
The Second Discussion	103
The Concept of Naṣb according to the Twelver Shī'ah	103
The First Position	105
The Second Position	111
Khawārij	121
The Ahl al-Sunnah	121
The first view	122
The second view	122
The Shī'ah besides the Twelvers	124
The First view	124
The second view	124
The Second Sub-Chapter	126
The History of Naṣb and the Efforts of the Ahl al-Sunnah in Combatting it	126
The First Discussion - The Inception of Naṣb	127
The Issues Raised against 'Uthmān	133
Nepotism: Appointing his Relatives	133
His Absence in the Battle of Badr	137
His Fleeing on the Day of Uḥud from the Battle field	137
His Absence in the Pledge of Riḍwān	138
Demarcating a Sanctuary	138
Compiling the Qur'ān	138
The Second Discussion - The Causes of its Inception	167
The first category: Plausible causes, which are the following:	167
The First Cause: The martyrdom of 'Uthmān <small>رضي الله عنه</small>	167
The Second Cause: The Battles:	168
The Third Cause: The Belief that 'Alī <small>رضي الله عنه</small> was a Kāfir	172
The Fourth Cause: Fanaticism Regarding 'Alī <small>رضي الله عنه</small>	173
The Fifth Cause: The Influence of the Rulers:	175
The Sixth Cause: The Influence of Society	175

The Seventh Cause: The Effects of the <i>Quṣāṣ</i> (story tellers)	178
The Eighth Cause: Love for the World	180
The Ninth Cause: The Revolts of the ‘Alawīs	182
The Second category: Implausible causes	183
The First Cause: Competition between the Banū Hāshim and the Banū Umayyah which existed in the days of <i>Jāhiliyyah</i> (ignorance).	183
The Second Cause: Killing of fathers and relatives	190
The Third Discussion - The Loci of Naṣb	195
The first category: Areas where the excommunicating Nawāṣib existed, i.e. the Khawārij	199
The Khawārij in the East	199
The Khawārij in the West	206
The Second Category: Areas where Nawāṣib other than the Khawārij existed.	218
The Nawāṣib in the East	218
Nawāṣib in the West	229
The Fourth Discussion - The Efforts of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā’ah in Refuting them	227
The First Category:	236
1. Narrating the merits of ‘Alī <small>عليه السلام</small> and his household:	236
2. Authoring books regarding the merits of ‘Alī <small>عليه السلام</small> and the Ahl al-Bayt and their rights	240
The Second Category: Their Efforts in Countering the Detractors of ‘Alī <small>عليه السلام</small> and the Ahl al-Bayt	243
1. Narrating Aḥādīth which condemn the Khawārij and exhort fighting them	244
2. Debating the Khawārij and Proving them Wrong In their Stances	246
3. Fighting the Khawārij	248
4. Condemning the Detractors of ‘Alī <small>عليه السلام</small> and Rebutting their Claims:	249
5. Not Narrating from the Nawāṣib	263
The Third Sub-Chapter	271
The First Discussion - The Stance of the Umayyad Khulafā’	272
The first perspective: The Umayyads and the non-excommunicating Nawāṣib.	273

The First Aspect: The Religious Aspect:	284
The Second Aspect: The familial aspect:	286
The Third Aspect: The Political Aspect	292
The first reason: Their passion to rule exclusively.	292
The Second Reason: The Alawids coveting the Khilāfah	312
The Third Reason: The Shī'ah of the Alawids	315
1. The Role of the Khulafā'	317
2. The Role of the Governors	337
Form 1: Reviling him and granting permission for his revilement	338
Form 2: Ordering people to Revile him and Disassociate from him:	343
The Second Perspective: The Umayyads and the excommunicating Nawāṣib	348
The Second DiscussionThe Stance of the Abbasid Rulers	352
1. The stance of the Abbasids regarding 'Alī <small>رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ</small>	356
2. The stance of the Abbasids regarding the Alawids	358
Manner in which the Abbasids countered Alawid rebellions	372
1. Military confrontation	372
2. Ideological clashes	379



Introduction

All praise is for Allah. We praise Him, seek help from Him, and beseech Him for His forgiveness. We seek His refuge from the evils of ourselves and from our bad deeds. No one can misguide the one whom Allah has guided and no can guide the one whom Allah has misguided.

I testify that there is no deity besides Allah; He is alone and has no partner. I testify that Muḥammad is His servant and Messenger.

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا اتَّقُوا اللَّهَ حَقَّ تَقَاتِهِ وَلَا تَمُوتُنَّ إِلَّا وَأَنتُمْ مُسْلِمُونَ

O you who have believed, fear Allah as He should be feared and do not die except as Muslims [in submission to Him].¹

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ اتَّقُوا رَبَّكُمُ الَّذِي خَلَقَكُمْ مِنْ نَفْسٍ وَاحِدَةٍ وَخَلَقَ مِنْهَا زَوْجَهَا وَبَثَّ مِنْهُمَا رِجَالًا كَثِيرًا وَنِسَاءً وَاتَّقُوا اللَّهَ الَّذِي تَسَاءَلُونَ بِهِ وَالْأَرْحَامَ إِنَّ اللَّهَ كَانَ عَلَيْكُمْ رَقِيبًا

O mankind, fear your Lord, who created you from one soul and created from it its mate and dispersed from both of them many men and women. And fear Allah, through whom you ask one another, and the wombs. Indeed Allah is ever, over you, an Observer.²

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا اتَّقُوا اللَّهَ وَقُولُوا قَوْلًا سَدِيدًا يُصْلِحْ لَكُمْ أَعْمَالَكُمْ وَيَغْفِرْ لَكُمْ ذُنُوبَكُمْ وَمَنْ يُطِيعِ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ فَقَدْ فَازَ فَوْزًا عَظِيمًا

O you who have believed, fear Allah and speak words of appropriate justice.³ He will [then] amend for you your deeds and forgive you your sins. And whoever obeys

1 Sūrah Āl 'Imrān: 102.

2 Sūrah al-Nisā': 1.

3 Sūrah Ahzāb: 70.

Allah and His Messenger has certainly attained a great attainment.^{1,2}

Now to our topic:

After Allah ﷻ favoured me by making me a student of higher studies, on the master's level, of 'Aqīdah, belief, and contemporary schools therein; I preferred that the topic of my thesis for this level be **Naṣb and the Nawāṣib, a doctrinal study in light of the position of the Ahl al-Sunnah**. This was after I had sought goodness from Allah ﷻ.

This is because studying any innovative denomination which has surfaced in the early stages of the history of this Ummah, knowing the causes of its inception, studying its doctrinal views, identifying its link with other Islamic denominations, and thereafter ascertaining the position of the Ahl al-Sunnah regarding it is of utmost importance. In order to identify the areas of deviance and their causes, and answer and refute the misconceptions of the deviants, which is pivotal.

In addition, many of the other leanings, like *Irjā'*, *I'tizāl*, and *Tashayyu'* have been thoroughly studied and analysed. *Naṣb*, however, remains neglected since the bygone eras without any light being shed on it; it has always remained distant from academic research which could reveal its unknown aspects.

1 Sūrah Aḥzāb: 72.

2 This is the Khuṭbah al-Ḥājjah, the sermon of need, which Nabī ﷺ would teach his companions, as is reported by Ibn Ma'sūd رضي الله عنه. It appears in the following books: Abū Dāwūd: *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*: chapter of Nikāḥ: sub-chapter regarding Khuṭbah al-Ḥājjah: ḥadīth no. 2118; al-Tirmidhī: *Sunan al-Tirmidhī*: chapter of Nikāḥ: subchapter regarding Khuṭbah of Nikāḥ: ḥadīth no. 1105; al-Nasā'ī: *Sunan al-Nasā'ī*: chapter of Nikāḥ: sub-chapter regarding the speech which is recommended in Nikāḥ: ḥadīth no. 3277; Ibn Mājah: *Sunan Ibn Mājah*: chapter of Nikāḥ: subchapter regarding the Khuṭbah of Nikāḥ: ḥadīth no. 1893. The ḥadīth is considered Ḥasan by al-Tirmidhī, in his *Sunan*, and Ibn al-Mulaqqan in *al-Badr al-Munīr* 7/531). Albānī has considered it to be Ṣaḥīḥ in his book *Ṣaḥīḥ wa Ḍa'īf Sunan Abī Dāwūd*. He has also dedicated a booklet to it with the title: *Khuṭbah al-Ḥājjah al-latī kān Rasūl Allah Yu'allimuhā Aṣḥābahū* (the sermon of need which Nabī ﷺ would teach his companions).

The Reason for Choosing the Topic

1. According to my knowledge, there is no dedicated study on this topic. Thus it is important that the veils be raised from a leaning regarding which very little is known.
2. The concept of *Naşb* is a convoluted one; The Ahl al-Sunnah use it for a specific meaning and their opponents use it for another completely different meaning. Hence this calls upon the researchers to clarify and elucidate its true implications.
3. It falls part of defending the integrity of some of the Şahābah رضي الله عنهم and plays a significant role in debunking the attacks which tarnish their reputation, (together with stating the position of the Ahl al-Sunnah regarding them).
4. It has a very strong link with stating the rights of the Ahl al-Bayt and the refutation of those who fall short of fulfilling them by clearly elucidating the position of the Ahl al-Sunnah regarding them.
5. Some denominations have always accused the Ahl al-Sunnah of *Naşb*. It thus makes it compulsory upon the researchers to debunk these accusations and render them baseless.
6. Understanding this concept will help in protecting the probity of some scholars who have been accused of it falsely, like al-Aşmāī and Ibn Taymiyah amongst others.
7. It will set the parameters of the speech which is permissible regarding the Ahl al-Bayt, in terms of the Sharī viewpoint, and of that which falls under the ambit of *Naşb*.

There is no doubt that the unclarity of these aspects on the one hand, and the lack of understanding regarding the various methods of debate and argumentation on the other, have led to some people accusing Ibn Taymiyah of *Naşb* due to some things which appear in his monumental work *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyah*.

The Objectives of the Study

1. Dedicating an in-depth study to the topic of *Naşb* and *Nawāşib*. This will enrich the Islamic library with an academic study which will shed light upon one of the innovative leanings.
2. Defending the position of the Ahl al-Sunnah and exonerating them from what is attributed to them.
3. Bringing to the fore the efforts the Ahl al-Sunnah have made in refuting the *Nawāşib*.
4. Combatting the opponents by debunking their arguments and falsifying their claims.

The Structure of the Study

The Introduction: This entails the reasons for choosing the topic, the objectives of the study, its structure, and the method of preparation.

Prologue: A brief discussion regarding the Şaḥābah and the Ahl al-Bayt and their status according to the Ahl al-Sunnah.

Chapter 1: The concept of *Naşb*, its history and the position of the Umayyad and the Abbasids rulers in its regard; therein there are three sub-headings:

1. The concept of *Naşb* between the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Twelver Shī'ah. This will include two discussions:
 - a. The concept of *Naşb* according to the Ahl al-Sunnah.
 - b. The concept of *Naşb* according to the Twelver Shī'ah.
2. The history of *Naşb* and the contributions of the Ahl al-Sunnah in combatting them. This will include four discussions:
 - a. Its inception.
 - b. The causes of its inception.

- c. The areas of *Naṣb*.
 - d. The efforts of the Ahl al-Sunnah in combatting them.
3. The position of the Umayyad and Abbasid rulers with regard to *Naṣb* and the *Nawāṣib*. This will include two discussions:
- a. The position of the Umayyad Rulers.
 - b. The position of the Abbasid rulers.

Chapter 2: The *Nawāṣib* in the past and the *Nawāṣib* in the present. Hereunder there will be two sub-headings:

1. The *Nawāṣib* in ancient times, between reality and mere claims. Under this there will be two discussions
 - a. Those regarding who *Naṣb* is established.
 - b. Those who were accused of *Naṣb*, but regarding who it is not established.
2. *Naṣb* and other Islamic denominations. Under this there will be three discussions:
 - a. The link between *Naṣb* and *Khurūj*.
 - b. The link between *Naṣb* and *Tashayyu'*.
 - c. The link between *Naṣb* and *I'tizāl*.
3. The *Nawāṣib* in the present, between denial and approval. This will include two discussions:
 - a. The deniers of their existence.
 - b. The affirmers of their existence.

Chapter 3: The views of the *Nawāṣib* and their refutation. Herein there are two subheadings:

1. The views of the *Nawāṣib* and their refutation, which will include three discussions:

- a. The views of the *Nawāṣib* regarding the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ.
 - b. The views of the *Nawāṣib* regarding the Ahl al-Bayt رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ.
 - c. The views of the *Nawāṣib* regarding ‘Alī and Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا.
2. Their status. This will entail two discussions:
 - a. Their status according to the Twelver Shī‘ah.
 - b. Their status according to the Ahl al-Sunnah.

Conclusion: The crux of the study.

Bibliography: Includes a bibliography of the verses of the Qur’ān, the ḥadīths, scholars, and various denominations.

The procedure of the study

1. I have given the reference of the Sūrah and the verse number for all the verses of the Qur’ān which appear in the core text.
2. The ḥadīth which appear in the text are referenced in the following way:
 - a. If a ḥadīth appears in the *Ṣaḥīḥayn* or one of them, I have sufficed on attributing it to its source due to the Ummah unanimously accepting their narrations as authentic.
 - b. Any ḥadīth which appears in a source other than the *Ṣaḥīḥayn*, I have only referenced it from the reliable collections of ḥadīth. I have also cited the grading of the scholars which I came across regarding that particular ḥadīth.
 - c. When giving the reference of any ḥadīth I have mentioned the following:
 - The Ṣaḥābī who narrates it, if he is not mentioned in the core text.
 - The name of the book, the chapter, and the number of the ḥadīth if it appears in any of the collections which are

arranged according to chapters. When citing narrations from collections other than the above I have sufficed on mentioning the number of the ḥadīth, if there is any, or else the number of the volume and page.

- The sequence of the references wherein the ḥadīth appears will be detailed as follows: *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*, *Sunan al-Nasā'ī*, *Sunan Ibn Mājah*. As for the collections besides these, the sequence will revolve around ancientness and seniority.
 - When alluding to a ḥadīth which is narrated whose approximate meaning is transmitted (with a slight variation from the actual words), I will suffice on indicating to its source with the volume and page number without any further detail.
3. I have referenced everything that I have cited by mentioning its source. And I have enlisted the references in a chronological order save in a few places, like when the cited text appears in its entirety in a later text, etc.
 4. I have endeavoured to place vowel signs on the noble ḥadīths, the quotations of the *Ṣaḥābah* and the unclear names, etc.
 5. I have commented on all the beliefs in which the *Nawāṣib* have opposed the Ahl al-Sunnah.
 6. Although the term *Nawāṣib* is inclusive of those who deviated regarding 'Alī عليه السلام, irrespective of whether they excommunicated him or not, but at times I have shed more light upon those *Nawāṣib* who do not excommunicate him because I believe that that might be more befitting; like for instance when a detailed discussion has already passed regarding the excommunicating *Nawāṣib*, etc.
 7. I have penned the biographies of the scholars and luminaries who appear in this work, but with the exception of the *Ṣaḥābah*, the four Imāms, the authors of the nine ḥadīth collections and Ibn Taymiyyah and Ibn al-Qayyim.

8. I have given a brief introduction to the various sects and denominations which appear in the book.
9. I have likewise given brief details regarding places and cities and have explained the less common words which appear in the discussion.
10. I have delayed the detailed descriptions of the various references and sources till its bibliography due to my distaste for repetition and the elongation of the study.

Furthermore, although I have presented the manner of the study, but I am quite sure that treading the path accordingly is not going to be easy. Rather there will be a number of difficulties which will be encountered. Most prominent among them is the following:

1. This topic has not been isolatedly studied and academically researched in a way that would make it easy for the researcher to tread the path.
2. There are no references which specifically provide information regarding *Naşb* wherefrom the researcher can draw his information directly, and whereupon he can rely when discussing various aspects of the topic. Hence one can only learn of the various positions and beliefs of the *Nawāʿib* by way of an array of means and sources.
3. Undertaking a study of this nature demands the exertion of ones capabilities and application of ones strengths. This is in order to have an encompassing idea of the sources pertaining to the various spheres of knowledge and to undertake a lengthy journey through the commentaries of ḥadīth, the transmitter biographies, the specific and general books of heresiography and the sources of history, all of this in an effort to put together what is scattered in different places and to link everything which has some sort of relationship to the topic.

Moving on, the choicest and the purest of praises all belong to Allah ﷻ Who has favoured me by enabling me to study this topic and complete it. To Him

belongs all praise in the beginning and at the end, outwardly and inwardly, such praise that is proportionate to His bounties and reciprocative of His additional favours.

I would thereafter thank my beloved parents for all the efforts they have exerted in my good upbringing and the dispensation of sound advice. This study is nothing but a result of their support and their supplications.

I would also like to thank my wife who withstood all my shortfalls during the duration of my preparation of this study.

Lastly, I would especially like to thank my two advisors:

1. The great scholar and Professor Yūsuf ibn Muḥammad al-Saʿīd, who honoured me by agreeing to oversee my thesis, blessed me with his wonderful opinions and deep comments. I have benefitted tremendously from his graceful character, noble ethics, and immense humility.
2. His excellence, Shaykh ʿAbd al-Rāḍī Muḥammad ʿAbd al-Muḥsin.

May Allah elevate their status and grant them goodness and blessings in their knowledge and practice.

Lastly, this is the efforts and contributions of the one who possesses meagre knowledge and this is its end-result. Whatever good is contained in it is from Allah alone, and whatever wrong is contained in it is from me and from Shayṭān. I beseech Allah **سُبْحَانَكَ رَبِّي** to favour me by overlooking my shortcomings and accepting my efforts.

وصلى الله على نبينا محمد وعلى آله وصحبه أجمعين

The Ṣaḥābah and their Status according to the Ahl al-Sunnah

The literal meaning of a Ṣaḥābī:

The root letters Ṣ, Ḥ, B mean: to live with and the word *Ṣuḥbah* means companionship. These root letters always give the meaning of one thing accompanying another and being close to it,¹ as stated by Ibn Fāris.²

The plurals of the word *Ṣāḥib* are: *Aṣḥāb*, *Aṣāḥīb*, *Ṣaḥb*, *Ṣiḥāb*, *Ṣuḥbah*, *Ṣuḥbān*, *Ṣaḥābah* and *Ṣiḥābah*.

The word *Ṣaḥābī* is attributed either to the word *Ṣaḥābah*, which is the verbal noun of the verb *Ṣaḥiba* and *Ṣāḥaba*, or to the plural of the word *Ṣāḥib*, which is the active participle of the verb *Ṣaḥiba*.³

The Technical Definition of a Ṣaḥābī:

This is a very crucial issue wherein the scholars have debated and their views have differed. The crucialness thereof is owing to the various issues which are linked to it, like the preservation of their high rank, dubbing them as people of probity, and accepting their narrations, even if they are *Mursal*, inconsistent,⁴ without taking the trouble of investigating their integrity. This issue is thus normally discussed in the books of the sciences of ḥadīth, the biography dictionaries of the Ṣaḥābah, and the principles of Fiqh.

1 *Maqāyīs al-Lughah* 3/335.

2 Aḥmad ibn Fāris ibn Zakariyyā al-Hamdānī, Abū al-Ḥasan al-Rāzī. A senior lexicographer and author. He was born in Hamadan or Qazvin in the year 306 A.H. He was well versed in the Mālikī School and was an expert in theology. He wrote innumerable abridgements. He passed away in 395 A.H. Some of his works are the following: *al-Mujmal fī al-Lughah*, *Maqāyīs al-Lughah* and *al-Ṣāḥībī*. See *al-Tadwīn fī Akhbār Qazwīn* 2/215; *Wafayāt al-A'yān* 1/118; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 17/103; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 11/335.

3 *Al-'Ayn* 3/124; *al-Muḥkam wa al-Muḥīṭ al-A'zam* 3/168; *Lisān al-'Arab* 1/520; *al-Qāmūs al-Muḥīṭ* p. 134.

4 *Al-Manhal al-Rawī* p. 45; *Muqaddamah Faṭḥ al-Bārī* 1/350; *Tadrīb al-Rāwī* 1/207; *Qawā'id al-Taḥdīth* p. 143.

Hereunder are the various positions of the scholars in this regard:

The First Position

الصحابي هو من لقي النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم مؤمنا به ومات على الإسلام

A Ṣaḥābī is a person who met Nabī ﷺ believing in him and passed away upon Islām.¹

With a little more detail:

من لقي النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم يقظة مؤمنا به بعد بعثته حال حياته ومات على الإيمان

A person who met Nabī ﷺ whilst awake, believing in him after his prophethood during his lifetime, and passed away upon īmān.²

This is the position of majority of the ḥadīth scholars³ and is also the position of some of the scholars of the principles of Fiqh.⁴ It is the preferred opinion.

Imām Aḥmad says:

كل من صحبه سنة أو شهرا أو يوما أو ساعة أو رآه فهو من أصحابه، له من الصحبة على قدر ما صحبه

Anyone who accompanied him for a year, a month, a day or even an hour, or merely saw him is from his Companions. Each one has attained his companionship proportionate to the time he accompanied him.⁵

1 *Nuzḥah al-Naẓr* p. 28; *al-Iṣṣābah fī Tamyīz al-Ṣaḥābah* 1/353; Raḍī al-Dīn al-Ḥalabī: *Qafw al-Athar* 1/89; *al-Munāwī al-Yawāqīt wa al-Durar* 2/200. Also see: *al-Subkī: al-Ibhāj* 1/15; *Tadrīb al-Rāwī* 2/209.

2 *Ṣaḥābah Rasūl Allah ﷺ fī al-Kitāb wa al-Sunnah* p. 39. Also see: *al-Kifāyah* p. 50; *al-Taḥqīq wa al-Idāh* p. 295; *Faḥḥ al-Mughīth* 3/93.

3 *Taḥqīq Munīf al-Rutbah* p. 32; *Irshād al-Fuḥūl* p. 129.

4 *Bayān al-Mukhtaṣar (Sharḥ Mukhtaṣar Ibn al-Ḥājib)* 1/716.

5 *Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥanābilah* 1/243; *al-Kifāyah* p. 192; *al-Kalūdhānī: al-Tamhīd* 3/173; *Faḥḥ al-Mughīth* 3/93.

Al-Bukhārī says:

من صحب النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم أو رآه من المسلمين فهو من أصحابه

Any Muslim who accompanied Nabī ﷺ or saw him is from his Companions.¹

The proofs for this stance being correct are the following:

Firstly, according to all the scholars of Arabic companionship does not have a specific limit in language.² It is a common/gender noun which applies to two things which share something in common, whether little or lot, literally or metaphorically.³

Consider the following verses:

مَا ضَلَّ صَاحِبِكُمْ وَمَا غَوَىٰ

*Your companion [i.e., Muhammad] has not strayed, nor has he erred.*⁴

مَا بِصَاحِبِكُمْ مِّنْ جِنَّةٍ

*There is not in your companion any madness.*⁵

وَمَا صَاحِبُكُم بِمَجْنُونٍ

*And your companion [i.e., Prophet Muhammad] is not [at all] mad.*⁶

1 Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī 3/1335.

2 Al-Kifāyah p. 51; al-Manhal al-Rawī p. 111; al-Taḥqīd wa al-Īdāh p. 296; Fath al-Mughīth 3/93.

3 Al-Āmidī: Al-Iḥkām 2/104; Majmū' Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām 4/464; al-Samīn al-Ḥalabī: 'Umdah al-Ḥuffāz 2/320; Ibn al-Wazīr: al-'Awāṣim wa al-Qawāṣim 1/387.

4 Sūrah al-Najm: 2.

5 Sūrah al-Sabā: 46.

6 Sūrah al-Takwīr: 22.

Allah ﷻ has deemed His Nabī ﷺ a companion of his people, and it is common knowledge to all that some of his people did not accompany him but for a very short time.

Likewise, consider the following verses:

وَصَاحِبُهُمَا فِي الدُّنْيَا مَعْرُوفًا

And accompany them in [this] world with appropriate kindness.¹

This injunction is inclusive of all companionship even if it be very short.

فَأَنْجَيْنَاهُ وَأَصْحَابَ السَّفِينَةِ

But we saved him and the companions of the ship.²

Allah ﷻ has deemed them ‘the companions of the ship’ whereas their companionship therein was not for long.

يَوْمَ يَفِرُّ الْمَرْءُ مِنْ أَخِيهِ وَأُمِّهِ وَأَبِيهِ وَصَاحِبَتِهِ وَبَنِيهِ

On the Day, a man will flee from his brother. And his mother and his father. And his wife and his children.³

This is also inclusive of every wife, whether the marriage with her was for a lengthy period of time or for a short period of time.

Secondly, if a person takes the following oath, ‘I will never accompany you,’ or ‘You will not accompany me on my journey,’ his oath will be violated if the addressee accompanies him even for the shortest of periods.⁴

1 Sūrah Luqmān: 15.

2 Sūrah al-‘Ankabūt: 15.

3 Sūrah ‘Abas: 34-36.

4 Al-Wāḍiḥ fī Uṣūl al-Fiḥ 5/61; al-Iḥkām fī Uṣūl al-Aḥkām 2/104.

Lastly, if someone says, “I accompanied so and so,” it will be correct to ask him, “Have you accompanied him for an hour, a day, or more than that? Have you assimilated knowledge from him and narrated from him or not?” Had *Ṣuḥbah* (companionship) not been inclusive of all these cases and had it been specific to a particular time frame and case there would be no need for any of these questions.¹

The Second Position

A *Ṣaḥābī* is:

من رأى النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم واختص به اختصاص صاحب بالمصحوب، وطالت مدة صحبته، وإن لم يرو عنه

A person who saw Nabī ﷺ and had a special relationship with him, akin to the relationship of a companion with the person he is accompanying, his period of companionship is long, even though he does not narrate from him.²

This is the position of a group of scholars of the principles of *Fiqh*.³ And some have deemed this to be the stance of the majority.⁴

Al-Ḥakīm al-Tirmidhī,⁵ whilst commenting upon the narration, “My companions

1 *Al-Iḥkām* 2/104.

2 *Ibid.* 2/104. *Al-Musawwadah* p. 263.

3 *Al-Iḥkām* 2/104; *al-Musawwadah* 263; *al-Baḥr al-Muḥīṭ fī Uṣūl al-Fiqh* 3/360; *Taḥqīq Munīf al-Rutbah* p. 33.

4 See: *al-Taqrīr wa al-Taḥbīr* p. 15.

5 Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn Bishr al-Tirmidhī, Abū ‘Abd Allāh, well known as ‘al-Ḥakīm al-Tirmidhī’. An ascetic ḥadīth scholar who was disinclined from this world. He heard a great amount of ḥadīths in Khorasan and Iraq. Later, toward the end of his life, he was banished from Tirmidh and was dubbed a disbeliever due to his book *Khatm al-Wilāyah* whereafter he settled in Balkh. He passed away in 285 A.H. The following are some of his books: *Nawādīr al-Uṣūl*, *Ḥaqā’iq al-Tafsīr* and *Riyāḍah al-Nafs*. See: *Tārīkh al-Islām* 21/276; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 13/439; *al-Dāwūdī: Ṭabaqāt al-Mufasssīrīn* p. 56; *al-A’lām* 6/272.

are like stars, whoever you will follow you will be guided,”¹ states:

وليس المراد به (أي الصحابي) من لقي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أو بايعه أو رآه رؤية واحدة، وإنما أراد (يعني النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم) من لازمه غدوة وعشية، وكان يتلقى الوحي منه طريا ويأخذ عنه الشريعة التي جعلت منهجاً للأمة، وينظر منه إلى آداب الإسلام وشمائله

The intended (by the word companions) is not a person who met Rasūl Allāh ﷺ, pledged allegiance to him or saw him once. Rather he (Nabī ﷺ) is referring to those who accompanied him morning and evening, received from him the knowledge of revelation when it was freshly revealed, learnt the Sharīah from him, which is the constitution of this Ummah, and assimilated from him the ethics of Islam and its attributes.²

This group has thus considered prolonged companionship of Nabī ﷺ to be a condition rather than merely narrating from him.

The evidence for their position is drawn from language and from convention, as asserted by al-Sam‘ānī³ who says:

اسم الصحابي من حيث اللغة والظاهر يقع على من طالقت صحبتته مع النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم وكثرت مجالسته، بخلاف الرواية عنه صلى الله عليه وسلم، فإن اشتراطها لتتحقق مفهوم الصحبة بعيد لغة وعرفا

1 Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr has cited the narration of Jābir ibn ‘Abd Allāh رضي الله عنه in *Jāmi’ Bayān al-‘Ilm wa Faḍlih* 2/91, and ‘Abd ibn Ḥumayd has cited the narration of Ibn ‘Umar, which is slightly variant, in his *Musnad* p. 250, amongst others. The ḥadīth is not authentically established in any of its transmissions. See: *Khulāṣah al-Badr al-Munīr* 2/431; *A’lām al-Muwaqqi’in* 2/242; *Talkhīṣ al-Ḥabīr* 4/191; *al-Silsilah al-Ḍa’īfah* 1/144.

2 *Nawādir al-Uṣūl* 3/62.

3 Manṣūr ibn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Tamīmī, Abū al-Muzaḥfar al-Sam‘ānī. A versatile scholar and an author of many books. He was born in Khorasan in 426 A.H. He grew up and studied there as well. He was one of the leading scholars of the Ḥanafīs who studied the school and mastered it. Thereafter he reverted to the Shāfi‘ī School. He passed away in 490 A.H. Some of his books are the following: *al-Iṣṭilām*, *al-Radd ‘alā al-Rāwandī* and *Qawāṭi’ al-Adillah*. See *al-Ansāb* 3/299; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 19/114; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 12/153; *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi’iyyah al-Kubrā* 5/335.

The term *Ṣaḥābī* in terms of language and its obvious meaning applies to a person who accompanied Nabī ﷺ for a long time and sat with him frequently,¹ as opposed to merely narrating from him ﷺ; for considering it (narrating) to be a requisite for the realisation of the *Ṣuḥbah* is far-fetched according to language and convention.²

However, considering prolonged companionship to be a requisite is weak due to the following reasons:

1. It is against the unanimity of the scholars of language.
2. Resorting to convention to ascertain the extent of lengthy companionship and short companionship is not definitive, and thus the differences of opinion.³
3. Based upon this stance, some *Ṣaḥābah*, like Mālik ibn al-Ḥuwayrith رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, who narrated from Nabī ﷺ but did not accompany him for a long time, will be excluded.⁴

The Third Position

A *Ṣaḥābī* is:

من طالت صحبته للنبي صلى الله عليه وسلم وأخذ عنه العلم

A person who accompanied Nabī ﷺ for a long time and acquired knowledge from him.⁵

1 Qawāṭi' al-Adillah p. 392.

2 Abū Ya'lā: *Al-'Uddah fī Uṣūl al-Fiqh* 3/989; al-Ṣan'ānī: *Ijābah al-Sā'il Sharḥ Bughyah al-Āmil* p. 129.

3 Ibn Ḥazm: *al-Iḥkām* 5/86; *al-Baḥr al-Muḥīṭ fī Uṣūl al-Fiqh* 3/360.

4 *Irshād al-Fuḥūl* p. 129.

5 *Al-Iḥkām* 2/1041; *Tadrib al-Rāwī* 2/216; *Irshād al-Fuḥūl* p. 129; *al-Fuṣūl al-Lu'lu'iyah* p. 308.

This position is attributed to Jāhiz.¹

Based upon this position, two requirements need to be met in order for one to be deemed a Ṣaḥābī:

1. An extended duration of companionship with Nabī ﷺ, which will be measured by convention.
2. Narrating from Nabī ﷺ, for assimilating knowledge from him, even though it be by observing one of his actions, in consideration of his companionship, is necessary. And it is common knowledge that the most prime objective of companionship is the dispensation of rulings.²

This position is flawed due to the following reasons:

1. Considering extended companionship to be a requisite is against the literal purport of the word.
2. Resorting to convention in determining extended or short companionship is not definitive, as has passed already.
3. People who have not narrated anything at all from Nabī ﷺ but accompanied him for an extended period of time have always been considered to be Ṣaḥābah,³ to the extent that some have deemed this to be the unanimous position of the entire Ummah. One such person is Ziyād

1 *Al-Wāḍiḥ fi Uṣūl al-Fiqh* 5/60; *al-Musawwadah* p. 263; *Fatḥ al-Mughīth* 3/103; *Manḥaj Dhawī al-Naẓr* p. 215.

Jāhiz is 'Amr ibn Baḥr, ibn Maḥbūb al-Kinānī, Abū 'Uthmān al-Baṣarī, famously known as Jāhiz. A Mu'tazilite theologian who was a master in the Arabic language. He was born in 163 A.H. He adopted Mu'tazilism due to the influence of al-Nazzām and one of its sub-sects, the Jāhizīyyah, is attributed to him. He authored many books, among them are the following: *al-Bayān wa al-Tabyīn*, *al-Ḥayawān* and *al-Bukhalā'*. He passed away in Basrah in 255 A.H. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 12/212; *al-Muntaẓam* 12/93; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 45/431; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 11/526.

2 *Tahqīq Munīf al-Rutbah* p. 33; *Ghāyah al-Wuṣūl* p. 104.

3 *Tahqīq Munīf al-Rutbah* p. 33.

ibn Ḥaṇḏalah al-Tamīmī; his companionship of Nabī ﷺ is established, but he is not reported to have narrated a ḥadīth from him.¹

4. Deeming the transmission of ḥadīths from him a requisite for companionship is improbable in terms of language and convention. Because they neither inherently include it nor do they suggest it.²

The Fourth Position

A Ṣaḥābī is:

من أقام مع النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم سنة أو سنتين وغزا معه غزوة أو غزوتين

A person who stayed with Nabī ﷺ for a year or two, and participated with him in one or two expeditions.³

This is the narrowest of all the positions. It is said to be the position of Saʿīd ibn al-Musayyab but is not confirmed from him.⁴

In reality this position also reflects the requisiteness of extended companionship which brings about a change in a person in terms of his conduct and traits, etc.⁵

This position is also flawed for the following reasons:

1. Deeming extended companionship a requisite is against the unanimity of the linguistics.

1 *Al-Istīʿāb* 2/531

2 *Fawātiḥ al-Raḥamūt* 2/158.

3 *Al-Kifāyah fī ʿIlm al-Riwāyah* p. 50; *al-Manhal al-Rawī* p. 111; *Tadrīb al-Rāwī* 2/211; *Irshād al-Fuḥūl* p. 129.

4 In its transmission appears Muḥammad ibn ʿUmar al-Wāqidi who has been impugned by many ḥadīth scholars. See: *al-Taḥqīd wa al-Īdāh* p. 297; *Faṭḥ al-Mughīth* 3/211.

5 *Tadrīb al-Rāwī* 2/211.

2. Placing the condition of one/two years or participation in one/two expeditions is arbitrary. This is besides the fact that influencing and being influenced are not limited to a specific time, long or short.
3. The proponents of this position are not known. And what is reported from Sa'īd ibn al-Musayyab is not authentically established.
4. The necessary result of this position is the exclusion of an extraordinary group of people whom the scholars have unanimously considered to be from the Ṣaḥābah, i.e. the people who accepted Islām in the ninth year A.H. and thereafter, like Jarīr ibn 'Abd Allāh, Wā'il ibn Ḥujr and Mu'āwiyah ibn al-Ḥakam رضي الله عنه.
5. It also necessitates the exclusion of all those individuals who accompanied him but did not strive with him in any of the expeditions, like the men who were exempted due to their excuses, women, and children with discretion.

The Fifth Position

A Ṣaḥābī is:

هو كل من أدرك زمنه صلى الله عليه وسلم وهو مسلم، وإن لم يره، بل حتى لو ولد فيه

A person who lived in the time of Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم with Islam, even though he did not see him. Rather even if he was born in his era (he will be considered a Ṣaḥābī).¹

This is the broadest of all the positions. But it is flawed for two reasons:

1. It goes against the literal meaning of *Ṣuḥbah* (companionship) and is also goes against convention, for people do not deem a person who is born in the era of another person to be his companion.

1 *Tahqīq Munīf al-Rutbah* p. 35; *Fath al-Mughīth* 3/103; *Tadrīb al-Rāwī* 2/212; *al-Shadhā al-Fayyāh* 2/495.

2. It goes against the following ḥadīth of Nabī ﷺ:

يأتي زمان يغزو فنام من الناس فيقال: فيكم من صحب النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم؟ فيقال: نعم. فيفتح عليه. ثم يأتي زمان فيقال: فيكم من صحب أصحاب النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم؟ فيقال: نعم. فيفتح. ثم يأتي زمان فيقال: فيكم من صحب صاحب أصحاب النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم؟ فيقال: نعم. فيفتح.

A time will come when a group of people will fight. It will be asked, “Is there amongst you a person who accompanied Nabī ﷺ?” It will be said, “Yes,” and victory will be granted to him. Then a time will come and it will be asked, “Is there anyone amongst you who accompanied the Companions of Nabī ﷺ?” It will be said, “Yes,” and victory will be granted. Thereafter a time will come and it will be asked, “Is there anyone amongst you who accompanied a companion of the Companions of Nabī ﷺ?” It will be said, “Yes,” and victory will be granted.¹

The point of evidence in the ḥadīth is that Nabī ﷺ has considered seeing his blessed countenance to be a merit by virtue of which victory will be attained. Hence those who did not see him are not included. Consequently considering both groups, those who saw him and those who did not, to be equal is invalid.

In conclusion, it is crucial to note that giving preference to the first position does not entail that all the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ who were privileged with the companionship of Nabī ﷺ were of the same stature and standing. Rather each ones merit and stature is proportionate to the extent of his companionship of Nabī ﷺ, as stated by Imām Aḥmad and others.²

Ibn Taymiyah mentions:

1 Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī: chapter of Jihād and Siyar: sub-chapter regarding seeking help by virtue of the weak and the pious in battle: ḥadīth no. 2740 (narrated by Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī); Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim: chapter of the merits of the Ṣaḥābah: sub-chapter regarding the merit of the Ṣaḥābah, those who succeeded them and those who succeeded them: ḥadīth no. 2532.

2 Al-Kifāyah p. 192; Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥanābilah 1/243; al-Kalūdhānī: al-Tamhīd 3/173; Majmūʿ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām 4/464.

لما كان لفظ الصحبة فيه عموم وخصوص كان من اختص من الصحابة بما يتميز به عن غيره يوصف بتلك الصحبة دون من لم يشركه فيها

Because the word *Ṣuḥbah* has general and specific connotations, a *Ṣaḥābī* who exclusively enjoyed a particular type of companionship will be described with it, to the exclusion of those who did not share the same with him.¹

Ibn Ḥajar² mentions:

لا خفاء برجحان رتبة من لازمه صلى الله عليه وسلم وقاتل معه أو قتل تحت رايته على من لم يلازمه، أو لم يحضر معه مشهدا، وعلى من كلمه يسيرا، أو ماشاه قليلا، أو رآه على بعد، أو في حال الطفولة، وإن كان شرف الصحبة حاصلا للجميع

No doubt that those who constantly accompanied Nabī ﷺ, fought by his side or were martyred under his flag hold a higher rank than those who did not constantly accompany him, did not participate in any expedition with him, had a short conversation with him, walked with him a little, saw him from far or whilst still children. Yes the merit of companionship is true for all of them.³

Probably the incident wherein Khālīd ibn al-Walīd رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ verbally offended ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Awf رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, subsequent to which Rasūl Allāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ forbade him from doing so, will shed more light on the matter. Nabī صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ said:

1 *Majmū’ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām* 35/59.

2 Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad al-Kinānī, Abū al-Faḍl al-‘Asqalānī, famously known as Ibn Ḥajar (a title accorded to one of his forefathers). An adherent of the Shāfi’ī School who was prolific scholar of ḥadīth. He became popular for his in depth research and extensive knowledge in the sciences of ḥadīth. He was born in Cairo in 773 A.H. His books were widely acknowledged. He presided as a judge many a times. He passed away in 852 A.H. Some of his books are: *Fath al-Bārī*, *al-Iṣābah* and *al-Durar al-Kāminah*. See: *al-Ḍaw’ al-Lāmi’* 2/36; *Shadharāt al-Dhahab* 7/270; *al-Dāwūdī: Ṭabaqāt al-Mufassirīn* 329; *al-A’lām* 1/178.

3 *Sharḥ Nukhbah al-Fikar* p. 29.

لاتسبوا أصحابي، فلو أن أحدكم أنفق مثل أحد ذهباً ما بلغ مد أحدهم ولا نصيفه

Do not abuse my companions, for if one of you were to spend gold equivalent to the mount of Uḥud it would not reach the *Mudd*¹ of any of them, nay not even half of it.²

‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Awf and his like were from the forerunners who accompanied Nabī ﷺ at a time when Khālīd and his like were opposing him; they spent their wealth before the conquest and strove. They therefore hold a higher rank than those who spent after the conquest and strove (but Allah has promised goodness to all of them). They enjoyed companionship which Khālīd did not. Nabī ﷺ thus forbade him and his like, i.e. those who accepted Islam after the conquest (the treaty of Ḥudaybiyyah) and strove thereafter, from verbally offending those who accompanied him before that.

Similarly, the comparison between those who did not accompany him at all and those who accompanied him is just like the comparison between Khālīd ibn al-Walīd and the forerunners, or even broader.³

The Status of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ, their Integrity and their Rights

The companionship of Nabī ﷺ is the greatest of privileges that a person can enjoy, for in essence it is a selection from Allah ﷻ; and Allah would not select for the companionship of his Nabī, the noblest of all the prophets who was sent with a complete religion, but the purest of people. They were thus the best generation of this Ummah without any dispute.

1 A measurement which is equal to 0.688 litres.

2 The narration of Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ which is recorded in: *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*: chapter regarding the merits of the Ṣaḥābah: sub-chapter regarding the statement of Nabī ﷺ, “If I were to take a bosom friend...” ḥadīth no. 3470; *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: chapter regarding the merits of the Ṣaḥābah: sub-chapter regarding the prohibition of verbally assaulting the Ṣaḥābah: ḥadīth no. 4541.

3 *Al-Ṣārim al-Maslūl* 3/1077.

In order to gauge their merit and lofty rank, it is sufficient to note that Allah ﷻ, knowing their inner realities, praised them, and announced His pleasure for them, not to mention that he knew full well what their eventual condition would be and what would transpire between them. Therefore there can be no one superior to a people whom Allah ﷻ has declared as people of integrity and deemed upright. Allah ﷻ says:

فَلَا تُزَكُّوا أَنْفُسَكُمْ هُوَ أَعْلَمُ بِمَنِ اتَّقَىٰ

*So do not claim yourselves to be pure; He is Most Knowing of who fears Him.*¹

Likewise, from the greatest attestations of the merit of their companionship of Nabī ﷺ is the virtue which is established for a person who merely saw him, believing in him. So what would be the status of those who were honoured with much more than that? Imām Aḥmad mentions:

فأدناهم صحبة أفضل من القرن الذين لم يروه ولو لقوا الله بجميع الأعمال

The lowest amongst them, in companionship, is better than the entire generation which did not see him even though they meet Allah ﷻ with all deeds.²

And Ibn Taymiyah mentions:

من نظر في سيرة القوم بعلم وبصيرة، وما من الله عليهم من الضائل علم يقينا أنهم خير الخلق بعد الأنبياء، لا كان ولا يكون مثلهم، وإنهم صفوة الصفوة من قرون هذه الأمة، التي هي خير الأمم وأكرمها على الله

Whoever studies the biographies of these people and the virtues Allah ﷻ favoured them with, with knowledge and insight, will learn with certainty that they are the best of the creation after the Ambiyā' ﷺ.

1 Sūrah al-Najm: 32.

2 Sharḥ Uṣūl I'tiqād Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah 1/160; Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥanābilah 1/243; Maqal al-Shahīd 'Uthmān p. 175.

There hasn't and there will never be another like them. They were the choicest of the generations of this Ummah, which is the best of nations and the most honoured in the sight of Allah ¹ *سُبْحَانَكَ يَا عَلِيُّ*.

Nonetheless, the exclusive and general evidences of their merits and excellence are too many. Hereunder we allude to some of them:

Firstly, from the noble Qur'ān:

Verse 1:

مُحَمَّدٌ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ وَالَّذِينَ مَعَهُ أَشِدَّاءُ عَلَى الْكُفَّارِ رُحَمَاءُ بَيْنَهُمْ تَرَاهُمْ رُكَّعًا سُجَّدًا يَبْتَغُونَ فَضْلًا
مِّنَ اللَّهِ وَرِضْوَانًا سِيمَاهُمْ فِي وُجُوهِهِمْ مِّنْ أَثَرِ السُّجُودِ ذَلِكَ مَثَلُهُمْ فِي التَّوْرَةِ وَمَثَلُهُمْ فِي
الْإِنْجِيلِ كَزَرْعٍ أَخْرَجَ شَطْأَهُ فَآزَرَهُ فَاسْتَغْلَظَ فَاسْتَوَىٰ عَلَىٰ سَوَابِغِهِ يُعْجِبُ الزُّرَّاعَ لِيَغِيظَ بِهِمُ الْكُفَّارَ
وَعَدَّ اللَّهُ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَعَمِلُوا الصَّالِحَاتِ مِنْهُمْ مَغْفِرَةً وَأَجْرًا عَظِيمًا

Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah; and those with him are forceful against the disbelievers, merciful among themselves. You see them bowing and prostrating [in prayer], seeking bounty from Allah and [His] pleasure. Their mark [i.e., sign] is on their faces [i.e., foreheads] from the trace of prostration. That is their description in the Torah. And their description in the Gospel is as a plant which produces its offshoots and strengthens them so they grow firm and stand upon their stalks, delighting the sowers - so that He [i.e., Allah] may enrage by them the disbelievers. Allah has promised those who believe and do righteous deeds among them forgiveness and a great reward.²

This verse is brimming with praise for the Ṣaḥābah of Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ in their various conditions. It explicitly announces forgiveness for the sins they might have committed and the errors they might have made. It also promises great reward for the tremendous sacrifices they made in aiding His Dīn, supporting His Rasūl, and uplifting His word.

1 Majmū' Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām 3/156.

2 Sūrah al-Faḥ: 29.

Verse 2:

لَا يَسْتَوِي مِنْكُمْ مَنْ أَنْفَقَ مِنْ قَبْلِ الْفَتْحِ وَقَاتَلَ أُولَئِكَ أَعْظَمُ دَرَجَةً مَنِ الَّذِينَ أَنْفَقُوا مِنْ بَعْدِ وَقَاتَلُوا وَكُلًّا وَعَدَ اللَّهُ الْحُسْنَى وَاللَّهُ بِمَا تَعْمَلُونَ خَبِيرٌ

*Not equal among you are those who spent before the conquest [of Makkah] and fought [and those who did so after it]. Those are greater in degree than they who spent afterwards and fought. But to all Allah has promised the best [reward]. And Allah, with what you do, is acquainted.*¹

This verse suggests that whoever enjoyed the Sharī companionship of Nabī ﷺ is from the people of Jannah, for *al-Ḥusnā* is Jannah which Allah ﷻ has promised to all of them.²

Verse 3:

لَكِنِ الرَّسُولُ وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا مَعَهُ جَاهِدُوا بِأَمْوَالِهِمْ وَأَنْفُسِهِمْ وَأُولَئِكَ لَهُمُ الْخَيْرَاتُ وَأُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْمُفْلِحُونَ أَعَدَّ اللَّهُ لَهُمْ جَنَّاتٍ تَجْرِي مِنْ تَحْتِهَا الْأَنْهَارُ خَالِدِينَ فِيهَا ذَلِكَ الْفَوْزُ الْعَظِيمُ

*But the Messenger and those who believed with him fought with their wealth and their lives. Those will have [all that is] good, and it is those who are the successful. Allah has prepared for them gardens beneath which rivers flow, wherein they will abide eternally. That is the great attainment.*³

This verse is an attestation of their probity and a glad tidings. Allah ﷻ has pronounced their honour by describing them as people of true faith and great sacrifice, and has thereafter promised them a great victory.

Can there be any pronouncement of integrity higher than this pronouncement?
And can there be any virtue greater than this virtue?

1 Sūrah al-Ḥadīd: 10.

2 *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 27/221; Ibn 'Aṭīyah: *al-Muḥarrar al-Wajīz* 5/260; *al-Faṣl fī al-Mīl wa al-Ahwā'* wa al-Nīhal 4/117.

3 Sūrah Tawbah: 88, 89.

Secondly, from the noble Sunnah:

Ḥadīth 1:

عن أبي سعيد الخدري رضي الله عنه قال قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: لا تسبوا أصحابي، فلو أن أحدكم أنفق مثل أحد ذهباً ما بلغ مد أحدهم ولا نصيفه

Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī رضي الله عنه narrates that Rasūl Allāh صلى الله عليه وسلم said, “Do not revile my Companions, for if one of you were to spend gold equivalent to the mount of Uḥud it would not reach the *Mudd*¹ of any of them, nay not even half of it.”²

This ḥadīth clearly establishes their virtue and lofty rank, for Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم forbade from reviling them. He attributed them to himself by using the personal possessive pronoun *Yā* (my). He also informed us that the great contributions of others are not equal to their little.

This prohibition was primarily for those who accompanied him صلى الله عليه وسلم at a later stage, then how much more emphasised would it be for those who did not accompany him at all? One should bear in mind that the superiority of the later Ṣaḥābah over those who succeeded them is just like the superiority of the early Ṣaḥābah over them.³

Ḥadīth 2:

عن أبي موسى الأشعري رضي الله عنه قال: قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: قال النجوم أمانة للسماء فإذا ذهب النجوم أتى السماء ما توعد وأنا أمانة لأصحابي فإذا ذهب أتى أصحابي ما يوعدون وأصحابي أمانة لأمتي فإذا ذهب أصحابي أتى أمتي ما يوعدون

1 A measurement which is equal to 0.688 litres.

2 The reference has passed already on p. 28. (Add page number)

3 *Al-Faṣl fī al-Mīlāl wa al-Ahwāʾ wa al-Niḥāl* 4/92; *al-Ṣārim al-Maslūl* 3/1077; *Faṭḥ al-Bārī* 7/42; *Faṭḥ al-Mughīth* 3/110.

Abū Mūsā al-Ash‘arī رضي الله عنه narrates that Rasūl Allāh صلى الله عليه وسلم said, “The stars are a source of security for the sky, and when the stars disappear there comes to the sky what it is promised (i.e. it meets its fate). I am a source of security for my Companions, and when I will go away there will come to my Companions what they are promised. My Companions are a source of security for my Ummah, and when my Companions go away there will come to my Ummah what it is promised.”¹

This ḥadīth likewise discusses the merit of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم. It states that their presence in itself is a source of safety for the Ummah from the emergence of innovations in Dīn and from trials and the disunity of hearts. With their absence consequently the doors of trials will open upon the Ummah.²

Hence the blessings of their presence amidst the next generation is just like the blessings of his صلى الله عليه وسلم presence amidst the Ṣaḥābah. Therefore, the contrast between them and the rest of the Ummah in virtue is just like the contrast between Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم and them.

Ḥadīth 3:

عن أبي سعيد الخدري رضي الله عنه عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قال: يأتي زمان يغزو فئام من الناس فيقال: فيكم من صحب النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم؟ فيقال: نعم. فيفتح عليه. ثم يأتي زمان فيقال: فيكم من صحب أصحاب النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم؟ فيقال: نعم. فيفتح. ثم يأتي زمان فيقال: فيكم من صحب صاحب أصحاب النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم؟ فيقال: نعم. فيفتح.

Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī رضي الله عنه narrates the following from Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم, “A time will come when group of people will fight. It will be asked, “Is there amongst you a person who accompanied Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم?” It will be said, “Yes,” and victory will be granted to him. Then a time will come and it will be asked,

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: chapter regarding the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah: sub-chapter regarding the presence of Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم being a source of security for his companions, and the presence of his companions being a source of security for the Ummah: ḥadīth no. 2531.

2 *Sharḥ al-Nawawī ‘alā Muslim* 16/83.

“Is there anyone amongst you who accompanied the Companions of Nabī ﷺ?” It will be said, “Yes,” and victory will be granted. Thereafter a time will come and it will be asked, “Is there anyone amongst you who accompanied a companion of the Companions of Nabī ﷺ?” It will be said, “Yes,” and victory will be granted.¹

This ḥadīth also contains a great merit of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ of Nabī ﷺ, for by virtue of their presence the armies which they are in will gain victory.

The Integrity of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ

The scholars have unanimously deemed all the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ, without any exception, to have been people of integrity, before the internal strife and after it. This is the viewpoint of all the early scholars and majority of the later scholars; only a very few people, who hold an innovatory status, have differed, but their difference does not really matter.

However, it is important to note that deeming the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ to be people of integrity does not necessitate their infallibility from all types of sins, and purity from every type of mistake. Instead, they were like those besides them in their anatomy and temperaments; temperaments in the entire human race are the same. Hence the weakness which one among them is prone to others are prone to as well:

وَوُحِّلِقَ الْإِنْسَانَ ضَعِيفًا

*And mankind was created weak.*²

Likewise the instinctive inclination toward evil is equal in all:

إِنَّ النَّفْسَ لَأَمَّارَةٌ بِالسُّوءِ

1 The reference has passed already on p. 26. (Add page number)

2 Sūrah al-Nisā': 28.

*Indeed, the soul is a persistent enjoiner of evil.*¹

And the love for the fulfilment of passions is also inherent in each one:

زَيْنٌ لِلنَّاسِ حُبُّ الشَّهَوَاتِ مِنَ النِّسَاءِ وَالْبَنِينَ وَالْقَنَاطِيرِ الْمُقَنْطَرَةِ مِنَ الذَّهَبِ وَالْفِضَّةِ وَالْخَيْلِ
الْمُسَوَّمَةِ وَالْأَنْعَامِ وَالْحَرْثِ

*Beautified for people is the love of that which they desire - of women and sons,
heaped-up sums of gold and silver, fine branded horses, and cattle and tilled land.*²

But because Allah ﷻ selected them for the companionship of His Nabī and the propagation of His Dīn, He purified their hearts and cleansed their souls. As a result, they were the most complete of the deficient human race, and the bad deeds of any of them was like a droplet in comparison to his ocean of good.

Ibn al-Anbārī³ mentions:

ليس المراد ب(عدالتهم) ثبوت العصمة لهم واستحالة المعصية عليهم، وإنما المراد قبول رواياتهم دون تكلف بحث العدالة وطلب التزكية، إلا ان يثبت ارتكاب قاذح. ولم يثبت ذلك ولله الحمد، فنحن على استصحاب ما كانوا عليه في زمن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم حتى يثبت خلافه، ولا التفات إلى ما يذكره أهل السير فإنه لا يصح، وما يصح فله تأويل صحيح.

Their uprightness does not necessitate their infallibility and the impossibility of them sinning. Rather it necessitates accepting their narrations without taking the trouble of investigating their integrity and without ascertaining

1 Sūrah Yūsuf: 53.

2 Sūrah Āl 'Imrān: 14.

3 Muḥammad ibn al-Qāsim ibn Muḥammad ibn Bashshār, Abū Bakr ibn al-Anbārī. A great scholar and author. He was born in 271 A.H. and earned acclaim for his in depth knowledge of the sciences of language. To the extent that it is said that he memorised three hundred thousand examples (for various laws) from the Qur'ān. Al-Khaṭīb has described him saying, "A truthful person, pious and virtuous. From the Ahl al-Sunnah." He passed away in 328 A.H. Some of his works are: *al-Waqf wa al-Ibtidā'*, *Kitāb al-Mushkil*, *Kitāb al-Zāhir*. See *Tārīkh Baghdād* 3/181; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 15/274; *al-'Ibar fī Khabar man Ghabar* 2/220; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 11/196.

their innocence, unless the commission of an impugning sin is established. And that is not established by the grace of Allah. Hence the condition upon which they were in the time of Nabi ﷺ is what we deem to be their primary status until otherwise is established. As for what is recorded by the historians, we do not pay attention to it due to it being unauthentic. And whatever is authentic has a plausible explanation.¹

Ibn Taymiyah mentions:

وهم (يعنى أهل السنة) مع ذلك لا يعتقدون أن كل واحد من الصحابة معصوم عن كبائر الإثم وصغائره، بل يجوز عليهم من الذنوب في الجملة، ولهم من السوابق والفضائل ما يوجب مغفرة ما يصدر منهم إن صدر، حتى إنه يغفر لهم من الستات ما لا يغفر لمن بعدهم

Despite that, they (the Ahl al-Sunnah) do not believe that each one of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم was free from major and minor sins. Rather it was possible for them to commit sins in general. However the contributions that they have made and the merits that they enjoy will earn them forgiveness for what came forth from them. To the extent that they will be forgiven for actions which others after them will not be forgiven for.²

Their Rights

One of the principles of the Ahl al-Sunnah is that the Ṣaḥābah enjoy rights which others besides them do not. Hence it is compulsory upon the believers to love them, acknowledge their sacrifices, concede their merit, entertain good thoughts about them, find plausible explanations for them and seek forgiveness on their behalf.

1 *Fath al-Mughith* 3/115; *Irshād al-Fuḥūl* p. 129.

2 *Majmū' Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām* 3/155.

Abū Nu‘aym¹ says:

الواجب على المسلمين في أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إظهار ما مدحهم الله تعالى به
وشكرهم عليه من جميل أفعالهم وجميل سوابقهم

Regarding the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūl Allāh ﷺ, it is compulsory upon the Muslims to demonstrate the praises Allah ﷻ has showered upon them and the acknowledgement He has displayed for their outstanding actions and excellent contributions.²

And al-Ṭaḥāwī³ mentions:

نحب أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ولا نفرط في حب أحد منهم، ونبغض من يبغضهم وبغير
الخير. لا نذكرهم، وحبهم دين وإيمان وإحسان، وبغضهم كفر ونفاق وطغيان

We love the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūl Allāh ﷺ. We do not slack in loving any of them. We hate those who hate them and talk about them in only in good ways. Loving them is part of our Dīn, our faith, and is a virtue, and hating them is disbelief, hypocrisy, and transgression.⁴

1 Aḥmad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Aḥmad al-Mahrānī, Abū Nu‘aym al-Aṣḥāhānī. A scholar of ḥadīth who was inclined to mysticism. He was born in 336 A.H. His scholars gave him *Ijāzah* in ḥadīth (permission to narrate ḥadīths) when he was six years of age. Scholars from all places gathered at his feet owing to his high chains of transmission and thorough knowledge of ḥadīth and its sciences. He was impugned without any evidence. Some of his works are: *Ḥilyat al-Awliyā*, *Mu‘jam al-Ṣaḥābah*, and *Kitāb al-Imāmah wa al-Radd ‘alā al-Rāfiḍah*. He passed away in 430 A.H. See: *Tadhkirat al-Ḥuffāz* 3/1092; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā* 17/453; *Lisān al-Mizān* 1/201; *Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥuffāz* p. 423.

2 *Al-Imāmah wa al-Radd ‘alā al-Rāfiḍah* p. 341.

3 Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Salāmah al-Azdī, Abū Ja‘far al-Ṭaḥāwī (attributed to Ṭaḥā, a village in Egypt). A jurist and a scholar of ḥadīth. He was born in 239 A.H. Initially he studied the Shāfi‘ī School from his uncle al-Muzānī and thereafter switched to the Ḥanafī School. Subsequently he became the supreme authority therein in Egypt. He passed away in 321 A.H. Some of his works: *Sharḥ Ma‘ānī al-Āthār*, *Aḥkām al-Qur‘ān* and *al-Mukhtaṣar fī al-Fiqh*. See: *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 5/367; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā* 15/27; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 11/173; *al-Jawāhir al-Muḍī‘ah fī Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥanafīyyah* 1/102.

4 Ibn Abī al-‘Iz: *Sharḥ al-‘Aqīdah al-Ṭaḥāwiyyah* p. 528.

Another principle from the principles of the Ahl al-Sunnah is the impermissibility of reviling them, denigrating them, or slandering any one of them; because the Rasūl ﷺ has forbade us from doing so; and also because it goes against the praises Allah ﷻ has showered upon them and His announcement of being pleased with them.

In fact, impugning them is in reality impugning the Sharī'ah itself due to them being its bearers and conveyers; if they are impugned then necessarily what they have borne and conveyed will lose credit. Abū Zur'ah al-Rāzī¹ therefore states:

إذا رأيت الرجل ينتقص أحدا من أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فاعلم أنه زنديق، وذلك أن الرسول صلى الله عليه وسلم عندنا حق، والقرآن حق، وإنما أدى إلينا هذا القرآن والسنن أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، وإنما يريدون أن يجرحوا شهودنا ليبتلوا الكتاب والسنة

If you see a person denigrating any of the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūl Allāh ﷺ, know he is a heretic. This is because it is our belief that Rasūl Allāh ﷺ is true and the Qur'ān is true; and those who transmitted the Qur'ān and the Sunnah were the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūl Allāh ﷺ. Hence these people intend to impugn our witnesses and thereby discredit the Qur'ān and the Sunnah.²

The statements of the scholars pertaining to the prohibition of reviling them are more than popular. Imām Aḥmad said:

من سب أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أو أحدا منهم أو تنقصه أو طعن عليهم أو عرض بعيبيهم أو عاب أحدا منهم فهو مبتدع رافضي خبيث مخالف لا يقبل الله منه صرفا ولا عدلا

1 'Ubayd ibn 'Abd al-Karīm ibn Yazīd al-Makhzūmī (their client/ally), Abū Zur'ah al-Rāzī. A prolific scholar of ḥadīth, a master in *Jarḥ* and *Ta'dīl* (impugning and endorsing), and a jurist with utmost piety and disinclination from this world. He was born in 200 A.H. Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal said regarding him, "There has not crossed the bridge of Baghdād any one more knowledgeable than Abū Zur'ah." He passed away in 263 A.H. Narrations with his transmissions feature in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, *Sunan al-Tirmidhī*, *Sunan al-Nasā'ī* and *Sunan Ibn Mājah*. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 10/326; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 38/11; *Sīyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 13/65; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 7/28.

2 *Al-Kifāyah* p. 188.

Whoever reviles the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūl Allāh ﷺ or one among them, belittles him, or impugns them, hints towards their faults and criticises any of them is an innovator and a wicked Rāfiḍī from who Allah ﷻ will not accept any optional or obligatory prayer.

Thereafter he says:

لا يجوز لأحد أن يذكر شيئاً من مساوئهم، ولا يطعن على أحد منهم، فمن فعل ذلك فقد وجب على السلطان تأديبه وعقوبته، ليس له أن يعفو عنه، بل يعاقبه ويستتبهه، فإن تاب قبل منه، وإن لم يتب أعاد عليه العقوبة، وخلده في الحبس حتى يتوب ويراجع

It is not permissible for anyone to mention their negatives or impugn any of them. Whoever does so, it will be compulsory upon the ruler to discipline him and penalise him. It will not be permissible to forgive him, rather he will punish him and ask him to repent. If he repents, his repentance will be accepted, and if he does not, the punishment will be reinstated and he will be imprisoned for life, unless he repents and recants his statements.¹

Al-Khaṭṭābī² says:

من أبغضهم وسبهم ونسبهم إلى ما تنسبهم الروافض والخوارج لعنهم الله فقد هلك في الهالكين

Whoever despises them, reviles them, or attributes to them what the Rawāfiḍ and the Khawārij attribute to them—may the curse of Allah descend upon them—is indeed a loser like the other losers.³

1 Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥanābilah 1/30; al-Ṣārim al-Maslūl 3/1056; Ḥādī al-Arwāḥ p. 291; Ibn Badrān: al-Madkhal p. 94.

2 Ḥamd/Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm ibn al-Khaṭṭāb al-Bustī Abū Sulaymān al-Khaṭṭābī. A Shāfiʿī jurist who was an expert in the sciences of ḥadīth, Arabic and literature. He passed away in 388 A.H. some of his works are: Maʿālim al-Sunan, Gharīb al-Ḥadīth and Kitāb al-ʿUzlah. See: Siyar Aʿlām al-Nubalāʾ 17/23; al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt 7/207; Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfiʿiyyah al-Kubrā 3/282; Ibn Qāḍī Shuhbah: Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfiʿiyyah 2/156.

3 Al-Ghunyah ʿan al-Kalām wa Ahlih p. 58.

And al-Nawawī¹ says:

اعلم أن سب الصحابة رضی الله عنهم حرام من فواحش المحرمات، سواء من لا بس الفتن منهم وغيره

Know that reviling the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم is forbidden and is from the worst of prohibited actions. Reviling those who were part of the conflicts and those who were not is the same.²

Likewise Ibn Taymiyah has explicitly stated the following:

إن سب الصحابة رضي الله عنهم حرام بالكتاب والسنة وإجماع الأمة، وإن من سيهم وجب تأديبه وعقوبته، ولا يجوز العفو عنه

The prohibition of reviling the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم is established through the Qur'ān, the Sunnah, and the unanimity of the Ummah. Hence whoever reviles them, it is necessary to discipline him and penalise him; it is not permitted to pardon him.³

In fact, a group of scholars hold the view that anyone who reviles the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم is unconditionally a disbeliever and have thus asserted that he will not receive a portion from the wealth of Fay'^{4,5} However the more correct opinion is

1 Yaḥyā ibn Sharaf ibn Ḥasan al-Nawawī, Abū Zakariyyā. A ḥadīth scholar and a leading Shāfi'ī jurist in his time, who was entirely disinclined from this world. He was born in Nawā (city in Syria) in 631 A.H. He would not waste any moment of his time in doing nothing. He had presided over the supreme post of in the Dār al-Ḥadīth al-Ashrafiyyah and all his books earned acclaim. He passed away in 676 A.H. The following are some of his works: *Sharḥ Muslim*, *al-Majmū' Sharḥ al-Muḥadhdhab* and *al-Adhkār*. See: *al-'Ibar fī Khabar man Ghabar* p. 312; *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi'iyyah al-Kubrā* 8/395; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 13/278; *Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥuffāz* p. 513.

2 *Sharḥ al-Nawawī 'alā Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* 16/93.

3 *Al-Ṣarīm al-Maslūl 'alā Shātim al-Rasūl* 3/1121.

4 Fay' is the wealth which is taken from the disbelievers without war. See: *al-Mughnī* 6/312; *Majmū' Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām* 7/48; *al-Mardāwī: al-Inṣāf* 4/198.

5 *Ḥilyat al-Awliyā'* 9/112; *al-Istidhkār* 5/17; *Sharḥ al-Nawawī 'alā Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* 18/158; *Tafsīr ibn Kathīr* 1/487; *al-Inṣāf* 4/198.

that reviling can lead to either disbelief or to heresy, depending on the gravity and type of revilement.¹

Moving on, whilst discussing the issue of the prohibition of reviling the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ and impugning them, the discussion necessarily leads to another dimension; and that is the Sharī position pertaining to discussions around the conflicts that transpired between them at the occasions of Jamal, Ṣiffīn, etc.

In this regard, the preferred position of the Ahl al-Sunnah is to refrain completely from discussing any of that, not delving into it, not targeting any of the Ṣaḥābah with evil and believing that whatever had transpired between them does not compromise their integrity. Bearing in mind that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى pronounced their integrity, praised them, and announced His pleasure for them; this is after He knew full well what was to come forth from them in the future.

Ibn ‘Abbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا mentions:

لاتسبوا أصحاب محمد، فإن الله قد أمر بالاستغفار لهم، وهو يعلم أنهم سيقتتلون

Do not revile the Ṣaḥābah of Muḥammad صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, for Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى has ordered that forgiveness be sought for them whereas He knew that they will fight in the future.²

And Abū Nu‘aym has alluded to the following regarding the responsibilities of the Muslims toward the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ:

إن يغضوا عما كان منهم في حال الغضب والإغفال، وفرط منهم عند استزلال الشيطان إياهم، وتأخذ في ذكرهم بما أخبر الله تعالى به. فقال تعالى: وَالَّذِينَ جَاءُوا مِنْ بَعْدِهِمْ يَقُولُونَ رَبَّنَا اغْفِرْ لَنَا وَلِإِخْوَانِنَا الَّذِينَ سَبَقُونَا بِالْإِيمَانِ وَلَا تَجْعَلْ فِي قُلُوبِنَا غِلًّا لِلَّذِينَ آمَنُوا رَبَّنَا إِنَّكَ رَءُوفٌ رَحِيمٌ فإن الهفوة الزلل والغضب والحدة والإفراط لا يخلو منه أحد، وهو لهم غفور، ولا يوجب ذلك البراءة منهم والعداوة لهم

1 Al-Ṣārim al-Maslūl 3/1061; al-Ṣawā‘iq al-Muḥriqah 2/621.

2 Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal: Faḍā‘il al-Ṣaḥābah 1/59. Ibn Taymiyah has graded the transmission as authentic in his book Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyah 2/22.

They should overlook that which came forth from them at times of anger and inattentiveness, and that which transpired at their hands when Shayṭān tried to mislead them. We hold on to what Allah ﷻ has mentioned in the Qurʾān when talking about them: ‘And [there is a share for] those who came after them, saying, “Our Lord, forgive us and our brothers who preceded us in faith...”¹ This is because there is no person who is exempted from slipping, making mistakes, anger and immoderation, and Allah ﷻ will forgive them. Any of this does not demand disassociation from them, or opposing them.²

Likewise al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī³ mentions:

وليجتنب المحدث رواية ما شجر بين الصحابة ويمسك عن ذكر الحوادث التي كانت منهم، ويعم جميعهم بالصلاة عليهم والاستغفار.

A scholar of ḥadīth should refrain from narrating the conflicts which broke out between the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم, and he should refrain from mentioning the events which transpired between them; he should pray for all of them and seek forgiveness for them.⁴

Hereunder we discuss the reasons owing to which the pious predecessors have refrained from delving into the conflicts which transpired between the Ṣaḥābah

رضي الله عنهم:

1 Sūrah al-Ḥaṣhr: 10.

2 *Al-Imāmah wa al-Radd ‘alā al-Rāfiḍah* p. 341; *al-Ghunyah ‘an al-Kalām wa Ahlih* p. 59; *Lum‘at al-Ītiqād* p. 36.

3 Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī ibn Thābit ibn Aḥmad al-Baghdādī, Abū Bakr al-Khaṭīb. A prominent ḥadīth scholar and great historian. He was born in Ghuzayyah in 392 A.H. After al-Dār Quṭnī, there was no one like him in Baghdād. He endowed all his books to the Muslims and distributed all his wealth in avenues of good and upon the scholars in his fatal illness. He passed away in 463 A.H. Some of his works are: *Tārīkh Baghdād*, *al-Jāmi‘* and *al-Kifāyah*. See: *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 5/31; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 18/270; *Tārīkh al-Islām* 31/86; *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi‘iyyah al-Kubrā* 4/119.

4 *Al-Jāmi‘ li Akhlāq al-Rāwī wa Ādāb al-Sāmi‘* 2/119.

Firstly, delving into this topic can in all likelihood lead to disrespecting some of them, intentionally or inadvertently. Hence when Imām Aḥmad was asked about the narration:

ويح عمار تقتله الفئة الباغية، يدعوهم إلى الجنة ويدعونه إلى النار

Poor ‘Ammār, the rebel group will kill him. He will be inviting them to Jannah and they will be inviting him to Jahannam.¹

He sufficed on saying, “There is more than one authentic narration in this regard,” and disliked saying anything thereafter.² As if to suggest that if the people of Shām in general are deemed to be the purport of the ḥadīth, then it might lead to disrespecting Mu‘āwiyah and ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ رضي الله عنهما.

Furthermore, if Salmān رضي الله عنه would prevent Ḥudhayfah رضي الله عنه from relating to the people what he had heard Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم saying to some of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم whilst happy or angry, then how much more forbidden would it be to talk about the conflicts which broke out between them, especially when much of it is not even established. Consider the narration:

كان حذيفة بالمدائن، فكان يذكر أشياء قالها رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم لأناس من أصحابه في الغضب، فينطلق ناس ممن سمع ذلك من حذيفة، فيأتون سلمان فيذكرون له قول حذيفة، فيقول سلمان: حذيفة أعلم بما يقول. فيرجعون إلى حذيفة فيقولون له: قد ذكرنا قولك لسلمان فما صدقك ولا كذبك. فأتى حذيفة سلمان وهو في مبقلة فقال: يا سلمان، ما يمنعك أن تصدقني بما سمعت من رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم؟ فقال سلمان: إن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم كان يغضب فيقول في الغضب لناس من أصحابه، ويرضى فيقول في الرضا لناس من أصحابه. أما تنتهي حتى تورث رجلا حب رجال، ولا رجال بغض رجال، وحتى توقع اختلافا وفرقة، ولقد علمت أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم خطب فقال: أيما رجل من أمتي سبته سبة أو لعنته لعنة في غضبي فإنما أنا من ولد آدم أغضب كما يغضبون، وإنما بعثني رحمة للعالمين فاجعلها عليهم صلاة يوم القيامة. والله لتنتهين أو لأكتنين إلى عمر.

1 The narration of Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī which appears in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*: chapter of Ṣalāh: sub-chapter regarding helping in building the Masjid: ḥadīth no. 436.

2 *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 43/436; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 1/421.

When Ḥudhayfah رضي الله عنه was in Madā'in, he would relate to the people things which Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم said to some of his Companions when angry. Subsequently some of those who heard from him would come to Salmān رضي الله عنه and inform him of what Ḥudhayfah رضي الله عنه had said. Salmān رضي الله عنه would reply by merely saying, “Ḥudhayfah knows well what he is saying.” These people would then return to Ḥudhayfah رضي الله عنه and tell him, “We mentioned what you related to Salmān, but he did not approve or disprove.” Hence Ḥudhayfah رضي الله عنه came to Salmān whilst he was in his farm and asked him, “What prevents you from believing me in what I have heard from Rasūl Allāh صلى الله عليه وسلم?” To which Salmān رضي الله عنه replied, “Rasūl Allāh صلى الله عليه وسلم would get angry and would say things in his anger to some of his Companions. He would likewise be happy and would say things in his happiness to some of his Companions. Will you not stop until you instil love for some men in the hearts of some and hatred for some men in the hearts of others, thereby engendering disputes and disunity? You know well that Rasūl Allāh صلى الله عليه وسلم delivered a sermon and said, ‘Any person in my Ummah whom I have offended or cursed whilst angry, I am merely from the children of Ādam and thus become angry just as they do, and Allah سبحانه وتعالى has sent me as a mercy to all the worlds; therefore, O Allah make that a source of blessings for them on the Day of Judgment.’ By Allah you either stop or I will write to ‘Umar.”¹

Indeed, what many of the predecessors feared actually came to the fore amongst the Shī'ah whose hearts are filled with hatred and ill-feelings for many of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم. Al-A'mash² says the following regarding the people of his city, the people of Kufah:

1 *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*: Chapter of Sunnah; sub-chapter regarding the prohibition of cursing the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūl Allāh صلى الله عليه وسلم; ḥadīth no. 4659. The ḥadīth is graded Ṣaḥīḥ by Albānī in *Ṣaḥīḥ Sunan Abī Dāwūd*.

2 Sulaymān ibn Mahrān al-Asadī al-Kāhili (their client/ally), Abū Muḥammad al-Kūfi, famously known as A'mash. He was the *Muqri'* (instructor of the Qur'ān) and a prolific and reliable scholar of ḥadīth, except that he would do *Tadlīs* (conceal the name of the person from who he received a particular transmission and narrate from the narrator above him). He is considered to be from junior Tābi'īn, successors of the Ṣaḥābah. He was well known for his excessive worship as well. He passed away in 148 A.H. and his narrations feature in the six canonical works. See: *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 6/342; *Tārīkh Baghdād* 9/3; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 12/76; *Mīzān al-I'tidāl* 3/315.

حدثناهم بغضب صحاب محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم فاتخذوه ديناً

We narrated to them the anger of the Ṣaḥābah of Muḥammad ﷺ and they took that as religion.¹

He has also said:

نستغفر الله من أشياء كنا نرويها على وجه التعجب اتخذوها ديناً! وقد أدرك أصحاب النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم معاوية أميراً في زمان عمر وبعد ذلك عشر سنين فلم يقم إليه أحد فيقتله

We seek the forgiveness of Allah for things that we would narrate by way of displaying amusement, which they have now taken as religion. The Ṣaḥābah of Nabī ﷺ lived during the era of ‘Umar رضي الله عنه when Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه was the governor and ten years thereafter. But none of them endeavoured to kill him.²

Secondly, it can in all likelihood lead to embedding hatred in the hearts for some of the Ṣaḥābah, whereas the Muslims are ordered to seek forgiveness for their brothers who has preceded them with faith.

Shihāb ibn Khirāsh³ says:

أدركت من أدركت من صدر هذه الأمة وهم يقولون: اذكروا محاسن أصحاب رسول الله ما تأتلف عليه القلوب، ولا تذكروا الذي شجر بينهم فتنحروا عليهم الناس

Whoever of the predecessors of this Ummah I accompanied, I heard him saying, “Mention the merits of the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūl Allāh ﷺ that

1 *Al-Ma‘rifah wa al-Tārīkh* 3/85; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 32/93; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 2/394.

2 *Al-Tārīkh al-Awsaṭ* 1/136.

3 Shihāb ibn Khirāsh ibn Ḥawshab al-Shaybānī, Abū al-Ṣalt al-Wāsiṭī. First he settled in Kufah and then he moved to Ramlah in Palestine. Imām Ahmad has deemed him authentic. He was an adherent of the Sunnah. Some of his narrations, however, are reprehensible. Ibn Ḥajr said, “A satisfactory narrator who at times errs.” In the sources that I referred to, I have not come across the year of his demise. His narrations feature in the Sunan of Abū Dāwūd al-Sijistānī. See *al-Kāmil fī Ḍu‘afā’ al-Rijāl* 4/34; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 8/284; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 12/568; *Taqrīb al-Tahdhīb* p. 269.

will be a means of the hearts uniting. And do not mention what transpired between them, so as not provoke the people against them.¹

And Ibn Taymiyah has said:

الخوض فيما شجر يوقع في نفوس كثير من الناس بغضا وذا

Discussing what transpired between them, engenders hatred and criticism in many people.²

Thirdly, it can lead to confusing some people, especially the commonality and the young generation; they will get the impression that there is some sort of contradiction between the respect and acknowledgement of virtue which has settled in their hearts regarding the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ and the events which transpired between them.³

However, even though the general principle of the pious predecessors is refraining from discussing the topic, but at times, where the need is dire, like when refuting the misconceptions of the innovators, it is permitted to delve into it.

Ibn Taymiyah has mentioned the following in this regard:

ولهذا أوصوا بالإمساك عما شجر بينهم لأننا لا نسأل عن ذلك، كما قال عمر بن عبد العزيز: تلك دماء طهر الله منها يدي فلا أحب أن أخضب بها لساني. وقال آخر: تِلْكَ أُمَّةٌ قَدْ خَلَتْ لَهَا مَا كَسَبَتْ وَلَكُمْ مَا كَسَبْتُمْ وَلَا تُسْأَلُونَ عَمَّا كَانُوا يَعْمَلُونَ لكن إذا ظهر مبتدع يقدر فيهم بالباطل فلا بد من الذب عنهم وذكر ما يبطل حجته بعلم و عدل

Thus they have advised that one withholds discussion regarding what transpired between them, because we will not be asked regarding that, as stated by ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, “That is blood from which Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى

1 Al-Kāmil fī Ḍu‘afā’ al-Rijāl 4/34; Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’ 8/285.

2 Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah 4/449.

3 I’tiqādāh Ahl al-Sunnah fī al-Ṣaḥābah p. 77.

has kept my hands pure. Hence I would not want to taint my tongue with it.” And another person said, “That was a nation which has passed on. It will have [the consequence of] what it earned, and you will have what you have earned. And you will not be asked about what they used to do.”¹ However, if an innovator comes about and criticises them with false accusations, it becomes necessary to defend their integrity and advance such arguments which will destroy his evidences with knowledge and impartiality.²

But when doing so, two things have to be considered:

1. Through investigation of whatever he will narrate regarding them, because much of what is reported is either, false, added to, or distorted.
2. Finding the best and most plausible explanation for whatever is established.³

Ibn Taymiyah mentions:

إن هذه الآثار المروية في مساويهم، منها ما هو كذب، ومنها ما قد زيد فيها ونقص وغير من وجهه، والصحيح منه هم فيه معذورون: إما مجتهدون مصيبون، وإما مجتهدون مخطئون ومن ثم فهم محفوظون عن ما يوجب التضليل والتفسيق

These reports which are reported regarding their demerits, some of them are false, in some additions and omissions have taken place and in some distortions have been made. In that which is authentically established from them, they are excused due to either doing *Ijtihād* (applying themselves to the best possible extent) and reaching the right conclusion or doing *Ijtihād* and reaching the wrong conclusions. Hence they are, in both cases, free from anything which necessitates deeming them misguided or sinful.⁴

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 134.

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 6/254.

3 *Risālah al-Qayrawānī* p. 9; al-Khaṭṭābī: *al-'Uzlah* p. 23; *al-Şawā'iq al-Muḥriqah* 2/621.

4 *Majmū' Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām* 3/155.

And Ibn Musharraf¹ says:

بالخير والكف عما بينهم شجرا
عن اجتهاد وكن إن خضت معتذرا

وواجب ذكر كل من صحابته
فلا تخض في حروب بينهم وقعت

It is compulsory to remember all his Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم with goodness, and to refrain from delving into what transpired between them.

Hence do not delve into the battles which occurred as a result of their viewpoints varying. And even if you do then find a plausible excuse.²

1 Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī ibn Ḥusayn ibn Musharraf al-Wuhaybī al-Tamīmī. A Mālikī scholar who had composed poetry in abundance. He was a Salafī in belief. He was from Aḥsā’. For a while he was a judge. He has written many poems regarding the oneness of Allah سُبْحَانَكَ رَبَّنَا, in debunking the claims of the deniers of the attributes of the Ahl al-Sunnah, endorsing the revivalist call and defending it and praises. All of these can be found in the collection of his poetry. He passed away in 1285 A.H. Some of his books are: *Ikhtisār Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. See: *al-A’lām* 1/182; *Mu’jam al-Mu’allifīn* 2/32.

2 *Dīwān Ibn Musharraf* p. 55.

The Ahl al-Bayt and their Status according to the Ahl al-Sunnah

The Root Letters of the word Āl:

The scholars have differed as to the root letters of the word Āl; there are two views in this regard:

The first view

The root letters are *Ahl*, on the scale of *Fa'l*, i.e. with a *Fathah* which is followed by a *Sukūn*. The letter *Hā'* was changed to a *Hamzah* making the word *A'l* (with two *Hamzahs* coming together). Due to two *Hamzahs* coming together, the first one having a *Fathah* and the second one a *Sukūn*, the second one was changed to an *Alif*, making the word *Āl*. This is the viewpoint of most of the linguistics.¹

This view has, however, been deemed weak, due to the many differences which exist in the usage of both words. If the word *Ahl* was the original of *Āl* they both would have been the same completely.²

The second view

The root letters are *Awala*, on the scale of *Fa'ala*. Due to the *Waw* having a short vowel sign and the letter before it having a *Fathah* it was changed to an *Alif*.³ It is thus derived from the verb *Āla Yāūlu* which means 'to return'. The *Āl* of a man would thus mean: those who return to him and are attributed to him. Likewise *Yāūluhum* means: 'he governed them'; and the word *Iyālah* also means 'to govern'. Hence the *Āl* of a person are his subordinates whom he governs and takes care of. Yes of course, he himself is more deserving of his care and governance, therefore, he himself will also be included in his *Āl*.⁴

1 *Lisān al-'Arab* 11/30; *Jilā' al-Afhām* p. 203; *al-Qāmūs al-Muḥīṭ* p. 1245; *al-Qawl al-Badī'* p. 191.

2 *Majmū' Fatāwā Shaikh al-Islām* 22/463; *Jilā' al-Afhām* p. 203; *'Umdah al-Ḥuffāz* 1/140.

3 *Al-Bayān wa al-Ta'rīf* 1/31.

4 *Jilā' al-Afhām* p. 204.

The author of *Ḥirz al-Amānī* has alluded to the difference of views in this regard in the following stanza:

وقد قال بعض الناس من أبدا

فأبداله من همزة هاء أصلها

*The Hā' which is its root letter was changed to a Hamzah. And some have suggested that it was a waw which was changed to a Hamzah.*¹

As for the literal meaning of *Āl*, it is the family of a person. It also includes his followers and his associates.²

Probably the initial meaning of *Āl* was the family of a person and his relatives. Thereafter, due to the similarity between the followers and the relatives in terms of their dependence upon him and his dependence upon them, its purport was broadened to include his followers as well.³

Likewise, the root letters A, W, L in all their different forms and conjugations give one meaning: 'uniting and gathering'.⁴

Furthermore, the word *Āl* is only used to refer to people of stature and dignity; hence the bearers of the Qur'ān are known as the *Āl* of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, and the household of Nabī صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ is known as the *Āl* of Muḥammad صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. But expressions like *Āl* of the barber or the *Āl* of the tailor are not used.⁵

The Technical Meaning of *Āl*

The scholars have differed regarding the technical meaning of *Āl*. The reason for their difference is the broad meaning of the word in the Arabic language which includes the household of a person, his relatives, his followers and his associates.

1 *Ḥirz al-Amānī* p. 29.

2 *Maqāyīs al-Lughah* p. 95; *al-Fā'iq* 1/67; *Lisān al-'Arab* 11/31; *al-Qāmūs al-Muḥīṭ* p. 1245.

3 *Khaṣā'is Āl al-Bayt* p. 35.

4 *Al-Qawl al-Badī* p. 48; *Maqāyīs al-Lughah* 1/158.

5 *Lisān al-'Arab* 11/30; *Jilā' al-Afhām* p. 205; *al-Qāmūs al-Muḥīṭ* p. 1245; *al-Qawl al-Badī* p. 191.

In addition to that, the word *Āl* has been used in various texts for various meanings; as a result, when many of the scholars found it plausible to apply a particular meaning to a particular text they extended that meaning arbitrarily to all the other texts as well.

Hence there are various views in this regard:

The First View

The *Āl* of Nabī is the people of the *Kisā'* (the shroud) and their progenies. The term 'people of the *Kisā'*' refers to 'Alī, Fāṭimah, Ḥasan and Ḥusayn رضي الله عنهم'.¹ This is the view of majority of the members of Ahl al-Bayt who were Zaydīs.²

They have advanced the following narration of 'Ā'ishah رضي الله عنها as evidence for their view:

قالت عائشة خرج النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم غداة وعليه مرط مرحل من شعر أسود فجاء الحسن بن علي فأدخله ثم جاء الحسين فدخل معه ثم جاءت فاطمة فأدخلها ثم جاء علي فأدخله ثم قال إِنَّمَا يُرِيدُ اللَّهُ لِيُذْهِبَ عَنْكُمُ الرِّجْسَ أَهْلَ الْبَيْتِ وَيُطَهِّرَكُمْ تَطْهِيرًا.

Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم came out one morning and upon him was an embellished shroud³ made of black fur. Ḥasan رضي الله عنه came and Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم covered him.

1 *Al-Majmū' Sharḥ al-Muḥadhdhab* 3/431.

2 *Nayl al-Awtār* 2/327. The Zaydiyyah are the followers of Zayd ibn 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib. He would associate with Abū Bakr and 'Umar رضي الله عنهما but would give preference to 'Alī رضي الله عنه over them. He likewise considered it permissible to revolt against the rulers. His followers have subdivided into many groups after agreeing that 'Alī رضي الله عنه was on the truth in all his battles and that leadership is the exclusive right of his children; thus if anyone amongst them comes forth calling for the establishment of the Qur'ān and the Sunnah it will be compulsory to unsheathe the sword with him (support his mission). They also believe that those who commit major sins will be doomed to Jahannam forever. See: *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* p. 65; *al-Fiṣal* 4/76; *al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* p. 16; *al-Mīlāl wa al-Niḥāl* 1/154.

3 *Mirṭ* refers to a specific type of Yemeni shroud made of wool or silk; its plural is *Murūt*. See: *al-Miṣbāḥ al-Munīr* 2/569. *Muraḥḥal* also refers to a specific type of embellished Yemeni garment. The reason why she brought the word *Muraḥḥal* as an adjective for *Mirṭ* is that it had drawings of saddles on it. See: *al-Fā'iḳ* 3/360; *Lisān al-'Arab* 11/278.

He was followed by Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه who went in with him as well. Then came Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها and so he covered her. She was followed by ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and he covered him as well. Thereafter he said, “Allah intends only to remove from you the impurity [of sin], O people of the [Prophet’s] household, and to purify you with [extensive] purification^{1, 2}

In some narrations it appears that Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم pointing towards them said the following:

اللهم هؤلاء أهل بيتي

O Allah this is my household.³

And in some narrations Rasūl Allāh صلى الله عليه وسلم is reported to have resisted from including Umm Salamah رضي الله عنها under the shroud when she requested.⁴

This view is weak due to the following reasons:

Firstly, the verses before and after the verse in question are all pertaining to the wives of Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم. Hence it would not be correct to say that they are not included therein. Otherwise the verse would be completely foreign to the context wherein it appears, which in itself goes against the style of the Qur’ān.⁵

1 Sūrah Aḥzāb: 33.

2 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: chapter regarding the merits of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم; sub-chapter regarding the virtues of the household of Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم: ḥadīth no. 2424.

3 The narration of Wāthilah ibn al-Asqa’ رضي الله عنه which appears in *Musnad Aḥmad*: ḥadīth no. 17029; There is a similar narration reported from Umm Salamah رضي الله عنها: ḥadīth no. 26551; *Sunan al-Tirmidhī* contains the narration of ‘Umar ibn Abī Salamah which appears in the chapter of *Manāqib* (merits): sub-chapter regarding the merits of the household of Nabī *H*: ḥadīth no. 3787. The ḥadīth has been deemed Ṣaḥīḥ by Shu’ayb al-Arnāūṭ in his *Takhrīj* of the *Musnad* and by al-Albānī in his *Ṣaḥīḥ wa Ḍa’īf al-Tirmidhī*.

4 *Musnad Aḥmad* 6/323; Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal: *Faḍā’il al-Ṣaḥābah* 2/602; *Musnad Abī Ya’lā* 12/456; *al-Mu’jam al-Kabīr* 3/53.

5 Al-Jaṣṣāṣ: *Aḥkām al-Qur’ān* 5/230; *Tafsīr al-Bayḍāwī* 4/374; *al-Jāmi’ li Aḥkām al-Qur’ān* 14/183.

Hence Ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه would say:

نزلت في نساء النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم خاصة

It was revealed regarding the wives of Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم specifically.¹

And ‘Ikrimah² would say:

من شاء باهلته أنها نزلت في أزواج النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم.

Whoever wants, I can enter into a *Mubāhalah* (mutual imprecation) with him and claim that it was revealed regarding the wives of Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم.³

Furthermore, according to majority of the scholars of the principles of Sharī‘ah the scenario which prompted the revelation of the verses, i.e. giving the wives of Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم the option of enduring poverty whilst staying with him or parting with him and attaining the riches of this world, is most certainly included in the verses. Hence it would not be correct to exclude it due to a secondary excluding/specifying text.⁴

Secondly, even though the ḥadīth suggests exclusivity, the most that can be said is that it excludes others besides those mentioned implicitly. But there are many other narrations which explicitly state that they are part of the Ahl al-Bayt.

1 *Tafsīr al-Sam‘ānī* 4/280; *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* 3/484; *al-Durr al-Manthūr* 6/603; *Rūḥ al-Ma‘ānī* 13/22.

2 ‘Ikrimah ibn ‘Abd Allah al-Hāshimī (their client/ally), Abū ‘Abd Allah al-Madanī, the freed slave of Ibn ‘Abbās. He was from the prominent successors (of the Ṣahābah) and a reliable narrator. He learnt the exegesis of the Qur‘ān from his master Ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه and became a master therein. He would issue Fatwas during the lifetime of Ibn ‘Abbās upon his instruction. He traversed the lands and thus many people benefitted from him. He was accused of having leanings toward the views of the Ṣufriyyah, a sub-sect of the Khawārij. He passed away in Madīnah in 105 A.H. His narrations appears in the six canonical works. See: *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 20/264; *Tārīkh al-Islām* 7/174; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 5/12; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 7/234.

3 *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* 3/484; *al-Durr al-Manthūr* 6/603; *Rūḥ al-Ma‘ānī* 13/22; *Faḥḥ al-Qadīr* 4/279.

4 *Aḍwā’ al-Bayān* 6/237; *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* 3/484.

Hence the explicit will take precedence over the implicit, as is well established in the principles of Fiqh.¹

Thirdly, if the narration suggests exclusivity, then what is the proof for the progeny of those enshrouded being included in the Ahl al-Bayt, whereas the exclusivity ought to have excluded them as well?²

Lastly, the reason for not including Umm Salamah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا is either because her inclusion in the verses was already obvious due to the context, or because ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was not her *Maḥram* (close male relative who is unmarriageable).³

The Second View

Āl refers to those who stayed with Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, i.e. his wives and his children. The proponents of this view have advanced the following as evidence:

Proof 1: the verse:

إِنَّمَا يُرِيدُ اللَّهُ لِيُذْهِبَ عَنْكُمُ الرِّجْسَ أَهْلَ الْبَيْتِ وَيُطَهِّرَكُمْ تَطْهِيرًا.

*Allah intends only to remove from you the impurity [of sin], O people of the [Prophet's] household, and to purify you with [extensive] purification.*⁴

They aver that the context of the verse definitively refers to the wives of Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ alone, for Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى says:

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّبِيُّ قُلْ لَأُزْوَاجِكِ إِن كُنْتُنَّ تُرِدْنَ الْحَيَاةَ الدُّنْيَا وَزِينَتَهَا فَتَعَالَيْنَ أُمْتِعْكَنَّ وَأُسرِحْكَنَّ سَرَاحًا جَمِيلًا

1 Al-Maḥṣūl 5/579; Nayl al-Awṭār 2/327.

2 Nayl al-Awṭār 2/327.

3 ‘Aqīdah Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā‘ah fī al-Ṣaḥābah wa Ahl al-Bayt 2/159.

4 Sūrah Aḥzāb: 33.

O Prophet, say to your wives, "If you should desire the worldly life and its adornment, then come, I will provide for you and give you a gracious release."¹

Likewise:

يَا نِسَاءَ النَّبِيِّ مَنِ يَاْتِ مِنْكُنَّ بِفَاحِشَةٍ مُّبِينَةٍ يُضَاعَفْ لَهَا الْعَذَابُ ضِعْفَيْنِ ۗ وَكَانَ ذَلِكَ عَلَى اللَّهِ يَسِيرًا

O wives of the Prophet, whoever of you should commit a clear immorality – for her the punishment would be doubled two fold, and ever is that, for Allah, easy.²

Also:

يَا نِسَاءَ النَّبِيِّ لَسْتُنَّ كَأَحَدٍ مِنَ النِّسَاءِ ۗ إِنِ اتَّقَيْتُنَّ فَلَا تَخْضَعْنَ بِالْقَوْلِ فَيَطْمَعَ الَّذِي فِي قَلْبِهِ مَرَضٌ

O wives of the Prophet, you are not like anyone among women. If you fear Allah, then do not be soft in speech [to men], lest he in whose heart is disease should covet.³

And after the verse in question he says:

وَأذْكُرَنَّ مَا يُنْتَلَىٰ فِي بُيُوتِكُنَّ مِنْ آيَاتِ اللَّهِ وَالْحِكْمَةِ ۗ إِنَّ اللَّهَ كَانَ لَطِيفًا خَبِيرًا

And remember what is recited in your houses of the verses of Allah and wisdom. Indeed, Allah is ever Subtle and Acquainted [with all things].⁴

All these verses are inter-linked, hence it would not be plausible to aver that one verse amidst all of them is different from them and addresses others besides the wives of Nabī ﷺ.

1 Sūrah Aḥzāb: 28.

2 Sūrah Aḥzāb: 30.

3 Sūrah Aḥzāb: 32.

4 Sūrah Aḥzāb: 34.

As for why the masculine pronoun 'kum' is brought, it is in consideration of the word *Ahl* (which is masculine); the Arabs very often use the masculine pronouns due to words they are referring back to, as in the verse:

فَلَمَّا قَضَىٰ مُوسَى الْأَجَلَ وَسَارَ بِأَهْلِهِ آنَسَ مِنْ جَانِبِ الطُّورِ نَارًا قَالَ لِأَهْلِهِ امْكُثُوا إِنِّي آنَسْتُ نَارًا
لَّعَلِّي آتِيكُم مِّنْهَا بِخَبَرٍ أَوْ جَذْوَةٍ مِّنَ النَّارِ لَعَلَّكُمْ تَصْطَلُونَ

And when Mūsā had completed the term and was traveling with his family, he perceived from the direction of the mount a fire. He said to his family, “Stay here; indeed, I have perceived a fire. Perhaps I will bring you from there [some] information or burning wood from the fire that you may warm yourselves.”¹

The answer to this proof is the following:

The context suggesting that the words *Ahl al-Bayt* are inclusive of the wives of Nabī صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ is more than clear. However, the exclusion of everyone else besides them is merely implicit, whereas on the other hand there are other texts which explicitly include them as well.

Hence the correct reason for bringing the masculine pronoun 'kum' would be to include the men of the *Ahl al-Bayt* as well,² because the rule is that when masculine and feminine nouns come together preference is given to the masculine pronoun.³

Proof 2:

The ḥadīth of Nabī صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ:

اللهم اجعل رزق آل محمد قوتا

1 Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ: 29.

2 Zād al-Masīr 6/376; al-Taḥfīr al-Kabīr of Rāzī 25/181; al-Jāmi' li Aḥkām al-Qur'ān 14/183; Faṭḥ al-Qadīr 4/279.

3 Al-Jāmi' li Aḥkām al-Qur'ān 14/183; Taḥfīr al-Tha'ālibī 8/35.

O Allah make the sustenance of the Āl of Muḥammad just enough for them to subsist.¹

The proponents of this view aver that it is a known fact that this supplication did not eventually have a bearing on all the Banū Hāshim and the Banū al-Muṭṭalib, for there were rich and influential people among them; even till today they are found among them.

As for his wives, their sustenance was just about enough for them to subsist; whatever wealth they would receive they would spend it in avenues of charity and would only keep for themselves what was enough for their subsistence.²

The answer to this proof is the very same as the answer to the previous proof, i.e. expression/explicitness takes precedence over impression/implicitness.

Proof 3:

The following narration of ‘Ā’ishah رضي الله عنها:

ما شبع آل محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم منذ قدم المدينة من طعام البر ثلاث ليال تباعا حتى قبض .

Since they came to Madīnah, the Āl of Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم did not eat wheat to its fill for three consecutive days till he passed away.³

1 The narration of Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنه which appears in: *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*: chapter of *Riqāq* (heart softeners); sub-chapter regarding how Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم and his Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم would live and how they shunned this world: ḥadīth no. 6095; *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: Chapter of *Zakāh*: sub-chapter regarding have enough (for the fulfilment of one’s needs) and being content: ḥadīth no. 1055.

2 *Jilā’ al-Afhām* p. 216.

3 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*: chapter of *Riqāq* (heart softeners); sub-chapter regarding how Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم and his Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم would live and how they shunned this world: ḥadīth no. 6089; *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: Chapter of *disinclination from the world and heart softeners*: sub-chapter regarding the world being the prison of a believer and the paradise of a disbeliever: ḥadīth no. 2970.

They say that it is known that ‘Abbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, his children and the Banū ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib do not fall part of this ḥadīth (because they were in Makkah).¹

The answer to this proof is the very same as the above as well, i.e. explicit mention takes precedence over inference.

Proof 4:

The following ḥadīth which has many variant transmissions:

اللهم صل على محمد وعلى آل محمد

O Allah send salutations upon Muḥammad and the Āl of Muḥammad.²

And in another version which is narrated by Abū Ḥumayd al-Sā‘idī the following appears:

اللهم صلى على محمد وأزواجه وذريته

O Allah send salutations upon Muḥammad, his wives and his children.³

The second version suggests that only the wives and the children of Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ are meant by Āl.⁴

The answer to this proof is that in the narration of Abū Hurayrah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ all three have been mentioned together, i.e. Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, his wives and children, and his Āl. The narration reads as follows:

1 *Jilā’ al-Afhām* p. 217.

2 The narration of Ka’b ibn ‘Ujrah which appears in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*: chapter of Tafsīr: cub-chapter regarding the verse: إِنَّ اللَّهَ وَمَلَائِكَتَهُ يُصَلُّونَ عَلَى النَّبِيِّ; ḥadīth no. 4519; *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: chapter of Ṣalāh: subchapter regarding salutations upon Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ after the Tashahhud: ḥadīth no. 406.

3 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*: chapter of supplications: sub-chapter regarding the whether salutations can be sent to others besides Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ; ḥadīth no. 5999; *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: chapter of Ṣalāh; subchapter regarding salutations upon Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ after the Tashahhud: ḥadīth no. 407.

4 *Al-Qawl al-Badī* p. 192.

من سره أن يكتال بالمكيال الأوفى إذا صلى علينا أهل البيت فيليقل: اللهم صل على محمد النبي وأزواجه أمهات المؤمنين وذريته وأهل بيته كما صليت على آل إبراهيم إنك حميد مجيد.

Whoever desires that his deeds be weighed with a complete scale when he sends salutations upon us the Ahl al-Bayt should say: O Allah send salutations upon Muḥammad the Nabī, his wives the mothers of the believers, his children and his *Ahl al-Bayt*, just as you sent salutations upon the family of Ibrāhīm. You are praiseworthy and glorious.¹

As you have noticed, in this narration he mentioned the Ahl al-Bayt after mentioning the wives and the children. This is proof that the term *Āl* is not specific to them.

The variance in the wordings of various narrations, i.e. some of them are mentioned in some whereas others are not can probably be attributed to remembrance of some narrators and the forgetting of others.²

However, a stronger explanation thereof would be to say that the injunction of sending salutations upon Nabī ﷺ has come in different ways:

Hence at times the injunction is to send salutations upon Nabī ﷺ merely without including anyone else, like in the ḥadīth of Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī wherein he says:

قلنا يا رسول الله، هذا التسليم، فكيف نصلي عليك؟ قال: قولوا اللهم صلى على محمد عبدك ورسولك كما صلت على آل إبراهيم.

We asked, “O Rasūl Allāh, this is *Taslīm* (the manner of sending peace upon you) so how should we send *Ṣalāh* (salutations) upon you?” He said, “Say: O Allah send salutations upon Muḥammad, your servant and messenger, just as you sent salutations upon the household of Ibrāhīm.”³

1 *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*: chapter of Ṣalāh; sub-chapter regarding salutations upon Nabī ﷺ after Tashahhud: ḥadīth no. 982. The ḥadīth is graded as weak by al-Albānī in *Ḍaʿīf Sunan Abī Dāwūd*.

2 *Al-Qawl al-Badī* p. 192.

3 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*: chapter of Tafsīr: sub-chapter regarding the verse: إِنَّ اللَّهَ وَمَلَائِكَتَهُ يُصَلُّونَ عَلَى النَّبِيِّ: ḥadīth no. 4520.

At times the injunction is to send salutations upon Nabī ﷺ and his wives ﷺ, as in the narration of Abū Ḥumayd ﷺ.

And at times, the injunction is to send salutations upon him and his Āl, i.e. the rest of his relatives, like in the narration of Ka'b ibn 'Ujrah ﷺ and others.

This variance in sending salutations is in consideration of the virtue of each one. That is to say that because, after the grace of Allah ﷻ, all credit goes to Rasūl Allāh ﷺ in guiding the creation, we are told to send salutations upon him all the time and in every condition.

As for his wives and his relatives ﷺ, their merit and high stature is obvious. But their merit is in reality an offshoot of the merit and status of Nabī ﷺ. We are thus told to send salutations upon this group at times and upon the other group at other times.

The Third View

Āl refers to those of the relatives of Nabī ﷺ for who *ṣadaqah* (charity) is impermissible, keeping in mind the differences of the scholars in specifying them. This is the view of Mālik, the stated opinion of al-Shāfi'ī and a narration from Aḥmad. And this is the view of the majority.

Their proofs are as follows:

Proof 1:

The following narration of Abū Hurayrah ﷺ:

كان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يؤتى بالتمر عند صرام النخل فيجيء هذا بتمره وهذا من تمره حتى يصير عنده كوما من تمر فجعل الحسن والحسين رضي الله عنهما يلعبان بذلك التمر فأخذ أحدهما ثمرة فجعلها في فيه فنظر إليه رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فأخرجها من فيه فقال أما علمت أن آل محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم لا يأكلون الصدقة

When the dates would be harvested they would be brought to Nabī ﷺ; this person would come with his dates and that person would come with his dates until a heap of dates would form. Ḥasan and Ḥusayn ؓ were playing with those dates when one of them took a date and put it in his mouth. Nabī ﷺ saw him and took the date out of his mouth and said, “Did you not know that the family of Muḥammad ﷺ does not eat charity.”¹

Proof 2:

The narration of ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib ibn Rabī‘ah which is as follows:

He and Faḍl ibn ‘Abbās ؓ asked Rasūl Allāh ﷺ to use them as Zakāh collectors so that they may collect and submit to him like others, and so that they may get a share therefrom just like others. To which Nabī ﷺ said:

إن الصدقة لا تنبغي لآل محمد إنما هي أوساخ الناس

Ṣadaqaḥ is not appropriate for the Āl of Muḥammad; for it is from the defilements of people.²

The proponents of this view aver that these two ḥadīths explicitly state the impermissibility of charity for the Āl. Although they do not state who is referred to by Āl, but another narration contains the following explanation. Zayd ibn Arqam ؓ narrates:

قام رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يوما فينا خطيبا بماء يدعى خميا بين مكة والمدينة فحمد الله وأثنى عليه ووعظ وذكر ثم قال أما بعد ألا أيها الناس فإنما أنا بشر يوشك أن يأتي رسول ربي فأجيب وأنا تارك

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*: chapter of Zakāh: sub-chapter regarding collecting charity when the dates are harvested, and should a child be left to take from the dates of Ṣadaqaḥ: ḥadīth no. 1414; *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: chapter of Zakāh: sub-chapter regarding Zakāh being impermissible for Rasūl Allāh ﷺ and his family, which is Banū Hāshim and Banū ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib: ḥadīth no. 1069.

2 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: chapter of Zakāh: sub-chapter regarding Nabī ﷺ not using his household for the collection of Zakāh: ḥadīth no. 1072.

فيكم ثقلين أولهما كتاب الله فيه الهدى والنور فخذوا بكتاب الله واستمسكوا به فحث على كتاب الله ورغب فيه ثم قال وأهل بيتي أذكركم الله في أهل بيتي أذكركم الله في أهل بيتي أذكركم الله في أهل بيتي فقال له حصين ومن أهل بيته يا زيد أليس نساؤه من أهل بيته قال نساؤه من أهل بيته ولكن أهل بيته من حرم الصدقة بعده قال ومن هم قال هم آل علي وآل عتيق وآل جعفر وآل عباس قال كل هؤلاء حرم الصدقة قال نعم

Rasūl Allāh ﷺ stood amongst us at a pond called Khum, between Makkah and Madīnah, to deliver a sermon. He praised Allah ﷻ, advised and reminded us and then said, “Behold oh people! I am merely a human; very soon the messenger of my lord will call to whom I will respond. I am leaving amidst you the two weighty things. The first is the Book of Allah, wherein is contained light and guidance. So practice upon the Book of Allah and hold onto it firmly. Hence he exhorted regarding the Book of Allah and encouraged regarding it. Thereafter he said, “And my Ahl al-Bayt. I remind you of Allah regarding my Ahl al-Bayt, I remind you of Allah regarding my Ahl al-Bayt; I remind you of Allah regarding my Ahl al-Bayt.” Al-Ḥusayn thus said to him (the narrator), “Who is his Ahl al-Bayt, O Zayd? Are not his wives from his Ahl al-Bayt?” He replied, “His wives are certainly from his Ahl al-Bayt, but his Ahl al-Bayt (those intended here) are those for who charity is forbidden.” Thereupon he asked, “And who are they?” To which he replied, “The family of ‘Alī, the family of ‘Aqīl, the family of Ja‘far and the family of ‘Abbās.” He further asked, “Is charity forbidden for all these people?” He replied, “Yes.”¹

The proponents of this view aver that a Ṣaḥābī knows better the meaning intended by Nabī ﷺ than anyone else, hence his explanation supports the specification of the aforementioned families.²

The answer to this is as follows:

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: chapter regarding the merits of the Ṣaḥābah: sub-chapter regarding the merits of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib: ḥadīth no. 2408.

2 *Nayl al-Awṭār* 2/327.

Firstly, this ḥadīth explicitly includes the wives of Nabī ﷺ in his Āl; because when Zayd رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was asked regarding them, he did not deny, rather he said, “His wives are surely from his Ahl al-Bayt.”

If it is further asked: if that was really the case, then why did he not mention them when enlisting those for who charity is impermissible?

The answer is that he did not mention them for one of two reasons:

1. Either because the inclusion of the wives in the household of a person is obvious to one and all, hence he did not see any need to mention them.
2. Or because he specifically wanted to enlist those of the relatives of Nabī ﷺ who enjoyed a continuous relationship with him, i.e. his blood relatives. As opposed to spouses, for marriage is a temporary cause for building relations which can end with divorce or other means.

Secondly, their non-inclusion in the term Āl is deduced by way of inference, whereas there are other express proofs which include them therein. And the principle is that expression takes precedence over impression.

The Fourth View

Āl refers to the Ummah of *Ijābah*, i.e. the followers of Nabī ﷺ and those who adhere to his Dīn till the Day of Judgment.¹ This view has been attributed to Mālik,² is supported by some in the Ḥanafī and the Shāfi‘ī schools and is the preferred view of the Ḥanbalī School.³

The proofs of this group are the following:

1 *Al-Majmū’ Sharḥ al-Muḥadhdhab* 3/431.

2 *Sharḥ al-Zarqānī ‘alā Muwaṭṭā’ al-Imām Mālik* 1/476.

3 Ibn Qudāmah: *al-Mughnī* 1/319; *Al-Majmū’ Sharḥ al-Muḥadhdhab* 3/431; *Majmū’ Fatāwā Shaikh al-Islām* 22/462; *Ḥāshiyah al-Ṭaḥṭāwī ‘alā Marāqī al-Falāḥ* 1/8.

Proof 1:

The word *Āl* in itself is suggestive of this meaning. It is derived from the verb *Āla Yāūlu* which means to return; and the point of return for all followers is the person they follow due to him being their leader and source of refuge.¹ Consider the following verse:

أَذْخِلُوا آلَ فِرْعَوْنَ أَشَدَّ الْعَذَابِ

*Make the Āl of Pharaoh enter the severest punishment.*²

The intended meaning here is his army and his followers.³

Likewise consider the following poem:

وعابديه اليوم آلك

وانصر على آل الصليب

*And help against the followers of the cross and its worshipers today your followers.*⁴

Obviously the intended meaning here is followers as well.

The answer to this proof is the following:

The point of dispute is not that ‘followers’ is one of the meanings of the word *Āl* in terms of language, nor is it regarding it referring to this meaning as per the context it appears in and as per the suggestions of language. The dispute is rather regarding deeming this particular meaning to be the only intended meaning in all the texts, and that is unacceptable.

1 *Jilā' al-Afhām* p. 220

2 *Sūrah Ghāfir*: 46.

3 *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 24/71; *Daqā'iq al-Tafsīr* 2/255; *Tafsīr al-Baḥr al-Muḥīṭ* 1/350; *Jilā' al-Afhām* p. 220.

4 The poem of 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib, the grandfather of Nabī ﷺ. See: *al-Rawḍ al-Unuf* 1/122; *Ma'ālim al-Tanzīl* 4/526; *al-Jāmi' li Ahkām al-Qur'ān* 1/383; *Jilā' al-Afhām* p. 206; *Hama' al-Hawāmi'* 2/516

For instance, consider the following narration of ‘Ā’ishah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا wherein she mentions that Nabī صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ took hold of a sheep and laid it down saying:

باسم الله، اللهم تقبل من محمد وآل محمد ومن أمة محمد

In the name of Allah. O Allah accept from Muḥammad, the family of Muḥammad. and the Ummah of Muḥammad.

And thereafter slaughtered it.¹

Linking the word Ummah to the word Āl by way of a conjunction is indicative of them being different, even though the second is part of the first. Because linking by way of a conjunction necessitates variance between what is being linked and what it is being likened to by default, as long as there is no evidence to the contrary.²

Furthermore, explaining the word Āl in light of the speech of Nabī صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ is better than explaining it in light of the speech of others.³

Proof 2:

The following narration of Wāthilah ibn al-Asqa رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ:

أن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم دعا حسنا وحسينا، فأجلس كل واحد منهما على فخذه، وأدنى فاطمة من حجره وزوجها، ثم لف عليهم ثوبه ثم قال: اللهم هؤلاء أهلي. قال واثلة: فقلت يا رسول الله وأنا من أهلك؟ فقال: وأنت من أهلي

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: chapter of sacrificial animals: sub-chapter regarding the desirability of the sacrificial animal being chubby and slaughtering it without appointing anyone else to do so, and saying the Tasmiyah and the Takbīr: ḥadīth no. 1967.

2 *Al-Baḥr al-Muḥīṭ fi Uṣūl al-Fiqh* 2/57; *Faḥḥ al-Bārī* 8/332; al-Taftāzānī: *Sharḥ al-Talwīḥ ‘alā al-Tawdīḥ* 1/208.

3 *Jilā’ al-Afhām* p. 215.

Nabī ﷺ called Ḥasan and Ḥusayn and made each of them sit on his lap. He then brought Fāṭimah and her husband close to his lap. Thereafter he enshrouded them with his garment and said, “O Allah this is my Ahl.” So Wāthilah asked, “O Rasūl Allāh ﷺ am I also from your Ahl?” He said, “You are from my Ahl.”¹

The point of substantiation here is that Nabī ﷺ included Wāthilah ibn al-Asqaʿ in his Ahl. Whereas it is an accepted fact that he was not from the relatives of Nabī ﷺ; he was from Banū Layth ibn Bakr ibn Manāt. Hence the ḥadīth suggests that the followers are intended in the word Ahl.²

The answer to this proof is that at times Nabī ﷺ would give preference to a more general meaning of the word Ahl which surpasses the restrictions of blood relations; thereby including some strangers therein due to likening them to the Ahl al-Bayt in their knowledge and piety; not because they by default are included in the meaning thereof.³ The proof of this is that charity was not forbidden for Wāthilah ibn al-Asqaʿ without any dispute in that regard.

The Fifth View

Āl refers to the pious people from the Ummah of Nabī ﷺ.⁴ Some of the scholars have deemed the generality in the fourth view to specifically refer to this meaning.⁵

Nonetheless, the following have been advanced as evidence for this view:

Proof 1:

The narration of Anas رضي الله عنه:

1 Al-Ṭabarānī: *al-Muʿjam al-Kabīr*: ḥadīth no. 2670; al-Bayhaqī: *al-Sunan al-Kubrā*: ḥadīth no. 2690. Ibn al-Qayyim has graded the narration as Ṣaḥīḥ in his book *Jilāʾ al-Afhām* p. 221.

2 *Jilāʾ al-Afhām* p. 221.

3 *Jilāʾ al-Afhām* p. 223.

4 *Jilāʾ al-Afhām* p. 222; *al-Qawl al-Badī* p. 194.

5 *Al-Qawl al-Badī* p. 194.

سئل رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: من آل محمد؟ فقال: كل تقى، وتلا إن أوليائِهِ إِلَّا الْمُتَّقُونَ

Nabī ﷺ was asked, “Who is the household of Muḥammad ﷺ?” He said, “Every pious person,” And thereafter recited the following verse: Its [true] guardians are not but the righteous^{1, 2}

The answer to this proof is that it does not qualify as evidence.³

Proof 2:

Allah ﷻ ordered Nūḥ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ to carry his Ahl with him in the verse:

قُلْنَا احْمِلْ فِيهَا مِنْ كُلِّ زَوْجَيْنِ اثْنَيْنِ وَأَهْلَكَ

Load upon it [i.e., the ship] of each [creature] two mates and your family.⁴

And when his son drowned he beseeched Allah ﷻ saying:

رَبِّ إِنَّ ابْنِي مِنْ أَهْلِي وَإِنَّ وَعْدَكَ الْحَقُّ وَأَنْتَ أَحْكَمُ الْحَاكِمِينَ

My Lord, indeed my son is of my family; and indeed, your promise is true; and you are the most just of judges⁵

And Allah ﷻ rejected that:

إِنَّهُ لَيْسَ مِنْ أَهْلِكَ

O Nūḥ, indeed he is not of your family.⁶

1 Sūrah Anfāl: 34.

2 Al-Ṭabarānī: *Al-Muḥjam al-Kabīr*: ḥadīth no. 318.

3 Ibn Taymiyah has deemed the narration baseless in *Majmū' Fatāwā* 22/462; likewise al-Haythamī has graded it as weak in *Majma' al-Zawā'id* 10/269; Ibn Ḥajar has deemed it very weak in *Fath al-Bārī* 11/161; and so has al-Sakhāwī in *al-Qawl al-Badī* p. 194.

4 Sūrah Hūd: 40.

5 Sūrah Hūd: 45.

6 Sūrah Hūd: 46.

The point of evidence is that Allah ﷻ declared that Nūḥ's عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام son is not from his Ahl, despite him being his biological son, due to his polytheism. Hence this is evidence of the fact that the Āl of a messenger in reality are his followers.¹

The answer to this proof is that Allah ﷻ has not rejected the fact that the son of Nūḥ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام was from his Ahl in the broader sense of the word, rather he rejected that he was part of his Ahl in consideration of a more specific meaning, which is the following:

وَأَهْلَكَ إِلَّا مَنْ سَبَقَ عَلَيْهِ الْقَوْلُ

*And your family, except those about whom the word has preceded.*²

Allah ﷻ ordered him to carry with him from his family those regarding whom his decree (of punishment) had not preceded.³ Hence what is being rejected is the son not being part of that Ahl which Nūḥ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام was ordered to carry and save (not his inclusion in the Ahl in the broader sense of the word, i.e. he was still part of his household, but was excluded from attaining salvation).

Proof 2:

The ḥadīth of Wāthilah ibn al-Asqa' which has passed already.

The point of substantiation in the narration is that including Wāthilah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ because of his piety and Allah-consciousness is better than including the entire Ummah, its pious and impious.⁴

The answer to this has passed already so there is no need for repetition.⁵

1 Jilā' al-Afhām p. 221.

2 Sūrah Hūd: 40.

3 Al-Sunan al-Kubrā 3/151; al-Majmū' Sharḥ al-Muhadhdhab 3/430; Lisān al-'Arab 11/38; Jilā' al-Afhām p. 223.

4 Al-Majmū' Sharḥ al-Muhadhdhab 3/432; Jilā' al-Afhām p. 223.

5 See page no. 65. (Add page number)

Conclusion

In conclusion, the preferred view, and Allah ﷻ knows best, is that the word *Āl* refers to those for who charity was forbidden, including the wives of Nabī ﷺ, according to the correct opinion in this regard. Some scholars have offered a very interesting rationale for why his wives are part of his *Āl*. They say that owing to the fact that their relationship with Rasūl Allāh ﷺ is complete in both the abodes, i.e. they are his wives in both of them, during his lifetime and after his demise, this complete relationship which will never come to an end is equal to a blood relationship which similarly does not end.¹

This selection which is a combination of the second and third view sums up all the various texts pertaining to this topic. Thus if at times the word *Āl* appears in a particular context where only some members thereof are intended, to the exclusion of the others, that is inconsequential; because in Arabic at times the whole is mentioned and only a few members thereof are intended.

The Status of the Ahl al-Bayt according to the Ahl al-Sunnah

The Ahl al-Bayt enjoy a very intimate bond with Nabī ﷺ due to the relationship they enjoy with him; they are from him and he is from them. Hence they enjoy such rights which no one besides them shares with them; their rights have a direct link with his rights, rather they are so intertwined that they cannot be separated. There are many texts, specific and general, which emphasise this. These texts at times extoll their virtues and praise them, and at times they exhort the Ummah to be cognizant of their rights and see to their well-being.

Zayd ibn Arqam رضي الله عنه narrates:

قام رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يوما فينا خطيبا بماء يدعى خميا بين مكة والمدينة فحمد الله وأثنى عليه ووعظ وذكر ثم قال أما بعد ألا أيها الناس فإنما أنا بشر يوشك أن يأتي رسول ربي فأجيب وأنا تارك فيكم ثقلين أولهما كتاب الله فيه الهدى والنور فخذوا بكتاب الله واستمسكوا به فحث على كتاب الله ورغب فيه ثم قال وأهل بيتي أذكركم الله في أهل بيتي أذكركم الله في أهل بيتي أذكركم الله في أهل بيتي

1 *Al-Sunan al-Kubrā* 2/150; *Shu'ab al-Īmān* 2/225; *Jilā' al-Afhām* p. 217.

Rasūl Allāh ﷺ stood amongst us at a pond called Khum, between Makkah and Madīnah, to deliver a sermon. He praised Allah ﷻ, advised and reminded us and then said, “Behold O people! I am merely a human; very soon the messenger of my lord will to whom I will respond. I am leaving amidst the two weighty things. The first is the Book of Allah, wherein is contained light and guidance. So practice upon the Book of Allah and hold onto it firmly. Hence he exhorted regarding the Book of Allah and encouraged regarding it. Thereafter he said, “And my Ahl al-Bayt. I remind you of Allah regarding my Ahl al-Bayt, I remind you of Allah regarding my Ahl al-Bayt, and I remind you of Allah regarding my Ahl al-Bayt.”¹

It is therefore compulsory upon every Muslim to carefully regard this advice of Nabī ﷺ regarding his pure Ahl al-Bayt, not only during his ﷺ lifetime, but after his death as well, as stated by Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ:

ارقبوا محمدا صلى الله عليه وسلم في أهل بيتي

Cautiously consider Muḥammad ﷺ when dealing with his Ahl al-Bayt.²

However, it is crucial to remember that this reverence and regard is specific to the believers among his Ahl al-Bayt. As for those besides them, even though they share the noble pedigree with Nabī ﷺ, like Abū Lahb the uncle of Nabī ﷺ, ³ they do not deserve any respect or consideration. To establish this it is

1 The reference has passed already on p. 62. (Add page number)

2 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*: chapter regarding the merits of the Ṣaḥābah: sub-chapter regarding the merits of the household of Nabī ﷺ and the merits of Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا, the daughter of Nabī ﷺ: ḥadīth no. 3509.

3 ‘Abd al-‘Uzzā ibn ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib ibn Hāshim al-Qurashī, Abū ‘Utbah, the uncle of Nabī ﷺ. His father ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib had given him the title Abū Lahb owing to his handsomeness, for he was the most handsome of people. He opposed Nabī ﷺ in his mission. He would disillusion the people from Nabī ﷺ. Sūrah Masad in the Qur’ān was revealed regarding him. He died in Makkah after the battle of Badr after contracting a fatal illness known as measles. See: *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 67/161; *Tahdhīb al-Asmā’ wa al-Lughāt* 2/543; *al-A’lām* 4/12.

sufficient to note that Allah ﷻ revealed verses of the Qur’ān regarding him which will be recited till the Day of Judgment. In fact no one else, besides Abū Lahb and his wife, has been condemned by name in the entire Qur’ān.¹ Consider, why would he deserve inviolable respect and regard which stem from the respect and regard we ought to have for Nabī ﷺ when he himself disbelieved in him and rejected his message.

Nonetheless, in light of this prophetic instruction regarding the Ahl al-Bayt, it is the belief of the Ahl al-Sunnah that loving the Ahl al-Bayt is an obligation. The fulfilment thereof will earn a person reward² and the abandoning thereof will engender deficiency in his faith.

When ‘Abbās رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, the uncle of Nabī ﷺ discerned that some people of the Quraysh were being cold toward them, he complained to Nabī ﷺ. Nabī ﷺ said to him:

والله لا يدخل قلب امرئ إيمان حتى يحبكم لله ولقرايتي

By Allah, īmān will not enter the heart of a person till he does not love you for the sake of Allah and due to my relationship with you.³

Hence the reasons for loving them are many:

1. Owing to their Islam.
2. Owing to their relationship with Nabī ﷺ.
3. The exhortation of Nabī ﷺ regarding loving them.⁴

1 *Majmū’ Fatāwā Shaikh al-Islām* 16/602.

2 *Majmū’ Fatāwā Shaikh al-Islām* 4/487.

3 *Musnad Aḥmad*: ḥadīth no. 1777; *Musnad al-Bazzār*: ḥadīth no. 2175. The ḥadīth has been graded as weak by Shu’ayb al-Arnāuṭ in his *Takhrīj* of the *Musnad*.

4 *Al-Sa’dī: al-Laṭīfāt al-Sa’diyyah* p. 94.

It goes without doubt that the prophetic exhortation demands that the Ummah goes out of its way in revering them. Hence they should do so by: giving them preference, respecting them, being good to them, dealing amiably with them, being patient with them, overlooking their shortcomings and praying for them.¹

The Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ were the first to understand this. They were thus very keen on adhering to this exhortation. Therefore, Abū Bakr and ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا conceded the virtue of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, they would respect him immensely in every way possible and give him preference in rank, reverence, love, association, and praise.²

Furthermore, his love and veneration was not exclusively for ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, rather it surpassed him and reached each member of the Ahl al-Bayt. Hence Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would say:

والذي نفسي بيده لقرابة رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أحب إلى من أن أصل قرابتي

By the one in whose hands is my soul, maintaining ties with the family of Rasūl Allāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ is more beloved to me than maintaining ties with my own family.³

Likewise ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would give preference to them over all the people in allowances and would give them more than the rest of the people. He would give Ḥasan and Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا the same share as their father due to their relationship with Rasūl Allāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ; he would give each one five thousand.⁴

At one occasion he told Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ:

هل أنبت على رؤوسنا الشعر إلا الله ثم أنتم

1 *Kitāb al-Sharīḥ* p. 832; *Majmū‘ Fatāwā Shaikh al-Islām* 3/154.

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 6/178.

3 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī: Faḍā’il al-Ṣaḥābah*: sub-chapter regarding the merits of the relatives of Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and the merits of Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا: ḥadīth no. 3508.

4 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 6/33.

No one besides Allah and then you has grown hair on our heads (taken us to glory).¹

And when he married Umm Kulthūm, the daughter of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ,² he gave her forty thousand out of respect and appreciation.³

However, it is crucial to note that although this merit is true for all of the Ahl al-Bayt, it does not imply that they are equal; for surely those who accompanied Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ are the most meritorious among them due to combining two great qualities, viz. the companionship of Rasūl Allāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and being his relative; each of which has its own virtues. Hence there is no dispute amongst the Ahl al-Sunnah regarding the fact that ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is the most virtuous member of the Ahl al-Bayt after Rasūl Allāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.⁴

Furthermore, association with the Ahl al-Bayt and veneration for them expands and contracts based upon their obedience to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and His Rasūl صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.⁵ Hence the more complete the adherence of any of them will be the more would association with him and veneration for him be complete. Thereafter if he deviates from the path, commits sins or gets involved in innovations they might decrease gradually; because pedigrees in themselves are not worth consideration, and at times the inconsistency of a prominent person is considered to be a greater crime.⁶

1 *Ma’rifah al-Thiqāt* 1/301; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 3/285. Al-Dhahabī has deemed the report to be authentic.

2 Umm Kulthūm bint ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib ibn ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib al-Hāshimiyah. Her mother is Fātimah the daughter of Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. She was born around the year 6 A.H. She saw Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ but did not narrate anything from him. ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ married her when she was young and she bore his son Zayd for him. She passed away in the beginning of the reign of Mu’āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. See: *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 3/500; *Ruwāt al-Āthār* p. 211.

3 *Tafsīr al-Qur’ān al-‘Adhīm* 3/257; *al-Kāmil fī Ḍu’afā’ al-Rijāl* 4/186; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 8/116; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 3/501.

4 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyah* 7/241-242

5 Ibn Kathīr: *Tafsīr al-Qur’ān al-‘Adhīm* 4/114.

6 *Majmū’ Fatāwā Shaikh al-Islām* 16/602.

This is exactly what al-Ḥasan ibn al-Ḥasan¹ told a person who was exaggerating regarding the Ahl al-Bayt:

ويحكم! أحبونا لله، فإن أطعنا الله فأحبونا، وإن عصينا الله فأبغضونا. قال فقال له الرجل: إنكم قرابة رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وأهل بيته. فقال: لو كان الله مانعا بقرابة من رسول الله أحدا بغير طاعة الله لنتفع ذلك من هو أقرب إليه منا أبا وأما

“Woe to you! Love us for the sake of Allah; if we obey Allah then love us, and if we disobey Allah then hate us.” The man thus said to him, “You are the relatives of Rasūl Allāh ﷺ and his Ahl al-Bayt.” To which he replied, “If Allah were to protect anyone merely on the basis of his relationship to Rasūl Allāh ﷺ without obedience to him it would have benefitted those who were closer to him paternally and maternally.”²

The general rule in this regard is that when good and bad, obedience and disobedience, and adherence to Sunnah and involvement in innovations are collectively found in a person he will deserve veneration and association to the extent of his good and disassociation and disregard to the extent of his bad.³

In addition, when the noble pedigree does not save against the execution of capital punishments upon those who deserve them according to the unanimity of the Muslims,⁴ then it would more so not earn any of them the privileges of association and veneration. For example, why would an ‘Alawī⁵ deserve any reverence if all that he does when conquering a city is drink wine openly in the

1 Al-Ḥasan ibn al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī al-Hāshimī, Abū Muḥammad al-‘Alawī al-Fāṭimī. Ibn Ḥajr has said regarding him, “a truthful narrator.” I have not come across the date of his demise. See: *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 5/319; *al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr* 2/289; *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta’dīl* 3/5; *al-Taqrīb wa al-Tahdhīb* p. 159.

2 *Al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 5/319.

3 *Majmū’ Fatāwā Shaikh al-Islām* 28/209.

4 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 4/586.

5 ‘Alawī is a title use for someone who is attributed to a person whose name is ‘Alī. Four people are known for this, amongst them is ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib. See: *al-Ansāb* 4/229. What is meant here is a person from his lineage.

Masjid of Rasūl Allāh ﷺ, commit adultery with a songstress concubine who does not belong to him, kill the people of that city with the sword or with starvation, and does not read Ṣalāh in congregation or Jumu'ah at all.¹

A poet has very beautifully said:

لعمرك ما الإنسان إلا ابن دينه
فقد رفع الإسلام سلمان فارس
فلا تترك التقوى اتكالا على النسب
وقد هجن الشرك الشريف أبا لهب

By your life a person is not but the son of his creed, so do not discard piety due to reliance upon lineage.

For surely Islām raised Salmān of Persia, and surely polytheism degraded the noble man Abū Lahab.²

It is important to note that whilst the Ahl al-Sunnah concede and establish the virtue of the Ahl al-Bayt and their superiority, they do not give them complete preference over the entire Ummah in all conditions. Rather at times others besides them, due to many aspects, will surpass them, as is clear from the verse:

إِنَّ أَكْرَمَكُمْ عِنْدَ اللَّهِ أَتْقَاكُمْ

The most honoured of you by Allah is the most virtuous.³

And the ḥadīth of Nabī ﷺ:

من بطأ به عمله لم يسرع به نسبه

He whose actions keep him behind, his lineage will not take him forward.⁴

1 Jamharah Ansāb al-'Arab p. 39.

2 Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq 21/426.

3 Sūrah al-Ḥujurāt: 13.

4 Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim: chapter of Dhikr, Du'ā', Tawbah and Istighfār; sub-chapter regarding the virtue of convening for the recitation of the Qur'ān and the remembrance of Allah: ḥadīth no. 2699.

Ibn Taymiyah has mentioned:

تفضيل الجملة على الجملة لا يستلزم أن يكون كل فرد أفضل من كل فرد

Giving preference to one whole over another whole does not necessitate giving preference to each individual over each individual.¹

He has also said the following:

إنما يفضل الإنسان بدينه وتقواه، لا بأبائه ولو كانوا من بني هاشم

A person attains merit by way of his Dīn and piety, not by way of his fathers, even if they be from the Banū Hāshim.²

This is because:

القرابة الدينية أعظم من القرابة الطينية

Relationship based on Dīn is greater than relationship based upon soil.³

He has also drawn our attention to the fact that the Ahl al-Sunnah respect and associate on the basis of piety and not on the basis of mere pedigree.⁴

In this regard, how profound indeed was the vision of Abū Bakr ibn ‘Ayyāsh who said:

لو أتاني أبو بكر وعمر وعلي رضي الله عنهم في حاجة لبدأت بحاجة علي قبل حاجة أبي بكر وعمر لقرابته من رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، ولأن آخر من السماء إلى الأرض أحب إلي من أن أقدمه عليهما

If Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, and ‘Alī عليه السلام came to me with a need, I would start with the need of ‘Alī before seeing to the needs of Abū Bakr and ‘Umar, due to

1 *Majmū‘ Fatāwā Shaikh al-Islām* 19/29; *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 7/240.

2 *Al-Fatāwā al-Kubrā* 4/353.

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 7/78.

4 *Ibid.* 4/376.

him being the relative of Rasūl Allāh ﷺ. But I would prefer falling from the heavens to the earth than claim that ‘Alī is superior to them.’¹

To sum up the stance of the Ahl al-Sunnah, the Ahl al-Sunnah associate with all the members of the Ahl al-Bayt, the relatives of Rasūl Allāh ﷺ and his wives, without going to extremes in doing so and falling short of fulfilling their rights. In doing so they have treaded the middle path; they do not exaggerate in loving them like the extremists and claim knowledge of the unseen and infallibility for select individuals amongst them, nor do they adopt the view of the detractors who harass the Ahl al-Bayt verbally or by action; they are the moderates amongst the extremists on either end.

They also believe that the Ahl al-Bayt are not infallible and are thus susceptible to sinning and faltering. Consequently they are not exempted from any punishment in this world or the hereafter. And when it is said that amongst their rights is to overlook the shortfalls of the wrongdoers among them, the shortfalls intended are those which do not compromise any of the injunctions of Sharī‘ah.

The evidence for this is the following address of Allah ﷻ to the Mothers of the Believers:

مَنْ يَأْتِ مِنْكُمْ بِفَاحِشَةٍ مُّبِينَةٍ يُضَاعَفْ لَهَا الْعَذَابُ ضِعْفَيْنِ

*Whoever of you should commit a clear immorality - for her the punishment would be doubled two fold.*²

1 Shu‘bah ibn ‘Ayyāsh ibn Sālim al-Asadī (their client, associate), Abū Bakr al-Kūfī. A teacher of the Qur’ān, a scholar of ḥadīth and a jurist. He was born in 95 A.H. He read the Qur’ān by ‘Āṣim and mastered it. Ibn al-Mubārak said regarding him, “I have not seen anyone hastening more in following the Sunnah than Abū Bakr ibn ‘Ayyāsh.” Imām Aḥmad said, “A reliable narrator who errs at times.” He passed away in 193 A.H. His narrations are cited in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, the introduction to *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* and the four *Sunan*. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 14/371; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 12/37; *Siyar al-‘Alam al-Nubalā’* 8/495; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 33/129.

2 Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 30.

And the verse:

وَأَنْذِرْ عَشِيرَتَكَ الْأَقْرَبِينَ

And warn, [O Muḥammad], your closest kindred.¹

The following two ḥadīths also suggest the same:

يا فاطمة بنت محمد سليمان ما شئت من مالي لا أعني عنك من الله شيئا

O Fāṭimah the daughter of Muḥammad! Ask me for anything of my wealth, but I cannot avail you in the least before Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى.²

والذي نفس محمد بيده لو أن فاطمة بنت محمد سرقت لقطعت يدها

By the one in whose control is my life, if Fāṭimah the daughter of Muḥammad stole [Allah forbid] I would cut her hand.³

Al-Shawkānī⁴ has thus said:

1 Sūrah al-Shu‘arā’: 214.

2 The narration of Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنه which appears in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*: chapter of bequests: sub-chapter regarding whether women and children are part of the relatives: ḥadīth no. 2602; *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: chapter of Īmān: sub-chapter regarding the verse وَأَنْذِرْ عَشِيرَتَكَ الْأَقْرَبِينَ ḥadīth no. 206. The wording is of *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*.

3 The ḥadīth of ‘Ā’ishah رضي الله عنها which appears in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*: chapter of capital punishments: sub-chapter regarding the dislike of interceding in a capital punishment once it is raised to the ruler: ḥadīth no. 2406; *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: chapter of capital punishments: sub-chapter regarding amputating the hand of a notable and those besides him, and the impermissibility of interceding in capital punishments: ḥadīth no. 1688.

4 Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allah al-Shawkānī. A scholar of the principles of Shar‘ah and a jurist. He is considered to be from the prominent scholars and reformers of Yemen. He was born in Shawkān in Yemen in the year 1173, he grew up in Sana, became a judge therein in the year 1229 A.H., and passed away in 1250 A.H. One of his isolated views was the impermissibility of *Taqīd* (following one school specifically). He has written 114 books, some amongst them are: *Nayl al-Awtār*, *Fath al-Qadīr*, *al-Badr al-Ṭālī*. See: al-Zarkalī: *al-A‘lām* 6/298; *Mu‘jam al-Mu‘allifīn* 11/53.

أما القول برفع العقوبات عن عصاتهم وأنهم لا يخاطبون بما اقترفوه من المآثم ولا يطالبون بما جنوه من العظائم فهذه مقالة باطلة ليس عليها أثارة من العلم، ولم يصح في ذلك عن الله ولا عن رسوله حرف واحد

As for the view that the sinful amongst them will not be punished, that they will not be taken to task for the crimes they perpetrate and that they will not be told to pay up for losses they cause, it is completely false and there is not a shred of evidence that supports it. In this regard not even a letter has been authentically proven from Rasūl Allāh ﷺ.¹

1 *Irshād al-Sā'il Ilā Dalīl al-Masā'il* p. 80.

The First Chapter

The Concept of Naṣb, its History and the Stances of the Umayyad and the Abbasid Rulers regarding it

In this chapter there will be three sub-chapters:

1. The concept of Naṣb between the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Twelver Shī'ah.
2. The history of Naṣb.
3. The stances of the Umayyad and the Abbasid Rulers regarding Naṣb and the Nawāṣib.

The First sub-chapter

The concept of Naṣb between the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Twelver Shī'ah

In this sub-chapter there will be two discussions:

1. The concept of Naṣb according to the Ahl al-Sunnah
2. The concept of Naṣb according to the Twelver Shī'ah.

The First Discussion

The Concept of Naṣb according to the Ahl al-Sunnah

The term ‘Naṣb’ is an invented term which has no basis in the Book of Allah *سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى*, the Sunnah of Rasūl Allah *صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ*, or the reports of the Ṣaḥābah *رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ*. It is a term which does not feature in the works of any of the early scholars who have documented the *Fitnah* (unrest) and analysed its various events, starting from the murder of the Khalīfah ‘Uthmān *رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ* and continuing through the various battles which ensued between the people of Iraq and the people of Syria.

Despite it being difficult to identify the precise time wherein this term, with its specific definition, was born, it is, however, possible to say with certainty that it was born at the hands of the Shī‘ah. This is so due to the following reasons:

Firstly, the oldest texts wherein this term is used are the texts of the Shī‘ah.

Secondly, some of the early scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah considered the usage of this term to be a sign of its user being a Rāfiḍī, which implies that according to their understanding it had a link with the Shī‘ī dogma and that it was a term specifically used by the Shī‘ah, as will come ahead.

Lastly, the divergence of people regarding the rulership of ‘Alī *رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ* and their various opinions regarding it are issues which dominated the Shī‘ī attention in the past and remains so right up to the present. Given such attention it is not far-fetched that this term was conceived at their hands so that they may use it to impugn any person who opposes them in their views and beliefs.

Probably the oldest text wherein this term appears, according to the sources of the Ahl al-Sunnah, is the following poem of al-Sayyid al-Ḥimyarī:¹

¹ Ismā‘īl ibn Muḥammad ibn Yazīd ibn Mufarragh al-Ḥimyarī, Abū Hāshim, known as al-Sayyid. He was born in 105 A.H. He was a very staunch Rāfiḍī who was an affiliate of the Kaysāniyyah sect. *continued ...*

وما يجحد ما قد قلت في السبطين إنسان

وإن أنكر ذو النصب فعندي فيه برهان

No person can deny what I have said regarding the *Sibṭayn* (the grandsons).

And if a person of Naṣb denies, then I have evidence.¹

If the demise of al-Sayyid al-Ḥimyarī was somewhere between 173 A.H. and 179 A.H. then most probably the inception of this term came to fruition in the second century, with its usage remaining limited and unpopular at that time.

Now, once it is established that he was a Shīʿī, it is a given fact that any term which is invented by people certainly passes through various stages. In the pages to come we will try to discover these developments according to the viewpoint of the Ahl al-Sunnah.

Ostensibly, this term did not enter the circles of the Ahl al-Sunnah but in the third century A.H. This is because the oldest text in which the usage of this term features is the text of one of the pioneers of the sciences of ḥadīth ‘Alī ibn al-Madīnī,² who passed away in 234 A.H. It reads as follows:

continued from page 81

Most of his poetry is regarding the Ahl al-Bayt. But because he reviled the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم and accused the Mothers of the Believers رضي الله عنهن, his poetry was discarded despite it being of a high quality. He praised some of the Abbasid rulers and was famous for consuming wine. He died in 173 A.H. See: *al-Muntazam* 9/39; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 8/44; *Fawāt al-Wafayāt* 1/218; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/173.

1 *Al-Ghadīr* 2/158; *Mawāqif al-Shī'ah* 2/426.

2 'Alī ibn al-Tamīmī (their client, associate), Abū al-Ḥasan al-Madīnī. One of the scholars of ḥadīth and the pioneers of approving and impugning narrators. He was born in 161 A.H. Al-Bukhārī said regarding him, "I did not consider myself to be junior before anyone besides Ibn al-Madīnī." He passed away in 234 A.H. The following are some of his books: *'Ilal al-Ḥadīth*, *al-Asāmī wa al-Kunā* and *al-Tārīkh*. His narrations feature in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* and the *Sunans* of Abū Dāwūd, al-Tirmidhī and al-Nasā'ī. See: *al-Thiqāt* 8/469; *Tārīkh Baghdād* 11/455; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 21/5; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 11/41.

من قال: فلان مشبه علمنا أنه جهمي، ومن قال: فلان مجبر علمنا أنه قدري، ومن قال: فلان ناصبي علمنا أنه رافضي

If someone says that so and so is a *Mushabbih* (anthropomorphist) we will know that he is a *Jahmī*. And whoever says that so and so is a *Mujabbir* (determinist) we will know that he is a *Qadarī* (a disputer regarding predestiny). And whoever says that so and so is a *Nāṣībī* we will know that he is a *Rāfiḏī*.¹

Thereafter, al-Dhuhālī² who passed away in 258 A.H. and Abū Zur‘ah who passed away in 264 A.H. used this term but in a way that does not denote any condemnation from their side. Hence al-Dhuhālī says:

لا تسألوه (يعني البخاري) عن شيء من الكلام، فإنه إن أجاب بخلاف ما نحن عليه وقع بيننا وبينه، وسمت بنا كل ناصبي ورافضي

Do not ask him (i.e. al-Bukhārī) anything regarding the speech of Allah; for if he answers with an answer which is against what we believe a dispute will ensue between us and him, whereafter every *Nāṣībī* and *Rāfiḏī* will rejoice at our dispute.³

And Abū Zur‘ah says:

1 *Sharḥ Uṣūl I’tiqād Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā‘ah* 1/147. Similar reports are reported from the two *Rāzīs* Abū Zur‘ah and Abū Ḥātim in the same book (1/167). Also see: al-Barbihārī: *Sharḥ al-Sunnah* p. 52. For the implementation of this principle refer to *Lisān al-Mizān* 5/268.

2 Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Khālīd al-Dhuhālī (their client), Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Nīsābūrī. One of the great scholars and analysts of ḥadīth. He was born sometime after 170 A.H. He became famous for collecting the knowledge of al-Zuhrī and perfecting it till he became known as al-Zuhrī. A dispute had broken out between him and al-Bukhārī due to the issue of the enunciation of the word of the Qur‘ān. He passed away in 258 A.H. His narrations are reported in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* and the four *Sunan*. *Jam‘ ḥadīth al-Zuhrī* is one of his books. See: *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 12/273; *Tadhkirah al-Ḥuffāẓ* 2/530; *Lisān al-Mizān* 7/507; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 9/452.

3 *Muqaddamah Faṭḥ al-Bārī* 1/490; *Taghlīq al-Ta‘līq* 5/431.

إذا رأيت الكوفي يطعن في سفیان الثوري وزائدة فلا شك في أنه رافضي، وإذا رأيت الشامي يطعن على مكحول والأوزاعي فلا شك أنه ناصب

If you see a Kufī impugning Sufyān al-Thawrī¹ and Zā'idah² then there is no doubt that he is a Rāfiḍī. And if you see a Shāmī impugning Makḥūl³ and Awzā'ī⁴ then no doubt he is a Nāṣibī.⁵

Subsequent to this its usage became very popular ushering it henceforth into the circles of people. Hence in the biography of al-Qunnabīṭī,⁶ who passed away in

1 Sufyān ibn Sa'īd ibn Masrūq al-Thawrī, Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Kūfī. He was one of the prominent people of his time in knowledge and piety. He was born in 97 A.H. and was accorded the title 'the leader of the believers in ḥadīth'. He was offered the post of a judge few times but he declined. He had his own school in Fiqh but with the passage of time it dwindled away. He passed away in 161 A.H. Some of his works are: *al-Jāmi' al-Kabīr*, *al-Jāmi' al-Ṣaghīr* and *Kitāb fī al-Farā'id*. His narrations feature in all six canonical works. See: *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa'd* 6/371; *Tārīkh Baghdād* 9/151; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 11/154; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 7/229.

2 Zā'idah ibn Qudāmāh al-Thaqafī, Abū al-Ṣalt al-Kūfī. A scholar of precision in ḥadīth and a great retainer thereof; he is considered to be an equal of Shu'bah in precision. But he only narrated from the people of his city and would not narrate any narration to an innovator. He passed away whilst out in Jihād in the lands of Rome in 161 A.H. The following are his books: *Kitāb al-Sunan*, *Kitāb al-Qirā'āt* and *Kitāb al-Tafsīr*. His narrations feature in all six of the canonical works. See: *al-Fihrist* p. 316; *Tadhkirah al-Ḥuffāz* 1/215; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 9/273; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 7/375.

3 Makḥūl ibn Abī Muslim Shahzāb ibn Shādhil al-Hudhalī (their client), Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Dimashqī. A prominent jurist of his time and a Qārī'. He was originally from Persia and was born in Kabul. He is considered to be from the middle class of the Tābi'īn. Al-Zuhrī has said the following regarding him, "There was no one more knowledgeable than him in his time in matters of Fatwā." He had an unclear way of expression. He passed away in Damascus in 112 A.H. His narrations appear in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* and the four *Sunans*. See: *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 7/453; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 60/197; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 28/464; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 5/155.

4 'Abd al-Rahmān ibn 'Amr ibn Yaḥmud al-Awzā'ī, Abū 'Amr. A reliable scholar and ascetic who was considered the supreme jurist of Sham. He was born in 88 A.H. He was known to follow the Sunnah rigorously. His school prevailed for a while in Sham and Spain and thereafter dwindled away. He passed away in Beirut in 157 A.H. Some of his books are: *Kitāb al-Sunan fī al-Fiqh* and *al-Masā'il fī al-Fiqh*. His narrations appear in all six of the canonical works. See: *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 35/147; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 17/307; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 7/107; *Tārīkh al-Islām* 9/483.

5 *Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥanābilah* 1/200; *al-Maqṣid al-Arshad* 2/70.

6 Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn Khālid al-Qunnabīṭī, Abū al-Ḥasan al-Baghdādī. Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī has considered him reliable. He passed away in 304 A.H. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 2/231; *al-Ansāb* 4/547.

304 A.H., al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī has documented that he said the following to a person who was accused of being a Rāfiḍī:

لو أخذت معاوية على كتفك لقال الناس رافضي، ولو أخذت عليا على كتفي لقال الناس ناصبي

If you carry Mu‘āwiyah on your shoulder people would say, ‘He is a Rāfiḍī’.

And if I carry ‘Alī on my shoulder they would say, ‘He is a Nāṣibī.’¹

In his words ‘the people would say’ and in bringing ‘Naṣb’ as an opposite of ‘Rafḍ’ there is indication that its usage was popular and its meaning was known.

In the fourth century its usage became even more rampant, to the extent that even the poets started using it in their poetry.²

Till now whatever has passed was regarding the history of its inception. Henceforth we will be discussing the meaning and the definition thereof.

Naṣb literally means to erect something or target it.³ It is said:

ناصر الرجل مناصبة

He opposed him and combatted him.

Likewise:

ناصره الحرب أو العداوة

He declared war/enmity against him.⁴

1 *Tarīkh Baghdād* 2/232. Interestingly what really draws ones attention is that all the scholars whose quotes have been cited above were from Iraq, which is suggestive of the fact that the term Naṣb was born in Iraq.

2 See: al-Mutanabbī, d. 354 A.H.: *Dīwān al-Mutanabbī* 1/269; the biography of al-Khāl al-Qarmaṭī, d. 291 A.H., in *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafāyāt* 7/79; *Dīwān Ibn Hānī’ al-Andalusī*, killed in 362 A.H., p. 351; *Dīwān Tamīm ibn al-Mu‘izz li Dīn Allah al-Fātimī*, d. 374, p. 221; *Dīwān Badī’ al-Zamān al-Hamdānī*, d. 398 A.H., p. 39; *Dīwān al-Wāwā’ al-Dimashqī*, d. 385 A.H., p. 18.

3 *Maqāyīs al-Lughah* 5/434.

4 *Al-‘Ayn* 7/136; *al-Muḥkam wa al-Muḥīṭ al-A‘zam* 8/344; *Lisān al-‘Arab* 1/761; *al-Qāmūs al-Muḥīṭ* p. 176

When attributing a person to it the term *Nāṣībī* is used, and the plural thereof is *Nawāṣīb*. Likewise the terms *Nāṣibah*, *Nāṣibiyyah* and *Ahl al-Naṣb* are also used.¹

As for the technical definition of *Naṣb*, the scholars have given variant but close definitions of *Naṣb* and *Nawāṣīb*:

1. *Naṣb* is hating ‘Alī عليه السلام and opposing him.² This is the definition given by al-Zamakhsharī.³
2. *Naṣb* is hating ‘Alī عليه السلام and giving preference to others over him.⁴ Or it is turning away from ‘Alī عليه السلام and his household.⁵ Both these definitions are given by Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī.
3. *Naṣb* also refers to a school which is all about hating ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib عليه السلام.⁶ This is stated by Abū al-Baqā’ al-Kafawī.⁷
4. *Nawāṣīb* are a people who consider hating ‘Alī عليه السلام to be an act of worship.⁸

1 *Asās al-Balāghah* p. 458; *Iqtidā’ al-Ṣirāṭ al-Mustaqīm* p. 300; *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 4/39; *al-Qāmūs al-Muḥīṭ* p. 177; *Faḥḥ al-Bārī* 7/437; *al-Ṣawā’iq al-Muḥriqah* 2/534.

2 *Al-Kashshāf* 4/777; *Rūḥ al-Ma’ānī* 30/172.

3 Maḥmūd ibn ‘Umar ibn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Khawārizmī, Abū al-Qāsim al-Zamakhsharī. A Ḥanafī jurist who was an expert in language and its various sciences. He was born in Zamakhshar, one of the villages of Khwarazm, in 467 A.H. He earned acclaim for his knowledge of Arabic literature and for his affiliation to I’tizāl. He passed away in 538 A.H. Some of his works are: *al-Kashshāf*, *al-Fā’iq* and *Asās al-Balāghah*. See: *Tārīkh al-Islām* 36/486; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 20/151; *al-Jawāhir al-Muḍī’ah fī Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥanafīyyah* 2/160; *Bughyah al-Wu’āh* 2/279.

4 *Hady al-Sārī* p. 459; *Tadrib al-Rāwī* 1/328; *Tawḍīḥ al-Afkār* 2/443.

5 *Faḥḥ al-Bārī* 10/420.

6 *Al-Kullīyyāt* p. 361.

7 Ayyūb ibn Mūsā al-Ḥusaynī al-Qarīmī, Abū al-Baqā’ al-Kafawī. A Ḥanafī scholar. He assumed the position of judicature in Kafā, in Turkey, the place to which he is attributed. Likewise he was appointed as a judge in al-Quds and Baghdād. He thereafter returned to Istanbul and passed away there in 1094 A.H. One of his books in Arabic is *Kitāb al-Kullīyyāt*. See: *al-A’lām* 2/38; *Mu’jam al-Mu’allifin* 3/31.

8 *Al-Muḥkam wa al-Muḥīṭ al-A’ẓam* 8/345, *Lisān al-‘Arab* 1/762; *al-Qāmūs al-Muḥīṭ* p. 176. Also see: al-Ṣan’ānī: *Thamarāt al-Naẓr* p. 30, 36.

This is stated by Ibn Sīdah,¹ Ibn Manẓūr², and al-Fīrozābādī.³

5. The Nawāṣib are the people who hurt the Ahl al-Bayt by word or by action.⁴
This is stated by Ibn Taymiyah.

Having analysed all these definitions two things are clearly noticeable:

1. The meagre amount of definitions offered by the Ahl al-Sunnah, this is owing to the fact that the Nawāṣib barely existed in Sunnī communities.
2. The strong link between the literal and technical meanings.

Also, although the definitions seem to be slightly different from one another, but in reality that is not the case; because some scholars considered the core meaning, which is pertaining to ‘Alī (عليه السلام) only, and provided a definition accordingly, whilst others took into consideration the more broader meaning and provided a broader definition. But in reality Naṣb is a combination of both.

1 ‘Alī ibn Aḥmad ibn Sīdah, Abū al-Ḥasan al-Mursī al-Ḍarīr. One of the masters of language and Arabic literature. Al-Dhahabī said regarding him, “There was no one in his time who could match him in language.” He was deemed to partially be a *Shū‘ūbī* (populist). He passed away in Andalusia in 458 A.H. some of his books are: *al-Mukhaṣṣiṣ*, *al-Muḥkam wa al-Muḥīṭ al-A’ẓam* and *al-Anīq fī Sharḥ al-Ḥamāsah*. See: *Mu’jam al-Udabā’* 3/544; *Tārīkh al-Islām* 30/448; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 18/144; *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 20/100.

2 Muḥammad ibn Mukarram ibn ‘Alī ibn Manẓūr al-Khazrajī, Abū al-Faḍl al-Miṣrī. A linguist and dynamic author. He was born in Egypt in 630 A.H. He was appointed as a judge in Ṭarābulus. He had Shī‘ī leanings, but without Rafḍ. He paid due importance to abridging books, to the extent that it is said that his abridgements had reached five hundred volumes. He passed away in 711 A.H. Some of his books are *Lisān al-‘Arab*, *Mukhtaṣar al-Aghānī* and *Mukhtaṣar al-‘Iqd al-Farīd*. See: *al-Durar al-Kāminah* 6/15; *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 5/37; *Shadharāt al-Dhahab* 6/26; *Abjad al-‘Ulūm* 3/10.

3 Muḥammad ibn Ya’qūb ibn Muḥammad al-Shīrāzī, Abū Ṭāhir al-Fīrozābādī. A dynamic Shāfi‘ī scholar. He was a master in language. He was born in Fīrozābād, Persia, in 729 A.H. He traversed to many a cities and was welcomed by their rulers. He finally settled in Zabīd as a judge and passed away there in 817 A.H. Some of his works are: *al-Qāmūs al-Muḥīṭ*, *Baṣā’ir Dhawī al-Tamyīz* and *Sifr al-Sa’ādah*. See: *al-Nujūm al-Zāhirah* 14/132; *al-Ḍaw’ al-Lāmi’* 10/79; *Shadharāt al-Dhahab* 7/126; *al-Badr al-Ṭālī* 2/280.

4 *Majmū’ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām* 3/154.

The Two phases of Naṣb

The First Phase

In this phase ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was the direct victim of Naṣb, for all that it entailed at that time was hatred for ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Hence it comprised of two components:

1. Open hatred, whether it be for religious reasons or otherwise.
2. It was specific to Amīr al-Mu’minīn ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ

Two types of people considered this to be a virtue and an act of worship:

The first type: The Khawārij. Initially they were his ardent supporters and his courageous soldiers who fought by his side and under his flag. Subsequently, after the famous incident of arbitration occurred they turned against him; they excommunicated him and considered harbouring enmity against him to be an act of worship due to entertaining the notion that a disbeliever can never be befriended.¹

There is no dispute amidst the scholars as to the Khawārij being from the people of Naṣb; because they opposed him very vigorously by hating him, excommunicating him and thereafter assassinating him.

However, some scholars like al-‘Ukbarī² and al-Zabīdī³ have suggested that Naṣb

1 Ibid. 4/469.

2 ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Baghdādī, al-‘Ukbarī. A dynamic Ḥanbalī scholar who became famous for language and literature, to the extent that people would come to benefit from him from all places. He was born in 538 A.H. He was ‘Ukbarā, a small town on the bank of Euphrates River. He was afflicted with measles in his childhood. He passed away in Baghdād in 616 A.H. Some of his books are: *Imlā’ mā Manna bihī al-Rahmān*, *Sharḥ Dīwān al-Mutanabbī* and *Sharḥ al-Luma’*. See: *Tārīkh al-Islām* 44/294; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 13/85; *Tārīkh ibn al-Wardī* 2/136; *Bughyah al-Wu’āh* 2/38.

3 Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Ḥusaynī, Abū al-Fayḍ al-Zabīdī. A dynamic Ḥanafī jurist. He was born in India and grew up in Zabīd, in Yemen. He travelled to Ḥijāz and thereafter settled in Egypt. He earned acclaim there and the kings wrote letters to him. He passed away in Egypt in a plague in the year 1205. Some of his books are: *Tāj al-‘Arūs*, *Ithāf al-Sādah al-Muttaqīn* and *‘Uqūd al-Jawāhir al-Munīfah*. See: *‘Ajā’ib al-Athar* 2/104; *Abjad al-‘Ulūm* 3/12; *al-A’lām* 7/70; *Mu’jam al-Mu’allifīn* 11/282.

specifically applies to the Khawārij only.¹ This is what is understood from the definition of Ibn Sīdah and others as well.

But the reality is that although the Khawārij are one of the first people regarding who the definition of Naṣb is true, however, restricting Naṣb to them is not very precise, especially when considering the various usages of the scholars in this regard; for they have labelled people and groups who have no link with the Khawārij whatsoever as Nawāṣib, rather at times these groups turnout to be the most staunch opponents of the Khawārij.

The second type: Many of the Marwāniyyah² and those who agree with them. They all agreed that ‘Alī عليه السلام played a role in the murder of ‘Uthmān عليه السلام, but thereafter they disputed. Some said that he openly ordered the assassination of ‘Uthmān عليه السلام, some said that he clandestinely ordered his murder, whilst others say that he did not do any of that but displayed happiness when he received the news.³ They therefore considered hating ‘Alī عليه السلام to be an act of worship, as suggested by Ibn Ḥajr. But at a later stage the movement was dominated by political motives.

Very soon after the tribulation of the murder of ‘Uthmān عليه السلام those who held this stance amongst the early generations became known as the “Uthmāniyyah”,⁴ i.e. his supporters, the establishers of his merits, and his defenders.⁵

1 Al-‘Ukbarī: *Dīwān al-Mutanabbī bi Sharḥ Abī al-Baqā’ al-‘Ukbarī* 1/156; al-Zabīdī: *Tāj al-‘Arūs* 4/277.

2 Al-Marwāniyyah: The second branch of the Umayyad family which came into power, the first amongst who to rule was Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam and the last amongst who was Marwān ibn Muḥammad. This title came about after Marwān rose to power in Damascus. See: *al-Dawlah al-Umawiyah wa al-Mu’araḍah* p. 126; *Tārīkh Khilāfah Banī Umayyah* p. 60.

3 *Majmū’ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām* 35/73; *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyah* 4/405.

4 The opposite of this term is ‘Alawiyah which refers to those who are drawn to ‘Alī عليه السلام and give him preference over ‘Uthmān عليه السلام. This is a famous stance of a group of scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah in Kūfah. See: *Fath al-Bārī* 6/191. To see how the terms are used as opposites of each other also see: *Ma’rifah al-Thiqāt* 1/460, 480; *al-Kāmīl fī Du’afā’ al-Rijāl* 6/236; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 9/337; *Fath al-Bārī* 12/306. Likewise the ‘Uthmānīs might have dubbed one of the partisans of ‘Alī عليه السلام ‘Turābī’ attributing him to the famous title of ‘Alī عليه السلام Abū Turāb. See: *al-Kāmīl fī al-Tārīkh* 3/330.

5 This is from the introduction of the book *al-Uthmāniyyah* of ‘Abd al-Salām Hārūn with slight alteration. According to the Twelvers the term ‘Uthmāniyyah refers to a group of Nawāṣib who go beyond limits in loving ‘Uthmān عليه السلام. See: *Mashāriq al-Shumūs* 2/391.

This term was very often used by the later historians who documented the events of that era.¹ Hence when al-Jāḥiẓ wrote his book regarding the issue of Imāmah in which he comprehensively discussed the evidences and views of those who impugn ‘Alī عليه السلام and his Khilāfah, he named his book *al-‘Uthmāniyyah*.

Later on, much of expansion had occurred in the usage and the purport of the term “‘Uthmāniyyah’. As a result, some of its meanings were considered to be synonymous with Naṣb, subsequent to which Naṣb replaced it² and it, the term ‘‘Uthmāniyyah, no more remained popular.

1 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 3/503; *Tārīkh al-Ya‘qūbī* 2/187; *al-Bad’ wa al-Tārīkh* 5/123, 209; *Tārīkh Dimashq* 49/465; *al-Muntaẓam* 5/150; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 3/229, 232; *Majmū’ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām* 35/73; *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawīyyah* 6/199; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 3/39; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 7/252, 314; *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* 2/641, 4/381.

2 When analysing the various usages of the scholars of the term ‘Uthmānī it becomes abundantly clear that its purport was very general and vast and that it passed through various stages. It therefore includes a variety of people who all have one thing in common, inclination toward ‘Uthmān عليه السلام.

The first usage: It was used to refer to those who respected ‘Uthmān عليه السلام and gave him preference over ‘Alī عليه السلام in merit, but without impugning ‘Alī عليه السلام and denying his lofty rank. This was the initial usage of this term, for Ibn ‘Abbās عليه السلام used it as well, as is stated in *al-Iḥkām* of Ibn Ḥazm 6/315. And it is probably this meaning which is meant when this term is used to describe many of the scholars, especially those from Baṣrah and Kūfah.

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajr عليه السلام has defined a ‘Uthmānī in the following way in his book in his book *Fatḥ al-Bārī* 6/191: “A person who give preference to ‘Uthmān عليه السلام over ‘Alī عليه السلام in virtue”. Also see *Umdat al-Qārī* 15/12.

A report which is documented by al-Khallāl in his *al-Sunnah* (2/324) supports this meaning:

Abū Ishāq Ibrāhīm ibn Bakr al-Shaybānī narrates from Sa‘īd ibn Abī ‘Arūbah that he said, “When a person would pass by the early scholars and they were told that he is a ‘Uthmānī they would love that.” The narrator says, “I asked Sa‘īd, “Why would that be?” He said, “Because he gave preference to ‘Uthmān but did not denigrate ‘Alī.”

Likewise another report which is documented by al-Fasawī in his *al-Ma‘rifah wa al-Tārīkh* also supports this meaning. He says:

I heard ‘Aṭā’ saying, “I said to Abū ‘Abd al-Raḥmān, who was a ‘Uthmānī, “It seems as though you display more disinterest in the narrations you heard from ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib.” He replied, “Certainly the narrations I have heard from ‘Alī عليه السلام are more beloved to me than red camels.”

continued....

continued from page 90

It is for this reason we find that many a times the term 'Uthmānī is contrasted with the term 'Alawī, or even at times Shī'ī. In which case 'Alawī would refer to a person who believes in giving preference to 'Alī عليه السلام over 'Uthmān عليه السلام. To see examples of this contrast refer to: *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* 3/1120; *Tārīkh Baghdād* 10/201; *al-Kāmil fī Ḍu'afā' al-Rijāl* 6/236; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 24/199.

This is also the reason why many of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم were described as 'Uthmānīs after the occurrence of the *Fitnah*, tribulation. Their 'Uthmānī status did not mean anything more than giving 'Uthmān عليه السلام preference over 'Alī عليه السلام and being inclined toward him. Hence Abū 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-Barr mentions the following in his book *al-Istī'āb* 2/540:

'Uthmān عليه السلام loved Zayd ibn Thābit رضي الله عنه, and Zayd was a 'Uthmānī. He did not participate in any of the battles with 'Alī عليه السلام, but despite that he would give preference to 'Alī عليه السلام and display love for him. Ibn Athīr likewise mentions:

Zayd ibn Thābit رضي الله عنه was a 'Uthmānī. He did not participate in any of the battles with 'Alī عليه السلام.

But he would respect him tremendously and acknowledge his virtue. (*Fayḍ al-Qadīr* 2/22).

Ḥassān ibn Thābit رضي الله عنه was likewise described with the same. See: *al-Bad' wa al-Tārīkh* 5/209; *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 3/67; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 3/156.

So was al-Nu'mān ibn Bashīr (See: Ibn Sa'd: *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 6/53), Mu'āwiyah ibn Ḥudayj (See: *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 7/503; *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 3/204; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 59/19; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 8/61), and Busr ibn Arṭāh, if authentically proven (see: *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 7/409).

Furthermore, hereunder are the names of some scholars and transmitters of ḥadīth who were dubbed 'Uthmānīs:

- Bishr ibn al-Mufaḍḍal al-Raqqāshī (*al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 7/290)
- Qays ibn Ḥāzim (Ibn al-Madīnī: *al-'Ilal* 1/50)
- Mūsā ibn Ṭarīf (*Su'ālāt Abī 'Ubayd al-Ājurri* 1/141)
- Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī (*al-Ma'rifah wa al-Tārīkh* 2/240)
- 'Āṣim ibn Abī al-Najūd (*Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 5/258)
- 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Awn (*Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 6/365)
- Ḥammād ibn Zayd (*Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 7/463)
- Masrūq (*Ma'rifah al-Thiqāt* 1/460)
- Ṭalḥah ibn Muṣarrif al-Yāmī (*Ma'rifah al-Thiqāt* 1/479)
- 'Abd Allāh ibn Idrīs ibn Yazīd al-Awdī (*Ma'rifah al-Thiqāt* 2/21)
- 'Abd Allāh ibn Abī al-Hudhayl (*Ma'rifah al-Thiqāt* 2/64)
- 'Uthmān ibn 'Āṣim, Abū Ḥuṣayn al-Asadī (*Ma'rifah al-Thiqāt* 2/129)
- Fūḍayl ibn Ghazwān al-Ḍabbī (*Ma'rifah al-Thiqāt* 2/207)
- Muḥammad ibn 'Ubayd al-Ṭanāfīsī (*Ma'rifah al-Thiqāt* 2/247)

continued...

continued from page 91

- Muḥammad ibn al-Qāsim al-Asadī (*Ma'rifah al-Thiqāt* 2/250)
- Mughīrah ibn Miqsam al-Ḍabbī (*Ma'rifah al-Thiqāt* 2/293)
- Abū Ḥuṣayn 'Uthmān ibn 'Āṣim (*al-Ibar fī Akhbār man Ghabar* 1/167)
- Abū al-Rawā al-Dawsī (*al-Tabaqāt al-Kubrā* 4/341).

However it is important to note that none of these people and their like have been accused of Naṣb besides 'Abd Allāh ibn Shaqīq due to him denigrating 'Alī عليه السلام, as will come. This clearly suggests that what is meant when dubbing them 'Uthmānī is merely giving 'Uthmān عليه السلام preference over 'Alī عليه السلام. **The second usage** concerned those who exceeded the extent of merely giving preference to 'Uthmān عليه السلام over 'Alī عليه السلام to becoming disillusioned with him and using unsavoury language regarding him, but without impugning his Dīn and exaggerating regarding the Umayyads. It has been used with this meaning, for example, regarding Mughīrah ibn Miqsam al-Ḍabbī; al-Dhahabī mentions the following in his biography in *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 6/12, "He was a 'Uthmānī who to some extent despised 'Alī عليه السلام." The same has been said regarding 'Abd Allāh ibn Shaqīq al-Uqaylī, for we find the following regarding him in *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 29/161, "He was a 'Uthmānī who would undermine 'Alī عليه السلام." In *Mīzān al-I'tidāl* 4/120 the following appears regarding him, "A reliable narrator who despised 'Alī عليه السلام." In *Ma'rifah al-Thiqāt* 2/37 of al-'Ijlī the following appears, "A Baṣrī scholar who despised 'Alī عليه السلام." For more details see: *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 3/39.

Furthermore, regarding some of them al-Dhahabī and Ibn Ḥajr state that 'he has a tendency of Naṣb'. And at times the biographers would overstate their status and say that 'he was a Nāṣibī'. Hence we find that 'Abd Allāh ibn Shaqīq al-Uqaylī is described differently in difference sources; he is described as a 'Uthmānī in *al-Tabaqāt al-Kubrā* 7/126 and *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 29/161, as one who would despise 'Alī عليه السلام in *Ma'rifah al-Thiqāt* 2/37, as a person who had Naṣb leanings in *Mīzān al-I'tidāl* 4/120, as a Nāṣibī in *al-Mughnī fī al-Ḍu'afā'* 1/342, and as one with Naṣb leanings in *Taqrīb al-Tahdhīb* p. 307.

The third usage concerned those who openly proclaimed hatred for 'Alī عليه السلام and exaggerated in extolling the Banū Umayyah.

From amongst these people was Shimar ibn Dhū al-Jawshan. Abū Ishāq has said the following regarding him, "Shimar ibn Dhī al-Jawshan would perform the Fajr prayer with us, whereafter he would sit till sunrise, perform Ṣalāh and supplicate thus, "O Allah you are noble and you love nobility, You know that I am noble so forgive me." Abū Ishāq says, "I said to him, "How will Allah سبحانه وتعالى forgive you when you came out and helped in the assassination of the grandson of Rasūl Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم?" He said, "What could we do? Our leaders ordered us and we could not oppose them, and if we opposed them we would be worse than these water donkeys." See: *al-Ishrāf fī Manāzil al-Ashraf* 1/140; *Lisān al-Mīzān* 3/152.

Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf al-Thaqafī falls under this category as well. Ibn Kathīr has said the following regarding him in *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/131, "He was an 'Uthmānī and Umawī who was very drawn toward them; he would consider opposing them to be disbelief and would due to that consider shedding blood to be permissible. No reprimand would come in the way of him doing so." *continued...*

This transition conveys to us the developments that have occurred in the concept. This is because the term ‘Uthmāniyyah suggests that the primary motive of this sect was supporting ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه by spreading his merits and defending him against the oppression and injustice he suffered, even if doing so entailed disrespecting ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. As opposed to the concept of Naṣb, for it suggests, according to its meaning in language, that the matter no more concerned ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه but surpassed him to ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, making the display of enmity toward him a salient feature in itself which previously was not so.

Hence the term Nawāṣib is vaster than the term ‘Uthmāniyyah in a sense,¹ because the former includes every person who is disillusioned with ‘Alī رضي الله عنه whereas the latter does not include the Khawārij due to them holding the same stance of enmity and opposition against ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه which they held against ‘Alī رضي الله عنه.

Furthermore, the fact that the Khawārij are part of the Nawāṣib suggests that Naṣb is not an independent sect that has set principles which distinguish it from all others sects. Rather it is a leaning which a myriad of people share with the only common factor among them being disillusionment with ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, even though they thereafter deem each other misguided.

As for the statement of Abū al-Baqā’ al-Kafawī that ‘Naṣb also refers to a position which entails hating ‘Alī رضي الله عنه’, he does not intend to provide a technical definition

continued from page 92

Khālīd al-Qasrī was likewise. He would say, “By Allah if Amīr al-Mu’minīn wrote to me I would demolish the Ka’bah brick by brick.” See: *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 16/161.

All the scholars of the ‘Uthmānī sect, many among who believe that if Allah سبحانه وتعالى appoints a Khalīfah his good will be accepted and his evil will be overlooked and that his obedience is obligatory in everything he orders (*Mīnhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawīyah* 6/199), can also be included here.

In conclusion, whoever falls under the third usage is certainly a Nāṣībī. Hence every Nāṣībī is a ‘Uthmānī, but every ‘Uthmānī is not a Nāṣībī; just as is the relation between Tashayyū’ and Rafḍ, i.e. every Rāfiḍī is a Shī’ī but every Shī’ī is not a Rāfiḍī.

1 And from a different perspective the term ‘Uthmāniyyah is vaster than the term Nawāṣib; because the former includes those who hate ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and those who do not, whereas the latter only includes those who hate ‘Alī رضي الله عنه.

by way of this, instead he is referring to the more general literal meaning which is the point of progress.¹

The Second Phase: In this this phase the concept of Naṣb considerably expanded from what it previously was. And this expansion occurred in both the components which we discussed in the first phase, which form the basis of Naṣb, i.e.:

1. The component of open hatred, for it exceeded this extent and later on became inclusive of every person upon who any signs of disillusionment with ‘Alī رضي الله عنه were discernible, whether it be due to him denying his established merits, impugning his integrity, or doubting his Khilāfah. Similar indications would be: giving preference to those who without any dispute were inferior to him, like Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه, even if the incentive for doing so be some sort of reasoning² however weak it might be.

Ibn Taymiyah has stated that deeming ‘Alī or Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه, either of the two, to be correct without specifying is a type of Naṣb. Hence he has considered the refrainment from giving preference to be from the views of the Nawāṣib.³

2. The component of the hatred being restricted to ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. It surpassed this extent to include his sons as well, thereby taking into its fold all those who claim that Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه was a rebel killing whom was permissible.⁴ Likewise also deeming any disillusionment with his relatives, however distantly related they may be, and harassing them without any right to be Naṣb. For example, a person who opposes their leadership, neglects their compulsory rights or exaggerates in extolling Yazīd ibn Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه without any right.⁵

1 *Al-Tawqīf ‘alā Muhimmāt al-Ta‘ārif* p. 636.

2 *Majmū‘ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām* 4/438.

3 *Ibid.* 4/438.

4 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 4/585.

5 *Majmū‘ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām* 28/493. Yazīd ibn Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān al-Qurashī, Abū Khālīd al-Umawī.

continued....

However, it should be noted that including disillusionment with his progeny into the definition of Naṣb is not a distinct extension but a natural one. Because intentionally slackening in fulfilling their rights specifically and being disillusioned with them, not anyone else, is mostly due to disillusionment with their father.

Moving on, one of the researchers has concluded that the Rawāfiḍ are Nawāṣib, a view that is unprecedented. He has advanced the following to substantiate his view:

Proof 1: The Kāmiliyyah,¹ who were Shī'ah, excommunicated 'Alī عليه السلام due to him not taking up arms against the Ṣaḥābah who had disbelieved after not pledging allegiance to him.²

This proof does not stand, especially when considering the fact that they no more remained Shī'ah after taking the position they took, which is why the rest of the Shī'ah excommunicated them.

Also, would it be fine to consider someone who excommunicates 'Alī عليه السلام to be a Rāfiḍī, especially when knowing full well that much of hatred for him and

continued from page 94

He was born during the Khilāfah of 'Uthmān عليه السلام and the mantle of Khilāfah was handed over to him after the demise of his father in 60 A.H. Many horrendous events, like the incident of Ḥarrah and the massacre of Ḥusayn عليه السلام occurred in his time, and he was accused of drinking wine. 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz thus lashed a person who called him Amīr al-Mu'minīn. A narration of his appears in the *Marāṣil* of Abū Dāwūd. He passed away in 64 A.H. See: *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 65/394; *Mīzān al-I'tidāl* 7/262; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 8/146; *Taqrīb al-Tahdhīb* p. 605.

1 Al-Kāmiliyyah: are the followers of a person called Abū Kāmil. He claimed that the Ṣaḥābah عليه السلام disbelieved due to not pledging allegiance to 'Alī عليه السلام and 'Alī عليه السلام in turn also disbelieved due to not fighting them. He also denied any rebellion against oppressive rulers without the presence of the emphatically appointed Imām. He would say, "Imāmah is a light which transmigrates from person to person." See: *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* p. 17; *al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* p. 39; *al-Mīlāl wa al-Niḥāl* 1/174; *I'tiqādāt Firaq al-Muslimīn wa al-Mushrikīn* p. 60.

2 *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* p. 17; *Sharḥ Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* 15/174; *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 4/585.

opposition will set in due to this stance? And if it is fine to consider the Kāmiliyyah to be part of the Shī'ah, then it should be also fine to consider the Khawārij to be part of the Shī'ah because they were initially from his supporters and partisans.

Furthermore, when the scholars say that the Kāmiliyyah are from the Rawāfiḍ, it does not imply that they remained Rawāfiḍ even after the stance they took. Rather it means that in terms of their origin they and the Shī'ah were born out of the same Shī'ī roots.

Proof 2: The Rawāfiḍ impugn some of the Mothers of the Believers, 'Abbās رضي الله عنه, and others besides them despite them all being from the Ahl al-Bayt,¹ and it goes without doubt that whoever harasses any member of the Ahl al-Bayt is a Nāṣibī, as is stated by Ibn Taymiyah who has defined them by saying, “They verbally and by action harass the Ahl al-Bayt.”²

This proof also cannot be accepted, for whoever knew Naṣb or dealt with some of its issues has never identified a similarity between it and them. Hence the scholars, of ancient and of recent, have not spoken a word referring to Naṣb when discussing the issue of 'Ā'ishah رضي الله عنها being accused after she was exonerated by Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَرَعَالَهُ. As for the generality in the definition ‘they harass the Ahl al-Bayt verbally or by action’ the generality here is restricted to 'Alī رضي الله عنه and his progeny; this falls under the principle of mentioning a general but intending a specific. An example of this would be to say that the Rawāfiḍ revile all the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم and despise them,³ but it is well known that they do not revile 'Alī, Salmān, Abū Dhar, and others.⁴

Furthermore, Ibn Taymiyah himself has mentioned the harassment of the Rawāfiḍ toward many members of the Ahl al-Bayt besides the 'Alawī branch, but still did

1 *Al-'Aqīdah fī Ahl al-Bayt bayn al-Ifrāṭ wa al-Tafriṭ* p. 533.

2 *Majmū' Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām* 3/154.

3 *Ibid.* 3/154.

4 *Al-Tanbīh wa al-Radd 'alā Ahl al-Ahwā' wa al-Bida' 1/13; al-Bad' wa al-Tārīkh* 5/127.

not deem them Nawāṣib and did not consider their behaviour to be a reflection of Naṣb.¹

Proof 3: The Rāfiḍah impugn some members of the ‘Alawī branch of the children of Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها. Doing so at times by deeming them liars, at times by deeming them imposters, and at times by excommunicating them.²

This proof also does not have any merit because the basis of Naṣb originally is only linked to ‘Alī رضي الله عنه; he is the primary target of his opponents. As for his children and his progeny thereafter; they follow him, i.e. they become victims because of him just as his companions were hated because of him.³ Whereas when we analyse the stance of the Rawāfiḍ regarding ‘Alī رضي الله عنه we will find that not only do they love, but they go to the furthest extremes regarding him.

Having discussed the aforementioned, a question persistently lingers, and that is: Why is the term Naṣb coined to specifically to refer to hatred for ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, to the exclusion of the rest of the Ahl al-Bayt, whereas they all fall part of the texts which exhort us to respect, associate with and love the Ahl al-Bayt.

The answer to this lies in history. The reason why this term specifically refers to him is that he was the focal point of many great events which transpired in the early dawn of the history of this Ummah. The unjust murder of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه in Madīnah, the capital of the Khilāfah, is the first spark which brought about unrest and dispute. Hence in this hyped atmosphere various views and ideas were being circulated, one among them being that ‘Alī ibn Ṭālib رضي الله عنه had something to do with the murder of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه. Consequently, he became the focal point of discussion in every conflict and dominated the hearts and minds of many even decades after his martyrdom. This of course is not true for any of the other members of the Ahl al-Bayt.

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyah* 4/592.

2 *Al-‘Aqīdah fī Ahl al-Bayt bayn al-Ifriṭ wa al-Tafrīṭ* p. 535

3 *Majmū‘ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām* 25/301.

The Second Discussion

The Concept of Naşb according to the Twelver Shī'ah

The issue of Naşb is an issue which is discussed in various chapters of the Twelver Fiqh due to many rulings being linked to it. Hence it is discussed in: the chapter of purity, the chapter of the various types of impurities, the chapter of *As'ār*¹ (leftovers), the chapter of *Khums*, the chapter of *Zakāh*, the chapter of *Jihad*, and the chapter of *Nikāh*, amongst others.

It is a very complex issue in which the views of the Shī'ah have drastically varied. This is despite the fact that it was very excessively used by their early and later scholars alike.²

1 *As'ār* is the plural of *Su'r* which literally means the remains of something. The *Su'r* of an animal is like the saliva of a human. However what is meant here is: whatever is little in quantity and is touched by an animal. See: *Lisān al-'Arab* 4/339; *al-Miṣbāḥ al-Munīr* 1/295; *Jāmi' al-Maqāsid* 1/122; *al-Muhadhdhab al-Bāri'* 1/122.

2 I managed to come across the following personalities of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم and those after them who are dubbed *Nawāṣib* by the Shī'ah:

1. 'Ā'ishah رضي الله عنها. *Al-Anwār al-Sāṭi'ah* p. 219.
2. Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān رضي الله عنه. *Khulāṣah 'Abaqāt al-Anwār* 9/212.
3. 'Amr ibn al-'Āṣ and his son 'Abd Allāh رضي الله عنه. *Iḥqāq al-Ḥaqq* p. 406.
4. 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Umar رضي الله عنه. *Ghāyat al-Marām* 1/248, 6/52.
5. 'Abd Allāhibnal-Zubayrandhisbrother'Urwahibnal-Zubayr رضي الله عنه. *SharḥIḥqāqal-Ḥaqq* 2/541.
6. Miswar ibn Makhramah رضي الله عنه. *Sharḥ Minhāj al-Karāmah* p. 420.
7. 'Ikrimah رضي الله عنه. *Sharḥ Iḥqāq al-Ḥaqq* 2/541.
8. Al-Sha'bī. *Ghāyat al-Marām* 5/286.
9. Abū Ḥanīfah. *Al-Anwār al-Nu'māniyyah* 2/307.
10. Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal. *Al-Ṣirāṭ al-Mustaqīm* 3/223.
11. Al-Bukhārī and Muslim. *Iḥqāq al-Ḥaqq* p. 196.
12. Ibn Ḥibbān. *Nafaḥāt al-Azhār* 15/305.
13. Ibn al-Jawzī. *Al-Musnad al-Ṣaḥīḥ* p. 85.
14. Ibn Ḥazm. *Nafaḥāt al-Azhār* 6/40; *Majallah Turāthinā* 37/11.
15. Al-Rāzī. *Bihār al-Anwār* 36/33.

The reason for this confusion is that they have differed in ascertaining the basis of Naṣb due to their conflicting narrations and how they contradict the practice of their Imāms who dealt amiably with the “dissenters”.

Hence at times Naṣb has been equated to opposing the Shī‘ah themselves, at times it has been defined as giving preference to the *Jibt* and the *Tāghūt* (names of two idols by which they refer to Abū Bakr and ‘Umar رضي الله عنهما) over ‘Alī رضي الله عنه in Imāmah,¹ at times as loving the enemies of the Imāms together with loving them, and at times as rejecting the Imāmah of any one of them.

What is really surprising though is that the Imāmiyyah are very passionate about researching the concept of Naṣb and refining the many rulings they have based upon its various narrations, whereas one of their scholars has averred the following:

عدم صحة أسانيدها، ومخالفتها للمشهور بين الأصحاب، وتعارضها فيما بينها... وإشكال مضامينها
في نفسها

continued from page 98

16. Ibn Khaldūn. *Al-Khilāfah al-Mughtaṣabah* p. 205.
17. Ibn Taymiyah. *Sharḥ Iḥqāq al-Ḥaqq* 2/385; *al-Ghadīr* 3/188; *Dirāsāt fī Minhāj al-Sunnah* p. 207.
18. Al-Dhahabī. *Nafaḥāt al-Azhār* 14/159; *Majallah Turāthinā* 41/75.
19. Ibn Kathīr. *Nuṣūṣ Mutafarriqah fī Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā‘ah* p. 193.
20. Ibn Ḥajr al-Haytamī. *Al-Ṣawārim al-Muḥriqah* p. 267.
21. Al-Ālūsī. *Al-Ghadīr* 1/238.
22. Al-Dihlawī. *Khulāṣah ‘Abaqāt al-Anwār* 4/274.
23. Jamāl al-Dīn al-Qasimī. *Ma’ Rijāl al-Fikr* 2/217.
24. Rashīd Riḍā. *Āyāt al-Ghadīr* 284.

And the list continues.

1 The wording of the narration is as follows: Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn ‘Īsā says, “I wrote to him (‘Alī al-Hādī) to ask him regarding a Nāṣibī: do I need to assess him with anything more than him giving preference to the *Jibt* and the *Tāghūt* and acknowledging their leadership?” He replied, “Whoever believes that is a Nāṣibī.” See: *Bihār al-Anwār* 69/135.

Those meant are Abū Bakr and ‘Umar رضي الله عنهما. See: *al-Ḥadā‘iq al-Nāḍirah* 10/360; *Miṣbāḥ al-Faqāhah* of al-Khūṭī 5/87.

Their chains of transmission being unauthentic, them being in conflict with what is well-known amongst the scholars, their internal contradiction..., and their content in itself being very problematic.¹

Nonetheless, the Imāmiyyah have differed regarding the definition of Naṣb and, in summary, have taken two main positions:

The First Position

This is the more restricted position. The proponents of this position have agreed that Naṣb is linked to the stance one holds regarding the Twelve Imāms specifically, but they have thereafter differed. In order for someone to be labelled with Naṣb, is it necessary for him to openly proclaim hatred, or is internal hatred sufficient?²

The former, i.e. the open proclamation of hatred, is the prevalent opinion among the later Shīṭī clergy and is also the preferred opinion of some of their early scholars.³

Hereunder some definitions provided by the later scholars are presented:

Ja'far ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ḥillī⁴ defines a Nāṣībī by saying:

الذي يسب أو يعادي الأئمة الإثني عشر أو بعضهم

A person who reviles or hates the Twelve Imāms or some of them.⁵

1 *Mustamsak al-'Urwah* 1/395 with a little bit of; al-Khumaynī: *Kitāb al-Ṭahārah* 3/324.

2 *Al-Ḥadā'iq al-Nāḍirah* 24/61.

3 *Ibid.* 5/175, 24/54-60.

4 Ja'far ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Yaḥyā al-Dhuhalī, Abū al-Qāsim al-Ḥillī. A Shīṭī jurist from Ḥillah, Iraq. He was born in 602 A.H. He was the reference scholar of the Imāmī Shī'ah in his era. He had knowledge in the field of literature and his poetry was outstanding. He passed away in 676 A.H. Some of his books are: *Sharā'ī' al-Islām*, *al-Nāfi'* and *al-Mu'tabar fi Sharḥ al-Mukhtaṣar*. See: *al-Anwār al-Sāṭi'ah* p. 30; *al-A'lām* 2/123; *Mu'jam al-Mu'allifin* 3/137.

5 *Sharā'ī' al-Islām* 3/63.

Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī¹ has stated the following:

المعلن بالعداوة لأهل البيت

A person who openly proclaims enmity for the Ahl al-Bayt.²

‘Abd Allāh al-Jazā’irī³ has mentioned:

الناصب: وهو المعادي لأهل البيت كلا أو بعضا، على المشهور في معناه بين الفقهاء والمحدثين
واللغويين

A Nāṣib is a person who displays enmity for the Ahl al-Bayt, all of them or some of them, as is the popular meaning in the circles of the jurists, the ḥadīth scholars and the linguists.⁴

Muḥammad Amīn Zayn al-Dīn⁵ states:

1 Al-Ḥasan ibn Yūsuf ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī. The supreme scholar of the Imāmiyyah in his time. He was born in 647 A.H. When the title ‘*Allāmah* (very knowledgeable) is said by the Imāmiyyah it is he who is meant. He authored many books most of which are credible according to the Imāmiyyah up to the present day. He passed away in Ḥillah in 726 A.H. and was moved to Najaf. Some of his books are: *Minhāj al-Karāmah*, *Muntahā al-Ṭalab* and *Qawā’id al-Aḥkām*. See: *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 13/54; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 14/125; *al-Durar al-Kāminah* 2/188; *A’yān al-Shī’ah* 5/396.

2 *Qawā’id al-Aḥkām* 3/308; *al-Mu’tabar* 2/766.

3 ‘Abd Allāh ibn Nūr al-Dīn ibn Ni’mat Allah al-Mūsawī al-Jazā’irī. An Imāmī jurist who participated in other sciences as well. He stayed in the company of his father till the time of his death, graduated at his hands and thereafter wrote more than thirty books. He passed away in 1173 A.H. Some of his works are: *al-Anwār al-Jaliyyah*, *Tadhyīl Sulāfah al-‘Aṣr* and *al-Tuḥfah al-Saniyyah*. See: *A’yān al-Shī’ah* 12/109; *Mu’jam al-Mu’allifīn* 6/160.

4 *Al-Tuḥfah al-Saniyyah* p. 91.

5 Muḥammad Amīn ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz ibn Zayn al-Dīn al-Baḥrānī al-Baṣārī. An Imāmī scholar who had a share in literature. He was born in Nahr-Khūz, a village in Basrah in 1333 A.H. He grew up in Basrah, thereafter travelled to Najaf and studied at feet of its scholars. Some of his works are: *Ma’ al-Duktūr Aḥmad Amīn* and *al-Akhlaq ‘ind al-Imām al-Ṣādiq*. See: *Nuqabā’ al-Bashar fi al-Qarn al-Rabī ‘Ashar* 1/179.

الناصب هو من أظهر المعاداة للأئمة المعصومين أو لبعضهم

A Nāṣib is a person who displays enmity for the infallible Imāms or for some of them.¹

And Jawwād al-Tabrīzī² says:

الناصب هو الذي يظهر العداوة لأهل البيت

A Nāṣib is a person who expresses hatred for the Ahl al-Bayt.³

The fact of the matter, however, is that this definition is against what is reported from the Imāms of the Shī'ah. Because there is not a single narration, not even a single statement of their early scholars, with the exception of al-Ṣadūq,⁴ which links Naṣb to hatred and enmity.

But what prompted these scholars to take this stance is the following three matters:

Firstly, taking into consideration the literal meaning of Naṣb which has passed already.

Secondly, hatred is suitable a reason to be the basis of that Naṣb the bearer of which, as appears in many of their narrations, is excommunicated by their Imāms, due to it being associated with the denial of what is categorically known

1 *Kalimah al-Taqwā* 6/309.

2 A contemporary Shī' scholar. I did not come across his biography in the books in have at my disposal.

3 *Ṣirāṭ al-Jannah* 2/413.

4 Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn Mūsā al-Qummī. An Imāmī scholar and one of their prominent ḥadīth masters. He is known as Ibn Bābawayh. He was born in 306 A.H. He settled in Ray where he earned acclaim. He passed away in Ray in 381 A.H. He wrote close to three hundred books, some being: *al-'I'tiqādāt*, *Man lā Yaḥḍurūhū al-Faqīh*, *'Ilal al-Sharā'i' wa al-Aḥkām*. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 3/89; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 16/303; *Nawābiḡh al-Ruwāt fī Rābi'ah al-Mi'āt* p. 287; *al-A'lām* 6/274.

in the Dīn according to them. The impermissibility of opposing the Ahl al-Bayt is a categorically established aspect of Islam which is well-known to the elite and the commonality.¹

Lastly, the social conduct of the Imāms with those who opposed them. It is not reported from any of them that he would intentionally try to avoid meeting them. Rather they would socialise with them, inter-marry, and would eat from the food they slaughtered without any reservation. Whereas if every dissenter was a Nāṣib they would never have interacted with them in this way due to a Nāṣibī being a disbeliever according to their unanimity.²

Al-Jawāhirī³ says:

لعل الذي يظهر من السير والتواريخ أن كثيرا من الصحابة في زمن النبي صلى الله عليه وآله وبعده وأصحاب الجمل وصفين، بل وكافة أهل الشام وأكثر أهل المدينة ومكة كانوا في أشد العداوة للأمير المؤمنين وذريته عليهم السلام، مع أن مخالطتهم ومساورتهم لم تكن منكرا عند الشيعة أصلا ولو سرا. وكذلك الحال في بني أمية وأتباعهم وبني العباس وأتباعهم.

Probably what is apparent from history is that many of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم during the time of Nabī صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم, the participants of Jamal and Ṣiffīn, actually all the people of Shām, and all the people of Makkah and Madīnah severely opposed Amīr al-Mu'minīn and his children عليهم السلام. Despite that, socialising with them (at times) and opposing them (at times) was not something frowned upon by the Shī'ah at all, not even discreetly. The same was the situation with the Banū Umayyah and their followers and the Banū 'Abbās and their followers.⁴

1 Baḥr al-'Ulūm: *Bulghah al-Faqīh* 4/207.

2 Ibid; al-Khumaynī: *Kitāb al-Ṭahārah* 3/336.

3 Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan ibn Bāqir ibn 'Abd al-Raḥīm al-Najafī. A prominent scholar of the Imāmī jurists. He was born in Najf in approximately 1202 A.H. By the mid thirteenth century he became the supreme most authority of the Imāmīyyah and was thus the only reference scholar who was followed unquestionably. He passed away in Najf in 1266 A.H. Some of his books are: *Jawāhir al-Kalām*, *Najāh al-'Ibād* and *Hidāyah al-Sālikīn*. See: *al-Māzindarānī*, *al-'Aqd al-Munīr* p. 297; *A'yān al-Shī'ah* 9/149; *Mu'jam al-Mu'allifīn* 9/184.

4 *Jawāhir al-Kalām* 6/66. Also see: *Natā'ij al-Afkār* 1/244; *Mustanad al-Shī'ah* 1/208; *Kitāb al-Ṭahārah* 2/351.

He has likewise unequivocally denied the perpetual link between Naṣb and mere opposition due to the conduct of the Imāms and their constant practice suggesting otherwise.¹

The proponents of this view have rejected all the narrations of their Imāms which go against it. Hence Ja‘far ibn al-Ḥasan al-Ḥillī states:

ما روي في أن الناصب من قدم علينا لا يعمل به

The narration which state that ‘a Nāṣibī is the one who gives preference over us’ will not be practiced.²

One of them has even gone to the extent of saying that to consider every to dissenter to be a Nāṣibī is very weak and far from being correct.³

Furthermore, despite the meaning of ‘*Adāwah* (hatred/enmity) which is utilised by many in their definitions being completely clear, some Shī‘ī scholars have tried to expand its meaning in a way which is unacceptable. They have done so in order to include in it every person who does not believe in the Imāmah of some of the Twelve Imāms, and every person who denies any of their merits even though that denial be based on some sort of reasoning.

Amongst them is Zayn al-Dīn al-‘Āmilī⁴ who says:

1 *Jawāhir al-Kalām* 6/64.

2 *Al-Rasā’il al-Tis’* p. 278.

3 *Al-Tuḥfah al-Saniyyah* p. 92.

4 Zayn al-Dīn ‘Alī ibn Aḥmad al-‘Āmilī. A dynamic Imāmī scholar who was known as Ibn al-Ḥājjah al-Naḥārīrī. He was born in 911 A.H. in Jabal ‘Āmil in an erudite family. He became famous in jurisprudence and became popular as the ‘second martyr’ with Muḥammad ibn Makkī being the first. He is the first scholar of the Imāmiyyah to write on *Dirāyah al-Ḥadīth* (the branch of ḥadīth sciences which has to do with understanding ḥadīth and whatever is related to it, as opposed to merely narrating it). He was executed in 965 A.H. There are many views regarding the reason for his execution. Some of the book he authored: *Rawḍ al-Jinān*, *al-Maqāṣid al-‘Aliyyah*, *Masālik al-Afnām ilā Sharā’i’ al-Islām*. See: *A’yān al-Shī‘ah*.

المراد به (أي الناصب) من نصب العداوة لأهل البيت أو لأحدهم، وأظهر العداوة لهم صريحا أو لزوما، ككراهة ذكرهم ونشر فضائلهم والإعراض عن مناقبهم من حيث إنها مناقبهم والعداوة لمحبيهم بسبب محبتهم.

It refers, the term *Nāṣib*, to any person who proclaims hatred for the Ahl al-Bayt or any of them, or displays hatred for them openly or subtly. For example by disliking their mention and promulgating their merits, ignoring their virtues just because they enjoy them and hating their lovers merely because of their love.¹

Here he is trying to combine all the various views and narrations on the topic by categorising the disillusionment with the Ahl al-Bayt into two:

1. Open: like disliking their mention and their merits, ignoring their virtues due to them being virtues.
2. Subtle: despising their lovers merely because of their love.

The reason for concocting this far-fetched definition is to try and combine all the various definitions and unify them. But it is no better than beating cold iron. Because whoever has used the word '*Adāwah* (hatred) has used it in its literal meaning which is well-known. He has not used it to refer to some possible scenarios which could possibly fall part of it. If that was the case they could have used words like *Inkāṛ* (denial/rejection), etc.

Likewise the fact that some of them have added the word *Yasubbu* (to revile) in the definition compromises this combination (of open and subtle opposition).

This is besides the fact that some of them have denied subtle opposition altogether (and have not considered it to be warranting of *Naṣb*).

1 *Rawḍ al-jinān* p. 157.

The Second Position

This is the broader position. The proponents of this position have differed drastically, beginning with some averring that denying the Imāmah of any of the Twelve Imāms is part of Naṣb and culminating with some opining that merely hating their Shī'ah is Naṣb.

These people have relied upon the following factors in determining the basis of their understanding of Naṣb:

1. Giving preference to the *Jibt* and the *Ṭāghūt*, as has passed already. Murtaḍā al-Anṣārī¹ says:

الذي يظهر من بعض الأخبار أن النصب لا يختص ببغض أهل البيت، بل هو مطلق من قدم الجبت والطاغوت.

What becomes clear from some narrations is that Naṣb is not specific to hating the Ahl al-Bayt. Rather it unrestrictedly refers to anyone who give preference to the *Jibt* and *Ṭāghūt*.²

They have given the following reasons for this:

لا عداوة أعظم ممن قدم المنخرط عن مراتب الكمال، وفضل المنخرط في سلك الأغبياء والجهال، على من تسنم أوج الجلال، حتى شك في أنه الله المتعال.

There is no enmity greater than (the enmity of) a person who gives preference to a person who falls short of obtaining the stages of perfection and ought to be part of the foolish and ignorant upon the one who is atop the highest pinnacle of grandeur, to the extent that it is suspected that he might be Allah the Almighty.³

1 Murtaḍā ibn Muḥammad Amīn al-Anṣārī al-Tusturī al-Dazfūlī al-Najafī. An Imāmī jurist and expert in *Uṣūl* (principles of Sharī'ah). He was born in 1214 A.H. He resided in Ghary in Iraq. He passed away in 1286 A.H. Some of his books are the following: *al-Rasā'il*, *al-Makāsib* and *Kitāb al-Ṭahārah*. See: *al-A'lām* 7/210; *A'yān al-Shī'ah* 10/117; *Mu'jam al-Mu'allifīn* 12/216.

2 *Kitāb al-Ṭahārah* 2/357.

3 *Rawḍ al-jinān* 1/158.

Likewise when one of the poets said:

سطين قد خطا بلا كاتب
وحب أهل البيت في جانب

لو شق قلبي لرأو وسطه
الشرع والتوحيد في جانب

If my heart is split apart they will see in the centre of it two lines written without a writer.

The Sharīah and Tawhīd on the one side and love for the Ahl al-Bayt on the other side.¹

Yūsuf al-Baḥrānī² refuted his claim with the following:

فلعنة الله على الكاذب
وبغض أهل البيت في جانب
دون الإله الواحد الواجب
عن معشر النصاب يا ناصبي

كذبت في دعواك يا شافعي
بل حب أسياخك في جانب
عبدتم الجبت وطاغوته
فالشرع والتوحيد في معزل

You have lied in you claim, O Shāfiī. So may the curse of Allah be upon the liar.

Rather the love of your scholars is on one side, and hatred for the Ahl al-Bayt is on the other.

You have worshipped the *Jibt* and its *Tāghūt* instead of worshipping the one eternal being.

As a result, the Sharīah and the oneness of Allah is aloof from the congregation of the Nāṣibīs, O Nāṣibī.³

1 *Yatīmah al-Dahr* 3/310; *al-Istiqṣā li Akhbār Duwal al-Maghrib al-Aqṣā* 1/113; *Mawāqif al-Shī'ah* 3/26; Aḥmad Maḥmūd Ṣubḥī: *al-Zaydiyyah* p. 182.

2 Yūsuf ibn Aḥmad ibn Ibrāhīm al-Darāzī al-Baḥrānī, from the family of Āl 'Uṣfūr. An Imāmī jurist who hails from Bahrain. He was born in 1107. He was an *Akḥbārī* (the opposite of Uṣūlī. It refers to a group of the Shī'ah that stringently follow the source texts without applying reason). Due to this a severe conflict ensued between him and his contemporaries. He died in Karbalā' in 1186 A.H. Some of his works are: *al-Ḥadā'iq al-Nādirah*, *Anīs al-Musāfir* which is known as *Kashkūl* and *al-Durrah al-Najafīyyah*. See: *al-A'ām* 8/215; *A'yān al-Shī'ah* 10/317; *Mu'jam al-Mu'allifīn* 13/268.

3 *Mawāqif al-Shī'ah* 3/26.

2. Denying the emphatic appointment of ‘Alī after Nabī ﷺ. This according to them is violating the trust and results in disbelief due to it denying a categorically established aspect of Dīn.¹

Al-Khājūī² says:

من لم يقل بأمامتهم عليهم السلام من الفرق كلها فهو ناصب، إذ لا يخلو من نصب عداوة لواحد منهم، حيث اعتقد أنه في مرتبة الإمامة وفرض الطاعة

Whoever of all the sects does not believe in their Imāmah is a Nāṣib; for he will inevitably despise one of them due to assuming that he is not worthy of Imāmah and obedience to him is not compulsory.³

3. Considering ‘Alī ﷺ to be mistaken in some of his decisions. This results in Naṣb due to their belief that he was infallible and flawless.

One of their scholars has actually written a book in which he enumerates those issues in which the Muslims shunned the views of ‘Alī ﷺ and thereafter concluded that that is Naṣb. Like the book which discusses all the issues in which Abū Ḥanīfah opposed ‘Alī ﷺ.⁴

4. Attributing anything which compromises the integrity of the Imāms or smacks off disrespect for them.

1 Al-Anṣārī: *Kitāb al-Ṭahārah* 2/353; Gulpāyḡānī: *Kitāb al-Ṭahārah* 1/246.

2 Muḥammad Ismā‘īl ibn Muḥammad ibn Ḥusayn Riḏā al-Māzindarānī al-Khājūī, popularly known as Ismā‘īl. An Imāmī ḥadīth scholar and a theologian. He is attributed to Mazandaran, a town in Ṭabrustān and is also attributed to Khājū, a place in Aṣfahān where he resided. He passed away in 1173 A.H. Some of his works are: *Sharḥ Du‘ā’ al-Ṣubḥ*, *al-Rasā’il al-I’tiqādiyyah*, *Jāmi‘ al-Shatāt fī al-Nawādir wa al-Mutafarriqāt*. See: *al-A’lām* 1/325; *A’yān al-Shī‘ah* 13/347; *Mu‘jam al-Mu’allifīn* 2/291.

3 *al-Rasā’il al-I’tiqādiyyah* 1/434.

4 *Majallah Turāthīnā* 37/124.

Therefore some of them have accused Ibn Ḥibbān al-Bustī¹ of Naṣb because he says the following regarding ‘Alī al-Riḍā:²

كأنه كان يهيم ويخطئ

يروى عن أبيه العجائب

He narrates strange things from his father. It is as if he would forget and falter.³

5. Opposing the Shī‘ah.

They say that whoever hates the Shī‘ah or opposes them only does so due to them loving the Ahl al-Bayt, following them, and giving them preference over others. Hence they narrate the following report from Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq:⁴

1 Muḥammad ibn Ḥibbān ibn Aḥmad ibn Ḥibbān al-Tamīmī, Abū Ḥātim al-Bustī. The supreme scholar of Khorasan and one of the great retainers of ḥadīth. He took ḥadīth from more than two thousand scholars. He was a vessel of knowledge in jurisprudence, language, ḥadīth, and imparting advices. He was very intelligent. He passed away in Bust in 354 A.H. Some of his books are: *al-Anwā‘ wa al-Taqaṣīm*, *Tārīkh al-Thiqāt* and *Kitāb al-Majrūhīn*. See: *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 16/92; *Lisān al-Mizān* 5/112; *Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥuffāz* p. 375; *Shadharāt al-Dhahab* 3/16.

2 ‘Alī ibn Mūsā ibn Ja‘far al-Hāshimī, Abū al-Ḥasan al-Madanī. The head of the ‘Alawiyyīn in his time. He was accorded the title ‘al-Riḍā’. He was born in Madīnah in 148 A.H. Māmūn’s immense respect for him led him to appoint al-Riḍā as the next Khalīfah after him and engrave his name on the Dirhams and Dinars which were in circulation at that time. The Imāmiyyah consider him to be their eighth Imām. He passed away in 202 A.H according to the popular narration. See: *Wafayāt al-A‘yān* 3/269; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 9/387; *Mizān al-‘Itidāl* 5/191; *al-Tuḥfah al-Laṭīfah* 2/302.

3 *Kitāb al-Majrūhīn* 2/106. See the book *Nafaḥāt al-Azhār* 15/305 to locate this accusation.

4 Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Hāshimī, Abū ‘Abd Allah al-Madanī. A scholar from the high ranking scholars of the *Tābī‘īn* (successors). He was born in Madīnah in 80 A.H. He was the head of the ‘Alawiyyīn in his time. He was accorded the title al-Ṣādiq and is considered the sixth Imām of the Shī‘ah. He passed away in Madīnah in 148 A.H. Al-Bukhārī has narrated his narrations in *al-Adab al-Mufrad*. His narrations also appear in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* and the four *Sunans*. See: *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 5/74; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 6/255; *Tārīkh al-Islām* 9/88; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 2/88.

ليس الناصب من نصب لنا أهل البيت. لأنك لا تجد أحدا يقول: أنا أبغض محمدا وآل محمد ولكن الناصب من نصب لكم، وهو يعلم أنكم تتولوننا أو تترأون من أعدائنا.

A Nāṣib is not a person who hates us the Ahl al-Bayt because you will not find a person who says, “I hate Muḥammad and the household of Muḥammad.” But a Nāṣib is the one who opposes you whilst he knows that you associate with us and disassociate from our enemies.¹

Yūsuf al-Baḥrānī says:

المستفاد من هذه الأخبار أن مظهر النصب المترتب عليه الأحكام والدليل عليه إما تقديم الجبت والطاغوت أو بغض الشيعة من حيث التشيع. فكل من اتصف بذلك فهو ناصب تجري عليه أحكام النصب

What is understood from these narrations is that the display of Naṣb which has a bearing upon rulings and which is suggestive thereof, is either giving preference to the *Jibt* and *Tāghūt* or hating the Shī'ah due to their partisanship. Hence any person who is of this nature is a Nāṣib to who the rulings of Naṣb will apply.²

To summarise, after analysing the various usages and the definitions of Naṣb presented by this cult, irrespective of their divergent stances, one finds that the word Nāṣib holds various meanings according to them, which are as follows:

1. A Khārijī who impugns ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.
2. A person who attributes to any of the Imāms of the Ahl al-Bayt that which compromises their integrity.
3. A person who upon hearing a merit of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ or any of the infallible Imāms denies it.
4. A person who believes in others besides ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ being better than him.

1 Al-Ṣadūq: *Ma‘ānī al-Akḥbār* p. 365; al-Ḥurr al-‘Āmilī: *Wasā’il al-Shī’ah* 24/274; al-Nirāqī: *Mustanad al-Shī’ah* 1/206; Burūjardī: *Jāmi’ Aḥādīth al-Shī’ah* 8/507.

2 *Al-Ḥadā’iq al-Nāḍirah* 5/186.

5. A person who rejects a tradition of ‘Alī عليه السلام after hearing it or after it reaching him in a way that can be trusted.
6. A person who displays enmity for the Shī‘ah.¹

It is obvious that whoever has offered a broader definition of Naṣb, will necessarily approve of the narrower one as well.

The impact of this dispute becomes evident when categorising the people of the Qiblah (people who identify themselves as Muslims).

Hence those who aver that Naṣb is hating ‘Alī عليه السلام have categorised their dissenters into three categories:

The first category: Believers, i.e. any person who acknowledges the Imāmah of ‘Alī عليه السلام as per the demands of the Twelver Dogma.

The second category: Dissenters, i.e. any person who is not upon their dogma but has not reached the stage of enmity which constitutes Naṣb according to them. Hence he is considered an incapable dissenter (i.e. his opposition is unintentional).² These people will be treated as a Muslim.³

1 *Jawāhir al-Kalām* 6/66; *Miftāḥ al-Karāmah* 2/45; *Riyāḍh al-Masā’il* 2/65, 9/542.

2 *Al-Ḥadā’iq al-Nāḍirah* 5/175.

3 What is meant by treating him like a Muslim is that he will be considered a Muslim outwardly in the worldly life only and will thus be treated accordingly, as is the view of the majority of the Shī‘ah scholars.

Abū al-Qāsim al-Khūī says the following in *Kitāb al-Ṭahārah* 2/86:

فالصحيح الحكم بطهارة جميع المخالفين للشيعة الإثني عشرية وإسلامهم ظاهرا، بلا فرق في ذلك بين أهل الخلاف وغيرهم، وإن كان جميعهم في الحقيقة كافرين، وهم الذين سميناهم بمسلم الدنيا كافر الآخرة.

The correct view is averring that all the dissenters of the Twelver Shī‘ah are pure and that they are outwardly Muslim, without any differentiation between the various sects, even though they all are in reality disbelievers. They are the people whom we dub ‘Muslim in this world and Kāfir in the afterlife’.

continued . . .

The Third category: Nāṣibīs. ‘Nāṣib’ is more specific than a dissenter, for every Nāṣib is a dissenter but every dissenter is not a Nāṣib. To them the rulings of Naṣb will apply.

This is the categorisation which is popular amongst the later Shī'ah.¹ To the extent that al-Ṣadūq has attributed whatever goes against it to the ignorant people and has said:

الجهلاء يتوهمون أن كل مخالف ناصب وليس كذلك.

The ignorant people assume that every dissenter is a Nāṣib, whereas that is not the case.²

continued from page 111

And Muḥammad Āṣif Muḥsinī has explained the statement of their scholars ‘the dissenters will be accorded the ruling of Islam’ with the following statement, as appears in *Mashra'ah Biḥār al-Anwār* 1/413:

أي إنهم كفار، لكن حكم شرعا بطهارتهم، وبصححة التزوج والتزويج، وأكل ذبائحهم لمجرد التسهيل على الشيعة في هذه الحياة
i.e. they are disbelievers, but in Sharī'ah the ruling is that they will be considered pure, it will be permissible to marry them, get them married, and eat their slaughtered animals; in order to simplify things for the Shī'ah in this life.

And al-Majlisī says the following in *Biḥār al-Anwār* 8/369:

لما علم الله أن أئمة الجور وأتباعهم يستولون على الشيعة وهم يتلون بمعاشرتهم ومخالطتهم ومناكحتهم أجرى الله عليهم حكم الإسلام توسعة، فإذا ظهر القائم عليه السلام يجري عليهم حكم سائر الكفار في جميع الأمور، وفي الآخرة يدخلون النار ماكين فيها أبدا مع الكفار

Because Allah knew that oppressive rulers and their followers will gain dominance over the Shī'ah and that they will be tested by socialising with them, mixing with them, and intermarrying with them; he passed the ruling of Islam upon them in order to ease things. But when the Mahdī عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام will emerge he will apply on them the status of the disbelievers in all matters. And in the hereafter they will stay forever in hell-fire with the disbelievers.

For more details see: *al-Ḥadā'iq al-Nāḍirah* 21/323; *Jawāhir al-Kalām* 30/97; al-Hindī: *Kashf al-Shām* 1/410; *Mashra'ah Biḥār al-Anwār* 1/413; al-Rahmānī: *‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib* p. 188.

1 *Al-Ḥadā'iq al-Nāḍirah* 5/183.

2 *Jawāhir al-Kalām* 6/64.

Al-Jawāhirī has likewise considered the view of Naṣb and mere opposition being inseparable to be a view based on some sort of conjecture.¹

And Gulpāygānī² says:

إطلاق النواصب والخوارج لا يشمل كل من كان له عداوة بأي ألوانها، بل المسلم منها العداوة الدينية
واتخاذها ديناً لنفسه يتقرب بها إلى الله سبحانه

The terms Nawāṣib and Khawārij do not include every person who is involved in any sort of opposition. Rather the degree thereof which is agreed upon is religious hatred which is considered an act of virtue by way of which closeness to Allah is sought.³

Murtaḍā al-Anṣārī has also alluded to the view of generalising ‘Nāṣib’ to include a dissenter being weak.⁴ In substantiating this he has argued that the commonality (the Ahl al-Sunnah) comprises of three types of people: Nāṣibīs, *Mustaḍ’afs* (people under religious constraints), and those between the two.⁵

As for those who aver that Naṣb is broader than just mere opposition, they have categorised their dissenters into two types only:

The first type: Believers, whose explanation has passed already.

The second type: Nāṣibīs, those who deny the Imāmah of the Twelve Imāms or any of them.

1 Ibid. 6/64.

2 Muḥammad Riḍā ibn Muḥammad Bāqir al-Mūsawī al-Gulpāygānī. One of the reference scholars of the Shī’ah. He was born in Kūkād in 1316 A.H. He studied in Arāk and Qum and has written close to thirty books. He died in 1414 A.H. The following are some of his book: *Kitāb al-Qaḍā’*, *Kitāb al-Ḥajj*, and *Natā’ij al-Afkār fī Najāsāt al-Kuffār*. See: *Itmām al-A’lām* p. 234.

3 *Natā’ij al-Afkār* 1/196.

4 *Kitāb al-Ṭahārah* 2/357.

5 *Kitāb al-Ṭahārah* 2/358.

Hence all the dissenters according to them are Nawāṣib, of course with the exception of the *Mustaḍ'afs* and the gullible who are not aware of the various views and do not hate the Shī'ah. Put another way, the ignorant whose ignorance stems from their inability and not from their slackening.¹

This viewpoint was popular amongst the early Shī'ah scholars like al-Mufīd,² al-Sharīf al-Murtaḍā,³ and Ibn Idrīs al-Ḥillī,⁴ and is also the preferred view of some of the later scholars.⁵ This view is based on the fact that every dissenter is necessarily a denier of the emphatic appointment, and whoever is a denier thereof is either a disbeliever or a renegade. Hence there is a binding relationship between Naṣb and opposition.⁶

1 *Al-Shuḥub al-Thāqib* p. 22. There are various but close definitions for the term *Mustaḍ'af* provided by the Shī'ah which can be seen in *al-Ḥadā'iq al-Nāḍirah* 24/64.

2 Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Nu'mān al-'Ukbarī, Abū 'Abd Allāh. A prominent scholar of the Imāmiyyah who was known as al-Mufīd. He was born in 'Ukbarā in 336. He was the chief Shī'ī scholar in his time and was well-respected in the dynasty of 'Aḍud al-Dawlah. He has written books wherein he impugns the pious predecessors of the Ummah. He died in 413 A.H. He authored close to two hundred books, amongst them are: *al-Muqni'ah*, *Awā'il al-Maqālāt*, and *al-Amālī*. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 3/231; *Mizān al-'itidāl* 6/321; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 17/344; *Lisān al-Mizān* 5/368.

3 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn Mūsā al-Hāshimī, Abū al-Qāsim al-'Alawī. An Imāmī scholar with vast knowledge in the sciences of language, theology, and poetry. He was born in 304 A.H. and was accorded the title 'al-Murtaḍā Dhū al-Majdayn'. He wrote few books regarding the schools of the Shī'ah. He was also the head of the Mu'tazilah and the leader of Ṭālibiyyīn. He died whilst blind in 436 A.H. Some of his books are: *Kitāb al-Shāfi'ī fī al-Imāmah*, *Tanzīh al-Ambiyā'*, and *al-Širfah*. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 11/402; *al-'Ibar fī Khabar man Ghabar* 3/188; *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 20/231; *al-Darajāt al-Raḥīh* p. 458.

4 Muḥammad ibn Idrīs ibn Aḥmad al-'Ijlī, Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥillī. The leading Shī'ī cleric of his time. He had vast knowledge and very strong reasoning in jurisprudence. He died in 597 A.H. Some of his books are: *al-Ḥāwī li Taḥrīr al-Fatāwī*; *Khulāṣah al-Istidlāl*, and *al-Manāsik*. See: *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 21/332; *Tārīkh al-Islām* 42/314; *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 2/129; *Mu'jam al-Mu'allifīn* 9/32.

5 Amongst them are: Yūsuf al-Baḥrānī, Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ al-Māzindarānī, and Abū al-Ḥasan al-Sharīf ibn Muḥammad Ṭāhir. See: *al-Ḥadā'iq al-Nāḍirah* 3/176, 406, 14/163, 18/159, 61/24; *al-Shuḥub al-Thawāqib* p. 23; *Riyāḍ al-Masā'il* 9/542.

6 *Al-Shuḥub al-Thāqib* p. 23.

Therefore, we find that al-Mufid has categorised the Nawāṣib into two:

The first category: People who love Amīr al-Mu'minīn and his progeny, but are unaware of many of their rights.

The second category: The Khawārij and those who are like them in hating him and his progeny.¹

Āghā Riḍā al-Hamdānī² says:

المراد بالناصب في الروايات-على الظاهر- مطلق المخالفين، لا خصوص من أظهر عداوة أهل البيت وتدين بنصبهم

Nāṣib in the narrations apparently refers to all dissenters, not specifically to someone who displays enmity for the Ahl al-Bayt and considers opposing them to be an act of worship.³

As for al-Majlisī,⁴ he has described the Ahl al-Sunnah by saying that they are on a very high degree of Naṣb.⁵

In conclusion, after this brief mention, I now will mention the stance of the Shī'ah regarding their dissenters in detail. Their opponents are the following:

1 *Al-Muqni'ah* p. 579.

2 Āghā Riḍā Muḥammad Hādī al-Hamdānī al-Najafī. From the later scholars of the Shī'ah who held a prominent position in his time. He earned acclaim for his in-depth knowledge of jurisprudence. He passed away in 1322 A.H. in his seventies. Some of his books are: *Miṣbāḥ al-Faqīh*, *Hāshiyah 'alā al-Rasā'il*, and *Hāshiyah 'alā al-Makāsib*. See: *A'yān al-Shī'ah* 9/45, 183; *al-A'lām* 6/489.

3 *Miṣbāḥ al-Faqīh* 2/568.

4 Muḥammad Bāqir ibn Muḥammad Taqī ibn Maqṣūd al-Aṣfahānī. A prominent Imāmī scholar. He was born in 1027 A.H. He is known as 'the second al-Majlisī', the first one being his father. He played the most instrumental role in spreading the Safawid model of Shī'ism. The author of *al-Tuḥfah al-Ithnay 'Ashariyyah* has said the following regarding him, "If the Shī'ī dogma is named 'the al-Majlisī dogma' it would be correct." He died in 1110 A.H. Some of his books are: *Biḥār al-Anwār*, *Mir'āt al-'Uqūl*, and *Kitāb al-'Aql wa al-'Ilm wa al-Jahl*. See: *'Iqd al-Munīr* p. 436; *A'yān al-Shī'ah* 9/ 45, 183; *al-A'lām* 6/489.

5 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 29/646.

Khawārij

According to the unanimity of the Imāmiyyah they are Nawāṣib because they excommunicate ‘Alī رضي الله عنه greater than which there can be no expression of hatred, especially when it implies the permissibility of his blood.

Al-Ḥillī has thus stated that the Khawārij are from the Nawāṣib.¹ And according to al-Anṣārī they are the worse of them.² In fact some scholars deem the Khawārij specifically to be the Nawāṣib.³

It should, however, be noted that in the writings of many of their scholars the term Nawāṣib is mentioned side by side with the term Khawārij, which apparently suggests that they are both distinct from one another.⁴ But that is not the case because the Khawārij are unanimously included in the definition of Naṣb due to the term Nawāṣib being more general than the term Khawārij.⁵

Hence al-Gulpāyḡānī says:

عطف النواصب على الخوارج من باب عطف العام على الخاص

Linking Nawāṣib to the Khawārij by way of a conjunction is from linking the general to the specific.⁶

The Ahl al-Sunnah

The Shī‘ī scholarship has differed regarding them, i.e. are all of the Ahl al-Sunnah from the Nawāṣib or just some of them?

1 *Qawā'id al-Aḥkām* 3/308; see also: *Rawḍ al-Jinān* p. 157; *Nihāyah al-Marām* 1/224.

2 *Al-Ṭahārah* 2/357.

3 *Miftāḥ al-Karāmah* 2/43.

4 *Masālik al-Afhām* 1/397.

5 *Ibid.* 1/397; also see: *al-Fuṣūl al-Mukhtārah* p. 339.

6 *Irshād al-Sā'il* p. 15; also see: *Mustanad al-Shī'ah* 1/204.

In this regard there are two views:

The first view

They are not Nawāṣib, even though amongst them there some whose traits necessitate that they be dubbed with Naṣb, but not because of the mere opposition of the Imāmiyyah. The proponents of this view have thereafter disputed regarding these necessitating factors based on each ones exclusive understanding of Naṣb.

‘Abd Allah al-Jazā’irī says:

أما ما ذهب إليه شذاذ من المعاصرين ومن قاربهم –وربما نسبوه إليّ بعض القدماء أيضا– من أن كل مخالف في الإمامة فهو ناصب يحكم عليه بالنجاسة وتحريم المناكحة وسائر لوازم الكفر، ففي غاية الضعف والبعد عن الصواب.

As for the view adopted by a select few contemporary scholars, which some of them attributed to the early scholars as well, regarding every dissenter in Imāmah being a Nāṣib who holds an impure status, marriage with who is impermissible, and to who all the other rulings of disbelief apply, it is very weak and far from being correct.¹

The second view

They are all Nawāṣib.

Ni‘mat Allāh al-Jazā’irī² mentions:

1 *Al-Tuḥfah al-Saniyyah* p. 91.

2 Ni‘mat Allah ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Jazā’irī al-Mūsawī al-Tusturī. An Imāmī scholar who was born in al-Jazā’ir (one of the suburbs of Basrah) in 1050 A.H. He studied at the feet of the scholars there and thereafter travelled to various cities eventually settling in Aṣfahān. He was the protégé of al-Majlisī and thus helped him in authoring some of his works. He became the judge of Tustur. He died in 1112 A.H. Some of his works are: *al-Anwār al-Nu‘māniyyah*, *Zahr al-Rabī*, and *Sharḥ Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām*. See: al-Majlisī: *Ijāzāt al-Ḥadīth* p. 298; *A’yān al-Shī‘ah* 15/133; *Amal al-Āmil* 2/336; *al-A’lām* 8/39.

ويؤيد هذا المعنى (أي التعميم في مدلول الناصب) أن الأئمة عليهم السلام وخواصهم أطلقوا لفظ الناصبي على أبي حنيفة وأمثاله، مع أن أبا حنيفة لم يكن ممن نصب العداوة لأهل البيت عليهم السلام، بل كان له انقطاع إليهم، وكان يظهر لهم التودد.

What supports this meaning (i.e. the generality in the definition of a Nāṣib) is that the Imāms عليه السلام and their protégés dubbed Abū Ḥanīfah and his like to be Nawāṣib. Whereas Abū Ḥanīfah was not someone who displayed hatred for the Ahl al-Bayt, he was rather drawn toward them and would display love for them.¹

And Ḥusayn Āl ‘Uṣfūr² says:

لا كلام في أن المراد بالناصبية هم أهل التسنن

There is no dispute regarding the fact that those referred to by the term ‘Nāṣibah’ are the Ahl al-Sunnah.³

He also says:

على أنك قد عرفت سابقاً أنه ليس النصب إلا عبارة عن التقديم على علي عليه السلام... بل أخبارهم عليهم السلام تنادي بأن الناصب هو ما يقال له عندهم سني.

Besides you have previously known that Naṣb does not refer to anything but giving others preference over ‘Alī عليه السلام... Rather their reports explicitly proclaim that a Nāṣib is a person who amongst them is called a Sunnī.⁴

1 *Al-Anwār al-Nu‘māniyyah* 2/307; also see: *al-Muqni‘ah* p. 778.

2 Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Ibrāhīm al-Darāzī. An Imāmī jurist and one of the prominent scholars of the Akhbārīs in his time. He was born in Shākhūrāh in Bahrain and was killed in a battle which ensued there in 1216 A.H. He has written thirty six books, some of which are: *al-Ḥaqā‘iq al-Fākhirah*, *al-Sawāniḥ al-Nazariyyah*, and *al-Maḥāsin al-Nafsāniyyah*. See: *al-A‘lām* 2/257; *A‘yān al-Shī‘ah* 6/140; *Anwār al-Badrayn* p. 209; *Mu‘jam al-Mu‘allifīn* 4/44.

3 *Al-Maḥāsin al-Nafsāniyyah fī Ajwibah al-Masā‘il al-Khurāsāniyyah* p. 147.

4 *Al-Maḥāsin al-Nafsāniyyah fī Ajwibah al-Masā‘il al-Khurāsāniyyah* p. 157.

And al-Khājūṭ says:

جل المخالفين بل كلهم من أهل النصب

Most of the dissenters, rather all of them are from the people of Naṣb.¹

The Shī'ah besides the Twelvers

Regarding them as well the Twelvers have differed:

The First view

They are not Nawāṣib.²

The second view

They are Nawāṣib. This is the view of majority of the early scholars, as has passed already, and is the preferred view of some of the later scholars. This view is supported by the following narration they report from one of their Imāms:

إن الزيدية والواقفية والنصاب عنده سواء

The Zaydiyyah, the Wāqifiyyah³ and the Nawāṣib are all the same according to him.⁴

1 *Al-Rasā'il al-I'tiqādiyyah* 1/431; also see: *Sharḥ Iḥqāq al-Ḥaqq* 1/63.

2 *Mustamsak al-'Urwah al-Wuthqā* 1/398; also see: al-Rūḥānī: *Minḥāj al-Ṣāliḥīn* 1/26.

3 The word Waqf has two usages:

1. Suspending decision regarding the Imāmah of a particular individual after the demise of the previous Imām. This is the general meaning.
2. It refers to the Seveners amongst the Shī'ah who consider the last Imām to be Mūsā al-Kāzīm. They consider him to be alive and thus reject the Imāmah of his son 'Alī al-Riḍā. That is why Muḥammad ibn 'Alī al-Riḍā would dub them 'the donkeys of the Shī'ah'. These people are known as the Wāqifiyyah, but they have ceased to exist. This is the more specific meaning of Waqf. See: *Biḥār al-Anwār* 48/267; *al-Shī'ah fi al-Mizān* p. 34; al-Subḥānī: *Buḥūth fi al-Milal wa al-Niḥal* 8/379.

4 *Biḥār al-Anwār* 48/267; al-Shāharūdī: *Mustadrakāt 'Ilm Rijāl al-Ḥadīth* 3/481.

They likewise narrate from another Imām that the Zaydiyyah are the Nawāṣib.¹

Yūsuf al-Baḥrānī says:

ينبغي أن يعلم أن جميع من خرج عن الفرقة الاثني عشرية من أفراد الشيعة كالزيدية والواقفية والفضحية ونحوها فأن الظاهر أن حكمهم كحكم النواصب.

It should be noted that whoever of the Shī'ah are aloof from the Twelver sect, like the Zaydiyyah, the Wāqifiyyah, the Faṭḥiyyah,² and their like, their status is the status of the Nawāṣib.³

Others besides him have also suggested that according to the Imāmiyyah the status of these sects is the status of the Nawāṣib and the Khawārij.⁴

1 *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām* 4/53; *Biḥār al-Anwār* 37/34; *Wasā'il al-Shī'ah* 9/222; *Mustadrak al-Wasā'il* 7/109.

2 The Faṭḥiyyah is a sub-sect of the Rāfiḍah. They are attributed to 'Abd Allāh ibn Ja'far ibn Muḥammad due to considering him the Imām after his father Ja'far al-Ṣādiq. They were dubbed the Faṭḥiyyah because 'Abd Allah ibn Ja'far had wide legs, which in Arabic is described with Faṭḥ, amongst other reasons given. At first most of the prominent personalities of the Shī'ah had deemed him the Imām, but when he passed away without issue they retracted their view. See: *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* p. 27; *Firaq al-Shī'ah* p. 78; *al-Tabṣīr fī al-Dīn* p. 38; *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 3/482.

3 *Al-Ḥadā'iq al-Nāḍirah* 5/189.

4 *Khulāṣah 'Abaqāt al-Anwār* 4/226.

The Second Sub-Chapter

The History of Naşb and the Efforts of the Ahl al-Sunnah in Combatting it

In this sub-chapter there will be four discussions:

Discussion no. 1: The inception of Naşb.

Discussion no. 2: The causes of its inception.

Discussion no. 3: The loci of Naşb.

Discussion no. 4: The efforts of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā'ah in countering it.

The First Discussion

The Inception of Naṣb

‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رضي الله عنه enjoyed a very lofty stature which was befitting for him in the Muslim society he lived in. He attained such feats and was privileged with such merits as were not enjoyed by many. He was a leader in knowledge, in faith, in disinclination from this world, in intelligence, and in bravery. He was from the forerunners from amongst the Muhājirīn, from the ascetic scholars, and from the few warriors who were unmatched. This is besides the fact that he was from the prestigious household of Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم, being his cousin, and the husband of his daughter, Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها.

His virtues are innumerable and his merits cannot be fully covered.¹ To the extent that Imām Aḥmad would say:

ما جاء لأحد من أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم من الفضائل ما جاء لعلي بن أبي طالب

There has not come to us regarding any of the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūl Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم as many merits as has come to us regarding ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رضي الله عنه.²

All of this played a pivotal role in the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم conceding his merits and acknowledging his rights.

Yes, during the era of Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم amongst the members of the Quraysh there were people who were churlish toward the Banū Hāshim in general and would not fulfil their rights. This was either owing to the remnants of some of the deep-seated traits of the *Jāhiliyyah* (the era of ignorance, before the advent of Islam), like vying for status,³ or due to the loss their tribes suffered at the hands of Nabī

1 *Tārīkh Baghdād* 1/133.

2 *Al-Mustadrak ‘alā al-Ṣaḥīḥayn* 3/116; *Tārīkh Dimashq* 42/418.

3 Ibn ‘Uthaymīn: *Sharḥ al-‘Aqīdah al-Wāsiṭiyyah* p. 610.

ﷺ due to him waging war against them,¹ amongst other reasons. Hence ‘Abbās ibn ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ had complained to Nabī ﷺ regarding the unfriendly behaviour of some of the Quraysh toward him, to which he replied:

والله لا يدخل قلب امرئ إيمان حتى يحبكم لله ولقرايتي

By Allah, īmān will not enter the heart of a person till he does not love you for the sake of Allah and for the sake of my relationship.²

Likewise there were some who hated ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ specifically.³ But this was not a widespread phenomenon in society, rather it was the behaviour of select individuals thereof, as is the case in every society and era. Hence Buraydah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is reported to have said the following:

بغضت عليا بغضا لم يبغضه أحد قط، قال: وأحببت رجلا من قريش لم أحبه إلا على بغضه عليا

I hated ‘Alī so much that no one hated him that much. He also says, “Whoever of the Quraysh I loved, I only loved due to his hatred for ‘Alī.”

Moving on, Nabī ﷺ conveyed all the laws of Sharī‘ah he was instructed to convey. Not only that, but he also foretold us of many of the tribulations and events which were to occur after him and provided for us solutions for them. For example, He foretold that ‘Umar and ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمَا will be assassinated, he said:

أثبت أحد فإنما عليك نبي وصديق وشهيدان

Settle O Uḥud, for there is not upon you but a Prophet, a Ṣiddīq, and two martyrs.⁴

1 Al-Ṭabarānī: *al-Mu‘jam al-Kabīr*: ḥadīth no. 12228; Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal: *Faḍā’il al-Ṣaḥābah*: ḥadīth no. 1791.

2 *Musnad Aḥmad*: ḥadīth no. 1777; also see: ‘Alawī *al-Saqqāf*: his annotations on *Sharḥ al-Wāsiṭiyyah* of Harrās p. 245.

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 6/285.

4 The narration of Anas ibn Mālīk رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ which appear in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*: chapter of merits: sub—chapter regarding the merits of ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ: ḥadīth no. 3483.

He also prophesised that ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه will encounter hardship¹ and that he will be on the truth² and ordered him to exercise patience.

Amongst his prophecies and advices was that he exhorted the Ummah to treat his Ahl al-Bayt with goodness, and more specifically ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, the most virtuous amongst them. He ordered that ‘Alī رضي الله عنه be loved and warned against hating him, he deemed him the bosom friend of any person who considered Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم to be his bosom friend,³ he informed that his killer will be the most wretched of people,⁴ and he told Zubayr رضي الله عنه:

تقاتله وأنت له ظالم

You will fight him and you will be wronging him.⁵

He also addressed the Mothers of the Believers saying:

كيف يا حداكن إذا نبحتها كلاب الحوآب

What would be the condition of one of you when the dogs of Ḥaw’ab will bark at her?⁶

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* 6/2499.

2 *Musnad al-Ṭayālisī*: ḥadīth no. 176; *Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah* 6/360; *Musnad Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal* 4/235.

3 *Sunan al-Tirmidhī* 5/633; *Sunan al-Nasāī al-Kubrā* 5/45; *Sunan Ibn Mājah* 1/45.

4 *Musnad Aḥmad*: ḥadīth no. 4/263; *Musnad al-Bazzār* 4/254; *Musnad Abī Ya’lā* 1/377.

5 The narration of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه which features in *Mustadrak Ḥākim*: chapter regarding knowing the Ṣaḥābah: sub-chapter regarding the martyrdom of Zubayr رضي الله عنه: ḥadīth no. 5574 (he deemed the ḥadīth authentic); al-Bayhaqī: *Dalā’il al-Nubuwwah* 6/377.

6 The narration of ‘Ā’ishah رضي الله عنها which appears in *Muṣannaf Ibn Shaybah*: chapter of Jamal: sub-chapter regarding the march of ‘Ā’ishah, ‘Alī, Ṭalḥah and al-Zubayr رضي الله عنه: ḥadīth no. 37771; *Musnad Aḥmad*: ḥadīth no. 24299; *Mustadrak Ḥākim*: chapter regarding knowing the Ṣaḥābah: sub-chapter regarding the Islam of Amīr al-Mu’minīn ‘Alī رضي الله عنه: ḥadīth no. 3613; *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān*: chapter of history: sub-chapter of his prophecies regarding the tribulations which will befall the Ummah: ḥadīth no. 6732. Ibn Ḥajr has stated that its chain of transmission meets the requirement of the Ṣaḥīḥ, and the ḥadīth has been graded Ṣaḥīḥ by al-Albānī in his *al-Silsilah al-Ṣaḥīḥah*: ḥadīth no. 474. Ibn al-‘Arabī and Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb who followed him, have both erred in discrediting this ḥadīth (see: *al-‘Awāṣim min al-Qawāṣim* p. 162. And also see the animadversion thereof by al-Qurṭubī in *al-Tadhkirah* 2/255). *continued...*

Probably the reason why these exhortations of Rasūl Allah ﷺ have come forth in these forms, regarding the Ahl al-Bayt in general and regarding ‘Alī رضي الله عنه in specific, is that he knew of the virulence and contempt that many of them were to suffer after him. But because the share of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه in all of that was going to be much more than anyone else of the Ahl al-Bayt, the ḥadīths stressing upon his rights and stature were more. This is because he was tested with a people who loved him to such an extent that in endeavouring to extoll him they denigrated him, and a people who hated him to an extent that they tried to harm him in every way possible. This is clear from the following statement of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه:

ليحبنى قوم حتى يدخلوا النار في حبي، وليبغضني قوم حتى يدخلوا النار في بغضي

A people will love me to an extent that they will enter Hell-fire due to loving me, and a people will hate me to an extent that they will enter Hell-fire due to hating me.¹

There is no doubt as to the fact that no one amongst the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم encountered what ‘Alī رضي الله عنه encountered; he was accused when he was innocent

continued from page 124

It should be noted that just as Nabī ﷺ hinted to ‘Ā’ishah رضي الله عنها regarding what was to happen in the future with one of his wives, i.e. that her life will be spared in a Fitnah in which many people will be killed around her, similarly Nabī ﷺ ordered ‘Alī رضي الله عنه to be good to her when this very fitnah arises. The following ḥadīth of Abū Rāfi‘ رضي الله عنه, which appears in *Musnad Aḥmad* 6/393 and *al-Mu‘jam al-Kabīr* 1/333, is an attestation to this:

أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال لعلي بن أبي طالب: إنه سيكون بينك وبين عائشة أمر. قال: فأنا أشقاهم يا رسول الله؟ قال: لا، ولكن إذا كان ذلك فارددها إلى ما أمنها

Rasūl Allah ﷺ said to ‘Alī, “There will be a matter between you and ‘Ā’ishah.” He said, “I will be the most wretched of them then O Rasūl of Allah?” “No, but when that happens, then return ‘Ā’ishah to her safety.”

Ibn Ḥajr has deemed the transmission to be *Ḥasan* (a grade below *Ṣaḥīḥ*) in *Fath al-Bārī* 13/55.

Ḥaw‘ab refers to an oasis between Makkah and Basrah. See: *Mu‘jam al-Buldān* 2/314; *Lisān al-‘Arab* 1/289.

1 *Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah*: chapter of merits: sub-chapter regarding the merits of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه: ḥadīth no. 32133.

and he was fought and opposed without any legitimate reason, starting with those who fought him based on *Ijtihād* (their analyses of the situation and how best to resolve the issue) and ending with those who killed him deeming him a disbeliever. Not only that, but even after his demise for years on end he remained a victim of contempt, so much so that he was openly cursed from the pulpits and his followers and partisans were forced to curse him. Rather the matter reached such sensitivity that some scholars would be afraid to even mention his name in the presence of the rulers and would suffice on referring to him through hints.¹ His progeny likewise was victim of much contempt after him, that also for no valid reason.²

But when we return to the era of the Rightly Guided Khulafā' رضي الله عنه who preceded 'Alī رضي الله عنه, we will find that he was treated as a prominent person and enjoyed a very privileged position.³ Hence Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه would honour him and consult with him, so would 'Umar who did not hesitate at multiple occasions to go with the opinion of 'Alī رضي الله عنه⁴ and also appointed him as a member of the *Shūrā* (council) of six people who were to elect a ruler from amongst themselves.

And when 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه assumed the Khilāfah, 'Alī رضي الله عنه remained, as was his wont, adherent, obedient, and a well-wisher, as he said:

لوسيرني عثمان إلى صرار لسمعت وأطعت

If 'Uthmān were to send me to *Ṣirār* I would listen and obey.⁵

1 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/238.

2 *Jawāhir al-'Iqdayn* p. 251.

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 6/176.

4 *Al-Ṭarā'iq al-Ḥukmiyyah* p. 69.

5 *Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah*: chapter of Fitan: sub-chapter regarding what is mentioned regarding 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه: ḥadīth no. 37699; Ibn Shaybah: *Akhbār al-Madīnah*: ḥadīth no. 2091; Nu'aym ibn Ḥammād: *al-Fitan*: ḥadīth no. 208.

Ṣirār, according to the famous view, is a well three miles away from Madīnah on the way to Iraq. See: *Mu'jam mā Istajām* 3/830; al-Zamakhsharī: *al-Fā'iḳ* 1/37; *Mu'jam al-Buldān* 3/398.

Thereafter in the latter part of his reign the Fitnah started gaining momentum, for complaints, sometimes legitimate and sometimes not, began to increase regarding the governors of ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. The Khalīfah did not leave them unattended, rather he ordered that every complaintive should meet him in the season Ḥajj and he also ordered that all his governors be present in order to confirm the complaints and demand the rights from those whose oppression or contravention is confirmed.¹

Ostensibly, the approach of softness which ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ adopted with his detractors and his kind nature both indirectly engendered an increase in the mischief of the riff-raff. ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ himself realised this, as he is reported to have said:

لنت لكم، وأوطأت لكم كتفي، وكففت يدي ولساني عنكم فاجترأتم علي

I was kind to you, I made my shoulder a support for you, and I withheld my hand and my tongue, consequently you became bold against me.²

Subsequent to that, the criticism of these people increased even more and expanded,³ but now it started taking a new route and was aimed directly at ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ himself, whereas previously it was directed toward his governors only.⁴

1 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 2/648; *Maqṭal al-Shahīd ‘Uthmān* p. 100; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 7/219.

2 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 2/645; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 7/169.

3 *Maqṭal al-Shahīd ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān* p. 103.

4 *Muqaddamah Ibn Khaldūn* p. 215, 216.

The Issues Raised against ‘Uthmān¹

Nepotism: Appointing his Relatives

He appointed some of his relatives, like al-Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah,² Sa‘īd ibn al-‘Āṣ,³ ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa‘d ibn Abī Sarḥ.⁴

Ibn Ḥajar mentions in *Fatḥh al-Bārī*:

إن قتل عثمان كان أشد أسبابه الطعن على امرأته ثم عليه بتوليته لهم

The assassination of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه was mostly because of criticisms against his governors and thereafter criticisms against him for appointing them.⁵

1 *Al-‘Awāṣim min al-Qawāṣim* p. 76; *Maqṭal al-Shahīd ‘Uthmān* p. 188.

2 Al-Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah ibn Abī Mu‘ayṭ (whose name was Abān) ibn Dhakwān al-Umawī, Abū Wahb. A Ṣaḥābī who accepted Islam on the Conquest of Makkah. He was acknowledged for his humorous nature, his forbearance, bravery and etiquette and dignity, despite his few weaknesses. He was the uterine brother of ‘Uthmān. He stayed away from the Fitnah and stayed at the end of his life in Raqqah where he passed away. See: *al-Istī‘āb* 4/1552; *Usd al-Ghābah* 5/467; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 3/412; *al-Iṣābah fī Tamyīz al-Ṣaḥābah* 6/614.

3 Sa‘īd ibn al-‘Āṣ ibn Sa‘īd ibn al-‘Āṣ al-Umawī, Abū ‘Uthmān. One of the nobles of Quraysh. Nabī صلی الله علیه وسلم passed away when he was nine years old. He resembled Nabī صلی الله علیه وسلم the most in his speech and narrated from him *Mursal* (with a link missing him between him and Nabī صلی الله علیه وسلم narrations. He was one of those appointed by ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه to write the copies of the Qur’ān and was appointed as a governor by ‘Uthmān and Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه. He passed away in 58 A.H. His narrations are documented in *al-Adab al-Mufrad* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, *Marāsīl Abī Dāwūd*, and *Sunan al-Nasā’ī*. See: *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 21/107; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 4/43; *al-Iṣābah fī Tamyīz al-Ṣaḥābah* 3/107.

4 ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sa‘d ibn Abī Sarḥ ibn al-Ḥārith al-Qurashī al-‘Āmirī, Abū Yahyā. A Ṣaḥābī who accepted Islam on the day of the Conquest of Makkah. He witnessed the conquest of Egypt and was the leader of the right faction of the army. He was the conqueror of Africa in the era of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه and his strategies were praised. He was the foster brother of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه whom the latter had appointed over Egypt. When the Fitnah transpired he stayed in ‘Asqalān and did not pledge his allegiance to anyone. He passed away in 36 A.H. See: *Usd al-Ghābah* 3/263; *Tārīkh al-Islām* 3/529; *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 17/100; *al-Iṣābah fī Tamyīz al-Ṣaḥābah* 4/109.

5 *Fatḥh al-Bārī* 13/13.

Without a doubt, it is not valid to criticise the ruler, whoever he maybe, merely because of him appointing his relatives when he deems them fit. Yes he becomes deserving of criticism when relationship is the sole factor which he considers when appointing someone, without considering anything else.

Likewise, it is also well-known to everyone that being completely upright is not a condition for assuming administrative positions, for every Allah-conscious and pious person is not necessarily the most capable and the most suited in the worldly matters.¹ Hence ‘Umar رضي الله عنه is reported to have said:

نستعين بقوة المنافق وإثمه عليه

We will draw help from the strength of a hypocrite and his sin will be upon himself.²

Although ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه was famous for his love for the Banū Umayyah and honouring them,³ but that does not necessitate that his love for them was the only reason which propelled him to appoint them to different positions.

The reality of the matter is that he practiced *Ijtihād* (exerted himself to reach the best possible conclusion) and he was apt for doing so because he was a *Mujtahid* (a scholar who has the authority to form opinions and rulings by exerting all his knowledge and mental faculties). Hence he discerned that some of his relatives were compatible for leadership and thus appointed them, especially when considering that:

أن بني أمية كان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يستعملهم في حياته، واستعملهم بعده من لا يتهم بقرابة فيهم. بل كانوا أكثر من ولي عملا من القبائل.

1 Banū Umayyah Bayn al-Suqūt wa al-Intihār p. 18.

2 Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah: chapter regarding governors: sub-chapter regarding governors and visiting them: ḥadīth no. 30654.

3 Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah 6/356.

Nabī ﷺ appointed the Banū Umayyah to various positions during his lifetime. After him others who cannot be suspected of having any relationship with them also appointed them.¹ In fact most of the people appointed by Nabī ﷺ were from this tribe.²

What proves this crucial detail that he did not appoint them merely out of love for them is that when any of his relatives proved to be incompetent he would dismiss them. In fact, he even executed a capital punishment on the one who perpetrated a crime which would warrant that.³ Had the reason for their appointment only been his attachment to them and his zealotry to side with them whatever the situation, as is the claim of his haters, he would have overlooked their flaws; but that is not what happened.

Furthermore criticising him can be attributed to one of two reasons:

1. He can be criticised for merely appointing some of his relatives. In that case then ‘Alī ibn Ṭālib رضي الله عنه also appointed some of his relatives, but he was not criticised. He appointed ‘Ubayd Allāh ibn ‘Abbās⁴ over Yemen, Qutham ibn ‘Abbās⁵ over Makkah and Ṭā’if, ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Abbās over

1 Ibid. 6/192.

2 Ibid. 4/144, 460; 6/192; *al-Nizā’ wa al-Takhāṣum* p. 73.

3 See the report of lashing al-Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah in Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī 3/1405; Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim 3/1331.

4 ‘Ubayd Allāh ibn al-‘Abbās ibn ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib ibn Hāshim al-Hāshimī, Abū Muḥammad al-Madanī. He saw Nabī ﷺ and narrated from him. He was one year younger than his brother ‘Abd Allah. ‘Alī رضي الله عنه appointed him as the governor of Yemen. He was very generous. He passed away in Madīnah during the reign of Yazīd ibn Mu‘āwiyah. His narrations are documented in *Sunan al-Nasā’ī*. See: *al-Istī‘āb* 3/1009; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 19/60; *Tārīkh al-Islām* 4/267; *al-Iṣābah fī Tamyīz al-Ṣaḥābah* 4/396.

5 Qutham ibn ‘Abbās ibn ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib al-Hāshimī. The cousin of Nabī ﷺ who saw him and narrated from him and resembled him. He was the youngest of his siblings and was also the foster brother of Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. He passed away in Samarqand in 57 A.H. and his narrations are documented in *Sunan al-Nasā’ī*. See: *al-Istī‘āb* 3/1304; *Usd al-Ghābah* 4/414; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 23/538; *al-Iṣābah fī Tamyīz al-Ṣaḥābah* 5/420.

Basrah, amongst others.¹ Why should ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ alone be criticised then for appointing his relatives.

This is exactly what one of the rebels observed when he came to know that ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ appointed his cousin, ‘Abd Allah ibn ‘Abbās, over Basrah. He said with resentment:

فقيم قتلنا الشيخ أمس بالمدينة

So why did will kill the old man yesterday in Madīnah,² i.e. ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

2. He can be criticised due to the blunders and transgressions of some of his governors. In that case they were the ones worthy of criticism not him, unless he approved of their wrongs and that did not happen.³

Consider the case of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. He appointed some people and later discovered that they were not as he assumed them to be in their competence. He thus said:

وليت فلانا فأخذ المال، ووليت فلانا فخانني

I appointed so and so and he took wealth, and I appointed so and so and he breached my trust.⁴

But no one is reported to have criticised ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ for the flaws and blunders of his governors. Likewise should be the approach regarding ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

1 *Al-Fiṣal fi al-Milal wa al-Ahwā’ wa al-Niḥal* 4/111; *al-Kāmil fi al-Tārīkh* 3/242; *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 6/18, 184, 360; *Tārīkh al-Islām* 4/288; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 8/323.

2 *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 3/353.

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 6/248.

4 *Al-Imāmah wa al-Radd ‘alā al-Rāfiḍah* p. 312; *Maqṭal al-Shahīd ‘Uthmān* p. 189; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 10/361; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 7/326.

His Absence in the Battle of Badr

He had stayed behind because Nabī ﷺ had ordered him to do so in order to nurse his daughter Ruqayyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا. That is why Nabī ﷺ allotted a share of the booty for him and promised him reward.¹

Furthermore, it is a strange paradox indeed that Nabī ﷺ passes away whilst being pleased with ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and the entire Ummah unanimously elects him as their Khalīfah, and then comes a handful of people who have not made any contributions to Islam nor enjoy any virtue and criticise him specifically for not participating in the Battle of Badr.²

His Fleeing on the Day of Uḥud from the Battle field

This is not something that he can be criticised for because Allah ﷻ forgave all those who fled on that day in the Qur’ān:

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ تَوَلَّوْا مِنْكُمْ يَوْمَ الْتَقَى الْجَمْعَانِ إِنَّمَا اسْتَزَلَّهُمُ الشَّيْطَانُ بِبَعْضِ مَا كَسَبُوا ۗ وَلَقَدْ عَفَا اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ ۗ إِنَّ اللَّهَ غَفُورٌ حَلِيمٌ

Indeed, those of you who turned back on the day the two armies met [at Uḥud] – it was Satan who caused them to slip because of some [blame] they had earned. But Allah has already forgiven them. Indeed, Allah is Forgiving and Forbearing.³

If people below ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in stature attained this glad-tiding, then why wouldn’t he, especially when considering his virtues, his contributions, and his immense good.⁴

1 Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī 3/1139.

2 Fitnah Maqatal ‘Uthmān 1/61.

3 Sūrah Āl ‘Imrān: 155.

4 Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī 3/1352.

His Absence in the Pledge of Riḍwān

Deeming his absence in the pledge a demerit is astonishing when considering that the pledge took place because of him. Nabī ﷺ sent him to negotiate with the polytheists of Makkah and upon his delay rumours abounded that he was killed. At that time Nabī ﷺ took the allegiance of the people to fight the people of Makkah and himself pledged allegiance on behalf of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه, out of precaution that he might be alive. So on what legitimate basis can he be criticised?¹

Demarcating a Sanctuary

He did not demarcate the sanctuary for his personal interests and gains, owing to which criticising him would be legitimate. Rather he demarcated it for the camels of charity specifically. In addition, this was not his initiative, rather it was previously done by ‘Umar رضي الله عنه. The only difference is that he increased the area of the sanctuary over that which ‘Umar رضي الله عنه had increased due to the camels of charity increasing owing to the immense booty Allah سبحانه وتعالى had granted the Muslims during his era.

If criticising ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه is allowed on this basis then criticising ‘Umar رضي الله عنه should also be allowed, but because ‘Umar رضي الله عنه was not criticised it would be invalid to criticise ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه.²

Compiling the Qur’ān

This compilation materialised after Ḥuzayfah رضي الله عنه came to him seeking help saying:

أدرك هذه الأمة قبل أن يختلفوا في الكتاب اختلاف اليهود والنصارى في الكتب

1 *Fitnah Maqal ‘Uthmān* 1/61.

2 *Maqal al-Shahīd ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān* p. 194; *Fitnah Maqal ‘Uthmān* 1/70.

Save the Ummah before they start disputing regarding the Qur'ān like how the Jews and the Christians differed regarding their scriptures.

Thereafter he consulted with the prominent Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم, like 'Alī رضي الله عنه and others, who all approved the compilation.¹

He only advanced in compiling the copies of the Qur'ān in order to repel the dispute and bickering of the Muslims which was clearly beginning to gain momentum. This is exactly what an objective outlook to this situation would demand. For the reason for revealing the Qur'ān in seven *Aḥruf* (dialects [close translation]) was to make the recitation of the Qur'ān easy for the Arabs who comprised of various tribes and spoke various lingos and dialects. Hence once this objective was achieved and because these dialects were not intended in themselves and the preservation of the Qur'ān was not dependent on them, what importance then would their existence hold if they became a means of dispute and bickering amongst the Muslims due to their ignorance. That is why 'Alī رضي الله عنه is reported to have said:

لا تقولوا لعثمان في إحراق المصاحف إلا خيرا

Do not say about 'Uthmān in the matter of burning the (individual) copies of the Qur'ān but good.²

He also said:

لو لم يصنعه عثمان لصنعته

If 'Uthmān had not done it, I would have.³

1 Ibn Abī Dāwūd: *al-Maṣāḥif*: chapter regarding 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه compiling the *Maṣāḥif* (copies of the Qur'ān): ḥadīth no. 77. The annotator has deemed its chain of transmission as authentic.

2 *Kitāb al-Sunnah of al-Khallāl*: ḥadīth no. 351.

3 *Al-Maṣāḥif*: chapter regarding the agreeing of the people with 'Uthmān regarding the compilation of the *Maṣāḥif*: ḥadīth no. 39, 40.

Hence this initiative of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه is actually a virtue in his favour which will not be forgotten and omitted by the passage of time.¹

These are all the issues that the mischief makers had raised against him. They reveal how ignorant, narrow minded, and prejudiced these people really were that they contrived the weakest of reasons to criticise ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه, even though he was not blameworthy at all, without any evidence. It is strange indeed that some of the issues raised against him were actually some of his great feats and achievements. Ibn ‘Umar رضي الله عنه indeed spoke the truth when he said:

لقد عبتم على عثمان أشياء لو أن عمر فعلها ما عبتموها

You have criticised ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه for such issues that if ‘Umar رضي الله عنه were to do the same you would never have criticised him.²

‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه,³ one of the leading members of the Ahl al-Bayt, is reported to have said:

والله ما قتل عثمان على وجه الحق

By Allāh! ‘Uthmān was not killed for a legitimate reason.⁴

When rebutting all these claims and criticisms it is sufficient to note that Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم foretold that the Khilāfah after him will last for thirty years,⁵ and his

1 *Al-‘Awāšim min al-Qawāšim* p. 80; *al-Ṭuruq al-Ḥukmiyyah* p. 18, 27, 400; *Fitnah Maqatal ‘Uthmān* 1/73.

2 *Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah*: chapter of merit: sub-chapter regarding the virtues of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه: ḥadīth no. 32047.

3 ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib al-Hāshimī, Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Madanī. From the scholars of the successors and their ascetics. He was born in 33 A.H. He was with Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه in Karbalā’ but was spared due to his sickness. He was reliable and enjoyed prominence and leadership. Al-Zuhrī has said regarding him, “I have not seen a Qurayshī more virtuous than ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn.” He passed away in 94 A.H. and was buried in al-Baqī’. His narration are found in the six canonical collections. See: *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 41/360; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 20/382; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 4/386; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 5/216.

4 *Al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 5/216.

5 *Sunan Abī Dāwūd* 4/211; *Sunan al-Tirmidhī* 4/503.

Khilāfah was within those thirty years. He also informed that he will be on the truth and ordered him not to remove the garb Allah ﷻ clothes him with, and he described those who will want to depose him as hypocrites.¹

Nonetheless, in this environment which was replete with criticisms and objections a group of the mischief makers was constantly going to some of the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ with their complaints regarding some of the governors of ‘Uthmān ﷺ. As a result those Ṣaḥābah ﷺ spoke to the Khalīfah regarding them and consequently he dismissed some of them. But despite that the criticisms of the mischief makers did not stop.²

In actual fact some of these governors had opened the door of criticism, unwittingly, against ‘Uthmān ﷺ in which every conspirator found room for criticism, because of his evil doings, either with those under him or in his personal conduct.

Ibn Khaldūn³ mentions:

ثم انتقل الخلاف بين عثمان ومن معه من الصحابة ونقموا عليه امتناعه عن العزل فأبى إلا أن يكون على جرحه، ثم نقلوا النكير إلى غير ذلك من أفعاله، وهو متمسك بالاجتهاد وهم أيضا كذلك. ثم تجمع قوم من الغوغاء و جاؤوا إلى المدينة يظهرهم طلب النصفة من عثمان، وهم يضمرون خلاف ذلك من قتله، فيهم من البصرة والكوفة ومصر، وقام معهم في ذلك علي وعائشة والزبير وطلحة وغيرهم يحاولون تسكين الأمور ورجوع عثمان إلى رأيهم.

1 *Musnad Ahmad* 6/75; *Sunan al-Tirmidhī* 5/628; *Sunan al-Tirmidhī* 5/628; *Sunan Ibn Mājah* 1/41. Al-Albānī deemed the narration Ṣaḥīḥ in his *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Mājah* 1/25.

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 6/155, 248; *Muqaddamah Ibn Khaldūn* p. 216.

3 ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad ibn Khaldūn al-Ḥaḍramī al-Tūnisī. A jurist, a scholar and a sociologist. He was born in Tūnis in the year 732 A.H. but his family was originally from *Ishbiliyyah* (Spain). He shifted from position to position till he settled as the supreme judge of the Mālikīs in Egypt. Thereafter he resigned and freed himself for teaching and authoring books. He passed away in 808 A.H. Some of his books are: *Muqaddamah*, *Sharḥ al-Burdah*, and *Risālah fi al-Mantiq*. See: *al-Ḍaw’ al-Lāmi’* 4/145; *Shadharāt al-Dhahab* 7/76; *al-A’lām* 3/330; *Mu’jam al-Mu’allifin* 5/188.

Thereafter the dispute shifted to ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه and the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم who were with him in Madīnah. Hence they resented his refusal to dismiss and he on the other hand refused unless there was compelling impugning evidence. They thereafter censured his other doings in which he held a particular viewpoint based on his *Ijtihād* and they held a particular viewpoint based on their *Ijtihād*.

Subsequent to that, a group of commoners marched to Madīnah and outwardly expressed intentions of bringing ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه to book, but inwardly had the intention of assassinating him. They comprised of people from Basrah, Kūfah, and Egypt. Together with them stood ‘Alī, ‘Ā’ishah, Zubayr, and Ṭalḥah رضي الله عنه, amongst others, who were trying to calm the situation and convince ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه to accept their viewpoint.¹

Whatever the case may be, this Fitnah drew untold problems to the Ummah to an extent that it engendered dispute and resentment between the noble Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم.²

Ibn Taymiyyah mentions:

أما في خلافة عثمان فقوي النزاع في بعض الأمور حتى صار يحصل كلام غليظ من بعضهم لبعض.
وقد تقموا منه أشياء بعضها هم فيها معذورون فيه، وكثير منها كان عثمان هو المعذور فيه.

As for the Khilāfah of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه, disputes intensified in some issues. So much so that they started exchanging harsh speech with one another.³

They decried his doings, in some of which they were excused and in most of which ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه was excused.⁴

1 *Muqaddamah Ibn Khaldūn* p. 216.

2 *Tārīkh al-Khulafā’* p. 158.

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 5/498.

4 *Ibid.* 6/252.

One such issue was when some people came to ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ complaining about the Zakāt collectors of ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Subsequently he sent his son, Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah, with the letter of Rasūl Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ which contained the details of Ṣadaqah. ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ rejected it saying:

أغنها عنا

Remove it away from us.¹

This is a phrase which denotes discarding and ignoring.² The sternness in the rejection of ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is quite evident.

Nonetheless, it is established from ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ that he said:

إني لأرجو أن أكون أنا وعثمان ممن قال الله تعالى فيهم وَنَزَعْنَا مَا فِي صُدُورِهِمْ مِنْ غِلٍّ إِخْوَانًا عَلَىٰ سُرُرٍ مُّتَقَابِلِينَ.

I have hope that I and ‘Uthmān will be from those regarding whom Allah said, “We removed what was in their hearts of rancour, and they will be brothers reclining on cushions facing one another”^{3,4}

And ‘Ā’ishah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا said:

غضبت لكم من السوط ولا أغضب لعثمان من السيف

I was angered when you suffered under the whip; shall I not be angered when ‘Uthmān is put to the sword?⁵

She also said:

1 The narration of Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah which appears in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*: chapter of Jihād: sub-chapter regarding the mention of the shield, the staff, the sword, the bowl, and the ring of Nabī... ḥadīth no. 2944. For more details see: *Minḥāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawīyyah* 8/279.

2 ‘*Umdah al-Qārī* 15/34.

3 *Sūrah al-Ḥijr*: 47.

4 *Tārīkh Dimashq* 39/452; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 7/193.

5 *Tārīkh Dimashq* 39/487; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 7/195.

كان القوم يختلفون إلي في عيب عثمان ولا أرى إلا أنها معاتبية، وأما دمه فأعوذ بالله من دمه! واللهم وددت
أني عشت في الدنيا برصاء صالحا وأني لم أذكر عثمان بكلمة قط.

The people would frequently come to me with faults of ‘Uthmān. And I do not consider (my address to him) but a reprimand. As for his blood, I seek the refuge of Allah from his blood. By Allah I wish I lived in this world as a deaf leper and that I did not say a word regarding ‘Uthmān.¹

Likewise Ṭalḥah رضي الله عنه would say the following on the Day of Jamal:²

إنا داهنا في أمر عثمان، فلا نجد اليوم شيئا أمثل من أن نبذل فيه دماءنا، اللهم خذ لعثمان مني اليوم حتى ترضى

We compromised in the matter of ‘Uthmān. Hence we do not find anything better today than shedding our blood for him. O Allah, You take for ‘Uthmān from me till you are pleased.³

These mischief makers exploited the disillusionment of some of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم with ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه⁴ and utilised it as a means of igniting the fire of Fitnah.

That is why Ḥuzayfah رضي الله عنه would say:

اللهم العن قتلة عثمان وغزاة عثمان وشنأة عثمان! اللهم إنا كنا نعاتبه ويعاتبنا، متى ما كان من قبله يعاتبنا
ونعاتبه فاتخذوا ذلك سلما إلى الفتنة، اللهم لا تمتهم إلا بالسيوف.

1 Ibn Shubbah: *Akhbār al-Madīnah*: ḥadīth no. 2156; al-Khallāl: *Kitāb al-Sunnah*: ḥadīth no. 545; al-Ṭabarānī: *Musnad al-Shāmiyyīn*: ḥadīth no. 944. The chain of transmission is deemed authentic by the annotator of Kitāb al-Sunnah.

2 The Battle of Jamal is battle which occurred near Basrah in 36 A.H. between ‘Alī رضي الله عنه on the one side and Ṭalḥah, al-Zubayr and ‘Ā’ishah رضي الله عنها on the other side. It was named the Battle of Jamal (camel) due to the camel of ‘Ā’ishah رضي الله عنها which the people very ferociously defended after it was targeted. The battle ended with ‘Alī رضي الله عنه being victorious. See: *al-Bad’ wa al-Tārīkh* 5/212; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 3/113; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 7/23.

3 *Al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 3/222; *Tārīkh Dimashq* 25/109; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 1/35; *Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah*: ḥadīth no. 37781.

4 Amongst them was ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ رضي الله عنه who was upset with ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه because he dismissed him from the governance of Egypt. See: *al-Thiqāt* 2/244; *al-Istī‘āb* 3/1369; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 55/26; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 7/253.

O Allah, curse the killers of ‘Uthmān and the fighters of ‘Uthmān! O Allah we would reprimand him and he would reprimand us. Whenever anything from him would emerge he would reprimand us and we would reprimand him. They thus made that a path to Fitnah. O Allah, You do not let them die but with swords.¹

Furthermore, when they gathered and came from Egypt, Kūfah, and Basrah, it had not passed the imagination of any of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم that events will escalate so rapidly and eventually culminate in the assassination of the Khalīfah as a wronged martyr.² As soon as he was killed Madīnah became gloomy upon its people and the seniors amongst the Ṣaḥābah were overtaken by shock and momentarily lost their perception.³ ‘Alī رضي الله عنه would say:

لقد طاش عقلي يوم قتل عثمان وأنكرت نفسي

I lost my mind the day ‘Uthmān was killed, and I resented myself.⁴

Subsequently, ‘Ā’ishah, Ṭalḥah and Zubayr رضي الله عنهم united upon seeking retribution for the blood of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه, especially because each one felt some sort of compunction due to them falling short in standing by his side and helping him as they ought to. Similarly they had never thought that he would be killed, whatever the situation, and that anyone would be so bold to attack the Khalīfah of the Muslims in the capital of his Khilāfah. Had they known that, they would have taken measures to put an end to the roots of the Fitnah and bar whatever might contribute to it.⁵

However, there is no accuracy in the claim that when the Fitnah occurred the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم became either forsakers or fighters.⁶

1 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 2/692.

2 *Maqṭal al-Shahīd ‘Uthmān* p. 194.

3 *Tārīkh al-Khulafā’* p. 160.

4 *Mustadrak Ḥākim*: chapter regarding knowing the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم; sub-chapter regarding the virtues of Amīr al-Mu’minīn ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān: ḥadīth no. 4527. He has graded the ḥadīth authentic.

5 *Minḥāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 4/323.

6 *Firaq al-Shī’ah* p. 4.

Al-Subkī mentions:

لا نحفظ عن أحد منهم الرضا بقتله، إنما المحفوظ الثابت عن كل منهم إنكار ذلك

We do not know regarding any of them that they were happy with his assassination. What is preserved and established from each one of them is that they abhorred it.¹

And Ibn Kathīr² mentions:

أما ما يذكره بعض الناس من أن بعض الصحابة أسلمه ورضي بقتله فهذا لا يصح عن أحد من الصحابة أنه رضي بقتل عثمان رضي الله عنه، بل كلهم كرهه ومقته وسب من فعله، ولكن بعضهم كان يود لو خلع نفسه من الأمر

As for the claim of some people that some of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنه surrendered him and were happy with his murder, it is not authentically proven from any of the Ṣaḥābah that he was happy with the killing of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه. Rather each one of them despised it and abhorred it, and chastised those who did it. However, some of them desired that he depose himself.³

What further enforces this is the following narration of ‘Alqamah ibn Waqqāṣ al-Laythī:⁴

1 *Al-Taqrīr wa al-Taḥbīr* 2/347.

2 Ismā‘īl ibn ‘Umar ibn Kathīr al-Qurashī al-Buṣrawī (attributed to Buṣrah a village in the outskirts of Damascus), Abū al-Fidā’ al-Dimashqī. He taught and issued Fatwas, and mastered the sciences of Fiqh, Tafsīr, Ḥadīth and history. He passed away in 774 A.H. Some of his works are: *Tafsīr al-Qur’ān al-‘Aẓīm*, *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, and *Ṭabaqāt al-Fuqahā’*. See: *al-Durar al-Kāminah* 1/445; *Dhayl Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥuffāz* p. 57; *Shadharāt al-Dhahab* 6/231; *al-Dāwūdī: Ṭabaqāt al-Mufasssīrīn* p. 260.

3 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 7/198.

4 ‘Alqamah ibn Waqqāṣ ibn Muḥṣan al-Laythī al-‘Utwārī. One of the scholars of Madīnah who met a group of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنه and narrated from them. There is a possibility that he was a Ṣaḥābī. He is deemed authentic by Ibn Sa’d and al-Nasā’ī. He wouldn’t narrate much ḥadīths. He passed away in Madīnah after 80 A.H. His narrations feature in all six collections. See: *Tadhkirah al-Ḥuffāz* 1/53; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 20/313; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 4/61; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 7/247.

لما خرج طلحة والزبير وعائشة للطلب بدم عثمان عرجوا عند منصرفهم بذات عرق، قال: ورأيت طلحة- وأحب المجالس إليه أخلاها، وهو ضارب بلحيته على زوره. فقلت: يا أبا محمد: إني أراك وأحب المجالس إليك أخلاها، إن كنت تكره هذا الأمر فدعه. فقال: يا علقمة لا تلمني، كنا أمس بدا واحدة على من سوانا فأصبحنا اليوم جبلين من حديد يزحف أحدنا إلى صاحبه، ولكنه كان مني شيء في أمر عثمان مما لا أرى كفارتة إلا أن يسفك دمي في طلب دمه.

When Ṭalḥah, al-Zubayr and ‘Ā’ishah رضي الله عنهم marched out to seek retribution for the blood of ‘Uthmān, they stopped on their way at Dhāt ‘Irq.¹ He says, “I saw Ṭalḥah and noticed that seclusion was most beloved to him and that he was hitting his beard to his chest. So I said, “O Abū Muḥammad, I see that the gatherings in which there is most seclusion are most beloved to you. If you dislike this matter then leave it.” He replied, “Do not blame me O ‘Alqamah. Yesterday we were one unit against those besides us and today we have transitioned into two mountains of iron drawing closer to one another. But there was something from me in the matter of ‘Uthmān and I do not see the expiation thereof but in my blood being shed in seeking retribution for his.”²

This feeling had settled deep down in his heart. Hence when he was shot with an arrow he said the following:

هذا والله سهم أرسله الله، اللهم خذ لعثمان مني حتى ترضى

This, by Allah, is an arrow sent by Allah. O Allāh, take for ‘Uthmān from me till you are pleased.³

He also said:

اللهم هل يجزئ دمي كله بقطرة من دم عثمان

1 The Mīqāt of Ḥajj for the people of Iraq, it is the boundary between Najd and Tihāmah. And ‘Irq is a small mountain in it. See: *Mu’jam al-Buldān* 4/107; *Lisān al-‘Arab* 10/249.

2 *Mustadrak Ḥākim*: chapter regarding knowing the Ṣaḥābah: sub-chapter regarding the merits of Ṭalḥah ibn ‘Ubayd Allah رضي الله عنه; ḥadīth no. 5595.

3 *Al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 3/223; *Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt* p. 185; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 25/109.

O Allah, will all my blood ever suffice for one droplet of the blood of ‘Uthmān.¹

And this is what made Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam say the following after shooting him with an arrow:

والله لا أطلب قاتل عثمان بعدك أبدا

By Allah! I will not search for the killer of ‘Uthmān ever after you.²

This was because according to Marwān, Ṭalḥah was the severest against ‘Uthmān.³

He is also reported to have said:

لا أطلب بثأري بعد اليوم

I will not seek my revenge after this day.⁴

He likewise said to one of the sons of ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ:

قد كفيناك بعض قتلة أبيك

We have sufficed on your behalf in doing away with some of your father’s killers.⁵

1 Akhbār al-Madīnah 2/221.

2 Al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā 3/223; Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq 25/113; Tahdhīb al-Kamāl 13/422.

3 Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq 57/259.

4 Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt p. 181; Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq 25/112; Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’ 1/36; al-Iṣābah fī Tamyīz al-Ṣaḥābah 3/532. The report is deemed Ṣaḥīḥ by Ibn Ḥajr.

5 Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt p. 185; Akhbār al-Madīnah 2/221; Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq 25/133; Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’ 1/36.

Commenting upon this, al-Ḥāfiẓ al-Dhahabī¹ mentions:

الذي كان منه في حق عثمان تمغفل وتأليب فعله باجتهاد، ثم تغير عندما شاهد مصرع عثمان فندم على ترك نصرته

What had come forth from his side regarding ‘Uthmān was obliviousness and instigated against those actions of his base on Ijtihād. However, when he saw the death of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه he changed and regretted upon not helping him and standing by his side.²

Nonetheless, his murder was indeed a terrible Fitnah as a result of which the Ummah encountered tumultuous situations, as was prophesied by Nabī صلی الله علیه وسلم:

من نجا من ثلاث فقد نجا- ثلاث مرات - موتي، والدجال، وقتل خليفة مصطبر بالحق معطيه

Whoever is saved from three things is indeed safe, he said that three times: my death, Dajjāl, and the murder of a Khalīfah who will be steadfast upon the truth and will dispense it.³

1 Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn ‘Uthmān ibn Qāyimāz al-Turkumānī, Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Dhahabī. One of the great scholars of ḥadīth and historians. He was born in 673 A.H. He dedicated himself to ḥadīth and benefitted many and was exceptionally brilliant. He authored many books. He passed away in 747 A.H. He had become blind a short while before his death. The following are some of his books: *Mīzān al-I’tidāl*, *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’*, and *Tārīkh al-Islām*. See: *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi’iyyah al-Kubrā* 9/100; *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 2/114; *al-Durar al-Kāminah* 5/66; *Shadharāt al-Dhahab* 6/153.

2 *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 1/35; see also: *Akhbār al-Madīnah* 2/290.

3 *Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah*: chapter of Fitan: sub-chapter regarding the mention of the Fitnah of al-Dajjāl: ḥadīth no. 37475; *Musnad Aḥmad*: ḥadīth no. 17014; *Mustadrak Ḥākim*: chapter regarding knowing the Ṣaḥābah: sub-chapter regarding the murder of Amīr al-Mu’minīn ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه: ḥadīth no. 4548. Al-Haythamī has said the following regarding the report in *Majma’ al-Zawā’id* 7/334, “Aḥmad and al-Ṭabarānī have narrated it. And the transmitters of Aḥmad are the transmitters of the Ṣaḥīḥ, with the exception of Rabī’ah ibn Laqīṭ who is still reliable.” Al-Albānī has graded the ḥadīth as Ṣaḥīḥ in *Zīlāl al-Jannah* (ḥadīth no. 1177) and Shu’ayb al-Arnāuṭ has graded it as Ḥasan in his revision of the *Musnad*.

And ‘Abd Allah ibn Salām رضي الله عنه said the following:

لقد فتح الناس على أنفسهم بقتل عثمان باب فتنة لا تغلق عنهم إلى قيام الساعة

By killing ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه the people have opened a door of Fitnah upon themselves which will not close till the advent of the final hour.¹

Hence after the martyrdom of Amīr al-Mu‘minīn ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه the fitnah broke out on such a large scale that not a household from the household of the Arabs was spared.² Hence the people were flabbergasted regarding the events still to unfold and how to interpret what had just happened. This is where rumours regarding ‘Alī رضي الله عنه having a share in what had happened took root. And this was largely being circulated by the Banū Umayyah.³

Therefore, in eulogising the demise of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه and depicting the chitchat of the people Ḥassān ibn Thābit رضي الله عنه said the following poem:

فليات مأسدة في دار عثمانا	من سره الموت صرفا لا مزاج له
فوق المخاطم بيض زان أبدانا	مستحقي حلق الماذي قد سفعت
يقطع الليل تسبيحا وقرآنا	ضحوا بأشمط عنوان السجود به
قد ينفع الصبر في المكروه أحيانا	صبرا فذي لكم أمي وما ولدت
وبالأمير وبالإخوان إخوانا	فقد رضينا بأرض الشام نافرة
ما دمت حيا وما سميت حسانا	إني لمنهم وإن غابوا وإن شهدوا
الله أكبر، يا ثارات عثمانا	لتسمعن وشيكا في ديارهم
ما كان شأن على وابن عفانا	يا ليت شعري وليت الطير تخبرني

Whoever is happy with a death which is pure and untainted, he should come to a den in the house of ‘Uthmān.

Carrying weapons on their backs whilst helmets which they wore darkened their noses but beautified their bodies.

1 *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 19/460.

2 *Al-Jawāb al-Ṣaḥīḥ* 6/86.

3 *Tārīkh Dimashq* 39/450; *Tārīkh al-Khulafā’* p. 163.

They sacrificed a grey person upon who the sign of prostration was clear, and who would spend the night in glorification and the recitation of the Qur'ān.

Be patient, may my mother and whoever she bore be sacrificed for thee. For at times patience in trying times is of benefit.

We are pleased with the land of Shām having an aversion, and with the Amīr and with the brothers as our brothers.

I am from them, whether they are absent or present, as long as I live and as long as I am called Ḥassān.

You will soon hear in their abodes Allah is the greatest! O how great is revenge for 'Uthmān.

If only I had some way to know, and if only the birds informed me of what really was the issue between 'Alī and 'Uthmān ¹ ﷺ.

And al-Walīd ibn 'Uqbah who was the uterine brother of 'Uthmān ² ﷺ reveals to us what many of the Umayyads were assuming regarding 'Alī ³ ﷺ and the Banū Hāshim, i.e. that they played a clandestine role in the murder of the Khalīfah. He says:

كصدع الصفا ما يرمض الدهر شائبه
وسيف بن أروى عندكم وحرائبه
بني هاشم إلا تردوا فإننا
بني هاشم ردوا سلاح ابن أختكم
غدرتم به كيما تكونوا مكانه
فوالله لا أنسى انسى ابن أمي عيشتي

بني هاشم إنا وما كان بيننا
بني هاشم كيف المودة بيننا
بني هاشم إلا تردوا فإننا
بني هاشم ردوا سلاح ابن أختكم
غدرتم به كيما تكونوا مكانه
فوالله لا أنسى انسى ابن أمي عيشتي

1 *Dīwān Ḥassān ibn Thābit* p. 215. Also see: *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 2/695; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 3/77; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 7/196; *Maqal al-Shahīd 'Uthmān* p. 208. Also see the comments of Abū 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-Barr in *al-Istī'āb* p. 550 and the comments of Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā al-Andalusī in *Maqal al-Shahīd 'Uthmān* p. 182.

2 Ibn Khayyāt: *Ṭabaqāt* p. 11; *Usd al-Ghābah* p. 1108.

Could not get translation for this verse.

O Banū Hāshim how can there be affinity between us when Sayf ibn Arwā (i.e. ‘Uthmān) is by you¹ and so is his usurped belongings.

O Banū Hāshim if you do not give back, then his two killers and looter are equal to us.

Banū Hāshim return the weapon of the son of your sister and do not loot it for his property is inviolable.

You breached his trust in order to replace him in his position, just as the courtiers of Kisrā did one day with him.

By Allah I will not forget the son of my mother as long as I live. And can a person who drinks the water ever forget it.²

Several factors contributed to the emergence of this false assumption. Hereunder we enlist them:

Firstly, ‘Alī عليه السلام did not arise to help the oppressed Khalīfah during the days he was besieged, when he required his help, his support, and his defence the most; especially when considering that the siege lasted for over a month.³

1 This is attributing ‘Uthmān عليه السلام to his mother who was Arwā Bint Kurayz ibn Rabī‘ah ibn Ḥabīb ibn ‘Abd al-Shams. See: *Akhbār al-Madīnah* 2/132; *Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt* p. 156; *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 2/692; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 39/8.

2 *Al-Bad’ wa al-Tārīkh* 5/207; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 39/541; *Simṭ al-Nujūm al-‘Awālī* 2/532; *Maqṭal al-Shahīd ‘Uthmān* p. 210. I have previously indicated that Walīd ibn ‘Uqbah stayed away from the Fitnah. This poem although is insightful, but ostensibly he said it at the very beginning before matters intensified.

3 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 7/177.

Secondly, some people, like Ashtar,¹ who were part of the siege and the murder of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه were considered to be from the men of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, in fact, even from his close associates. Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr,² an accomplice, was likewise praised by ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and accorded preference, even though in actual fact he praised him and gave him preference due to his worship and exertion in devotion.³

Thirdly, immediately after the murder of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه when people were still confused and appalled these wretched people pledged their allegiance to ‘Alī رضي الله عنه.⁴ Thereafter they coerced many people to pledge their allegiance to him, especially those whose opposition and attraction of followership they feared. Hence Ṭalḥah رضي الله عنه was brought and it is said that he was brought by force and was coerced to pledge his allegiance.⁵

Al-Dhahabī mentions:

كان طلحة أول من بايع علياً أُرهِقَهُ قَتْلَةُ عِثْمَانَ وَأَحْضَرُوهُ حَتَّى بَايَعَ

1 Mālik ibn al-Ḥārith al-Nakhaṭī: the head of all the Yamānī tribes and famous warrior. He was known as ‘al-Ashtar’. His eye was gouged on the day of Yarmūk. He was one of those who incited the people against ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه and fought him. He participated with ‘Alī رضي الله عنه in all his battles. And when ‘Alī رضي الله عنه was returning from Ṣiffīn he pointed him as the governor of Egypt but he passed away in 37 A.H. en-route due to being poisoned, as is speculated. His narration appears in *Sunan al-Nasā’ī*. See: *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 6/213; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 4/34; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 27/126; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 10/10.

2 See: *Tamhīd al-Awā’il wa Talkhīṣ al-Dalā’il* p. 554; *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 2/66. Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr al-Ṣiddīq. He was born in the farewell Ḥajj. ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه appointed him over Egypt but he later joined the ranks of the rebels and marched to besiege ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه till he was killed. Thereafter he joined the ranks of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and became one of his commanders. He appointed him as the governor of Egypt in 37 A.H, but subsequently suffered defeat at the hands of the army of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه. He thus hid away and when he was found he was killed and stuffed into the stomach of a dead donkey and was burnt. He was less than thirty years old. See: *al-Istī’āb* 3/1366; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 3/481; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 7/319.

3 *Al-Istī’āb* 3.1367; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 9/70.

4 *Al-Muntaqā min Minhāj al-’ītidāl* 1/59.

5 *Ibid.* 1/59.

Ṭalḥah was the first person to pledge his allegiance to ‘Alī. The murderers of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه forced him and brought him till he pledged.¹

And Zubayr ibn al-‘Awwām رضي الله عنه said:

إنما بايعت عليا واللعج في عنقي

I pledged allegiance to ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and the sword was on my neck.²

These actions were interpreted as ‘Alī رضي الله عنه being in agreement with the rebels in their siege on ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه and his murder, or at least being pleased with what had happened so that the Khilāfah may be enjoyed by him.

Nonetheless, ‘Alī رضي الله عنه assumed the reigns of the Khilāfah thereafter and the Fitnah was still at its peak. According to many he was somewhat responsible in the blood of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه, but Allah سبحانه وتعالى knows that he was innocent and free from that which the liars calumniate him of.³

Ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه was rather inspired in the following statement of his:

الآن إن قمت بهذا الأمر ألزمتك الناس دم عثمان إلى يوم القيامة

Now if you assume this position, people will incriminate you for the murder of ‘Uthmān till the Day of Judgment.⁴

And Ibn Sīrīn⁵ said:

1 *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 1/35.

2 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 7/227.

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyah* 7/452.

4 *Akhbār al-Madīnah* 2/280; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 42/438; also see: *al-Fitnah wa Waq‘ah Jamal* p. 99.

5 Muḥammad ibn Sīrīn al-Anṣārī, Abū Bakr al-Ḥaṣārī. From the leading figures of the successors. His father was taken as a captive in Jirjirāyā and he thus became the slave of Anas ibn Mālik رضي الله عنه who enacted the contract of *Kitābah* (the payment of a specific amount to earn freedom) with him. Muḥammad was born two years before the end of the Khilāfah of ‘Umar رضي الله عنه and heard ḥadīths from a group of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم. He was a jurist, an ascetic and a reliable narrator. His narrations are found in the six collections. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 5/331; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 4/606; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/267; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 9/190.

ما علمت أن عليا اتهم في قتل عثمان حتى بويع، فلما بويع اتهمه الناس

I do not know of ‘Alī being accused of the murder of ‘Uthmān till he was given the pledge. When he was given the pledge the people accused him.¹

Fourthly, ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would at times be compelled to use phrases indicative of his participation in the murder of ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. For example:

إنكم قد أكثرتم علي في قتل عثمان، إلا إن الله تعالى قتله وأنا معه

You have spoken much to me about the murder of ‘Uthmān. Behold Allah killed him and I with him.

Likewise the following statement, as is reported from him:

والله ما ساءني ذلك ولا سرني

By Allāh, that did not disappoint me nor did it please me.

And the statement:

إن دم عثمان في جمجمتي

The blood of ‘Uthmān is in my skull.²

Consequently some people misconstrued these statements to refer to his happiness with the murder of the Khalīfah.³

Abū Bakr al-Bāqillānī⁴ mentions:

1 *Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah*: Chapter of leaders: sub-chapter regarding the leaders and entering upon them: ḥadīth no. 30710.

2 *Akhbār al-Madīnah* 2/274, 276; *Tamhīd al-Awā’il wa Talkhīṣ al-Dalā’il* p. 555.

3 *Akhbār al-Madīnah* 2/274.

4 Muḥammad ibn al-Ṭayyib ibn Muḥammad ibn Ja‘far al-Baghdādī, Abū Bakr al-Bāqillānī. A leading Ash‘arī theologian who was very brilliant and witty. One of the most prolific authors in theology, for he wrote against the Rāfiḍah, the Mu‘tazilah, the Khawārij, and the Jahmiyyah. He passed away in 403 A.H. Some of his works are: *al-Tamhīd*, *al-Tabṣīrah*, *Daqā’iq al-Ḥaqā’iq*. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 5/379; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 17/190; *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafāyāt* 3/147; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 11/350.

كان إذا سئل عنه (يعني مقتل عثمان) أورد الكلام محتملا، وتغلغل إلى لطيف التأويل والرفق بالفريقين، وكانوا إذا سمعوا منه الكلام المحتمل ورأوا قتلته مختلطين بعسكره ظنوا أنه مؤثر لما جرى، وأنه متمكن من إقامة الحد وأخذ القصاص لأولياءه وأنه متحيف لهم وإن كان بريئا من ذلك، فيصير ظاهر اختلاط القوم بعسكره وما يسمع من محتملات أقاويله طريقا لاجتهاد المحارب المطالب له بدم عثمان والقاعد عنه لموضع ظنهم بما هو بعيد عنه

When he would be asked regarding it (the murder of ‘Uthmān) his answers could be construed in many ways, and he would resort to intricate meanings and would try to be soft and amiable to both parties. Hence when they would hear him speaking in suggestive ways and would see the killers in his army they would assume that he preferred what happened; they would think that he is able to execute the capital punishment and seek retribution for the family of ‘Uthmān but that he was wronging them, even though he was free from that. Hence the apparent mixing of the people with his army and his suggestive language both gave room to the opponents, seekers of retribution for the blood of ‘Uthmān, and those who sat away from supporting him to all respectively adopt their stances due to their respective *Ijtihād* (analyses of the situation).¹

Fifthly, he is likewise reported to have made statements in which he threatened the governors of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه saying that if he assumes the Khilāfah he will dismiss them and take their wealth, etc. Consider the following:

لئن وليت بني أمية لأنفضنهم نفص القصاب والوذام التربة

If I have to rule over the Banū Umayyah I will dust them like how a butcher dusts the dusty intestines.²

This led to some people assuming that ‘Alī was certain that he will one day assume the Khilāfah.³

1 *Tamhīd al-Awā’il wa Talkhīṣ al-Dalā’il* p. 555.

2 *Al-‘Ayn* 8/116; *Ibn Sallām: Gharīb al-Ḥadīth* 3/438; *Tahdhīb al-Lughah* 14/195; *al-Muḥkam wa al-Muḥīṭ al-A’zam* 10/120.

3 *Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah* 7/469; *al-Anwār al-Kāshifah* p. 270.

Sixthly, those who murdered ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه were part of the army of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. They were actually the majority and had much of influence.¹ This fact is undisputed amongst the historians, and it was on the basis of this that Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه refused to pledge his allegiance to ‘Alī رضي الله عنه unless he handed them over to him.²

Seventhly, ‘Alī رضي الله عنه did not seek retribution from them for ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه who was murdered wrongfully, which, at best, according to his detractors was a sign of his compromise on the issue, due to remaining silent regarding them.³

Eighthly, some of the partisans of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه claimed that he ordered the murder of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه, or was at least pleased with it, thereby wanting to impugn ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه. On the other hand, some of the partisans of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه were likewise claiming the same, thereby wanting to impugn ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. It is in fact narrated that a group of people testified before the people of Shām that he was involved in the murder of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه.⁴

All these assumptions would not gain much traction, had it not been for the hyped up aura which had engulfed the Muslim society in those trying times which resulted in the murder of the Khalīfah. But it shadowed the reality and engendered the circulation of rumours.

Nonetheless, Amīr al-Mu‘minīn ‘Alī رضي الله عنه would take oaths in the name of Allah سبحانه وتعالى and assertively state that he was innocent and free from the blood of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه, in order to eradicate all the rumours and false assumptions which were in circulation. Hence when he heard some noise raising from Mirbad, a famous place in Basrah, he sent someone to see what it was. He was told, “It

1 *Majmū‘ Fatāwā Shaikh al-Islām* 25/72.

2 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 3/79; *al-Bad’ wa al-Tārīkh* 5/210, *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 59/132; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 7/258, 8/21.

3 *Muqaddamah Ibn Khaldūn* p. 214.

4 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyah* 4/406; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 59/134.

is ‘Ā’ishah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا cursing the killers of ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and the people are saying ‘Āmīn,” to which he replied, “I also curse the killers of ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ whether they be on flat lands or in the mountains.”¹

Likewise he would say, “By Allah I have not killed ‘Uthmān nor have I ordered his killing,” Repeating it thrice.

It also reported from him that he cursed the killers of ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.²

Similarly, when ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was asked:

هل شرك علي في دم عثمان

Did ‘Alī take part in the murder of ‘Uthmān?

He replied:

لا والله ما علمت ذلك في سر ولا في علن، ولكن كان رأسا يفرع إليه فألحق به ما لم يكن

No, by Allah. I do not know of that happening, not in secrecy and not in openness. But he was a leader to who others resorted at the time of need, and thus he was blamed for that which did not really happen.³

Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam⁴ said to ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn:

1 *Tārīkh Dimashq* 29/456.

2 *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 3/82; *Tārīkh Dimashq* 39/451; *Simṭ al-Nujūm al-‘Awālī* 2/533.

3 *Ansāb al-Ashrāf* 1/593.

4 Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam ibn Abī al-‘Āṣ al-Umawī. One of the leaders of the Quraysh and its prominent figures. He is considered to be from the high ranking successors. He was born in the era of Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. He was a close associate of ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, and because of the letter attributed to him ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was killed. He went out of his way in seeking revenge for his blood. He assumed the position of governorship over Madīnah several times for Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and ruled over Shām for nine months. He passed away in 65 A.H. His narration appears in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* and the four *Sunan*. See: *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 5/35; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 3/476; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 8/257; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 10/82.

ما كان في القوم أذفع عن صاحبنا من صاحبكم! يعني عليا وعثمان

“There was not in the people anyone who defended our man more than your man!” referring to ‘Alī and ‘Uthmān.¹

‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān has likewise said:

ما أرى له ذنبا

I don’t see him guilty of any sin.²

Ibn Taymiyyah has hence said:

كان في جهال الفريقين من يظن بعلي وعثمان ظنونا كاذبا، برأ الله منها عليا وعثمان، كأن يظن أنه أمر بقتل عثمان، وكان علي يحلف-وهو البار الصادق بلا مین- أنه لم يقتله ولا رضي بقتله ولم يمالئ على قتله. وهذا معلوم بلا ريب من علي رضي الله عنه، فكان إناس من محبي علي ومن مبغضيه يشيعون ذلك عنه، فمحبوه يقصدون بذلك الطعن على عثمان بأنه كان يستحق القتل، وإن عليا أمر بقتله، ومبغضوه يقصدون بذلك الطعن على علي، وأنه أعان على قتل الخليفة المظلوم الشهيد الذي صبر نفسه، ولم يدفع عنها، ولم يسفك دم مسلم في الدفع عنه، فكيف في طلب طاعته، وأمثال هذه الأمور التي يتسبب بها الزائغون على المتشيعين العثمانية والعلوية

The ignorant among both camps would assume false assumptions regarding ‘Alī and ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنهما, may Allah exonerate ‘Alī and ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنهما. For example it would be speculated that he ordered the killing of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه, whereas ‘Alī رضي الله عنه would take an oath, keeping in mind that he was the virtuous and the truthful without doubt, that he did not kill him, was not happy with his murder, and did not in way help in his murder.

This is very well-known regarding ‘Alī. For some of his partisans and others from his detractors would falsely circulate this rumour; his partisans would do so intending to denigrate ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه by claiming that he deserved

1 Al-Dhahabī mentions the following regarding this report in his book *Tārīkh al-Islām* 3/461, “Ibn Abī Khaythamah has reported it with a strong chain of transmission from ‘Umar.” ‘Umar here refers to ‘Umar ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn, the narrator.

2 *Musnad ibn al-Ja’d* 1/329.

to be murdered and that ‘Alī رضي الله عنه ordered that he be murdered, and his detractors would do so intending to discredit ‘Alī رضي الله عنه by claiming that he helped in the murder of the patient Khalīfah who did not defend himself and did not shed the blood of a Muslim in doing so (so why would he do so in seeking adherence to himself). These types of issues were raised and provoked by both the ‘Uthmāniyyah and the ‘Alawiyyah.¹

He has alluded to the following:

إن عليا رضي الله عنه إلى قتل عثمان كثير من شيعته ومن شيعة عثمان، هؤلاء لبغضهم لعثمان وهؤلاء لبغضهم لعلي، وأما جماهير المسلمين فيعلمون كذب الطائفتين على علي.

Alī رضي الله عنه was accused of murdering ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه by many of his partisans and the partisans of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه; the former due to their hatred for ‘Uthmān and the latter due to their hatred for ‘Alī. As for the majority of the Muslims, they knew that both groups had been lying about ‘Alī رضي الله عنه.²

He has also said:

كان في عسكر معاوية من يتهم عليا بأشياء من الظلم وهو بريء عنها

In the army of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه likewise there were people who accused ‘Alī رضي الله عنه of various sorts of oppression, whereas he was free from them.³

This disturbing situation is what prompted ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, who was falsely accused by many ignorant people, to say:

نجا والله قتلة عثمان إلا أن يشاء الله

The killers of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه have indeed escaped only those who Allāh wanted otherwise for.⁴

1 *Majmū‘ Fatāwā Shaikh al-Islām* 35/73.

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 4/344.

3 *Ibid.* 4/384.

4 *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 49/267.

Furthermore, after the Battle of Jamal reviling and impugning began to surface from both sides as a natural result of what had just transpired. Hence:

أن رجلا نال من عائشة عند عمار بن ياسر فقال: اعزب مقبوحا منبوحا، أتؤذي حبيبة رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم

A person criticised ‘Ā’ishah رضي الله عنها in the presence of ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir. He thus said, “Go away condemned and accursed. Do you harass the beloved of Rasūl Allāh صلى الله عليه وسلم?”¹

Likewise there emerged a people who would revile everyone without differentiating between ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and those besides him. These people were certainly not from the partisans of ‘Alī or ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه. Probably what had ensued in Jamal between both parties is what prompted them to criticise and ridicule.

Hence, once Sa’d ibn Abī Waqqāṣ رضي الله عنه saw a group of people surrounding a man. When he peered into the congregation he found that the man was reviling ‘Alī, Ṭalḥah, and Zubayr رضي الله عنهم. He thus prevented him from doing so, and when he did not heed his reprimand he said that I will curse you. The man arrogantly responded saying, “You are threatening me as if you are a prophet.” Sa’d رضي الله عنه thus turned away, entered the house of the family of so and so, performed ablution, and offered two Raka’āt of prayer; he then raised his hands and prayed thus:

اللهم إن كنت تعلم أن هذا الرجل قد سب أقواما قد سبق لهم منك سابقة الحسنى، وأنه قد أسخطك سبه إياهم، فاجعله اليوم آية وعبرة، فخرجت بخيبة نادة من دار آل فلان لا يرد لها شيء حتى دخلت بين أضعاف الناس فافترق الناس، فأخذته بين قوائمها، فلم يزل تتخبطه حتى مات

“O Allah if you know that this man has reviled people who you have already promised *Husnā* (Jannah) and that his revilement has displeased you, then

1 *Sunan al-Tirmidhī*: chapter of the virtues of Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم: sub-chapter regarding the virtues of ‘Ā’ishah رضي الله عنها: ḥadīth no. 3888 (the ḥadīth is Ḥasan according to al-Tirmidhī); *al-Mustadrak ‘alā al-Ṣaḥīḥayn*: chapter regarding the knowing the Ṣaḥābah: sub-chapter regarding the virtues of ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir: ḥadīth no. 5784, he has deemed the narration authentic.

make him a sign and a lesson today.” Hence a female *Bukhtī* camel¹ emerged from the house of the family of so and so, penetrated the crowd leaving them scattered, took him under its feet and continuously trampled upon him till he died.²

On the other hand, after the return of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and his army from Şifīn, the signs of criticism against him began to emerge in some circles out of annoyance at some of the things that had happened. Thereafter they began to openly revile ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, impugn him and even accorded openly hating him religious status. As a result he was compelled to narrate the following ḥadīth of Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم to them:

والذي فلق الحبة وبرأ النسمة إنه لعهد النبي الأمي صلى الله عليه وسلم إلي أن لا يحبني إلا مؤمن ولا
يغضني إلا منافق

By the one who has split the seed and created the soul, Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم had forewarned me that only a believer will love me and only a hypocrite will hate me.³

What is strange though is that these people were initially from his partisans, but thereafter rebelled against him. Hence he debated with them at first, and thereafter sent Ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه to debate with them which resulted in some of them retracting.⁴ But some of them still remained upon their ideas and eventually the Battle of Nahrawān⁵ ensued wherein ‘Alī رضي الله عنه emerged victorious.

1 A female Khurāsānī camel, known for its hugeness and having two humps. This word was Arabised. See: *Mashāriq al-Anwār* 1/79; *Lisān al-‘Arab* 2/9.

2 *Tārīkh Dimashq* 20/346; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 8/77. Ibn Abī Shaybah has likewise documented this narration from Mu‘ab ibn Sa‘d from his father in his *Muṣannaḥ*: chapter of merits: sub-chapter regarding what is narrated regarding Sa‘d ibn Abī Waqqāṣ رضي الله عنه: ḥadīth no. 32149; and so has al-Ṭabarānī narrated it in his *al-Mu‘jam al-Kabīr* from ‘Amir ibn Sa‘d from his father with a similar wording: 1/140.

3 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: chapter of Īmān: subchapter regarding love for the Anṣār and ‘Alī رضي الله عنه being from Īmān and its signs, and hatred for them being a sign of hypocrisy: ḥadīth no. 78.

4 *Al-Bad’ wa al-Tārīkh* 5/222; *al-Muntaẓam* 5/124; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 6/216, 7/280.

5 Al-Nahrawān a town between Baghdād and Wāsiṭ, to the east; its upper boundary is adjacent to Baghdād. The famous battle took place there in 38 A.H. See: *Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt* p. 197; *Mu‘jam mā Ustu‘jīm* 4/1336; *Mu‘jam al-Buldān* 5/325.

Despite him attaining victory, he was unable to completely extirpate them, for there were many amongst them who did not take part in the war at all.¹ That is besides the four hundred who were wounded but not killed.² These people thus still remained upon their false beliefs of him being a disbeliever and their defeat had merely embittered them and infuriated them even more against him.

Thus one of them once came and stood at the head of ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar رضي الله عنه and said, “By Allāh I hate ‘Alī.” Ibn ‘Umar raised his head to him and said, “May Allāh hate you, do you hate a person whose one feat is better than this world and whatever it contains.”³

Likewise another person came to him and asked him regarding ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. He thus mentioned his good deeds and then said:

هو ذاك بيته أوسط بيوت النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم

He is that person whose household is the highest of all the households of Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم.

He then asked him, “Probably this offends you?” to which the man replied, “Yes” whereupon he said:

فأرغم الله بأنفك! انطلق فاجهد علي جهديك

May Allāh soil your nose with dust, go and try whatever you can against me.⁴

1 *Al-Khawārij Tārīkhuhum wa ‘Arā’uhum al-I’tiqādiyyah* p. 126.

2 *Al-Muntaẓam* 5/193; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 7/289.

3 *Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah*: chapter of merits: sub-chapter regarding the virtues of ‘Alī ibn Ṭālib رضي الله عنه: ḥadīth no. 32127.

4 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*: chapter regarding the merits of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم: sub-chapter regarding the merits of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رضي الله عنه: ḥadīth no. 3501.

However, it should be noticed that the opposition of the Khawārij of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه remained as was without progressing in any way. This was due to the following reasons:

1. They had already reached the furthest possible extent, i.e. they had excommunicated him and deemed his blood permissible to shed.
2. They would not consider lying admissible, even if it be against their opponents, hence Khawārij with their various sects were all free from lying.¹ Ibn Taymiyah has stated that they would not lie and were not people who would intentionally lie,² but were rather known for their truthfulness. To the extent that their narrations are the most authentic of narrations.³
3. They were preoccupied in fighting against the Umayyad and the Abbasid dynasties which lasted for a very long period, especially with the Umayyads.⁴ Hence rebelling against their governors and killing them one after the other was their main occupation. They would only go undercover when they needed to replenish their sources and increase their numbers.⁵

Hence it would be justified to conclude that the open hatred for ‘Alī رضي الله عنه initially came to the fore in Shām because the people thereof refused to pledge allegiance to ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and took up arms against him in Şiffīn. Subsequent to that it took root in Iraq, but it gained a lot of traction in Shām as a result only very few people were safe from it.⁶

As opposed to Iraq where criticism for ‘Alī رضي الله عنه did exist but to a very limited extent, when compared to the criticism of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه which prevailed there,

1 *Al-Kāmil fī al-Adab* 2/106.

2 *Ibid.* 1/68.

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawīyah* 5/154, 6/344, 7/192, 260.

4 *Ibid.* 2/90.

5 *Al-Khawārij, Tārīkhuhum wa ‘Ārā’uhum al-‘I’tiqādiyyah* p. 129.

6 *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 3/128.

especially in Kūfah which was the epicentre of Shī'ism. And so the Ummah disputed regarding 'Alī and 'Uthmān رضي الله عنهما in to four groups as stated by al-Sha'bī:¹

أصبحت الأمة على أربع فرق: محب لعلي مبغض لعثمان، ومحب لعثمان مبغض لعلي، ومحب لهما ومبغض لهما.

The Ummah parted into four groups: a group that loved 'Alī and hated 'Uthmān, a group that loved 'Uthmān and hated 'Alī, a group that loved both of them, and a group that hated both of them.²

And many people adopted either side of the balanced stance regarding 'Uthmān and 'Alī رضي الله عنهما³ in such a way that it settled in their minds that partisanship for one implies aversion for the other. Hence the partisan of 'Uthmān would criticise 'Alī رضي الله عنهما and the partisan of 'Alī رضي الله عنهما would criticise 'Uthmān رضي الله عنهما

Ibn Taymiyyah mentions:

قد كانت الفتنة لما وقعت بقتل عثمان وافتراق الأمة بعده صار قوم ممن يحب عثمان ويغلو فيه ينحرف عن علي مثل كثير من أهل الشام ممن كان إذ ذاك يسب عليا ويبغضه، وقوم ممن يحب عليا ويغلو فيه ينحرف عن عثمان مثل كثير من أهل العراق ممن كان يبغض عثمان ويسبه.

When the Fitnah ensued after the murder of 'Uthmān, many a people who loved 'Uthmān and exaggerated regarding him detracted from 'Alī رضي الله عنهما, like the people of Shām who would revile and despise 'Alī رضي الله عنهما. Similarly those who loved 'Alī رضي الله عنهما and exaggerated regarding him detracted from 'Uthmān رضي الله عنهما, like the people of Iraq who would hate 'Uthmān رضي الله عنهما and revile him.⁴

1 'Āmir ibn Sharāḥīl ibn 'Abd al-Sha'bī al-Hamdānī, Abū 'Amr al-Kūfī. One of the leading scholars of the successors and a prominent figure for his knowledge, his jurisprudence and piety. He was born in the Khilāfah of 'Umar رضي الله عنه and was fortunate to meet five hundred Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم. He was famous for his retentive memory and was a reliable narrator. His narrations appear in the six canonical works. He passed away in 104 A.H. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 12/227; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 25/335; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 34/133; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 5/57.

2 *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 4/308.

3 *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 4/308.

4 *Majmū' Fatāwā Shaikh al-Islām* 3/408.

That is why Anas رضي الله عنه would say:

إن ناسا تزعم أن حب علي وعثمان لا يجتمعان في قلب مؤمن، ألا وإنهما قد اجتمعا في قلبي

Some people claim that love for ‘Uthmān and ‘Alī رضي الله عنه cannot gather in the heart of a believer. Behold they have gathered in my heart.¹

And Sufyān al-Thawrī would say:

لا يجتمع حب علي وعثمان إلا في قلوب نبلاء الرجال

Love for ‘Alī and ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه cannot gather but in the hearts of noble men.²

Although previously we have alluded that the ignorant people would revile Ṭalḥah and Zubayr رضي الله عنهما, but all of that came to an end after the great reconciliation which reached fruition between Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī رضي الله عنهما and Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān رضي الله عنه. For there was nothing left which would engender criticism for them due to them marching for the blood of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه and leadership now settling for those who were seeking retribution for it as well. This of course did not happen in the case of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, rather the very opposite happened.

Hence hardly anyone remained who would criticise them, with the exception of the partisans of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه who would at times do so but not openly. Because the only reason for which they would be criticised is their march against ‘Alī رضي الله عنه which naturally entailed their criticism of those whose authority was established.

1 *Tārīkh Dimashq* 39/501; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 19/460.

2 *Tārīkh Dimashq* 39/501; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 7/273.

The Second Discussion

The Causes of its Inception

It is an undisputed fact that any event has a repercussion, or a set of repercussions, which at times are direct and at times although not direct but play a very instrumental role in some way or the other in to the existence or strength of other movements.

At first it is possible to categorise the causes of the inception of Naṣb into two categories:

The first category: Plausible causes, which are the following:

The First Cause: The martyrdom of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه

The assassination of the Khalīfah ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه was the first spark which brought about social imbalance regarding ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. This was due to the common assumption that he played some sort of role in what had happened, either by conspiring against the Khalīfah or due to being pleased with what had befallen him.¹ Whereas it is a well-established fact that the life of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه was not just inviolable, but together with that he was the Khalīfah of the Muslims and their leader. Hence the silence of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه in this regard was indeed a matter of question.

This assumption was, of course, not going to leave the hearts of those in which it had become entrenched without effect and it resulted in them detracting from ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and becoming disillusioned with him. Hence based upon this false assumption they rebelled against him, fought him several times, and harassed him tremendously.²

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 7/452.

2 *Asnā al-Maṭālib fī Ṣīlah al-Aqārib* p. 404 (with a slight change).

This was the case of most of the people who fought him, especially the people of Syria who raised the slogans of seeking revenge for the blood of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه.¹ Added to that was the hatred which was provoked by bigotry of pedigree, as was the case in the opposition of many of the Umayyads.

The Second Cause: The Battles:

The effects of battles do not end with their termination and the physical wounds which they leave, but their dreadful effects and harsh memories endure and eventually engender deep wounds in the human psyche; they instigate within it feelings of disillusionment and ingrained hatred which a person cannot easily overcome. It for this reason that such a victim is not reprimanded in Sharī‘ah, as long as it does not lead to wronging others and violating their rights without any legitimate reason.

Hence when Waḥshī appeared before Nabī صلی الله علیه وسلم after accepting Islam, he asked him:

أنت وحشي؟ فقال نعم. قال: أنت قتلت حمزة: قال: قد كان من الأمر ما قد بلغك. فقال له: فهل تستطيع أن تغيب وجهك عني. قال وحشي: فكنت أتجنبه حتى قبضه الله تعالى

“Are you Waḥshī?”

He said, “Yes.”

Nabī صلی الله علیه وسلم further asked, “Did you kill Ḥamzah?”

He replied, “The matter was as it has reached you.”

To which Nabī صلی الله علیه وسلم said, “Is it possible for you to keep yourself away from me?”

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 4/405.

Waḥshī said, “I would thus avoid approaching him till Allāh claimed his life.”¹

Nabī ﷺ disliked looking at the face of Waḥshī due to the overwhelming pain which had overtaken him after the horrendous murder and mutilation of his uncle. Hence the expression of what he was experiencing was restricted to his desire not to see him, for Allah ﷻ had sent him as a mercy to the worlds and Islam obliterates whatever crimes were committed before it. That is why he said:

دعوه فإسلام رجل واحد أحب إلي من قتل ألف كافر

Leave him, for the Islam of one man is more beloved to me than the killing of a thousand disbelievers.²

A similar incident is what is reported from ‘Abd Allah ibn ‘Abd Allah ibn Ubay ibn Salūl. He is reported to have come to Nabī ﷺ and said:

يا رسول الله، إنه بلغني أنك تريد أن تقتل أبي، فوالذي بعثك بالحق ما تأملت وجهه قط هيبه له، وإن شئت أن أتيك برأسه لأتيتك، فإني أكره أن أرى قاتل أبي

O Rasūl Allah, it has reached me that you intend to kill my father. By the one who has sent you with the truth, I have never closely looked at his face out of awe for him. If you want me to come with his head I will come with it to you, for I dislike seeing the killer of my father.³

Likewise here we have one of the people of Baṣrah reminiscing over their wounds which had not healed due to the Khawārij defeating them, and describing the agony and frustration which they still felt two years after the experience he says:

1 Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, chapter of the battles of Nabī ﷺ, sub-chapter regarding the murder of Ḥamzah ibn ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, ḥadīth no. 3844. As for the addition “I would avoid approaching him...” it is mentioned in *al-Mu’jam al-Kabīr* of al-Ṭabarānī, ḥadīth no. 2947.

2 *Al-Rawḍ al-Unuf* 3/256; *Faṭḥ al-Bārī* 7/370.

3 *Musnad al-Ḥumaydī*, ḥadīth no. 1240; *al-Iṣābah fī Tamayiz al-Ṣaḥābah* 4/155.

لا تستفيق عيون كلما ذكروا
قتلى، حلالهم حولان ما قبروا
نبتي عليهم، ولا يقون أن قدروا

وزادنا حنقا قتلى تذكروهم
إذا ذكرنا جروزا والذين بها
تأتي عليهم حزازات النفوس فما

The remembering of the killed has increased us in exasperation. The eyes do not recover whenever they are remembered.

When we remember Jarūz¹ and those who were killed there, leaders who have not been buried for two years.

Upon them the rancour of the hearts is incited and thus we do not spare them and they would not spare us if they were capable of doing so.²

Hence, as a result of those battles many people had lost their fathers, sons, brothers, and other dear ones. That naturally provoked hatred for whoever they deemed the cause of their loss, for hatred toward the offender is ingrained in the hearts of men. From all the people involved, ‘Alī عليه السلام became the greatest victim of hatred. This was because at first the Battle of Jamal took place between him and the people of Baṣrah, subsequent to that was the Battle of Şifīn³ which broke out between him and the people of Syria, and subsequent to that was the Battle of Nahrawān which ensued between him and the Khawārij. Hence he was the enduring opponent in all three conflicts.

Therefore when Abū Labīd⁴ was asked, “Do you love ‘Alī?” He replied:

1 A place in ancient Persia where a battle had ensued between the Azāriqah and the people of Basrah. *Mu‘jam al-Buldān* 2/130.

2 Poem of Ka‘b al-Ashqarī. See: *Mu‘jam al-Buldān* 2/130.

3 Şifīn: A place near Raqqah on the western shores of the Euphrates river. It is situated between Raqqah and Bālis. The famous battle took place there on Wednesday in 37 A.H. *Mu‘jam al-Buldān* 3/414; *Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt* p. 191.

4 Limāzah ibn Zabbār al-Azdī al-Jahḍamī, Abū Labīd al-Baṣrī. He saw ‘Umar, ‘Alī, and a group of Şahābah عليهم السلام and narrated from them. He was a reliable and truthful narrator, but was a hater of ‘Alī عليه السلام due to the Battle of Jamal. He visited Yazīd ibn Mu‘āwiyah and praised him. I did not come across his date of death. His narrations appear in the *Sunan* of Abū Dāwūd, al-Tirmidhī, and Ibn Mājah. See: *Tārīkh Dimashq* 50/299; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 24/250; *Mizān al-Ītidāl* 5/507; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 8/410.

كيف أحب رجلا قتل من قومي حين كانت الشمس من ها هنا إلى أن صارت ها هنا ألفين وخمسة

How do I love a man who has killed two thousand five hundred people from my people from sunrise to sunset?¹

And when Ḥarīz ibn ‘Uthmān al-Raḥabī² was asked regarding the reason for his hatred of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه he said:

لا أحب من قتل آبائي

I will not love a person who killed my fathers.³

He also said:

لا أحب من قتل لي جدين

I will not love a person who killed two of my grandfathers.⁴

He likewise said:

هو القاطع رؤوس آبائي وأجدادي

He is the one who decapitated the heads of my fathers and grandfathers.⁵

1 *Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt* p. 186; *Tārīkh Dimashq* 50/306.

2 Ḥarīz ibn ‘Uthmān ibn Jabr al-Raḥabī, Abū ‘Uthmān/Abū ‘Awn al-Ḥimṣī. He was considered to be from the scholars of the people of Syria and their ascetics. He was born in 80 A.H. He was deemed reliable by many scholars, but was, however, deemed a Nāṣibī. Mu‘ādh ibn Mu‘ādh said about him, “I do not know that I saw anyone more virtuous than him in Syria.” He passed away in 163 A.H. His narrations appear in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* and the four *Sunan*. See: *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 12/339; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 7/79; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 5/568; *Tahdhīb al-Taḥdhīb* 2/207. He will be discussed in more detail in the chapters to come, Allah willing.

3 *Tārīkh Baghdād* 8/267; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 5/576; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 7/81; *Tahdhīb al-Taḥdhīb* 2/209.

4 *Al-Ma‘rifah wa al-Tārīkh* 2/225; *Tārīkh Baghdād* 8/267; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 12/349; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 5/576.

5 *Al-Majrūḥīn* 1/268; *al-Ansāb* 3/50; *Tahdhīb al-Taḥdhīb* 2/209.

Ibn Taymiyyah has alluded to this when he said:

كان من شيعة عثمان من يسب عليا ويجهر بذلك على المنابر وغيرها لأجل القتال الذي كان بينهم وبينه

Amongst the partisans of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه there were some who reviled ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, openly doing so on the pulpits and in other places due to the battles which ensued between them and him.¹

It is not far-fetched to assume that this was the prime reason why Qaṭāmī² wanted the murder of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه as part of her dowry, for the historians have stated that her father and brothers were martyred on the Day of Nahrawān when fighting against ‘Alī رضي الله عنه.³

The Third Cause: The Belief that ‘Alī رضي الله عنه was a Kāfir

This belief did not take root within those who fought him in the battles of Jamal and Şifḥīn. Instead it took root amongst his partisans who violated their allegiance after the call for arbitration; they detracted by rebelling against him and were thus known as the *Khawārij* (rebels) according to prominent view.⁴

The cause of this belief was that according to them ‘Alī رضي الله عنه gave men the authority to pass judgement in the Dīn of Allah and gave preference to their views over the law of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. This according to them constituted disbelief because according to the text of the Qur’ān passing judgements was solely the purview of

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 6/201.

2 Qaṭāmī bint Shajnah ibn ‘Adī ibn ‘Āmir. A woman belonging to the Banū Taym ibn al-Rubāb. She held the ideology of the Khawārij. When ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Muljim intended to marry her she placed a condition that her dowry be three thousand and the murder of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. See: *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 3/36; *al-Thiqāt* 2/302; *Mustadrak al-Ḥākim* 3/154; *al-Ikmāl* 7/274.

3 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 3/156; *al-Muntazam* 5/174; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 3/255; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 7/327. For more details regarding the aftermath of the battle of Nahrawān and its impact upon the people of Kūfah see: *Ḥarakah al-Khawārij, Nash’ atuhā, wa Ṭaṭawwuruhū ilā Nihāyah al-‘Ahd al-Umawī* p.48.

4 Ibn Qutaybah: *Gharīb al-Ḥadīth* 1/252; *Sharḥ al-Nawawī ‘alā Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* 7/164; al-Suyūṭī: *Sharḥ Sunan al-Nasā’ī* 7/119.

Allah ﷻ. They further reasoned that it is impermissible to love a disbeliever, who according to them was ‘Alī ﷺ, and thus it would be compulsory to hate him and fight him unless he repents, which ‘Alī did not do. Hence it was no surprise that they confronted him in the severest of ways, deemed his blood violable¹ and some of their leaders dubbed him the *Jāhid* (denier) thereby expressing his hatred and detraction.²

It is clear to any person who reflects that the worst form of opposition is religious opposition, even though it may be based on falsehood. For, owing to the ignorance of the opponent regarding the proof, or his warped understanding thereof which distances him completely from its actual purport, he becomes unstoppable in his actions however reprehensible they may be. Because he assumes that this is the actual Dīn of Allah and that whatever he is doing in defending it is an act of worship and whatever befalls him in doing so is all in the way of attaining the pleasure of Allah ﷻ.

The Fourth Cause: Fanaticism Regarding ‘Alī ﷺ

The fanaticism of the Shī‘ah in respect to ‘Alī ﷺ is well-known. It does not stop at merely giving him preference over others but exceeds logical boundaries. To the extent that if it is claimed that none of the sub-sects of the Ummah can or has matched this type of fanaticism it would not be far-fetched. There can be no greater evidence of this than their passion to consecrate him and attribute to him contrived virtues even if they may be impossible.³ All of this in an endeavour to elevate him to a stage which no one else can share with him and thereby bolster their viewpoint regarding Imāmah.

1 *Majmū‘ Fatāwā Shaikh al-Islām* 4/469; *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 6/16; *Fatḥ al-Bārī* 13/537.

2 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 7/290.

3 For example: A dog one day addressed him saying, “Your Wilāyah was presented to me and I did not accept, and so I was disfigured.” *Al-Nāfi‘ Yawm al-Ḥaṣhr* p. 170; and that he covered a distance in one night which cannot normally be covered in two months; and that a person in Iraq (whose name was Ibn Hubayrah) missed his children who were in Madīnah. Whereupon ‘Alī said to him, “Close your eyes and then open them, “and suddenly he was in his house amidst his children. See: *al-Ṣirāṭ al-Mustaqīm* 1/205.

Reality attests that extremism is only opposed by an opposite extremism which is at times based on ignorance and at times upon transgression. For one breeds in the hearts of the proponents of the other such animosity that removes them from moderation and fixes them into an extreme wherein their only intent becomes opposing their opponents and debunking their claims in whichever way possible. For example, some of the ignorant Sunnīs are reported to have said:

سبوا عليا كما سبوا عتيقكم كفر بكفر وإيمان بإيمان

Revile 'Alī just as they revile your 'Atīq. Disbelief in lieu of disbelief and faith in lieu of faith.¹

Another example is that when the Shī'ah² forged innumerable narrations regarding the specialities, virtues, and miracles of 'Alī رضي الله عنه, and likewise narrations criticising Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه and impugning him, others combatted this lie with another lie; and hence they forged narrations regarding Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه³ and at times even impugned 'Alī رضي الله عنه.⁴ Ibn Taymiyyah has alluded to this:

طائفة وضعوا للمعاوية ورووا أحاديث عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم في ذلك كلها كذب

A group of people forged narrations attributing them to Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم regarding the virtues of Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه, all of which are lies.⁵

1 *Tabyīn Kadhib al-Muftarī* p. 378; *al-Ṣārim al-Maslūl* 3/925.

2 Shī'ah: Refers to those people who supported 'Alī رضي الله عنه specifically, believed in his Imāmah and his immediate successorship which was emphatic, and that Imāmah will not leave his children but by way of oppression. They believe that Imāmah is a principle of Dīn. There are many sub-sects within the Shī'ah the common denominator amongst all of which is believing in the infallibility of the Imāms and the Ambiyā' from all minor and major sins and association with the Ahl al-Bayt and disassociation with everyone beside them in word, action and contract, with the exception of Taqiyyah permitting situations. The Zaydiyyah differ with them in some of these ideas. See: *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* p. 5, *al-Tanbīh wa al-Radd* p. 18; *al-Milal wa al-Niḥāl* 1/146; *al-Mawāqif* 3/671.

3 *Al-'Ilal al-Mutanāhiyah* 1/272; *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 7/371; *al-Manār al-Munīf* p. 116; *al-Shawkānī: al-Fawā'id al-Majmū'ah* p. 404.

4 *Tārīkh Aṣḥāhān* 2272; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 13/229.

5 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 4/400.

Likewise when the Shī'ah mastered the art of mourning over the martyrdom of Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and forged narrations and stories best known only to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, some ignoramus countered that by forging narrations regarding the virtues of expressing joy on the day of 'Āshūrā' and spending upon the family.

The Fifth Cause: The Influence of the Rulers:

Many of the Umayyad rulers played a very pivotal role in the emergence of Naṣb and its spread amongst people due to exploiting their influential capacities.¹

The Sixth Cause: The Influence of Society

A person can never be free from accepting the effect from his environment, for he is the product of the environment in which he grew up due to it contributing to the development of his conscience, the formation of his satisfactions, and the shaping of his outlook; this is what later influences all his ideas and activities inevitably. Even though at times he will manage to shed off some of its impacts upon him, but he can never possibly overcome all of them altogether because they have already become a part of his identity.

The causes of social influence differ in terms of strength and weakness for various reasons: like being close to the impactor or far therefrom, or the period of exposure being long or short. Hence the stronger the relation and the longer the period of exposure, the stronger and the deeper the impact, as in the case of the parents. The polytheists would therefore refuse to accept the message of the truth due to them being heavily influenced by this factor, as is mentioned by Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى in the Qur'ān:

وَإِذَا قِيلَ لَهُمْ اتَّبِعُوا مَا أَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ قَالُوا بَلْ نَتَّبِعُ مَا أَلْفَيْنَا عَلَيْهِ آبَاءَنَا ۗ أَوَلَوْ كَانَ آبَاؤُهُمْ لَا يَعْقِلُونَ شَيْئًا وَلَا يَهْتَدُونَ

1 A more detailed discussion around this will come under the discussion: 'the stance of the Khulafā' of the Banū Umayyah' on p. 220. (add page number)

And when it is said to them, “Follow what God has revealed,” they say, “Rather, we will follow that which we found our fathers doing.” Even though their fathers understood nothing, nor were they guided?¹

وَإِذَا قِيلَ لَهُمْ تَعَالَوْا إِلَىٰ مَا أَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ وَإِلَىٰ الرَّسُولِ قَالُوا حَسْبُنَا مَا وَجَدْنَا عَلَيْهِ آبَاءَنَا ؕ أُولَٰئِكَ كَانُوا فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ لَا يَعْلَمُونَ شَيْئًا وَلَا يَهْتَدُونَ

And when it is said to them, “Come to what God has revealed and to the Messenger,” they say, “Sufficient for us is that upon which we found our fathers.” Even though their fathers knew nothing, nor were they guided?²

بَلْ قَالُوا إِنَّا وَجَدْنَا آبَاءَنَا عَلَىٰ أُمَّةٍ وَإِنَّا عَلَىٰ آثَارِهِم مُّهْتَدُونَ

Rather, they say, “Indeed, we found our fathers upon a religion, and we are in their footsteps [rightly] guided.”³

Therefore, due to Naṣb gaining a lot of traction in the Syrian environment it engendered negative effects in the formation of the ideas of many of its inhabitants and their position regarding Amīr al-Mu’minīn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, as said by the poet:

وينشأ ناشئ الفتيان منا على ما كان عوده أبوه
وما دان الفتى بحجا ولكن يعلمه التدين أفرابه

A youngster amongst us grows according to the habits his father instils in him.

The youngster does not become devoted by way of intellect, rather it is his relatives who teach him devotion.⁴

Likewise another has said:

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 170.

2 Sūrah al-Mā'idah: 104.

3 Sūrah al-Zukhruf: 22.

4 Abū al-'Alā' al-Ma'arrī: *al-Luzūmiyyāt* 2/421.

ولن تموت وللآباء أبناء

أحيا الضغائن آباء لنا سلفوا

Our fathers who have passed gave life to grudges which will not die as long as fathers will have sons.¹

Al-Dhahabī says:

خلف معاوية خلق كثير يحيونه ويتغالون فيه ويفضلونه، إما ملكهم بالكرم والحلم والعطاء، وإما قد ولدوا في الشام على حبه وتربي أولادهم على ذلك، وفيهم جماعة يسيرة من الصحابة وعدد كثير من التابعين والفضلاء وحاربوا معه أهل العراق ونشأوا على النصب، نعوذ بالله من الهوى

Behind Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه there were many people who love him, exaggerate regarding him, and give him preference over all else; this is either because he won their hearts with his generosity, his forbearance, and his bonuses; or because they were born in Syria and grew up loving him and as did their children. Amongst them was a small group of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم, a large group of Tābi'īn, and virtuous people who fought by his side against the people of Iraq and grew up with tendencies of Naṣb. We seek the refuge of Allah from following the ego.²

He likewise says the following regarding one of the Tābi'īn of Syria who did not see 'Alī رضي الله عنه or meet him:

غالب الشاميين فيهم توقف عن أمير المؤمنين علي رضي الله عنه من يوم صفين، ويرون أنهم وسلفهم أولى الطائفتين بالحق

Most of the Syrians are hesitant regarding Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī رضي الله عنه since the day of Ṣiffīn. They assume that they and their forefathers were the closer of the two groups to the truth in the conflict.³

1 *Al-Wāfi bi al-Wafāyāt* 17/232. The poem was said by Abū al-'Abbās al-Saffāh, the first Khalīfah of the Abbasids.

2 *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 3/128.

3 *Mizān al-'tidāl* 6/153.

On the other hand, in Iraq as well there were people who inherited hatred for ‘Alī عليه السلام from their fathers.¹ However, it was not as widespread as it was in Syria. The reason being that the Syrians remained united under both the banners of the Umayyads, i.e. the Sufyānī and the Marwānī banners, whereas the people of Iraq were divided by conflict and disparity.

The Seventh Cause: The Effects of the Quṣāṣ (story tellers)

Quṣāṣ refers to people who would enact gatherings in the Masjids to advise the scores of people who frequented them. Hence they would motivate, warn, and instil enthusiasm in the hearts of people, mimicking the circles of knowledge by doing so. But many a time they would rely upon fabricated narrations, Isrā’īlī reports, and eerie incidents and dreams² without differentiating between what is well-established and what not, or resorting to reason in trying to separate between that which is logically reasonable and which is not.

The phenomenon which probably made them the most effective was that they were some of the few sources of knowledge, at times the only sources of information, for the commoners of the time. Furthermore deploying the appealing narrative style would draw the people to them, especially the laity. Hence:

ومن شأن العوام ملازمة القصاص ما دام يأتي بالعجائب الخارجة عن نظر العقول

The laity are such that they will latch onto the tale teller as long as he produces strange stories which are beyond the comprehension of the minds.³

Likewise:

1 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 2/204.

2 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 3/457; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 12/29; *Dirāsāt fī al-Ahwā’ wa al-Firaq wa al-Bida’* p. 239.

3 *Lisān al-Mīzān* 1/13.

إذا الحديث عن جمل طار أشهى إليهم من الحديث عن جمل سار، ورؤيا مرتبة عندهم آثر من رواية مروية

For a story of a flying camel is more appealing to them than a story of a walking camel. And a dream takes preference according to them over a transmitted narration.¹

This influence would at times, however, take a negative route and would play a crucial role in instigating turmoil and would thus lead to the intervention of the Khalīfah and a subsequent band upon the story tellers.² Likewise at times it would lead to the implantation of incorrect ideologies, wittingly or unwittingly, especially when considering that most of them would not be seekers of the correct and would not avoid mistakes due to their lack of knowledge and piety.³ Rather most of them would intentionally lie and narrate false narrations in their talks.⁴

It for this reason that the scholars of ḥadīth commonly use certain expressions which allude to this reality, like ‘this was forged by the story tellers’, and ‘the story tellers added’, and ‘from the forgeries of some of the story tellers’, and ‘fabricated by some story tellers’, and from ‘the fables of the story tellers’, etc.⁵ Some scholars actually authored books dedicated to the narrations and stories of these people.⁶

Their influence on the commonality specifically is more because of them being people of primitive thinking. Hence they would accept everything which these

1 *Al-Bad' wa al-Tārīkh* 1/4.

2 *Al-'Ibar fī Khabar man Ghabar* 2/78, 3/68.

3 Ibn al-Jawzī: *al-Quṣāṣ wa al-Mudhakkirīn* p. 161; *Ṣubḥ al-A'shā fī Ṣanā'ah al-Inshā* 12/62.

4 *Ṣubḥ al-A'shā fī Ṣanā'ah al-Inshā* 12/62.

5 See, for example: *al-Muntaẓam* 9/96; *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* 2/22; Ibn al-Jawzī: *al-Mawḍū'āt* 1/208; *al-Lā'ālī al-Maṣnū'ah* 1/243; al-Qārī: *al-Maṣnū'* p. 267; al-Qārī: *al-Asrār al-Marfū'ah* p. 416; *Kashf al-Khafā'* 2/563; *al-Fawā'id al-Majmū'ah* p. 320.

6 Like: *al-Quṣāṣ wa al-Mudhakkirīn* of Ibn al-Jawzī, *Aḥādīth al-Quṣāṣ* of Ibn Taymiyah and *Taḥdhīr al-Khawāṣ* of al-Suyūṭī.

people would mention in their gatherings considering it to be Dīn without any hesitation. One of these things was aversion toward ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

Hence al-Junayd ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān¹ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ narrates:

دخلت على حوران أخذ عطائي، فصلبت الجمعة، ثم خرجت إلى باب الدرج فإذا عليه شيخ يقال له: أبو شيبية القاص يقصص على الناس، فرغب فرغبنا وخوف فبكينا. فلما انقضى حديثه قال: اختموا مجلسنا بلعن أبي تراب، فلعنوا أبا تراب! فالتفت عن يميني فقلت ومن أبو تراب فقال: علي بن أبي طالب.

I went to Ḥawrān² to collect my bonus. I read Jumu‘ah and then came out to the door by the stairs. Upon it was seated a man who was known as Abū Shaybah, the story teller,³ who would narrate tales to the people. He motivated us and we felt motivated and he made us fear and we cried. When his conversation was over he said, “Culminate your gathering with reviling Abū Turāb,” and everyone thus cursed Abū Turāb. So I turned to my right and asked, “Who is Abū Turāb?” He said, “‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib.”⁴

The Eighth Cause: Love for the World

People have been created with inherent love for this world and inclination toward its various attractions. A person is not condemned for loving the world as long as it does not dominate his conscience and become the deciding factor in all his activities, thereby making him oblivious of all his obligations and the

1 Al-Junayd ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Amr al-Murrī al-Ghaṭafānī. A generous and prominent leader. Originally from Damascus. Hishām ibn ‘Abd al-Malik appointed him as the governor of Sindh and Khorasan in 113 A.H. However, he was not praiseworthy in his battles and thus was dismissed in 115 A.H. A year later he passed away due to an ailment he contracted in his stomach. See: *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 4/153; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 11/322; *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 11/158; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/312.

2 Ḥawrān: A very vast town and one of the suburbs of Damascus which has lots of villages and orchards. See: *Mu‘jam al-Buldān* 2/317; *Mu‘jam ma Ustu‘jim* 1/474.

3 I have not come across his biography in the books I have at my disposal. However, he lived during the era of the Khalīfah Ibn ‘Abd al-Malik and participated in the Jihād in the lands of Syria. See: *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 11/290; *Bughyah al-Ṭalab fī Tārīkh Ḥalab* 10/4485.

4 See the entire story in *Tārīkh Dimashq* 11/290; *Akhbār wa Ḥikāyāt* of al-Ghassānī p. 52.

consideration of the rights of others and the fear of punishment. When the love of this world deeply settles in his heart then one would begin to consider it the means to acquire all his goals and ambitions.

The love for position and the fame that it brings along¹ is what propelled ‘Umar ibn Sa’d ibn Abī Waqqāṣ² to choose marching against Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ rather than accepting his dismissal from the governorship of Ray.³ Whereas he knew the difficulties and atrocities which were glooming over Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.⁴ Likewise was the condition of most of the people who were with him.⁵

Ibn Taymiyyah says:

عمر هذا كان يحب الرياسة ولو حصلت على الوجه المذموم، ولهذا لما ولي ولاية وقيل له: لا توليك حتى تتولى قتال الحسين وأصحابه كان هو أمير تلك السرية

‘Umar was a person who loved leadership and would not mind achieving it even if it be in a condemnable way. Hence when he took charge of some affairs and was later promised governorship he was told, “We will not appoint you as governor unless you assume the responsibility of fighting Ḥusayn,” he happily accepted to be leader of that expedition.⁶

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 2/70.

2 ‘Umar ibn Sa’d ibn Abī Waqqāṣ, Abū Ḥafṣ al-Madanī. He was born in the era of Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, but his companionship is not established. He stayed in Kūfah and was appointed as the governor of Ray. He was the commander of the army which confronted Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ owing to which he was despised by the people. As for his narrations, he has been deemed reliable according to al-‘Ijlī. He was killed at the hands of Mukhtār ibn ‘Ubayd in 67 A.H. His narrations appear in *Sunan al-Nasā’ī*. See: *Ma’rifah al-Thiqāt* 2/166; *Tārikh Madīnah Dimashq* 45/37; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 45/37; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 21/356; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 3/227.

3 Ray is a famous city and is one of the largest cities of Aṣfahān. It has been described as a land with abundance of wealth. Currently it is close to Tehran, the capital city of Iran. See: *Mu’jam al-Buldān* 3/116.

4 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 2/65./., .

5 *Ibid.* 4/560.

6 *Ibid.* 6/335.

Likewise Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam would acknowledge before ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn that ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was innocent from the blood of ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Not only that, but was also his greatest defender. But in spite of all of this he would very often talk ill of him. When asked, “What is it with you people that you revile ‘Alī from the pulpits?” He said, “The matter will not be straight without doing so.”¹ I.e. leadership.

He also suggested the following to the governor of Madīnah:

أَنْ أَبْعَثَ إِلَى الْحُسَيْنِ بْنِ عَلِيٍّ وَعَبْدِ اللَّهِ بْنِ الزُّبَيْرِ فَإِنْ بَايَعَا وَإِلَّا فَاضْرِبْ أَعْنَاقَهُمَا

Send a messenger to Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī and ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr, if they pledge their allegiance (well and good), or else decapitate them.²

The reason for this suggestion again was none other than his desire for rulership to stay in the Banū Umayyah and his fear that it would leave them after the demise of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ before the allegiance was fully taken for Yazīd.

Based on this it would be fine to assert that initially the basis of Naṣb in the Nawāṣib who did not excommunicate was religion. Subsequent to that it progressed after the Umayyads had settled into power and took on the dimension of opposing the Ahl al-Bayt for various reasons and political motives.³ Thereafter it was the latter which remained the general feature of Naṣb and the prevalent distinction of their aversion.

The Ninth Cause: The Revolts of the ‘Alawīs

Many of the ‘Alawīs for a very long time continuously tried to reach the pedestal of rulership due to the assumption that it was their inevitable right due to it being an extension of the Khilāfah of their father ‘Alī which was usurped from

1 *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 42/438; *Simṭ al-Nujūm al-‘Awālī* 2/533.

2 *Tārīkh Khalīfah Ibn Khayyāt* p. 232; *al-Bad’ wa al-Tārīkh* 6/8; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 28/202; *Tārīkh al-Islām* 4/169.

3 Muḥammad Khalīl Harrās: *Sharḥ al-‘Aqīdah al-Wāsiṭiyyah* p. 251

him by the Umayyads and the Abbasids. Hence they would instigate revolts when they found the moment opportune. These revolts kept the Umayyads and the Abbasids restless for a very long period of time.¹

By undertaking these revolts, unwittingly, they provoked many of the rulers to continue reviling ‘Alī عليه السلام and increasingly violate his rights in an endeavour to bar any person who would try to exploit his relationship with him.

The Second category: Implausible causes²

Some people have tried to discover the reasons behind the inception of the phenomenon of Naṣb in the Muslim society, but have not been fully inspired to reach the correct conclusions. This is either due to them not studying the history of the fitnah and whatever followed thereafter in depth, or due to them going with certain presupposed perceptions which were dictated by their inclinations and leanings to a specific school. As a result it became an obstacle between them and an objective study of the actual causes.

The most prominent of these causes are the following:

The First Cause: Competition between the Banū Hāshim and the Banū Umayyah which existed in the days of *Jāhiliyyah* (ignorance).

In the days of *Jāhiliyyah* the competition for status and honour was at its peak between the various Arabian tribes and sub-tribes; it was the dominating thought which occupied the mind of every person.

Because the Quraysh were not aloof from this reality, there was competition between its sub-tribes as well. This is especially true between the Banū Hāshim and the Banū Umayyah who were united by very strong bonds. But these bonds were alloyed by their competition for glory and leadership in an environment

1 *Al-Ḥaḍārah al-Islāmiyyah fī al-Qarn al-Rābi’ al-Hijrī* 1/270.

2 They are only deemed causes in consideration of those who consider them causes.

whose first priority was leadership and honour.¹ Hence ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz would say:

ما زلنا نحن وبنو عمنا من بني هاشم مرة لنا ومرة علينا، نلجأ إليهم ويلجؤون إلينا، حتى طلعت شمس الرسالة فأكسدت كل نافع، وأخرست كل ناطق

We and our cousins of the Banū Hāshim remained such that at times the odds would be in our favour and at times they would be against us. They would resort to us and we would resort to them. Then rose the sun of prophethood which made every hypocrite valueless and made every speaker speechless.²

When Islam came with its novel ideas and beliefs it brought about an astounding revolution in the criteria of the people and their priorities; it purified the people from the deep seated traits of Jāhiliyyah which overpowered their lives. This does not mean that they completely vanished, rather some of its effects still lived on, as in the following ḥadīth of Nabī ﷺ:

أربع في أمتي من أمر الجاهلية لا يتركونها: الفخر في الأحساب، والطعن في الأنساب والاستسقاء بالنجوم والنياحة

Four things in my Ummah are from the traits of Jāhiliyyah which they will never leave: boasting over high pedigrees, impugning lineages, seeking rain through the stars, and mourning.³

Likewise when Abū Dhar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ vilified a man and taunted him because of his mother, Nabī ﷺ said to him, “You are a person in who there is still some Jāhiliyyah.”

1 Banū Umayyah Bayn al-Suqūṭ wa al-Intihār p. 16.

2 Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq 45/222; al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah 9/203.

3 The narration of Abū Mālik al-Ash‘arī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ which appears in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: chapter of funerals: sub-chapter regarding the severity of mourning; ḥadīth no. 934.

However, this was not the prevalent situation in the Muslim society, but rather was an exception.

Upon the advent of Islam some of the Banū Hāshim and the Banū Umayyah hastened to embracing it whilst the majority of the people still opposed. Thereafter Islam continued to grow gradually till Allah ﷻ favoured the Muslims with the Conquest of Makkah after which people entered the Dīn of Allah in droves and scores.

The Banū Hāshim and the Banū Umayyah united under the umbrella of Islam and the ideas of the new religion which confined true status to piety became embedded in their hearts. There was nothing that tarnished this newly realised bond, with the exception of the little aversion which some of the Quraysh would display for the Banū Hāshim; this was not specific to the Banū Umayyah, but was rather a phenomenon common to the Quraysh.

Matters remained this way till the fitnah of the murder of ʿUthmān رضي الله عنه transpired. That was followed by the war which broke out between ʿAlī and Muʿāwiyah رضي الله عنه. It was at this point that some people went on to reintroduce the long buried history of animosity between these two tribes of the Quraysh and deemed it the cause for all the bickering. Hence fables were invented which stated that the struggle between Hāshim and ʿAbd al-Shams was an old one which started from the days of Jāhiliyyah.¹ They further went on to state that it was something destined since eternity and started the day they both were born as twins with their heads attached which were later separated with the sword; this was interpreted as bloodshed remaining in their progenies till the Day of Judgment.²

Some Shīʿah writers do not hesitate in going on to assert that the Banū Umayyah were always known for their embedded and inherited hatred for the Islamic

1 Nabīh ʿAqil: *Tārīkh Khilāfah Banī Umayyah* p. 5.

2 *Al-Muntaẓam* 2/211; *al-Nizāʾ wa al-Takhāṣum* p. 38, 39; *al-Anwār al-Nuʿmāniyyah* 1/68; *Hāshim wa ʿAbd al-Shams* p. 14.

message which brought their glory and leadership to an end.¹ Nor do they hesitate in claiming that they always harboured enmity for the Banū Hāshim and that Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه directed it to the Ahl al-Bayt specifically and exuded all of it against Amīr al-Mu'minīn and his children; this enmity was further embodied by Yazīd in the horrendous massacre of Karbalā' when he killed the senior of the Ahl al-Bayt and its leader al-Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī.²

Some of their contemporary scholars even went onto author books in this regard,³ a practice not uncommon for the Shī'ah, for it is well known regarding them that they endeavour to offend their opponents in every way possible, including lying. As a result many a time they become victims of open contradiction; hence here they claim that the dispute between these two tribes started the first day their forefathers came into this world, and in another place they impugn the lineage of Umayyah and claim that he was bastard.⁴ If the latter is true then would there be any basis to claiming that enmity between them was destined since eternity, whereas Umayyah was not the son of 'Abd al-Shams at all.

However, what is really shocking is that a Sunnī scholar like al-Muqrīzī⁵ is deluded by these claims and assumptions and authors a book in which he gathers all the

1 *Aṣl al-Shī'ah wa Uṣūluhā* p. 46.

2 *Jihād al-Imām al-Sajjād* p. 63.

3 Ṣadr al-Dīn Sharaf al-Dīn: *Hāshim wa Umayyah* and Ḥusayn al-Shākirī: *Hāshim wa 'Abd Shams*.

4 *Hāshim wa 'Abd al-Shams* p. 118.

5 Aḥmad ibn 'Alī ibn 'Abd al-Qādir al-Ba'ālī. A scholar who had fair share in many sciences but was specifically known for his expertise in history. He was known as Ibn al-Muqrīzī, an attribution to a street in Ba'labak which was known as 'the street of the Maqārizah', where from his grandfather migrated to Egypt. He was born in Cairo in 766 A.H. He was first a Ḥanafī and then became a Shāfi'ī. He passed away in 845 A.H. The following are some of his works: *al-Khuṭaṭ*, *Imtā' al-Asmā'*, *Īqāz al-Ḥunafā' bi Akhbār al-A'immaḥ al-Fāṭimiyiyyīn al-Khulafā'*. See: *al-Ḍaw' al-Lāmi'* 2/21; *Shadharāt al-Dhahab* 7/254; *al-A'lām* 1/177.

Note: In my view al-Muqrīzī had slight leanings toward Shī'ism. This I say for the following reasons:

Firstly, he authored books regarding the virtues of the Ahl al-Bayt in which he gathered all sorts of authentic, weak and even fabricated narrations without any scrutiny, like the books *Faḍl 'Āl al-Bayt* and *al-Nizā' wa al-Takhāṣum*.

continued ...

narrations in this regard without scrutiny and names it *al-Nizā' wa al-Takhāṣum Fīmā Bayn Umayyah wa Banī Hāshim*.

Those who aver that the clash between the Banū Hāshim and the Banū Umayyah endured tried to explain everything that had transpired, from the opposition of the Umayyads to 'Alī عليه السلام and their rebellion against him, to all the suffering the 'Alawīs suffered at their hands; in light of this supposed clash.¹

But their analysis is not correct for the following reasons:

Firstly, this analysis undermines the various causes which contributed to the instigation of this clash, especially the political cause.

Secondly, it necessitates the impugning of the Banū Umayyah in general, i.e. whether they were from the people who accepted Islam at the conquest of Makkah or before that. Whereas amongst them there were great Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم who were known for their sound Islam according to all.² Sufficient to establish their virtue is the fact that Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم got his daughters married to them and married in them. Also, it was from their tribe that Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم had appointed the most people to prominent positions; had they been insincere in their faith,

continued from page 181

Secondly, his disillusionment with Abū Sufyān رضي الله عنه and deeming him a hypocrite, as is clear in his book *al-Nizā' wa al-Takhāṣum*. Some researchers are, however, of the opinion that this book is falsely attributed to al-Muqrīzī and this opinion is forged against him. See: *Abāṭil Yajib an Tumḥā min al-Tārikh* p. 209.

Thirdly, he has approved the lineage of the Fatimids which according to the quasi unanimity of the scholars and genealogists is not true. Likewise his book *Itti'āz al-Ḥunafā' bi Akhbār al-Fāṭimiyyīn al-Khulafā'* is also an indication of this.

Here also, however, it should be noted that he considered his lineage to be linked with the 'Ubaydiyyīn. So was his praise for them and his approval of their lineage because of this or not? See: *al-Ḍaw' al-Lāmi'* 2/23.

1 *Sharḥ Iḥqāq al-Ḥaqq* 23/644.

2 *Majmū' Fatāwā Shaikh al-Islām* 35/64.

he would never have confided in them at a time when Allah ﷻ had granted glory to his Dīn and his Rasūl.¹

In reality, returning everything that had happened to the Banū Hāshim to this clash is not only impugning the Banū Umayyah but entails impugning Islam as well. Because it entails that Islam had no effect in transforming the lives of those who embraced it, especially the Muslims of the Conquest of Makkah who are portrayed as if they did not accept Islam but due to the fear of the sword; and who are depicted as though they attacked Islam when they found the time opportune.

Thirdly, the Banū Umayyah had already earned acclaim when one of their members, ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه assumed the Khilāfah. So why would they feel inferior or why would they deem the Banū Hāshim to be better if they surpassed them in obtaining the Khilāfah.

Fourthly, if the only reason for fighting ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and opposing him was the fear of the Banū Umayyah that the Banū Hāshim will surpass them in status due to collectively enjoying both Nubuwwah and Khilāfah, then why was Abū Sufyān ibn Ḥarb so keen on pledging his allegiance to ‘Alī رضي الله عنه rather than Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه?² Did he not know that doing so would very quickly grant the Banū Hāshim both the honours?

Furthermore, if the competition was the only cause of the clash between the Banū Hāshim and the Banū Umayyah, then why did Ṭalḥah, Zubayr, and ‘Ā’ishah رضي الله عنهم, who were not Umayyads and had no relationship with any of the two tribes, fight him.

Fifthly, it is a complete misreading of history because history bears that the Banū Hāshim and the Banū Umayyah both held common positions regarding the acceptance and the rejection of the prophethood of Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم.

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 4/460.

2 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 2/237; *al-Māwardī: al-Ḥāwī al-Kabīr* 14/99; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 2/189.

As for after their acceptance of Islam, everyone who has common sense and knows even a little of the history of both people will know that they were very united in the time of Nabī ﷺ, Abū Bakr, and ‘Umar رضي الله عنهما.¹

‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Mu‘allimī² has made this fact very clear in his following statement:

شمل الإسلام الفريقين ظاهرا وباطنا، وكما أسلم قديما جماعة من بني هاشم فكذلك من بني أمية كابني سعيد بن العاص وعثمان بن عفان وأبي حذيفة، وكما تأخر إسلام جماعة من بني أمية فكذلك من بني هاشم، وكما عاداه بعض بني أمية فكذلك بعض بني هاشم كأبي لهب بن عبد المطلب وأبي سفيان بن الحارث بن عبد المطلب، ونزل القرآن بدم أبي لهب ولا نعلمه نزل في ذم أموي معين، وتزوج النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم بنت أبي سفيان بن حرب الأموي ولم يتزوج هاشمية، وزوج إحدى بناته في بني هاشم وزوج ثلاثا في بني أمية، فلم يبق في الإسلام في أحد الطرفين حتى يحتفل أن يستمر هدفا لكرهية الجانب الآخر، بل ألف الله بين قلوبهم فأصبحوا بنعمته إخوانا.

Islam included both tribes internally and externally. Hence just as a group of the Banū Hāshim accepted Islam at a very early stage, likewise did a group of the Banū Umayyah accept Islam at a very early stage, like the two sons of Sa‘īd ibn al-‘Āṣ, ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān, and Abū Ḥudhayfah. Similarly, just as a group of the Banū Umayyah only entered the fold of Islam much later, so too was there a group of the Banū Hāshim who embraced Islam much later.³ Also, just as some of the Banū Umayyah opposed him, so did some of the Banū Hāshim like Abū Lahb ibn ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib and Abū Sufyān ibn al-Ḥārith oppose him. Furthermore, the Qur’ān was revealed condemning Abū Lahab and we do not know of any section of the Qur’ān being revealed condemning a specific individual of the Banū Umayyah;

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 6/168.

2 ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Yaḥyā ibn ‘Alī al-Mu‘allimī. An expert ḥadīth scholar. He was born in 1313 A.H. in village a Yemen. He was appointed as a judge in Jāzān for Idrīsī. Thereafter he travelled to India and worked on correcting manuscripts of ḥadīth in the *Dā‘irah al-Ma‘ārif al-‘Uthmāniyyah*. He thereafter went to Makkah and settled as the trustee of the library of the Ḥaram. He passed away in 1386 A.H. Some of his works are: *al-Tankīl*, *al-Anwār al-Kāshifah*, *Ighāthah al-‘Ulamā’*. See: the introduction of *al-Tankīl* 1/9 which is written by ‘Abd Allah al-Mu‘allimī.

3 Actually most of them, as is stated by Ibn Taymiyyah in *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/398.

Nabī ﷺ married the daughter of Abū Sufyān ibn Ḥarb and did not marry a Hāshimiyah; He married only one of his daughters in the Banū Hāshim and three of them in the Banū Umayyah. As a result Islam did not exclusively remain on either side so that the other remains a target of hatred. Rather Allah ﷻ united their hearts and by his favour they became brothers.¹

The Second Cause: Killing of fathers and relatives

This is from two angles:

1. ‘Alī ﷺ killing their forefathers in Badr

A group of Twelver scholars, many of the Zaydiyyah² and some contemporary scholars have averred that the hatred of most of the Umayyads for ‘Alī ﷺ³ did not take root after the murder of ‘Uthmān ﷺ specifically. Their hatred for him is rather linked to the many battles that ensued between Nabī ﷺ and the polytheists of Makkah, like the battle of Badr, in which ‘Alī ﷺ managed to kill some of their forefathers and relatives. They go on to narrate that Mu‘āwiyah ﷺ said the following to his people on the day of Ṣiffīn:

ما من أحد إلا وقد قتل علي أباه أو أخاه أو ولده

There is not anyone but that ‘Alī has killed his father, brother, or son.⁴

These killings had allegedly left them disillusioned and upset with him, but they were unable to express that previously. Then, as soon as ‘Uthmān ﷺ was martyred they found the time opportune to seek revenge from

1 *Al-Anwār al-Kāshifah* 169, 270.

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyah* 6/331.

3 The Twelvers add that most of the people of the Quraysh and those besides them hated him due to him killing their children, their brothers, and their relatives. See: *Sharḥ Iḥqāq al-Ḥaqq* 7/400, 416.

4 *Al-Ḥā’irī: Shajarah Ṭūbā* 2/333.

‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and settle their long-harboured hatred under the pretext of seeking revenge for the murder of ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

So for example, Professor Hishām Ja‘ayṭ is of the view that the Umayyads did not love ‘Alī because he killed a number of the seniors of the Quraysh with his hands, amongst them was the brother of Mu‘āwiyah and his grandfather. They would thus exude hatred for him.¹

But this view is incorrect. After the advent of Islam the tendencies of revenge were abolished and thus there remained no room for them in the Muslim life. Reality is the greatest attestation to this, for none of these people are known to have intended harming ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in any way. Even the aversion that some of the Quraysh displayed, of which ‘Abbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ complained to Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, was directed at the Banū Hāshim in general, not ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ specifically.

In fact, the diametrically opposite happened:

أكثر بني عبد مناف من بني أمية وبني هاشم وغيرهم لهم ميل قوي إلى علي بن أبي طالب يختارون ولايته

Most of the decedents of ‘Abd Manāf from the Banū Umayyah and the Banū Hāshim, amongst others, were very strongly inclined to ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālīb and gave preference to his leadership.²

Thus, Abū Sufyān Ṣakhr ibn Ḥarb, who was the head of the Banū Umayyah at that time, was amongst those who desired that a descendent of ‘Abd Manāf assume leadership, whether he be a Hāshimī or an Umawī, and despised the leadership of a Taymī due to the tribal fanaticism which was entrenched in them.³ He thus said to ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ:

1 *Kitāb al-Fitnah* p. 181.

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 7/49.

3 *Al-Fiṣal fi al-Milal wa al-Ahwā’ wa al-Niḥal* 4/82; *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 1/519, 2/54, 4/360.

ما بال هذا الأمر في أقل قريش قلة وأذلها ذلا (يعني أبا بكر) والله لئن شئت لأملأنها عليه خيلا ورجالا

Why is this matter in the least of the Quraysh in number and the most insignificant of them in status (referring to Abū Bakr)? By Allah if you want I will fill Madīnah with horses and men against him.¹

He then said:

أبا حسن، ابسط يدك حتى أبايعك

Spread your hand so that I may pledge my allegiance.

But ‘Alī رضي الله عنه refused.²

Furthermore, here we have before us all the books of history which, despite the divergent leanings of its writers and their disparate tendencies, have documented a plethora of details regarding the rulers of the Banū Umayyah, their gatherings, and their personal lives. But not one of them has reported any report which suggests that any of them would eulogise any of his forefathers who were killed in Badr or elsewhere, let alone displaying grief upon what befell them, with the exception of what is narrated regarding Yazīd (which we will discuss in the pages to come, Allah willing).

What makes the matter even clearer is that:

‘Alī did not exclusively kill some of the disbelievers,³ rather there were many Muslims who killed with him. So why would he alone be made a victim of hatred, to the exclusion of everyone else who was involved, when the ‘crime’ is one?

1 *Mustadrak Ḥākim*: chapter regarding knowing the Ṣaḥābah: sub-chapter regarding Abū Bakr ibn Abī Quḥāfah: ḥadīth no. 4462. Al-Dhahabī has deemed the narration authentic in *Tārīkh al-Khulafā’* p. 68.

2 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 2/237; *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawīyyah* 7/457.

3 See *al-Fiṣal fī al-Milal wa al-Niḥāl* 4/82 to discover the amount of people ‘Alī رضي الله عنه killed from the Quraysh.

Likewise it is not known that the Banū Umayyah sought revenge from their descendants due to the killings their fathers had committed after having grounded themselves in power and having full authority to do so.

Similarly, ‘Umar رضي الله عنه was very stern against all the polytheists; there was no one who denigrated them and offended them as boldly as ‘Umar رضي الله عنه, not forgetting him fighting them with his sword. So why did they not do anything to him when he assumed leadership and why did they instead listen and obey? And why would they thereafter then rebel against ‘Alī رضي الله عنه who was a Hāshimī, considering that the Banū Hāshim were higher in rank than the Banū ‘Adī?’¹

Furthermore, how foolish would it be for them to wait for him to become the Khalīfah and earn the support of the people and their loyalty and then rise to seek revenge from him, and prior to that do nothing to him during the time of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه when most authority was with them?

Moving on, many of the people who fought ‘Alī رضي الله عنه were not descendants of those who ‘Alī رضي الله عنه had killed, like the people of Syria and the other partisans of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه.² So why is this claim being made regarding the Banū Umayyah specifically?

Also, ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān,³ and alongside him the Umayyads, fought ‘Abd Allah ibn al-Zubayr very ferociously till eventually the odds turned in their favour. In spite of this no one has claimed that they fought him

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyah* 6/321.

2 *Ibid.* 7/460.

3 ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam al-Umawī, Abū al-Walīd. One of the great rulers of the Banū Umayyah. He was born in Madīnah in 26 A.H. He ranked amongst the jurists of Madīnah and their scholars before he assumed leadership. He was known for his strategizing and intelligence and excessive shedding of blood. After seven years of conflict people united upon him. He passed away in Damascus in 86 A.H. al-Bukhārī has narrated his narrations in *al-Adab al-Mufrad*. See: *al-Thiqāt* 5/119; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 37/116; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 4/246; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 6/373.

in order to take revenge from his father Zubayr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ who fought the disbelievers of Makkah, amongst who many were Umayyads, alongside Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Instead the rationale given is that they fought for worldly authority, as is stated by Abū Barzah al-Aslamī.¹

2. The fate their forefathers met at the hands of Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ

The Shī'ah continuously claim that the Umayyads did not enter Islam sincerely and that they hated it and were enemies of it internally. They claim that the fate their forefathers met at the hands of Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ left indelible grudges in their hearts and induced them to hate him, 'Alī, and the their household. But they were unable to do anything during his era and the eras of his Khulafā' and thus only initiated their uproar during the era of 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ by making the people revolt against him.

They go on to say that the martyrdom of Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in Karbalā' during the reign of Yazīd ibn Mu'āwiyah was nothing but revenge against Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and avenging the murder of those of his forefathers who were killed in Badr and other battles.²

In response, even though previously we had stated the effects of wars and the enmity it brings about, but that does not necessitate that every incident be analysed in light thereof and that it be the basis for any event whatsoever it maybe, unless there is compelling evidence to suggest that.

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* 6/2603; *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawīyyah* 5/153; *al-Iṣābah fī Tamyīz al-Ṣaḥābah* 6/434.

2 *Sharḥ Minhāj al-Karāmah* p. 545.

The Third Discussion

The Loci of Naṣb

Usually people prefer to settle in places where they know their needs will be secured, whether those needs are financial, social, religious or otherwise.

This, over the passage of time, plays a role in the people of a particular society assimilating and developing shared interests which they all agree upon and distinctions which distinguish them from all else, as the proverb goes ‘people are naturally inclined toward sameness and similarity’.

Thus, for example, Kūfah was infamous for being the hub of Shī‘ism, to the extent that Ma‘mar ibn Rāshid¹ would say:

عجبت من أهل الكوفة كأن الكوفة إنما بنيت على حب علي، ما كلمت أحدا منهم إلا وجدت المقتصد
منهم الذي يفضل عليا على أبي بكر وعمر

I am amazed at the people of Kūfah. It is as if Kūfah was established upon the love of ‘Alī. I have not spoken to any of them but I have found that their moderate people give preference to ‘Alī over Abū Bakr and ‘Umar.²

Hence it is recorded that only two people specifically went against the norm of Kūfah and gave preference to ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه over ‘Alī رضي الله عنه.³ Likewise it was

1 Ma‘mar ibn Rāshid al-Azdī, their client, Abū ‘Urwah al-Baṣrī. He eventually settled in Yemen. He was one of the prominent reliable scholars. He was born in 95 A.H. and was one of the vessels of knowledge. He was a truthful person and was an ascetic and pious man. He has made mistakes which have been overlooked due to his immense transmissions which he overall mastered and perfected. He passed away in 153 A.H. His narrations appear in the six canonical works. See: *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 28/303; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 7/5; *Mizān al-‘Itidāl* 6/480; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 10/218.

2 *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 42/530; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 8/11.

3 They are Ṭalḥah ibn Muṣarrif and ‘Abd Allāh ibn Idrīs. See: *al-Sunnah* of al-Khallāl: 2/395; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 9/438.

completely normal when referring to someone who was a Shī'ī as one who held 'the Kūfī dogma'.¹

Similar was the situation of Baṣrah which had become popular for being the birth place of the innovation of *Qadr* (the denial of pre-destiny).² It was in fact the hub of *Qadr*, adopting which was a fitnah which had gripped the people of Baṣrah.³

As for Shām, it was the epicentre of Naṣb, as will be discussed ahead.

When Naṣb came about, there were several factors which contributed to it prevailing amongst the people. Its spread across different was linked to the strength of these factors or their weakness. Thus as a result, some places unanimously accepted Naṣb, whereas in other areas it was only embraced by a few individuals or small groups.

Several scholars have alluded to the proliferation of Naṣb in certain areas to an extent that only a handful of people were free from it. Al-Ruhani⁴ says the following when enumerating the virtues of Sijistān:⁵

وأجل من هذا كله أنه لعن علي بن أبي طالب رضي الله عنه على منابر الشرق والغرب ولم يلعن على منبرها إلا مرة، وامتنعوا على بني أمية حتى زادوا في عهدهم إلا يلعن على منبرهم أحد... وأي شرف

1 *Mīzān al-I'tidāl* 2/426.

2 *Bayān Talbīs al-Jahmiyyah* 1/274; *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi'iyyah* 2/231.

3 *Mīzān al-I'tidāl* 5/114.

4 Muḥammad ibn Baḥr al-Shaybānī, Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Ruhānī. An expert genealogist and historian who was well versed in jurisprudence and who authored many books. Ruhnah is one of the villages of Kirmān. He would revise eight hundred thousand narrations, but was infamous for paying special attention to strange ones. Some have described him as a fanatic Shī'ī. He passed away after 408 A.H. See: *Mu'jam al-Udabā'* 5/236; *Mu'jam al-Buldān* 3/108; *Nawābiḡh al-Ruwāt fī Rābi'ah al-Mi'āt* 1/248.

5 Sijistān: situated north of Hirāt and between them is a distance of ten days. Its land is described as being sandy and rocky and as always having strong winds and storms. See: *Mu'jam al-Buldān* 3/19; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 13/220; *Umdah al-Qārī* 24/224. Sijistān today is situated on the west of Afghanistan and the east side of Iran. This area of Iran currently is known as Sistan.

أعظم من امتناعهم من لعن أخي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم على منبرهم، وهو يلعن على منابر
الحرمين مكة والمدينة

Greater than all of this is that 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib was being cursed upon the pulpits of the east and the west but he was not cursed upon its pulpit except once. They refused to pledge their allegiance to the Banū Umayyah unless they assured them that no one will be cursed upon their pulpit. Can there be any accolade greater than them refusing to curse the brother of Rasūl Allah ﷺ upon their pulpit when at that time he was being cursed upon the pulpits of Makkah and Madīnah.¹

Even though this statement is not free of exaggeration, as is apparent; however, the spread of Naṣb to various places is a fact that cannot be denied. Also, the fact that only 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was cursed and that they added to their pact that he will not be cursed on their pulpits suggests that cursing him was promoted by the ruling empire.

However, it should also be clear that there is a very big difference between what the ruling empire promotes and what the general subjects do, for there is no relation of necessity between the two; even though the influence yielded by the empire cannot be denied.

Nonetheless, we will analyse the loci of Naṣb according to the following method:

First of all, I have relied purely upon the sources of the Ahl al-Sunnah in identifying and expounding upon the areas of Naṣb, and not upon the sources of the Imāmī Shī'ah. This is because the latter has extended the definition of Naṣb to include anyone who is not an Imāmī, even if he be a Shī'ī, let alone him being from the Ahl al-Sunnah; hence according to them all the lands of the Ahl al-Sunnah are lands of Naṣb. A person who studies their literature will be appalled at the

1 *Mu'jam al-Buldān* 3/191.

accusations he will come across, for not even Makkah and Madīnah, the two most sacred lands of the Muslims, have been spared.¹

Secondly, the discussion will include everyone upon who the definition of Naṣb fits. It is well-known that the Nawāṣib are not all of the same level in their Naṣb. Hence the Khawārij are the most staunch amongst them, and besides them there are other groups who hold variant views and positions regarding ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ with the common factor in all of them being the non-excommunication of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

Thirdly, what is intended by the loci of Naṣb is areas which the Nawāṣib made their base and wherein they openly proclaimed their Naṣb, irrespective of whether they were alone or not, and whether they inhabit them today or not.

As for areas besides the aforementioned, like places which they made their military base² or where they fought battles³ and which they took control of for a

1 Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm al-Nu‘mānī quotes the following narration on p. 309 of his book *al-Ghaybah*:

ثلاث عشرة مدينة وطائفة يجارب القائم أهلها ويجاربونه: أهل مكة، وأهل المدينة، وأهل الشام، وبنو أمية، وأهل البصرة، وأهل دست ميسان، والأكراد، والأعراب، وصبية، وغنى، وباهلة، والأزد، وأهل الري.

Thirteen cities and groups will fight the Mahdī and he will fight them: the people of Makkah, the people of Madīnah, the people of Shām, the Banū Umayyah, the people of Basrah, the people of Dast Mīsān, the Kurds, the Bedouins, Ḍabbah, Ghinā, Bāhilah, Azd, and the people of Ray.

Similarly, Abū Ja‘far al-Iskāfī states the following, as appears in the *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah* of Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd 4/103:

كان أهل البصرة كلهم يبغضونه، وكثير من أهل اكوفة، وكثير من أهل المدينة. وأما أهل مكة فكلهم كانوا يبغضونه قاطبة

All the people of Baṣrah hated him. Likewise many of the people of Kūfah and many of the people of Madīnah. As for the people of Makkah, they all hated him.

Furthermore, the Shī‘ah have considered the following places to be the loci of Naṣb: Aṣfahān, Khawārizm, Sijistān, Qazwīn, Ray, Shanshat, Andalus, Shām, Ḥarrān, Dimashq, Ḥimṣ, Mawṣil and Wāsiṭ. See: al-Mu‘allim: *al-Naṣb wa al-Nawāṣib* p. 229-243.

2 Like the valley of Āl al-Akhnas which is known as the valley of the Khawārij due to Najdah al-Ḥarūrī basing himself there the year he performed Ḥajj. See: *Akhbār Makkah* of al-Azraqī 2/287.

3 Like Salā, Sillabrī, Kāzar, Khūzistān Fāris, and Karnabā. See: *Mu‘jam al-Buldān* 3/232, 4/429, 438, 457.

short period,¹ or to which some of them fled,² there is no real reason to mention them.

These loci can be categorised into two categories:

The first category: Areas where the excommunicating Nawāṣib existed, i.e. the Khawārij

The Khawārij in the East

- Iraq

It is fact that the Khawārij first emerged in Iraq³ when they rebelled against Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī عليه السلام after the famous incident of arbitration. Therefrom they spread to many areas according to impending situations and due to their strength or weakness.⁴

After the Umayyad dynasty cracked down on them, many of them were forced to flee from Iraq and search for other locations which would guarantee more safety for them and a better environment to propagate their views.⁵ Their history is one filled with great events for whose documentation many books have been dedicated.⁶

Even though in the west the only groups of the Khawārij that existed were the Ibāḍiyyah and the Ṣufriyyah, but in the east there were many more groups which continued to sub-divide into more groups.⁷

1 Like Kirmān and Mawṣil. See: *al-Muntaẓam* 6/193, *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 4/181, 5/257.

2 Like Sadhūr, a place to which the Khawārij resorted under the leadership of 'Ubaydah ibn Hilāl after the death of Qaṭārī ibn al-Fujā'ah in Ṭabrustān. Sufyān had subsequently besieged them there till he eventually managed to banish them. See: *Mu'jam al-Buldān* 3/202.

3 *Faḥ al-Bārī* 13/536.

4 *Al-Bad' wa al-Tārīkh* 6/27.

5 *Al-Firaq al-Islāmiyyah fī al-Shimāl al-Afrīqī* p. 144.

6 Like the book *Akhbār al-Khawārij* of al-Mas'ūdī and *Tārīkh al-Khawārij* of Muḥammad ibn Qudāmah. See: *Kashf al-Ẓunūn* 1/26, 1/293.

7 *Tārīkh al-Ya'qūbī* 2/339.

- **Kūfah and Baṣrah**

Although the Khawārij had a presence there for a while,¹ they did not remain there for long. With the Umayyads killing, imprisoning, and banishing them, they encountered overwhelming pressure, and were thus compelled to flee to various places. Hence, for example, during the reign of Ziyād ibn Abīhi² and his son ‘Ubayd Allah ibn Ziyād³ thirteen thousand of them were killed in Kūfah and Baṣrah. Likewise during the time of ‘Ubayd Allah ibn Ziyād alone four thousand of them were imprisoned.⁴

However, these pressures did not deter them, for whenever they would find a chance they would launch their attack.⁵

- **‘Ummān (Oman)**

In ‘Ummān the Khawārij were found at a very early stage, the exact time of their arrival there, however, is unknown. It is alleged that the first people to introduce this dogma to ‘Ummān were some of the survivors of the

1 *Al-Ma‘rifah wa al-Tārīkh* 3/81; *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 17/359.

2 Ziyād ibn ‘Ubayd al-Thaqafi. The governor of Iraq who was known as Ziyād ibn Abīhi or Ziyād ibn Sufyān or Ziyād ibn Abī Sufyān. He was born in the year of Hijrah. He accepted Islam during the era of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه and was a genius and master mind. ‘Alī رضي الله عنه used him and thereafter Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه. He earned acclaim for his prolific oratory and for his sternness against those who opposed him. He passed away in 53 A.H. in a plague. See: *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 19/162; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 3/494; *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 15/6; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 8/61.

3 ‘Ubayd Allah ibn Ziyād al-Thaqafi. The governor of Iraq after his father. He was born in 39 A.H. and his mother was from the daughters of the Persian kings. He took charge of Baṣrah at the age of twenty two and was intimidating. He dared to do things which were not permissible, like his order to summon Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه before him, even if they were forced to murder him whilst intercepting him. He was killed in 67 A.H. See: *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 19/162; *Tārīkh al-Islām* 5/175; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 3/545; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 8/283.

4 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 3/375; *Tārīkh al-Ya‘qūbī* 2/275; *Simṭ al-Nujūm al-‘Awālī* 3/220.

5 *Tārīkh al-Ya‘qūbī* 2/264.

battle of Nahrawān, just as it is alleged that Naṣb entered these lands with two men, one of who was Ibn Ibād.¹

Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī² has made mention of their presence there, he states:

أكثر أهلها في أيامنا خوارج إباضية، ليس بها من غير هذا المذهب إلا طارئ غريب وهم لا يخفون ذلك

Most of its people in our days are Khawārij belonging to the Ibādī sect. Besides this sect there is not anyone belonging to any other sect with the exception of a temporary traveller. And they do not conceal that.³

This is also recorded by Ibn al-Jawzī⁴ and Ibn al-Athīr.⁵

Likewise:

1 *Al-Khawārij Tārīkhuhum wa Ārā'uhum al-I'tiqādiyyah* p. 163; *al-Ḥarakah al-Ibādiyyah fī al-Mashriq al-'Arabī* p. 152. 'Abd Allāh ibn Ibād al-Maqā'isī al-Murrī al-Tamīmī. The eponym of the Ibādiyyah and their leader. Historians have differed as to his life and the year of his demise. He had, as is alleged, repented from his innovation and thus his followers disassociated from him, but their attribution to him still remained. He died in the era of 'Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān. See: *Lisān al-Mīzān* 3/248; *'Umdah al-Qārī* 24/85; al-Zarkalī: *al-A'lām* 4/61.

2 Yāqūt ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Rūmī. A grammarian and historian. He was born in the lands of Rome in 575 A.H. He would earn a living by writing manuscripts. He was very ambitious in acquiring information. He eventually settled in Ḥalab. He passed away in 621 A.H. Some of his books are: *Mu'jam al-Buldān*, *Mu'jam al-Udabā'*, *al-Mushtarak Waḍ'an al-Mukhtalif Ṣiq'an*. See: *Wafayāt al-A'yān* 6/127; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 22/312; *Shadharāt al-Dhahab* 5/121.

3 *Mu'jam al-Buldān* 4/150.

4 *Al-Muntaẓam* 7/324. Ibn al-Jawzī is 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn 'Alī ibn Muḥammad al-Qurashī, Abū al-Faraj al-Baghdādī. A Ḥanbalī jurist who was an expert in many sciences. His lineage ends at Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رضي الله عنه. He was born in 510 A.H. He became very popular for his oratory skills and his immense influence on the people, to the extent that he was invited to the court of the Khalīfah al-Mustaḍī a few times. He has authored many books. He passed away in 597 A.H. Some of his works are: *Zād al-Masīr*, *al-Muntaẓam*, and *al-'Ilal al-Mutanāhiyah*. See: *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 21/365; *al-Wafī bi al-Wafayāt* 18/109; *al-Maqṣid al-Arshad* 2/93; *Shadharāt al-Dhahab* 4/329.

5 *Al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 5/93, 185.

وقد قامت للإباضية دولة مستقلة في عمان، وتعاقب على الحكم فيها إلى العصر الحديث أئمة إباضيون

An autonomous dynasty has emerged for the Ibādiyyah in ‘Ummān. Up to the present day Ibādī leaders have successively ruled over it.¹

The early scholars have made specific reference to two cities in ‘Ummān:

- a. **Qalhāt (Qalhat):**² Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī has made mention of it and said:

أهلها كلهم خوارج إباضية إلى هذه الغاية، يتظاهرون بذلك ولا يخفونه

Its people are all Ibādī Khawārij to this extent, they openly proclaim that and do not conceal it.³

- b. **Nazwah (Nizwa):**⁴ it is also mentioned by Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī who says:

فيها قوم من العرب كالمعتكفين عليها، وهم خوارج إباضية

Therein are Arab people who are semi-based there. And they are Ibādī Khawārij.⁵

1 *Al-Mawsū‘ah al-Muyassrah fī al-Adyān wa al-Madhāhib wa al-Aḥzāb al-Mu‘āṣirah* 1/62.

2 Qalhāt: One of the oldest coastal cities of ‘Ummān. It was its capital even before Islam. Its name remains the same up to the present day. See: *Mu‘jam al-Buldān* 4/393.

3 *Mu‘jam al-Buldān* 4/393. However what draws ones attention is the report of Ibn Baṭūṭah, who passed away some time after Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī, wherein he suggests that the Khawārij there would conceal their dogma. This is recorded in his famous *Riḥlah* 1/296, “Most of them are Khawārij, but cannot display their religion due to them being subjects of Quṭb al-Dīn Tamahtun who is from the Ahl al-Sunnah.”

4 A mountain in ‘Ummān which is not coastal. Around it are many villages which are all known by this name. See: *Mu‘jam al-Buldān* 5/281.

5 *Mu‘jam al-Buldān* 5/281.

- **Ḥaḍramawt (Hadhramaut)**¹

Several scholars have alluded to it. Hence al-Mas'ūdī² says the following:

أكثرها إباضية إلى هذا الوقت، وهو سنة اثنتين وثلاثين وثلاثمائة، ولا فرق بينهم وبين من بعمان من الخوارج في هذا المذهب

Most of them are Ibāḍiyyah up to the present day, which is the year three hundred and thirty two. There is no difference between them and the Khawārij of 'Ummān in this dogma.³

Similarly, Ibn Khaldūn has stated that most of them hate 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ due to the incident of arbitration.⁴

- **Al-'Aramah (Al Armah)**⁵

Al-Mubarrid has pointed toward their existence there.⁶

1 Ḥaḍramawt: a very vast stretch of land on the eastern side of 'Adan, situated near the ocean. Around it are many sand dunes which are known as Aḥqāf. In Ḥaḍramawt there are two famous cities: Tarīm and Shiyām. As for in our time, it is situated in Yemen. See: *Mu'jam al-Buldān* 2/270.

2 'Alī ibn Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī al-Mas'ūdī, Abū al-Ḥasan al-Baghdādī. A historian with interesting facts and strange stories. It is said that he was from the progeny of Ibn Mas'ūd. He was born in Iraq and travelled expansively to various places. He thereafter settled in Egypt and passed away there in 345 A.H. Some of his books are: *Akhbār al-Zamān*, *al-Awsaṭ*, *Murūj al-Dhahab*. See: *Mu'jam al-Udabā'* 4/48; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 15/569; *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 21/5; *Lisān al-Mizān* 4/224.

3 *Murūj al-Dhahab* 4/82.

4 *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* 4/287.

5 A mountain series which expands across the eastern side of al-'Āriḍ and shares boundaries with al-Dahnā'. Its eastern side is next to al-Sahbā' and its northern side starts at the Mujazzal Mountain. Up to the present day it holds the same name. See: *Mu'jam al-Buldān* 4/110; al-Aṣḥāhānī: *Bilād al-'Arab* p. 305 (footnote no. 3); *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Akhbār 'Ammā fi Bilād al-'Arab min al-Āthār* 2/87; al-Mubaddil: *al-Muntazahāt al-Barriyyah* p. 13. As for al-Mubarrid, he is Muḥammad ibn Yazīd ibn 'Abd al-Akbar ibn 'Umayr al-Azdī, Abū al-'Abbās al-Thumālī. One of the leading scholars of Baṣrah in language and literature. He became famous by the name al-Mubarrid and was very reliable in what he quoted. He was the rival of Tha'lab who was the leading scholar of Kūfah during the same era. He passed away in 281 A.H. after the age of seventy. Some of his books are: *al-Kāmil*, *al-Muqtaḍab fi al-Naḥw*, *Ma'ānī al-Qur'ān*. See: *Mu'jam al-Udabā'* 5/479; *Wafayāt al-A'yān* 4/313; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 13/576; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 11/79.1

6 *Mu'jam al-Buldān* 4/110.

- **Zanjibār (Zanzibar)**¹

The Ibādī Khawārij existed there. This dogma had entered this area after some people of ‘Ummān migrated to it and increased, to the extent that:

إن قبائل زنجبار فروع من عمان، قل أن توجد قبيلة في عمان إلا وقسم منها في زنجبار

The tribes of Zanjibār are offshoots of ‘Ummān. There is hardly a tribe in ‘Ummān but that a portion of it is based in Zanjibār.²

- **Ardkū**³

Aḥmad ibn Fuḍlān⁴ has made mention of the presence of the Khawārij there in his famous letter:

وبها قرية على يوم، يقال لها: أردكو أهلها يقال لهم: الكردلية، كلامهم أشبه بيفيق الضفدع، وهم يتبرؤون من أمير المؤمنين علي بن أبي طالب في دبر كل صلاة.

In Khawārizm⁵ there is a village till today which is known as Ardkū and its people are known as the Kardaliyyah. Their language is very similar to the

1 Zanjibār refers to a group of islands which are under Tanzania but enjoy independent and autonomous rule. It is made up of two big islands: Zanjibār and Bambā, and twenty seven small islands which are all scattered around Bambā and are about thirty five kilometres away from the eastern African shores.

2 *Is‘āf al-A‘yān fī Ansāb Ahl ‘Ummān*: p. 22.

3 I have not found a detailed description of this place in the books I have at my disposal. However, Ibn Fuḍlān and al-Ḥamawī have mentioned that it is one of the villages of Khawārizm. *Riḥlah Ibn Fuḍlān* 1/113; *Mu‘jam al-Buldān* 2/397.

4 Aḥmad Ibn Fuḍlān ibn al-‘Abbās ibn Rāshid ibn Ḥammād. One of the freed slaves of the Abbasid Khalīfah al-Muqtadir. He earned acclaim because of his famous travels to the lands of the Turks, Khazr (in present day Kazakhstan), Russia and Ṣaqālibah. Al-Muqtadir had sent him to the dynasty of the Ṣaqālibah (which was at the side of the Volga River) with a group of commanders and an army after accepting the request of the Bulgarians of the Volga who had accepted Islam and wanted someone to instruct them in their Dīn. He passed away in 310 A.H. See: *al-A‘lām* 1/195; *Mu‘jam al-Maṭbū‘āt al-‘Arabiyyah* 1/205.

5 Khawārizm is a historical location situated in Transoxiana, in Central Asia, upon the banks of the Amu River. It is presently situated in Turkmenistan and Uzbekistan. Its lands are plain and flat. For more details see: *Mu‘jam mā Ustu‘jīm* 2/515.

croaking of the frogs. After every Ṣalāh they disassociate themselves from Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib.¹

• Sijistān (Sistan)

Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī has made mention of their presence there. He states:

بسجستان كثير من الخوارج يظهرون مذهبهم ولا يتحاشون منه، ويفتخرون به عند المعاملة... وهم يتزيون بغير زي الجمهور، فهم معروفون مشهورون.

In Sijistān there are many Khawārij who openly proclaim their dogma and do not shy away from doing so. They actually boast about it before the common people...They wear an attire other than the attire of the majority, and hence they are well known and famous.²

Likewise Ibn al-Jawzī³ has alluded to their presence therein. And al-Dhahabī and al-Dāwūdī⁴ have also recorded reports which suggests their presence there.⁵

1 *Riḥlah Ibn Fuḍlān* 1/113. *Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī* 2/397 (with reference to *Riḥlah Ibn Fuḍlān*). Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī has many a times cited quotations from the *Riḥlah* of Ibn Fuḍlān and has then at times falsified them, commented disapprovingly regarding them and has deemed them strange. However, here what he has cited is very different to what Ibn Fuḍlān has actually said; Ibn Fuḍlān has mentioned the Khārijī dogma as a feature of Ardkū specifically, whereas Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī has mentioned it as a feature of Khawārizm in general. In addition, Ḥasan al-Amīn, a contemporary Shīṭ scholar, raised questions regarding this quotation and eventually concluded that they were not Khawārij but Nawāṣib from the followers of the Banū Umayyah. See: *Mu'jam al-Buldān* 2/397, 3/79; *Kitāb Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī* p. 67.

2 *Mu'jam al-Buldān* 3/19.

3 *Al-Muntaẓam* 8/164.

4 Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn Aḥmad al-Dāwūdī. A Shāfi'ī ḥadīth scholar (some have suggested that he was Mālikī). He was considered the leading ḥadīth scholar of his time. He was the student of Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī. He passed away in Cairo in 945 A.H. Some of his books are: *Ṭabaqāt al-Mufasssīrīn*, *Dhayl Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi'iyyah*, *Tarjamah al-Ḥāfiẓ al-Suyūṭī*. See: *Shadharāt al-Dhahab* 8/264; *al-A'lām* 6/291; *Mu'jam al-Mu'allifīn* 10/304.

5 *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 9/447; al-Dāwūdī: *Ṭabaqāt al-Mufasssīrīn* p. 30.

- **Karkūyah**¹

Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī has referred to it saying:

وبها بليدة يقال لها كركوية كلهم خوارج، وفيهم الصوم والصلاة والعبادة الزائدة، ولهم فقهاء وعلماء
على حدة

In Sijistān there is a small town called Karkūyah all of whose inhabitants are Khawārij. They observe fasting, ṣalāh and engage in additional worship. They also have scholars and jurists who are unique.

- **Kurink**²

Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī has made mention of it and has stated that all its people are Khawārij.³

- **Quzdār**⁴

Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī has made mention of their presence there.⁵

The Khawārij in the West⁶

The Khawārij spread in the West during some patches of history and settled in some of its cities and villages. When exactly did this dogma infiltrate their circles and how, this is what we will try to discover briefly.

1 Karkūyah: An old town in Sijistān wherein existed a firehouse of the fire worshippers. It was conquered by al-Rabī ibn Ziyād al-Ḥārithī. See: *Futūḥ al-Buldān* 1/385; *Mu'jam al-Buldān* 4/453; *Āthār al-Bilād wa Akhbār al-'Ibād* p. 246.

2 Kurink: A town three *Farsakhs* (14 km) away from Sijistān. See: *Mu'jam al-Buldān* 4/457. Presently it is situated in Iran and still carries the same name.

3 *Mu'jam al-Buldān* 4/457.

4 Quzdār is on one of the sides of Sindh and is also known as Quṣḍār. Between it and Bust is 80 *Farsakhs* (386 km). It was conquered by al-Mundhir ibn al-Jārūd al-'Abdī. See: *Futūḥ al-Buldān* p. 422; *al-Ansāb* 4/493; *Mu'jam al-Buldān* 4/341; *Āthār al-Bilād wa Akhbār al-'Ibād* p. 104.

5 *Mu'jam al-Buldān* 4/341.

6 West here refers to the northern shores of Africa, the entire area beyond Egypt westwards.

Droves of people had accepted Islam after it had reached the west. However, full attention was not paid to instructing them in the Dīn so as to firmly ground it in their hearts. Hence it is not strange to learn that many of the Berber tribes remained confused and hesitant regarding fully accepting it, and thus apostatised, up to twelve times, as is alleged.¹

‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz² had thus tried to remedy this situation and sent ten jurists to the people of the west to instruct them in the Dīn.³ As noble as his endeavour was, it did not produce the desired results due to him passing away before it could fully bear its fruits.

Analysed from another perspective, the Berber Muslims are generally described as ‘the best people in terms of peace and obedience’, but due to their governors ruling exclusively over them and oppressing them their hearts became overwhelmed with hatred for the Khilāfah itself and they began to assume that it does not represent the actual Islam.

At precisely this time the Bid‘ah of the Khawārij began to spread gradually, i.e. during the initial period of the second century of Hijrah, via the Khawārij of Iraq who were fleeing from the Umayyad Empire after having failed to stand their ground against it. These people did not fall short of exploiting the recent and fairly new Islam of these people to spread their dogma within them.

As a result, the actual emergence of the Khawārij to the surface collectively was in the year 123 A.H.⁴

1 *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* 6/144; *Muqaddamah Ibn Khaldūn* p. 164; *al-Istiqṣā li Akhbār Duwal al-Maghrib al-Aqṣā* 1/156.

2 ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz ibn Marwān al-Umawī, Abū Ḥafṣ al-Madanī al-Dimashqī. The rightly guided Khalīfah. He was born in 61 A.H. He was appointed as the Khalīfah by his cousin Sulaymān ibn ‘Abd al-Malik. His conduct and mannerisms were similar to those of his grandfather ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb رضي الله عنه. Unfortunately he was not blessed with a long period of rulership. He passed away in Dayr Sam‘ān in 101 A.H. His narrations are narrated in the six books. *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 45/126; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 21/432; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 5/114; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/192.

3 *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 1/424, 2/68, 6/74, 153; *al-Istiqṣā li Akhbār Duwal al-Maghrib al-Aqṣā* 1/157.

4 *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* 3/213.

There were two primary reasons which had paved the way for the Berbers to accept the Khārijī propaganda:

Firstly, the suppression they were encountering from the Umayyad Empire and the oppression they were suffering from some of its governors.¹ This was in spite of their recent Islam and their ignorance regarding its tenets. Hence the more appropriate approach toward them should have been winning their hearts by being good to them and dealing with them with kindness.

In this environment they became exposed to the propaganda of the Khawārij which entailed the importance of justice without any distinction between Arab and Non-Arab, and that the Khilāfah is not necessarily confined to the Quraysh; rather any person who is most fearing of Allah **سُبْحَانَكَ وَبِحَمْدِكَ** is deserving of it even if he be an Abyssinian slave. These ideas touched these weak hearts and influenced them very heavily.

Secondly, they observed how passionately the Khawārij were immersed in worship and how greatly disinclined they were from this world and how firmly grounded they were in the Dīn. This gave them the impression that the Dīn of the Khawārij is the actual Dīn, not the oppression and suppression they were suffering at the hands of their rulers.

Hence in the years to follow the dogma of the Khawārij spread profusely in the west² and it gained a lot of prominence and strength.

In order to get an idea of the extent to which their influence had reached it is enough to note that in some of their battles they had reached four hundred thousand.³ Likewise, the battles that had ensued between them and the Arabs

1 Ibid. 4/241; *al-Istiḳṣā li Akhbār Duwal al-Maghrib al-Aqṣā* 1/162.

2 *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 18/429; *al-'Ibar fī Akhbār Man Ghabar* 1/219; *al-Istiḳṣā li Akhbār Duwal al-Maghrib al-Aqṣā* 1/186.

3 *Al-Bad' wa al-Tārīkh* 6/87; *al-Muntaẓam* 8/166; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 15/156.

after they had revolted against ‘Umar ibn Ḥaḥḥ reached three hundred and seventy five battles.¹ They were thus successful in overthrowing the governors of the Khilāfah and establishing an autonomous dynasty for themselves.²

The Khawārij in the West were either Ibāḍiyyah or Ṣufriyyah.³

And in the West two Khārijī dynasties came about:⁴

1. The Midrāriyyah dynasty, which was Ṣufriyyah.⁵
2. The Rustumiyyah dynasty, which was Ibāḍiyyah.⁶

1 *Al-Istiḡṣā li Akhbār Duwal al-Maghrib al-Aqṣā* 1/188. ‘Umar ibn Ḥaḥḥ ibn ‘Uthmān al-Azdī, Abū Ja‘far. From the progeny of Qabīṣah ibn Abī Ṣufrah, the brother of Muhallab. Abū Ja‘far al-Manṣūr had appointed him over Africa in 150 A.H after dismissing him from Sindh. He became occupied with fighting the Khawārij and thus managed to rule for only three years. Thereafter they united against him and defeated him and killed him in mid Dhū al-Ḥijjah in 154 A.H. See: *Al-Bad’ wa al-Tārīkh* 6/87; *al-Muntazam* 8/166; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 5/195; *al-Istiḡṣā li Akhbār Duwal al-Maghrib al-Aqṣā* 1/186.

2 *Al-Istiḡṣā li Akhbār Duwal al-Maghrib al-Aqṣā* 1/184.

3 *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 15/153; *Al-Istiḡṣā li Akhbār Duwal al-Maghrib al-Aqṣā* 1/164.

4 For details regarding these two dynasties see: *Al-Istiḡṣā li Akhbār Duwal al-Maghrib al-Aqṣā* 1/179.

5 The Ṣufriyyah: one of the sub-sects of the Khawārij which is attributed to Ziyād ibn al-Aṣfar. The following are some of their beliefs: Every major sin constitutes disbelief and every disbelief equates to Shirk. They would not approve of killing the women and children of the opposition, nor would they excommunicate those who did not participate in warfare as long as they agreed with them in belief. Likewise they did not do away with the capital punishment of lapidation and at times have allowed the practice of Taḡiyyah in speech, not in action. See: *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* p. 118; *al-Tanbīh wa al-Radd ‘alā Ahl al-Ahwā’ wa al-Bida’* p. 52; *al-Farq Bayn al-Firaq* p. 70; *al-Mīlāl wa al-Niḥāl* 1/137.

6 The Ibāḍiyyah are also one of the sub-sects of the Khawārij and are attributed to ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ibād. From it many sub-sects have emerged as well. Some of their beliefs are the following: Those who oppose them are disbelievers, in terms of being ungrateful for the bounty Allah; their abode is the abode of Islam with the exception of the military base of their ruler; their testification is acceptable; their blood is inviolable even in secrecy, unless evidence is established against them and they openly proclaim their deviance; it is permissible to marry into them and establish mutual inheritance between the two groups. See: *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* p. 102; *al-Farq Bayn al-Firaq* 82; *al-Tabṣīr fī al-Dīn wa Tamyīz al-Firqaq al-Nājiyyah* p. 58; *al-Mawāqif* 3/693.

However, in a very short time they became extremely weak and their innovations almost vanished in the time of Yazīd ibn Ḥātim¹ who reconquered the West and continuously subdued its people till they became obliging. At the same time he had done away with many of the leaders of the Khawārij.² His brother³ had continued in his footsteps after his demise. Despite all of this, a group of the Khawārij still managed to subsist, but not like before in terms of strength and public appearance.⁴

Ibn Khaldūn says:

ثم لم يزل أمرهم في تناقض إلى أن اضمحلت ديانتهم وافتترقت جماعتهم، وبقيت آثار نحلتهم في أعقاب البربر الذين دانوا بها أول الأمر

Thereafter they continued retrogressing till eventually their dogma faded away and their people became scattered. The effects of their dogma only then remained in the progenies of those Berbers who had initially embraced it.⁵

Now, hereunder I am going to briefly highlight some of the loci of Naṣb in the West, for covering all of them is extremely difficult; especially when considering that Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī has stated that around Sarūs⁶ alone there were more than three villages all of which were Khawārij.⁷

1 Yazīd ibn Ḥātim ibn Qabīṣah al-Azdī. A leader from the children of al-Muhallab ibn Abī Ṣufrah. He was well known for his generosity and bravery and was the governor of Ja'far al-Manṣūr over Egypt for a period of seven years. Thereafter when the problem of the Khawārij intensified in the West, Manṣūr sent him as the governor where he subsequently ruled for fifteen years and three months. He passed away during the era of Hārūn al-Rashīd in 170 A.H. See: *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 8/233; *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 28/48; *Mir'āt al-jinān* 1/361; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/111.

2 *Al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 5/197; *al-'Ibar fī Akhbār man Ghabar* 1/224; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/113; *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* 7/18.

3 Rūḥ Ibn Ḥātim. See: *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 5/282.

4 *Miḍmār al-Khalā'iq* 1/54.

5 *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* 3/213.

6 Sarūs or Sharūs is a great city which is in the centre of the Nafūsah mountain range (which are today known as the Western mountain range). In fact it is the central village therein and is very large and populated. See: *Mu'jam al-Buldān* 3/217; *al-Rawḍ al-Mi'tār fī Khabar al-Aqṭār* p. 216.

7 *Mu'jam al-Buldān* 3/217.

- **Tāhirt (Tiaret)**¹

Al-Maqdisī,² Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī,³ Ibn al-Athīr,⁴ Ibn Khaldūn,⁵ Abū al-‘Abbās al-Nāṣirī⁶ all have alluded to the Khawārij building this city and residing therein.

- **Jabal Nafūṣah (Nafusa Mountains)**⁷

1 Tāhirt is the name of two cities facing one another in the central west (currently in Algeria). The first one is known as the Old Tāhirt, which is beyond our discussion. The second one is the New Tāhirt, which is a city where it frequently rains and is always foggy. It is five miles away from the Old city. It was founded by the Ibādī Khawārij in the West and thereafter became of the capital of the Rustumī dynasty. See: *Mu‘jam al-Buldān* 2/7; *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* 6/147. Now it is known as Tiaret and is 300 km on the southern western side of Algeria.

2 *Al-Bad’ wa al-Tārīkh* 4/73. Maqdisī is Muṭahhar ibn Ṭāhir al-Maqdisī. A historian who hails from Bayt al-Maqdis. He passed away in 355 A.H. See: *al-A‘lām* 7/253; *Mu‘jam al-Mu‘allifīn* 12/294.

3 *Mu‘jam al-Buldān* 2/8.

4 *Al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 6/461. Ibn al-Athīr is ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad al-Shaybānī, Abū al-Hasan al-Jazarī. A Shāfi‘ī ḥadīth expert. He became well-known for his vast knowledge in Arabic literature, history and genealogy. He was born in 555 A.H. He moved from place to place maintaining his grandeur and esteem. He passed away in 630 A.H. Some of his works are: *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh*, *Uṣd al-Ghābah*, *Tahdhīb al-Ansāb*. See: *Wafayāt al-A‘yān* 3/348; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 22/354; *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi‘iyyah al-Kubrā* 8/299; *Shadharāt al-Dhahab* 5/137.

5 *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* 4/51, 6/147, 159.

6 *Al-Istiṣṣā li Akhbār Duwal al-Maghrib al-Aqṣā* 1/184. Al-Nāṣirī is Aḥmad ibn Khālīd ibn Ḥammād al-Nāṣirī, Abū al-‘Abbās al-Salāwī. A great research scholar of the West. He became famous for his work in history. He was born in 1250 A.H. He is from the progeny of Ja‘far عليه السلام. He shifted from position to position in the government and thereafter he went into seclusion in order to complete his works. He passed away in Salā in Morocco in 1315. Some of his works are: *al-Istiṣṣā*, *Zahr al-Afnān min Ḥadīqah ibn al-Wannān*; *Ṭul‘ah al-Mushtarī fī al-Nasab al-Ja‘farī*. See: *Mu‘jam al-Maṭbū‘āt al-‘Arabiyyah* 1/104; *al-A‘lām* 1/120, *Mu‘jam al-Mu‘allifīn* 1/214.

7 This is a range of high mountains in the west. There are many villages in and around it. Between it and Ṭarābulus is a distance of three days, and between it and Qayrawān is a distance of six days. See: *Mu‘jam al-Buldān* 3/217. This mountain now falls part of Libya and is famously known as the western mountain, although the old name still stands.

Al-Idrīsī¹ has made mention of the Khārijī existence there. He says:

وأهل جبل نفوسة كلهم أهل الإسلام، لكنهم خوارج.

The people of the mountain of Nafūsah are all Muslims, but they are Khawārij.²

Ibn ‘Asākir,³ al-Ayyūbī⁴ and others⁵ have also suggested the same.

- **The Island of Jarbah⁶**

Ibn Khaldūn states:

1 Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Idrīsī, Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥusaynī. A historian, geographer, Traveller and expert in literature. He was born in 493 A.H. He grew up and studied in Qurtubah and thereafter travelled to Sicily. He settled there by its ruler Roger the second. He passed away in 560 A.H. Some of his works are: *Nuzhah al-Mushtāq fi Ikhtirāq al-Āfāq, al-Jāmi’ li Ṣifāt Ashtāt al-Nabāt, Rawḍ al-Uns wa Nuzhah al-Nafs*. See: *al-A’lām* 7/24; *Mu’jam al-Mu’allifīn* 11/236.

2 *Nuzhah al-Mushtāq fi Ikhtirāq al-Āfāq* 1/299.

3 *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 26/238. Ibn ‘Asākir is ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Hibat Allah ibn ‘Asākir al-Dimashqī, Abū al-Qāsim. A Shāfi’ī scholar and a great ḥadīth retainer. He was born in 499 A.H. He heard ḥadīth from more than one thousand three hundred scholars. He was very bright, a perfectionist and used to engage in a lot of worship. He was disinclined from positions. He passed away in 571 A.H. Some of his works are: *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq, Tabyīn Kadhib al-Muftarī, Gharā’ib Mālik*. See: *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 20/554; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 12/294; *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi’iyyah al-Kubrā* 7/215; *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi’iyyah* of Ibn Shuhbah 2/13.

4 *Maṣādir al-Ḥaqā’iq wa Sirr al-Khalā’iq* 1/54. Ayyūbī is Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar ibn Shāhanshāh. The governor of Ḥumāt who was accorded the title al-Manṣūr. He was brave, loved scholars and a man who read and researched a lot. He collected innumerable books and more than 200 hundred scholars of various sciences always accompanied him. His dynasty remained for thirty years and he passed away in 617 A.H. Some of his works are: *Miḍmār al-Ḥaqā’iq wa Sirr al-Khalā’iq, Ṭabaqāt al-Shu’arā’*. See: *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 22/146; *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 4/182; *al-Nujūm al-Zāhirah* 6/250; *Shadharāt al-Dhabab* 5/77.

5 *Al-Rawḍ al-Mi’tār fi Khabar al-Aqtār* p. 316.

6 This is an island which is situated between Ṭarābulus and Qābus. It was named after the Berber tribe that populated it. See: *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* 6/161; *Nuzhah al-Mushtāq fi Ikhtirāq al-Āfāq* 1/305.

إن القبائل الذين بها البربر لم يزالوا يدينون لدين الخارجية، ويتدارسون مذاهبهم مجلدات تشتمل على تأليف لائمتهم في قواعد ديانتهم وأصول عقائدهم وفروع مذاهبهم، يتناقلونها ويعكفون على دراستها قراءتها

The tribes which populate it are Berbers. They still follow the dogma of the Khārijīs; they study their dogma and views from volumes of books authored by their scholars elaborating upon the fundamentals of dogma and secondary day to day issues. They impart these books and dedicate their lives to studying them.¹

- **Damar**²

Al-Ayyūbī has made mention of the existence of the Khawārij there.³

- **Ruzayqā**⁴

Al-Ayyūbī has made mention of the Khārijī existence there.⁵

- **Zanzaqā**⁶

Al-Ayyūbī has made mention of the Khārijī presence there.⁷

1 *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* 6/161, also see: 6/447, 543.

2 I have not come across a description of Damar in the references I have at my disposal, but the Damar Mountain is the first range of mountains amongst many which connect each other. It starts from Qābus and Ṭarābulus and ends at Fās and Ṣafāqus in the West. It is as lengthy as seven *Marāḥil* (560 km approx.) and between it and the mountain range of Nafūsah is three *Marāḥil* (150 km approx.). See: *Muʿjam al-Buldān* 1/378, 2/463; *Muʿjam mā Ustuʿjim* 2/556; *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* 6/187; *Nuzhah al-Mushtāq fī Ikhtirāq al-Āfāq* 1/299.

3 *Miḍmār al-Ḥaqāʾiq wa Sirr al-Khalāʾiq* 1/54.

4 I have not come across any definition of this place in the references at my disposal.

5 *Miḍmār al-Ḥaqāʾiq wa Sirr al-Khalāʾiq* 1/54.

6 I have not come across any definition of this place in the references at my disposal.

7 *Miḍmār al-Ḥaqāʾiq wa Sirr al-Khalāʾiq* 1/54.

- **The Zīzwā Island¹**

Al-Idrīsī has made mention of the Khārījī presence there. He says:

هذه الجزيرة عامرة بأهلها، وهم قوم نكار خوارج عن الإسلام... وكذلك جميع الحصون والقصور التي تلي هاتين الجزيرتين يعني جربة وزيزوا يتمذهبون بمثل ذلك.

This island is fully populated and its people are strange and are Khawārij. Likewise all the forts and palaces which are near these two islands, Jarbah and Zīzwā, also subscribe to the same dogma.²

- **Sarūs**

Al-Ḥamawī has indicated that its people are Khawārij. He says:

أهلها إباضية خوارج، ليس بها جامع ولا فيما حولها من القرى

Its people are Ibādī Khawārij. Therein there is no central Masjid, nor in any of its surrounding villages.³

The author of *al-Rawḍ al-Mi'tār* has also suggested the same.⁴

- **Sijilmāsah⁵**

1 A small island adjacent to the Jarbah Island to its east. See: *Nuzhah al-Mushtāq fī Ikhtirāq al-Āfāq* 1/306.

2 *Nuzhah al-Mushtāq fī Ikhtirāq al-Āfāq* 1/306 (with a little of difference).

3 *Mu'jam al-Buldān* 3/316.

4 *Al-Rawḍ al-Mi'tār fī Khabar al-Aqtār* p. 316. Its author is Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abd al-Mun'im ibn 'Abd al-Nūr al-Ḥimyarī, Abū 'Abd Allāh. A jurist, linguistic, geographer and historian from the people of Sabtah. He passed away 727 A.H. some of his works are: *al-Rawḍ al-Mi'tār*. See: *al-A'lām of al-Zarkalī*: 7/53; *Mu'jam al-Mu'allifin* 11/238; the introduction of *al-Rawḍ al-Mi'tār* of Iḥsān 'Abbās.

5 Sijilmāsah: A city which is situated on the western side of the great desert and is currently part of Morocco. Through it passes the valley of Īslī. It was one of the most important cities for commerce in the Islamic era due to caravans passing through it to West Africa. Today it is part of the Rīsānī city and is about 325 km from Fās. See: *Mu'jam al-Buldān* 3/192; *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* 6/147; *al-Istiṣā li Akhbār Duwal al-Maghrib al-Aqṣā* 1/180.

Ibn al-Athīr has made mention of the Khārijī presence there.¹ And Ibn Khaldūn says:

كان أهل مواطن سجلماسة من مكناسة يدينون لأول الإسلام بدين الصفرية من الخوارج

The people of Sijilmāsah who belonged to the Miknāsah tribe subscribed to the Ṣufriyyah branch of the Khawārij.²

Al-Nāṣirī also says:

اجتمعت الصفرية من مكناسة بناحية المغرب الأقصى... واختطوا مدينة سجلماسة سنة أربعين ومائة من الهجرة، ودخل سائر مكناسة من أهل تلك الناحية في دينهم.

The Ṣufriyyah of Miknāsah gathered in the furthest part of the West and planned the city of Sijilmāsah in the year 140 A.H. Thereafter all the people of Miknāsah living in those lands entered into their dogma.³

- **The Ṭarābulus (Tripoli) of the West⁴**

Ibn Khaldūn has referred to their presence there. He says:

وكذلك في جبال طرابلس أثر باق من تلك النحلة

Likewise in the mountains of Ṭarābulus there remains the effects of that dogma.⁵

- **'Arbān⁶**

Al-Ayyūbī has made mention of the Khawārij there.⁷

1 *Al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 5/208, 258.

2 *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* 6/171.

3 *Al-Istiṣā li Akhbār Duwal al-Maghrib al-Aqṣā* 1/180 (with a little difference).

4 A big city which is situated upon the shores of the Mediterranean ocean. It was conquered at the hands of 'Amr ibn al-ʿĀṣ رضي الله عنه in 32 A.H. *Muʿjam al-Buldān* 4/25.

5 The author of *al-Istiṣā* has narrated this from him 1/189; *Muʿjam al-Buldān* 3/55; *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* 4/246, 6/146; *Futūḥ Miṣr wa Akhbāruhā* p. 373.

6 I have not found any reference to it in the books I have at my disposal.

7 *Miḍmār al-Khalāʿiq wa Sīr al-Khalāʿiq* 1/54.

- **Qābis**¹

Ibn al-Athīr² and al-Ayyūbī³ have alluded to the presence of the Khawārij there.

This city is the oldest city in which the Khawārij existed, for they made it their base during the Umayyad Empire; and very frequently wars would break out between them and Hishām ibn ‘Abd al-Malik.⁴

- **Maṭmāṭah**⁵

Al-Ayyūbī has made mention of the Khārijī presence there.⁶

- **Maqrah**⁷

Al-Ayyūbī has made mention of the Khārijī presence there.⁸

1 Qābis is a Tunisian city which is situated at the gulf of Gabès, south of the city of Madiyyah and west of the island of Jarbah. It is approximately 400 km away from the capital of Tunisia. It was conquered with Qayrawān in 72 A.H. See: *Mu‘jam al-Buldān* 4/289; *al-Ansāb* 4/421; *al-Mu‘jab* 1/349.

2 *Al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 4/417, 5/195.

3 *Miḍmār al-Khalā‘iq wa Sīr al-Khalā‘iq* 1/54.

4 *Futūḥ Miṣr wa Akhbārūhā* p. 365; *Nafḥ al-Ṭīb* 3/20. Hishām ibn ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān al-Qurashī, Abū al-Walīd al-Umawī al-Dimashqī. He ascended the throne after his brother Yazīd in 105 A.H. He was very bright and firm in his views, was a man of tolerance and forbearance, and an amasser of wealth and miserly. Likewise he hated to shed blood. He passed away in 125 A.H. See: *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 5/351; *al-‘Ibar fī Khabar man Ghabar* 1/160; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/351; *Shadharāt al-Dhahab* 1/163.

5 A mountainous area which currently is in the south of Tunisia. It was named after one of the Berber tribes which populated it. See: *Mu‘jam al-Buldān* 1/368; al-Kattānī: *Fihris al-Fahāris* 2/1099.

6 *Miḍmār al-Khalā‘iq wa Sīr al-Khalā‘iq* 1/54.

7 A village which is situated on the eastern side of the Algerian Masīlah, about 30 km away from it. *Mu‘jam al-Buldān* 5/175; Ibn Nāṣir: *Tawḍīḥ al-Mushtabih* 8/245; *al-Rawḍ al-Mi‘ṭār fī Khabar al-Aqtār* p. 556.

8 *Miḍmār al-Khalā‘iq wa Sīr al-Khalā‘iq* 1/54.

- **Malāqah**¹

Al-Ayyūbī has made mention of the Khārijī presence there.²

- **Al-Andalus (Andalusia)**

The dogma of the Khawārij first reached it by way of the Ibādī Berbers who migrated to it from Morocco after it had proliferated there.³ Hence they had a few forts and they had also fought a few battles against the Umayyads in Andalus.⁴ Several scholars have alluded to their presence in al-Andalus: hence Ibn Ḥazm⁵ has alluded to their existence there during his era and has also gone on to state some of their ideas and beliefs. He says:

وشاهدنا الإباضية عندنا بالأندلس

We saw the Ibādīyyah by us in Andalus.⁶

Ibn Khaldūn has also asserted the same.⁷

1 I have not found any description of it in the books I have at my disposal.

2 *Miḍmār al-Khalā'iq wa Sirr al-Khalā'iq* 1/54.

3 *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* 6/155.

4 *Al-'Ibar fī Akhbār Man Ghabar* 2/120.

5 'Alī ibn Aḥmad ibn Sa'īd ibn Ḥazm al-Umawī, Abū Muḥammad al-Andalusī. The spear header of the literalist school and a great jurist and ḥadīth expert. He was born in Qurṭubah in 384 A.H. He earned acclaim for having vast knowledge and a strong grasp of matters. He has been criticised for his sharp criticism of his opponents. He went into seclusion from the people in a place called Lablah, which is near Ishbīlyyah. He passed away in 456 A.H. It is said that his works exceed four hundred, some of which are: *al-Muḥallā*, *al-Fiṣal*, *al-Iḥkām*. See: *Naḥḥ al-Ṭīb* 2/77; *Wafayāt al-A'yān* 3/325; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 18/184; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 12/91.

6 *Al-Fiṣal fī al-Mīlal wa al-Niḥal* 4/144.

7 *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* 6/155. Note: the Ibādīyyah still currently exist in Oman to a very large extent. Likewise they still have a presence in Libya, Tunisia, Algeria, the Western Desert, and Zanzibar which has been recently added to Tanzania. See: *al-Mawsū'ah al-Muyassarrah fī al-Adyān wa al-Madhāhib wa al-Aḥzāb al-Mu'āṣirah* 1/62.

The Second Category: Areas where Nawāṣib other than the Khawārij existed.

These places are the following:

The Nawāṣib in the East

- **Shām**

Shām was the epicentre of Naṣb and the actual abode of the Nawāṣib. The following distinguished it from other places:

Firstly, Naṣb was the dominant idea there. Hence most of the Shāmis were hesitant to concede the virtue of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رضي الله عنه from after the Battle of Ṣiffīn.¹ Their hatred was such that they would call every ‘Alī ‘Ulay (doing so denigratingly).² Naṣb had also influenced some of the scholars of Shām, something unprecedented anywhere else where the Nawāṣib existed. The people of Shām were known to be the enemies of the Ṭālibiyyīn.³ It was assumed that the only household which they knew was the household of Abū Sufyān and the only obedience which they knew was being obedient to the Banū Marwān.⁴ They had reached in their adherence to their Khulafā’ a level which later became proverbial. It would thus be said ‘obedience like the Shāmis’.⁵ Some historians even go on to falsely allege that Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه delayed the Jumu‘ah Ṣalāh when marching toward Ṣiffīn and only performed it with the people on Saturday, and they followed.⁶

1 *Mizān al-‘itidāl* 6/153.

2 *Al-Thiqāt* 7/454; *Faṭḥ al-Mughīth* 3/285; *Tadrīb al-Rāwī* 2/331.

3 *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* 3/240; *Simṭ al-Nujūm al-‘Awālī* 4/171.

4 *Mu‘jam al-Buldān* 2/352.

5 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 6/431.

6 *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 1/366. Ibn ‘Asākir commenting upon this narration mentions, “As for what the commonality narrate regarding Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه delaying the Jumu‘ah Ṣalāh till Saturday and the people of Shām agreeing with him in doing so, it is an incident which is fabricated. Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and his contemporaries from amongst the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم and the successors were too pious and cautious regarding the fulfilment of the obligatory prayer to be unaware of delaying the Ṣalāh being impermissible.

Muthannā ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Anṣārī¹ states:

قال لي رجل، كنت بالشام فجعلت لا أسمع عليا ولا حسنا، إنما أسمع معاوية، يزيد، الوليد، فمررت برجل على بابي، فقال: اسقه يا حسن. فقلت أسمى حسنا. فقال: أولادي حسن وحسين وجعفر، فإن أهل الشام يسمون أولادهم بأسماء خلفاء الله ثم يلعن الرجل ولده ويشتمه. قلت: ظننتك خير أهل الشام، وإذا ليس في جهنم شر منك.

A person said to me, “I was in Shām. I would hardly hear the names ‘Alī and Ḥasan, I would only hear Mu‘āwiyah, Yazīd, and al-Walīd. Then I passed by a person who was standing at his door. So he said, ‘Give him water, O Ḥasan.’ I asked him, ‘Did you name your son Ḥasan?’ to which he replied, ‘My sons are Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, and Ja‘far, because the people of Shām name their children after the Khulafā’ of Allah and thereafter curse them and swear them.’ I said to him, ‘I thought you were from the best people of Shām, but seems as if there is not in Jahannam anyone worse than you.’”²

Whether this narration is authentic or not, the fact that Shām was a locus of Naṣb is undisputable. However, this does not mean that the entire population of Shām was tainted with Naṣb, rather amongst them there were those who condemned it.³ But the majority was still affected by Naṣb, for people always follow the creed of their rulers, especially if they love them and believe that they are on the truth, as was the case of the people of Shām. Hence many of them would hate ‘Alī عليه السلام and revile him.⁴

Secondly, the extended period of time in which Naṣb prevailed in Shām. For it was already conceived when rumours reached the people of the Shām that ‘Alī عليه السلام played some sort of role in the murder of ‘Uthmān عليه السلام. This became evident after the Battle of Şiffin.⁵

1 Have not come across his biography in the books I have at my disposal.

2 *Mu‘jam al-Udabā’* 4/222; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 10/402; *Tārīkh al-Islām* 16/290.

3 *Tārīkh al-Islām* 12/72; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 8/415.

4 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 6/431.

5 *Mīzān al-I‘tidāl* 6/153.

Similarly its prevalence was not limited to the presence of the Umayyad empire, as was the case in many places where it took rise due to pressure from the dynasty, rather it remained even after the fall of the Umayyad empire, although it had become very weak.

Imām al-Nasā'ī who passed away in 303 A.H.¹ took note of the huge presence of the Nawāṣib in Shām when he visited it. He says:

دخلت دمشق والمنحرف بها عن علي كثير

I entered Dimashq and the detractors of 'Alī therein were many.²

That is close to a hundred and seventy years after the fall of the Umayyad Empire.

What is more surprising is that al-Dhahabī, who was from the eighth century, has alluded to their presence in Dimashq during his time. He says:

أما نواصب وقتنا فقليل

As for the Nawāṣib of our time, there are few.³

The presence of Naṣb in Shām to this extent can be attributed to two reasons:

1. An internal and personal cause which was born out of the conflict which had ensued between 'Alī and Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه. The Battle of Ṣiffīn was hence considered a distinctive sign of the Nawāṣib; they would say 'we are the followers of Mu'āwiyah in Ṣiffīn'.⁴

1 *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 14/133.

2 *Wafāyāt al-A'yān* 1/78; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 14/129; *Tadhkirah al-Ḥuffāz* 2/699; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 1/33.

3 *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 5/374.

4 *Fatḥ al-Bārī* 13/537.

In this type of an aura it was obviously necessary for them to mentally prepare themselves for this conflict by believing that they were upon the truth and that they were demanding revenge from the murderers of the oppressed Khalīfah, and by averring that ‘Alī played a role in what had happened and therefore was tainted with the blood of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه.¹

As a result, naturally enmity for him would settle in the hearts of many of them and thereby the circle of his detractors would gradually increase. It was thus completely normal for their children to inherit this hatred from them.

2. An external cause which was mostly the role played by the Umayyad rulers in giving birth to and perpetuating the problem of Naṣb.

Despite Naṣb being prevalent in all of Shām, two cities however were more effected than the rest. And they are:

- a. **Dimashq:** No oddity in this, for it was the capital of the Umayyad Empire, one of whose policies was openly proclaiming hatred for ‘Alī رضي الله عنه in order to subdue their rivals. Thus Naṣb was the dogma of the people of Dimashq.² It became entrenched in them to an extent that some narrators of Dimashq are reported to have heavily adopted the dogma of the people Dimashq and to have severely hated ‘Alī رضي الله عنه.³ To it many of the prominent Nawāṣib like Khālid al-Qasrī⁴ and others would be attributed.

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 7/452.

2 *Mizān al-ʿitidāl* 1/205.

3 *Al-Kāmil fī al-Ḍuʿafāʾ al-Rijāl* 1/310; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 7/281; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 1/159.

4 Khālid ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Yazīd al-Qasrī, Abū al-Haytham al-Dimashqī. The governor of Iraq. He presided over Makkah during the era of al-Walīd and Sulaymān ibn ‘Abd al-Malik. Subsequently he was appointed as the governor of Iraq by Hishām. He was an eloquent orator and was deemed to be from the noblemen. He was also famous for his generosity. He died after suffering severe punishment in 126 A.H. His narrations appear in *Khalq Afāl al-ʿIbād* of al-Bukhārī and Sunan Abī Dāwūd. See: *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 16/135; *Siyar Aʿlām al-Nubalāʾ* 5/425; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/17; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 3/88.

In addition, probably the greatest evidence of Naṣb being the dominant dogma of Dimashq and it being deeply entrenched in the hearts of its people is the fate al-Nasā'ī had met at the hands of its Nawāṣib.¹

Likewise, al-Dhahabī found it perplexing that Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī² described Muḥammad ibn Rāshid³ by saying, 'He was a Rāfiḍī.' And asked the question, "How can a Dimashqī who settled in Baṣrah be a Rāfiḍī?"⁴

Two things had caused the confusion of al-Dhahabī:

Firstly, he knew that Naṣb was widespread in Dimashq and thus that would demand the impossibility of a Rāfiḍī coming about in a purely Nāṣibī circle.

Secondly, he moved to Baṣrah which was also popularly known for being an abode of the detractors of 'Alī عليه السلام.

b. **Ḥimṣ**: The people of Ḥimṣ would denigrate 'Alī عليه السلام.⁵ It is said that the staunchest people against 'Alī عليه السلام on the Day of Ṣiffīn and

1 *Wafayāt al-A'yān* 1/78; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 14/129; *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 6/257; *Mir'āt al-Jinān* 2/241.

2 Muḥammad ibn Idrīs ibn al-Mundhir ibn Dāwūd al-Ḥanzālī, Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī. One of the senior retainers of ḥadīth and the leaders in the field of approbating and impugning narrators. He was a contemporary of al-Bukhārī and Muslim. He passed away in 277 A.H. in Ray at the age of eighty two. His narrations appear in *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*, *Sunan al-Nasā'ī* and *Sunan Ibn Mājah*. Some of his works are: *Ṭabaqāt al-Tābi'in* and *Kitāb al-Zīnah*. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 2/73; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 24/381; *Tārīkh al-Islām* 20/430; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 11/59.

3 Muḥammad ibn Rāshid al-Makhḥūl al-Khuzā'ī, Abū Yaḥyā (and it said Abū 'Abd Allāh) al-Dimashqī. He settled in Baṣrah. He was always endeavoured to speak the truth but was accused of the innovations of Shī'ism, denial of destiny, and being of the opinion of the sword. Thus al-Nasā'ī and others deemed him weak. 'Abd al-Razzāq said about him, "I have not seen a person more cautious in ḥadīth than him." He passed away in 160 A.H. and his narrations appear in the four Sunan. See: *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 53/4; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 7/343; *al-Kāshif* 2/170; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 9/140.

4 *Mizān al-'itidāl* 6/143. This perplexity was later solved by al-Dhahabī. Refer to the reference.

5 *Bughyah al-Ṭalab fī Tārīkh Ḥalab* 4/1731; *Wafayāt al-A'yān* 4/130; *Tārīkh al-Islām* 12/72; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 8/148.

those who incited the people most against him were the people of Başrah.¹

Hence when Ḥajjāj² became angry with Kumayl ibn Ziyād³ due to his Shīism he said to him:

والله لأبعثن إليك من يبغض عليا أكثر مما تحبه أنت

By Allah, I will send to you someone who hates ‘Alī more than you love him.

He thereafter sent to him a person from the people of Ḥimṣ.⁴

In order to ascertain that Naṣb was deeply entrenched in them it would be sufficient to note that every Shāmī narrator who has been identified with Naṣb is from the people of Ḥimṣ.

Furthermore, the scholars’ texts from a very early stage are suggestive of the fact that Shām and its people were popular for being deeply grounded in Naṣb. Hence Sufyān al-Thawrī who passed away in 161 A.H.⁵ says:

1 *Mu‘jam al-Buldān* 2/304.

2 Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf ibn al-Ḥakam ibn Abī ‘Aqīl al-Thaqafī. The governor of Iraq. He was born in 40 A.H. He ruled over Ḥijāz for three years and thereafter over Iraq for twenty years. In that time he managed to consolidate the Umayyad rule in Iraq and he penalised its people severely. He was brave, a mastermind and a person thirsty for blood. He was also very famous for his eloquence. He passed away in 95 A.H. See: *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 12/113; *Wafayāt al-A‘yān* 2/29; *al-‘Ibar fī Khabar man Ghabar* 1/112; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/117.

3 Kumayl ibn Ziyād ibn Nuḥayk al-Nakhaṭī. One of the notables of Kūfah and its warriors. He heard narrations from a number of Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ. He was from the partisans of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ who participated with him in the Battle of Ṣiffīn. He was an ascetic and was disinclined from this world. Ḥajjāj ordered that he be murdered in front of him in 82 A.H. Ibn Ma‘īn and others have deemed him reliable whilst Ibn Ḥibbān has impugned him. His narration appears in *Sunan al-Nasā’ī*. See: *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 6/179; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 50/247; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/46; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 8/402.

4 *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/47.

5 *Sīyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 7/279.

إذا كنت في الشام فاذكر مناقب علي رضي الله عنه

When you are in Shām then talk of feats of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه.¹

And Abū Zur‘ah al-Rāzī states:

إذا رأيت الشامي يطعن على مكحول والأوزاعي فلا تشك أنه ناصبي

When you see a Shāmī impugning Makḥūl and Awzāī then do not doubt that he is a Nāṣibi.²

This text of Abū Zur‘ah which is vague in terms of the link between impugning these two scholars and Naṣb becomes abundantly clear when considering the aspect of detraction from ‘Alī رضي الله عنه.

That is to say that these two scholars were from the most prominent scholars of Shām and were held in the highest of esteem by its people. They had realised their merit and no none had ever criticised them, nor in their knowledge and nor in their practice. Hence despite all of this if a Shāmī still impugned them it was primarily because of their positive position regarding ‘Alī رضي الله عنه.

In addition, Abū Bakr al-Khallāl,³ Ibn Taymiyah,⁴ al-Dhahabī,⁵ Ibn Kathīr,⁶ and Ibn Ḥajr⁷ have also alluded to the presence of the Nawāṣib in Shām.

1 *Ḥilyah al-Awliyā’* 7/27.

2 *Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥanābilah* 1/200; *al-Maqṣid al-Arshad* 2/70.

3 *Kitāb al-Sunnah* 2/410. Al-Khallāl is Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Hārūn al-Baghdādī, Abū Bakr al-Khallāl. The leading scholar of the Ḥanbalī School and a great jurist and scholar of ḥadīth. He became famous for gathering the knowledge of Imām Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal and codifying it. As a result of his strenuous efforts the Ḥanbalī School was born. He passed away in 311 A.H. at approximately eighty. Some of books are: *Kitāb al-Sunnah*, *Kitāb al-‘Ilal*, and *Kitāb al-Jāmi’*. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 5/112; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 14/297; *Tadhkirah al-Ḥuffāz* 3/785; *Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥuffāz* 1/331.

4 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/146.

5 *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 3/128.

6 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 6/198, 229.

7 *Fath al-Bārī* 13/537.

• Iraq

Iraq was the epicentre of events that unfolded after the martyrdom of 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه. Hence lots of disputes ensued between its people. And upon its lands were where the Shī'ah and the Khawārij born.

Iraq was not really different from Shām in terms of the causes which led to the inception of Naṣb. Yes with the exception of the direct influence of the Umayyad rulers. As for their governors, they were keener on consolidating the rule of the Umayyads there and doing away with their enemies. They would do so at times by vilifying 'Alī رضي الله عنه upon the pulpits¹ and at times by tracking down his partisans.²

The staunchest of the governors and those who were most steeped in Naṣb were the ones who governed over Iraq, the likes of Ziyād ibn Abīhi, his son 'Ubayd Allah, Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf, and Khālīd al-Qasrī.

As for the common factors, they are the following:

1. The various wars, as has been alluded to by Limāzah ibn Zabbār al-Baṣrī.³
2. Inheritance, although much less than what it was like in Shām due to Naṣb relatively being less in Iraq. Al-Zubayr ibn Bakkār⁴ has stated the following in the biography of Sāmāh ibn Lu'ay:

1 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 3/170; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 3/278; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/327.

2 *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 3/495.

3 *Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt* p. 186; *Tārīkh Dimashq* 50/306; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 24/251; *Tārīkh al-Islām* 6/538.

4 Al-Zubayr ibn Bakkār ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Qurashī al-Zubayrī, Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Madanī. The judge of Makkah, a historian and a genealogist. He was born in 172 A.H. al-Dāraquṭnī has deemed him reliable and al-Khaṭīb has praised him. Some people have without evidence criticised him. He passed away in 256 A.H. His narrations appear in *Sunan al-Tirmidhī*. Some of his books are: *Ansāb Quraysh wa Akhbārūhā*, *Akhbār al-'Arab wa Ayyāmuhā*, *Wufūd al-Nu'mān 'alā Kīsrā*. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 8/467; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 12/311; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 11/24; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 3/269.

له ذرية في العراق يبغضون عليا، ومنهم علي بن الجعد. كان يشتم أباه لكونه سماه عليا

His descendants in Iraq despise 'Alī, amongst who is 'Alī ibn al-Ja'd¹ who would revile his father due to naming him 'Alī.²

Ibn Taymiyah has alluded to the presence of the Nawāṣib in Iraq in the following statement:

كان بالعراق طائفة ناصبة من شيعة عثمان تبغض عليا والحسين

In Iraq there was a group of Nawāṣib who were the partisans of 'Uthmān and who hated 'Alī and Ḥusayn.³

Furthermore, because 'Alī عليه السلام had made Kūfah the capital of his Khilāfah, and he had stayed there for approximately five years, in which many events occurred, majority of its inhabitants had naturally become his partisans.⁴ Hence it was very rare to find a person who was not a Shī'ī, let alone coming across a Nāṣibī, as stated by al-Dhahabī:

يندر أن تجد كوفيا إلا وهو يتشيع

1 This is the name which appears in the copy of *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* published by *Maktabah al-Ma'ārif* 2/204 and *Dār Hajr* 3/228. Probably this is a mistake and the correct name is 'Alī ibn al-Jahm, the famous poet. This is for the following reasons: **Firstly**, 'Alī ibn al-Jahm was from the children Sāmah ibn Lu'ay, as opposed to 'Alī ibn al-Ja'd who was a client of the Banū Hāshim. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 7/240; *al-'Ibar fī Khabar man Ghabar* 1/406; *Tawḍīḥ al-Mushtabih* 7/301. **Secondly**, the above quoted text is in accordance with what Ibn Ḥajr has mentioned in *Lisān al-Mīzān* 4/210 in the biography of 'Alī ibn al-Jahm. Hence he says, "It is said that he would curse his father for naming him 'Alī. **Thirdly**, I have not found any scholar who has mentioned this in the biography of Ibn al-Ja'd. All that they have mentioned is that he would at time revile some Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم like 'Uthmān and Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه; and normally a person who reviles them would not revile 'Alī عليه السلام. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 11/360; *al-Muntazam* 11/160.

2 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 2/204.

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 8/148.

4 *Al-Masār al-Fikrī Bayn al-Mu'tazilah wa al-Shī'ah* p. 27.

It is very rare that you will find a Kūfi but that he will be a Shī'i.¹

Likewise he describes one of the Kūfis with the following:

من عجائب الزمان: كوفي ناصبي

From the oddities of time: A Kūfi Nāṣībī.²

He also says the following regarding another person:

لون آخر، كوفي ناصبي

Another colour, a Kūfi Nāṣībī.³

In contrast, the people of Baṣrah were more inclined toward Ṭalḥah and Zubayr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا. Probably this was one of the many reasons why they headed for Baṣrah when they embarked on their journey to Iraq.⁴ However, after the Battle of Jamal the matter had progressed from mere inclination toward them to detraction from 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, thereby yielding the opposition between the two integral cities of Iraq.

Likewise what had further fuelled the detraction of the Baṣrīs from 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was the role their governors played in subduing the Iraqis in general and demanding that they completely comply with the whims of the Umayyads and their fantasies;⁵ especially when the environment was conducive for that as well.

1 *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 5/374.

2 *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 5/374

3 *Mīzān al-I'tidāl* 7/46.

4 *Al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 3/120.

5 *Tārīkh al-Dawlah al-'Arabiyyah: the Rāshidī and the Umayyad era*: p. 171.

Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī¹ has alluded to this reality when he sent his campaigners to the various cities saying:

أما الكوفة وسوادها فهناك شيعة علي وأولاده، والبصرة وسوادها فعثمانية

As for Kūfah and its people, there lives the partisans of ‘Alī and his children.
And as for Baṣrah, there are the partisans of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه.²

Actually, mere affiliation to Baṣrah was considered a sign of being free from Shī‘ism. Hence it was one of the proofs Abū al-‘Aynā³ had used before the Khalīfah al-Mutawakkil⁴ when he said to him, “It has reached me that you are a Rāfiḍī,” to which he replied by saying:

يا أمير المؤمنين، وكيف أكون رافضيا وبلدي البصرة

1 Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-‘Abbās al-Hāshimī. The father of the Abbasids, the first person to raise the slogan of the Abbasid dynasty, and the first person on whose hands people were invited to pledge allegiance. This was in 89 A.H. during the Khilāfah of al-Walīd ibn ‘Abd al-Malik. It is said that he was only fourteen years younger than his father and resembled him the most. He passed away in 125 A.H. See: *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 4/215; *al-Muntaẓam* 7/244; *al-‘Ibar fi Khabar man Ghabar* 1/160; *al-Zarkalī: al-A‘lām* 6/271.

2 *Al-Muntaẓam* 7/56; *Mu‘jam al-Buldān* 2/352.

3 Muḥammad ibn al-Qāsīm ibn Khallād al-Baṣrī, Abū al-‘Aynā’ al-Ḍarīr. A linguist and a historian. He was born in Ahwāz and grew up in Baṣrah. In Baṣrah he studied ḥadīth and literature. He was the most intelligent of people, the most eloquent and a person with the most retentive memory. He earned acclaim due to the interesting tales which were narrated from him, just as he became popular for his silencing answers. He died in 283 A.H. after having reached ninety. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 3/17; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 13/309; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 11/73; *Shadharāt al-Dhabab* 2/180.

4 Ja‘far ibn al-Mu‘taṣim ibn al-Rashīd al-Hāshimī, Abū al-Faḍl al-Mutawakkil. The Abbasid Khalīfah who was born in 205 A.H. He was acknowledged as the Khalīfah after his brother al-Wāthiq in 232. After assuming power he proclaimed the Sunnah and it was discussed in his gathering. He wrote to all the places that the inquisition be eliminated and he spread the Sunnah and revered its people. He was loved by his subjects. He was killed on Wednesday night on the fourth of Shawwāl in 247 A.H. in al-Mutawakkliyyah. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 7/165; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 12/30; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/349; *Tārīkh al-Khulafā’* p. 346.

O Amīr al-Mu'minīn, how can I be a Rāfiḍī when my city is Baṣrah.¹

Therefore, when some of the scholars like al-Thawrī would enter Baṣrah they would expound on the virtues of 'Alī رضي الله عنه.²

Considering the aforementioned details it was completely natural that most of the people of Iraq who were tainted with Naṣb, with the exception of the Khawārij, were from Baṣrah.

In conclusion, several scholars have alluded to Naṣb being prevalent amongst them. Hence al-Dhahabī says:

إنهم عثمانية فيهم انحراف عن علي رضي الله عنه

They are the partisans of 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه and in them is detraction from 'Alī رضي الله عنه.³

And Ibn Ḥajr mentions:

النصب معروف في كثير من أهل البصرة

Naṣb is known to be the dogma of many of the people of Baṣrah.⁴

Nawāṣib in the West

- **Al-Andalus**

Even if it is established that Naṣb existed in al-Andalus, there is no doubt that it was not Naṣb in the real sense of the word. Rather it was a sort

1 *Mu'jam al-Buldān* 1/97; *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 5/230.

2 *Ḥilyah al-Awliyā'* 7/27.

3 *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 11/47.

4 *Lisān al-Mīzān* 4/439.

of *Ijtihād* (application of oneself and knowledge in reaching a plausible conclusion) in which the people of al-Andalus unwittingly agreed with the Nawāṣib. In other words, it was narrated regarding many of the Umayyad rulers of al-Andalus and its preachers that they would not concede the Khilāfah of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, but would rather consider Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه to be the fourth Khalīfah.¹

Hence when the judge Mundhir ibn Sa‘īd² studied a book in which was contained a poem of Ibn ‘Abd Rabbihī,³ which detailed the Khulafā’ and deemed Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه the fourth of them, he was enraged. He thus wrote the following verses in the footnotes:

أوما علي لا برحت ملعنا يابن الخبيثة عندكم يمام
رب الكساء وخير آل محمد داني الولاء مقدم الإسلام

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 4/162, 401.

2 Mundhir ibn Sa‘īd ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Balūṭī, Abū al-Ḥakam al-Andalusī. The supreme judge of Qurtubah. He was born in 265 A.H. He was a brilliant debater, a prolific orator, and an excellent poet. He was inclined toward the school of the *Zāhiriyyah* (the literalist) and was a person who always proclaimed the truth. Throughout his tenure not one case of oppression is recorded against him. He passed away in 355 A.H. He has written: *Kitāb al-Aḥkām* and *al-Nāsikh wa al-Mansūkh*. See: *Tārīkh al-‘Ulamā’ bi Al-Andalus* 2/142; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 16/173; *al-Bulghah* of al-Fīroz Ābādī p. 226; *Nafḥ al-Ṭīb* 1/372.

3 Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Rabbihī ibn Ḥabīb al-Umawī, their client, Abū ‘Umar al-Qurtubī. One of the great masters of literature of Andalus and its historians. He was born in 246 A.H. Ibn Kathīr has said the following regarding him, “Much of his statements suggest that he had Shī‘ī tendencies and the propensity to denigrate the Banū Umayyah. He passed away in 328 A.H. Some of his books are: *al-‘Iqd al-Farīd*, *al-Lubāb fī Ma‘rifah al-‘Ilm wa al-‘Ādāb*, *Akhbār Fuqahā’ al-Qurtubah*. See: *Tārīkh al-‘Ulamā’ bi Al-Andalus* 1/49, *Wafayāt al-A’yān* 1/110, *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 15/283; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 11/193. Note: What Ibn Kathīr has stated is indeed strange. For the incident of al-Mundhir ibn Sa‘īd suggests the complete opposite. Yes a person who reads *al-‘Iqd al-Farīd* will surely find basis to what Ibn Kathīr has said in terms of him denigrating the Umayyads in general and Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه in specific. Hence, ostensibly, he would just collect all the reports without verifying them, as was the wont of many of the historians and masters of literature, without intentionally intending to denigrate anyone. For more details see: *al-Dawlah al-Umawiyyah al-Muftarā’ Alayhā* p. 74.

Is not ‘Alī, may you always remain cursed, O the son of the wretched woman, a leader according to you?

The owner of the shawl, the best of the household of Muḥammad, the one who enjoyed an intimate relationship (with Rasūl Allah) and the forerunner of Islām.¹

Nonetheless, denying the Khilāfah of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is a prominent viewpoint of Naṣb. However Ibn Taymiyah was of the opinion that for some of the scholars of al-Andalus not to deem ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ the fourth Khalīfah was not due to discrediting his Khilāfah and rejecting his merits, but was because the leaders intended were those whom the Muslims had unanimously acknowledged, which was not the case regarding ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.²

He also asserts:

كان بالأندلس كثير من بني أمية يذهبون إلى هذا القول ويترحمون على علي ويثنون عليه، لكن يقولون لم يكن خليفة، وإنما الخليفة من اجتمع الناس عليه، ولم يجتمعوا على علي

In Andalus there were many people who held this viewpoint; they would invoke the mercy of Allah for ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and would praise him, but would assert that he was not a Khalīfah, because a Khalīfah is one upon who all people unite, whereas they did not unite upon ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.³

Based on this, it would be admissible to aver that their denial of his Khilāfah was a minor form of Naṣb due to it indirectly implying it. As for the actual Naṣb which entails disillusionment and hatred, it was very rare. Hence I have not come across anyone of this nature amongst the people of al-Andalus, with the exception of one person who would revile ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and his son Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.⁴

1 *Naḥḥ al-Ṭīb* 2/984; *al-Takmilah li Kitāb al-Ṣilah* 1/239 (with a little bit of difference)

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 4/163.

3 *Ibid.* 4/401.

4 *Lisān al-Mīzān* 5/58.

The Fourth Discussion

The Efforts of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā‘ah in Refuting them

This Ummah is chosen. Allah ﷻ chose it to be the most honourable of nations; to it he sent his Last Messenger after whom the door to all divine revelation was closed for eternity; He also made its Dīn the final Dīn besides which no other Dīn will be accepted till the Final Day. One of the necessities of this finality was that it remain unadulterated, unlike the fate the other divine religions had met of distortion and interpolation, and that it remain free from the mixture of innovations and deviations, due to it being the only path of salvation. Hence Allah ﷻ himself has guaranteed to preserve it due to him guaranteeing to preserve the Qur’ān:

إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّكْرَ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُونَ

*Indeed it is we who sent down the message, and indeed we will be its guardian.*¹

He thus put mediums in place which would ensure that the Dīn remains as it was during its embryonic stage. The greatest of these mediums is enjoining good and preventing evil, which stands as a solid fortification against the distortions to emerge till the Final Day in every era and place, and a support which the Ummah relies upon when combatting any attempt to tamper with this Dīn. It is no doubt then that the virtue of this Ummah and its excellence lies in carrying out this great task, as in the verse:

كُنْتُمْ خَيْرَ أُمَّةٍ أُخْرِجَتْ لِلنَّاسِ تَأْمُرُونَ بِالْمَعْرُوفِ وَتَنْهَوْنَ عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ

*You are the best nation produced for mankind. You enjoin what is right and forbid what is wrong.*²

1 Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 9.

2 Sūrah Āl ‘Imrān: 110.

Therefore, the ummah has been ordered that a group of people dedicate themselves to this important facet. Hence Allah ﷻ says:

وَلْتَكُنْ مِنْكُمْ أُمَّةٌ يَدْعُونَ إِلَى الْخَيْرِ وَيَأْمُرُونَ بِالْمَعْرُوفِ وَيَنْهَوْنَ عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ وَأُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْمُفْلِحُونَ

*And let there be from you a nation inviting to good, enjoining what is right and forbidding what is wrong, and those will be the successful.*¹

Once it is understood that enjoining good and forbidding evil is the responsibility of every capable person in case of no one else carrying it out, it should be borne in mind that the responsibility of the scholars is even greater, due to them being tasked with the responsibility of conveying and elucidating. Allah ﷻ says:

لَتُبَيِّنَهُ لِلنَّاسِ وَلَا تَكْتُمُونَهُ

*You must make it clear to the people and not conceal it.*²

Likewise, Rasūl Allah ﷺ has stated the following to be the duty of the scholars:

يحمل هذا العلم من خلف عدوله، ينفون عنه تحريف الغالين، وانتحال المبطلين وتأول الجاهلين

The pious of every generation will bear this knowledge from their predecessors. They will remove from it the distortions of the extremists, the false claims of the wrong doers, and the interpretations of the ignorant.³

1 Sūrah Āl 'Imrān: 104.

2 Sūrah Āl 'Imrān: 187.

3 The ḥadīth of Abū Umāmah, Abū Hurayrah, and 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Umar which appears in: al-'Uqaylī: *al-Du'afā'* 1/9. The ḥadīth of Abū Hurayrah also appears in: al-Ṭabarānī: *Musnad al-Shāmiyyīn*: ḥadīth no. 599. Likewise the ḥadīth of Ibn 'Umar appears in the *Fawā'id* of Tammām: ḥadīth no. 899. And al-Bayhaqī has reported the Mursal report of Ibrāhīm ibn 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-'Udhri in his *Sunan*: ḥadīth no. 20700. The scholars have debated its authenticity. Amongst those who have deemed it Ṣaḥīḥ are: Imām Aḥmad, as appears in *al-Badr al-Munīr* 1/259; Ibn 'Abd al-Barr, as appears in *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/337; al-Albānī in his work on *Mishkāt al-Maṣābiḥ*: ḥadīth no. 248. *continued...*

Ibn Taymiyyah says:

يجب الأمر بالمعروف والنهي عن المنكر بحسب إظهار السنة والشريعة، والنهي عن البدعة الضلالة بحسب الإمكان كما دل على وجوب ذلك الكتاب والسنة وإجماع الأمة

It is compulsory to enjoin good and forbid evil as per the need to display the Sunnah and the Sharī'ah. Likewise it is compulsory to prevent innovations and deviances as per one's ability. The necessity of this is established in the Qur'ān, the Sunnah, and the consensus of the Ummah.¹

Nonetheless, the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah have contributed tremendously in combatting all types of innovations and have risen against its founders and propagators. Who else would be more rightful of bearing this load and rising to this task other than them, whereas they are the bearers of the message of Rasūl Allah ﷺ and the guardians of the Sharī'ah; if they remain silent and do not carry out their task, the symbols of Dīn would become disfigured and its teachings would suffer distortion.

Nonetheless, when Naṣb emerged the scholars likewise countered it in various ways, akin to the efforts they had made in countering Shī'ism. However, in the case of Naṣb a very sophisticated methodology was devised, which rested upon two basic principles:

The first principle: They would take into consideration the conditions of various times and places, in the sense that in certain places they would deploy a particular way and in others they would completely discard it. Likewise in certain times they would display certain notions whereas at others times they would very zealously conceal those very same notions. This would make some people,

continued from page 228

On the other hand al-'Alāī has deemed it Ḥasan, as appears in *al-Ghāyah fī Sharḥ al-Hidāyah fī 'Ilm al-Riwāyah* p. 64. For more details see: *Majma' al-Zawā'id* 1/140; *Tadrīb al-Rāwī* 1/302; *al-Shadhā al-Fayyāh* 1/239; *al-Ḥiṭṭah fī Dhikr al-Ṣiḥāh al-Sittah* p. 38.

1 *Al-Istiqāmah* 1/41.

who do not possess knowledge of the reality of affairs, characterise their stance as one which is contradictory and not well thought out.

Hence it is narrated regarding Sufyān al-Thawrī that when he would enter Baṣrah he would narrate reports regarding the virtues of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and when he would enter Kūfah he would narrate reports regarding the virtues of ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.¹

He would say:

إذا كنت في الشام فاذكر مناقب علي وإذا كنت بالكوفة فاذكر مناقب أبي بكر وعمر

When you are in Shām, mention the merits of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and when you are in Kūfah mention the merits of Abū Bakr and ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.²

Similarly when he went to Yemen, he asked, “What are these people known for?” He was told that they are known for consuming Nabīdh and for ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Hence he did not narrate a single ḥadīth regarding any of the two till he departed from Yemen.³

‘Alī ibn al-Madīnī was similar in that when he would go to Kūfah he would display the Sunnah and when he would go to Baṣrah he would display partisanship for the Ahl al-Bayt.⁴

It is clear that the rationale for the variant approaches adopted by these two Imāms was that they realised that Naṣb was prevalent amongst the people of Shām and Baṣrah and that Shī‘ism was prevalent amongst the people of Kūfah and Yemen; thus they felt the need to mention the merits of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in Shām and Baṣrah but not in Yemen and Kūfah.⁵

1 *Ḥilyah al-Awliyā’* 7/27; *al-Jāmi’ li Akhlāq al-Rāwī wa ‘Ādāb al-Sāmi’* 2/118; *Tabyīn Kadhib al-Muftarī* p. 389; *Tārīkh al-Islām* 10/237.

2 *Ḥilyah al-Awliyā’* 7/27; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 7/260

3 *Kitāb al-Sunnah* of al-Khallāl 2/410.

4 *Tārīkh Baghdād* 11/463; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 21/17; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 11/47; *Tārīkh al-Islām* 17/278.

5 *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 1/364; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 11/47.

The second principle: They were not unaware of the reality they were living. Rather they knew full well that approbating one party or becoming occupied in countering it would probably create a feasible opportunity for the other party to benefit therefrom in advancing their *Bid'ah* to the furthest possible extent; this would of course be an outright violation of their purpose. Hence they were circumspect enough to devise a balanced approach in their rebuttal of Naṣb on the one hand, and not allowing the Shī'ah the advantage of exploiting on the other hand,¹ thereby barring the way of the Shī'ah who always anticipated such opportunities.

It is a known fact that overemphasising the merits of the Ahl al-Bayt and exhorting the people to love them and know their rights can unintentionally become a call to Shī'ism. Hence moderation is what was key, as al-Sha'bī said to a person:

أحب أهل بيت نبيك، ولا تكن رافضيا

Love the household of your Nabī, but do not be a Rāfiḍī.²

It was due to this consideration that Wuhayb ibn al-Ward³ would say:

إذا أردت أن تذكر فضائل علي بن أبي طالب فابدأ بفضائل أبي بكر وعمر ثم اذكر فضائل علي

When you intend to mention the merits of 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, then first start with the merits of Abū Bakr and 'Umar رضي الله عنهما and thereafter mention the merits of 'Alī رضي الله عنه.⁴

1 Refer to a very important discussion around this topic in the *Majmū' Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām* 20/396.

2 *Tārīkh Ibn Ma'īn* via the narration of al-Dūrī 3/248; al-Khallāl: *al-Sunnah* 1/79; *al-Mujālasah wa Jawāhīr al-'Ilm* p. 414; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 25/372.

3 Wuhayb ibn al-Ward ibn Abī al-Ward al-Makhzūmī, their client, Abū 'Uthmān al-Makkī. His name is 'Abd al-Wahhāb, as for Wuhayb, it was his title. A reliable narrator of ḥadīth and an ascetic. He was famous for his advices. He passed away in 153 A.H. His narrations feature in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, and the *Sunans* of Abū Dāwūd, al-Tirmidhī and al-Nasā'ī. See: *al-Thiqāt* 7/559; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 31/169; *Tārīkh al-Islām* 9/662; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 11/150.

4 *Tārīkh Baghdād* 1/260; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 30/399.

And Sufyān al-Thawrī would say:

امتنعنا من الشيعة أن نذكر فضائل علي

Due to the Shī'ah we refrain from mentioning the merits of 'Alī رضي الله عنه.¹

He would also say:

تركني الروافض وأنا أبغض أن أذكر فضائل علي

The Rawāfiḍ have denounced me. And I dislike mentioning the merits of 'Alī رضي الله عنه.²

This approach of his was not because he denied the merits of 'Alī رضي الله عنه or hated him, how would that be possible when he was from Kūfah and when giving preference to 'Alī رضي الله عنه over 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه was one of his views?³ Instead he knew well that the Shī'ah will exploit his narrations in order to proselytise their falsehood amongst the people, especially when they would be citing a prominent Sunnī scholar such as Sufyān as their reference.

Al-Nasā'ī also adopted the same methodology, but with the Nawāṣib. Hence when he entered Damascus he noticed the ubiquitous presence of the Nawāṣib, which prompted him to write his acclaimed book *Khaṣā'is 'Alī*. And when a person asked him to narrate to him something of the merits of Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه he responded in a suggestively condescending manner.⁴

1 *Ḥilyah al-Awliyā'* 7/27; *Tārīkh al-Islām* 10/228; *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 15/175.

2 *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 7/253.

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 2/73.

4 *Bughyah al-Ṭālib fi Tārīkh Ḥalab* 2/786; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 1/339; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 14/133; *Mir'āt al-Jinān* 2/241. It is very far-fetched that Imām al-Nasā'ī intended to denigrate Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه. But he thought it wise, after seeing this state of affairs, to not narrate anything about him so as not to allow the Nawāṣib the opportunity to draw evidence therefrom for their innovation. The evidence for this is that when he was asked regarding Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه he said, "Islām is like a house with a door, the door of Islam is the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم. continued ...

Akin to his situation was the situation of Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī.¹ When he learnt that some scholars of Baghdād reject the ḥadīth of the pond of Khum, which is from the very clear narrations regarding the merits of ‘Alī عليه السلام, he began narrating the merits of ‘Alī عليه السلام and the various transmission of the ḥadīth of the pond. Then when the people thronged around him and his gathering started buzzing, he realised that amongst those present were a group of Rawāfiḍ as well, and thus he started narrating the merits of Shaykhayn عليهما السلام.

Conversely, when he returned to Ṭabrstān² he was appalled to find that the denigration of the Ṣaḥābah عليهم السلام was on the rise due to spread of Rafḍ, hence he started dictating the merits of Abū Bakr and ‘Umar عليهما السلام.³

Nonetheless, despite the insight of these scholars and their immense wisdom in the approach they had adopted, there still remained a group of the scholars of

continued from page 232

Hence whoever reviles the Ṣaḥābah عليهم السلام actually targets Islam itself, akin to a person who knocks on the door wanting to enter the house.” He further says, “Whoever targets Mu‘āwiyah عليه السلام has indeed targeted the Ṣaḥābah عليهم السلام.” (*Tahdhib al-Kamāl* 1/239).

Some scholars, however, do not accept this explanation, they offer an alternate explanation and suggest that the reason for responding in this way was that he was tainted with a light form of Shiasm. Hence al-Dhahabī says, “He had a little bit of Tashayyu’ and was thus averse to the opponents of Imām ‘Alī, like Mu‘āwiyah and ‘Amr عليه السلام. May Allah سبحانه وتعالى forgive him for that.” (*Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 14/133).

1 Muḥammad ibn Yazīd ibn Kathīr al-Ṭabarī, Abū Ja‘far. A polymath who was unmatched in his knowledge in his time. He was born in 224 A.H. He was a very devout worshipper, disinclined from this world, pious and a person who stood for the truth. A fitnah ensued between him and the Ḥanābilah owing to which the latter dubbed him a Rāfiḍī falsely. He passed away in 310 A.H. Some of his works are: *Tārīkh al-Umam wa al-Mulūk, Jāmi‘ al-Bayān* and *Tahdhib al-Āthār*. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 2/162; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 14/267; *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 2/212; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 11/145.

2 Ṭabrstān, the mountainous area which surrounds the southern side of the Caspian Sea. It includes many cities and the mountains that expand around it are known as Jibāl al-Burz (the Al-Borz mountain range). Another name for Ṭabrstān is also Māzīndarān which is now the popular name by which it is known. See: *Mu‘jam al-Buldān* 4/13; *Mu‘jam mā Ustu‘jim* 3/887.

3 *Mu‘jam al-Buldān* 5/269.

the Ahl al-Sunnah who did not condone the specific mention of the virtues of a particular Ṣaḥābī, whoever he maybe. This was due to the fear that someone might start exaggerating regarding him or get the impression that those besides him were less than him in stature and thus impugn them.

Hence ‘Aṭā’ ibn Muslim,¹ would go to the Aḥad market whenever he went to Raqqah and would narrate the merits of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ due to many Ibādī Khawārij gathering there, a noble mission indeed. However Ja‘far ibn Burqān² prevented him from doing so and told him:

إذا جلست مجلسا فذكرت رجلا من أصحاب محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم بفضيلة فأشرك معه غيره

When you sit in a gathering and make mention of the merits any of the Ṣaḥābah of Muḥammad صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, then include others with him as well.³

Many scholars adopted this approach and authored their works in accordance with it, irrespective of whether the work related to the Ṣaḥābah in general or to a Ṣaḥābī in specific.

1 ‘Aṭā’ ibn Muslim al-Kaffāf, Abū Makhlad al-Kūfī al-Ḥalabī. A reliable narrator who has been deemed reliable by several scholars. However, out of precaution he buried his books and thereafter started to narrate from his memory but would make a lot of mistakes. He passed away in 190 A.H. His narrations appear in the *Shamā’il* of al-Tirmidhī and the *Sunan* of al-Nasā’ī and Ibn Mājah. See: *al-Kāmil fī Ḍu‘afā’ al-Rijāl* 5/367; *Tārīkh Baghdād* 12/294; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 20/104; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 7/189.

A humorous anecdote: Sufyān al-Thawrī asked ‘Aṭā’ ibn Muslim, “How is your love for Abū Bakr today?” He said, “Intense.” He then asked, “How is your love for ‘Umar?” He said, “Intense.” He again asked, “How is your love for ‘Alī?” He replied, “Intense.” (This time emphasising his answer). Sufyān thus said to him, “O ‘Aṭā’ this intensity deserves a mark on your forehead.” See: *Ḥilyah al-Awliyā’* 7/31.

2 Ja‘far ibn Burqān al-Kilābī, their client, Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Jazarī. An ascetic scholar from the people of Raqqah. It is said that his prayers were readily accepted by Allah سُبْحَانَكَ رَبَّنَا. Several scholars have deemed him reliable. However he would err in the narrations of al-Zuhrī. He passed away in 154 A.H. at the age of forty four. His narrations appear in *al-Adab al-Mufrad* of al-Bukhārī the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of Muslim and the four *Sunan*. See: *al-Thiqāt* 6/136; *al-Kāmil fī Ḍu‘afā’ al-Rijāl* 2/140; *Mizān al-Itidāl* 2/129; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 2/73.

3 *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 5/16.

Hence, they would not suffice on recording the merits of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ alone in their works, but would also record the merits of others besides him. And even when they wrote a book regarding the merits and specialities of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ specifically, they would couple it with writing another book regarding the merits of other Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ, like Abū Bakr, ‘Umar and ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ.¹

What had prompted them to do this was their endeavour to have a balanced approach regarding all the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ.²

Furthermore, the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah did not deem this to be sufficient. They were vigilant at all times and were fully alert of any action which could be exploited to promote an innovation, even if those carrying it out tried their best to quote it with a veneer of the Sharī‘ah so that it may be more appealing to the common people. Hence when Sufyān al-Thawrī was told that Sālim ibn Abī Ḥaḥṣah,³ a Shī‘ī ḥadīth transmitter, always starts his gatherings with the mention of the merits of Abū Bakr and ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمَا and only thereafter does he mention the merits of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, he said:

احذروه فإنه يريد ما يريد

Fear him, for he intends what he intends.⁴

He was implying that mentioning the merits of Shaykhayn was not really what Sālim intended, due to him being at the forefront of those who denigrate them and despise them.

1 For example: *al-Arba‘īn fi Faḍā’il ‘Uthmān* and *al-Arba‘īn fi Faḍā’il ‘Alī*, both the works of Ismā‘īl ibn Yūsuf al-Qazwīnī al-Ḥākim. See: *Kashf al-Zunūn* 4/287.

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/287.

3 Sālim ibn Abī Ḥaḥṣah, Abū Yūnus al-Kūfī. A leading Shī‘ī scholar. The scholars have disputed regarding his reliability after having agreed that he was an extremist Shī‘ī. He died in 140 A.H. His narrations appear in *al-Adab al-Mufrad* of Imām al-Bukhārī and the *Sunan* of Imām al-Tirmidhī. See: *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* of Ibn Sa‘d 6/336; *al-Kāmil fi Ḍu‘afā’ al-Rijāl* 3/343; *Mizān al-I’tidāl* 3/162; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 3/374.

4 *Ḍu‘afā’ al-Uqaylī* 2/153; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 10/135.

In summary, their efforts in countering Naṣb varied and took many forms, all of which can be summarised in two categories:

The First Category:

Their efforts regarding ‘Alī عليه السلام and his household, which are also of two types:

1. Narrating the merits of ‘Alī عليه السلام and his household:

The scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah and its people did not fall short of countering the averseness many people felt toward Amīr al-Mu’minīn ‘Alī عليه السلام in any way. The most effective way and the most successful medium which they deployed was narrating his established virtues, whereby they intended to bring to the fore those of his virtues which might otherwise be unknown to many who have no relation whatsoever with the ḥadīth tradition, i.e. the majority. It is obvious that this type of ignorance plays an integral role in making them vulnerable to the propaganda of the Nawāṣib, especially when there are other factors as well contributing to the same, like pressure from the Umayyad Empire and the constant proselytization of the Khawārij.

Hence the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah, deployed the ḥadīth tradition as a weapon against this falsehood, due to it holding a very high ranking in the heart of a Muslim and his psyche. For latching on to the Sunnah is salvation,¹ or it is, as succinctly described by Imām Mālik:

كسفينة نوح، من ركبها نجا، ومن تخلف عنها غرق

It is like the arch of Nūḥ عليه السلام, whoever boards it will attain salvation, and whoever stays behind will drown.²

It is for this reason the scholars passionately strove to narrate the merits of ‘Alī عليه السلام and spread them amongst the people. Hence al-Thawrī would narrate

1 *Sunan al-Dārimī* 1/58; *Ḥilyah al-Awliyā’* 3/369; *Tafsīr al-Sam’ānī* 3/460; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 5/337.

2 *Tārīkh Baghdād* 7/336; *Dham al-Kalām wa Ahlih* of al-Harawī 5/81; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 14/9; *Miftāḥ al-Jannah* of al-Suyūṭī p. 76.

them in Baṣrah and Shām,¹ Ibn al-Madīnī would narrate them in Baṣrah,² Ibn Abī Dāwūd³ would read them to the people in Baghdād⁴ and Ismāʿīl ibn ʿAyyāsh⁵ would mention them to the people of Ḥimṣ, which ultimately lead to them desisting from the denigration of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه.⁶

Furthermore, they did not consider it enough to propagate the virtues of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه in their cities, but some of them would purposely mention them even when travelling to places wherein the Nawāṣib had a strong presence.⁷

This special dedication was only in order to repel the undue criticism and tarnishing of ʿAlī رضي الله عنه.⁸

As a result, his virtues proliferated amongst the people greatly, so much so that Imām Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal would say:

1 *Ḥilyah al-Awliyāʾ* 7/27.

2 *Tārīkh Baghdād* 11/463; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 21/17; *Siyar Aʿlām al-Nubalāʾ* 11/47.

3 ʿAbd Allāh ibn Sulaymān ibn al-Ashʿath al-Azdī, Abū Bakr al-Sijistānī. A reliable scholar who was well versed in genealogy, history, the deeper flaws of ḥadīth and the campaigns of Nabī صلی الله علیه وسلم. He was born in Sijistān in 230 A.H. and he grew up in Baghdād. Al-Dār Quṭnī has said about him, “He is reliable, however when commenting upon narrations he makes a lot of mistakes.” He passed away in Baghdād in 316 A.H. Some of his books are: *al-Musnad*, *Kitāb al-Maṣāḥif* and *al-Tafsīr*. See: *Ṭabaqāt al-Muḥaddithīn bi Aṣfahān wa al-Wāridīn ʿAlayhā* 3/533; *Tārīkh Baghdād* 9/464; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 29/77; *Lisān al-Mīzān* 3/293.

4 *Al-Kāmil fī Ḍuʿafāʾ al-Rijāl* 4/266; *Siyar Aʿlām al-Nubalāʾ* 13/228; *Tadhkirah al-Ḥuffāz* 2/771.

5 Ismāʿīl ibn ʿAyyāsh ibn Salīm al-Anasī, their client, Abū ʿUtbah al-Ḥimṣī. An ascetic ḥadīth scholar and an adherent of the Sunnah. He was born in 108 A.H. Yazīd ibn Hārūn said about him, “I have not seen a Shāmi or an Iraqī with who knew as many narrations as Ismāʿīl ibn ʿAyyāsh. His narrations from others besides the people of his town have been criticised. He passed away in 181 A.H. His narrations appear in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* and the four *Sunan*. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 6/221; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 9/35; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 3/163; *Siyar Aʿlām al-Nubalāʾ* 8/312.

6 *Tārīkh Baghdād* 13/7; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 50/366; *Siyar Aʿlām al-Nubalāʾ* 8/148; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 8/415.

7 *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 5/16.

8 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawīyah* 4/371.

ما جاء لأحد من أصحاب رسول الله من الفضائل ما جاء لعلي بن أبي طالب

The merits of any of the Companions of Rasūl Allah ﷺ have not reached us as much as the merits of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib have reached us.¹

He is also reported to have said:

ما بلغنا عن أحد من الصحابة ما بلغنا عن علي بن أبي طالب

The merits of any of the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ have not reached us as much as the merits of ‘Alī ibn Ṭālib have reached us.²

Several scholars are also reported to have said:

لم يرد في حق أحد من الصحابة بالأسانيد الحسان أكثر مما جاء في علي

The merits of any of the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ have not featured with admissible transmissions more than those that have featured regarding ‘Alī ﷺ.³

It should not be understood from these quotes and others of their kind that the Khulafā’ who preceded ‘Alī ﷺ did not enjoy many merits. Instead, the fact of the matter is that each one of them enjoyed merits and privileges which were unique to him. But because the need of the time was combatting the prevailing aversion towards ‘Alī, those who remained of the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ dispensed the merits they knew about him; and the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah channelled their efforts toward documenting them preserving them and propagating them. As opposed to many of the other Ṣaḥābah ﷺ who were not impugned at all, or very little. Hence it is vital to note that these matters are not from the distinctions of ‘Alī ﷺ, but are rather from his merits and virtues which point to his virtuousness;

1 *Mustadrak Ḥākim* 3/116, *Tafsīr al-Tha’labī* 4/81; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 3/263; *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 8/421.

2 *Fath al-Bārī* 7/74.

3 *Al-Istī’āb* 3/1115; *Fath al-Bārī* 7/71; *al-Ṣawā’iq al-Muḥriqah* 2/353; *Fayḍ al-Qadīr* 4/355.

the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah earned acclaim for narrating them in order to repel from him the criticism of the criticses.¹

Al-Bayhaqī² says:

وهذا لأن أمير المؤمنين عليا عاش بعد سائر الخلفاء حتى ظهر له مخالفون وخرج عليه خارجون، فاحتاج من بقي من الصحابة إلى رواية ما سمعوه في فضائله ومراتبه ومناقبه محاسنه ليردوا بذلك عنه ما يليق به من القول والفعل

This was because Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī عليه السلام lived after all the Khulafā'. Thus there emerged people who opposed him and rebelled against him. Hence those who remained of the Ṣaḥābah عليهم السلام were compelled to narrate what they had heard of his virtues, good and merits. This was in order to repel from him that which does not behave him of statements and actions.³

And Ibn Ḥajar mentions:

وكان السبب في ذلك أنه (أي علي) تأخر وقوع الخلاف في زمانه وخروج من خرج عليه، فكان ذلك سببا لانتشار مناقبه من كثرة من كان بينها من الصحابة ردا على من خالفه، فكان الناس طائفتين لكن المبتدعة قليل جدا، ثم كان من أمر علي ما كان فنجمت طائفة أخرى حاربه، ثم اشتد الخطب فتقصوه واتخذوا لعنه على المنابر سنة، ووافقهم الخوارج على بغضه، وزادوا حتى كفروه... فصار الناس في حق علي ثلاثة: أهل السنة، والمبتدعة من الخوارج والمحاربين له من بني أمية وأتباعهم. فاحتاج أهل السنة إلى بث فضائله فكثر الناقل لذلك لكثرة من يخالف ذلك. وإلا فالذي في نفس الأمر أن لكل من الأربعة من الفضائل إذا حرر بميزان العدل لا يخرج عن قول أهل السنة والجماعة أصلا

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 4/371.

2 Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī ibn Mūsā al-Khasrūjardī, Abū Bakr al-Bayhaqī. The leading scholar of Khurāsān and a jurist and ḥadīth master. He was born in 384 A.H. He authored many books, all with perfection, which all earned acclaim. He was the first person to compile the views of Imām al-Shāfi'ī and substantiate them with proof-texts from the Qur'ān and the Sunnah. He passed away in 458 A.H. Some of his books are: *al-Sunan al-Kubrā*, *Shu'ab al-Īmān*, *al-Sunan wa al-Āthār*. See: *Tārīkh al-Islām* 30/438; *al-Wāfi' bi al-Wafayāt* 6/219; *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi'iyyah al-Kubrā* 4/8; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 12/94.

3 *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 42/418.

The reason for this was that he (i.e. ‘Alī) came afterwards and the dispute occurred in his time which caused those who rebelled to rebel against him. So the reason for the proliferation of his merits was that many of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ mentioned them in refutation of those who opposed him. Hence people were split into two, but the innovators were very few. Thereafter transpired with ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ whatever transpired. As a result, a third group who fought him was born. Then the matter became even graver and they began to denigrate him and deemed cursing him upon the pulpits an official practice. The Khawārij also agreed with them in hating him, and added to that they excommunicated him also. Hence the people were now split into three: the Ahl al-Sunnah, the Khawārij and his opponents the Banū Umayyah and their followers. The Ahl al-Sunnah, thus, were compelled to propagate his merits. Consequently, people excessively narrated them. Or else the fact of the matter is that if the merits of any of the four Khulafā’ are documented with fairness, a person will never part with the stance of the Ahl al-Sunnah.¹

This is on the one hand. On the other hand the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah begun expressing their views regarding two very pertinent issues which were heavily disputed:

- a. Considering ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to be correct in all his battles,
- b. And deeming him to be the fourth person deserving of the Khilāfah and the fourth most superior amongst the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ.

2. Authoring books regarding the merits of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and the Ahl al-Bayt and their rights

Many books consisting of various styles have been written in this regard:

- Some books specifically discuss merits, whether they be dedicated to discussing his merits alone, or his merits alongside the merits of the other

¹ *Fatḥ al-Bārī* 7/71; *al-Iṣābah fī Tamayīz al-Ṣaḥābah* 4/565.

rightly guided Khulafā’, or the merits of the ‘Asharah Mubashsharah (the ten Ṣaḥābah who were given glad tiding of Jannah in one gathering), or the merits of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ in general. Sometimes they concern the Ahl al-Bayt in general, i.e. they discuss the merits of the Ahl al-Bayt and expound on their rights. It is obvious that ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would naturally be included in all of them.

Probably the most important types of this genre are the following two types:

1. Books which are pertaining to ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ alone: like the *Khaṣā’iṣ* of al-Nasā’ī, which consists the most amount of authentic narrations regarding his merits,¹ *Faḍā’il ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib* of Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī,² and *Kitāb ‘Alī* of Abū al-Qāsim al-Ṭabarānī.³
 2. Books pertaining to the Ahl al-Bayt in general, like Ibn Abī Ḥātim’s book regarding the merits of the Ahl al-Bayt.⁴
- Books whose themes are general, they are of two types:
 1. The ḥadīth collections of the Ahl al-Sunnah. You will hardly find a book of ḥadīth but that its author will have dedicated a chapter to the Ahl al-Bayt, this can easily be understood when analysing the *Ṣaḥīḥayn* for example:

1 *Fath al-Bārī* 7/74.

2 *Mu’jam al-Udabā’* 5/266.

3 He is: Sulaymān ibn Aḥmad ibn Ayyūb al-Lakhmī and al-Shāmī, Abū al-Qāsim al-Ṭabarānī. From the great retainers of ḥadīth and most reliable of transmitters. He was born in ‘Akkā in 260 A.H. He became famous for his multiple voyages and for writing ḥadīth from every ḥadīth scholar he came across. He reached a stage in his life wherein people started flocking toward him from every direction. He passed away in Aṣfahān in 360 A.H. Some of his books are the three *Ma’ājim* (ḥadīth collections). See: *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 16/119; *Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥuffāẓ* 1/372; *Mizān al-I’tidāl* 3/278.

4 *Mu’jam al-Udabā’* 3/121.

In *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* we find the following chapters:

- Chapter regarding the merits of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, the Qurashī and Hāshimī, Abū al-Ḥasan.¹
- Chapter regarding the merits of the relatives of Rasūl Allah ﷺ, and the merits of Fāṭimah عليها السلام the daughter of Nabī ﷺ.²
- Chapter regarding the merits of Ḥasan and Ḥusayn رضي الله عنهما.³
- Chapter regarding the merits of Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها.⁴

And in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* you will find the following chapters:

- Chapter regarding the merits of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رضي الله عنه.⁵
- Chapter regarding the merits of Ḥasan and Ḥusayn رضي الله عنهما.⁶
- Chapter regarding the merits of the household of Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم.⁷
- Chapter regarding the merits of Fāṭimah the daughter of Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم.⁸

2. The books of theology and doctrine. In this genre it is very clear that the Ahl al-Sunnah have paid a lot of attention to mentioning the rights of the Ahl al-Bayt in general and the rights of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* 3/1357.

2 *Ibid.* 3/1360.

3 *Ibid.* 3/1369.

4 *Ibid.* 3/1374.

5 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* 4/1870.

6 *Ibid.* 4/1882.

7 *Ibid.* 4/1883.

8 *Ibid.* 4/1902.

in specific. Hence many of them comprise of the mention of his virtues, the elaboration of the validity of his rule, and the mention of the high rank of the Ahl al-Bayt and their rights. Consider the following books for example: *Kitāb al-Sunnah* of al-Khallāl, *Sharḥ Madhāhib Ahl al-Sunnah*, *al-‘Aqīdah al-Ṭahāwiyyah*, *Sharḥ I’tiqād Ahl al-Sunnah*, *Lum‘at al-I’tiqād*, *al-‘Aqīdah al-Wāsiṭiyyah*.

The Second Category: Their Efforts in Countering the Detractors of ‘Alī عليه السلام and the Ahl al-Bayt

The first innovation to emerge in the Ummah was the innovation of the Khawārij.¹ The incident of arbitration between the people of Iraq and the people of Shām was decisive in determining a change in their approach; for they ignited the flame of excommunication—unprecedented before this—regarding Imām ‘Alī. Subsequently it went on to implicate every person who was pleased with his rule, and thereafter it surpassed them as well and went on to implicate those who refused to excommunicate him as well.

The Ummah concurs upon condemning them and deeming them astray.² Their fitnah was of such a magnitude that many a people were misled by it, to the extent that Abū al-‘Āliyah³ says:

ما أدري أي النعمتين أفضل علي: أن هداني للإسلام أو لم يجعلني حروريا

1 *Majmū‘ Fatāwā Shaikh al-Islam* 3/279, 28/476.

2 *Majmū‘ Fatāwā Shaikh al-Islām* 28/518; *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 4/395.

3 Rāfi‘ ibn Mahrān al-Rayāḥī, their client, Abū al-‘Āliyah al-Baṣrī. A jurist and master in science of *Qirā‘ah*. He was from senior successors and an authority amongst them. He lived during the era of ignorance but only accepted Islam two years after the demise of Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم. He saw and met many of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم. Abū Bakr ibn Abī Dāwūd says the following about him, “There is no one more learned regarding the Qur‘ān after the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم than Abu al-‘Āliyah.” He passed away in 90 A.H. His narrations appear in all six collections. See: *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 18/159; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 9/214; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 4/207; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 3/246.

I do not know which of the two blessings are greater for me: Allāh ﷻ guiding me to Islam or him not making me a *Ḥarūrī* (a *Khārijī*).¹

Their threat was so impending that a person was compelled, after seeing that his son was inclining toward the opinions of the *Khawārij*, to detain him and confine him out of the fear that he will join them.²

Due to their very early emergence, the *Ṣaḥābah* ﷺ who had lived to see them had a very stern position in countering them, as opposed to the *Nawāṣib* who did not excommunicate him and who only openly came to the fore much later; they were tackled by the *Ṣaḥābah* ﷺ who remained to see their time.

Nonetheless, they had countered the *Khawārij* in various ways, some being:

1. Narrating *Aḥādīth* which condemn the *Khawārij* and exhort fighting them³

These *aḥādīth* are authentic and plenty, as Imām Aḥmad has said:

صح الحديث في الخوارج من عشرة أوجه

The *ḥadīth* regarding the *Khawārij* is authentically established in ten different ways.⁴

In fact the narrations about them have reached the extent of *Tawātur* (incontrovertibility) according to the scholars of *ḥadīth*. Ibn Kathīr says:

الأخبار بقتال الخوارج متواترة عن رسول الله لأن ذلك من طرق تفيد القطع عند أئمة هذا الشأن

1 *Muṣannaf ‘Abd al-Razzāq* 10/153; *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 7/114; *Firyābī*: *al-Qadr* 257; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 9/216.

2 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 6/167; *al-Iṣābah fī Tamyīz al-Ṣaḥābah* 5/359.

3 See some of these narrations in the book *al-Khawārij, Dirāsah wa Naqd li Madhhabihim* p. 28.

4 *Majmū‘ Fatāwā Shaikh al-Islām* 3/279, 28/512; *Kitāb al-Nubuwwāt* p. 139.

The narrations about fighting the Khawārij are categorically established from Rasūl Allah ﷺ, for it established through transmissions which give the benefit of certainty according to the scholars of the science.¹

They likewise persistently warned the people about them and induced them to put an end to them.² They would also interpret some verses as referring to them. Hence Sa'd ibn Abī Waqqāṣ رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ would deem them *Fāsiqīn* (transgressors) drawing that from the verse:

وَمَا يُضِلُّ بِهِ إِلَّا الْفَاسِقِينَ الَّذِينَ يَنْقُضُونَ عَهْدَ اللَّهِ مِنْ بَعْدِ مِيثَاقِهِ وَيَقْطَعُونَ مَا أَمَرَ اللَّهُ بِهِ أَنْ يُوصَلَ وَيُفْسِدُونَ فِي الْأَرْضِ ۗ أُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الْخَاسِرُونَ

And he misleads not except the defiantly disobedient. Who break the covenant of Allah after contracting it and sever that which Allah has ordered to be joined and cause corruption on earth. It is those who are the losers.^{3,4}

He would also say regarding them:

هم قوم زاغوا فأزاغ الله قلوبهم

They are a people who deviated, and thus Allah mislead their hearts.

Ibn Taymiyyah has made mention of the efforts of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ in this regard:

لما شاغ في الأمة أمر الخوارج تكلمت الصحابة فيهم، ورووا عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم الأحاديث فيهم، وبينوا ما في القرآن من الرد عليهم

When the fitnah of the Khawārij spread in the Ummah, the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ spoke out regarding them. They narrated the aḥādīth of Nabī ﷺ

1 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 6/218.

2 *Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah* 7/553; Ibn 'Abd al-Barr: *al-Tamhīd* 23/335; *al-Nubuwwāt* p. 141.

3 *Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah* 7/560.

4 *Sūrah al-Baqarah*: 26, 27.

pertaining to them and they mentioned whatever rebuttals there were in Qur'ān of them.¹

These efforts were not going to prove useless of course, much of them produced the desired results and many people who were affected repented.²

As an extension to the efforts of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم, the books of ḥadīth comprised of chapters specifically discussing the Khawārij and the laws which concern them. So for example, in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* we find the chapter: Chapter regarding fighting the Khawārij and the heretics after evidence in established against them;³ In *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* we find the chapters: Chapter regarding the exhortation of killing the Khawārij⁴ and Chapter regarding the Khawārij being the worst of creation;⁵ In *Sunan Abī Dāwūd* we find the following chapters: Chapter regarding killing the Khawārij⁶ and Chapter regarding fighting the Khawārij;⁷ and Ibn Ḥibbān has established the following chapter in his *Ṣaḥīḥ*: Chapter regarding the Khawārij being the most disliked of the creation of Allah سُبْحَانَكَ وَتَعَالَى.⁸

2. Debating the Khawārij and Proving them Wrong In their Stances

The first people to debate them were Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رضي الله عنه and Ibn 'Abbās رضي الله عنه.⁹ Thereafter it became a practice followed by others, hence 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz debated them after he became the Khalīfah.¹⁰ The

1 *Majmū' Fatāwā Shaikh al-Islām* 7/483.

2 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* 1/179.

3 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* 6/2539.

4 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* 2/746.

5 *Ibid.* 2/750.

6 *Sunan Abī Dāwūd* 4/241.

7 *Ibid.* 4/242.

8 *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān* 15/387.

9 *Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah* 7/556; *Majmū' Fatāwā Shaikh al-Islām* 19/89; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 7/282; *Tārīkh al-Khulafā'* p. 174.

10 *Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah* 1/258.

rationale behind debating them was to establish evidence against them and thereby acquire legitimacy for fighting them and stand exonerated before Allah ﷻ. They were very eager to falsify their claims and rebut them so that their misconceptions do not easily slip into people who were not aware of their reality and would thus be beguiled by their external state; for they were described as:

إذ فيهم من الاجتهاد في العبادة والورع ما لم يكن في الصحابة

People in who there was more devotion and ‘piety’ than even the Ṣaḥābah

ﷺ.¹

Exactly what Nabī ﷺ had said:

يخرج فيكم قوم تحقرون صلواتكم مع صلواتهم، وصيامكم مع صيامهم، وعملكم مع عملهم

There will emerge amongst you a people, in comparison to whose Ṣalāh you will undermine your Ṣalāh, in comparison to whose fasting you will undermine your fasting, and in comparison to whose actions you will undermine your actions.²

Amazing indeed is the statement of Ibn ‘Abbās رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ which he made when he was told of how devout they were in their worship:

ليسوا بأشد اجتهادا من اليهود والنصارى

They are not more devout than the Jews and the Christians.³

1 *Al-Istiḳāmah* 1/258.

2 The ḥadīth of Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī which appears in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*: Chapter regarding the virtues of the Qur’ān: sub-chapter regarding the evil of a person who shows off with the recitation of the Qur’ān, eats off it, or boasts about it: ḥadīth no. 4771; *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: Chapter of Zakāh: sub-chapter regarding the Khawārij and their description: ḥadīth no. 1064.

3 *Muṣannaf ‘Abd al-Razzāq*: Chapter regarding blood money: sub-chapter regarding the Ḥarūriyyah: ḥadīth no. 18581; *Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah*: Chapter regarding the battle of Jamal: sub-chapter regarding the mention of the Khawārij: ḥadīth no. 37901.

3. Fighting the Khawārij

The reports of the Khawārij killing men, women, and children are quite popular, so is their excommunication of their opponents and the violation of their lives and wealth due to the slightest of doubts.

That is why the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ were unanimous regarding fighting them,¹ especially after having known the following order of Rasūl Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ:

فَأَيْنَمَا لَقَيْتَهُمْ فَاقْتُلُوهُمْ، فَإِنْ فِي قَتْلِهِمْ أَجْرًا لِمَنْ قَتَلَهُمْ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ

Kill them wherever you meet them, for there will be reward for the one who kills them on the Day of Qiyāmah.²

In fact, Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ would say, in his old age when he hands would shiver out of weakness:

لِقِتَالِ الْخَوَارِجِ أَحَبُّ إِلَيَّ مِنْ قِتَالِ عَدُوِّهِمْ مِنْ أَهْلِ الشَّرْكِ

Fighting the Khawārij is more beloved to me than fighting the same amount of polytheists.³

As a result of these great efforts many people arose to fight them after their deviance had become clear to them. Thus their defeat in the battle of Nahrawān against Amīr al-Muʾminīn ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is very well known. Even thereafter, i.e. after the demise of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ some Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ still held a very stern position against them; hence it is stated in the biography of Samurah ibn Jundub that:

1 *Majmūʿ Fatāwā Shaikh al-Islām* 20/394.

2 The ḥadīth of ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ which appears in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*: Chapter regarding demanding repentance from the renegades and opponents and fighting them; sub-chapter regarding fighting the Khawārij after establishing evidence against them: ḥadīth no. 6531; *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: Chapter of Zakāh: sub-chapter regarding the encouragement of killing the Khawārij: ḥadīth no. 1066.

3 *Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah*: Chapter regarding the battle of Jamal: sub-chapter regarding the Khawārij: ḥadīth no. 37886.

كان شديدا على الخوارج مكثرا للقتل فيهم

He was staunch against the Khawārij and would fight them a lot.¹

Likewise:

قتل منهم بشرا كثيرا

He killed a lot of people from among them.²

Many of the successors followed in the footsteps of the Ṣaḥābah. They would encourage the people very passionately to fight them. They would likewise dispel any doubts people would have which would cause them to hesitate in fighting them.³

4. Condemning the Detractors of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and Rebutting their Claims:

As was the norm, no evil would emerge whilst any of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ were alive but that they would be the first people to rise to tackle it and condemn it without any hesitation and fear.

Because the Khawārij emerged before the other types of the Nawāṣib and because the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ lived during that time, they advanced in fighting them; and just as they fought them with spears they also confronted them verbally, at times by debating with them and at times by openly and directly condemning them.

Hence we see that when a Khārijī came to Ibn ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and asked him about ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ he said:

إذا أردت أن تسأل عن علي فانظر إلى منزله من منزل رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم، هذا منزله وهذا منزل رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم

1 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 6/227.

2 *Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt* p. 222.

3 *Muṣannaf ‘Abd al-Razzāq* 10/120; Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr: *al-Tamhīd* 23/325.

If you want to ask about ‘Alī, then see what position he enjoys from Rasūl Allah ﷺ; this is his position and this is the position of Rasūl Allah ﷺ.

To which he replied, “Well, I hate him.” Ibn ‘Umar رضي الله عنه thus told him, “Then may Allah hate you.”¹

Likewise he told another person who asked him about ‘Alī رضي الله عنه:

ابن عم رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وحببيه ومن أهل بيته وزوج ابنته

The cousin of Rasūl Allah ﷺ, his beloved, a member of his household, and the husband of his daughter.

The questioner thus had no option but to remain silent.²

On the other hand, when the other type of the Nawāṣib, those who did not excommunicate ‘Alī رضي الله عنه but merely reviled him and denigrated him, emerged, those who remained of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم did not sit without taking any action; rather they confronted them as well and condemned their doings.

Hence in Madīnah, Zayd ibn Arqam رضي الله عنه condemned a governor of the Umayyads whom he heard reviling ‘Alī رضي الله عنه saying to him:

أما إنك قد علمت أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم كان ينهى عن شتم الهلكى، فلم تسب عليا وقد مات

Do you not know that Rasūl Allah ﷺ has forbade us from reviling the deceased? So why do you then revile ‘Alī when he has passed on.³

1 *Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah*: Chapter of virtues: Sub-chapter regarding the virtues of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib: ḥadīth no. 32067.

2 *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 31/193.

3 *Ḥilyah al-Awliyā’* 7/237.

Likewise in Kūfah, Saʿīd ibn Zayd رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ condemned a person whom he saw reviling ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. He also condemned those who did not condemn the criticiser despite knowing and having the ability to do so. Riyāḥ ibn al-Ḥārith¹ narrates:

كنت قاعدا عند فلان في مسجد الكوفة وعنده أهل الكوفة، فجاء سعيد بن زيد بن عمرو بن نفيل فرحب به، وحياه وأقعده عند رجله على السرير، فجاء رجل من أهل الكوفة يقال له: قيس بن علقمة فاستقبله فسب وسب. فقال سعيد: من يسب هذا الرجل؟ قال: يسب عليا. قال ألا أرى أصحاب رسول الله يسبون عندك ثم لا تنكر ولا تغير؟

I was sitting by so and so in the Masjid of Kūfah and around him were the people of Kūfah. Saʿīd ibn Zayd came and so he welcomed him, greeted him, and made him sit by his feet upon the bed. Then came a person of Kūfah who was known as Qays ibn ʿAlqamah² whom he welcomed. This person started reviling and reviling. Saʿīd thus said, “Who is this person reviling?” He said, “He is reviling ʿAlī.” Upon which Saʿīd said, “Do I not see that the Companions of Rasūl Allah ﷺ are being reviled in your presence and you do not condemn or make an effort to bring about a change.”³

At another instance, when he heard a person reviling ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ upon the pulpit he stood up and walked out of the Masjid and said to the person who was with him:

ألا تعجب من هذا يسب عليا. أشهد على رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أنا كنا على حراء أو أحد فقال النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم: اثبت حراء أو أحد، فإنما عليك صديق أو شهيد

Are you not appalled at this person who reviles ʿAlī? I testify that we were upon the mountain of Ḥirāʾ or Uḥud when Nabī ﷺ said, “Stay still

1 Riyāḥ ibn al-Ḥārith al-Nakhaʿī, Abū al-Muthannā al-Kūfī. A successor who heard from ʿAlī and Saʿīd ibn Zayd. Al-ʿIjlī has deemed him reliable and Ibn Ḥibbān has mentioned him in his Thiqaṭ. I did not come across the date of his demise. His narrations appear in the *Sunans* of Abū Dāwūd, al-Nasāʾī and Ibn Mājah. See: *Maʿrifah al-Thiqaṭ* 1/365; *Tārīkh Baghdad* 8/419; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 9/256; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 3/258.

2 I did not come across his biography in the books I have at my disposal.

3 Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal: *Faḍāʾil al-Ṣaḥābah*: ḥadīth no. 90; *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*: Chapter of al-Sunnah: sub-chapter regarding the Khulafāʾ: ḥadīth no. 4650; Ibn Abī ʿĀṣim: *al-Sunnah*: ḥadīth no. 1433; *Musnad al-Shāshī*: ḥadīth no. 216. Al-Albānī has deemed the ḥadīth Ṣaḥīḥ in his *Ṣaḥīḥ Sunan Abī Dāwūd*.

o Hirā' or Uḥūd, for upon you is a *Ṣiddīq* (a very truthful person) and a martyr."

Thereafter Nabī صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ went on to mention the ten *Ṣaḥābah*. Hence he mentioned Abū Bakr, 'Umar, 'Uthmān, 'Alī, Ṭalḥah, al-Zubayr, Sa'd, 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn 'Awf and he mentioned Sa'īd.¹

Also, in Baṣrah after the truce between Ḥasan and Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ reached its culmination and the latter appointed Busr ibn Arṭāh² as its governor. He ascended the pulpit and started to revile 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and thereafter said:

أشدد الله رجلا علم أي صادق إلا صدقتي أو كاذب إلا كذبي

I ask in the name of Allah, if any person knows me to be truthful then he should affirm, or if he knows me to be a liar then he should belie me.

Abū Bakrah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ thus said to him:

لا نعلمك إلا كاذبا

We do not know you but to be a liar.

Subsequently it was ordered that he be strangled until someone came and released him.³

1 *Musnad Ahmad*: ḥadīth no. 1638. Shu'ayb al-Arnāuṭ has said that the ḥadīth is *Ṣaḥīḥ li Ghayriḥ* (reliable due to multiple versions).

2 Busr ibn 'Umayr ibn 'Uwaymir ibn 'Imrān al-Qurashī, Abū 'Abd al-Raḥmān al-Shāmī. A partisan of 'Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and a diehard supporter of Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. There is difference of opinion regarding him being a *Ṣaḥābī* due to him being very young at the demise of Nabī صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. He became infamous for boldly shedding blood. He passed away in the era of 'Abd al-Malik after having become senile. His narrations appear in the *Sunans* of Abū Dāwūd, al-Tirmidhī and al-Nasā'ī. See: *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 7/409; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 10/144; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 3/409; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 1/381.

3 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 3/170; *al-Muntaẓam* 5/186; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 3/278; *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* 3/6.

Similarly, some of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم would prevent those who came to them from out of Madīnah from reviling ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. Abū Bakr ibn Khālid ibn ‘Urfuṭah¹ says:

رأيت سعد بن مالك بالمدينة فقال: ذكر أنكم تسبون عليا قلت نعم قال: لعلك سببته. قلت: معاذ الله. قال: لا تسبه، فإن وضع المنشار على مفرقي على أن أسب عليا ما سببته بعد ما سمعت من رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ما سمعت

I saw Sa‘d ibn Mālik in Madīnah. He said to me, “It is said that you people revile ‘Alī.” I replied, “Yes.” “Probably you also reviled him?” he asked. I said, “I seek the refuge of Allah.” Whereafter he said, “Do not revile him, for if the saw were placed upon my head and I were told to revile ‘Alī I would not do so after I heard from Rasūl Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم whatever I heard.”²

Even though most of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم only witnessed the emergence of the Khawārij, those who succeeded them witnessed the emergence of their other type and thus were eager to follow in the same path of refuting them. They, however, expanded their efforts in combatting Naṣb after its people came to the fore very openly. Hence their efforts were multiple and were channelled against both categories. It goes without doubt that covering all their efforts in this regard is difficult, but alluding to some of them will suffice.

As with regard to the Khawārij, they combatted them by exposing their deviance to the people, barring their harassment from them, warning people from socialising

1 Abū Bakr ibn Khālid ibn ‘Urfuṭah al-‘Udhri, the ally of the Banū Zuhrah. He met a few Ṣaḥābah and narrated from them. Imām Aḥmad has said, “Narrations can be narrated from him.” and Ibn Ḥajar has said, “He is acceptable.” I have not come across the date of his demise. His narrations appear in *Khaṣā’iṣ ‘Alī* of al-Nasā’ī. See: *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta’dīl* 9/340; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 33/90; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 12/28; *Taqrīb al-Tahdhīb* 622.

2 *Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah*: chapter of merits: sub-chapter regarding the merits of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رضي الله عنه ḥadīth no. 32122; *Sunan al-Nasā’ī al-Kubrā*: chapter of specialities: sub-chapter regarding the statement of Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم, “Whoever reviles ‘Alī has reviled me.” ḥadīth no. 8488; *Musnad Abī Ya’lā*: ḥadīth no. 777; al-Maqdisī: *al-Aḥādīth al-Mukhtārah*: ḥadīth no. 1077. Al-Haythamī has deemed the transmission of Abū Ya’lā Ḥasan in *Majma’ al-Zawā’id* 9/130., and Ibn Ḥajar has alluded that it is acceptable in *Fath al-Bārī* 7/74

with them and prohibiting those who interacted with them from attending their gatherings.¹

Some of these efforts would at times be very open and bold. Hence in the Ḥaram where Muslims of all backgrounds, races, and places convene; the leading scholar of Makkah ‘Aṭā’ ibn Abī Rabāḥ² would announce whilst circumambulating the Ka’bah:

احفظوا عني خمسا... والشهادة على الخوارج بالضلالة

Remember five things from me... and remember my testimony regarding the Khawārij being upon deviance.³

Likewise in Baṣrah a person of the Khawārij stood in the gathering of al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī,⁴ the leading scholar of Baṣrah and its ascetic, and asked him, “What do you say about ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib?” The cheeks of al-Ḥasan became red and he said furiously:

رحم الله عليا. إن عليا كان سهما لله صائبا في أعدائه. وكان في محلة العلم أشرفها وأقربها من رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم. وكان رهباني هذه الأمة، لم يكن لمال الله بالسروقة، ولا في أمر الله بالنؤومة. أعطى القرآن عزيمة علمه فكان منه في رياض موقنة وأعلام بيته. ذاك علي بن أبي طالب يا لكع.

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* 1/20; *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 6/181; al-‘Uqaylī: *al-Ḍu‘afā’* 2/186.

2 ‘Aṭā’ ibn Aslam al-Qurashī al-Fihri, their client, Abū Muḥammad ibn Abī Rabāḥ al-Makkī. The jurist of Makkah and its worshipper. He was born during the Khilāfah of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه and was originally from Africa. He met two hundred of the Companions of Rasūl Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم. He was the supreme Muftī of Makkah alongside Mujāhid. He was reliable but would often omit the Ṣaḥābī between him and Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم. He passed away in 114 A.H. His narrations appear in the six books. See: *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 40/366; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 20/69; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 5/78; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 7/179.

3 *Ḥilyah al-Awliyā’* 3/312; *Tārīkh Aṣḥāhān* 2/152; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/308.

4 Al-Ḥasan ibn Abī al-Ḥasan (his name was Yasār) al-Anṣārī, their ally, Abū Sa‘īd al-Baṣrī. The leading scholar of Baṣrah its ascetic and one of the prominent successors. He was born in Madīnah two years before the demise of ‘Umar رضي الله عنه. He met a fair amount of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم. Ibn Sa‘īd said about him, “He was a polymath, a person of high stature, a jurist, an authority, a worshipper, and an eloquent orator.” He passed away in 121 A.H. His narrations appear in the six books. See: *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 6/95; *al-‘Ibar fī Khabar man Ghabar* 1/490; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/268; *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafāyāt* 12/190.

May Allah have mercy upon ‘Alī. Indeed ‘Alī was an arrow of Allah who struck the enemy; he was upon the noblest position of knowledge and he was the closest relative of Rasūl Allah ﷺ. He was the ascetic of the Ummah, he was not one who stole the wealth of Allah nor was he one who was heedless regarding the orders of Allah. He gave the Qur’ān the cream of his knowledge and was thus in a glamorous orchard thereof and upon clear signs. That is who ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib is, O lowly man.¹

Likewise some scholars would not allow a Ḥarūrī to visit them.²

The efforts of the successors and those who followed them in this regard were considered to be an extension of the efforts of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ which had already previously weakened the might of the Khawārij to a very large extent.

As with regard to the second type, despite Naṣb spreading amongst many of the Umayyads who were known to be leaders of might, but this did not stop the scholars from condemning them whenever they deviated from the straight path regarding ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

Al-Zuhrī³ had stood firm on his stance at two occasions with two of the Khalīfahs of the Banū Umayyah. He says:

كنت عند الوليد بن عبد الملك ليلة من الليالي وهو يقرأ سورة النور مستلقيا فلما بلغ إِنَّ الَّذِينَ جَاءُوا بِالْإِفْكِ عُصْبَةٌ مِّنْكُمْ لَا تحْسِبُوهُ شَرًّا لَّكُمْ بَلْ هُوَ خَيْرٌ لَّكُمْ لِكُلِّ امْرِئٍ مِّنْهُمْ مَا اكْتَسَبَ مِنَ الْإِثْمِ وَالَّذِي تَوَلَّى كِبْرَهُ مِنْهُمْ لَهُ عَذَابٌ عَظِيمٌ جلس ثم قال: يا أبا بكر من تولى كبره؟ أليس علي بن أبي طالب. قلت

1 *Al-Mujālasah wa Jawāhir al-‘ilm* p. 220; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 42/490; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 8/5.

2 *Al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 7/185; *Muṣannaḥ Ibn Abī Shaybah* 7/557; *Ḥilyah al-Awliyā’* 2/285.

3 Muḥammad ibn Muslim ibn ‘Ubayd Allāh ibn Shihāb al-Zuhrī, Abū Bakr al-Madanī. A successor who settled in Shām. He was a jurist and a great retainer of ḥadīth. His prominence and perfection is unanimously accepted. Ayyūb al-Sakhtiyānī said about him, “I have not seen anyone more knowledgeable than al-Zuhrī.” He passed away in Shām in 124 A.H. His narrations appear in all six books. See: *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 55/294; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 26/419; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 5/326; *Tadhkirah al-Ḥuffāz* 1/108.

في نفسي ماذا أقول؟ لئن قلت: لا، لقد خشيت أن ألقى منه شرا! ولت قلت نعم، لقد حثت بأمر عظيم! قلت لرجل من أصحاب رسول الله ما لم يقل. ثم قلت في نفسي: لقد عودني الله على الصدق خيرا. لا يا أمير المؤمنين. قال فضرب بقضيبه السرير مرتين أو ثلاثا، ثم قال: فمن؟ حتى ردد ذلك مرارا. قلت: يا أمير المؤمنين، عبد الله بن أبي بن سلول

I was in the gathering of Walīd ibn ‘Abd al-Malik¹ one night and he was reading Sūrah al-Nūr whilst lying down. When he reached the verse, “*Indeed, those who came with falsehood are a group among you. Do not think it bad for you; rather it is good for you. For every person among them is what [punishment] he has earned from the sin, and he who took upon himself the greater portion thereof for him is a great punishment [i.e., Hellfire].*”

He sat up and said, “O Abū Bakr, who was responsible for its major share? Was it not ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib?”

I said to myself, if I say ‘no’ I fear that I might encounter bad from him; and if I say ‘yes’ I will indeed be doing a very grave matter, for I will be attributing to one of the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūl Allah ﷺ what he did not say. I then said to myself ‘Allah has promised me good upon speaking the truth’ and said, “No, O Amīr al-Mu‘minīn.”

He thus hit his bed with his stick two or three times and then said, “Who then?” repeating that several times.

I said, “O Amīr al-Mu‘minīn, it was ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ubay ibn Salūl.”²

1 Walīd ibn ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam al-Umawī, Abū al-‘Abbās al-Dimashqī. He assumed the Khilāfah after his father in the year 86 A.H. Many places were conquered during his time. He had likewise built the Jāmi’ Masjid of Damascus. He managed the affairs of the Khilāfah well even though he was hard and tyrannical. He passed away in 96 A.H. at the age of fifty one. See: *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 63/164; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 4/347; *Fawāt al-Wafayāt* 2/588; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/161.

2 *Al-Mu’jam al-Kabīr* of al-Ṭabarānī: ḥadīth no. 145. For more details see: *al-Ma’rifah wa al-Tārīkh* 1/201; *Tafsīr al-Ṣan’ānī* 3/52; *Ḥilyah al-Awliyā’* 3/369; *al-Durr al-Manthūr* 6/157.

At another occasion a similar incident took place with another Khalīfah. Sulaymān ibn Yasār¹ came to visit Hishām ibn ‘Abd al-Malik and the following transpired:

يا سليمان، الذي تولى كبره من هو؟ قال: عبد الله بن أبي. قال: كذبت! هو علي. قال أمير المؤمنين أعلم بما يقول. فدخل الزهري فقال: يا بن شهاب، من الذي تولى كبره؟ قال: ابن أبي. قال: كذبت! هو علي. فقال: أنا أكذب لا أبا لك. والله لو نادى مناد من السماء أن الله أحل الكذب ما كذبت! ثم روى عن عائشة باسانيده أن الذي تولى كبره عبد الله بن أبي. وعندئذ قال هشام: إنا أن نهيج الشيخ يهيج الشيخ.

Hishām thus said to him, “O Sulaymān, who is the one who was responsible for its major share?”

He said, “‘Abd Allāh ibn Ubayy.”

“You are lying! It was ‘Alī,” he retorted.

He thus said, “Amīr al-Mu`minīn knows better what he is saying.”

Subsequently al-Zuhrī entered, so he asked him, “Who is the one who was responsible for its major share?”

He replied, “‘Ibn Ubayy.”

“You are lying,” responded the Khalīfah.

To which al-Zuhrī said, “Would I lie, may you lose your father. By Allah if an announcer has to announce from the heavens that Allah has made lying permissible I would still not lie.”

He then went onto narrate from ‘Ā’ishah رضي الله عنها that the one who was responsible for most of the propaganda was ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ubayy.

1 Sulaymān ibn Yasār al-Hilālī, their client, Abū Ayyūb al-Madanī, the freed slave of Maymūnah رضي الله عنها. He was one of the seven prominent jurist of Madīnah. He met more than ten Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم. Some scholars would hold him in higher esteem than Sa‘īd ibn al-Musayyab. He was reliable in whatever he narrated. He passed away in 107 A.H. His narrations appear in the six books. See: *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 5/174; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 12/100; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 4/444; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 4/199.

Subsequently Hishām said, “If we incite the old man he will become furious.”¹

This comment made by the two Umayyad rulers was stemming from the Naṣb that was prevalent,² as opined by al-Ālūsī.³

Likewise Ibn Ḥajar, after having covered all its various sources, whilst commenting on this story mentions:

كأن بعض من لا خير فيه من الناصبة تقرب إلى بني أمية بهذه الكذبة... لعلمهم بانحرافهم عن علي، فظنوا صحتها حتى بين الزهري للوليد أن الحق خلاف ذلك، فجزاه الله تعالى خيرا

It seems as though some of the Nawāṣib endeavoured to attain closeness to the Banū Umayyah by way of this lie, due to them knowing of their disdain for ‘Alī. The governors thus thought that it is correct until al-Zuhrī came about and told al-Walīd that the truth is otherwise. May Allah ﷻ reward him with goodness.⁴

Another very pertinent position is the position taken by Ṭalḥah ibn Muṣarrif⁵ when he was threatened to be executed if he did not revile ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Hereunder are the details of what happened:

1 *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 55/371; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 5/329; *Fath al-Bārī* 7/437.

2 *Rūḥ al-Ma’ānī* 18/117.

3 Maḥmūd ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥusaynī, Abū al-Thana’ al-Ālūsī, attributed to the Ālūs Island which is situated in the Euphrates River. An exegete of the Qur’ān, and ḥadīth scholar, a master in literature and a scholar with immense knowledge. He passed away in 1270 A.H. Some of his books are: *Rūḥ al-Ma’ānī fī Tafsīr al-Qur’ān al-‘Aẓīm wa al-Sab’ al-Mathānī*, *Daqā’iq al-Tafsīr*, *al-Risālah al-Lāḥiriyyah*. See: *al-A’lām* 7/176; *Mu’jam al-Mu’allifīn* 12/175.

4 *Fath al-Bārī* 7/437, with a little condensation.

5 Ṭalḥah ibn Muṣarrif ibn ‘Amr al-Hamadānī, Abū Muḥammad al-Kūfī. One of the reliable scholars. He was known as the *Sayyid al-Qurrā’* (the leader of the scholars) due to him being the most learned. ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Abjar said about him, “I have not seen him with a people but found him to be more virtuous. He passed away in 112 A.H. His narrations appear in all six books. See: *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 6/308; *Ma’rifah al-Thiqāt* 1/379; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 13/433; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 5/23.

إن سليمان بن عبد الملك كان جالسا، فمر به رجل عليه ثياب يخیل في مشيته. فقال: هذا ينبغي أن يكون عراقيا، وينبغي أن يكون كوفيا، وينبغي أن يكون من همدان. ثم قال: علي بالرجل، فأتي به فقال: ممن الرجل. فقال: ويلك دعني حتى ترجع إلي نفسي. قال: فتركه هنيهة، ثم سأله ممن الرجل؟ قال: من أهل العراق. قال: من أيهم؟ قال: من أهل الكوفة. قال: أي أهل الكوفة؟ قال: من همدان. فزاد عجباً فقال: ما تقول في أبي بكر؟ قال: والله ما أدركت دهره وأدرك دهره! ولقد قال الناس فيه فأحسنوا، وهو إن شاء الله كذلك. قال: فما تقول في عمر؟ فقال مثل ذلك. قال: فما تقول في عثمان؟ قال: والله ما أدركت دهره ولا أدرك دهره، ولقد قال فيه الناس فأحسنوا، وقال فيه ناس فأساؤوا، وعند الله غلمه. قال: فما تقول في علي؟ قال هو الله مثل ذلك. قال: سب عليا. قال: لا أسبه. قال: والله لتسبته. قال: والله لا أسبه. قال: والله لتسبته أو لأضربن عنقك. قال: والله لا أسبه. قال: فأمر بضرب عنقه، فقال رجل في يده سيف فهزه حتى أضاءه في يده كأنه الخوصة، فقال: والله لتسبته أو لأضربن عنقك. قال: والله لا أسبه. ثم نادى: ويلك يا سليمان! أدني منك، فدعا به فقال: يا سليمان: أما ترضى مني بما رضي به من هو خير منك ممن هو خير مني فيمن هو شر من علي؟ قال: وما ذاك؟ قال: الله رضي من عيسى وهو خير مني إذ قال في بني إسرائيل وهم شر من علي: *إِنْ تُعَذِّبُهُمْ فَإِنَّهُمْ عِبَادُكَ وَإِنْ تَغْفِرْ لَهُمْ فَإِنَّكَ أَنْتَ الْعَزِيزُ الْحَكِيمُ*. قال: فنظرت إلى الغضب ينحدر من وجهه حتى صار في طرف أرنبته ثم قال: خليا سبيله، فعاد إلى مشيه.

Sulaymān ibn ‘Abd al-Malik¹ was sitting one day when a person passed by him walking proudly. He thus said, “This person should be an Iraqi, and he should be from Kūfah, and he should be from Hamadān.

He then said, “Bring the man to me.” And he was thus brought.

So he asked, “From where is the gentleman?”

He replied, “Leave me till my breath returns to me.”

He thus left him for a while and then asked, “From where is the gentleman?”

“From Iraq,” he replied.

1 Sulaymān ibn ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān al-Umawī, Abū Ayyūb al-Dimashqī. He was born in Madīnah and grew up in Shām. He was eloquent, loved justice and fighting in the path of Allah. He took his cousin ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz his personal advisor through whom lots of good came to being. He sent an army to besiege Constantinople who was successful in entering into agreement with its people and building a Masjid there. He passed away in 99 A.H. See: *Wafayāt al-A‘yān* 2/420; *Fawāt al-Wafayāt* 1/453; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/177; *Māāthir al-Ināqah* 1/138.

“From which of the people of Iraq?” he asked.

“From the people of Kūfah,” he replied.

He then asked, “From which of the people of Kūfah?”

He said, “From the people of Hamadān.”

This excited him and he thus asked, “What do you say about Abū Bakr?”

He said, “By Allah I did not see his era nor did he live to see mine. The people have said good about him and are right in doing so, and he is by the will of Allah as they say.”

He further asked, “What do you say about ‘Umar?” and He gave the same answer.

Then he asked, “What do you say about ‘Uthmān?”

He said, “By Allah I did not see his time and nor did he see mine. Some have commented about him and have done good in doing so and others have likewise commented about him and have done wrong in doing so; knowledge of his state lies with Allah.”

He asked, “What do you say about ‘Alī?”

He retorted, “He is no different.”

Sulaymān demanded, “Revile him.”

He said, “I will not revile him.”

He again said, “By Allah you will surely revile him.”

He responded, “By Allah I will not revile him.”

He again demanded, “By Allah you will surely swear him or else I will slay you.”

He replied, “By Allah I will not revile him.”

He thus ordered that he be slayed. A person thus stood up with a sword flashing in his hand as if it was a big pearl.

He once more demanded, “By Allah you will revile him or I will slay you.”

He replied, “By Allah I will not revile him.”

He then called out, “Woe to you, O Sulaymān, allow me to come near you.”

He thus called him and he said, “O Sulaymān, would you not be happy with me if I said that which made the one better than you happy with he who he is better than me regarding those who are worse than ‘Alī?”

He said, “What do you mean?”

He replied, “Allah was happy with *Ṭisā* طيسا, who is better than me, when he said the following regarding the Banū Isrāʾīl who were worse than ‘Alī: *If you should punish them, indeed they are your servants; but if you forgive them, indeed it is you who is the Exalted in Might, the Wise.*”

He says “I saw the anger leaving his face till it settled at the tip of his nose.”

Thereafter he said, “Leave him.” and consequently he returned to his proud walk.¹

What captures ones attention in this awe inspiring story is that Ṭalḥah was classed as an ‘Uthmānī (a partisan of ‘Uthmān)² due to him opposing most of the people of

1 *Ḥilyah al-Awliyā’* 5/16.

2 *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 13/437.

Kūfah by giving preference to ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه over ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. But his consideration for the trust of knowledge was so sublime that that did not allow him to please the Khalīfah by reviling ‘Alī رضي الله عنه even though he would be executed.¹

Similarly, another interesting incident which occurred is that Hishām ibn ‘Abd al-Malik wrote a letter to al-A‘mash requesting him to document the merits of ‘Uthmān and the demerits of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. When al-A‘mash received it his response was disdainful; he took the letter and fed it to a sheep which was by him and said to the messenger of the Khalīfah, “This is your answer. But when the messenger insisted that he write a response and beseeched him by telling him that he did not return with an answer the Khalīfah will kill him, al-A‘mash wrote the following:

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم، أما بعد، فلو كان لعثمان مناقب أهل الأرض ما نفعتك، ولو كانت لعلي مساوئ
أهل الأرض ما ضرتك، فعليك بخويصة نفسك، والسلام.

In the name of Allah the beneficent the merciful. If ‘Uthmān enjoyed the merits of the people of the world they would not benefit you; and if ‘Alī رضي الله عنه was tainted with all the demerits of the people of the world they would not harm you. So worry about yourself. Wa al-Salām.²

One last incident in this regard is what occurred between ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz and one of his teachers of Madīnah. The latter had corrected him after seeing that he was also influenced by much of the Naṣb which was prevalent in the Umayyad household. What happened was that he would often visit ‘Ubayd Allāh ibn ‘Abd Allāh³ and would assimilate knowledge from him. One day ‘Ubayd Allāh came to know that ‘Umar denigrates ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and thus said to him:

1 Al-Khallāl: *al-Sunnah* 2/395; *al-‘Ibar fī Khabar man Ghabar* 1/139.

2 *Ḥilyah al-Awliyā’* 3/369; *Wafayāt al-A‘yān* 2/403; *Mir’āt al-Jinān* 1/306; *Shadharāt al-Dhabab* 1/221.

3 ‘Ubayd Allāh ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Utbah ibn Mas‘ūd al-Hudhalī, Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Madanī. One of the seven prominent jurists of Madīnah and its worshippers. He was reliable and trustworthy and was an expert in poetry. ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz said the following regarding him, “If ‘Ubayd Allāh was alive I would only give up my opinion for his.” He passed away in 98 A.H. His narrations appear in all six books. See: *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 5/250; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 19/73; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 4/475; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 5/272.

متى بلغك أن الله تعالى سخط على أهل بدر بعد أن رضي عنهم؟

When has it reached you that Allah became displeased with the participants of Badr after being pleased with them?

‘Umar immediately picked up his intent and said, “May Allah forgive me and I seek your pardon. I will never do this again.” Thereafter ‘Umar was never heard mentioning ‘Alī رضي الله عنه but with goodness.¹

5. Not Narrating from the Nawāṣib

Some scholars of the Sunnah were of the opinion that the Nawāṣib should not be accepted at all, not even the narrations of those who were meticulous amongst them. This was, however, a personal approach based on their personal reasoning and choices. Hence we see variant approaches come to the fore.

A group of the early scholars opined that it would not be permissible to use their narrations as authority. This group has given two reasons for their position:

1. Their disbelief,² in which case this would apply to the Khawārij specifically and not to the other Nawāṣib. Rejecting the narrations of the former on this basis is completely clear.
2. Their *Fisq* (sinfulness): this would include all the stripes of the Nawāṣib.

The basis of this difference is due to a theological contention which pertains to the ruling of innovators whose innovations pertain to dogma and belief, will they be classed as disbelievers or merely as imposters?³

1 *Al-Ma’rifah wa al-Tārīkh* 1/316; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 45/136; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 5/117; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/193.

2 The ruling regarding the Khawārij will come in depth on p. 852. (Add page number)

3 *Al-Kifāyah fī ‘ilm al-Riwāyah* 1/120; *Lisān al-Mizān* 1/7; *Faṭḥ al-Mughhith* 1/327.

Nonetheless, various scholars have forbade accepting the narrations of various Nawāṣib of both categories, hereunder we enlist some of them:

- Rabī'ah ibn Yazīd:¹ He would swear 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.² That is why Abū Ḥātim has said the following regarding him:

لا يروى عنه ولا كرامة، ولا يذكر بخير

No, never can one narrate from him, nor can he be mentioned with goodness.³

- Yazīd ibn Mu'āwiyah: Imām Aḥmad was asked whether one can narrate from him, and he said:

لا ولا كرامة

No, never.⁴

- 'Umar ibn Sa'd: The commander of the army which killed Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.⁵ Yaḥyā Ibn Ma'īn⁶ was asked, "Is he reliable?" He replied by saying:

1 Rabī'ah ibn Yazīd al-Sulamī: Some have stated that he was a Ṣaḥābī but most have denied that. Abū Ḥātim said about him, "Whoever has considered him amongst the Ṣaḥābah has not brought anything forth." Ibn Ḥibbān has documented him in his *al-Thiqāt*. I did not come across his date of death. See: *al-Thiqāt* 3/129; *al-Istī'āb* 2/493; *al-Iṣābah* 2/477.

2 *Al-Istī'āb* 2/493; *al-Iṣābah* 2/477.

3 *Al-Istī'āb* 2/493; *al-Iṣābah* 2/477.

4 *Al-Muntaẓam* 5/322; *Mizān al-ʿitidāl* 7/262.

5 *Ma'rifaḥ al-Thiqāt* 2/166.

6 Yaḥyā ibn Ma'īn ibn 'Awn ibn Ziyād al-Ghaṭafānī, their client, Abū Zakariyyā al-Baghdādī. A reliable and prominent scholar of ḥadīth. One of the most learned regarding transmitter biographies. He was born in 158 A.H. Imām Aḥmad described him as one whom Allah created to expose the lies of the liars. He passed away in Madīnah in 233 A.H. His body was carried upon the bench of Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. His narrations appear in all six books. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 14/177; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 65/3; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 31/543; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 11/246.

How can the person who killed Ḥusayn عليه السلام be reliable?¹

Likewise at one occasion Yaḥyā ibn al-Qaṭṭān² narrated a narration from him. But when he was rebuked for doing so he regretted and said that he will never narrate from him again.³

- ‘Imrān ibn Ḥiṭṭān:⁴ He was a Khārījī. Al-Dār Quṭnī⁵ said the following about him:

متروك لسوء اعتقاده و خبث مذهبه

He is discarded due to his evil beliefs and his dirty dogma.⁶

1 *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 65/3; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 31/543; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 11/246.

2 Yaḥyā ibn Sa‘īd ibn Farrūkh al-Qaṭṭān al-Tamīmī, their client, Abū Sa‘īd al-Baṣrī. An expert retainer of ḥadīth and a worshipper. He was an expert in ḥadīth transmitters but was a bit too stringent in his criticism. He was born in 158 A.H. Imām Aḥmad described him by saying, “I have not seen anyone like him.” He passed away in 198 A.H. His narrations appear in the six books. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 14/135; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 31/329; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 11/190; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 9/175.

3 *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 45/39; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 21/357.

4 ‘Imrān ibn Ḥiṭṭān ibn Zībān al-Sadūsī, Abū Simāk al-Baṣrī. A prominent scholar and one of the poets of the Khawārij. He met a group of the Ṣaḥābah عليهم السلام and eventually adopted the dogma of the Khawārij. It is alleged that he repented from it. He is deemed a reliable narrator of ḥadīth, as stated by al-‘Ijlī and others. He passed away in 84 A.H. His narrations appear in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, and the *Sunans* of Abū Dāwūd and al-Nasā‘ī. See: *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 22/322; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 4/214; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/52; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 8/113.

5 ‘Alī ibn ‘Umar ibn Aḥmad ibn Maḥdī al-Baghdādī, Abū al-Ḥasan al-Dār Quṭnī. One of the great scholars of ḥadīth. He is attributed to Dār al-Quṭn, a place in Baghdād. He was born in 306 A.H. He was considered the individual at who the memorisation and the knowledge of the inner flaws of ḥadīth ended. He was also an expert in the *Qirā’āt* (various modes of reading the Qur’ān) and a fair share in other sciences as well. He has been described as having some leanings toward Shī‘ism. He passed away in 385 A.H. Some of his books are: *al-Sunan*, *al-‘Ilal* and a book on the *Qirā’āt*. See: *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 43/93; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 16/449; *Tadhkirah al-Ḥuffāz* 3/991; *Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥuffāz* 1/393.

6 *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 8/114; *al-Iṣṣabah fī Tamyīz al-Ṣaḥābah* 5/305.

He also criticised al-Bukhārī for recording his narration in his *al-Ṣaḥīḥ*.¹

- Ismāʿīl ibn Sumayʿ al-Juʿfī.² He was a Khārijī and of those who hated ʿAlī رضي الله عنه.³ Due to his preposterous dogma Zāʿidah ibn Qudāmah, Jarīr ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd,⁴ and Sufyān ibn ʿUyaynah⁵ discarded his narrations, as his mentioned by several scholars.⁶
- Ḥarīz ibn ʿUthmān: Some scholars have discarded his narrations and have impugned him and accused him of Naṣb. Hence Yaḥyā ibn Ṣāliḥ⁷ has said regarding him that his narrations should not be written.⁸ And Abū Ḥātim al-Bustī has stated:

1 *Al-Iṣābah* 5/305.

2 Ismāʿīl ibn Sumayʿ al-Juʿfī, Abū Muḥammad al-Kūfī. He has narrated from Anas رضي الله عنه and others. Several scholars have deemed him reliable and he has been impugned due to his Khārijī leanings. See: *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 3/107; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 1/266.

3 *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 1/266.

4 Jarīr ibn ʿAbd al-Ḥamīd ibn Qurṭ al-Ḍabbī, Abū ʿAbd Allāh al-Rāzī. He was born in Aṣfahān and grew up in Kūfah. He settled in Ray and became a judge there. He was a very rough and hard worshipper. It is said that toward the end of his life he would at time err when narrating ḥadīth. He passed away in 188 A.H. at the age of seventy one. His narrations appear in all six books. See: *al-Jarḥ wa al-Taʿdīl* 2/505; *al-Thiqāt* 6/145; *Siyar Aʿlām al-Nubalāʾ* 9/9; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 2/65.

5 Sufyān ibn ʿUyaynah ibn Maymūn al-Hilālī, their client, Abū Muḥammad al-Makkī. A very prominent scholar whose prominence is undisputed. He was born in Kūfah in 107 A.H. He is deemed to be in the category of Imām Mālik in his knowledge and perfection. Imām Aḥmad has said about him, “I have not seen anyone more knowledgeable in ḥadīth than him.” He passed away in 198 A.H. His narrations appear in all six books. See: *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 11/177; *Tārīkh al-Islām* 13/189; *Siyar Aʿlām al-Nubalāʾ* 8/454; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 4/104.

6 Al-ʿUqaylī: *al-Ḍuʿafāʾ* 1/78; *al-Kāmil fī Ḍuʿafāʾ al-Rijāl* 1/287; *Mizān al-Iʿtidāl* 1/391; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 11/266.

7 Yaḥyā ibn Ṣāliḥ al-Waḥḥāzī: Abū Zakariyyā al-Dimashqī (and some say al-Ḥimṣī). He was a retainer of Ḥadīth and a jurist. Ibn Maʿīn and others have deemed him reliable, whilst others have impugned him due to his Jahmī tendencies, not due to his expertise. He passed away in 222 A.H. His narrations appear in the *Ṣaḥīḥs* of al-Bukhārī and Muslim and the *Sunans* of Abū Dāwūd, al-Tirmidhī and Ibn Mājah. See: *Ḍuʿafāʾ al-ʿUqaylī* 4/408; *al-Thiqāt* 9/260; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 64/275; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 11/201.

8 *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 2/209.

حريز بن عثمان ليس بشيء في الحديث

Ḥarīz ibn ‘Uthmān is not anything in ḥadīth.¹

He also said about him:

كان داعية إلى مذهبه يتنكب حديثه

He would invite toward his dogma and thus his narrations should be neglected.²

Ishāq ibn Suwayd:³ He would denigrate ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.⁴ Although he was satisfactory but some transmitter critics have impugned him because of this. Hence Abū al-‘Arab al-Tamīmī⁵ states that he would say, “I would not love ‘Alī.” and thereafter al-Tamīmī would say:

من لم يحب الصحابة فليس بثقة ولا كرامة

Whoever does not love the Ṣaḥābah is not a reliable narrator, never can he be.⁶

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān* 3/325.

2 *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 2/209.

3 Ishāq ibn Suwayd ibn Hubayrah al-‘Adawī. A poet who is considered to be from the successors. Several scholars like Ibn Ma‘īn, Aḥmad and al-Nasā‘ī have deemed him reliable. He passed away in a plague in 131 A.H. His narrations appear in the *Ṣaḥīḥs* of al-Bukhārī and Muslim and the *Sunans* of Abū Dāwūd and al-Nasā‘ī. See: *al-Thiqāt* 6/47; *al-Ta‘dīl wa al-Tarjīḥ* of al-Bājī 1/381; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 2/432; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 1/206.

4 *Ma‘rifah al-Thiqāt* 1/218; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 1/206.

5 Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn Tamīm al-Tamīmī, Abū al-‘Arab al-Maghribī. A Retainer of ḥadīth a historian and a polymath. He was from the posterity of the rulers of the West. He studied the school of Mālik from the students of Suḥnūn. He passed away in Dhī al-Qa‘dah in 333 A.H. Some of his books are: *Ṭabaqāt Ahl Ifrīqiyyah*, *Kitāb al-Miḥan*, *Kitāb al-Tārīkh*. See: *al-Ikmāl* 7/66; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 15/394; *Tadhkirah al-Ḥuffāz* 3/889.

6 *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 1/206; *Muqaddamah Faṭḥ al-Bārī* 1/389.

- Nu‘aym ibn Abī Hind:¹ Al-Thawrī did not narrate from him. When he was asked as to why he did not narrate from him he said:

كان يتناول عليا

He would denigrate ‘Alī عليه السلام.²

- Asad ibn Wadā‘ah:³ He was a reviling Nāṣibī.⁴ Abū al-‘Arab has said the following regarding him:

من سب الصحابة فليس بثقة ولا مأمون

He who reviles the Ṣaḥābah عليهم السلام is not reliable and trustworthy.⁵

- Ḥusayn ibn Numayr:⁶ he was accused of Naṣb.⁷

1 Nu‘aym ibn Abī Hind (his actual name is Nu‘mān) ibn Ashyam al-Ashja‘ī. A reliable narrator of Kūfah. His father was a Ṣaḥābī. He has narrated from Abū Wā‘il and others and from Shu‘bah has narrated and others. He passed away in 110 A.H. His narrations appear in the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of Muslim and the *Sunans* of al-Tirmidhī, al-Nasā‘ī and Ibn Mājah. See: *Ma‘rifah al-Thiqāt* 2/318; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 29/497; *Mīzān al-I‘tidāl* 7/45; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 10/417.

2 *Mīzān al-I‘tidāl* 7/46; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 10/417.

3 Asad ibn Wadā‘ah al-Ṭā‘ī al-Nabahānī, Abū al-‘Alā’ al-Shāmī. One of the saints of Shām and its scholars. He met some Ṣaḥābah عليهم السلام like Abū Umāmah and the people of Shām have taken narrations from him. He was the judge of the army in Ḥimṣ. Al-Nasā‘ī has approved of him and Ibn Ḥibbān has mentioned him in his *al-Thiqāt*. He was killed in 136 A.H. See: *al-Ma‘rifah wa al-Tārīkh* 1/5; *Ḍu‘afā’ al-Uqaylī* 1/26; *Mīzān al-I‘tidāl* 1/364; *Lisān al-Mīzān* 1/385.

4 *Al-Mughnī fī al-Ḍu‘afā’* 1/76.

5 *Lisān al-Mīzān* 1/385.

6 Ḥusayn ibn Numayr al-Hamadānī, their client, Abū Miḥṣan al-Wāsiṭī al-Ḍarīr. Originally of Kūfah. Shu‘bah, Sufyān, Ibn Abī Laylā and others have narrated from him. Most scholars have deemed him reliable. I did not come across his date of demise. His narrations appear in the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of al-Bukhārī and the *Sunans* of al-Nasā‘ī, Abū Dāwūd and al-Tirmidhī. See: *al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta’dīl* 3/197; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 6/546; *Mīzān al-I‘tidāl* 2/314; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 2/337.

7 *Taqrīb al-Tahdhīb* p. 171.

That is why Abū Khaythamah¹ discarded him and said:

أتيتُه، فإذا هو يحمل على علي فلم أعد إليه

I came to him and he was reviling ‘Alī عليه السلام and so I did not return to him.²

1 Zuhayr ibn Ḥarb ibn Shaddād al-Ḥarashī, their client, Abū Khaythamah al-Baghdādī. A retainer of ḥadīth and an authority. He was born in 160 A.H. He settled in Baghdād after having travelled extensively for knowledge. He authored books and done so with brilliance. Yaḥyā ibn Maʾīn has said regarding him, “Abū Khaythamah will suffice an entire tribe.” He passed away in the Khilāfah of al-Mutawakkil in 234 A.H. Besides al-Tirmidhī all others have narrated his narrations. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 8/482; *Siyar Aʿlām al-Nubalāʾ* 11/489; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 9/402; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 3/296.

2 *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 2/337.

The Third Sub-Chapter

The Stance of the Umayyad and Abbasid Khulafā' regarding Naṣb and the Nawāṣib

This will comprise of two discussions:

1. The stance of the Umayyads.
2. The stance of the Abbasids.

The First Discussion

The Stance of the Umayyad Khulafā'¹

1 It is more appropriate to rather class them and *Mulūk* (kings) than as *Khulafā'*, as per the ḥadīth of Nabī ﷺ. Dubbing them *Khulafā'* is merely a trope. Safīnah رضي الله عنه narrates that Rasūl Allah ﷺ said:

خلافة النبوة ثلاثون سنة ثم يؤتي الله الملك أو ملكه من يشاء. قال سعيد: قال لي سفينة: أمسك عليك: أبا بكر سنتين، وعمر عشرة، وعثمان اثنتي عشرة، وعلي كذا. قال سعيد: قلت لسفينة: إن هؤلاء يزعمون أن عليا لم يكن نبيا. قال: كذبت أستاذ بني الزرقاء! يعني بني مروان. زاد الترمذي: بل هم ملوك من شر الملوك.

The *Khilāfah* (succession) of Nubuwwah will be thirty years. Thereafter Allah will grant kingdom, or his kingdom, to whomsoever he wishes.”

Saʿd, the narrator from Safīnah رضي الله عنه, mentions, “Bear this from me: Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه ruled for two years, ‘Umar رضي الله عنه for ten years, ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه for twelve years, and ‘Alī رضي الله عنه for so many years.” Saʿd says that he said to Safīnah رضي الله عنه, “These people claim that ‘Alī رضي الله عنه was not a *Khalīfah*.” He replied, “The butt-cheeks of the Banū al-Zurqā’ have lied!” intending the Banū Marwān. Al-Tirmidhī has added, “In fact they are kings from the worst of kings.”

This ḥadīth appears in *Sunan Abī Dāwūd* 4/211; *Sunan al-Tirmidhī* 4/503 (he has deemed it Ḥasan; al-Albānī has deemed it Ṣaḥīḥ and has documented it in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Jāmi’ wa Ziyādatuh*: narration no. 5568.) When this ḥadīth was narrated before Mu’āwiyah رضي الله عنه he said, “We are content with kingdom.” See: *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 6/198.

Likewise he would also say, “I am the first king.” See: *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 3/157.

Whilst commenting upon the aforementioned ḥadīth of Safīnah رضي الله عنه Ibn Kathīr mentions:

وهذا الحديث فيه المنع من تسمية معاوية خليفه، وبيان أن الخلافة قد انقطعت بعد الثلاثين سنة لا مطلقا بل انقطع تتابعها
This ḥadīth contain the prohibition of dubbing Mu’āwiyah رضي الله عنه a *Khalīfah*, just as it contains mention of the fact that *Khilāfah* ended after thirty years, not completely but its perpetuity ended.

See: *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 6/250.

That is why Ibn Taymiyyah mentions the following in his *Fatāwā*:

اتفق العلماء على أن معاوية أفضل ملوك هذه الأمة، فأن الأربعة قبله كانوا خلفاء نبوة، وهو أول الملوك كان ملكه ملكا ورحمة
The scholars agree that Mu’āwiyah رضي الله عنه was the best king of this Ummah. The four that preceded him were successors of Nubuwwah, but he was the first king. His kingdom was kingdom coupled with mercy.

See: *Majmū’ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islam* 4/478; also see: 10/356, 35/19.

And al-Dhahabī said, “Amīr al-Mu’minīn and the first king of Islam.” See: *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 3/120.

The Umayyads are considered to be the most important link in the chain of events which lead to the development of Naṣb, a link which is not possible to understand without delving into its details and knowing about all its dynamics. This is because of the role they played which became the most effective reason in the development of the two types of Naṣb and its proliferation amongst people. At the same time they were the severest opponents who emerged to combat the Khawārij who were the extremist Nawāṣib; this combat which they took up was extremely effective in curbing the influence of the Khawārij and the spread of their beliefs and ideas, one of which was their severe resentment for ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, although not primarily intended by the Umayyads.

Hence the discussion will concern two perspectives:

The first perspective: The Umayyads and the non-excommunicating Nawāṣib.

The resentment the Umayyads had for ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is quite popularly found in the statements of the scholars. Hence al-Dhahabī says:

في آل مروان نصب ظاهر سوى عمر بن عبد العزيز

There was open Naṣb in the family of Marwān, with the exception of ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz.¹

continued from page 272

Likewise Ibn Kathīr has said the following in his Tafsīr, “The first king of Islam was Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān.” See: *Tafsīr Ibn Kathīr* 2/15.

Ibn Abī al-‘Iz al-Ḥanafī similarly said, “The first king of the Muslims was Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, he was the best king of the Muslims.” See: *Sharḥ al-Ṭaḥāwīyyah* p. 545.

Furthermore, Ibn al-‘Arabī al-Mālikī and Ibn Khaldūn both have rejected the ḥadīth of Safīnah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, but have erred in doing so. See: *al-‘Awāṣim min al-Qawāṣim* p. 208; *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* 2/650.

For more details see: *Majmū‘ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islam* 35/24; the annotations of Ibn al-Qayyim upon *Sunan Abī Dāwūd* 11/244; *Fath al-Bārī* 12/392; *al-Ṣawā‘iq al-Muḥriqah* 1/66; *Tuḥfah al-Aḥwadhī* 6/396.

1 *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 5/113.

Likewise Ibn Taymiyyah has alluded:

كان في بني أمية من يسب عليا ويذمه

In the Umayyads there were people who reviled ‘Alī عليه السلام and condemned him.¹

He also said:

وإن بعضهم كان ممن يبغض عليا

And some of them would despise ‘Alī عليه السلام.²

And he has also stated that some of them would curse ‘Alī عليه السلام³ and that:

لما كان بنو أمية ولاة البلاد؛ بعض بني أمية ينصب العداوة لعلي ويسبه

When the Umayyads were the rulers of the lands, some of them would openly declare enmity for ‘Alī عليه السلام and revile him.⁴

Others have suggested the following:

اشتغلت طائفة من بني أمية بتنقيصه وسبه على المنابر

A group of the Umayyads occupied themselves in denigrating him and reviling him upon the pulpits.⁵

They would deem that to be an official practice.⁶

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 4/164.

2 *Ibid.* 4/144; also see: 7/410.

3 *Ibid.* 5/9.

4 *Majmū‘ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islam* 4/488; *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 5/9.

5 *Al-Ṣawā‘iq al-Muhriqah* 2/353.

6 *Fath al-Bārī* 7/71.

Likewise, due to their immense hatred for him¹ and in order to obliterate all his accomplishments, at times they would discard the Sunnah which ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would enjoin in his time.²

Ibn Ḥazm has, however, alluded to the fact that (despite all of this) the Umayyads were unable to conceal the merits of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and do away with them.³

And Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr⁴ has stated that:

كان بنو أمية يتالون منه ويتقصونه، فما زاده إلا سماوا وعلوا ومجبة عند العلماء

The Umayyads would speak ill of him and denigrate him. But Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى only increased him in highness, stature and love in the sight of the scholars.⁵

Likewise one of the scholars has suggested the following in a poem:

عدتهم كعدة الرافضية	وهكذا خلفا بني أمية
مائة من السنين خالصة	ولكن المدة كانت ناقصة
إلا الإمام عمر التقيا	وكلهم قد كان ناصبيا

And so were the rulers of the Umayyads, their number was just like the number of the Rāfiḍah (twelve).

1 *Sunan al-Nasā’ī* 5/253; *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Khuzaymah* 4/260; *al-Mustadrak ‘alā al-Ṣaḥīḥayn* 1/636; *Sunan al-Bayhaqī al-Kubrā* 5/113.

2 *Al-Taḥfīr al-Kabīr* of al-Rāzī: 1/169.

3 *Al-Fiṣal fī al-Mīl wa al-Ahwā’ al-Niḥal* 1/66.

4 Yūsuf ibn ‘Abd Allah ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd al-Barr al-Namirī, Abū ‘Umar al-Qurtubī. One of the great scholars of Andalusia and its prominent leaders. He was born in 368 A.H. al-Dhahabī has said regarding him, “Amongst the people of the West there is not a greater retainer of ḥadīth than him. This is together with him being reliable, diligent in his Dīn, pure, and having through knowledge in jurisprudence, language and history.” He passed away in 463 A.H. Some of his books are: *al-Tamhīd*, *al-Istidhkār* and *al-Istī‘āb*. See: *Tadhkirah al-Ḥuffāz* 3/1128; *al-‘Ibar fī Khabar man Ghabar* 3/257; *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 29/99; *Shadharāt al-Dhahab* 3/314.

5 *Al-Istī‘āb* 3/257; *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 21/181.

However, their time period was a hundred years less (than the time period of the Imāms of the Rāfiḍah).

Each one of them was a Nāṣibī, with the exception of the pious ‘Umar.¹

Similarly, some of the Abbasid Khulafā’ would, in order to win the support of their Alawid opponents, remind them with presumptuousness of the abusive stance the Umayyads held toward ‘Alī رضي الله عنه.²

Nonetheless, although the resentment of the Umayyads differed from individual to individual, it did not lead them to the extent of them excommunicating him. Likewise, although what had propelled Naṣb in them initially was the grave events which took place after the martyrdom of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه, but subsequently it shifted to a purely politically motivated issue.

Since the Naṣb of most of the Umayyads is beyond dispute, it is important to ascertain the reality of their stance regarding ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. Likewise it is important to investigate the causes which led to them becoming disillusioned with him.

However, there is a contention here which poses itself to every researcher, i.e. the contention of their inconsistent stances regarding the Alawids in general, such that at times they would manifest as completely contradicting one another.

It would probably be easy to resolve a very large extent of this contention if one considers the human disposition. One should appreciate that within every human there is a mix of various conflicting interests, like love and hate, virtue and vice, pleasure and displeasure, inclination and aversion, advancement and decline. Hence, when there is a clash between these interests, often times what he displays is due to him succumbing to the strongest among them. Obviously

1 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 13/206 (Ibn Kathīr has not attributed to anyone specific.)

2 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 4/433; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 5/155; *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* 4/10; *Simṭ al-Nujūm al-‘Awālī* 4/175.

the influence of these interests is dependent on the environment which engulfs him. As a result it is not possible for him to constantly remain in one condition throughout his life.

One should also remember that one of the most crucial causes which contributed to the obscurity of the relationship between the Umayyads and the Alawids was the conflict of interests and the disparity of desires. This becomes evident when considering that the Umayyad household, especially after its dynasty fell, became a victim of aggressive attacks from more than one front, all of which were united at opposing it. At the head of them were the Shī'ah who believed that the Umayyads usurped the right of the Ahl al-Bayt. Similarly, the Abbasids were very keen on alienating them from the masses by obliterating their accolades in order to preserve the nascent stability of their dynasty from any political threat which the Umayyads might pose at any time.¹ And lastly, there were the *Mawālī* who were victims of the Umayyad suppression and abuse; even after accepting Islam *Kharāj* (land tax) was imposed upon them, and they were coerced to join the wars without any bonus or stipend being allocated to them, with the exception of the era of 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz², the crown of the Banū Umayyah.³

1 Consider the following incident. It is narrated regarding Abū Ja'far al-Manṣūr that he ordered al-Mustahil ibn al-Kumayt to ascend the pulpits of Shām and expound on the merits of the Banū Hāshim and the privileges Allah had granted them, and the demerits of the Banū Umayyah and the vice they were on. Hence, he did so, he ascended the pulpits of various places in Shām, starting with Ḥalab; he ascended its pulpit and mentioned the merits of the Banū Hāshim and the demerits of each individual of the Banū Umayyah until he reached 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz where he said, "His example was that of the prostitute of the Banū Isrā'īl who would fornicate in lieu of a seed of a pomegranate and give it in charity to the sick." See: *Bughyah al-Ṭalab fī Tārīkh Ḥalab* 4/1601.

Likewise in some books of exegesis it is narrated from Ibn 'Abbās رضي الله عنه that he said that the accursed tree refers to the Banū Umayyah. Whilst commenting upon the narrations of Ibn 'Abbās رضي الله عنه in his *al-Taḥrīr wa al-Tanwīr* 13/148, Ibn 'Ashūr says, "My assumption is that the Abbasids propagandists forged it in order to increase the resentment against the Banū Umayyah."

2 *Gharīb al-Ḥadīth* of Ibn Sallām 3/39; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 4/321; *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* 3/95. For more details see: *al-Dawlah al-Umawīyah al-Muftarā 'Alayhā* p. 353, 403; *Waḍ' al-Mawālī fī al-Dawlah al-Umawīyah* p. 83.

3 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 6/238.

There is no doubt as to the fact that the clash between these two families of the Quraysh (the Hashimid and the Umayyad) is very different than other clashes. For their history is replete with huge events which transpired between them and continued for a protracted period of time even after the fall of the Umayyad dynasty. Similarly, each one of them attracted an innumerable amount of fanatic partisans who trespassed all bounds of moderation; as a result, the Khawārij thronged around the Alawids and the Nawāṣib thronged around the Umayyads. Ibn al-Ḥanafīyah has alluded to this reality in his statement:

أهل بيتين من العرب يتخذهما الناس أندادا من دون الله: نحن وبنو عمنا هؤلاء؛ يعني بني أمية

People have taken two households of the Arabs as deities other than Allah:
Us and our cousins (i.e. the Banū Umayyah).¹

If the Nawāṣib of Shām on the one hand exaggerated regarding the Khulafā' of the Umayyads and elevated them,² then the Shī'ah on the other adopted a similar stance, rather one far more extreme, regarding the Ahl al-Bayt; a stance which progressed from mere partisanship to consecration, and from there to a form of deification.³ The Shī'ah, in order to support the Ahl al-Bayt, and in order to bring disrepute to the Umayyads and their contributions and achievements, would not hesitate in forging fables, fabricating lies and circulating hearsays against them; fabricating was very normal for the Shī'ah, as is stated by Ibn Kathīr.⁴

From this we understand the importance of deliberation when examining events which have some sort of relationship with the topic at hand, especially when it is narrated through a Shī' source or contains within it elements which smack off some sort of support for Shī'ism.

1 *Al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 5/94; *Tārīkh al-Islam* 6/192; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 4/116.

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawīyah* 2/477.

3 *Al-Shahrastānī: al-Milal wa al-Niḥal* 1/93.

4 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 12/4.

However, this does not exonerate the Pro Abbasid Historians, who utilised history as a medium of bolstering the Abbasid campaign,¹ from the suspicion of forging narrations and reports that poured into the same channel and which alongside the Shīʿī narrations emphasised the wickedness of the Umayyad Rulers and their ill treatment of the Ahl al-Bayt. This of course entailed a subtle declaration of innocence of the Abbasids in the eyes of the Shīʿah.

Hence, it is impossible for an impartial person to believe reports such as the one narrated from Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Muqri² which states:

كان بنو أمية إذا سمعوا بمولود اسمه علي قتلوه

When the Umayyads would hear of a child whose name was ʿAlī they would kill him.³

There are few considerations in this narration:

First of all, the endeavour to emphasise the transgressive nature of the Umayyads by giving them resemblance to Firʿawn who killed every male child that was born to the Banū Isrāʾīl due to fear of losing his kingdom. This alone entails a very powerful means of disenchanting the people.

Secondly, had this really happened it would widely echo throughout the society. Hence it is strange that only one person narrates it when it is an issue of such a magnitude that it would demand multitudes of people to narrate it; especially

1 Sosiolojiā al-Fikr al-Islamī: *Ṭawr al-Takwīn* p. 244.

2 ʿAbd Allah ibn Yazīd al-Qurashī al-ʿAdawī, their client, Abū ʿAbd al-Raḥmān al-Makkī. A reliable scholar who was from the eminent teachers of al-Bukhārī. He was originally from Basrah or Ahwāz. He became famous as ʿal-Muqriʿ because he taught the Qurʾān for seventy and some odd years consecutively. He passed away in Makkah in 212 A.H. almost reaching a hundred years. His narrations appear in the six books. See: *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 5/501; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 16/320; *Tārīkh al-Islam* 15/241; *Tadhkirah al-Ḥuffāz* 1/367.

3 *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 41/480; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 20/429; *Tārīkh al-Islam* 7/427; *Siyar Aʿlām al-Nubalāʾ* 7/413; *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 21/72; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 7/280 (also see the comment of al-Dhahabī).

when the report contains the word كان which denotes continuity, and also considering the fact that reports of lesser importance and significance have been widely reported.

Thirdly, a person who studies the books of transmitter biographies will certainly come to realise that during the Umayyad period there were many people whose names were 'Alī, but none of them suffered any sort of harassment merely because of his name. This was not specific to the common people but was also inclusive of the Alawids themselves.¹

Fourthly, the narrator of the report was born during the end period of the Umayyads, and thus only witnessed fifteen years of their rule. This supports the possibility that he narrated this from someone else, but who is this someone else?

Nonetheless, it is correct to aver that the Umayyads hated this name and wanted that no one be named with it, which is why during their rule this name was not very prevalent. But this is one thing, and killing every child because of his name is something completely different.

Likewise, there is doubt as to the fact that the Shī'ī historians and their scholars forged the greatest amount of lies in this regard. Lies which did not remain confined to the events that transpired, but surpassed them to impugning the lineage of the Umayyads and their integrity in the most of wicked ways; to the extent that they went on to impugn their forefathers of the pre-Islamic era who had nothing to do whatsoever with what had transpired after them. Thus, they first targeted Umayyah (the first grandfather)² by alleging that he was a Roman

1 *Al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr* 6/269; *al-Tuḥfah al-Laṭīfah fī Tarīkh al-Madīnah al-Sharīfah* 2/288.

2 Umayyah ibn 'Abd Shams ibn 'Abd Manāf ibn Quṣay al-Qurashī. The grandfather of the Umayyads of Syria and Andalusia. He lived in the pre-Islamic era and was an inhabitant of Makkah. He was the commander of the Quraysh after his father. He lived on to witness the birth of Nabī ﷺ. He and his cousin 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib were amongst those who visited Sayf ibn Dhī Yazan in his palace in Ghamdān in order to congratulate him upon his victory against the Abyssinians. His death of demise is not known. See: al-Zarkalī: *al-A'lām* 2/23 (with a little bit of change).

slave who was falsely attributed to ‘Abd Shams. Subsequently they targeted Hind bint ‘Utbah and alleged that she was initially a concubine and thereafter they claimed that she took up prostitution as an occupation, wherefrom Mu‘āwiyah was born. And lastly they attacked Yazīd and stated that he was an illegitimate child born out of wedlock.¹

They have likewise quoted one of their Imāms as saying:

اقتلوا الوزغ فإنها مسوخ بني أمية

Kill the lizards for they are the disfigured forms of the Banū Umayyah.²

They have also narrated that once a lizard came in front of one of their Imāms dangling its tongue, so the Imām said to the person with him, “Do you know what it is saying?” He said, “I have no knowledge of what it is saying.” The Imām said that it is saying:

والله لئن ذكرت عثمان لأسبين عليا أبدا حتى تقوم من ها هنا

By Allah if you make mention of ‘Uthmān, I will revile ‘Alī till you stand up and go away from here.

Thereafter the Imām told him that whenever any individual of the Umayyads dies he is disfigured into a lizard. He also added that ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān was disfigured into a lizard so his son had to place a date palm in his place in his winding sheet, i.e. so that the reality is not disclosed before the people.³

There is doubt that this narration and others of its like are patent lies, and that they disclose the inner animosity the Shī‘ah bore against the Umayyads. This indeed makes much of what they have narrated regarding the household of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه dubious at least.

1 *Al-Ṭarā‘if* p. 501; *Nahj al-Ḥaqq wa Kashf al-Ṣidq* p. 307; al-Tusturī: *Iḥqāq al-Ḥaqq* p. 249, 263; *Ilzām al-Nawāṣib* p. 169; *Kashf al-Ghiṭā’* 1/19; *Khafāyā Umawiyyah* p. 80.

2 *Mashāriq Anwār al-Yaqīn* p. 135; *al-Ta’arīf* 1/655.

3 *Baṣā’ir al-Darjāt* p. 373; *al-Kāfi* 8/232; *Mustadrak al-Wasā’il* 16/167; *Bihār al-Anwār* 62/225.

The following is another narration similar to the aforementioned:

It is narrated that a person stood and called out to Ḥajjāj, “O governor, my family has disowned me and they named me ‘Alī. I am a poor person and in need of the gift of the governor.”

Ḥajjāj thus laughed and said, “Interesting indeed is the means you have chosen to gain my closeness. I have appointed you as the governor of such and such a place.”¹

This narration is definitely a forgery. And even though there is a possibility that it was fabricated by the followers of the Abbasids, however, most probably it was forged by the Shī‘ah due to their sources independently citing it.

Was Hajjāj really such a simpleton and clueless person that he would appoint a poor person to governorship merely because he hated ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, not forgetting that he it was his genius that had helped pave the path to kingdom for the Umayyads?

Likewise, why did he not appoint anyone else from amongst his subordinates to that position when there were plenty amongst them who despised ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ?

Also, there were many people who coveted leadership, if it really was so easy then why did any one of them not seek the closeness of Ḥajjāj in the same way as this poor person did in order to obtain it.

How deep indeed was the insight of Ibn Kathīr who stated:

وقد روي عنه (يعني الحجاج) ألفاظ بشعة شنيعة ظاهرها الكفر كما قدمنا. فإن كان قد تاب منها وأقلع عنها وإلا فهو باق في عهدها، ولكن قد يخشى أنها رويت عنه بنوع من زيادة عليه؛ فأَن الشيعة كانوا يبغضونه جدا لوجوه، وربما حرفوا عليه بعض الكلم، وزادوا فيما يحكونه عنه بشاعات وشناعات.

Some very repugnant and ugly statements have been narrated from al-Ḥajjāj, the apparent meanings of which amount to disbelief, as we have

1 Ibn Ma‘ṣūm: *al-Darajāt al-Rafī‘ah* p. 7.

mentioned. If he repented from them and he gave them up, or else he will still be responsible for them. But the fear is that they have been narrated with some sort of exaggeration from him; for the Shī'ah hated him immensely for many reasons and thus they would at times distort his speech and add to it evil and bad statements.¹

Another narration similar to the aforementioned is the narration which states that 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رضي الله عنه one day witnessed the absence of 'Abd Allah ibn 'Abbās رضي الله عنه in the Ḥuḥr Ṣalāh. Hence he said to his companions, "What is up with Abū al-'Abbās, he did not attend the Ḥuḥr Ṣalāh?" Upon being informed that a child was born to him he performed the Ṣalāh and thereafter told the people to tag along with him. He congratulated him and said, "May you show gratitude to Allah, the Granter, and may you be granted blessings in the granted. What have you named him?"

'Abd Allah ibn 'Abbās said, "Would it ever be possible for me to name him before you name him." Hence He took him and performed his *Taḥnīk* (sucked on a date and made the child suck on it) prayed for him, returned him and then said:

خذ إليك أبا الأملاك قد سميته عليا، وكنيته أبا الحسن

Take Abū al-Amlāk (the father of kings). I have named him 'Alī and I have given him the agnomen Abū al-Ḥasan.

Thereafter, when Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه became the Khalīfah he said to Ibn 'Abbās:

ليس لكم اسمه وكنيته وقد كنيته أبا محمد

You cannot keep his name and agnomen. I have given him the agnomen Abū Muḥammad.

And thus that is what he became known by.²

1 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/132.

2 *Al-'Iqd al-Farīd* 5/84; *al-Bad' wa al-Tārīkh* 6/56; *Wafayāt al-A'yān* 3/274; *Mir'āt al-Jinān* 1/245; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 7/312.

There can be no doubt regarding this narration being a fabrication, especially when considering the fact that ‘Alī عليه السلام gave the child, who would go on to become the grandfather of the Abbasid rulers, the title ‘Abū al-Amlāk’. From where did ‘Alī عليه السلام come to possess the knowledge of the unseen when there are many barriers before it?

Hence the fabricator of this narration was either a Shī‘ī who wanted to elevate the status of ‘Alī عليه السلام by claiming that he possessed knowledge of the future, or he was an Abbasid who was trying to convince the Shī‘ah regarding the legitimacy of the Abbasid rule; doing so by stating that ‘Alī عليه السلام had prophesied that that would happen.¹

Due to all of the aforementioned, one cannot pay attention to much of what is documented by the historians. One has to investigate whether it is established, or are there contextual indicators which suggest that it is true: like the validity of similar incidents to it or even worse than it being established, or some of the great research scholars like Ibn Ḥazm, al-Dhahabī and Ibn Taymiyyah approving of it.

Returning to where we started from, the interaction of the Umayyads with the Alawids was governed by the following aspects:

The First Aspect: The Religious Aspect:

The loyalty of the Umayyads to Islam, their immense allegiance to it and their concern for it are things which cannot be suspected. However, they were humans and thus were prone to all the tendencies that humans are prone to; whether it be indulging in extravagance by way of following their fancies and base desires (in

1 In another narration Rashīd ibn Kurayb narrates that Abū Hāshim ‘Abd Allah ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah departed for Shām and met Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn ‘Abd Allah ibn ‘Abbās and said to him, “O cousin, I have some special knowledge which I am going to reveal to you so do not let anyone come to know of it; This matter which they covet is going to be in your family.” He thus replied, “I know, so let not anyone hear it from you.” *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 4/344; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 5/63; *Tārīkh al-Islam* 8/336.

which case they still remained Muslims internally and externally and their sins were no different than the sins of other Muslims),¹ or bringing about innovations in the Dīn: like delaying the Ṣalāh to its end time, appointing two *Mu'adhdhins* (callers to Adhān), giving Adhān and Iqāmah for the two ʿīds, bringing the Khuṭbah forward in both of them, raising the hands when supplicating in Jumu'ah, discarding the Takbīr (i.e. saying it softly) when going into lower postures and saying it aloud when coming up from them, and performing four Raka'āt in Minā, etc.²

Despite these being deficiencies in them, but when compared to the Abbasids they upheld the Sunnah to a greater extent than them; the Sunnah was much more prevalent and strong in the era of the former than in the era of the latter.³

Likewise, despite all these innovations, it is an undeniable fact that the Dīn had a very emphatic presence in much of their doings, like in Jihād, where they have made everlasting contributions. Islam was much more glorious in their times than in the times that followed; Jihād was never fully systematically carried out after the fall of their empire.⁴

Ibn Kathīr states:

كانت سوق الجهاد قائمة في بني أمية ليس لهم شغل إلا ذلك، وقد علت كلمة الإسلام في مشارق الأرض ومغاربها وبرها وبحرها، وقد أذلوا الكفر وأهله، وامتألت قلوب المشركين من المسلمين رعباً، لا يتوجه المسلمون إلى قطر من الأقطار إلا أخذوه، وكان في عساكرهم وجيوشهم في الغزو الصالحون والأولياء والعلماء من كبار التابعين. بل كان الحسين بن علي رضي الله عنه في الجيش الذي غزا قسطنطينية

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 4/519.

2 The aforementioned is scattered in the following sources: *Muṣannaf ʿAbd al-Razzāq* 2/518; *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 4/9; Ibn ʿAbd al-Barr: *al-Tamhīd* 10/243, 12/8, 16/303, 24/239; *al-Mudawwanah al-Kubrā* 1/87; *Sharḥ Maʿānī al-Āthār* 1/220; *al-Taḥqīq fī Aḥādīth al-Khilāf* 1/304; *al-Muḥallā* 1/55, 2/241, 3/140, 5/78; *al-Sarakhsī: al-Mabsūṭ* 2/37; *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 8/237, 239; *al-Jawāb al-Ṣaḥīḥ* 6/115; *Siyar Aʿlām al-Nubalāʾ* 4/306; *Fath al-Bārī* 2/201, 270, 8/223, 13/253; *Sharḥ Fath al-Qadīr* 1/243; *al-Fawākih al-Dawānī* 1/271; *Mawāhib al-Khalīl* 2/119; *Ḥāshiyah al-ʿAdawī* 1/492; *Subul al-Salām* 1/125; *Ḥāshiyah Ibn ʿĀbidīn* 3/390; *Ḥāshiyah al-Ṭaḥṭāwī ʿalā Marāqī al-Falāḥ* 1/129; *Sharḥ al-Zarqānī* 1/223, 2/478.

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 4/130.

4 *Ibid.* 6/419.

Jihād was alive and active in the Umayyads, they had no occupation besides that. The word of Islam had risen high in the east and the west of the earth, in its lands and in its oceans. They had subdued disbelief and its people. And the hearts of the polytheists were filled with awe for the Muslims. The Muslims would not advance toward any land or region but would conquer it and capture it. The pious, the ascetics, and great scholars of the successors participated in their campaigns and were part of their armies.¹ To the extent that even Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī ؑ was part of the army which attacked Constantinople.²

However, their interaction with the Alawids was governed by more than one aspect, the political aspect being the greatest of them, even though it blended at times with the religious aspect.³ The religious aspect did not emerge but in comparatively lesser times, especially during the era of ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz.⁴

The Second Aspect: The familial aspect:

This refers to the family ties which existed between the Banū Hāshim and the Banū Umayyah, for they were paternal cousins.⁵

Blood relations in essence lay at the very core of humanity, which is why it always remain attached to its roots and can never completely detach from them.

In light of this, it will be easy to understand some of the very noble stances taken by the Umayyads, which at times seem inaccurate or inexplicable due to there being a very huge contrast between them and between their stern and harsh positions, towards the Alawids.

1 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/87.

2 *Ibid.* 8/151.

3 *Al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 4/362; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 4/111; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/229.

4 *Al-Muntaẓam* 6/337; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/133.

5 *Fath al-al-Bārī* 8/328.

So it was the familial ties which proved as a very effective impetus for much of the amiable doings of the Umayyads toward the Alawid household, like becoming enraged for them¹ and forgiving them for their violations.² All of this, however, was still trumped by the greed and the struggle for power.

Nonetheless, it was primarily due to this reason that there were deep and genuine friendships which were fostered between senior members of both these households. Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam for example was very fond of ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn³ and would often assist him with wealth.⁴

What further clarifies the impact of kinship upon their dealings is the statement of Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ when the army of ‘Umar ibn Sa‘d surrounded him:

أَوْ يَبْعَثُ بِي إِلَى يَزِيدَ بْنِ مَعَاوِيَةَ فَيُرَى فِي رَأْيِهِ فَإِنْ رَحِمَ تَمَنَعَهُ مِنْ قَتْلِي

Or let him send me to Yazīd ibn Mu‘āwiyah who can decide whatever he has to regarding me, for the familial bond between us will prevent him from killing me.⁵

Likewise the disturbance of Yazīd ibn Mu‘āwiyah, if it is established, when he received the news of his martyrdom and his statement:

لَعْنُ اللَّهِ بِنِ مَرْجَانَةَ! أَمَا وَاللَّهِ لَوْ كَانَ بَيْنَهُ وَبَيْنَ الْحُسَيْنِ رَحِمٌ لَمَا قَتَلَهُ

May Allah curse Ibn Marjānah, by Allah if there existed kinship between him and Ḥusayn, he would never have killed him.⁶

1 See the story of ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn al-Ḍaḥḥāk with Fāṭimah bint al-Ḥusayn in: *al-Muntaẓam* 7/87; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 4/362; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/229; *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* 3/105

2 *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 4/111.

3 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 8/220.

4 *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 57/247; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 8/258.

5 *Al-Bad’ wa al-Tārīkh* 6/11.

6 *Majmū’ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islam* 27/480; *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawīyah* 4/557.

Likewise his statement when he saw the family of Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and his children in a pitiable situation, overcome by disgrace and humility:

قيح الله ابن مرجانة لو كانت بينكم وبينه قرابة ما فعل بكم هذا

May Allah humiliate Ibn Marjānah! Had there been any kinship between you and him he would never have done this to you.¹

In the words of Yazīd, ‘If he was his cousin’ and ‘had there been any kinship between you and him’ is a subtle attack on the lineage of Ibn Ziyād, i.e. by hinting to the fact that convention has always compelled closely related individuals to stand up for one another; even in times of intense acrimony their hearts would not allow them to mutilate their bodies or allow people to disgrace them and humiliate them. What Yazīd meant was that had there been close kinship between Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and Ibn Ziyād it would have barred him from killing him and disgracing his household, as long as his objective of subduing him would be achieved without having the need to kill and take revenge. This is exactly what had moved him and is clear from the following statement:

أما والله يا حسين، لو أني صاحبك ما قتلتك

By Allah, O Ḥusayn, if your affair was in my hand I would not have killed you.²

It was due to this familial aspect that he responded with the following to Muḥaffiz ibn Tha‘labah³ who came to him with the head of Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and said, “I have come to you with the head of most wretched of the Arabs”:

1 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 3/239; *al-Muntaẓam* 5/343; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 8/194.

2 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 3/328; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 34/316; *Tārīkh al-Islam* 5/18; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 8/191.

3 Muḥaffiz (Miḥfaz) ibn Tha‘labah ibn Murrah al-‘Ā‘idhī al-Qurashī. The person who brought the head of Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to Yazīd. His son ‘Ubayd Allah ibn Muḥaffiz narrated from him. See: *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 57/96; *al-Ikmāl* 7/164; *Tawḍīḥ al-Mushtabih* 8/57.

ما ولدت أم محفز ألام وأوضع

The child Umm Muḥaffiz gave birth to is more wretched and disgraced.¹

He also refrained from killing ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn, after he was given the suggestion to do so by one of his courtiers, and he honoured the household of Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه and his children.²

Hence the matter was as al-Buḥturī³ described it:

إذا احتربت يوما ففاضت دماؤها تذكرت القربى ففاضت دموعها

If they happen to fight on a particular day and their blood happens to flow, they immediately remember their kinship and thus their tears begin to flow.⁴

Nonetheless, there is still a question that lingers: is it not possible that the reason for his expression of grief was more because of a religious reason than a reason of kinship?

The answer to this is that is a possibility but evidence does not support it, especially when his biography is replete with criticisms and condemnations of his actions. He was condemned for sending an army to Madīnah giving it permission

1 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 3/338; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 57/98; *Tārīkh al-Islam* 5/19; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 3/315.

2 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 12/480.

3 Al-Walīd ibn ‘Ubayd ibn Yaḥyā al-Buḥturī, Abū ‘Ubādah al-Ṭā’ī. A very prominent poet who was a master in different formats of poetry. He was born in the Manbij near Ḥalab, he grew up there and studied literature there as well. Thereafter he travelled to Iraq and praised the Khalīfah al-Mutawakkil and other prominent people. He stayed in Baghdad for a long time and thereafter returned to his hometown and passed away there in 283 A.H. He is the author of *Dīwān al-Ḥamāsah* and *Kitāb Ma’ānī al-Shi’r*. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 13/476; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 63/188; *Mu’jam al-Udabā’* 5/570; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 13/486.

4 *Dīwān al-Buḥturī* 2/83.

to violate its sanctity for three days by looting and killing.¹ As a result, a fair amount of Ṣahābah رضي الله عنهم, their children, and the elite successors,² amongst who there were seven hundred bearers of the Qur'ān, were killed.³ Added to that is the fact that he did not take the killers of Ḥusayn to task nor did he take revenge on his behalf.⁴

What supports the fact that it was based more on kinship is that when 'Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān was told of the following poem of 'Imrān ibn Ḥiṭṭān regarding the killer of 'Alī رضي الله عنه:

يا ضربة من تقي ما أراد بها إلا ليلغ من ذي العرش رضوانا
 إني لأذكره حيناً فأحسبه أوفى البرية عند الله ميزانا

What a strike from a pious person by way of which he did not intend, but to reach the pleasure of the owner of the throne.

I at times think of him and assume that he has the weightiest of scales by Allah سبحانه وتعالى.

He was overtaken by rage due to his kinship with 'Alī رضي الله عنه and thus intended to spill his blood and placed spies on him.⁵

Likewise, it was due to their stark chauvinism that they were not happy with Ḥajjāj, who was a pure Arab, marrying a Hashimid lady. This is in spite of the fact that he enjoyed a very lofty position in the sight of the Umayyads (due to him paving their path to kingdom for them and destroying many of their opponents).⁶ This

1 *Lisān al-Mīzān* 6/294.

2 *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 11/316.

3 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 6/234.

4 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 8/141.

5 *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 4/215.

6 *Al-Muntaẓam* 6/275; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/67.

was because they conceded the merit of the Hashimids and their status despite all that had transpired between them. Whatever had happened did not stop them from expressing indignation at this marriage which in a way was compromising the high social standing of the Hashimids.

Ibn Taymiyyah mentions:

والحجاج كان قد تزوج بنت عبد الله بن جعفر فلم يرض بذلك بنو أمية حتى نزعوها منه، لأنهم معظمون
لبنو هاشم. وقالوا: ليس الحجاج كفؤاً لشريفة هاشمية

Ḥajjāj had married a daughter of ‘Abd Allah ibn Ja‘far. But the Umayyads were not happy and subsequently took her away from him due to them revering the Banū Hāshim.¹ They said, “Ḥajjāj is not compatible for a noble Hashimid lady.”²

This shows that their affinity for the Hashimids was very strong. But it would at times diminish when they would be overtaken by affinity for their own people, or when overwhelmed by the traces of the conflicts that had transpired between them. Hence Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam told Abū Hurayrah رضي الله عنه when he was upon his deathbed:

ما وجدت عليك منذ صطحبنا إلا في حبك الحسن والحسين

I have no grudge against you since we have been in each other’s company other than because of you loving Ḥasan and Ḥusayn.³

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 4/559.

2 As for the Shī‘ah, some of their contemporaries have suggested that the reason why the Umayyads were not happy with the marriage of Ḥajjāj is that they feared that it would remove the acrimony he bore for the Banū Hāshim, specifically the Banū Ṭālib. See: *Dirāsāt fī Minhāj al-Sunnah li Ma‘rifah Ibn Taymiyyah* p. 431; *Fī Khabar Tazwīj Umm Kulthūm min ‘Umar* p. 60; *Muḥāḍarāt fī al-‘Iṭiqād* p. 697.

3 Al-Ṭabarānī: *al-Mu‘jam al-Kabīr*: ḥadīth no. 2656. Al-Haythamī has deemed its narrators as authentic in *Majma‘ al-Zawā‘id* 9/181.

There is no doubt that his hatred for them was not because they were Hashimids, especially when he was a bosom friend of ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn. But it was because his chauvinism for the Umayyad household compelled him to disenchant people from everything that was related to ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, even it be by reviling him upon the pulpits and clashing vigorously with his two sons.¹ And thus Abū Hurayrah’s open expression of love for them actually went against his goal and mission.

The Third Aspect: The Political Aspect

The interaction of the Umayyads with many of the Alawids was characterised by harshness and intransigence, it was motivated by the phenomena of exercising caution and sensing fear. This was due to the following reasons:

The first reason: Their passion to rule exclusively.

Humans have been created with the tendency to own and claim possession of even the most basic things, then what can one say about kingdom and the authority and pomp that it holds. Hence it is no surprise that many a people have due to it become victims of inconsistencies and have sacrificed the closest and the dearest of people to them. When the head of Muṣ‘ab ibn al-Zubayr² was placed before ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān he said:

لقد كان أحب الناس إلي وأشدهم لي ألفة ومودة، ولكن الملك عقيم

He was the most beloved of people to me and of those who loved me the most, but kingdom is barren.³

1 *Al-Mu‘jam al-Kabīr* 3/85; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 3/276, 447.

2 Muṣ‘ab al-Zubayr ibn al-‘Awwām ibn Khuwaylid al-Qurashī, Abū ‘Abd Allah al-Madanī. The ruler of Iraq and one of the warriors of the Quraysh and its geniuses. He was the most handsome of men and the most generous of them. He assumed governorship over Iraq for his brother, ‘Abd Allah, and was the man who put an end to Mukhtār ibn ‘Ubayd and his comrades. Then in 71 A.H. he clashed with ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān and was killed. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 13/105; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 58/210; *al-Muntaẓam* 6/114; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 8/317.

3 *Tārīkh Baghdād* 13/107; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 58/235; *al-Muntaẓam* 6/114; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 8/321.

Furthermore, just as people fight for the procurement of leadership, they likewise do everything within their capacity to preserve it. The Umayyads were no different in this regard and were not immune from becoming victims of greed for continuous power even if it meant sacrificing a lot. This was the primary reason why ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and some of his sons had suffered much at the hands of the Umayyads.

Hence Ibn Taymiyyah mentions that Yazīd ibn Mu‘āwiyah did not execute the killers of Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه nor he did avenge his murder in any way. Rather he killed his supporters and aiders in order to firmly ground his kingdom.¹

This was not something unique to the Umayyads, i.e. their in-house fighting or their fights against the Alawids. For many of the events which transpired in the first century were due to greed for the world. This was precisely what Rasūl Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم had feared for his Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم:

فوالله ما الفقر أخشى عليكم، ولكني أخشى أن تبسط عليكم الدنيا كما بسطت على من كان قبلكم، فتنافسوها كما تنافسوها فتهلككم كما أهلكتهم

By Allah it is not poverty that I fear upon you. But I fear that the world will be given to you in abundance just as it was given to those before you in abundance. It will thus prompt you to vie with one another just as they vied with one another, and it will consequently destroy you just as it destroyed them.²

Ibn Kathīr has stated that this ḥadīth came to the fore in the eras of ‘Alī and Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنهما.³

1 *Majmū‘ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islam* 4/506.

2 The ḥadīth of ‘Amr ibn ‘Awf al-Anṣārī which appears in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*: Chapter of battles: sub-chapter regarding the presence of the angels in Badr: ḥadīth no. 3791; *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: Chapter regarding disinclination from the world and heart softening narrations: ḥadīth no. 2961.

3 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 6/190; *Fath al-Bārī* 6/614.

And Ibn ‘Umar رضي الله عنهما would say in his prostration:

قد تعلم أنه ما يمنعني من مزاحمة قريش على هذه الدنيا إلا خوفك

O Allah you know that the only thing which prevents me from rivalry with the Quraysh over this world is your fear.¹

He would also say:

رحم الله ابن الزبير أراد دنانير الشام! رحم الله مروان أراد دراهم العراق

May Allah have mercy on Ibn al-Zubayr, he wanted the gold coins of Shām.
May Allah have mercy on Marwān he wanted the silver coins of Iraq.²

Likewise he would say:

إنما هؤلاء فتیان قريش يتقاتلون على هذا السلطان وعلى هذه الدنيا، والله ما أبالي ألا يكون لي ما يقتل فيه بعضهم بعضا بنعلي

These youngsters of the Quraysh are fighting over rulership and this world.
By Allah it would not bother me if I were given what they are killing one and another for in lieu of my sandal.³

How profound indeed was the statement of Ayman Ibn Khuraym⁴ which he made when ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān called him to fight for him:

1 *Ḥilyah al-Awliyā’* 1/292; *al-Muntaẓam* 6/134; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 3/191; *Usd al-Ghābah* 3/350; *al-Nawawī: Tahdhīb al-Asmā’* 1/263.

2 *Muṣannaf ibn Abī Shaybah*: chapter of Fitān: sub-chapter regarding the one who dislikes being part of the Fitnah and seeks refuge from it: ḥadīth no. 37323.

3 *Al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 4/171; *Ḥilyah al-Awliyā’* 1/310; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 3/237.

4 Ayman ibn Khuraym ibn al-Akhrām ibn Shaddād al-Asadī, Abū ‘Aṭīyyah al-Shāmī. A prolific poet. There is difference of opinion regarding his *ṣuḥbah* (being a *ṣaḥābī*). Al-‘Ijlī says, “He was a reliable successor.” I did not come across his date of demise. His ḥadīth appears in Sunan al-Tirmidhī. See: *Ma’rifah al-Thiqāt* 1/240; *al-Istī‘āb* 1/129; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 10/41; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 1/343.

على سلطان آخر من قریش
معاذ الله من جهل وطیش
فليس بنافعي ما عشت عيشي

ولست بقاتل رجلا يصلي
له سلطانه وعلي إثمي
أقتل مسلما في غير شيء

I am not one to kill a person who performs Ṣalāh, over the kingdom of another individual of the Quraysh.

For him will be his kingdom but upon me will be my sin. I seek the refuge of Allah from ignorance and rage.

Should I kill a Muslim for no valid reason? In that case my life would be of no benefit to me as long as I live.¹

Nonetheless, few matters allude to this fact:

Firstly, the Umayyads are not recorded to have ill-treated the Alawids in general. Rather they are only known to have offended those amongst them who coveted rulership, which is evidence of the fact that the clash revolved around worldly issues. Had it been because of the Alawids themselves, or because of the offender being a heretic, for example, then it would have implicated every 'Alawī. A phenomenon which we find occurred in the revolt of the leader of the *Zanj*,² who falsely claimed to be an Alawid;³ this man would bargain an Alawid lady for two to three silver coins, as a result of which some of the *Zanj* would have ten Alawid

1 *Al-Tabaqāt al-Kubrā* 6/38; In Qutaybah: *al-Ma'ārif* p. 340; *al-Thiqāt* 4/47; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 10/43.

2 Referring to a famous event which was known as the Fitnah of the *Zanj* (black people). There emerged in 255 A.H a person who claimed that he was 'Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad ibn 'Alī ibn Ṭsā ibn al-Shahīd Zayd ibn 'Alī. He campaigned and thus the first people to be drawn toward him were the black slaves of the people of Basrah, which is why it was dubbed 'the Fitnah of the *Zanj*'. Likewise many mischievous people had joined him. In due time he gained a lot of strength. He thus defeated the armies of the Khalīfah, looted Basrah and other places and done many heinous actions. His accursed days extended till 270 A.H. wherein he died. See: *al-'Ibar fī Khabar man Ghabar* 2/14.

3 He would go by the name: 'Alī ibn Muḥammad al-'Abqasī. See: *al-'Ibar fī Khabar man Ghabar* 2/47.

ladies under his custody whom he would cohabit with¹ and whom he would debase by assigning to them difficult chores.²

This is not something which the governors of the Umayyad dynasty were unaware of. Hence Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf, after having asked al-Shaʿbī about the view of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه regarding some matters of inheritance, said to him:

إنا لم نعب على قضائه، إنما عينا كذا و كذا

We did not criticise his judgements, we only criticised this and that.³

This statement is indicative of the type of clash which existed. This is notwithstanding that the Umayyads tried in every way to conceal this from the people by exaggerating in his denigration as if to suggest that he was not worthy of anything being drawn from him.

Ibn Taymiyyah tells us of the state of the killers of Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه. He says:

كان كثير منهم أو أكثرهم يكرهون قتله ويرونه ذنبا عظيما، لكن قتلوه لغرضهم، كما يقتل الناس بعضهم بعضا على الملك

Many of them, or most of them, disliked killing him and considered it a major sin. But they killed him for their ulterior motives, like people kill one another for rulership and authority.⁴

The Alawids, hence, suffered harassment of others besides the Umayyads as well due to the same reason, i.e. the Khilāfah. Ibn Ḥajar says:

1 *Al-ʿIbar fī Khabar man Ghabar* 2/48; *Simṭ al-Nujūm al-ʿAwālī* 3/477.

2 *Simṭ al-Nujūm al-ʿAwālī* 3/477.

3 *Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah*: chapter of inheritance: sub-chapter regarding a mother, a full sister and a grandfather: ḥadīth no. 31244.

Ostensibly it seems that because of Ḥajjāj accused ‘Alī رضي الله عنه of being complicit in the murder of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه, as was popular amongst the Umayyads and their governors, al-Shaʿbī disliked clearly mentioning that and thus he said ‘this and that’ instead.

4 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 4/560.

كان محمد بن علي بن أبي طالب المعروف بابن الحنفية وعبد الله بن عباس مقيمين بمكة منذ قتل الحسين، فدعاهما ابن الزبير إلى البيعة له فامتنعا وقالوا: لا نبايع حتى يجتمع الناس على خلفية وتبعهما جماعة على ذلك، فشدد عليهم ابن الزبير وحصرهم

Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, who was commonly known as Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyah, and ‘Abd Allah ibn ‘Abbās were both residing in Makkah since the martyrdom of Ḥusayn عليه السلام. Ibn al-Zubayr called them to pledge their allegiance but they refused and they said, “We will not pledge until the people all unite upon a Khalīfah.” And a group of people followed them in this regard. Hence Ibn al-Zubayr was hard on them and he besieged them.¹

And Ibn Kathīr states:

لما بوع لابن الزبير لم يبايعه (يعني ابن الحنفية) فجرى بينهما شر عظيم، حتى هم ابن الزبير به وبأهله

When people pledged their allegiance to Ibn al-Zubayr he, i.e. Ibn al-Ḥanafīyah, did not pledge his allegiance. Thus great evil ensued between the two of them and Ibn al-Zubayr eventually intended to inflict harm upon him and his family.²

The Umayyads themselves also suffered greatly and were massacred awfully, in ways that the Alawids were not, at the hands of al-Saffāḥ,³ the first Khalīfah of the Abbasids:

إذ تتبع بني أمية من أولاد الخلفاء وغيرهم فأخذهم، ولم يفلت منهم إلا رضيع أو من هرب إلى الأندلس

1 *Faṭḥ al-Bārī* 8/327; *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 5/106; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 54/338; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 3/356.

2 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/38.

3 ‘Abd Allah ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī al-Qurashī, Abū al-‘Abbās al-Hāshimī, commonly known as *al-Saffāḥ* (the blood shedder). The first ruler of the Abbasids upon whose hands the Umayyad dynasty fell. He was acknowledge as the Khalīfah and given allegiance in Kufah in 132 A.H. He ruled over Iraq, Khorasan, Hijaz, Sham and Egypt. He passed away in 136 A.H. after having lived for twenty eight years. See: *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 32/276; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 6/77; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 6/247; *Ma’āthir al-Ināqah* 1/170.

He searched for the Umayyads, the children of the Khulafā' and others, and he apprehended them. None amongst them survived besides an infant child or those who fled to Andalus.¹

He did not even leave those upon whom he got his hands in Makkah and Madīnah.² So much so that he searched for them even in the belly of the earth,³ for he ordered that the graves of some of them be exhumed.⁴

So in essence, these doings were all dictated by the clash over the materialistic things of this world. The Alawids thus were victims of these crimes due to them being part of the struggle, being no different than all else due to the human disposition being one and the same.

Secondly, the Umayyads offended the Zubayrids⁵ as well for the same reason. This was immediately after the clash which had ensued between the parties and after the Umayyads sealed the matter to their advantage. Hence some of their governors would curse 'Abd Allah ibn al-Zubayr رضي الله عنه upon the pulpit.⁶ His eldest son was likewise lashed by the order of al-Walīd ibn 'Abd al-Malik, a bag of cold water was thrown on his head on a cold day and thereafter he was made to stand at the door of the Masjid where he passed away.⁷

The objective of the Umayyads in doing this grave action was the exact same objective which propelled 'Abd Allah ibn al-Zubayr رضي الله عنه to be harsh to his real brother, a partisan of the Umayyads, who allegedly passed away after he was

1 *Al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 5/78.

2 *Al-Muntaẓam* 7/321; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 5/89.

3 *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* 4/154.

4 *Al-Bad' wa al-Tārīkh* 6/74.

5 The Zubayrids were the supporters of 'Abd Allah ibn al-Zubayr during his leadership. They comprised of the notables of Kūfah and Baṣrah and whoever else followed them. See: Yūsuf al-'Ish: *al-Dawlah al-Umawīyah* p. 193.

6 *Al-Muḥallā* 5/64.

7 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 4/20; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 8/225; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/87; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 3/116.

lashed and crucified.¹ He also ordered that all the Umayyads be banished from the lands of Ḥijāz after having secured control over it.²

Of course there is a very great difference between his doings and their doings, but the objective here is to prove that the rationale was one in both their doings.

Moving on, it is important to point out here that the Zubayrids were not abused with as much vigour and consistency as the Alawids. This was because they were very few in number and were completely extirpated, as opposed to the Alawids. Therefore, the prime concern of the Umayyads was to reduce the influence of the Alawids so as to prevent the people from being drawn toward them.

What makes this very clear is the incident of the Ḥajj of Hishām ibn ‘Abd al-Malik.

Before he assumed rulership he circumambulated the Ka’bah. But when he intended to touch the Black Stone he did not manage to do so and thus a pulpit had to be placed for him after which he touched it. He thereafter sat and the people of Shām stood around him. Subsequently ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn came and when he progressed toward the Black Stone the people, out of reverence and awe, cleared the path for him. Over and above this, he was dressed in an immaculate attire and was looking handsome. The People of Shām thus asked Hishām, “Who is this?” He replied, ‘I do not know.’

The reason why Hishām had wittingly displayed ignorance regarding ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn was in order to degrade him so that the people of Shām would not be drawn toward him.³

Thirdly, it is important to remember that the Hashimids, including the Alawids, had fought amongst themselves; they were not safe from the attacks of each other

1 ‘Amr ibn al-Zubayr was his name. See: *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 3/274; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 8/149; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 46/11.

2 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/63.

3 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/108.

when they came into power. In fact the Alawids had suffered more at the hands of the Hashimids than they had at the hands of their opponents the Umayyads.¹ Hence, the incentive which had driven the Hashimids to abuse their own kin was the very incentive which had driven the Umayyads to do so.

Ibn Taymiyyah mentions:

بنو هاشم قد جرى بينهم نوع من الحروب، وقد جرى بين بني حسن وبني حسين من الحروب ما يجري بين أمثالهم في هذا الأزمان، والحروب في الأزمان المتأخرة بين بعض بني هاشم وبين غيرهم من الطوائف أكثر من الحروب التي كانت في أول الزمان بين بعض بني أمية وبعض بني هاشم.

Some sort of warfare occurred between the Hashimids. Hence wars similar to those which take place in these ages occurred between the children of Ḥasan and the children of Ḥusayn عليه السلام. Similarly, the wars which have occurred in recent times between the Hashimids and their rivals of other groups are much more than those that occurred in the past between the Umayyads and some of the Hashimids.²

He also said:

قد فعل بنو هاشم بعضهم ببعض أعظم مما فعل يزيد

The Hashimids have done graver things to each other than even what Yazīd had done.³

Lastly, the harassment of the governors of the Umayyads had engulfed many people of different categories, including the scholars, the ascetics⁴ and the notables.⁵

1 Al-Khudrī: *al-Dawlah al-Umawiyah* 1/150.

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyah* 9/108.

3 *Ibid.* 4/574.

4 Like the killing of Saʿd ibn Jubayr, Muḥammad ibn Saʿd ibn Abī Waqqāṣ, and Māhān al-Ḥanafī al-Kūfī, and the detaining of Mujāhid ibn Jabr. See: *Siyar Aʿlām al-Nubalāʾ* 4/349; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/101; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 4/16.

5 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyah* 5/156.

Hishām ibn Ḥassān¹ says:

أحصوا ما قتل الحجاج صبورا فبلغ مائة وعشرين ألف قتيل

They did a count of the people whom Ḥajjāj detained and killed and it reached one hundred and twenty thousand.²

Likewise, in one morning Sulaymān ibn ‘Abd al-Malik freed 81000 prisoners from the prison of Ḥajjāj.³

In fact, they even harassed some of the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūl Allah ﷺ who opposed the Umayyads or whom they did not have satisfaction regarding even if they did not do anything. Hence Ziyād ibn Abīhi detained ‘Adī ibn Ḥātim رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ when he refused to bring forth his fugitive cousin; Ziyād had actually intended to kill him.⁴

As for Ḥajjāj and his transgression, it is more famous than a fire upon a hill. He would inflict upon them severe punishments, subdue them with vigour, would judge between them without the Sunnah and would deploy against them the riffraff of the people of Shām.⁵

Ibn al-Jawzī says:

كان الحجاج قد أذل أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم.

Ḥajjāj had disgraced the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūl Allah ﷺ.⁶

1 Hishām ibn Ḥassān al-Qurdūsī al-Azdī, their client, Abū ‘Abd Allah al-Baṣrī. A prominent scholar, an ascetic and a reliable transmitter. The most meticulous of narrators from Ibn Sīrīn. But there is some criticism regarding his narrations from Ḥasan and ‘Aṭā’ due to him omitting them. He passed away in 148 A.H. His narrations appear in the six books. See: *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 30/181; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 6/355; *Tadhkirah al-Ḥuffāz* 1/163; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 11/32.

2 *Sunan al-Tirmidhī* 4/433.

3 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/136.

4 *Al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 3/330.

5 *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 7/143; *al-Muntaẓam* 7/46; *Wafayāt al-A’yān* 2/42.

6 *Al-Muntaẓam* 6/336.

And al-Dhahabī has alluded to the fact that Ḥajjāj would denigrate the Ṣaḥābah
¹ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ

Hence in one of his sermons he said:

يا عذيري من عبد هذيل يزعم أن قراته من عند الله، والله ما هي إلا رجز من رجز الأعراب، ما أنزلها الله
على نبيه

Will anyone excuse me regarding ‘Abd Hudhayl (if I kill him or harass him)?
He claims that his reading of the Qur’ān is from Allah. By Allah it is not but
from the chants of the Bedouins, Allah did not reveal it upon his Nabī.²

And in another sermon he said:

والله لو أدركت عبد هذيل لضربت عنقه

By Allah if I get hold of ‘Abd Hudhayl I will kill him.³

In these statements he was referring to ‘Abd Allah ibn Mas‘ūd رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Whilst
commenting upon them al-Dhahabī states:

قاتل الله الحجاج ما أجرأه على الله كيف يقول هذا في العبد الصالح عبد الله بن مسعود

May Allah destroy Ḥajjāj, how bold was he against Allah! How could he make
such statements regarding ‘Abd Allah ibn Mas‘ūd, the pious bondsman?⁴

And Ibn Kathīr says:

1 *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 5/44.

2 *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*: chapter of Sunnah: sub-chapter regarding the Khulafā’: ḥadīth no. 4643. Al-Albānī has deemed the narration authentic. See what propelled him to make this statement in *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/128.

3 *Mustadrak al-Ḥākim*: chapter regarding knowing the Ṣaḥābah: mention of ‘Abd Allah ibn al-Zubayr ibn al-‘Awwām: narration no. 6352.

4 *Tārīkh al-Islam* 6/320.

هذا من جرأة الحجاج قبحه الله وإقدامه على الكلام السيء والدماء الحرام

This was due to the boldness of Ḥajjāj, may Allah disgrace him, and his advancement in making evil statements and spilling inviolable blood.¹

Ḥajjāj likewise sent a condescending message to ‘Abd Allah ibn ‘Umar taunting him therein that he coveted the Khilāfah for himself despite not being eligible for it.² And he would also say:

وددت أني قتلت ابن عمر

I wish I had killed Ibn ‘Umar.³

His insolence had reached such a level that he would say upon the pulpit of Masjid al-Ḥarām in front of the people:

ألا إن ابن الزبير نكس كتاب الله نكس الله قلبه

Behold, Ibn al-Zubayr altered the Book of Allah, may Allah alter his heart.⁴

No one had the courage to retort besides ‘Abd Allah ibn ‘Umar.

And one day he said to Anas ibn Mālīk رضي الله عنه after the latter had appeared before him:

إيه إيه يا أنيس! يوم لك مع علي، ويوم لك مع ابن الزبير، ويوم لك مع ابن الأشعث! والله لأستأصنك كما تستأصل الشاة، ولأدمغتك كما تدمغ الصمغة

1 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/128.

2 *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 3/219.

3 Ibn Sallām: *Gharīb al-Ḥadīth* 4/411; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 61/409; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 4/542.

4 *Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah*: chapter of leaders: sub-chapter regarding the leaders and visiting them: ḥadīth no. 30648; *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Khuzaymah*: Chapter of erring in Ṣalāh: sub-chapter regarding perfecting the Rukū’ of this Rak‘ah and its Sujūd in order to complete his Ṣalāh or his optional Ṣalāh: ḥadīth no. 1027.

Amazing o Unays (small Anas)! One day you stand with ‘Alī, one day you stand with Ibn al-Zubayr, and one day you stand with Ibn al-Ash‘ath!¹ By Allah I will destroy you just like how a sheep is destroyed, and I will completely remove you just as gum is completely removed.

Anas رضي الله عنه asked, “Is the governor referring to me, may Allah reform him?”

He retorted:

إياك أعني صك الله سمعك

It is you that I intend, May Allah make you deaf.²

That is why ‘Umar ibn al-‘Abd al-‘Azīz would say:

لو تخابت الأمم فجاءت كل أمة ببخثيها وجننا بالحجاج لغلبناهم

If the nations vie with one another in evil and each of them brings forth its most evil person and we bring forth Ḥajjāj we will overpower them.³

And ‘Āṣim ibn Abī al-Najūd⁴ would say:

1 ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ash‘ath ibn Qays al-Kindī. The governor of Sijjān. He had campaigned for himself and thus many scholars of Basrah had supported him due to their frustration regarding the oppression of Ḥajjāj and his harshness. He had put Ḥajjāj in tight position due to his victories against him, so much so that he was compelled to send his family to Shām out of fear for them. Thereafter Ḥajjāj got hold of him in 84 A.H. and thus killed him and sent his head around. See: *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 4/183; *Tārīkh al-Islam* 6/129; *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 18/134; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/53.

2 *Bughyah al-Ṭalab fī Tārīkh Ḥalab* 5/2052; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 12/185; *al-Muntaẓam* 6/337; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/132.

3 *Bughyah al-Ṭalab fī Tārīkh Ḥalab* 5/2043; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 12/185; *Tārīkh al-Islam* 6/323; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/132.

4 ‘Āṣim ibn Abī al-Najūd (his name was Bahdalah, al-Asadī, their client, Abū Bakr al-Kūfī. One of the seven prominent masters of Qirā‘ah (the art of the recital of the Qur‘ān). He was considered to be from the minor successors. After his teacher Abū ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Sulamī he became the most prominent. He had the best of voices. He was likewise a reliable narrator of ḥadīth; however, now and then he would err. He passed away in 129 A.H. His narrations appear in all six books. See: *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 6/320; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 25/220; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 13/473; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 5/256.

ما بقيت حرمة إلا وقد ارتكبها الحجاج

There is no sanctity which Ḥajjāj has not violated.¹

If this was the brazenness, the blatant contempt and the crude interaction he had with the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم, despite them enjoying great reverence amongst the people, then what would his interaction with those besides them be like? People whose merits could never match the merits of Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم and whose grandeur could never match their grandeur.

Hence, a poet who was stricken by intense fear due to Ḥajjāj apprehending him describes his situation in the following way:

كأن فؤادي بين أظفار طائر
من الخوف في جو السماء محلق
حذار امرئ قد كنت أعلم أنه
متى ما يعد من نفسه الشر يصدق

كأن فؤادي بين أظفار طائر
من الخوف في جو السماء محلق
حذار امرئ قد كنت أعلم أنه
متى ما يعد من نفسه الشر يصدق

It is as though, due to fear, my heart was between the claws of a bird which was flying in the sky

Beware of the person who I know to be such that when he threatens you of evil he will deliver on his threat.²

Nonetheless, the fear of losing leadership was what had overwhelmed the Umayyads. It was the mere thought that had motivated many of their actions and by extension the actions of their governors. People had two contentions regarding their dynasty, each one inseparable from the other:

The first contention: The rule of the Umayyads itself, which for an extended period of time continued to encounter a legal crisis which the Umayyads tried to impose upon those who denied it.

1 *Dalā'il al-Nubuwwah* 6/489; *Tārīkh al-Islām* 6/324; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/132.

2 *Tāwīl Mukhtalif al-Ḥadīth* p. 347; *Bughyah al-Ṭalab fī Tārīkh Ḥalab* 5/2061; *Kashf al-Mushkil* 2/143.

The second contention: The remonstrance of the people and their bemoaning of the Umayyads. This although was a result of the previous point, but at the same time it had prompted many of the *Khulafā'* to do the following: to appoint the harshest of governors and the most cruel of them, and to unsheathe the sword in combatting any opposition even if it be driven by people of knowledge and stature. Hence Yazīd ibn Mu'āwiyah cited the following poem and informed us of his feelings:

لقد بدلوا الحلم الذي في سجيتي فبدلت قومي غلظة بليان

They changed the forbearance that was my nature, so I treated my people with harshness in place of leniency.¹

Likewise if one has to ponder over the sermons of Ziyād ibn Abīhi, Ḥajjāj and others like them, the harshness and cruelty with which they treated people will become clear.

This had created an atmosphere of fear which had overwhelmed the scholars themselves.

The following is an excerpt from the *Khuṭbah Batrā'* (truncated sermon)² which Ziyād ibn Abīhi delivered when he first entered Basrah:

وإني لأقسم بالله لأخذن الولي بالولي، والمقيم بالطاعن، والمقبل بالمدير، والصحيح منكم بالسقيم، حتى يلتقى الرجل منكم أخاه فيقول: انج سعد فقد هلك سعيد أو تستقيم لي قناتكم... وأيم الله إن لي فيكن لصرعى كثيرة، فليحذر كل امرئ منكم أن يكون من صرعاي.

I swear by Allah that I will hold a relative accountable for a relative, a resident person for a traveller, an advancing person for a fleeing person, a healthy person for a sick person. To the extent that a time will come when a person amongst you will meet his brother and say, "Attain safety, O Sa'd

1 I don't know who said the poem. It appears in *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 3/352; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 3/455.

2 It was named thus because he did not praise Allah in it. See: *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 3/197.

for Sa'īd has died," (this will continue) till you become upright for me. By Allah I will surely have many people whom I will drop amongst you, so every person should be wary of not becoming part of those whom I will drop.¹

Ziyād was the first individual who applied harshness in the affairs of leadership and enforced the rulership of Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه. He made adherence compulsory upon the people, he advanced in penalising, he unsheathed his sword, and he apprehended and punished people based on suspicion. And thus the people feared him immensely.²

Much more harsh and daunting than his sermon was the sermon of Ḥajjāj, also the first sermon he delivered when entering Iraq. The following is an excerpt from it:

والله يا أهل العراق إني أرى رؤوساً قد أينعت وحان قطافها، وإني لصاحبها، فكأنني أنظر إلى الدماء فوق العمائم واللحى... والله لأعصبنكم عصب السلمة ولأضربنكم ضرب غرائب الأبل.

By Allah, O people of Iraq, I see heads that have ripened and whose time of harvest has arrived and I will be the one harvesting them. It is as though I see blood staining the turbans and the beards. By Allah I will tie you like how the Salamah tree³ is tied, and I will beat you like how stray camels are beaten.⁴

1 *Al-Bayān wa al-Tabayīn* 243; *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 3/197; *al-'Iqd al-Farīd* 4/102; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 3/305.

2 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 3/198; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 3/307; *Tārīkh ibn Khaldūn* 3/10.

3 This is a thorny tree from which it is difficult to pick leaves due to it being very thorny. Hence its branches are gathered and they are tied together firmly, and thereafter they are struck with a stick subsequent to which leaves fall for the animals or for those keen on collecting them. See: *al-Nihāyah fī Gharīb al-Athar* 3/244; *Lisān al-'Arab* 1/603.

4 *Al-Bad' wa al-Tārīkh* 6/29; *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 3/547; *al-Muntaẓam* 6/152; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 12/127. Ibn al-Athīr says whilst commenting upon his phrase 'stray camels', "He is threatening his subjects. What the statement means is that when the camels come to water to drink and a stray camels comes to join them it is hit and chased away. *Lisān al-'Arab* 1/647.

والله لأذيقنكم الهوان حتى تدرؤ، ولأعصبنكم عصب السلمة حتى تنقادوا، أقسم بالله لتقبلن على الإنصاف ولتدعن الإرجاف، وكان وكان، وأخبرني فلان وفلان، وأيش الخبر وما الخبر؟ أو لأهبرنكم بالسيف هبرا يدع النساء أيامى، والولدان يتامى

By Allah I will make you taste humiliation till you come to learn. And I will tie you like how the Salamah tree is tied till you relent. I swear by Allah you will surely advance to justice and you will give up your circulation of false rumours, your statements ‘that this happened and that happened’, that ‘so and so informed me from so and so’, and ‘what is the news’, or else I will slice you with the sword in a way that will make the women widows and the children orphans.¹

He likewise said in another sermon:

يا بني اللكيعة وعبيد العصا وأبناء الإمام والأيامى! ألا يربع كل رجل منكم على ظلعه ويحسن حقن دمه، ويتبصر موضع قدمه، فأقسم بالله لأوشك أن أوقع بكم وقعة تكون نكالا لما قبلها وأدبا بعدها

O the sons of an ignoble maid, the slaves of the stick, the children of slave girls and widows! Would not every person amongst you pity himself, prudently protect his life, and carefully watch his step. For, by Allah, very soon I will inflict you with a punishment which will be an admonishment for those to come.²

And when Ḥajjāj intended to travel from Baṣrah to Makkah, he addressed the people saying:

يا أهل البصرة إني أريد الخروج إلى مكة، وقد استخلفت عليكم محمدا ابني، وأوصيته فيكم بخلاف ما أوصى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم في الأنصار، فإنه أوصى في الأنصار أن يقبل من محسنهم ويتجاوز عن مسيئهم، ألا وإني قد أوصيته بكم ألا يقبل من محسنكم ولا يتجاوز عن مسيئكم

O people of Baṣrah, I intend leaving for Makkah. And I have appointed over you my son Muḥammad,³ and I have advised him with an advice contrary

1 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 3/548; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 4/139; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/9.

2 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 3/549; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 4/140; *Tārīkh al-Islam* 6/318; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/9.

3 Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf al-Thaqafī, Abū Ka'b. One of the man of the Banū Umayyah.

to the advice of Rasūl Allah ﷺ regarding the Anṣār; he advised that the good of their good doers be accepted and the bad of their falterers be overlooked, and I have advised him not to accept the good of your good doers and not to pardon the bad of your evil doers.¹

The threatening was not unique to a specific place, rather it was employed in any region where there was resentment and remonstrance. Hence in Makkah, Khālīd ibn ‘Abd Allah al-Qasrī delivered a sermon in the people and he said:

إني والله ما أوتى بأحد يطعن على إمامه إلا صلبته في الحرم

Indeed by Allah, if a person who criticises his leader is brought to me I will crucify him in the Ḥaram.²

Harshness was also deployed against the people of Madīnah who were not partisans of the Umayyads.³ In fact the pledge for Mu‘āwiyah ؓ was forcibly taken from many of them.⁴ But it was most vigorously deployed in Iraq due to it being the hub of the opposition consisting of the Shī‘ah, the Khawārij and others.

Ḥajjāj and others had realised that the people of Baṣrah and Kūfah would revolt wherever they found the time opportune, and that the only requirements for the success of their revolt was safety at the time of launching the revolt and the hope

continued from page 308

He heard from Anas Ibn Mālik ؓ. His father would entrust him with many a duties, like combatting Ibn al-Ash‘ath, and would deputise him. He passed away in 91 A.H. His father was struck with severe grief after his demise and passed away a week later. See: *al-Muntaẓam* 6/302; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 52/259; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/47.

1 *Al-Bayān wa al-Tabayīn* p. 201; *Bughyah al-Ṭalab fī Tārīkh Ḥalab* 5/2058; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 12/170; *al-Muntaẓam* 6/343.

2 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 4/8; *al-Muntaẓam* 6/299; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 4/262.

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyah* 2/85.

4 *Al-Bad’ wa al-Tārīkh* 5/229; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 11/235.

of attaining victory and defeating the Umayyads.¹ Thus they had created such an environment that the mere inclination of a man toward any of the opponents, like the Alawids and the Zubayrids, would engender him incurring harm and drawing harassment.

Hence, when it reached ‘Ubayd Allah ibn Ziyād that a certain individual was condemning the murder of Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, he ordered that he be lashed and imprisoned.² And Ḥajjāj’s treatment of the Shī‘ah was such that he would not acknowledge the good people amongst them and he would not overlook their bad people.³ Likewise ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān would not give a hearing to the poets of Muḍar due to them being Zubayrids.⁴ And when a Zubayrid hailing from Iraq asked one of the freed slaves of Sa‘īd ibn al-Musayyab whether he (Sa‘īd ibn al-Musayyab) preferred ‘Abd Allah ibn al-Zubayr or the people of Shām, Sa‘īd having heard his query turned around and said:

أفلا أضيف بك الآن، فأقول هذه زبيري

Should I not get you apprehended immediately by reporting that ‘this person is a Zubayr?’⁵

Likewise, Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam had innovated the bringing forth of the Khuṭbah before the Ṭd Ṣalāh, he was the first person to do so according to popular opinion.⁶ The reason behind this was that he would revile ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in his sermon. This disenchanted the people and consequently they started leaving immediately after the Ṣalāh; he thus brought the sermon forward in order to force the people to give him a hearing.

1 *Al-Dawlah al-Umawiyah* p. 222.

2 *Al-Iṣābah fī Tamyīz al-Ṣaḥābah* 6/351.

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyah* 2/92.

4 *Ṭabaqāt Fuḥūl al-Shu‘arā’* of Ibn Sallām al-Jumaḥī 2/418; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 52/261.

5 *Al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 5/135.

6 See: Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr: *al-Tamhīd* 10/261; Ibn Qudāmah: *al-Mughnī* 2/121; *Sharḥ al-Nawawī ‘alā Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* 2/21; *Faḥ al-Bārī* 2/450; *Umdah al-Qārī* 6/280.

Ibn Ḥazm has stated that after the Ṣalāh the people would leave the orators of the Umayyads and they would not sit for the sermon. This is because they would revile ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and so the Muslims would leave, and rightfully so.¹ Many others have stated the same.²

If one has to merely ponder over the audaciousness of Marwān in opposing the Sunnah in Madīnah, in the presence of a group of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ, in a way that compelled the people to walk away and not acquiesce, the immense exertion of authority of the Umayyads will become completely clear to him. Had it not been for fear which had settled in the hearts of the people he would never have managed to do so. Hence there were only a handful of people who objected to what he had did.³

Nonetheless, the Umayyads had honoured those of the Hashimids whom they perceived to be well-wishers and whose opposition they did not fear. Hence ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn was the best of his household, the most diligent and adhering and the most beloved to Marwān and his son, ‘Abd al-Malik.⁴

And amongst the advices of ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān to his son al-Walīd in his final moments was the following:

وانظر ابن عمنا علي بن عبد الله بن عباس فإنه قد انقطع إلينا بمودته ونصيحته، وله نسب وحق، فصل
رحمه واعرف حقه

1 *Al-Muḥallā* 5/86. Note: thereafter for a very long time people became accustomed to sermon before the Ṣalāh due to the Umayyads doing so. Hence Mu‘ādh ibn Mu‘adh narrates, “When the Banū ‘Abbās took control they performed the Ṣalāh before the sermon. The people started walking away saying ‘the Sunnah has been changed’ ‘the Sunnah has been changed on the day of ‘Īd’. See: *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 9/56.

2 *Al-Sarakhsī: al-Mabsūt* 2/37; *Badā’i’ al-Ṣanā’i’* 1/276; *Ḥāshiyah al-Dasūqī* 1/382.

3 See: *Sharḥ al-Nawawī ‘alā Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* 2/22; *Faṭḥ al-Bārī* 2/450; *Umdah al-Qārī* 6/280.

4 *Al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 5/215, *al-Tārīkh al-Awsaṭ* 1/214; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 20/386; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 4/389.

And care for our cousin ‘Alī ibn ‘Abd Allah ibn ‘Abbās who has joined our camp by loving us and being our well-wisher. He is a man of noble pedigree and has a right over us, so foster ties with him and acknowledge his rights.¹

Conversely, the beard of one of the Umayyads was plucked due to him not standing with his people and supporting them when they were gathered and besieged.² Likewise ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān got one of his cousins³ executed due to him coveting the Khilāfah; He slaughtered him after granting him amnesty and promising to appoint him to office after him.⁴

All of this makes it very clear that the harshness and leniency in many of the dealings of the Umayyads was not motivated by dīn or kinship, it was rather motivated by the desire to ground themselves in leadership.

The Second Reason: The Alawids coveting the Khilāfah

Probably this was the underlying malady which caused an increase in the suffering of the Alawids and the disillusionment of the Umayyads. The belief of majority of the Alawids was that ‘Alī and his household were much more deserving of the Khilāfah and that they were wronged and their rights were usurped.⁵ And thus they viewed the Umayyads as transgressors and usurpers.

This belief had dragged the Alawids to such harassment that only Allah ﷻ knows, whether it be during the era of the Umayyads or the era of the Abbasids. The sentiment of being the oppressed which never parted from them would always erupt in them the spirit of revolting at any availing opportunity. Hence it is worth

1 *Al-Muntaẓam* 6/275; *Tārīkh al-Islam* 6/144; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/67.

2 ‘Amr ibn ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān. See: *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 3/461; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 8/220.

3 ‘Amr ibn Sa‘īd ibn al-‘Āṣ, well known as al-Ashdaq.

4 *Al-‘Ibar fī Khabar man Ghabar* 1/78; *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 3/423; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 4/85; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 8/307.

5 *Al-Khuḍrī: al-Dawlah al-Umawiyah* 1/151.

noting that the Alawids throughout their history tried to attain leadership and take charge of issues, they led several revolts against the governing dynasties.¹

Al-‘Aqqād² says:

لم يعرف التاريخ نظيرا لثبات بني علي وفاطمة على حقهم في الإمامة أو الخلافة، حوربوا فيها زمانا، وتولاها من لا شك عندهم ولا عند الناس في فضلهم عليهم كيزيد بن معاوية، فإنفوا أن يتركوها استخذاء وخضوعا، وحاربوا فيها كما حوربوا، وصمدوا للطلب الحثيث طالين ومطلوبين مائة سنة ثم مائتين ثم ثلاثمائة سنة.

History has not known an example of steadfastness like that of the children of ‘Alī and Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا upon their right³ of Imāmah or Khilāfah. For a period of time they were fought for it. Thereafter, individuals who, without any doubt according to them and the rest of the people, were inferior to them assumed it, like Yazīd ibn Mu‘āwiyah, and they refused to accept that humiliatingly. And subsequent to that, they fought for it just as they were fought for it. They remained steadfast whilst seeking and whilst being sought for a hundred years, rather two hundred years, and even three hundred years.⁴

On the other hand, the Umayyads remained constantly in a state of alarm and caution with regard to the Alawids specifically. This was because they noticed that the Alawids were very ambitious and that their ambitions every now and then would flare up.⁵ At the same time they had realised that, due to them enjoying

1 *Fitnah al-Sulṭah* p. 98.

2 ‘Abbās ibn Maḥmūd ibn Ibrāhīm al-‘Aqqād. One of the prominent scholars of Arabic literature from Egypt. He was born in 1307 A.H. He was originally from Dimyāṭ. He had mastered English and had a good grasp over German and French. He worked in several positions and thereafter freed himself for writing till the end of his life. His name shone bright for almost half a century. He had written excessively and had left behind eighty three books. Some of his works are the following, “An Allāh, al-‘Abqariyyāt and his compilation of poetry. He passed away in 1383 A.H. see: *al-‘Alām* 3/266.

3 According to their assumption.

4 *Fāṭimah al-Zahrā’ wa al-Fāṭimiyyūn* p. 47.

5 See the amount of people who revolted against the Umayyads in *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* p. 75.

the love of the people and their veneration, it was not possible for anyone else besides the Alawids to claim Khilāfah for themselves. Hence when Ibn Kathīr alluded to Ibn al-Zubayr's annihilation of the remains of the army of Yazīd ibn Mu'āwiyah, which had resulted in him earning acclaim in Ḥijāz and gaining the support of the people, he still commented by saying:

ومع هذا كله ليس هو معظما عند الناس مثل الحسين، بل الناس إنما ميلهم إلى الحسين لأنه السيد الكبير، وابن بنت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم. فليس على وجه الأرض يومئذ أحد يساويه ولا يساويه.

Despite all of this, he was not as respected amongst the people as Ḥusayn was. People's inclination was still toward Ḥusayn because he was the great leader and the grandson of Rasūl Allah ﷺ. Hence there was no one upon the earth who could compete with him or match him.¹

He also says:

لا يمكنه أن يتحرك بشيء مما في نفسه أي من طلب الخلافة مع وجود الحسين

It would not be possible for him to campaign for himself in the presence of Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه.²

This caution of the Umayyad rulers was exploited by their governors to get rid of their rivals who also worked for the Umayyads, doing so by creating suspicion regarding their loyalty and allegiance. For example Yūsuf ibn 'Umar,³ the governor of Iraq, wrote the following to Hishām ibn 'Abd al-Malik:

1 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 8/151.

2 *Ibid.* 8/151.

3 Yūsuf ibn 'Umar ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥakam al-Thaqafī. The governor of Iraq and Khorasan. He was the cousin of Ḥajjāj. He had governed Yemen for Hishām ibn 'Abd al-Malik and thereafter Iraq after Khālīd al-Qasrī. He was generous, awe inspiring, adept at administration and was a little harsh. He was tested in the era of Yazīd al-Nāqīsh due to which he fled and hid away for a while. He was later discovered and was imprisoned in Damascus. Eventually he was killed at the hands of Yazīd ibn Khālīd al-Qasrī in 127 A.H. See: *al-Ma'ārif* of Ibn Qutaybah p. 398; *Wafayāt al-A'yān* 7/101; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 5/442; *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 29/117.

إن أهل البيت من بني هاشم قد كانوا هلكوا جوعاً حتى كانت لقمة أحدهم قوت عياله، فلما ولي خالد العراق أعطاهم الأموال ففقروا بها فتاقت نفوسهم إلى طلب الخلافة، وما خرج زيد إلا عن رأي خالد

The Hashimid members of the Ahl al-Bayt were completely destroyed due to hunger, so much so that a morsel of one of them would serve as the provisions of the entire family. But when Khālīd assumed the governorship of Iraq he granted them wealth by way of which they gained strength. Subsequently they coveted the Khilāfah. Zayd's rebellion was only because Khālīd had told him to do so.

The Third Reason: The Shī'ah of the Alawids

Avenging the murder of 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه was the focal point which had led to the establishment of the Umayyad Empire, it had granted it the legitimacy that in long required in its initial stages. Which is why the Umayyads were very eager to subdue anyone who did not think along the same lines, at the head of who were the Alawids.

Although after the martyrdom of 'Alī رضي الله عنه and the relinquishment of the Khilāfah by Ḥasan رضي الله عنه for Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه, the Umayyads had become grounded in power, but the Shī'ah still remained loyal to 'Alī رضي الله عنه; they believed that the Khilāfah was usurped from him. After his demise their allegiance shifted to the Alawids due to them being the natural and legal heirs of 'Alī رضي الله عنه and his Khilāfah. Together with that, they opposed the Umayyads fervidly and some of them would thus say:

كلب للعلوية خير من جميع بني أمية

A dog of the Alawids is better than all the Umayyads.¹

The Shī'ah had not only resented the Umayyads and their doings, rather they went on to openly impugn them and the legitimacy of their rule, and to kindle

1 *Tārīkh Baghdād* 4/248; *al-Muntaẓam* 7/247; *Wafayāt al-A'yān* 7/106; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 4/476.

the spirit of opposing the Umayyads amidst the people by criticising ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and reviling Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.¹

Apart from all of this, the most dangerous of measures which they implemented was that they incited the Alawids to revolt against the Khilāfah and induced them to reclaim what was usurped from them, promising them their full support if they did so.

But in reality, they would incite those of the Ahl al-Bayt whom they promised to support, and when they would develop confidence in the Shī‘ah and a reprimander would reprimand them for their doings they would abandon them hand them over and give preference to this world.²

Al-Khuḍrī,³ whilst elaborating upon the role the Shī‘ah played in straining the relationship between the Umayyad and the Alawid households, states:

تتمنى قلوب شيعتهم أن ينالوا هذا الحق، فيحملون الواحد منهم بعد الواحد على الخروج فيخرجون
وتكون العاقبة قتلا وتمثيلا

The hearts of their Shī‘ah yearned that they obtain this right. Hence they would incite one individual after the other to revolt. Subsequently they would revolt, but the result would only be murder and mutilation.⁴

There can be no doubt that impugning the Umayyads, making mention of the merits of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and his sons, campaigning for their right of Khilāfah, and some

1 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 3/182; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 3/291.

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 2/92.

3 Muḥammad ibn ‘Afīf al-Bājūrī, who was well known as al-Shaykh al-Khuḍrī. He was a jurist, a scholar of the principles of the Sharī‘ah, a historian, a master of literature, and an orator. He was born in 1289 A.H. He graduated at the Dār al-‘Ulūm institute. He served in many positions and eventually settled as an inspector in the ministry of Education. He passed away in Cairo in 1345 A.H. Some of his books are: *Uṣūl al-Fiqh*, *Tārīkh al-Tashrī‘ al-Islāmī*, *Muḥāḍarāt fī Tārīkh al-Umam*. See: *al-A‘lām* 6/269; *Mu‘jam al-Mu‘allifīn* 10/295.

4 *Al-Dawlah al-Umawiyyah* 1/150.

of the Alawids becoming propelled by all of this toward coveting the Khilāfah had incited the people to revolt. This had induced the fury of the Umayyads and had prompted them to deploy excessive harshness toward the Alawids, even if it be denigrating ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, disrespecting him and disassociating from him. Especially when they discerned that the Alawids have the capacity to pounce upon their kingdom at any given time.

The conclusion of all the aforementioned is that the Umayyad Khulafā’ and their subordinates played a role in the emergence of Naṣb. The details are as follows:

1. The Role of the Khulafā’

Previously we have alluded to the fact that impugning ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ had started a short while after the murder of ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. Subsequent to that, the Khawārij and the people of Shām had taken his disparagement to a more extreme level.

Hence, during the Battle of Ṣiffīn explicit revilement and mutual imprecation had ensued between the two groups. Here, however, we will only allude to that with which ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was targeted.

When the Umayyads had achieved stability in their dominion they found that there were people who objected to their Khilāfah and criticised it a lot, doing so by extolling the merits of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and claiming that they usurped his right. This could potentially cause the hearts to yearn toward Fitnah and rise toward rebellion once again. As a result, most of the Umayyad Khulafā’ were propelled to intentionally denigrate him and openly revile him, thereby attempting to disenchant the people from and obstruct the path of any person who wanted to criticise their Khilāfah.

Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ had asked Sa’d رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, “What prevents you from reviling Abū Turāb?” He replied thusly:

أما ما ذكرت ثلاثا قالهن له رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فلن أسبه - لأن تكون لي واحدة منهن أحب إليّ حمر النعم، سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يقول له: خلفه في بغض مغازيه فقال له علي:

يا رسول الله خلفتني مع النساء والصبيان؟ فقال له رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أما ترضى ان تكون مني بمنزلة هارون من موسى إلا أنه لا نبوة بعدي. وسمعتة يقول يوم خيبر: لأعطين الراية رجلا يحب الله ورسوله ويحبه الله ورسوله، قال ففظا ولنا لها فقال: ادعوا عليا فأتي به أرمدا فصق في عيته، ودفع الراية إليه ففتح الله عليه. ولما نزلت هذه الآية فُقِلْ تَعَالَوْا نَدْعُ أَبْنَاءَنَا وَ أَبْنَاءَكُمْ دَعَا رسول الله عليا وفاطمة وحسنا وحسبنا فقال: اللهم هؤلاء أهلي

After hearing three things Rasūl Allah ﷺ mentioned regarding him I will never revile him, I would prefer one of them over red camels for myself. When Rasūl Allah ﷺ deputised him in one his battles and ‘Alī asked, “O Rasūl Allah do you leave behind with the women and children,” I heard Rasūl Allah ﷺ saying, “Are you not happy that you to me like how Hārūn was to Mūsā, however there is no Nubuwwah after me.” I also heard him saying on the day of Khaybar, “I will give the flag to a man who loves Allah and his Rasūl and Allah and his Rasūl love him.” We all aspired for it but he said, “Call ‘Alī.” He was brought and his eyes were sore. Rasūl Allah ﷺ applied his saliva in his eyes and gave him the flag. Subsequently Allah had granted him victory. And when the verse: “So say, come we call our sons and your sons...” was revealed, Rasūl Allah ﷺ summoned ‘Alī, Fāṭimah, Ḥasan and Ḥusayn رضي الله عنهم and said, “O Allah this is my household.”¹

Al-Nawawī, however, explains:

قالوا: ولا يقع في روايات الثقات إلا ما يمكن تأويله. فقول معاوية هذا ليس فيه تصريح بأنه أمر سعدا بسبه، وإنما سأله عن السبب المانع له من السبب كأنه يقول: هل امتنعت تورعا أو خوفا أو غير ذلك؟ فإن كان تورعا وإجلالا له عن السبب فأنت مصيب محسن، وإن كان غير ذلك فله جواب آخر.

They (‘Ulamā) say, “In the narrations of reliable transmitters there is always content which is plausibly interpretable.” Hence in this statement of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه there is no explicit mention that he ordered Sa’d to revile him. In fact he only asked him regarding the reason which prevented him from doing so, as if he was asking him, “Is it due to piety or fear or otherwise

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: chapter of merits: sub-chapter regarding the merits of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib: ḥadīth no. 2404.

that you refrain?" If it is because of piety and respect then you are correct, and if it is for any other reason than the answer would be different.¹

Likewise al-Ṭāhir ibn 'Āshūr² has also supported the view that no revilement occurred during the era of Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه. He has said:

لم أف على تعيين الوقت الذي ابتدع فيه هذا السب، ولكنه لم يكن في خلافة معاوية رضي الله عنه

I have not come across the exact time in which this revilement was initiated. However it was not during the era of Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه.³

It has also been reported that one of the conditions placed by Ḥasan رضي الله عنه during the truce was that 'Alī رضي الله عنه not be reviled in front of him.⁴

It is reported that Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam would revile him upon the pulpit and that the governor of Madīnah, who was from the family of Marwān, had ordered Sahl ibn Sa'd رضي الله عنه to denigrate him. And lastly regarding Mughīrah رضي الله عنه there are also reports which support this viewpoint.⁵

1 *Sharḥ al-Nawawī 'alā Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* 15/175. In 15/176 he has offered another interpretation which reads as follows, "What prevents you from deeming him wrong in his opinion and reasoning and expressing to the people the accuracy of our opinion and reasoning?"

2 Muḥammad al-Ṭāhir ibn 'Āshūr. The head Muftī of the Mālikī school in Tunisia and the supreme scholar of the Zaytūnah University and its branches. He was born in 1296 A.H. He was part of the two Arabic academies in Damascus and Cairo. He passed away in 1393 A.H. Some of his books are: *al-Taḥrīr wa al-Tanwīr*, *Maqāsid al-Sharīah al-Islāmiyyah*, *Uṣūl al-Niẓām al-Ijtimā'ī fī al-Islām*. See: *al-A'lām* 6/174; *al-Jawāb al-Mufīd li al-Sā'il al-Mustafīd* p. 65; *Shaykh al-Islām al-Imām al-Akbar* of Muḥammad al-Ḥabīb ibn Khūjah.

3 *Al-Taḥrīr wa al-Tanwīr* 13/259.

4 *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 6/246; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 3/264; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 8/14.

Ibn Taymiyah says: As opposed to reviling 'Alī رضي الله عنه for it was rampant amongst the followers of Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه. See: *Majmū' Fatāwā* 4/436. He also says, "Reviling 'Alī رضي الله عنه and cursing him was part of the revolt because of which the opposition came to draw the title 'the rebellious group'.

5 *Sunan Abī Dāwūd* 4/211. The ḥadīth is deemed authentic by Albānī in his *Ṣaḥīḥ Sunan Abī Dāwūd*: ḥadīth no. 4648.

Even if it is accepted that Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه did in fact criticise ‘Alī رضي الله عنه then it will be said that Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه erred in reviling ‘Alī رضي الله عنه just as he erred in fighting him; for nor was he or any of the other Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم infallible. The principal in this regard is that from the narrations which contain elements which dispraise the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم: many are lies; in some of them they acted according to their reasoning and what they deemed best; and in some, even if they sinned, they were not infallible. Rather, together with them being the friends of Allah and from those promised Jannah they had sins which Allah will forgive them for.¹

Furthermore, the widely accepted principal of the Ahl al-Sunnah has always been that they do not exonerate Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه nor those who were better than him from sins, let alone exonerating them from committing errors in their reasoning.²

Profound indeed is the following analyses of Ibn Taymiyyah which he presents when discussing the mutual imprecation which ensued during the Battle of Ṣiffīn:

التلاعن وقع بين الطائفتين كما وقعت المحاربة، وكان هؤلاء يلعنون هؤلاء في دعائهم، هؤلاء يلعنون رؤوس هؤلاء في دعائهم، وقيل: إن كل طائفة كانت تقنت على الأخرى، والقنن باليد أعظم من التلاعن باللسان، وهذا كله سواء كان ذنباً أو اجتهداً أو مخطئاً أو مصيباً، فإن مغفرة الله ورحمته تتناول ذلك بالتوبة والحسنات الماحية والمصائب المكفرة وغير ذلك

Mutual imprecation ensued between them just as fighting ensued between them. These people would curse the leaders of these people, and these people in return would curse the leaders of these people. It is actually said that each group would recite the Qunūt against the other. Fighting with the hands is of course graver than cursing with the tongue. All of this, whether characterised as sins, or results of correct or incorrect reasoning, will be encompassed by the mercy and forgiveness of Allah, either by way of repentance, or good deeds that wipe out evil deeds, or calamities which expiate sins.³

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 4/244.

2 *Ibid.* 4/385.

3 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 4/468; *Majmū‘ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām* 4/485; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 7/284.

In all probability, Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه had did what he did based on his reasoning that that was most opportune for the time. He was driven to take such measures out of the fear of disunity shattering the Ummah and causing it to fall into civil strife. This was because the Shī‘ah were igniting unrest by relying upon the mention of the merits of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, wittingly or unwittingly, especially when considering that the hearts were not at ease and that they were ever willing to fight. This contained such calamities which only Allah knows.

Hence he assumed that although disparaging ‘Alī رضي الله عنه was an evil in itself, but the resultant bickering and bloodbath from the propaganda of the opposition was much worse. His reasoning was thus based upon doing the lesser of the two evils in order to circumvent the greater of them. This is clear from the fact that in the ḥadīth we are ordered to kill anyone who intends to shatter the unity of the Ummah whoever he maybe.¹ Surely reviling and disparaging is of a lesser degree than killing.

Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه condensed his policy in his statement:

أضع سيفي حيث يكفيني سوطي، ولا أضع سوطي حيث يكفيني لساني

I drop my sword where my whip suffices. And I do not drop my whip where my tongue suffices.²

And he said to Ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه at one occasion:

أنت على ملة علي؟ قال لا ولا على ملة عثمان، ولكني ملة النبي

“Are you upon the creed of ‘Alī?”

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* 3/1480; *Sunan al-Nasā’ī* 7/93; *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān* 10/438; *al-Mustadrak ‘alā al-Ṣaḥīḥayn* 2/169.

2 Ibn Qutaybah: *Gharīb al-Ḥadīth* 2/413; *al-‘Iqd al-Farīd* 1/37; *Tārīkh al-Ya‘qūbī* 2/238; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 59/173.

He replied, “No. Not even upon the creed of ‘Uthmān. But I am upon the creed of Nabī ﷺ.”¹

Al-Dhahabī declares:

ومعاوية من خيار الملوك الذين غلب عدلهم على ظلمهم، وما هو بيريء من الهنات، والله يعفو عنه

Mu‘āwiyah ﷺ was the best of kings whose justice had succeeded his injustice. He was not free from blemishes, but Allah will pardon him.²

There is no doubt as to the fact that if the Shī‘ah of ‘Alī did not exist and if they did not do whatever they did he would never have resorted to such measures, notwithstanding his piety, his understanding, his virtue and his forbearance.³

What emphasises this point is that Ḥasan and Ḥusayn ﷺ would often visit him and he would honour them and show them phenomenal respect. He would offer them a hearty welcome and gift them with handsome gifts. On one occasion he gave them two hundred thousand and then said:

خذاها وأنا ابن هند، والله لا يعطيكماها أحد قبلي ولا بعدي

Take this and I am the son of Hind. By Allah no one before me or after me will give you so handsomely.⁴

Likewise one day he told Ḥasan ﷺ, “I will give you a gift that no one before me has gifted,” and thereafter gave him four hundred thousand.⁵

1 *Sharḥ Uṣūl I’tiqād Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā‘ah* 1/94; *Ḥilyah al-Awliyā’* 1/329; Ibn Ḥazm: *al-Iḥkām* 4/607; *Majmū’ Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām* 3/415; *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyah* 2/96; *al-Nubuwwāt* p. 142; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 3/342.

2 *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 3/159.

3 *Tārīkh al-Ya‘qūbī* 2/

4 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 8/150; *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyah* 6/250.

5 *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 3/154.

Even after the demise of Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ would still visit him and he would gift him and offer him respect.¹

Similarly, when Yazīd ibn Mu‘āwiyah and Ḥasan one day vied with another as to who is better, his father asked him, and “Did you vie with Ḥasan?” he replied in the affirmative, whereafter he said to him:

لعلك تظن أن أمك مثل أمه، أو جدك كجده! فأما أبوك وأبوه فقد تحاكما إلى الله فحكم لأبيك على أبيه

You probably thinking that your mother is like his mother, or you grandfather is like his grandfather. As for your father and his father, they raised their case to Allah, and he decided in favour of your father over his father.²

Moving on, many of the Umayyads would designate the title *Abū Turāb* or *Abū al-Turāb* (the father of sand) to ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ condescendingly, as though suggesting that this title entailed disparaging him³ and assuming that he disliked it. Ibn Ḥajr al-‘Asqalānī states:

كان أعداؤه (يعني) عليا يقولون: أبو تراب ظننا منهم أنه يكرهها

His enemies (i.e. the enemies of ‘Alī) would call him *Abū Turāb* assuming that he disliked it.⁴

And Sahl ibn Sa‘d رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ narrates that a person came to him and said:

هذا فلان أمير من أمراء المدينة يدعوك لتسب عليا على المنبر. قال: أقول ماذا؟ قال: تقول له أبو تراب...

1 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 8/150.

2 *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 13/241; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 3/260.

3 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* 3/1358; *Faḥ al-Bārī* 10/588.

4 *Nuzhah al-Albāb fī al-Alqāb* 2/253.

This person, a governor from the governors of Madīnah, is calling you to revile ‘Alī عليه السلام upon the pulpit. He asked, “And what should I say?” The man replied, “You can call him Abū Turāb...”¹

This was noticed and picked up by some of their governors and partisans.² Hence some of them would intentionally call the Shī‘ah *Turābī*.³ This would make them feel indignant because they knew of the evil intent.⁴

Despite this, this did not in the least debase ‘Alī عليه السلام, due to this name being the most beloved of names to him; Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم had named him with it.⁵

The affair had remained such during the reign of most of the Umayyad rulers after him. But now it was not due to their fear of ‘Alī عليه السلام because he had moved on to his Lord. Rather it was out of the fear that people will gather around his sons who continuously opposed them and anticipated calamities to befall them.

It is well-known that the Alawids themselves did not have such qualities which would make them qualify for the Khilāfah. Hence their campaign was always

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān*: chapter regarding he صلى الله عليه وسلم informing regarding the merits of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم, their men and their women, by name: sub-chapter regarding Muṣṭafā صلى الله عليه وسلم naming ‘Alī عليه السلام Abū Turāb: ḥadīth no. 6925.

2 See: *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* 4/1870, 1874; *al-Ma‘rifah wa al-Tārīkh* 2/344; *I‘tiqād Ahl al-Sunnah* 8/1381; *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 2/15, 3/225; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 24/258, 42/18; *Mu‘jam al-Udabā’* 3/358; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 3/330; *Akhbār wa Ḥikāyāt* p. 52; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 4/267; *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 15/67; *Fawāt al-Wafayāt* 1/430; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/234; *Nuzhah al-Albāb fī al-Alqāb* 2/253.

3 *Akhbār al-Wāfīdīn min al-Rijāl* p. 30; *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 3/233; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 24/91; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 3/330.

4 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 3/225; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 24/258; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 3/330.

5 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* 4/1874. Abū Ḥayyān al-Andalusī has stated the these titles were not considered to be bad or disrespectful amongst the Arabs. He mentions in *al-Baḥr al-Muḥīṭ*:

When the Arabs intend to be light hearted with the addressee, they coin a name for him from the condition he is in. For example: Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم titled ‘Alī عليه السلام, when he was sleeping on the sand and his forehead had become dusty, “Stand, O Abū Turāb,” thereby suggesting that he was being light hearted. See: 8/353.

centred around advancing the merits of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and his virtues, and on claiming that the Shar‘ī Khilāfah has always been the right of ‘Alī. They would further aver that if it was usurped from him, then the Alawids were his heirs. The Umayyads were not unaware of this, as is clear from what ‘Abd al-‘Azīz ibn Marwān¹ told his son ‘Umar one day:

يا بني، إن الذين حولنا لو يعلمون من علي ما نعلم تفرقوا عنا إلى أولاده

O my son, if those around us come to know that regarding ‘Alī رضي الله عنه which we know, they would leave us and join the ranks of his sons.²

Because the motive of the Umayyads was to prevent the people from developing an inclination toward ‘Alī رضي الله عنه so that it not be exploited by his children, they would choose the times in which people would gather, like the ‘Ids and the days of Ḥajj, to disparage him and revile him. ‘Āmir ibn ‘Abd Allah³ would say:

انظروا إلى ما يصنع بنو أمية يخفضون عليا ويغرون بشتمه

Look at what the Umayyads do! They disparage ‘Alī and incite people to revile him...⁴

1 ‘Abd al-‘Azīz ibn Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam al-Umawī, Abū al-Aṣḥab al-Madanī. Remained the governor of Egypt for twenty years. He was the first person to mint gold coins during his tenure. He was appointed to office after ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān, but he passed away before him. Ibn Sa’d has said, ‘He was reliable and narrated a few narrations.’ He passed away in 85 A.H. His narration appears in *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*. See: *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 36/345; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 18/197; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 8/280; *al-Tuḥfah al-Laṭīfah fī Tārīkh al-Madīnah al-Sharīfah* 2/188.

2 *Al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 4/315.

3 ‘Āmir ibn ‘Abd Allah ibn al-Zubayr ibn al-‘Awwām al-Qurashī, Abū al-Ḥārith al-Madanī. A reliable scholar who an ascetic and highly appreciated. Al-Khalīlī has said regarding him, ‘‘All his narrations can be used as proof.’’ He passed away in 124 A.H. His narrations appear in the six books. *Al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta’dīl* 6/325; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 14/57; *al-Kāshif* 1/523; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 5/64.

4 *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 13/68.

Nonetheless, the reviling of the Umayyads of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is well-established according to many scholars. Ibn Taymiyyah mentions that the greatest issue the people held against the Umayyads was their disparaging of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.¹ And al-‘Aynī² has described their era as one in which they would curse him upon the pulpits.³ Others have also averred the same.⁴

It is not far-fetched that hatred for ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and disillusionment with him was something deeply rooted in the hearts of many of the later Umayyads who did not live to see many of the major events. Their situation was thus no different than that of the people of Shām who grew up hating ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Hence it is narrated that when ‘Alī ibn ‘Abd Allah ibn ‘Abbās,⁵ whose title was Abū al-Ḥasan, visited ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān the latter said to him:

غير اسمك وكنيتك فلا صبر لي على اسمك وكنيتك

Change your name and your title, for I cannot bear you name and your title.

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 8/239.

2 Maḥmūd ibn Aḥmad ibn Mūsā ibn Aḥmad al-‘Ayntābī, Abū Muḥammad al-‘Aynī. A Ḥanafī jurist, a ḥadīth master and a historian. He was born in 726 A.H. He was appointed as a judge in Cairo and was dismissed several times. Thereafter he presumed over the judiciary of the Ḥanafī judges. He was eloquent in both Turkish and Arabic. He passed away in 855 A.H. Some of his works are: *‘Umdah al-Qārī*, *Sharḥ al-Hidāyah*, *Sharḥ al-Kalim al-Ṭayyib*. See: *Shadharāt al-Dhahab* 7/286; *al-Badr al-Ṭālī* 2/294; *al-A‘lām* 7/163; *Mu‘jam al-Mu‘allifin* 12/150.

3 *‘Umdah al-Qārī* 24/194.

4 *Al-Ikhtilāf fī al-Lafẓ wa al-Rad ‘alā al-Jahmiyyah wa al-Mushabbihah* p. 42; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/234; *Tahdhīr al-‘Abqarī min Muḥāḍarāt al-Khuḍrī* 12/150.

5 ‘Alī ibn ‘Abd Allah ibn ‘Abbās al-Hāshimī, Abū Muḥammad al-Madanī. He was born the night ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was martyred in the year 40 A.H. and was thus named after him and given his title. Thereafter ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān changed his title. He became famous as al-Sajjād (the one who prostrates a lot) due to performing excessive Ṣalāh. He was amongst the most handsome man of Quraysh. He has been deemed reliable by several scholars. He passed away in Balqā’ in Shām in 117 A.H. His narrations appear in *al-Adab al-Mufrad* of al-Bukhārī, the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of Muslim of the four *Sunans*. See: *Ḥilyah al-Awliyā’* 3/207; *al-Muntaẓam* 7/181; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 43/37; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 7/312.

Upon which the former said:

أما الاسم فلا، وأما الكنية فأكتني بأبي محمد، فغير كنيته

As for name I will not change it. And as for my title I switch to Abū Muḥammad.

He thus changed his title.¹

Ibn Khallikān² says, whilst commenting upon this incident:

إنما قال له عبد الملك هذه المقالة لبغضه في علي بن أبي طالب رضي الله عنه، فكره أن يسمع اسمه
وكنيته

‘Abd al-Malik only said this to him because of his hatred for ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib عليه السلام. He disliked hearing his name and his title.³

In conclusion, reviling him and cursing him was a practice well-followed by most of the Umayyads. To the extent that when Hishām ibn ‘Abd al-Malik came to perform Ḥajj after assuming the Khilāfah, Sa‘īd ibn ‘Abd Allah ibn al-Walīd ibn ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān⁴ said to him:

يا أمير المؤمنين، إن الله لم يزل ينعم على أهل بيت أمير المؤمنين وينصر خلفيته المظلوم، ولم يزالوا
يلعنون في هذه المواطن الصالحة أبا تراب، فأمر المؤمنين ينبغي له أن يلعنه في هذه المواطن الصالحة

1 *Ḥilyah al-Awliyā’* 3/207; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 43/45; *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 4/165; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 4/422.

2 Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm al-Irbilī, Shams al-Dīn. More commonly known as Ibn Khallikān. A Shāfi‘ī jurist and a master in literature, Arabic and history. He was born in 608 A.H. and hails from the lineage of the Barāmīkah. He was appointed as the supreme judge in Shām. One of his many good attributes was that no one would ever dare to backbite regarding anyone else in his presence. He passed away in 681 A.H. amongst his works are: *Wafayāt al-A’yān*. See: *al-‘Ibar fī Khabar man Ghabar* 5/334; *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi‘iyyah al-Kubrā* 8/32; *al-Nujūm al-Zāhirah* 7/353; *Shadharāt al-Dhabab* 5/371.

3 *Wafayāt al-A’yān* 3/275.

4 I did not come across his biography.

O Amīr al-Mu'minīn! Allah has continued to shower his favours upon the household of Amīr al-Mu'minīn and has always supported his oppressed Khalīfah. They have continued to curse Abū Turāb in these holy places and Amīr al-Mu'minīn should also curse him in these holy places.¹

All of this had caused some of the scholars to exercise caution and not mention the name of 'Alī رضي الله عنه explicitly in the aspects of knowledge which they narrated to the Khulafā', i.e. due to them knowing how severely disillusioned they were with him.

Al-Amīr al-Ṣan'ānī² states:

وقد روي أن رواة الحديث وأهل العلم في بعض أيام بني أمية - وهي أيام عبد الملك وولاته كالحجاج وبعض بلدانهم - كانوا لا يقدرون على إظهار الرواية عن علي رضي الله عنه لشدة عدوانهم له ولمن ذكره

It has been reported that some transmitters of ḥadīth and people of knowledge, during a time in the era of the Umayyads (the time of 'Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān and some of governors like Ḥajjāj), did not have the courage to explicitly narrate the narrations of 'Alī رضي الله عنه, due to their immense acrimony for him and for whoever he mentioned.³

What al-Ṣan'ānī has mentioned was not specific to the era of 'Abd al-Malik. Rather it continued during the rule of many others besides him, intensifying and

1 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 4/118; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 4/374; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/224. The rest of the narration states that Hishām was disturbed by what he said and told him, "We have not come to revile anyone or curse him. We have merely come to perform Ḥajj."

2 Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl ibn Ṣalāḥ ibn Muḥammad al-Ḥasanī, Abū Ibrāhīm al-Ṣan'ānī. A great Mujtahid and a prolific author. He belonged to his Imāmah household in Yemen. His was born in Kaḥlān in 1099 A.H. and was known, just like his predecessors, as 'al-Amīr'. He suffered various trials at the hands of the fanatics and the laity due to him opposing the norm and approbating what was supported by evidence. He passed away in Ṣan'ā' in 1182 A.H. Some of his books are: *Subul al-Salām*, *Tawḍīḥ al-Afkār*, *Irshād al-Nuqqād ilā Taysīr al-Ijtihād*. See: *al-Badr al-Ṭālī*' 2/133; *al-A'lām* 6/38; *Mu'jam al-Mu'allifīn* 9/56.

3 *Tawḍīḥ al-Afkār* 1/369.

diminishing, depending on the surrounding impactors. Hence whenever there would be a Shīrī uprising, the pressure would intensify in this regard.

Al-Zuhrī reported that Sulaymān ibn ‘Abd al-Malik once saw a person who was striking in his appearance and intelligence, circumambulating the Ka’bah. He inquired, “Who is this O Zuhrī?” Al-Zuhrī replied, “This is Ṭā’ūs,¹ a person who has met multiple Ṣahābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ.” Sulaymān summoned him and asked him, “Would you narrate something to us?”

He said:

حدثني أبو موسى قال قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم: إن أهون الخلق على الله من ولي من أمور المسلمين شيئا فلم يعدل فيهم

Abū Mūsā narrated to me that Rasūl Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ said, “The most insignificant of people to Allah is a person who presided over the affairs of the Muslims and thereafter did not act justly amongst them.”

The face of Sulaymān changed. He lowered his head for a long time, thereafter he raised it and said, “Would you narrate something to us?”

Ṭā’ūs said:

حدثني رجل من أصحاب النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم - قال ابن شهاب ظننت أنه أراد عليا - قال: دعاني رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم إلى طعام في مجلس من مجالس قريش ثم قال: إن لكم على قريش حقا، ولهم على الناس حق، ما إذا استرحموا رحموا، وإذا حكموا عدلوا، وإذا اتتمنوا أدوا، فمن لم يفعل فعليه لعنة الله والملائكة والناس أجمعين، لا يقبل الله منه صرفا ولا عدلا.

1 Ṭā’ūs ibn Kaysān al-Hamadānī, their client, Abū ‘Abd al-Raḥmān al-Yamānī. The leading scholar of Yemen and its ascetic. He was one of the senior successors and one of the great students of Ibn ‘Abbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا. He performed forty Ḥajjs and was a person whose prayers were always accepted. ‘Amr ibn Dīnār said regarding him, “I have not seen anyone like Ṭā’ūs.” He passed away in the days of Ḥajj in 105 A.H. His narrations appear in all six books. See: *al-Thiqāt* 4/391; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 13/357; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 5/38; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 5/8.

A person from the companions of Rasūl Allah ﷺ narrated to me (al-Zuhrī says, “I assumed he was referring to ‘Alī,”), “Rasūl Allah ﷺ invited me to a gathering from the gatherings of the Quraysh. He said, “You have a right over the Quraysh and they have a right over the people. The rights of the people over them is that they show mercy when mercy is sought from them, they act justly when they rule, and they deliver when they are entrusted. Whoever does not do this, upon him is the curse of Allah, his angels and all the people. Allah will not accept any optional or obligatory action from him.”

The face of Sulaymān once again changed and he lowered his head for a long time. Thereafter he raised it and asked, “Would you narrate something to us?”

He said, “Ibn ‘Abbās narrated to me that the last verse of the Qur’ān to be revealed was:

وَاتَّقُوا يَوْمًا تُرْجَعُونَ فِيهِ إِلَى اللَّهِ ثُمَّ تُوَفَّى كُلُّ نَفْسٍ مَا كَسَبَتْ وَهُمْ لَا يُظْلَمُونَ

*And fear the day when you will be returned to Allah. Then every soul will be compensated for what it earned, and they will not be wronged.*¹

Similarly when Mughīrah ibn Miqṣam² narrated the ḥadīth of *Mubāhalah* (mutual imprecation between Nabī ﷺ and the Christians) from al-Sha‘bī, he was asked, “People have narrated in the ḥadīth of the people of Najrān that ‘Alī was with them?”

1 The narrations appears in *Ḥilyah al-Awliyā’* 4/15; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/238. And the verse is from Sūrah Baqarah: 281.

2 Mughīrah ibn Miqṣam al-Dabbī, their client, Abū Hishām al-Kūfī. He was a blind jurist and was from the students of Ibrāhīm al-Nakhaṭī. Ibn Ḥajar has said regarding him, “A reliable scholar who was meticulous, he would, however, practice Tadrīs.” His narrations appear in the six books. He passed away in 133 A.H. See: *Ma’rifah al-Thiqāt* 2/293; *Mashāriq al-Anwār* 1/399; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 28/397; *Mizān al-Itidāl* 6/496; *Taqrīb al-Tahdhīb* p. 543; *Tāj al-‘Arūs* 5/319.

He replied:

أما الشعبي فلم يذكره، فلا أدري لسوء رأي بني أمية في علي، أو لم يكن في الحديث

As for al-Sha'bī, he has not made mention of him. I do not know was it because of the ill-opinion of the Umayyads regarding 'Alī, or because he just was not in the narration.¹

This suggests that it had settled in the minds of many that at times the name of 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was purposely not mentioned due to the position of the Umayyads regarding him.

If the Umayyads could not tolerate people merely narrating a narration from 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, whatever its topic might be, then how would they have tolerated people narrating his merits and extolling his virtues.²

The fear of not explicitly taking the name of an individual or narrating from him was not confined to 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Rather it exceeded him to his children as well. Hence some scholars did not narrate the narrations of senior scholars of the Ahl al-Bayt but after the fall of the Umayyad dynasty, as al-Darāwardī³ narrates from Imām Mālik:

لم يرومالك عن جعفر حتى ظهر أمر بني العباس

1 *Tafsīr al-Ṭabarī* 3/297. Also see: *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 5/139; *Rūḥ al-Ma'ānī* 1/46.

2 *Al-Iṣābah fī Tamyīz al-Ṣaḥābah* 4/565.

3 'Abd al-'Azīz ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Ubayd al-Juhanī, their client, Abū Muḥammad al-Darāwardī. A ḥadīth scholar of Madīnah. His ancestors hailed from Darāward, a village from the villages of Persia. However, he was born in Madīnah and that is where he passed away in 187 A.H. Ibn Ḥajar has stated, "An average narrator who would narrate from the books of others and would err. His narrations appear in all six books. See: *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 18/187; *Tadhkirah al-Ḥuffāz* 1/269; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 6/315; *Taqrīb al-Tahdhīb* p. 358.

Mālik did not narrate from Ja'far¹ but after the matter of the Abbasids prevailed.²

Nonetheless, due to the reason for the denigration of 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ persisting, the Umayyad Khulafā' continued to do so. The later Umayyads had, however, taken a step ahead and begun to harass many of the Alawids to an extent that some of them had to resort to going undercover;³ they had likewise refused to acknowledge the prominent figures amongst them, as Hishām ibn 'Abd al-Malik had done with 'Alī Zayn al-Ābidīn in his time; and the most horrendous ill-treatment was carried out against Zayd ibn 'Alī who was crucified and left hanging naked for four to five years and thereafter burnt.⁴ Subsequent to that his son was crucified.⁵ The Abbasids constantly reminded the Alawids about these events (so as to win their sympathy).⁶

All of this had changed dramatically after 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz had assumed the Khilāfah. This was due to him being very keen on returning the Ummah to the teachings of the Qur'ān and the Sunnah in many of its political, religious, financial and social matters, wherein it had diverted from the correct path.

1 Ja'far ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn al-'Alawī, Abū 'Abd Allah al-Madanī. He was given the title 'al-Ṣādiq'. He was a jurist, an ascetic and a great scholar. He was the leader of the Banū Hāshim in his time and was considered the sixth Imām in the line of Imāmah according to the Twelvers. They falsely attribute themselves to him as 'the Ja'fariyyah'. He passed away in 148 A.H. at the age of 68. His narrations appear in the *al-Adab al-Mufrad* of al-Bukhārī, the *Ṣaḥīḥ* of Muslim and the four *Sunans*. See: *al-Muntaẓam* 8/110; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 5/74; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 6/255; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 2/88.

2 *Al-Kāmil fī Ḍu'afā' al-Rijāl* 2/131; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 5/76; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 6/256; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 2/88. Note: It would not be possible to say that the reason why Imām Mālik did not narrate from Ja'far ibn Muḥammad during the Umayyad era was due to his tender age. This is because at that time he was at least 39 years of age, because he was born in 93 A.H., as appears in *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 8/49. And the reign of the Abbasids started in 132 A.H., as appears in *al-Bad' wa al-Tārīkh* 6/55; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/38.

3 *Al-Ṣawā'iq al-Muḥriqah* 2/524.

4 *Wafayāt al-A'yān* 6/111; *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 1/35; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 5/389.

5 *Al-Bad' wa al-Tārīkh* 6/52; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 64/228; *Shadharāt al-Dhahab* 1/167.

6 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 3/431; *al-Muntaẓam* 8/66; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 5/154; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/86.

From the changes that he effected, two which are related to the topic are worth mentioning:

1. Discarding the denigration of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ upon the pulpits.¹ He was a person who did not possess such love for the world that would drive him to do such a grave action.² He thus supplanted it with the mention of the four Khulafā’ and a supplication of pleasure in order to obliterate that evil practice.³ He also added the recitation of the following verse in the sermon:

إِنَّ اللَّهَ يَأْمُرُ بِالْعَدْلِ وَالْإِحْسَانِ وَإِيتَاءِ ذِي الْقُرْبَىٰ وَيَنْهَىٰ عَنِ الْفَحْشَاءِ وَالْمُنْكَرِ وَالْبَغْيِ يَعِظُكُمْ لَعَلَّكُمْ تَذَكَّرُونَ

*Indeed, Allah orders justice and good conduct and giving to relatives, and forbids immorality and bad conduct and oppression. He admonishes you that perhaps you may be reminded.*⁴

He also included the merits of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in the sermon even after the remonstrations of a group of the detractors of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.⁵ And due to there being people in various areas who cursed ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ upon the pulpits and elsewhere,⁶ he wrote these instructions to all the areas of the Khilāfah.⁷ This was received well by the people and they praised him immensely for it.⁸ In fact up to present day, these insertions continue to be read in the sermons.⁹

1 Al-Bad’ wa al-Tārikh 6/46.

2 Al-Kāmil fī al-Tārikh 4/315.

3 Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyah 4/160. Ibn Taymiyah started this point by saying, “And it is alleged...”

4 Sūrah al-Nahl: 90.

5 Ibid. 4/164.

6 Tārikh al-Ya’qūbī 2/305; Simṭ al-Nujūm al-‘Awālī 3/326.

7 Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyah 6/201. Also see: Rūḥ al-Ma’ānī 14/220.

8 Al-Kāmil fī al-Tārikh 4/315.

9 Tārikh al-Khulafā’ p. 243.

Al-Ṭāhir ibn 'Āshūr says:

في تلاوة هذه الآية عوضا عن ذلك السب دقيقة، إنها تقتضي النهي عن ذلك السب إذ هو من الفحشاء
والمنكر والبغي

In supplanting that revilement with the recitation of this verse there was an intricate indication; the verse entailed the prohibition of that revilement due to it being immorality, bad conduct and oppression.¹

Even some Shī'ah poets have acknowledged this feat of 'Umar and have extolled him for it in a poem:

وليت فلم تشتم عليا ولم تخف برينا، ولم تقبل إشارة مجرم

You assumed leadership and subsequent to that you did not revile 'Alī, you did not intimidate an innocent person and you did not accept the council of a sinner.²

Al-Sharīf al-Raḍī³ likewise says the following, despite being very vocal about the impressions the Alawids had regarding the Umayyads:

يا بن عبد العزيز لو بكت العي ن فتى من أمية لبكيتك

1 *Al-Taḥrīr wa al-Tanwīr* 13/259.

2 *Dīwān Kuthayr 'Azzah* p. 310.

For more details see: *Ḥilyah al-Awliyā'* 5/322; *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 5/393; *Tārīkh al-Ya'qūbī* 2/305; *al-Muntaẓam* 7/40; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 50/92; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 4/315; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 5/147; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/252; *Ma'āthir al-Ināqah* 1/144.

3 Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn Mūsā al-Mūsawī, Abū al-Ḥasan al-Baghdādī. The leader of the Alawids who was famously known as al-Sharīf al-Raḍī. A prominent Shī'ī scholar and an outstanding poet. He was born in 359 A.H. al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī said regarding him, "He was from the people of virtue, literature and knowledge." He passed away in 406 A.H. and was buried in his house in Baghdad. He has written: *Kitāb fī Ma'ānī al-Qur'ān*, and a voluminous compilation of poetry. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 2/246; *al-'Ibar fī Khabar man Ghabar* 3/97; *al-Nujūm al-Zāhirah* 4/240; *Shadharāt al-Dhahab* 3/182.

أنت نزهتنا عن السب والشتم فلو أمكن الجزاء جزيتك

دير سمعان لا أعجبك غيث خير ميت من آل مروان ميتك

O the son of ‘Abd al-‘Azīz if the eye would tear for any youngster of the Umayyads it would tear for you.

You purified us from revilement and denigration. If it was possible for me to reward you I would reward you.

O Dayr Sam‘ān¹ may the rain never part from you, for the best deceased of the Umayyads is the deceased buried in you.²

2. Honouring the Hashimids in general and the Alawids in specific, thereby attempting to preserve the bequest of Nabī صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ regarding his Ahl al-Bayt:

أذكركم الله في أهل بيتي أذكركم الله في أهل بيتي أذكركم الله في أهل بيتي

I remind you of Allah regarding my household. I remind you of Allah regarding my household. I remind you of Allah regarding my household.³

He would also explicitly acknowledge the merits of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, he would say:

أزهد الناس في الدنيا علي بن أبي طالب

The most ascetic of people in this world was ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib.⁴

1 A place on the outskirts of Shām. *Mu‘jam al-Buldān* 2/517.

2 *Dīwān al-Sharīf al-Raḍī* 1/206.

3 The reference has passed on p. 45. (add page number)

4 *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 42/489; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 3/265; *Tārīkh al-Islām* 3/645; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/209.

He would also honour the ambassador of the Alawids and would increase the bonus he would give them.¹ He would prevent them from standing at his door and would say:

إني لأستحيي من الله تبارك وتعالى أن يقف على بابي رجل من أهل بيت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم
فلا يؤذن له علي من ساعته

I feel shy from Allah ﷻ that a person of the Ahl al-Bayt of Rasūl Allah ﷺ stand by my door and he is not immediately granted permission.²

What he also did was that he returned Fadak to what it was during the time of Nabī ﷺ [and the first four Khulafā’]; He would give charity from it and would spend upon the minors of the Hashimids and would utilise it to get their unmarried ladies married.³ In addition, he reinstated some of the nobles of the Hashimids to positions of overseeing the charities of Rasūl Allah ﷺ after they were dismissed prior to that.⁴

Due to his sterling efforts, one among which was prohibiting the denigration of ‘Alī ﷺ and acting justly with the Alawids and being good to them, they praised him immensely. Hence Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī al-Ḥusayn⁵ said:

لكل قوم نجبية، وإن نجبية بني أمية عمر بن عبد العزيز، وإنه يبعث يوم القيامة أمة وحده

1 *Ḥilyah al-Awliyā’* 5/364; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 65/323; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/95.

2 *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 54/269; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/203.

3 *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 5/128. Also see: *Tārīkh al-Ya’qūbī* 2/305; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/200; *Tārīkh al-Khulafā’* p. 231.

4 *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 10/53.

5 Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī al-Hāshimī, Abū Ja’far al-Madanī, commonly known as al-Bāqir. He was a reliable erudite. He complemented his knowledge with action and was also an acclaimed leader. He was born in 60 A.H. and is considered one the Imāms according to the Twelvers. His narrations appear in the six books. He passed away in 114 A.H. See: *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 5/320; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 54/268; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 4/401; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 9/311.

Every nation has a highbred and the highbred of the Umayyads is ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz. He will be raised as a nation by himself on the Day of Judgment.¹

And Fāṭimah bint al-Ḥusayn² would say:

لو كان بقي لنا عمر بن عبد العزيز ما احتجنا بعده إلى أحد

If ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz remained for us we would not need anyone after him.³

2. The Role of the Governors

The doings of the Umayyad governors was a reflection of the political tactics of the Khulafā’ in Damascus and their fears. They were, overall, unique in their harshness, iron grip and excessive transgression. Especially in specific periods and specific locations which witnessed a fair amount of upheaval and unrest.⁴

These people had made the tasks assigned to them their ultimate goal. Hence they deployed all such measures which they thought would secure stability for the Umayyads against their opponents, amongst who were the Alawids. One such measure was obliterating the mention of ‘Alī عليه السلام and his merits, and ultimately

1 *Ḥilyah al-Awliyā’* 5/254; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 21/439; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 5/120; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 7/419.

2 Fāṭimah bint al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib al-Hāshimiyah. A reliable successor. She was amongst those who were sent to Damascus after the martyrdom of her father. She was the sister of ‘Alī Zayn al-‘Ābidīn. She passed away after 110 A.H. at the age of ninety. Her narrations appear in the *Sunans* of Abū Dāwūd, al-Tirmidhī, al-Nasā’ī and Ibn Mājah. See: *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 70/10; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 35/254; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 6/81; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 12/469.

3 *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 45/196; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 4/330.

4 ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz had alluded to this in his statement, “Walīd ibn ‘Abd al-Malik in Shām, Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf in Iraq, Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf in Yemen, ‘Uthmān ibn Ḥayyān in Madīnah, and Qurrah ibn Sharīk in Egypt! By Allah the earth has been filled with oppression.” See: *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 38/343; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 19/361.

severing the rope which the Alawids and their Shī'ah were holding onto very firmly in order to obtain legitimacy.

Their revilement had taken two forms:

Form 1: Reviling him and granting permission for his revilement

The governors of the Umayyads did not refrain from reviling 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and denigrating him openly. Although widespread, it is important to note that amongst them there was a group that did not revile 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and did not debase him, like Sa'īd ibn al-'Āṣ.¹

Hence in Makkah, when the order to revile 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ had arrived to its governors,² there is no doubt that they all complied. This had caused one person to become enraged; he ascended the pulpit, held on to the covering of the Ka'bah and then said:

لعن الله من يسب عليا وبينه من سوقة وإمام
أيسب المطهرون أصولا والكرام الأخوال والأعمام
يأمن الظبي والحمام ولا يأ من آل الرسول عند المقام

May Allah curse the one who reviles 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and his sons, whether they be the ordinary salesmen of the market or the ruler.

Will the men who have a pure pedigree, and noble maternal and paternal uncles be reviled?

The deer and the dove enjoy safety, but the family of the Rasūl do not enjoy amnesty by the *Maqām* (of Ibrāhīm).

1 Al-'Ilal wa Ma'rifa al-Rijāl 3/176; Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq 21/129; al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah 10/84.

2 Al-Muntazam 7/103.

They brought him down from the pulpit and they hit him with their sandals till they made him bleed.¹

In Madīnah also several of its governors would revile ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ: Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam would revile ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ every Friday upon the pulpit,² and Hishām ibn Ismā‘īl³ would likewise swear him upon the pulpit.⁴

As for Iraq, many of its governors would criticise him, some lesser than others, one of them being Mughīrah ibn Shu‘bah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.⁵

Ibn al-Jawzī says:

أقام المغيرة على الكوفة عاملا لمعاوية سبع سنين وأشهرها هو حسن السيرة إلا أنه لم يدع الدعاء لعثمان
والوبيعة في علي.

Mughīrah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ remained the governor of Kufah for Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ for a period of seven years and few months. He ruled sublimely. However, he did not stop from praying for ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and from criticising ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.⁶

Mughīrah would say:

اللهم ارحم عثمان بن عفان وتجاوز عنه واجزه بأحسن عمله، فإنه عمل بكتابك واتبع سنة نبيك وجمع
كلمتنا وحقن دماءنا وقتل مظلوما، اللهم فارحم أنصاره وأولياءه ومحبيه والطالبين بدمه ويدعو على قتله

1 Al-Fākihī: *Akhbār Makkah* 3/347; *al-Bayān wa al-Tabyīn* p. 551; *al-Muntaẓam* 7/103.

2 *Al-‘Ilal wa Ma‘rifah al-Rijāl* 3/176; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 57/243; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 8/259; *Tārīkh al-Khulafā’* p. 190.

3 Hishām ibn Ismā‘īl ibn Hishām al-Makhzūmī al-Madanī. The governor of Madīnah. He was from amongst the scholars and the transmitters. He is the one who hit Sa‘īd ibn al-Musayyab when he refused to pledge his allegiance to Walīd ibn ‘Abd al-Malik. He was dismissed after two years of the Khilāfah of Walīd and was substituted with ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz. He visited Damascus and passed away there in 88 A.H. See: *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 5/244; *al-Thiqāt* 5/501; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/76, 160; *Ta’jīl al-Manfāah* p. 430.

4 *Al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 5/220.

5 *Musnad al-Imām Aḥmad* 1/189.

6 *Al-Muntaẓam* 5/241.

O Allah have mercy upon ‘Uthmān and overlook his shortcomings and reward him for his good deeds. He practiced upon your book, followed the Sunnah of your Nabī, united us, and protected our blood. He was killed wrongly. O Allah have mercy upon his helpers, his gaurdians, his lovers, and those who seek retaliation for his blood. Mughīrah would also make an evil prayer for his killers.¹

From those who governed Iraq, There was no one who displayed more insolence and cursed more than Hajjāj ibn Yūsuf, as stated by Ibn Ḥazm:

كان الحجاج وخطباؤه يلعنون عليا

Hajjāj and his orators would curse ‘Alī رضي الله عنه.²

Khālid al-Qasrī would also denigrate ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and his sons every Friday.³

In Yemen Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf al-Thaqafī,⁴ the brother of Ḥajjāj, would revile ‘Alī رضي الله عنه upon the pulpits.⁵

In addition to that, all the governors of Qazwīn⁶ would also curse him.⁷

1 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 3/219.

2 *Al-Muḥallā* 5/64.

3 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/327.

4 Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf ibn Abī ‘Aqīl ibn Mas‘ūd al-Thaqafī. The governor of Yemen who was the brother of Ḥajjāj. He was appointed over Ṣan‘ā’. When Ibn al-Zubayr رضي الله عنه was martyred his hand was sent to him so he hung it in Ṣan‘ā’. Thereafter Ḥajjāj appointed him over al-Jand as well and thus he governed over them till he died after contracting a fatal illness. Muḥammad ibn Ḥajjāj and he both died on the same night in 91 A.H. See: *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 4/30; *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafāyāt* 5/158; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/80; *al-A‘lām* 7/147.

5 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/80.

6 Qazwīn is situated in present day Iran on the west of Tehran. It was conquered during the era of the Umayyads. See: *Mu‘jam ma Ustu‘jīm* 3/1072; *Mu‘jam al-Buldān* 4/342.

7 *Al-Tadwīn fī Akhbār Qazwīn* 1/55.

From all the aforementioned, it is worth noting that Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam and Ḥajjāj ibn Yūsuf reviled him the most and exaggerated in doing so.

Considering their locations it is not difficult to understand why they were so aggressive, for they both ruled over places which were in general dissatisfied with the Umayyads.

The first was the governor of Madīnah which was the locus of Nubuwwah. Its people were thus never going to be ignorant of the merits of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, especially due to the presence of many of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم amongst them. This had, therefore, served as a propellant for Marwān to not only revile ‘Alī رضي الله عنه but to exaggerate in doing so,¹ as stated by Ibn Kathīr:

لما كان متوليا على المدينة لمعاوية كان يسب عليا كل جمعة على المنبر

When he was the governor of Madīnah for Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه he would revile ‘Alī رضي الله عنه every Friday upon the pulpit.²

As for Ḥajjāj, he was the governor of Iraq which was the stronghold of the Shī‘ah of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه.

Although both men reviled him and denigrated him, their revilements differed drastically. Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam would only disrespect ‘Alī رضي الله عنه in public, thereby wanting to disenchant the people from him. But he would acknowledge his knowledge and merits.

Hence, despite the fact that disputes would occur between him and Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī,³ which would prompt his brother Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه to refute him and revile him upon the pulpit,⁴ and despite him acknowledging that he did not love the two of them, no source states that he would curse ‘Alī رضي الله عنه like the others would do.

1 *Al-‘Ilal wa Ma‘rifah al-Rijāl* 3/176.

2 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 8/259.

3 *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 3/266.

4 *Majma‘ al-Zawā‘id* 9/180.

On the other hand, Marwān would clandestinely deal in an amiable way with the household of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ by fostering family ties with them and according them gifts. He had also befriended some of them to an extent that he sought amnesty for them.¹

And when al-Bāqir was asked regarding Marwān and Sa‘īd ibn ‘Āṣ, despite the former of the two exaggerating in the revilement of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ after assuming the governorship of Madīnah, he said:

كان مروان خيرا لنا في السر وسعيد خير لنا في العلانية

Marwān was better for us in secrecy and Sa‘īd was better for us in public.²

Actually, Marwān has himself explained the reason why he would revile ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in his following words to ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn:

ما كان في القوم أحد أذفع عن صاحبنا من صاحبكم يعني عليا عن عثمان

There was no one who defended our man more than your man, referring to ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ defending ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn asked him, “Why do you then revile him upon the pulpit?” He replied:

لا يستقيم الأمر إلا بذلك

The matter will not remain stable but with that.³

This is diametrically opposed to what Ḥajjāj would do, for it is not known that he conceded the merits of the Ahl al-Bayt or was considerate of their rights. Rather

1 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 8/220, 258.

2 *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 57/247; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 4/15.

3 *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 42/438; *Tārīkh al-Islām* 3/460; *Simt al-Nujūm al-‘Awālī* 2/533.

it is reported that he would exceed all bounds in debasing ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and would not hesitate in cursing him.

Form 2: Ordering people to Revile him and Disassociate from him:

With the Umayyad governors the matter did not stop at merely reviling ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Rather it surpassed that to instructing others to openly revile him, and to trialling yet others by asking them to do so. They did this especially with those people whom they thought were displeased with the Umayyad rule or whom they assumed were the partisans of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

Their insulthood had reached such an extent that they even went to order some of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ to revile him. If they could be so bold as to do this with them then to order others besides them was of course even easier.

Sahl ibn Sa’d رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ narrates:

استعمل على المدينة رجل من آل مروان، قال: فدعا سهل بن سعد فأمره أن يشتم علياً، قال: فأبى سهل، فقال له: إما إذا أبيت فقل: لعن الله أبا تراب! فقال سهل: ما كان لعلي اسم أحب من أبي التراب وإن كان ليفرح إذا دعي بها. فقال له: أخبرنا عن قصته لم سمي أبا تراب قال: جاء رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بيت فاطمة فلم يجد علياً في البيت فقال: أين ابن عمك؟ فقالت: كان بيني وبينه شيء فغاضبني فخرج فلم يقل عندي. فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم لإنسان: انظر أين هو. فجاء فقال: يا رسول الله هو في المسجد راقد، فجاء رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وهو مضطجع قد سقط رداؤه عن شقه فأصابه تراب فجعل رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يمسه عنه ويقول: قم أبا التراب، قم أبا التراب.

A person from the family of Marwān was appointed as the governor of Madīnah. He called Sahl ibn Sa’d and demanded from him that he denigrate ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Sahl refused. He thus said, “If you refuse to do so, then say May Allah curse Abū Turāb.” Sahl replied, “‘Alī did not have a name which was more beloved to him than Abū Turāb, and he would become happy when he was called by it.” So the governor said, “Inform us of his story, why was he named Abū Turāb?” He responded, “Rasūl Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ once came to the house of Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا and he did not see ‘Alī in the house. He thus asked, “Where is your cousin?” She said, “Something happened between

us and so he got upset with me and did not sleep by me.” Rasūl Allah ﷺ thus told a person, “See where he is.” He returned and said, “He is sleeping in the Masjid, O Rasūl Allah.” Rasūl Allah ﷺ came to him. He was lying asleep and his shawl had fallen from his side and consequently had become dusty. Rasūl Allah ﷺ started to dust the sand off him and said, “Stand, O Abū Turāb, stand, O Abū Turāb.”¹

Likewise Hishām ibn Ismā’īl wanted Yazīd ibn Umayyah, Abū Sinān al-Dīlī,² born during the Battle of Uḥud, to revile ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. But he replied thusly:

لا أسبه ولكن إن شئت قمت فذكرت أيامه الصالحة وموطنه

I will not revile him. But if you want I can stand up and mention his glorious days and places.³

And Ziyād said to one of them:

لتلعننه أو لأضربن عنقك

You better curse him or else I will slay you.⁴

Likewise, Ḥajjāj had ordered several men to curse ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, amongst them were the following:

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*: chapter of merits; sub-chapter regarding the merits of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رضي الله عنه: ḥadīth no. 2409.

2 Yazīd ibn Umayyah al-Dīlī, Abū Sinān al-Madanī. A reliable successor whom some scholars have adjudged amongst the Ṣaḥābah. I did not come across the date of his demise. His narrations appear in the *Sunans* of Abū Dāwūd, al-Nasā’ī and Ibn Mājah. See: *al-Thiqāt* 5/537; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 32/86; *al-Kāshif* 2/380; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 11/274.

3 *Al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr* 8/319; *al-Tārīkh al-Awsaṭ* 1/206; *al-Thiqāt* 5/537; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 32/87.

4 *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 24/259; *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 3/225; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 3/330; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/234.

- ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Laylā:¹ He was an Alawid. A ‘mash narrates:

رأيت عبد الرحمن مخلوقا على المصطبة وهم يقولون له العن الكاذبين - وكان رجلا ضخما به ربو -
فقال: اللهم العن الكاذبين آه، ثم يسكت: علي وعبد الله بن الزبير والمختار

I saw ‘Abd al-Raḥmān with a shaven head upon a raised platform. They were demanding, “Curse the liars.” (He was a big person who experienced difficulty in breathing) He would say, “O Allah curse the liars,” gasping for breath. He would then remain silent and say, “‘Alī, ‘Abd Allah ibn al-Zubayr and al-Mukhtār.”²

Al-A‘mash further says:

وأهل الشام حوله كأنهم حمير لا يدرون ما يقول، وهو يخرجهم من اللعن

The people of Shām around him were as though they were donkeys. They did not know what he was saying, whereas he was removing them from cursing.³

Al-Dhahabī has also stated that Ḥajjāj once hit him so that he may revile

‘Alī عليه السلام.⁴

1 ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī Layla (his name was Yasār according to one view) al-Anṣārī al-Awsī, Abū Ṭsā al-Kūfī. He was from the prominent jurists of the successors. ‘Abd al-Malik ibn ‘Umayr said regarding him, “I saw ‘Abd al-Raḥmān in a gathering wherein a group of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم were present, one of them being Barā’ رضي الله عنه. They were listening to his conversation and being attentive toward him.” He was part of the revolt of Ibn al-Ash’ath. He drowned in 82 A.H. His narrations appear in the six books. See: *Tārīkh Baghdad* 10/199; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 36/76; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 17/372; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 4/262.

2 *Al-Ma‘rifah wa al-Tārīkh* 3/3; *Ḥilyah al-Awliyā’* 4/351; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 36/98; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 4/265.

3 *Al-Ma‘rifah wa al-Tārīkh* 3/3; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 36/98; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 4/264; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 6/235. Al-A‘mash intended to say that Ibn Abī Laylā was saying, “‘Aliyyun...” in the state of *Raf* which denotes the beginning of a new sentence. Had he intended to curse them he would have said, “‘Aliyyan...” in the state of *Naṣb*.

4 *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 4/267.

- ‘Aṭīyyah al-‘Awfi:¹

Ibn Sa’d² states, “‘Aṭīyyah joined the revolt of Ibn al-Ash‘ath. Hence Ḥajjāj wrote to Muḥammad ibn al-Qāsim³ ordering to offer him to revile ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. And if he refuses, then to hit him four hundred lashes and shave his beard. He thus summoned him but he refused. So he carried out the instructions of Ḥajjāj on him.”⁴

- Mišda‘al-Ma‘arqab:⁵

1 ‘Aṭīyyah ibn Sa’d ibn Junādah al-‘Awfi, Abū al-Ḥasan al-Kūfi. A successor who had Shīṭ leanings. Ibn Ḥajar has said, “He was an average narrator who used to err a lot. He was a Shīṭ and would practice Tadrīs.” He died in 111 A.H. His narrations appear in the *al-Adab al-Mufrad* of al-Bukhārī and the *Sunans* of Abū Dāwūd, al-Tirmidhī and Ibn Mājah. See: *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 6/304; *Du‘afā’ al-Uqaylī* 3/359; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 20/145; *Taqrīb al-Tahdhīb* p. 393.

2 Muḥammad ibn Sa’d ibn Manī al-Hāshimī, their client, Abū ‘Abd Allah al-Baṣrī. A retainer of ḥadīth, reliable scholar with deep knowledge. He was known as the scribe of al-Wāqidī and the author of *al-Ṭabaqāt*. He was born in 106 A.H. Al-Khaṭīb has said regarding him, “From the people of merit, knowledge, understanding and impartiality. His narrations suggest that he was trustworthy.” He passed away in Baghdād in 230 A.H. His narrations appear in *Sunan Abī Dāwūd*. Some of his books are: *al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā*. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 5/321; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 10/664; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 9/161; *Ṭabaqāt al-Ḥuffāz* p. 186.

3 Muḥammad ibn al-Qāsim ibn Muḥammad al-Thaqafī. The governor of the lands of Sindh and its conqueror. He was the cousin of al-Ḥajjāj. He attacked these lands at the age of seventeen. Thereafter he remained its governor till Sulaymān ibn ‘Abd al-Malik assumed the Khilāfah. Sulaymān had deposed him and appointed Ibn Abī Kabshah in his place. Ibn Abī Kabshah had subsequently tied him and sent him to the governor of Wāsiṭ who imprisoned him and punished him till he died, doing so in order to take revenge for his brother who Ibn Qāsim had killed. This was in 98 A.H. See: *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 4/250, 286; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/87; *Tārīkh ibn Khaldūn* 3/83; *al-A‘lām* 6/333.

4 *Al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 6/304; *Tārīkh al-Islām* 7/424; *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 20/56; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 7/201.

5 Mišda‘ al-A‘raj al-Anṣārī, their client, Abū Yaḥyā al-Kūfi, commonly known as ‘al-Mu‘arqab. He was a successor who had Shīṭ leanings and had knowledge regarding Ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه. Al-Dhahabī has said regarding him, “An average narrator, regarding who scholars have spoken.” I did not come across the date of his demise. His narrations appear in Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim and the four Sunans. See: *al-Majrūhīn* 3/39; *Mīzān al-Itidāl* 6/433; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 10/143.

Ibn Ḥajr states, “The reason why he is known as al-Mu‘arqab is because Ḥajjāj or Bishr ibn Marwān¹ told him to revile ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, and when he refused to do so they cut his Achilles.² This was because he loved ‘Alī رضي الله عنه.³

Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf al-Thaqafī had likewise summoned Ḥujr al-Madarī⁴ and told him, “My brother Ḥajjāj has written to me that I make you stand before the people and that your curse ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib.” He replied by saying, “Gather the people for me.”

When he gathered them Ḥujr stood amongst them and said:

إلا إن الأمير محمد بن يوسف أمرني بلعن علي فالعنوه لعنه الله

Behold the governor Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf has ordered me to curse ‘Alī, so curse him, may Allah curse him.⁵

In conclusion, the Umayyads were so harsh and aggressive that many a people stayed away from crossing the limits. One of the successors, ‘Abd Allah ibn

1 Bishr ibn Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam al-Umawī, Abū Marwān al-Dimashqī. He governed Kūfah and Baṣrah for his brother ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān. He had a soft nature, always had a smiling face, and was generous and praiseworthy. He would not bar anyone from his door and would say, “Only woman cover up.” He passed away in Baṣrah in 75 A.H. due to a sickness which befell him. See: *al-Muntaẓam* 6/131; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 10/253; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 4/145; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/7.

2 *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 10/143.

3 *Ma‘rifah al-Thiqāt* 3/280.

4 Ḥujr ibn Qays al-Hamdānī al-Madarī. A prominent successor of Yemeni descent. He lived during the era of Jāhiliyyah but did not hear anything from Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم. He was of those who served ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. Al-‘Ijlī has said regarding him, “A reliable successor.” I did not come across his date of demise. His narrations appear in the *Sunans* of Abū Dāwūd, al-Nasāī and Ibn Mājah. See: *al-Mustadrak ‘alā al-Ṣaḥīḥayn* 2/390; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 56/310; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 5/475; *Jāmi’ al-Taḥṣīl* p. 161; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 2/188.

5 *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 56/310; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/80. Also see another story in *al-Mustadrak ‘alā al-Ṣaḥīḥayn* 2/390; also see the comments of Ibn Ḥajr upon it in *Lisān al-Mīzān* 4/122.

Shaddād,¹ thus merely hoped that he could ascend the pulpit one day and bring to the fore the merits of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ which the Umayyads were trying to conceal. He said:

وددت أنني قمت على المنبر من غدوة إلى الظهر فأذكر فضائل علي ثم أنزل فتضرب عتقي

I desire that I stand upon the pulpit tomorrow at the time of Zūhr and mention the merits of ‘Alī, subsequently I descend and I am killed.²

The Second Perspective: The Umayyads and the excommunicating Nawāṣib

The Khawārij were immensely infuriated by the arbitration which took place between the people of Iraq, under the leadership of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, and the people of Sham, under the leadership of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, and hence they excommunicated both of them.³

If they did not hesitate in excommunicating ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ whom they had supported and whose merit and knowledge they had acknowledged, then why would they hesitate in excommunicating Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ whom they considered a rebel? It was therefore expected of them to oppose him and endeavour to kill him.⁴

Furthermore, their enmity was not restricted to Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, rather it surpassed him and included all the Khulafā’ who ruled after him. This was because

1 ‘Abd Allah ibn Shaddād ibn al-Hādd al-Laythī, Abū al-Walīd al-Madanī. A successor who was jurist and resided in Kufah. He was born during the era of Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. He participated with ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in the battle of Nahrawān. Imām Aḥmad has said regarding him, “A reliable scholar who was from the prominent successors.” He went missing the night of Dujayl with Ibn al-Ash’ath in 83 A.H. His narrations appear in the six books. See: *Tārīkh Madīnah* 29/144; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 15/81; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 3/489; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 5/222.

2 *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 29/151; *Tārīkh al-Islām* 6/112; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 3/489; *al-Tuḥfah al-Laṭīfah fī Tārīkh al-Madīnah al-Sharīfah* 2/43.

3 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 6/216, 7/285.

4 *Al-Bad’ wa al-Tārīkh* 5/230; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 7/330.

they believed that they were disbelievers and that their rule was illegitimate, with the exception of ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz.

The clash between the two groups had started at a very early stage when Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه had dispatched a battalion from Shām to combat the Khawārij, but it was defeated near Kūfah. Subsequent to that Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه ordered the people of Kufah to attack them and they had succeeded in defeating them and banishing them.¹

Revolts followed one after the other in various areas.² It would barely stop in one area but that it would gain momentum in another. The only time they would rest was to recover from their exhaustion and to prepare for new revolts.

The Umayyad clash with the Khawārij had taken a political turn, i.e. the only objective thereof being safeguarding the dynasty from anyone plotting against it. And as was their wont, it was characterised by sternness and harshness. They had thus given their governors carte blanche authority in dealing with the Khawārij and in deploying all measures which they felt were appropriate in eliminating them. Consequently, some of the Khawārij were compelled to flee and hide.³ And with the combat intensifying over time, the governors were further incited with promises of handsome compensations. For example, they had told al-Muhallab:⁴

1 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 8/22.

2 *Al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 4/117; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/244, 10/25, 57; *al-‘Ibar fī Khabar man Ghabar* 1/90; *al-Maghrib* 1/156.

3 *Al-Isābah fī Tamyīz al-Ṣaḥābah* 5/305.

4 Al-Muhallab ibn Ḍālim ibn Surāqah al-Azdī, Abī Sa‘īd. He was well known as Ibn Abī Ṣufrah. He was the governor of Khorasan and was one of the notables of Baṣrah, their geniuses and their generous men. He was born the year Makkah was conquered. In the days of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه he participated in the Jihad in India. He had governed the Arabian peninsula for Ibn al-Zubayr in 68 A.H. Thereafter Ḥajjāj had selected him to combat the Khawārij and he had managed to kill four thousand eight hundred people in one battle. This had earned him acclaim. He passed away in 82 A.H. See: *al-Muntaẓam* 6/242; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 61/280; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/42; *Shadharāt al-Dhahab* 1/90.

إن كل بلد أجلي عنه الخوارج كان له التصرف في خراجها

Every city wherefrom the Khawārij will be banished he will have the right to administer its taxes.¹

Furthermore, they were ever ready to respond to any sudden mobilising of the Khawārij. Consider:

كانت ببغداد لهشام بن عبد الملك وغير من الخلفاء خمسمائة فارس رابطة، يغيرون على الخوارج إذا خرجوا في ناحيتهم

In Baghdad, Hishām ibn ‘Abd al-Malik and the other Khulafā’ had a battalion of five hundred horsemen on standby. They were meant to attack the Khawārij if they emerged in their region.²

Unsurprisingly, they did not deem it vital to debate with them and ask them to repent. All they were interested in was obedience to the dynasty. So they would be killed and their heads would be sent to different places and put on display in order to instil fear in the people. This practice became so popular amongst the people that if the heads of others were hung, they would express amazement, because only the heads of the Khawārij were put up.³

Crucifying was not specific to the men of the Khawārij. At times the clothes of their women would be removed and they would likewise be crucified, thereby preventing the people from even thinking of revolting and joining in the battles. The women of the Khawārij would emerge from their homes and participate in revolts.⁴

1 *Al-Iṣābah fī Tamyīz al-Ṣaḥābah* 6/387.

2 *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 3/99.

3 *Al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 4/485. Also see: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 4/205; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 5/247, 12/366, 24/52; *al-Khalīlī: al-Irshād* 2/468; *Ṭabaqāt al-Muḥaddithīn Bi Aṣbahān wa al-Wāridīn ‘Alayhā* 2/152.

4 *Ansāb al-Ashrāf* 4/177.

These brutal measures had surely put an end to the movements of the Khawārij and had imposed upon them the awe of the dynasty.¹ However, their evil was not completely extirpated due to the dynasty not bothered about doing so from the very beginning.

‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz was the only exception. His manner of dealing with them was very different than that of his predecessors. He was eager to establish the evidence against them and remove their doubts before engaging in warfare with them. Hence when some Khawārij revolted in Iraq he sent a message to his governor ordering him to call them to the truth and be lenient with them. He ordered him not to fight them till they wreaked havoc on the earth.² He also sent debaters to others amongst them and had also gone on to the extent of debating with them himself.³

1 Al-Bakkā’ī: *Ḥarakah al-Khawārij* p. 71.

2 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/187.

3 *Al-Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā* 5/358; *Ḥilyah al-Awliyā’* 5/309; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 9/187.

The Second Discussion

The Stance of the Abbasid Rulers¹

Despite the weakness that had befallen the Umayyads in the last phase of their rule, it was not possible for any group to eliminate them from power individually, as was evident from the revolts of the Khawārij, some of the Alawids and others. Hence the success of eliminating them was linked to having the capacity to fully subdue the efforts of all the parties which resented the Umayyad Rule. This is something that the forerunners of the Abbasid campaign had realised.

The best groups, who could help them in reaching their goals, were two: the Shī'ah who hated the Umayyads and denounced their rule, and the Mawālī² many among who resented the Umayyads and despised them.³ However the primary difference between the two groups was that the opposition of the Shī'ah for the Umayyads (the Kaysāniyyah⁴ specifically⁵) was rooted in religion and thus could not be altered due to it being rooted in faith and perception, as opposed to the Mawālī whose opposition was rooted in social matters (which by nature are susceptible to change), i.e. like the manner in which the dynasty treated them; their enmity was thus lighter than the enmity of the Shī'ah in this sense.

1 In principle, the Abbasids should be part of the Ahl al-Bayt. However, the term *Naṣb* is specific to stances regarding 'Alī عليه السلام and his children, to the exclusion of all else, as has been mentioned already.

2 Freed Slaves.

3 The Umayyads were better than the Abbasids in general, in terms of treating their subjects well in their worldly affairs and bringing their oppressors to justice. Hārūn al-Rashīd once asked Abū Bakr ibn 'Ayyāsh, "Are we the best of rulers or the Umayyads?" He said, "They were of more benefit to the people and you establish Ṣalāh more." (*Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/47).

4 One of the Shī'ah sects, the followers of Mukhtār ibn Abī 'Ubayd whose title was Kaysān according to one view. They held the view that Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah was emphatically appointed as the Imām and they believed in Badā'. They thereafter sub-divided into many groups. See: Firaq al-Shī'ah p. 36; *al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* p. 27; *al-Milal wa al-Niḥal* 1/28, 147; *Minhāj al-Sunnah* 3/474.

5 Al-Khudrī: *al-Dawlah al-'Abbāsiyyah* p. 14.

The question might arise as to the reason why the Khawārij were completely politically inactive, and as to why they did not openly participate in establishing the Abbasid Rule despite them indirectly contributing, due to being an obstacle in the way of the Umayyads from the beginning of their rule right up till the end.¹

The primary reason for this was that it was very difficult to permeate the ranks of the Khawārij, even though few attempts were made.² This is because they had principles, beliefs and societies unique to themselves and thus it was not possible for them to collaborate with those who were not their kind.

The Abbasids had found what they required in the Alawids because of the status they enjoyed amidst people which they wanted to exploit in order to win their sympathy without any difficulty. Added to this was exploiting their Shī'ah who believed in obedience to them being compulsory and Imāmah being a mainstay of their household.³ Hence the Abbasids did not need to incite the emotions of hatred in them against the Umayyads due to them existing already, but they only needed to channel them towards serving their goals in ways which suited their interests best.

And because it was known that the Alawids were not a tool of warfare by themselves without but alongside their Shī'ah, it was impossible for them to revolt for the establishment of the Abbasid Rule. Because according to them there was no difference in terms of both this party (the Abbasids) and that party (the Umayyads) not being worthy of the Khilāfah. Thus the Abbasid propagandists

1 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 4/302; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/29.

2 *Al-Muntaẓam* 7/276; *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* 3/154.

3 Al-Ma'sūmī says, "As for the lineages of the Ṭālibiyyīn most of them return to Ḥasan and Ḥusayn, the sons of 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib and Fāṭimah عليها السلام, the grandsons of Rasūl Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم, and to their brother Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah. Although 'Alī عليه السلام had other children; however, those who demanded their right of Khilāfah and had fanatic followers who advanced their agenda in all directions were these three, no one else." *Simṭ al-Nujūm al-'Awālī* 4/123.

were keen on provoking the feelings of hatred by focusing on the oppression of the Umayyad dynasty which would hopefully earn them the support and collaboration of every resenter no matter what the reason for his resentment be. At the head of them were the Shī'ah.

Similarly, at that time a misleading slogan was raised which easily appealed to every person, i.e. the slogan 'For the *Riḍā* (chosen one) of the household of Muḥammad.'¹ This slogan did not emerge by the way, rather it was intentionally used so that the Abbasids could exploit it for their interests very cleverly. Hence it is narrated regarding the Abbasid propagandist Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn 'Abd Allāh that he would order some of his cohorts to call toward 'the *Riḍā* of the Ahl al-Bayt' and not mention anyone.² It is obvious that the slogan a '*Riḍā* of the Ahl al-Bayt' included the Alawids and the Abbasids, but the first to occur to the people when it was mentioned was the Alawids. Especially because of their insistence on their right of rulership and their demands against the Abbasids who had not previously chanted that sort of slogan.

According to many of the Shī'ah.³ This *Riḍā* was not going to be anyone other than a man from the Alawids. As to why did they still obey the Abbasid propagandists, it

1 The first person to use this slogan, according to my knowledge, was Mukhtār ibn 'Ubayd al-Thaqafi. Thereafter it was excessively used by others. See: *al-Fihrist* 1/269; *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 5/361; *al-Muntaẓam* 11/41; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 58/237; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 5/38, 415; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 11/235.

2 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 4/320; *al-Muntaẓam* 7/297; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 5/63; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 6/58.

3 *Al-'Ilāqāt bayn al-'Alawiyyīn wa al-'Abbāsiyyīn* 15, 42, 54. **Note:** Some scholars opine that the Abbasid dynasty was from the dynasties of the Shī'ah. Al-Ma'ṣūmī says in *Simṭ al-Nujūm al-'Awālī* 3/359, "This dynasty was from the dynasties of the Shī'ah, specifically a subsect from among them which was known as the Kaysāniyyah. The Kaysāniyyah believed in the Imāmah of Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah after 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, thereafter his son, Abū Hāshim 'Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad, and thereafter 'Alī ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abbās." But in reality the Abbasid dynasty has nothing to do with Shī'ism. Yes some of its rulers and men had Shī'ī leanings, but in general the dynasty stood in stark contrast with the Shī'ah. However, it is not far-fetched that the initial propagandist of the Abbasids actually subscribed to the Kaysānī sect, or that they feigned being Shī'ah thereby winning the support of the Shī'ah and their sympathy (this seems to be more likely). The following factors support the aforementioned possibilities: **Firstly**, the immense support of the Kaysāniyyah for them. *continued*

was due to latter promising office for him,¹ and also because they had popularised that Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah had informed that the Khilāfah will be shifted to the progeny of Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī.² Al-Dhahabī has alluded to some of this broadly.³

continued from page 354

Secondly, the propagandist would give Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Abbās a fifth of their wealth, something which only the Shī‘ah do, as is known. See: *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 4/291; *al-Kāmil fi al-Tārīkh* 5/15; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/25. **Thirdly**, the rulers of the Abbasids would dub themselves ‘Imāms’, a title which was coined by the Shī‘ah, as is stated in *Māāthir al-Ināqah* 1/21. **Fourthly**, the Shī‘ī affiliations of the Abbasid propagandists, amongst them was Abū Salamah al-Khallāl al-Kūfī who tried to overthrow the Abbasids and put one of the household of ‘Alī into office. See: *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 17/232; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/40. **Fifthly**, When Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Abbās stated the reason for why he chose Khurāsān as a base for his campaign, he enumerated various places, like Baṣrah and Shām, and stated the obstacles therein. One of the obstacles in Kūfah was that its people were ardent supporters of ‘Alī عليه السلام and his children. If he really was a Shī‘ī this type of circumstance would not avert him from Kūfah but would rather propel him to act there. But he feared the rejection of people because it was popularised that ‘Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah, who was known as Abū Hāshim, had bequeathed rulership for Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī. See: *al-Muntaẓam* 7/56. **Sixthly**, the message which featured in the first sermon of al-Saffāḥ after assuming rulership. In it he said, “O the people of Kūfah, you are the mainstay of our love and the station of our affection. You did not change from that... till you witnessed our rule rise. You will be the most fortunate of people with us and the most honoured by us.” (*Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 4/347; *al-Muntaẓam* 7/299; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/41; *Tārīkh al-Khulafā’* p. 257. The following poem of ‘Alī ibn al-Jahm, which appears in his compilation p. 34, also alludes to this:

نحن أولو قوة وبأس شديد	نحن أشباغكم من أهل خراسا
دو أهل التشيع المحمود	نحن أبناء هذه الخرق السو

We are your partisans from Khurāsān, the people of strength and might.

We are the sons of these black cloths and the people of Shiasm which is praiseworthy.

As for the view of al-Ma‘šūmī, it is inaccurate, unless his intent was that it was a Shī‘ī dynasty in terms of its initial propagandists and supporters. This is understandable, as is stated by Ibn Khaldūn in his *Tārīkh* 4/6, “From amongst them, i.e. the Kaysāniyyah, were the partisans of the Abbasids.”

1 *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 54/365; *al-‘Ibar fi Khabar man Ghabar* 1/116; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/16; *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* 6/58.

2 *Al-‘Ibar fi Khabar man Ghabar* 1/116.

3 *Tārīkh al-Khulafā’* p. 367.

Nonetheless, by analysing the following aspects, the position of the Abbasids regarding Naṣb becomes determinable:

1. The stance of the Abbasids regarding ‘Alī عليه السلام

The Umayyads and the Abbasids have differed tremendously regarding their positions regarding ‘Alī عليه السلام. Whilst we find that many of the Umayyads were disillusioned with him, whether it was because they assumed he played a role in the murder of ‘Uthmān عليه السلام or they criticised his Khilāfah, etc., the Abbasids stood starkly different; they revered him, held him in high esteem and deemed his Khilāfah to be legitimate.

The Abbasids felt no qualms in naming their children ‘Alī who later on even became rulers, as opposed to the Umayyads.¹

Some of the Abbasid rulers have also lauded him in their poetry of. Hence one of them says:

كلاب الأعداي من فصيح وأعجم
وموت علي من حسام ابن ملجم

ولا عجبا للأسد إن ظفرت بها
فحربة وحشي سقت حمزة الردي ملجم

It is no surprise if the dogs of the enemies, Arabs and non-Arabs, get hold of the lion.

The spear of Waḥshī made Ḥamzah drink of death, and the death of ‘Alī was from the sword of Ibn Muljim.²

Due to the reverence they held for ‘Alī عليه السلام, their clash with those of the Alawids who revolted against them did not prompt them to disrespect him, criticise him regarding his Dīn and his knowledge, and denounce his leadership;³ despite all

1 *Tārīkh al-Khulafā’* p. 376.

2 *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 19/563; *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfi’iyyah al-Kubrā* 7/258; *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 24/16; *Tārīkh al-Khulafā’* p. 434.

3 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/42.

these matters politically demanding them to do so. Even if at times denigrating did occur it was restricted to the individuals they were disillusioned with,¹ it did not exceed them to others of their family, let alone extending to their father ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.

Despite their long history, they are not known for any sort of resentment toward ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, with the exception of what is reported about al-Mutawakkil,² as opposed to the Umayyads who continued to disrespect him decades after he passed away.

Some books of history also state that the Khalīfah Mahdī³ released some of the Alawids from prison after merely seeing ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ saying the following to him in a dream:

يا محمد: فهل عسيتم إن توليتم أن تفسدوا في الأرض وتقطعوا أرحامكم

O Muḥammad! So would you perhaps, if you came into power, cause corruption on earth and sever your family ties.⁴

Contingent on this difference between the Umayyad Rulers and the Abbasid Rulers was the conduct of their governors. Hence on the one hand the Umayyad Rulers, with the exception of ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, displayed open Naṣb.

1 *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 6/212.

2 I did not make mention of Ibn al-Mu’taz despite some accusing him of disillusionment with ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ because the period of his rule only lasted for one day and one night. Al-Ma’šūmī says in *Simṭ al-Nujūm al-‘Awālī* 3/485, “It is not appropriate to consider him among the rulers.”

3 Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Alī ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Hāshimī, Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Mahdī, the third Abbasid Ruler. He was born in 127 A.H. He was courageous and generous, was a man of prominence, and was loved by his subjects and affectionate to them. He was extremely concerned with settling injustices and doing away with heretics. He was the first person who ordered that books be authored to counter them. He passed away in 169 A.H. See: *Tārikh Baghdād* 5/391; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 7/400; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/151; *Tārikh al-Khulafā’* 271.

4 *Tārikh Baghdād* 13/30; *al-Muntazam* 9/87; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 6/272; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/183.

As a result, most of their governors were not free from the effects of it and falling prey to it. On the other hand the Abbasids were completely and fundamentally different, for none of their governors have been convicted of Naṣb despite the many and fierce encounters they had with the Alawid Revolutionists, with the exception of Ibn al-Jahm.¹

2. The stance of the Abbasids regarding the Alawids

Just as the Umayyads and the Abbasids had differed in their stances regarding ‘Alī عليه السلام, in a like manner they had differed in their stances regarding his children.

The Umayyads had disregarded and ignored the Alawids throughout their era, as opposed to the Abbasids whose interaction with the Alawids generally can be deemed as good, with the exception of the era of al-Mutawakkil in which they lived in fear.²

It was not uncommon for the Abbasids to shower tremendous amounts of wealth upon them and settle their debts. These favours were not confined to those who were partisans of the Rulers or those from who the rulers sensed no threat, rather at times it would also include those who rebelled against the Khilāfah from amongst them.

It is a known fact that the Umayyads had failed to do anything of this sort, except for ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz رحمته الله.

1 ‘Alī ibn al-Jahm ibn Badr ibn Mas‘ūd al-Qurashī, Abū al-Ḥasan al-Khurāsānī al-Baghdādī. A profound poet who was religious. He was accused of having reservations against ‘Alī عليه السلام. He was from the special people of al-Mutawakkil. But al-Mutawakkil became infuriated with him due to his remarks about some of his companions. He thus banished him to Khurāsān and ordered that he be lashed whilst bare. He was killed close to Ḥalab after encountering a group of horsemen from the Banū Kalb in 249 A.H. His compilation of poetry is quite popular. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 11/367; *al-Muntaẓam* 12/26; *Wafayāt al-A’yān* 3/355; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 11/4.

2 *Māāthir al-Ināqah* 1/238.

Probably the most outstanding proof regarding the Alawids enjoying such prominence in the Abbasid era is that al-Mutawakkil, the only Khalīfah accused of Naṣb, sought a ruling from ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad¹ and cried whilst he advised him and gave him four thousand Dirhams.²

If this was the state of the Khalīfah who was disillusioned with ‘Alī عليه السلام, what then would be the state of those who had Shī‘ī leanings like al-Māmūn,³ and those

1 ‘Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Mūsā al-‘Alawī, Abū al-Ḥasan al-‘Askarī, famously known as ‘al-Hādī’. An ascetic scholar and a prominent leader of the Ahl al-Bayt. He was born in Madīnah in 214 A.H. Al-Mutawakkil was informed about him subsequent to which he summoned him and made him settle in Sāmarrā’. He is the tenth of the twelve Imāms according to the Imāmiyyah. He passed away in Sāmarrā’ in 254 A.H. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 12/56; *Wafayāt al-A’yān* 3/272; *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 22/48; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 11/15.

2 See: *Wafayāt al-A’yān* 3/272; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 12/41; *al-‘Ibar fi Khabar man Ghabar* 2/12; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 11/15.

3 ‘Abd Allāh ibn Hārūn ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Hāshimī, Abū al-‘Abbās al-Māmūn. One of the acclaimed rulers of the Abbasids. He was born in 170 A.H. He studied knowledge, literature, history, logic and the sciences of the Greeks. He also ordered that their books be translated into Arabic. He built a watch post on the mountain of Dimashq. He is the one who called the people to the belief of the Qur’ān being created and started an inquisition based on it. He passed away in 118 A.H and was buried in Ṭarṣūs. See: *Tārīkh al-Khulafā’* p.306; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 33/275; *al-Muntaẓam* 10/49; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 10/272. **Note:** the following alludes to the fact that al-Māmūn had Shī‘ī leanings:

1. His view that ‘Alī عليه السلام was the best among the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم and his expression thereof. See: *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 10/286; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/279; *Māāthir al-Ināqah* 1/213.
2. He appointed an announcer to announce that he disassociates from anyone who prays that mercy descend upon Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه or who makes good mention of him. See: *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 10/281; *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 17/351; *Fawāt al-Wafayāt* 1/586.
3. He ordered that an announcement be made that Mut’ah is legal. Thereafter he withheld it because it reached him that the prohibition thereof was established from ‘Alī عليه السلام himself. See: *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 10/283; *Simṭ al-Nujūm al-‘Awālī* 3/446.
4. He appointed ‘Alī ibn Mūsā (also known as al-Riḍā) as the ruler after him who is deemed the eighth Imām according to the Ja‘fariyyah. This was followed by doing away with black which was the symbol of the Abbasids and adopting green which was the symbol of the Alawids. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 10/184; *al-Kāmil fi al-Tārīkh* 5/342; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 10/284; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/247.
5. He appointed Faḍl ibn Sahl (who was given the title Dhū al-Ri‘āsatayn) despite being a Shī‘ī. See: *al-Kāmil fi al-Tārīkh* 5/342.

continued ...

who fully embraced the Shī'ism dogma like al-Nāṣir?¹

There is no doubt that the inclination of some of them toward Shī'ism was a clear sign of them being pleased with 'Alī عليه السلام and the Alawids. As for their pleasure with 'Alī عليه السلام, that is obvious. And as for them being pleased with the Alawids, the proof of that is that Shī'ism was widespread among the Alawids; there was hardly an Alawid who was not a Shī'i, as stated by al-Dhahabī:

النوادر ثلاثة: شريف سني، ومحدث صوفي، وعالم متهتك

continued from page 359

Also see: *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/275; *al-'Ilāqāt bayn al-'Alawīyyīn wa al-'Abbāsīyyīn* p. 179.

Despite al-Dhahabī stating that al-Māmūn was extreme in his Shī'ism, as in *Tārīkh al-Islām* 15/6, the reality of the matter is that he was merely a Tafḍīlī. To further elaborate, as stated in *Majmū' Fatāwā Shaykh al-Islām* 13/33, 28,474 and *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawīyyah* 1/306, the Shī'ah during the era of 'Alī عليه السلام were of three types:

1. The *Mu'allīhah*: those who dieficated 'Alī عليه السلام. He had incinerated them.
2. The *Sabbābah*: those who reviled Abū Bakr and 'Umar عليه السلام.
3. The *Mufaḍḍilah*: those who gave preference to 'Alī عليه السلام over Abū Bakr and 'Umar عليه السلام.

Māmūn belonged to the third category, as stated by Ibn Kathīr in *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/277. The following poem, which appears in *Tārīkh al-Islām* 15/238; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 10/282; *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 17/352; *Fawāt al-Wafayāt* 1/586, supports this:

ولست منه الغداة متعذرا	أصبح ديني الذي أدين به
أشتم صديقا ولا عمر	حب علي بعد النبي ولا
أبرار ذاك القتل مصطبرا	ثم ابن عفان في الجنان مع ال
طلحة إن قال قائل غدرا	إلا ولا أشتم الزبير ولا
من يفترها فنحن من بر	وعائش الأم لست أشتمها بر

My religion which I subscribed to has become, and I will not apologise for it tomorrow,
Loving 'Alī after Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم, and I will not revile Abū Bakr and 'Umar,
Then, Ibn 'Affān who is in paradise with the virtuous and who was killed with patience.
Behold, and I will not revile al-Zubayr and Ṭalḥah, even if anyone else says anything evil.
And 'Ā'ishah the mother, I will not revile her. Whoever accuses her we are free from him.

And al-Dhahabī states in *Tārīkh al-Islām* 15/6, "Al-Māmūn was an extremist in his Shī'i leanings, but he did not say anything disrespectful regarding the Shaykhayn. Rather he would supplicate for them."

1 *Tārīkh al-Islām* 45/90; *Tārīkh al-Khulafā'* p. 451; *Shadharāt al-Dhahab* 5/98.

Three people are very odd: an Alawid who is a Sunnī, a ḥadīth scholar who is a Ṣūfī, and a scholar who violates the commands of Allah.¹

If this was the case, then for the Khalīfah to adopt Shī'ism and express it would only increase the prominence of the Alawids between the people, something which their detractors like the Umayyads could never accept due to being the most distant people from Shī'ism and its people.²

Nonetheless, the following are the probable reasons why the Abbasid were so keen on honouring the Alawids:

Firstly, fostering the kinship which existed between them, for they were all from the Banū Hāshim, irrespective of whether this was on the basis of religious obligation or on the basis of tribalism. The most outstanding in this regard was al-Māmūn who was drawn toward the Alawids and was extremely kind to them,³ even to those who revolted against him.⁴

Akin to him was al-Wāthiq⁵ regarding who it is said:

1 *Al-Nujūm al-Zāhirah* 13/164.

2 A very interesting fact in this regard is that Abū al-Faraj al-Aṣḥāhānī, the author of *al-Aghānī* was an Umayyad by blood but a Shī'ī by dogma. This had bewildered the historians and they did not know what to say about him. Al-Dhahabī said about him in *al-'Ibar fi Khabar man Ghabar* 2/311, "It is strange that he is a Marwānī who is a Shī'ī." And Muḥammad ibn 'Abd al-Malik al-Hamadānī in *Takmilah Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* p. 200, "No Umayyad is known to be a Shī'ī besides him."

3 *Al-Kāmil fi al-Tārīkh* 6/13.

4 *Al-Ṣawā'iq al-Muḥriqah* 2/531.

5 Hārūn ibn Muḥammad ibn Hārūn ibn Muḥammad al-Hāshimī, Abū Ja'far al-Wāthiq bī Allāh. An Abbasid Ruler. He was born in 190 A.H. Allegiance was pledged to him the day his father passed away. He had gone out of his way in putting the people to test regarding the issue of the creation of the Qur'ān. He had also assassinated Aḥmad ibn Naṣr al-Khuzā'ī because of that. It is claimed that he retracted his opinion toward the end of his life. He passed away in 232 A.H. His rule lasted for five years and nine months. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 14/15; *al-Muntaẓam* 11/119; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 10/306; *Tārīkh al-Khulafā'* 340.

ما أحسن أحد إلى الطالبيين ما أحسن إليهم الواثق، ما مات وفيهم فقير

No one was more benevolent to the Ṭalibīs than al-Wāthiq. There was not a single poor person among them when he died.¹

Similar was al-Muntaṣir² who after assuming the Khilāfah displayed love for ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, and his household and gave amnesty to the Alawids.³ He also gave Fadak to the family of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.⁴ It was said regarding him:

ذموا زمانا بعدها وزمانا
بعد العداوة بينهم أخوانا

ولقد بررت الطالبية بعدما
ورردت ألفة هاشم فرأيتهم

You have been kind to the Ṭalibīs after they had been condemned time after time.

And you restored the love of Hāshim and thus you saw them unite as brothers after they were enemies.⁵

Another figure who was like them was al-Mustaḍīr bi Amr Allāh⁶ who would distribute wealth amongst the Alawids.⁷

1 *Al-Muntaẓam* 11/120; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 10/307; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/310; *Tārīkh al-Khulafā'* p. 342.

2 Muḥammad ibn Ja'far ibn Muḥammad ibn Hārūn al-Hāshimī, Abū Ja'far al-Muntaṣir Bī Allāh. An Abbasid Ruler. He assumed office after the murder of his father al-Mutawakkil in Shawwāl 247 A.H. He was awe inspiring, a man of great intelligence and very little transgression and was benevolent to the Alawids. He was accused of conspiring with the Turks in the murder of his father. He passed away in 248 A.H at the age of twenty six and only remained in power for a month. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 2/119; *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 2/216; *Tārīkh al-Khulafā'* 356; *Shadharāt al-Dhahab* 2/118.

3 *Māāthir al-Ināqah* 1/238; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 6/149.

4 *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 12/43.

5 Said by Yazīd al-Muhallabī. See: *Tārīkh al-Islām* 18/419; *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 2/216; *Tārīkh al-Khulafā'* p. 357.

6 Al-Ḥasan ibn Yūsuf ibn Muḥammad al-Hāshimī, Abū Muḥammad al-Mustaḍīr bi Amr Allāh. An Abbasid Ruler. He was born in 536 A.H. and assumed office in 566 A.H. He was just and praiseworthy for his interaction with his subjects. He was generous and would hardly take people to task for their wrongs. He also loved to forgive. He passed away in 575 A.H. See: *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 10/97; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 21/68; *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 12/192; *Tārīkh al-Khulafā'* p. 444.

7 *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 21/69.

And Al-Muktafī bī Allāh¹ also clearly displayed this phenomenon. Hence when a poet praised him with a poem in which he made mention of the merit of the children of ‘Abbās over the children of ‘Alī, he stopped him and said, “As if they are not cousins, even if they are not Khulafā’. I do not prefer that our household be addressed with any of this.” He did not listen to his poem and did not reward him upon it.²

Secondly, being benevolent to them in order to appease them and be safe from their evil. This is obvious from a letter Abū Ja‘far al-Manṣūr³ wrote to al-Nafs al-Zakiyyah⁴ in which he promised him, his children, his family, his Shī‘ah, and whoever pledged allegiance to him amnesty. He also promised therein to fulfil all his needs and release from prison all his family and partisans.⁵

1 ‘Alī ibn Aḥmad ibn Ṭalḥah ibn Ja‘far al-Hāshimī, Abū Muḥammad (titled al-Muktafī bī Allāh). An Abbasid ruler. He was born in 264 A.H. and was appointed to office by his father in 289 A.H. He presided over the matters of the people in a good way. Several wars took place between him and the Qarāmiṭah and in most of them he was successful. He passed away in 294 A.H. after having remained sick for months. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 11/316; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 13/479; *Tārīkh al-Khulafā’* p. 376; *Shadharāt al-Dhahab* 2/219.

2 *Simṭ al-Nujūm al-‘Awālī* 3/482.

3 ‘Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Hāshimī, Abū Ja‘far al-Manṣūr. The second of the Abbasid Rulers. He was born in 95 A.H. He was elder than his brother al-Saffāḥ and was appointed to office after him in 136 A.H. He was the ‘man’ of the Abbasids in terms of his awe inspiring nature, courageousness, seriousness, intelligence, and firm grasp. He loved amassing wealth and avoided frivolities. He had a good share in knowledge. He killed many people in order to stabilize his authority. He passed away in 158 A.H. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 10/53; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 7/83; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/121.

4 Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Ḥasan ibn al-Ḥasan al-‘Alawī, Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Madanī. One of the prominent members of the Ahl al-Bayt. He was accorded the title *al-Nafs al-Zakiyyah* (the pure soul) and al-Mahdī. He revolted against al-Manṣūr in Madīnah in 143 A.H. and many people had joined him, but he was later defeated by the army of al-Manṣūr in 145 A.H. He was courageous, one of self-esteem, abundant knowledge and was a reliable transmitter of ḥadīth. His narrations appear in the *Sunans* of Abū Dāwūd, al-Tirmidhī and al-Nasā’ī. See: *al-Muntaẓam* 8/94; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 25/465; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 9/224; *al-Tuḥfah al-Laṭīfah* 2/491.

5 *Simṭ al-Nujūm al-‘Awālī* 4/172.

Likewise, when Hārūn al-Rashīd¹ apprehended an Alawid revolutionist after several attempts which spanned over several years, and that also after giving him amnesty, he was kind to him; he honoured him and gave him a lot of wealth.²

Maybe a third reason can be added to the aforementioned, and that is in order to give the Alawids the impression that there was a vast difference between them and the Umayyads at whose hands the Alawids had suffered for very long.

However, this amiable treatment was mostly due to them not revolting against them and the Abbasids not suspecting them and not sensing danger in them. But at times they dealt with the revolutionists amongst them with the same type of harshness with which they treated others.

The Alawids started to show contempt at the exclusivity the Abbasids came to enjoy over the newly attained dynasty. They were not happy with this new setting, as it was their belief which persisted till then that they were the most deserving of rulership, and that every other person who assumed it was a usurper, without differentiating between an Umayyad and an Abbasid. Hence it was expected that they would draw their weapons against the Abbasids immediately after they came into power.³ Just as it was expected that their revolts would continue unabated, it would not die down in some region but that it would regain momentum in another region.⁴

1 Hārūn ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad al-Hāshimī, Abū Ja‘far al-Rashīd. One of the great rulers of the Abbasids and the great kings of the world. He was born in 149 A.H. He was appointed to office after his brother al-Hādī in 170 A.H. He would excessively go for Jihād and Ḥajj. He had many outstanding traits and his grasp would be very severe when infuriated. He passed away in Ṭūs in 194 A.H. at the age of forty five. He remained in office for twenty three years. *Tārīkh Baghdād* 14/5; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 9/286; *Tārīkh al-Khulafā’* 283; *Māāthir al-Ināqah* 1/192.

2 *Shadharāt al-Dhahab* 1/338.

3 *Al-‘Ilāqāt Bayn al-‘Alawiyyīn wa al-‘Abbāsiyyīn* p. 55.

4 Al-Ma‘šūmī has probably given the most comprehensive account of the Alawid revolutionists. He says:

➤ Thereafter his brother (i.e. the brother of al-Nafs al-Zakiyyah), Ibrāhīm ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Maḥḍ, revolted. He was based in Baṣrah. *continued ...*

-
- Thereafter Ibrāhīm al-Ghamr ibn al-Ḥasan al-Muthannā, the brother of Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Maḥḍ.
 - Thereafter, al-Ḥasan ibn Ibrāhīm ibn 'Abd Allāh, in the days of al-Manṣūr as well.
 - Thereafter, in the days of al-Manṣūr as well, 'Abd Allāh al-Ashtar ibn Muḥammad al-Nafs al-Zakiyyah. He emerged in Sindh.
 - Thereafter, al-Ḥasan ibn Ibrāhīm ibn al-Ḥasan, who revolted in Baṣrah during the days of al-Maḥdī ibn al-Manṣūr. He went undercover due to not having supporters till he passed away.
 - Thereafter, 'Isā ibn Zayd ibn 'Alī Zayn al-'Ābidīn. He emerged in the days of al-Maḥdī. The people of Kufah pledged their allegiance to him alongside the people of Baṣrah and Ahwāz. Likewise the allegiance of the people of Ḥijāz came to him whilst he was in hiding.
 - Thereafter, 'Alī ibn al-'Abbās ibn al-Ḥasan who also revolted during the era of the Maḥdī in Baghdād.
 - Thereafter, al-Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī ibn al-Ḥasan al-Muthallath. He revolted during the days of al-Hādī ibn al-Maḥdī ibn al-Manṣūr in 169 A.H.
 - Thereafter Yaḥyā ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Maḥḍ during the era of al-Hādī as well.
 - Thereafter, his brother Idrīs ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Maḥḍ.
 - Thereafter, Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm Ṭabāṭabā ibn Ismā'īl al-Dībāj.
 - Thereafter, Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Mūsā ibn Ja'far al-Ṣādiq. He was a promoter for Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad, mentioned above. He attained stability in Yemen and few events transpired for him there. He then moved to Khurāsān and was killed with poisoning in Jurjān.
 - Thereafter Muḥammad ibn Sulaymān ibn Dāwūd ibn al-Ḥasan al-Muthannā. His helpers forsook him whereafter he went into hiding in Madīnah till he passed away.
 - Thereafter, Idrīs ibn Idrīs ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Ḥasan al-Muthannā who revolted in the west after his father. His matter intensified and he gained stability. His children's rule has lived up to the present day.
 - Thereafter, al-Qāsim al-Rassī revolted during the era of al-Māmūn. He started his revolt in 210 A.H. and he passed away in 246 A.H. during the era of al-Mutawakkil.
 - Thereafter Muḥammad ibn al-Qāsim ibn 'Alī ibn 'Umar al-Ashraf, the governor of Ṭāliqān, rebelled in the days of al-Mu'taṣim. Initially his influence expanded, but thereafter he went to Nasā where he went undercover. After that he was apprehended and imprisoned, but he managed to escape from prison. The scholars have differed as to what happened to him after that: some say that he returned to Ṭāliqān whilst others say to Wāsiṭ where he poisoned and killed by al-Mu'taṣim.
 - Thereafter Muḥammad ibn Ja'far ibn Yaḥyā ibn 'Abd Allāh revolted during the era of al-Wāthiq. He took control of southern Hirāt and was succeeded by his children till the year 290 A.H.

continued

-
- Thereafter Muḥammad ibn Ṣāliḥ ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mūsā revolted in Sawīqah, a place near Madīnah. He was later imprisoned in Surr Man Rāā and passed away in prison. During his time most of the Alawids had gone into hiding and they suspended their agenda.
 - Thereafter, al-Ḥasan ibn Zayd ibn Muḥammad Ismā‘īl revolted and took control of Ṭabrastān and some parts of Daylam. He ruled over them for forty years and passed away in 250 A.H.
 - Thereafter Muḥammad ibn Ja‘far ibn al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Umar revolted in the era of al-Mutawakkil. He was based in the lands of the ‘Ajam and was later imprisoned by al-Mutawakkil. It is also alleged that besides the aforementioned there were many others who revolted during the era of al-Mutawakkil. Some made their emergence in public, some remained discreet, some were imprisoned and others were killed.
 - Thereafter Yahyā ibn ‘Umar ibn Yahyā ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī Zayn al-‘Ābidīn emerged in Kufah. The people loved him. He revolted during the era of al-Musta‘īn.
 - Thereafter, emerged al-Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad ibn Ḥamzah ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī Zayn al-‘Ābidīn. Al-Musta‘īn imprisoned him and he eventually passed away in prison.
 - Thereafter Muḥammad ibn Ja‘far ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Ja‘far ibn al-Ḥasan ibn al-Ḥasan revolted during the era of al-Musta‘īn. He campaigned in Armīniyyah or Kufah. He was deceived and consequently imprisoned. He was later poisoned and thereafter passed away in 250 A.H.
 - Then came about al-Kawkabī, Aḥmad ibn ‘Īsā ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī Zayn al-‘Ābidīn. He revolted in Kufah in the era of al-Mu‘taz in 255 A.H.
 - Thereafter, Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Ṭabāṭabā revolted during the era of al-Mu‘tamid. He got embroiled in a few wars with Ibn Ṭūlūn and then was killed at the door of Iswān. His head was taken to al-Mu‘tamid.
 - Then came Muḥammad ibn Zayd ibn Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl who revolted in 277 A.H. during the era of al-Mu‘taḍid. He fought a few battles and was eventually killed in one of them in Jurjān.
 - Thereafter, al-Nāṣir al-Aṭrūsh al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn ‘Umar revolted. He started his movement in Jīl and Daylam in 284 A.H. His matter became one of concern till he passed away in the era of al-Muqtadir in 304 A.H.
 - He was succeeded by al-Ḥasan ibn al-Qāsim ibn al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān. He emerged in era of al-Rāḍī bī Allāh. He gained authority over Ṭabrastān, Nīsābūr and Ray and his opposition was great. He was later succeeded by his son al-Mahdī Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn al-Qāsim ibn al-Ḥasan during the era of al-Muṭṭī in 353 A.H. He gained authority over Jīl and Daylam. He passed away 360 A.H.
 - Thereafter al-Thā‘ir fī Allah Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn revolted. He became a formidable threat till he died in 367 A.H.

continued ...

- He was succeeded by his son Abū al-Ḥusayn al-Mahdī ibn Ja'far during the era of al-Qādir bī Allāh. He ruled with stability till he passed away.
- Thereafter, Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn Hārūn ibn al-Ḥusayn revolted during the era of al-Qādir in 380 A.H. He engaged in a few wars and eventually was successful in gaining authority over Ṭabrestān.
- He was succeeded by his brother al-Nāṭiq bi al-Ḥaqq Abū Ṭālib Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn Hārūn ibn al-Ḥusayn during the era of al-Qā'im bi Amr Allah. He ruled with stability till he passed away in 424 A.H.
- Thereafter al-'Aqīqī 'Alī ibn Ja'far ibn al-Ḥasan revolted during the era of al-Qā'im as well in 404.
- Thereafter Mānaldīm Sandīm Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan revolted in 417 A.H.
- Thereafter, al-Nāṣir al-Ḥusayn ibn Ja'far ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn al-Ḥasan ibn 'Alī ibn al-Nāṣir al-Aṭrūsh revolted toward Daylam.
- Thereafter al-Muwaffaq bī Allāh al-Ḥusayn ibn Ismā'īl ibn Zayd ibn Ja'far revolted. He was succeeded by his son al-Murshid bī Allāh Yaḥyā ibn al-Ḥusayn.
- Thereafter Abū Ṭālib Yaḥyā ibn Aḥmad ibn al-Āmir Abū al-Qāsim al-Ḥusayn ibn al-Mu'ayyad bī Allāh revolted in after 490 A.H. during the era of al-Mustaẓhir toward Daylam.
- Over and above these individuals there are others whose history in unknown. They are:
- Imām Muḥammad ibn Abī al-A'rābī ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan ibn 'Alī ibn 'Umar al-Ashraf ibn 'Alī ibn Zayn al-'Ābidīn, Imām 'Alī al-'Irāqī ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn 'Īsā ibn Zayd ibn Zayn al-'Ābidīn, Imām Aḥmad ibn 'Īsā ibn Zayd ibn Zayn al-'Ābidīn, Imām al-Hādī ibn al-Mahdī ibn al-Ḥasan ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Alī ibn al-Ḥasan ibn 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, Imām al-Rāḍī bī Allāh Nāṣir ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn Zayd ibn Ṣāliḥ, Imām Zayd ibn Ṣāliḥ ibn al-Ḥasan ibn Zayd ibn Ṣāliḥ, Imām 'Alī ibn Muḥsin ibn Aḥmad ibn 'Ubayd Allah ibn al-Ḥasan, Imām al-Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Alī ibn Ja'far ibn 'Ubayd Allah and his brother Imām al-Ḥasan ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Alī.
- Similarly, those regarding who it is not known how are they related to the Alawids are the following:
- Imām Ashraf ibn Zayd, from the children of Zayd ibn al-Ḥasan, Imām al-Sayyid al-Azraqī, Imām Abū al-Rihā al-Kaytamī. All these individuals had revolted in the Qazwīn, Ṭabrestān, al-Jīl, al-Daylam, Jurjān al-Ḥijāz, Iraq and the western regions.

Thereafter, al-Ma'šūmī goes on to enumerate all those who revolted in Yemen alone. See: *Simṭ al-Nujūm al-'Awālī* 4/177 (with slight adulteration).

It is also not far-fetched to assume that what had aggravated their anger was the realisation that the Abbasids had channelled the alliance of the Kaysāniyyah among the Shī'ah to their advantage; they realised that the Abbasids were pouring all their efforts in the direction of serving their purpose. They were using Shī'ism as a stepping stone to the Khilāfah,¹ whether by way of that misleading slogan (regarding the Riḍā of the Ahl al-Bayt) or by way of the passionate support of the Shī'ah for them, especially after the incident of the *Waṣiyyah* (bequest) and their eagerness to put an end to the Umayyads.²

To further elaborate, all the people who study history will realise that the person who played the greatest role in eliminating the Umayyad Dynasty was Abū Muslim,³ a Shī'ī from Khurāsān. He was the primary campaigner, the defeater of the Umayyad armies and the one who undertook the task of creating the Abbasid dynasty.⁴ After his emergence the rule of the Umayyads rapidly dwindled.⁵

Khurāsān was the locus of the Kaysānī Shī'ah.⁶ What had provoked its Shī'ah into action was the murder of Yaḥyā ibn Zayd ibn 'Alī⁷. This resulted in them becoming

1 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 4/431; *al-Muntazam* 8/65; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 5/152; *Simṭ al-Nujūm al-'Awālī* 4/172.

2 *Al-'Ilāqāt Bayn al-'Alawiyyīn wa al-'Abbāsiyyīn* p. 56.

3 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Muslim (some say: Uthmān) ibn Yasār, Abū Muslim al-Khurāsānī. The murderous commander. He is deemed the man who paved the way to rulership for the Banū 'Abbās. He was born in Aṣbahān in 100 A.H. He was a man of intelligence, valuable input and master planning. He was eloquent in both Arabic and Persian and was a profound narrator of poetry. He was killed by Abū Ja'far al-Manṣūr when the latter feared that he will soon covet the Khilāfah in 137 A.H. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 10/207; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 6/48; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/67; *Shadharāt al-Dhahab* 1/179.

4 *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 6/48.

5 *Al-Bad' wa al-Tārīkh* 6/55.

6 *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* 4/6.

7 Yaḥyā ibn Zayd ibn 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn al-Hāshimī. An Alawid notable who had rebelled with his father against the Umayyads. When his father was killed he ran away to one of the outlying areas of Khurāsān. There he campaigned secretly and many of the Shī'ah followed him. They fought alongside him till he was killed 125 A.H. His head was sent to Hishām and he was crucified in Jūzajān. His body was only taken down later by the order of Abū Muslim who had established a wailing ceremony for seven days after his demise. See: *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 64/224; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 4/471; *Tārīkh al-Islām* 8/299; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/5.

infuriated with the Umayyads.¹ This heated atmosphere of Khurāsān was one of the reasons why it was chosen as the starting point of the Abbasid campaign.²

So the Abbasids, out of fear for their kingdom, entertained the possibilities which had caused the end of the Umayyads before them. Hence they sensed in the Alawids a threat which could not be ignored at all, especially because they were continuously active³ and mentally prepared to take over.⁴ This is what had prompted them to, alongside being good to those whom they did not fear, exercise caution with the others in order to put a limit to their ambitions, as in the era of al-Saffāh.⁵

1 *Tārīkh al-Ya'qūbī* 2/362.

2 *Al-'Ilāqāt Bayn al-'Alawiyyīn wa al-'Abbāsiyyīn* p. 60.

3 For example, when al-Mu'taḍid decided to prepare a book which contained curses against Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه, the only thing which averted him from preparing it was the fear that the Alawids, who were revolting in all the places, would use it to their advantage. See: *al-'Ibar fī Khabar man Ghabar* 2/78; *Tārīkh al-Islām* 21/19; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 11/76; *Tārīkh al-Khulafā'* p. 371.

4 The following poem of al-Sharīf al-Raḍī in which he addresses the Khalīfah al-Qādir bī Allāh alludes to this:

عظفا أمير المؤمنين فإننا في دوحة العلياء لا نتفرق
ما بيننا يوم الفخار تفاوت أبدا كلانا في المعالي معرق
إلا خلافة ميزتك فإنني إنا عاقل منها وانت مطوق

Be easy, O Amīr al-Mu'minīn, for surely in the tree of highness we do not differ.

On the day of boasting and displaying pride we are not distinct. Never can that be for each one of us is deeply steeped in heights.

With the exception of the Khilāfah which has distinguished you, for I do not possess it and your neck is beautified with it. *Dīwān al-Sharīf al-Raḍī* 2/39.

5 *Tārīkh al-Ya'qūbī* 2/360. Al-Saffāh was 'Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Alī 'Abd Allāh, Abū al-'Abbās al-Saffāh al-Hāshimī. The first ruler of the Abbasids. He was a person with awe. He was dignified, generous and quick to shed blood. He was appointed as the Khalīfah in Kūfah in 132 A.H. He thus arrived with black flags and eliminated Marwān ibn Muḥammad. He then strove toward cementing his rule and putting an end to his opponents. But his days never last long and he passed away in 136 A.H. He lived for twenty eight years. See: *al-Bad' wa al-Tārīkh* 6/88; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 6/77; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 6/247; *Tārīkh al-Khulafā'* p. 256.

The reality is that in general they had dealt with the revolutionists from among the Alawids with the same amount of intensity and fierceness that the Umayyads had dealt with them with, or even more. To the extent that it is said, “The blood of the Ahl al-Bayt has been shed in every direction,”¹ during their era.

It is no surprise to note that the rulers of both dynasties were no different in their fierceness and harshness, for the objective was one, i.e. securing rulership and saving it from every person who tried to snatch it, irrespective of who he may be. This also explains al-Saffāh’s treatment of his opponents which at times was barbaric due to him not hesitating in shedding blood.² It also explains the doings of Abū Ja’far al-Manṣūr who started off his rule with killing Abū Muslim al-Khurāsānī, the man who campaigned for them and paved the way to rulership for them,³ and together with that his uncle who rebelled against him⁴ and also many other people. Only thereafter did he manage to secure uncontested rule for himself and his children.⁵

Al-Manṣūr had made his general policy clear to the people in a sermon which he delivered after killing Abū Muslim. He said:

أيها الناس، لا تنفروا أطيار النعم بترك الشكر فتحل بكم النقم، ولا تسروا غش الأئمة فإن أحدا لا يسر
منكم شيئا إلا ظهر في فلتات لسانه صفحات وجهه وطواع نظره، وإنا لن نجعل حقوقكم ما عرفتم حقتنا،
ولا ننسى الاحسان إليكم ما ذكرتم فضلنا، ومن نازعنا هذا القميص أوطانا أم رأسه حتى يستقيم رجالكم
وترتدع عمالكم

O people, do not repel the bounties by ingratitude, for calamities will befall you. And do not conceal treachery against your rulers, for whoever conceals treachery, it will become clear from the slips of his tongue, the expressions of his face and the looks of his eyes. We will not be unmindful

1 *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* 4/6; *Simṭ al-Nujūm al-‘Awālī* 4/154.

2 *Tārīkh al-Khulafā’* p. 259; *al-Muqrīzī: al-Sulūk* 1/116.

3 *Tārīkh al-Khulafā’* p. 260; *Simṭ al-Nujūm al-‘Awālī* 3/371.

4 ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Alī. See: *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/61.

5 *Al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 17/232; *Fawāt al-Wafayāt* 1/568.

of your rights as long as you acknowledge our rights, and we will not forget being kind and good to you as long as you keep our status in mind. And whoever will try to usurp from us this garment (leadership) we will crush his brains so that your men remain straight and your governors are struck with fear.¹

Similarly, what supports the fact that the Abbasids were only brutal and harsh to the Alawids due to preserving their rule and confining it to themselves is that when al-Mahdī released one of the Alawids who had rebelled against him he took a promise from him that he will not rebel against him or any of his children.²

However, the following are the most distinct differences between the Umayyads and the Abbasids in this regard:

1. The Umayyads harassed only those who rebelled against them, whether by killing or by imprisoning, but their harassment did not extend to their families and children. As for the Abbasids many of them done the exact opposite. In an effort to subdue those revolutionists they even harassed innocent Alawids who had no share whatsoever in the rebellion. They did this so that no one in the future entertain the thought of rebelling, for his family and the closest of people to him were sure to suffer because of him.
2. Most of the Umayyads, with the exception of ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, all despised the Alawid household, those who they feared and those who they did not. As for the Abbasids many of them honoured those who they did not fear from the Alawids even if he be the close relative of one of the revolutionists.

This is actually surprising as reason actually demands that the Umayyads, whose penalisation was restricted to the revolutionist himself and whose harassment did not extend to his family and children, be just to the distant people who had

1 *Al-Muntaẓam* 8/13; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/71.

2 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/183; *Shadharāt al-Dhahab* 1/204.

nothing to do with the revolutionist other than kinship. And on the other hand it demands that the Abbasids whose harassment had extended to the family of the revolutionist be unjust to the distant people. But this is not what had happened.

Manner in which the Abbasids countered Alawid rebellions

Nevertheless, the Abbasids had countered the rebellions of the Alawids in two different ways:

1. Military confrontation

Since the beginning of the Abbasid rule, they had tried to establish their worthiness for the Khilāfah, as is clear from the sermon of al-Saffāḥ and his uncle thereafter upon the pulpit of Kūfah.

The Alawids did not mobilise during the era of Abū al-‘Abbās, but were rather quite. Hence there were no clashes between them and the Alawids regarding anything. In fact he had brought them close and had honoured them. The affinity between them was pure.¹

Ostensibly, the Alawids did not rebel against al-Saffāḥ for the following reasons:

Firstly, due to him being preoccupied with eliminating the Umayyads who were the enemy number one according to them as well.² They were satisfied because he was doing something which they had failed to accomplish for a very long time despite their numerous and repeated attempts.

Secondly, due to him going out of his way in honouring them, like giving some of their leaders a million Dirhams, being forbearant with the wrongdoers among them and overlooking some of the offences that reached him regarding some of them. Likewise, he also insisted that the children of ‘Abbās and the children of

1 *Simṭ al-Nujūm al-‘Awālī* 3/362; also see: *al-‘Ilāqāt bayn al-‘Alawiyyīn wa al-‘Abbāsiyyīn* p. 105.

2 See what al-Saffāḥ did to the Umayyads in Makkah and Madīnah in *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 4/366; *al-Muntaẓam* 321; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 5/89; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/56.

‘Alī were one due to them both being Hashimids. Hence the affliction of one was the affliction of the other. In the following poem he describes what he had done to the Umayyads:

تناولت ثأري من أمية عنوة
وألقيت ذلا من مفارق هاشم
وحزت تراثي اليوم عن سلفي قسرا
وألبستها عزا وأعليتها قدرا

I forcefully took my revenge from the Umayyads, and I forcefully attained my legacy today from those who preceded me.

I done away with humility from the foreheads of the Hashimids and I adorned them with pride and I elevated them in rank.¹

His uncle, Dāwūd², who delivered a sermon after him in Kūfah, had expressed similar sentiments. He said:

إنما أخرجتنا الأنفة من التزاع حقنا، والغضب لبني عمنا

Our indignation over the usurpation of our right and our anger for our cousins is what propelled us to come out to the fore.³

This is despite the fact that the Abbasids had not suffered any harassment at the hands of the Umayyads.

Thirdly, the harshness which he displayed and the bloodbath that he brought about against the various groups who rebelled against him, in fact even with the

1 *Al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 17/232; *Fawāt al-Wafayāt* 1/567.

2 Dāwūd ibn ‘Alī ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Abbās al-Hāshimī, Abū Sulaymān al-Shāmī. The governor of Makkah and Madīnah. He was eloquent and profound in oratory. Al-Saffāḥ had appointed him as the governor of Kūfah at first. Thereafter he sent him to Makkah and Madīnah and appointed him as governor there. He performed the Ḥajj with the people, the first Ḥajj under the Abbasid rule. He also killed all the Umayyads in the two cities. He did not live for long for he passed away in 133 A.H. His narrations appear in Sunan al-Tirmidhī and al-Adab al-Mufrad of al-Bukhārī. See: *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 17/156; *al-Muntaẓam* 7/322; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 3/168; *al-Tuḥfah al-Laṭīfah* 1/328.

3 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 4/347; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 5/67; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/41.

most sincere of his cohorts and campaigners like Abū Salamah al-Khallāl¹ who endeavoured to shift the Khilāfah to the family of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه.²

He ordered Abū Muslim al-Khurāsānī to penalise people based on suspicion and also kill people merely on the basis of scepticism.³ This kind of approach surely implanted an impression of great fear in the hearts of people, even in the hearts of elite scholars.⁴

Nonetheless, this amiable relationship did not last for very long between the two households, due to the Alawids’ assumption that they were most deserving of the Khilāfah and their indignation at their failure in obtaining it.⁵ This is added to the fact that the people of Madīnah had already pledged allegiance to al-Nafs al-Zakiyyah even before the establishment of the Abbasid dynasty.⁶

Hence, as soon as al-Saffāh passed away and his brother Abū Ja‘far al-Manšūr assumed office they started coveting the Khilāfah. They wanted to dethrone the Abbasids due to the circumstances which the newly arising dynasty was still grappling with, especially cementing its rule and doing away with those whose ambitiousness it feared, like Abū Muslim al-Khurāsānī.⁷ Consequently, a long chain of Alawid rebellions ensued. It is probably enough to state that five people revolted against Abū Ja‘far himself.⁸

1 Ḥafṣ ibn Sulaymān al-Sabṭī, an ally to them, Abū Salamah al-Khallāl al-Kūfī (famously known as the governor of the household of Muḥammad صلى الله عليه وسلم). The first governor appointed by al-Saffāh. He was popular for his sincerity for the campaign and for spending huge sums of money for its cause. He was a person of stature, bravery, and administration. Al-Saffāh got him killed in 133 A.H. See: *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 14/409; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 6/79; *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 13/63; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/56.

2 *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 14/409; *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 13/63; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/56.

3 *Tārīkh Baghdād* 10/208; *al-Muntazam* 8/8; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/69.

4 *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/52, 118.

5 *Al-‘Ilāqāt bayn al-‘Alawīyyīn wa al-‘Abbāsiyyīn* p. 85.

6 *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/80; *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* 4/6; *Simṭ al-Nujūm al-‘Awālī* 4/167.

7 *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/71.

8 *Simṭ al-Nujūm al-‘Awālī* 4/167, 177, 178, 179).

Abū Ja‘far himself had alluded to the reason for the nature of his policies in a discussion with his uncle who was condemning his excessive usage of brutality. He said:

لأن بني مروان لم تلب رممهم وآل أبي طالب لم تغمد سيوفهم

Because the corpses of the Banū Marwān did not fully disintegrate and the swords of the Banū Ṭālib were not sheathed.¹

This reality had compelled Abū Ja‘far to impose upon an individual who he appointed as the governor of Madīnah to track some of the Alawid revolutionists. He also dismissed one of them when he learnt that he was drawn toward the family of Abū Ṭālib.²

Similarly when he dismissed another individual he apologised to al-Manṣūr saying:

إن دماء بني فاطمة علي عزيزة

The blood of the Banū Fāṭimah is dear to me.³

Sort of suggesting that he knew what al-Manṣūr wanted from him as a governor.

Thus, as a results of these revolts, many of the Alawids suffered for a very long time for no reason other than being relatives of a revolutionist⁴ or due to being feared even if they done nothing. To the extent that some of them died in prison,⁵ others were murdered therein through poisoning and other ways,⁶ and a group

1 *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 32/331; *Tārīkh al-Islām* 9/470; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 7/85; *Tārīkh al-Khulafā'* 267.

2 *Al-Tuḥfah al-Laṭīfah fī Tārīkh al-Madīnah al-Sharīfah* 1/52.

3 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 4/409; *al-Muntaẓam* 8/46.

4 *Al-Muntaẓam* 8/46; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 6/212; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/95; *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* 3/238.

5 *Al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 5/143; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 6/85; *Simṭ al-Nujūm al-'Awālī* 3/360, 4/178.

6 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/148; *Simṭ al-Nujūm al-'Awālī* 3/360.

of them were compelled to go undercover.¹ Even many of the prominent Alawid members, like Ja'far al-Şādiq, Mūsā al-Kāzim² and others³ were not spared from harassment.

The most brutal thing that al-Manşūr probably did was that when he arrested one of their revolutionists he ordered that a pillar be hallowed, and the individual be placed in it thereafter. Hence it was sealed upon him whilst he was alive. He was the first person to die from those imprisoned from the children of Ḥasan رضي الله عنه.⁴

What also explains his immense fear and great caution is that he lashed and imprisoned Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allāh⁵ and thereafter killed him. He was the uncle of two Alawids who revolted against him. He killed him merely due to the fear the he would attract the affinity of the people of Shām in order to support them, whereas the murdered man had not denounced his allegiance.⁶

1 *Al-Şawā'iq al-Muḥriqah* 2/524.

2 Mūsā ibn Ja'far ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Alī al-Hāshimī, Abū al-Ḥasan al-'Alawī (accorded the title al-Kāzim). He was an ascetic who was generous and forbearant and was a man of prominence. He was born in 128 A.H. He is considered the seventh Imām of the Imāmiyyah. Al-Rashīd persuaded him to accompany him to Baghdād. He thereafter imprisoned him and eventually he passed away in prison in 183 A.H. His narrations appear in the *Sunans* of al-Tirmidhī and Ibn Mājah. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 13/27; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 6/270; *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* 10/302; *Shadharāt al-Dhahab* 1/304.

3 *Al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 5/320; *al-Muntaẓam* 9/88; *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 4/57; *al-Kāshif* 2/303; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/183; *Simṭ al-Nujūm al-'Awālī* 3/360.

4 *al-Muntaẓam* 8/48; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 6/214.

5 Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Amr ibn 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān al-Umawī, Abū 'Abd Allāh al-Madanī. A notable who was generous and a man of chivalry. He was accorded the title *al-Dībāj* (silk) due to his handsomeness. Imām al-Nasā'ī has made conflicting remarks regarding him, he has deemed him reliable and deemed not very strong. Ibn Ḥibbān has enlisted him in his *al-Thiqāt*. He was killed in 145 A.H. His narrations appear in *Sunan Ibn Mājah*. See: *al-Thiqāt* 7/417; *Tahdhīb al-Kamāl* 25/516; *al-Mughnī fī al-Ḍu'afā'* 2/597; *al-Tuḥfah al-Laṭīfah* 2/498.

6 *al-Muntaẓam* 8/48; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 5/145; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 6/213; *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* 3/238. The details thereof is that Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allāh al-'Uthmānī was the uterine brother of 'Abd Allāh al-Maḥḍ (both of them were the sons of Fāṭimah bint al-Ḥusayn). And 'Abd Allāh was the father of Muḥammad and Ibrāhīm who revolted against al-Manşūr. See: *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 4/415; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 5/143.

This brutality, confinement and appointing of spies and scouts against the Alawids was not specific to the era of al-Manşūr, rather they continued in the eras of other rulers as well,¹ sometimes in ways which dwarfed the brutalities of the Umayyads. Hence in the time of al-Mustaʿīn² when an Alawid revolted against him he sent an army for him which defeated him and killed many of his cohorts. A thousand houses were burnt and all the wealth of those who had revolted was usurped. Over and above this every Alawid in Kūfah was arrested and one of the daughters of the Alawid revolutionist was sold whereas she was free.³

The matter had reached such proportions that they started abusing people on the basis of the suspicion that he might have some sort of collaboration with the Alawids who were feared. For example, Imām al-Shāfiʿī was sent from Yemen to Baghdād shackled in chains.⁴ Likewise someone had spied on Imām Aḥmad that he gave refuge to an Alawid in his house and that this Alawid was secretly accepting allegiances from people. This had prompted the Khalīfah to order his deputy in Baghdād to raid his house by night. The people of the household were unaware till they saw lanterns surrounding their house from all directions, even on top of the roof.⁵

Hence, the conflict between the Alawid and the Abbasid households had returned. And the extent of harassment which they suffered during the Khilāfah of the Hashimids was more than the harassment they suffered at the hands of the

1 *Shadharāt al-Dhahab* 1/338; *Simṭ al-Nujūm al-ʿAwālī* 3/360.

2 Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Hārūn ibn Muḥammad al-Hāshimī, Abū al-ʿAbbās al-Mustaʿīn bī Allāh. An Abbasid Ruler. He was born in 221 A.H. He was appointed to office after al-Muntaṣir. The Khilāfah sustained great defects during his era and matters went out of control. The Turkish generals had assumed control and thus he deposed himself because of al-Muʿtaz bī Allāh after several wars and clashes. He was imprisoned for nine months and thereafter was killed in Qādisiyyah of Sāmarrāʾ in Ramaḍān in 252 A.H. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 5/84; *Siyar Aʿlām al-Nubalāʾ* 12/46; *Fawāt al-Wafayāt* 1/177; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 11/2.

3 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 5/395; *al-Muntaẓam* 12/50; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 11/9.

4 *Ḥilyah al-Awliyāʾ* 9/126; *Siyar Aʿlām al-Nubalāʾ* 1/86; *Ṭabaqāt al-Shāfiʿiyyah al-Kubrā* 2/121.

5 *Sīrah al-Imām Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal* of Ṣāliḥ ibn Aḥmad p. 94; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/337.

Umayyads, for they were killed and they were mercilessly banished.¹ What the Hashimids had did to one another is far greater than even what Yazīd had did to them.²

Some Shī'ah writers have also alluded to this reality.³

This suffocating situation which the Alawids were suffering from: murder, imprisonment, confinement, banishment and placing of spies, etc., had caused some of them to relish the memories of the Umayyads and their goodness and entertain the notion that their era, despite all its flaws, was lesser in evil than the era of the Abbasids. Hence one of them said:

لقد كنا نتمنا على بني أمية ما نتمنا، فما بنو العباس أخوف لله منهم، وإن الحجة على بني العباس لأوجب
منها عليهم، ولقد كان للقوم (يعني بني أمية) أحلام ومكارم وفواضل ليست لأبي جعفر

We despised the Umayyads previously, but the Abbasids are not more fearful of Allah than them. In fact the evidence against the Abbasids is more binding upon them. Indeed the people (i.e. the Umayyads) enjoyed intellect, feats and merits which Abū Ja'far does not enjoy.⁴

And a poet has said:

يا ليت جور بني مروان عاد لنا وليت عدل بني العباس في النار

If only the oppression of the Umayyads returned for us, and if only the justice of the Abbasids was in hell-fire.⁵

1 Al-Khuḍrī: *Al-Dawlah al-Umawiyyah* 1/150. Also see: *al-'ilāqāt bayn al-'Alawiyyīn wa al-'Abbāsiyyīn* p. 73.

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyyah* 4/553.

3 *Al-Darajāt al-Raḥīh* p. 8.

4 *Al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 17/200.

5 Abū al-'Aṭā' al-Sindī. See: *Kitāb al-Aghānī* 17/333; *Muḥāḍarāt al-Uḍabā'* 1/223.

And another said:

تالله ما فعلت علوج أمية معشار ما فعلت بنو العباس

By Allah the gruff Umayyads did not do a tenth of what the Abbasids are doing.¹

The conclusion of the aforementioned discussion is the following two things:

1. Amiable relationship was the default nature between the Alawids and the Abbasids, even in the eras in which there were multiple clashes between them. For example, when Abū Ja‘far al-Manṣūr, who was considered to be the harshest to them when he clashed with them, performed Ḥajj in 140 A.H he distributed huge sums of money to the Alawids² and he also pardoned one of the revolutionists after Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq interceded for him.³

Likewise al-Rashīd would also not delay in settling the debts of the Alawids who sought assistance from him as big as they might have been. But at the same time he would fight the revolutionists and subdue them.⁴

2. The struggle between them was due to worldly matters, for in essence it revolved around seeking rulership.

2. Ideological clashes

The Abbasids had learnt from the very beginning the importance of an ideological clash and the impact it might have in supporting their viewpoint and grounding them, similar to what had transpired with the Umayyads before them.

1 I don't know who said this. See: *Simṭ al-Nujūm al-'Awālī* 3/362; *al-Darajāt al-Rafī'ah* p. 8.

2 *Al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 5/140.

3 *Simṭ al-Nujūm al-'Awālī* 4/141.

4 *Al-Muntaẓam* 9/210.

This clash had taken more than one form:

Firstly, the Abbasids had violated the Umayyads by burying their good and spreading their evil, even if it be by way of lying and slandering which proved to be the most instrumental tools in eliminating them. However, the approach had to be a bit different with the Alawids due to them being two branches of the same household, i.e. the Hashimid household. Hence impugning them would be impugning the Abbasids themselves. Hence, they realised the importance of devising another plan in order to defeat the Alawids, a plan which was suited for them and which primarily revolved around the method of dealing with the issue of Imāmah from a religious perspective. This was a plan which the leading propagandists and campaigners could not deny at all, which explains why they had exploited that misleading slogan. The matter, however, rapidly changed after the Abbasids became firmly grounded in power and when they became the sole rulers of the lands. The need for misleading the people no more remained, and thus they moved on to the next phase, and that is to prove their deservingness of the *Khilāfah*.¹

The Abbasids learnt that, despite their importance, military clashes were not enough to put an end to the ambitions of the Alawids due to them having set agendas which they deploy to win the support and interest of the people; hence, it was important that their ideology be challenged with an ideology, and that the claim of enjoying exclusive right to leadership be challenged with a similar claim which expounds upon the Abbasids' deservingness of the *Khilāfah*. This would cause the Alawids to lose their influence because of them losing their central and most core campaigning argument: inheritance. This is something that the Umayyads did not do and they did not bother to do because they knew that they had nothing to back it up had they gone down that route.²

1 *Al-'Ilāqāt bayn al-'Alawiyīn wa al-'Abbāsīyīn* 55, 74.

2 What makes this clear is that the poet Ibn Mayādah said the following poem in the presence of al-Walīd ibn Yazīd:

continued ...

Probably the first indication toward this was given in the sermon of al-Saffāh which he delivered in Kūfah, the hub of Shī'ism. In this sermon he alluded to the fact that the Abbasids were from the Ahl al-Bayt. He said:

وما توفيقنا أهل البيت إلا بالله

We the Ahl al-Bayt are not inspired and encouraged but by Allah.

He was pointing to the fact that they are part of all the merits and the exhortations of Rasūl Allah ﷺ regarding the Ahl al-Bayt which the Alawids continuously repeated. Thus, the Umayyads had technically usurped their right which Allah ﷻ later returned to them. These were the very same claims the Alawids were making.

In fact, he clearly stated that the Abbasids were more deserving of the Khilāfah in the following statement:

زعمت السبئية الضلال أن غيرنا أحق بالرياسة والسياسة والخلافة منا، فشاهات وجوههم

The astray Sabāiyyah claim that others besides us are more deserving of leadership, politics and the Khilāfah than us. May their faces be disfigured.¹

It is obvious that he intended the Alawids when saying 'others', because the Sabāiyyah never did see anyone else deserving of leadership.

This continued during the era of his brother, al-Manṣūr, who openly gave preference to 'Abbās over 'Alī and who emphatically claimed his deservingness of

continued from page 380

وغير بني مروان أهل الفضائل

فضلتم قريشنا غير آل محمد

You surpassed the Quraysh but not the family of Muḥammad, and not the Banū Marwān—the people of merits.

So al-Walīd said to him, "I see you are giving preference to the family of Muḥammad over us." He replied, "I don't think it's possible any other way." See: *Tārīkh al-Khulafā'* p. 252.

1 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 4/347; *al-Muntaẓam* 7/299; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/41; *Tārīkh al-Khulafā'* p. 257.

the Khilāfah due to him being the heir of Rasūl Allah ﷺ and his nominee.¹ And if that was true for him then the Abbasids were his heir, to the exclusion of all else. This exactly was the reasoning of the Alawids.

The most glaring evidence that both parties clung to the same argument is the correspondence that took place between him and al-Nafs al-Zakiyyah. Hence when al-Nafs al-Zakiyyah wrote to him saying that they were the children of Fāṭimah in Islam and that their father was ‘Alī who was the nominee of Rasūl Allah ﷺ and the rightful Imām, he further asked, “So how did you inherit his right whereas his children are alive?”

Al-Manṣūr rejected his claim by making a similar one saying, “We are the actual inheritors of the seal of Prophets عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَام not you.” Thereafter he retorted to the boasting of the Alawids about Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا by saying:

بنو بنته وإنها لقرابة قريبة ولكنها لا يجوز لها الميراث، ولا ترث الولاية ولا يجوز لها الإمامة، فكيف تورث بها؟ وبأن الله لم يجعل النساء كالعصمة والآباء ولا كالعصبة والأولياء لأن الله جعل العم أبا.

The children of his daughter, surely a very close bond of kinship. But inheritance was not admissible for her and she could, thus, not inherit rulership. And Imāmah was not permissible for her, so how could it be inherited from her? Also, Allah has not given the women equal status as the uncles and fathers, nor as the male inheritors and guardians, because Allah has deemed the uncle a father.

And he said the following in response to their claim that ‘Alī was nominee of Rasūl Allah ﷺ:

ميراث النبي له (يعني للعباس) والخلافة في ولده، فلم يبق شرف ولا فضل في جاهلية ولا إسلام في الدنيا والآخرة إلا والعباس وارثه ومورثه.

The inheritance of Nabī ﷺ was for him [‘Abbās] and the Khilāfah is now in his children. Hence there remains no honour or merit in Islam

1 Al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh 5/63.

or the pre-Islamic era in this world and the afterlife but that ‘Abbās has inherited him in it and has passed it on after him.¹

Al-Manṣūr would also, for the sake of argument, say that even if it is accepted that they were most deserving of the Khilāfah, as they claim, due to them being the heirs of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, then too their right is long gone; because the Khilāfah of their father ‘Alī رضي الله عنه ended during his time out of his personal choice when he accepted the proposal of arbitration which had resulted in him being denounced. If that was the case then what did they inherit, for he left nothing for them? Likewise his son, al-Ḥasan رضي الله عنه, relinquished his rule for Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه willingly and thus nothing remained for them thereafter.²

This dispute had pushed both of them to disrespecting ‘Abbās,³ ‘Alī, and Ḥasan رضي الله عنه; whereas prior to this, the Abbasids coming into power, the Alawids are not reported to have disrespected ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه in any way.

The argument of al-Manṣūr regarding an uncle having preference over the daughters was utilised by many Abbasid Rulers and their partisans after him. Hence Abū Dulāmah⁴ said the following to al-Manṣūr:

1 These are snippets from these letters. They can be studied in their entirety in *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 4/431; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 5/151; *al-Muntaẓam* 8/64; *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* 4/7.

2 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 4/432; *al-Muntaẓam* 8/66; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 5/154; *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* 4/9; *Simṭ al-Nujūm al-‘Awālī* 4/174.

3 For example al-Nafs al-Zakiyyah said that ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه was a captive who was freed, as appears in his letters. The Shī‘ah repeatedly raised this. Hence one of their poets, Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā ibn Abī Murrāh al-Taghlibī, said the following in a poem which he wrote as a response to the poem of Marwān ibn Abī Ḥaḥṣah:

صل الطليق وخافة الصمصام

ما للطلق وللثراث وإنما

What does the free captive have to do with inheritance? He only performed ṣalāh out of the fear of the sword. (*Al-‘Ilāqāt bayn al-‘Alawiyyīn wa al-‘Abbāsiyyīn* p. 116).

4 Zand ibn al-Jawn al-Asadī, their client, Abū Dulāmah. An impertinent poet and a famous amuser. He was originally from Kūfah and was an Abyssinian *Muwallad* (born to a mixed couple). He found the last part of the Umayyad rule but did not gain much prominence. In the era of the Abbasids he earned acclaim and prominence and devoted himself to al-Saffāh, al-Manṣūr, and al-Mahdī. He enjoyed much prestige from al-Manṣūr due to making him laugh, rendering poetry, and lauding him. He passed away in 163 A.H. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 8/488; *Wafayāt al-A’yān* 2/320; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 7/374; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/134.

O the sons of the inheritor of the Nabī in whose hands his wealth and property came.¹

Likewise when Marwān ibn Abī Ḥafṣah² entered upon al-Mahdī during his rule he said the following poem to him:

يا ابن الذي ورث النبي محمدا	دون الأقارب من ذوي الأرحام
الوحي بين بني البنات وبينكم	قطع الخصام فلات حين خصام
ما للنساء مع الرجال فريضة	نزلت بذلك سورة الأنعام
أنى يكون وليس ذاك بكائن	لبني البنات وراثة الأعمام

O the son of the one who inherited the Nabī Muḥammad, to the exclusion of all the other relatives and people of kinship.

The revelation was between the sons of the daughters and between you. He ended all disputes and thus there remains no time for disputes.

There is no share for women in the presence of men. This is the injunction that came down in Sūrah al-An'ām.³

How can it ever be? And it will never be that the sons of the daughter get the inheritance of the uncles.⁴

1 *Dīwān Abī Dulāmāh* p. 63; *Tārīkh Baghdād* 1/87.

2 Marwān ibn Sulaymān ibn Yaḥyā ibn Abī Ḥafṣah (his name was Yazīd), Abū al-Haydhām (and it is said: Abū al-Simṭ). He was a poet of high standing from the Mawālī. He was born in 150 A.H. He praised a group of Khulafā' and governors and attained much of their gifts. Al-Kisā'ī said about him, "Poetry is milk which has been purified. The butter of was given to Marwān Ibn Abī Ḥafṣah." He died in 182 A.H. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 13/142; *al-Muntaẓam* 9/69; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 57/285; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 8/479.

3 *Dīwān Marwān ibn Abī Ḥafṣah* p. 94.

4 This verse is not in his compilation, but it appears in *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 4/590; *Kitāb al-Aghānī* 3/220; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 57/292; *Simṭ al-Nujūm al-'Awālī* 3/395.

Al-Mahdī rewarded him with seventy thousand dirhams, which prompted Marwān to say the following:

وما نالها في الناس من شاعر قبلي

بسبعين ألفا راثنني من حيائه

He gave me seventy thousand as a gift from him. And no one before him attained such a huge gift.¹

Likewise he said the following in another poem referring to difference between the Alawids and the Abbasids:

بأكتفكم أم تسترون هلالها
جبريل بلغها النبي فقالها
بترائهم فأردتم أبطالها
لا تولغن دمانكم أشبالها

هل تظمسون من السماء نجومها
أم تدفعون مقالة عن ربكم
شهدت من الأنفال أخر أية
فذروا الأسود خوادرا في غيلها

Will you wipe out the skies of the heaven with your hands, or will you cover its moon?

Will you reject a message from your lord, which Jibrīl brought to Nabī صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and thus he conveyed it?

The last verse of al-Anfāl has testified to their inheritance and you want to discard it.

So leave the lions concealed in their dens. Do not give their cubs your blood to drink.²

Upon this he was rewarded with a hundred thousand. It is said that he was the first poet who was given a hundred thousand in the Abbasid era.³

1 *Dīwān Marwān ibn Abī Ḥaḥṣah* p. 88.

2 *Ibid.* p. 77.

3 *Tārīkh Baghdād* 13/145; *Wafayāt al-A'yān* 5/253.

Obviously, these huge sums indicate to the importance these poems enjoyed according to the Khalīfah al-Mahdī.

What is noteworthy in the above poem is that he alluded to the Imāmah of ‘Abbās by way of emphatic appointment. He also warned the Alawids of the bloodbath which was impending if they tried to question the legitimacy of the rule of the Abbasids.

Yet in another poem he says:

أباه ذوو الشورى وكانوا ذوي فضل بخطبته بنت اللعين أبي جهل على منبر بالمنطق الصادع الفصل فقد أبطلا دعواكمو الرثة الحبل وطالبتموها حين صارت إلى الأهل	علي أبوكم كان أفضل منكمو وساء رسول الله إذ ساء بنته فدم رسول الله صهر أبيكمو وحكم فيها من بعده الحسن ابنه وخلتتموها وهي في غير أهلها
--	--

‘Alī, your father, was more virtuous than you. But the members of the council denied him and they were people of virtue.

And it hurt Rasūl Allah ﷺ due to hurting his daughter that he proposed to the daughter of the accursed Abū Jahl.

Rasūl Allah ﷺ condemned the marital relatives of your father upon the pulpit with a speech which was powerful and decisive.

And your father appointed two arbitrators in it (Şiffīn) who removed him just as a person with shoes removes his shoes.

Thereafter al-Ḥasan, his son, gave it away and thus they have nullified your weak and tenuous claim.

You left it when it was in the hands of those who were not deserving of it. And now you demand it when it is in the hands of those who deserve it.¹

1 Al-Aghānī 23/214; *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah* of Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd 4/65; Baḥr al-‘Ulūm: *al-Fawā'id al-Rijāliyyah* 1/89.

The impugning and tarnishing of ‘Alī and his son, Ḥasan عَلَيْهِمَا السَّلَام, that this poem holds is obvious, something which is very rare.

It was because of these themes which he continuously included in his poetry did he become the special poet of the Abbasids.¹

Similarly some poets expressed the same themes in their poetry due to knowing its impact upon the Abbasids, akin to what one of them had did with al-Muktafi and others.²

One such poem was said by Maṣṣūr al-Namirī³ in the court of Hārūn al-Rashīd. Therein he denigrated the Alawids saying:

من الأحزاب سطر في السطور وردوا ما يناسب للذكور مع الأعمام في ورق الزبور عليكم بالسداد من الأمور وأحلاما بعدن عدات زور	يسمون النبي أبا وأبى وإن قالوا: بنو بنت فحق وما لبني بنات من تراث بنى حسن ورهط بني حسين أميطوا عنكم كذب الأمانى
---	---

They dub the Nabī ‘father’ and they by doing so reject a verse from the verses of Sūrah Aḥzāb.⁴

And if they say: ‘the children of the daughter’ it is true, but then they reject what is suited for the males.

There is no inheritance for the sons of the daughters in the presence of the uncle in the pages of the Holy Scripture.

1 *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 57/292.

2 *Al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 27/236; *Fawāt al-Wafayāt* 2/528.

3 Maṣṣūr ibn Salamah ibn al-Zabriqān (and some say Maṣṣūr ibn al-Zabriqān ibn Salamah ibn Sharīk, Abū al-Qāsim al-Namirī. A poet of the Abbasid court. He was originally from the Arabian Peninsula. He came to Baghdad and lauded Hārūn al-Rashīd. It is said that he did not laud any other ruler besides him. He passed away around in 210 A.H. See: *Tārīkh Baghdad* 13/65; *al-Muntaẓam* 9/211; *Fawāt al-Wafayāt* 2/528.

4 Referring to a verse no. 40 thereof which translates as, “Muḥammad is not the father of any of your men, but the messenger of Allah and the seal of the prophets.”

O the sons of Ḥasan and the sons of Ḥusayn, hold onto uprightness in all matters.

Obliterate the lies of false hopes and dreams which are like false promises.¹

Similarly Abū al-Simṭ² said the following whilst praising al-Mutawakkil:

وبعد لكم تشفي الظلّامة	لكم تراث محمد
ب وما لهم فيها قلامه	يرجو التراث بنو البنا
والبنت لا ترث الإمامه	والصهر ليس يوارث
ميراثكم إلا الندامة	ما للذين تنحلوا
فعلام لوكم علامه	أخذ الوراثه أهلها
لا والإله ولا كرامه	ليس التراث لغيركم

For you is the inheritance of Muḥammad. And with your justice all injustices are settled.

The sons of the daughters hope to attain the inheritance, whereas there is not for them the amount of a clipping (of a nail).

A son-in-law is not a legal inheritor, nor can a daughter inherit rulership.

There is not for those who falsely claim your inheritance anything besides regret.

The inheritance has been claimed by its rightful people, so for what reason are you reproving?

1 Ibn Qutaybah: *al-Shi'r wa al-Shu'arā'* p. 590; Ibn al-Mu'taz: *Ṭabaqāt al-Shu'arā'* p. 245; *Zahr al-Ādāb* 3/704; *Simṭ al-Nujūm al-'Awālī* 3/426.

2 Marwān ibn Abī al-Junūb (Yaḥyā) ibn Marwān ibn Sulaymān, Abū al-Simṭ. One of the brilliant poets of his time. He was known as the small Marwān due to him being the grandson of Marwān ibn Abī Ḥafṣah the acclaimed poet. Abū al-Simṭ lived during the era of al-Wāthiq and al-Mutawakkil. He has said several poems regarding al-Mutawakkil and Aḥmad ibn Abī Dāwūd. He would stay in Surr Man Rāā. He passed close to 240 A.H. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 13/153; *Wafayāt al-A'yān* 5/1935/193; *Siyar A'lām al-Nubalā'* 8/481; *al-A'lām* 7/209.

Inheritance is not for anyone besides you. No, by the name of Allah, never can it be for anyone else.¹

Al-Mutawakkil rewarded him by appointing him as the governor of Bahrayn and Yamāmah. He also gave him four garments and ordered that he be given three thousand Dinars. The reason for this extraordinary gift is not unclear.

And Ibn al-Mu‘taz² said:

ونحن أحق بأسلابها

قتلنا أمية في دارها

We killed the Umayyads in their abode, and we are most deserving of their remains.

And part of this poem is the following verses as well:

فكم تجذبون بأهدابها
ولكن بنو العم أولى بها

ونحن ورثنا ثياب النبي
لكم رحم يا بني بنته

And we inherited the clothes of the Nabī, so for how long will you pull its edges.

You enjoy kinship, O sons of his daughter, but the children of the uncle are more deserving.³

On the other hand the Khulafā’ had extended threats to any poet who was known to be drawn toward the Alawids and to support them by enumerating their virtues

1 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* 5/339; *al-Aghānī* 23/215; *al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* 6/140.

2 ‘Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad ibn Ja‘far ibn al-Mu‘taṣim al-Hāshimī, Abū al-‘Abbās al-Ghālib bī Allāh. A natural poet who was a master in literary criticism. The army pledged allegiance after the instability of al-Muqtadir and his dismissal. Thereafter they reinstated him and obeyed and Ibn al-Mu‘taz went into hiding and was eventually killed when he was found in 296 A.H. at the age of 48. He ruled for one day only. He has written *Ṭabaqāt al-Shu‘arā’*, *al-Sariqāt* and *al-Zahr wa al-Riyād*. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 10/95; *Wafayāt al-A‘yān* 3/76; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 14/42.

3 *Dīwān Ibn al-Mu‘taz* 1/25.

and stating that they were most deserving of rulership. This is exactly what Abū Ja'far had did to Ibn Harmah¹ who said the following poem regarding them:

<p>فإني أحب بني فاطمة وبالدين والسنة القائمة سواهم من النعم السائمة</p>	<p>ومهما آلام على حبيهم بني بنت من جاء بالمحكمات فلست أبالي بحبي لهم</p>
---	--

As much as I am criticised for loving them, I love the children of Fāṭimah.

The children of the daughter of the one who came with clear verses, the Dīn, and the established Sunnah.

Therefore, I do not bother, because of loving them, about anyone besides them who are like grazing animals.²

Similarly, al-Rashīd was extremely infuriated at al-Namirī when he learnt of his leaning toward the Alawids and when his poetry was said before him in which he encouraged the people to support them. To the extent that he ordered that he be summoned immediately and did not know that he had passed away not very long ago. And when learning of his death he ordered that he be exhumed and burnt. His minister had to pacify him till eventually he left him.³

Furthermore, it is also important to note that just as the Shī'ah had forged ḥadīths regarding the emphatic appointment of 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and his children in order to support their views and claims, so did the partisans of the Abbasids forge ḥadīths regarding the emphatic appointment of 'Abbās and his children.⁴

1 *Tārīkh Baghdād* 6/130; *al-Muntaẓam* 9/21; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 7/72; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/170. Ibn Harmah: Ibrāhīm ibn 'Alī ibn Salamah ibn 'Alī ibn Harmah al-Fihri, Abū Ishāq al-Madanī. One of the outstanding poets from the pre-Islamic era. He witnessed both the Umayyad and the Abbasid rule. He praised some from both the dynasties but was known to be fully drawn to the Alawids. Al-ʿAṣmāʾ has deemed him to be one of those with who pure Arabic poetry came to an end. He passed away in 150 A.H. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 6/128; *al-Muntaẓam* 9/21; *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 6/129; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 10/169.

2 *Kitāb al-Aghānī* 4/380; *Tārīkh Baghdād* 6/129; *al-Muntaẓam* 9/23; *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq* 7/76.

3 *Tārīkh Baghdād* 13/69; *al-Ansāb* 5/526; *Fawāt al-Wafayāt* 2/531.

4 *Al-Manār al-Munif* 117/; *al-Radd al-Qawīm 'alā al-Mujrim al-Athīm* p. 212.

This conflict was not going to carry on without leaving its impact upon the lives of people who would side with one of the two sides, as is observed in all conflicts. Hence just as the conflict between the Umayyads and the Alawids contributed to the emergence of Naṣb in order to counter Shī'ism, similarly the conflict between the Alawids and the Abbasids had given birth to something similar to it, although much lighter in magnitude; for there emerged the Rāwandīyyah who were the fanatic partisans of the Abbasids from Khurāsān who believed that the most deserving person of rulership after Rasūl Allah ﷺ was 'Abbās رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.

They based their belief on the fact that he was the male inheritor of Rasūl Allah ﷺ and Allah سبحانه وتعالى says in the Qur'ān:

وَأُولُو الْأَرْحَامِ بَعْضُهُمْ أَوْلَىٰ بِبَعْضٍ فِي كِتَابِ اللَّهِ

But those of blood relationship are more entitled to inheritance in the decree of Allah

They averred that the people had denied him his right and had wronged him till Allah سبحانه وتعالى returned it to his children.¹

1 Simṭ al-Nujūm al-'Awālī 3/359. They also disassociated from Abū Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ. But deemed allegiance to 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ to be valid because 'Abbās رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ had said to him, "O my nephew, Should I pledge allegiance to you so that no two people will dispute regarding you." And because Dāwūd ibn 'Alī had said on the pulpit of Kūfah the day al-Saffāḥ was elected as the ruler, "O the people of Kufah, There has not arose amidst you a leader after Rasūl Allah ﷺ besides 'Alī and this leader who has risen now." Referring to al-Saffāḥ. The Rāwandīyyah were considered to be sub-sect of the Kaysāniyyah. For more details see: *al-Fiṣal fī al-Milal wa al-Ahwā' wa al-Niḥal* 4/75; *al-'Awāṣim min al-Qawāṣim* p. 258; *Talbīs Iblīs* 1/125; *I'tiqādāt Firqat al-Muslimīn wa al-Mushrikīn* p. 63; *Nihāyah al-Arab fī Funūn al-Adab* 22/56; *Aṣr al-Dawlatayn al-Umawīyyah wa al-'Abbāsiyyah* of al-Ṣallābī p. 79. Jāḥiẓ authored a book titled *al-'Abbāsiyyah* in which he enlisted their views and evidences, but it seems as if they came to an end at a very early stage. Hence, al-Ṭūsī (died 460 A.H), a Shī'ī scholar says, "As for those who believe in the Imāmah of 'Abbās رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ not a person amongst them is known. Had Jāḥiẓ not written this book and not quoted this view it would have been unknown before him and after him." See: *al-Iqtisād al-Hādī ilā Ṭarīq al-Rashād* p. 207.

[Continuing with the forms the clash had taken]

Secondly, the Abbasids tried to decrease the social standing of the Alawid notables who they feared so that people are not drawn toward them. Hence, it is reported regarding Abū Ja‘far al-Manṣūr that he summoned Imām Abū Ḥanīfah and told him:

يا أبا حنيفة، إن الناس قد فتنوا بجعفر بن محمد فهيء له من مسألك الصعاب

O Abū Ḥanīfah, people have become drawn toward Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad,¹
so prepare for him some of your difficult questions.²

His motive thereby was to denigrate him by proving his inability to answer those questions. That would result in the reverence of the people and admiration diminishing. It is obvious that al-Manṣūr was not just fearful of the admiration of people, rather he was fearful of the challenges that it could potentially lead him to due to the people being drawn to him.

Thirdly, the Abbasids were very keen on learning the genuine lineages of the Alawids in order to shut the way for any person who tried to win the sympathy and support of the people by claiming that he was an Alawid revolutionist. Especially when this affiliation had become a stepping stone for many ambitious people and detractors alike. Probably this was the reason why the scholars paid due importance to the family trees of the Alawids and recorded them, as al-‘Aqqād said:

عظمت العناية خاصة بذرية النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم صونا للنسب الشريف ودفعا للأدعياء من طلاب
الخلافة

1 Referring to Ja‘far al-ṣādiq.

2 *Tārīkh al-Islām* 9/89; *Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’* 6/258.

Much importance was paid to the progeny of Nabī ﷺ in order to preserve the noble lineage and repel the fraudsters who sought the Khilāfah.¹

Therefore, the strongest argument which the Abbasids relied on in countering the Ubaydīs was exposing the lie that they were from the children of Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها. The Abbasid Ruler al-Qādir al-‘Abbāsī² wrote a treatise regarding the Egyptian Rulers and criticised their lineage and beliefs. Copies of it were read in Baghdād and letters were sought from the judges, rulers, and notables due to

1 *Fāṭimah al-Zahrā’ wa al-Fāṭimiyyūn* p. 51. The following books have been authored regarding the lineage of Nabī ﷺ:

- a. Yahyā al-‘Aqīqī (d. 277 A.H.): *Ansāb Āl Abī Ṭālib*. The first book written regarding the lineage of the Ṭalibīs.
- b. Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606 A.H.): *al-Shajarah al-Mubārakah fī Ansāb al-Ṭalibiyyah*.
- c. Ismā‘īl al-‘Alawī (d. after 614 A.H.): *Ghunya al-Ṭālib fī Nasab Āl Abī Ṭālib*.
- d. ‘Alī al-‘Alawī (d. 709 A.H.): *al-Majdī fī Ansāb al-Ṭalibiyyīn*.
- e. Al-Qalqashandī (d. 821 A.H.): *‘Umdat al-Ṭālib fī Ansāb Āl Abī Ṭālib*.
- f. *Baḥr al-Ansāb fī Nasab Banī Hāshim* of the previous author.
- g. ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Ḥasanī (d. 1099 A.H.): *Tālīf fī Ansāb al-Ashraf al-ladhīna lahum Shuhrah bi Faṣ*.
- h. *Nashr al-‘Ulūm al-Dārisah bi Rasm Shajarāt al-Juṭiyyīn al-Adārisah* of the previous author.
- i. Al-Qādir al-Ḥasanī (d. 1133 A.H.): *Nasab al-Shurafā’ al-‘Alamiyyīn*.
- j. ‘Alī al-Saqqāf (d. 1203 A.H.): *al-Shajarah al-‘Aliyyah*.
- k. Al-Jifrī al-Ḥusaynī (d. 1222 A.H.): *al-Kawkab al-Durrī fī Nasab al-Sādah Āl al-Jifrī*.
- l. Idrīs al-‘Alawī (d. 1316 A.H.): *al-Durar al-Bahiyyah wa al-Jawāhir al-Nabawiyyah*. A book dedicated to the lineage to the Alawids of Morocco.
- m. Ibn al-Mashhūr (d. 1320 A.H.): *Shams al-Zahīrah fī Ansāb al-Sādah al-‘Alawiyyah bi Ḥaḍramawt*.
- n. Al-‘Alawī al-Saqqāf (d. 1335 A.H.): *Ansāb Ahl al-Bayt*.
- o. Mahdī al-Mūsawī (d. 1343 A.H.) *Ansāb al-Hāshimiyyīn*.
- p. Abd al-Razzāq al-Ḥusaynī (d. 1390 A.H.): *‘Uqūd al-Tamā’im fī Ansāb Banī Hāshim*.

2 Aḥmad ibn Ishāq ibn Ja’far ibn al-Muṭaḍid al-Hāshimī, Abū al-‘Abbās al-Qādir bī Allāh. An Abbasid Ruler. He was elected as the ruler after the dismissal of al-Ṭā’ī. He was a great ruler and was known to be a follower of the Sunnah, an ascetic and a person who dispensed a lot of charity. He was known to be the poorest of all rulers. He passed away in 422 A.H. at the age of 87 and he ruled for 41 years. See: *Tārīkh Baghdād* 4/37; *Siyar A’lām al-Nubalā’* 15/127; *al-Ibar fī Khabar man Ghabar* 3/149; *Tārīkh al-Khulafā’* p. 411.

them having knowledge regarding the lineage of the Dayṣānīs,¹ the brothers of the disbelievers and the semen of the devils. They testified hoping thereby to attain closeness to Allah and believing in the obligation of disseminating to the people what they knew as binding.²

1 A sect of the fire worshippers known as Dayṣān. They believe in light as a source of good and darkness as a source of evil. Hence all good is from light and all evil is from darkness. They believed that light is alive, knowledgeable, capable and sensitive and that from it emerges movement and life. As for darkness it is dead, ignorant, incapable, and inert and has no will or perception. They hold other beliefs as well. See: *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* p. 338; *al-Māturīdī: al-Tawḥīd* p. 163; *al-Fiṣal fi al-Mīlāl wa al-Niḥāl* 1/37, *al-Mīlāl wa l-Niḥāl* 1/250.

2 *Tārīkh al-Islām* 28/11; *al-Nujūm al-Zāhirah* 4/229 (with a bit of condensation). For more information of the Ubaydīs who masqueraded as Alawids and others of their kin refer to: *al-'Ibar fi Khabar man Ghabar* 3/79; *al-Wāfi bi al-Wafayāt* 4/108; *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* 11/180; *Māāthir al-Ināqah* 3/163; *Shadharāt al-Dhahab* 3/162; *Simṭ al-Nujūm al-'Awālī* 3/560, 4/142.

