

Āyāt-e Bayyināt

By:

Nawāb Muḥsin al-Mulk Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdī 'Alī Khān

WWW.MAHAJJAH.COM

Transliteration key

أ- 'ā	د - 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

Moulānā Sayyid Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī al-Ḥusaynī Nadwī’s Opinion Regarding the Book and the Author	9
Āyāt-e Bayyināt Chapter One	13
Preface	13
Foreword and Biography of the Author	21
Foreword	31
Introduction	33
Rational proofs of the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah <small>رضي الله عنهم</small>	33
First Proof	33
Second Proof	35
Third Proof	37
Fourth Proof	39
Fifth Proof	41
Reported Evidence Regarding the Virtues of the Ṣaḥābah	43
The Virtues of the Ṣaḥābah in the Torah and Injīl	43
First Virtue in the Torah	44
Sayyidunā Abū Bakr’s Intention to kill his Father	44
Sayyidunā ‘Umar Proposes to Kill his Relatives	45
Second Virtue of the Injīl	46
Verses of the Qur’ān Complimenting the Ṣaḥābah	47
The First Verse	47
The Second Verse	52
The Third Verse	53
The Fourth Verse	58
The Fifth Verse	71
The Sixth Verse	76
The Seventh Verse	83
The Virtues of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr <small>رضي الله عنه</small> Deduced From These Verses	86
The Objections of the Shī’ah of ‘Abd Allah ibn Sabā’	89
Objection on the First Virtue	90
Objection to the Second Virtue	101

Objection to the Third Virtue	103
Proof for Point 4	104
Proof for Point 5	105
Proof for Point 6	105
Objection 7 to the Seventh Virtue	106
Objection 8 to the Eight Virtue	112
Objection 9 on the Ninth Virtue	131
The Testimonies of the A'immah Regarding the Virtues of the Ṣaḥābah	137
First Testimony	137
First proof	142
Second Proof	144
Third Proof	145
Proof 1	153
Proof 2	153
Proof 3	155
Proof 4	157
Second Testimony	159
1. The Imām supplicated for the Ṣaḥābah's ﷺ goodness	163
2. The Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ Bearing Hardships due to Īmān and the Superiority of Those who Brought Īmān in the Initial Stages	165
The incident of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr's Īmān	172
Proof 1	173
Proof 2	174
Proof 3	174
Proof 4	175
Proof 5	176
Proof 6	177
Sayyidunā 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb's Īmān	183
Rasūlullāh ﷺ Performing Ṣalāh in Ḥaram and the Anger of the Quraysh	192
3. The Virtues and Signs of the Tābi'īn of the Ṣaḥābah	206
Third Testimony	207
Fourth Testimony	208
Fifth Testimony	212

First Proof of its Fabrication	213
Second Proof of its Fabrication	214
Third Proof of its Fabrication	214
Fourth Proof of its Fabrication	215
Fifth Proof of its Fabrication	216
Sixth Proof of its Fabrication	217
Sixth Testimony	219
First Proof for the Fallaciousness of This Interpretation	226
Second Proof for the Fallaciousness of This Interpretation	226
Third Proof for the Fallaciousness of This Interpretation	227
Fourth Proof for the Fallaciousness of This Interpretation	228
Seventh Testimony	230
The First Answer of the Shī'ah	234
The Second Answer of the Shī'ah	237
The Third Answer of the Shī'ah	239
Eighth Testimony	246
Point One	247
Point Two	247
Point Three	248
Point Four	248
Point Five	248
The Second Opinion	257
The Third Opinion	257
The Fourth Opinion	258
The Fifth Opinion	264
First Proof	264
Second Proof	264
Third Proof	265
Ninth Testimony - Sayyidunā 'Umar's Nikāḥ to Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm	267
First View	269
Proof One	269
Evidence of Sayyidunā 'Umar's Nikāḥ to Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm	272
Evidence 1	272
Evidence 2	273

Evidence 3	273
Evidence 4	274
Evidence 5	274
Evidence 6	275
Evidence 7	275
Evidence 8	276
Second View	276
First Narration	278
Second Narration	279
Third Narration	279
Proof 1	281
Proof 2	281
Proof 3	282
Proof 4	283
Proof 5	285
Proof 6	289
First Point	290
Narration 1	290
Narration 2	291
Narration 3	292
Second Point	294
The Impermissibility of Marrying a Nāṣibī	294
Third View	307
Interpretation 1: Patience	307
Interpretation 2: Bequest	316
Narration 1	322
Narration 2	324
Narration 3	324
Interpretation 3: Taqiyyah	328
Reason 1	328
Reason 2	329
Reason 3	329
Fourth View	332
Addendum - Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm's ﷺ Nikāḥ	335

Chapter Two - Introduction	347
The Shīʿah Answer to Verses Extolling the Virtues of the Ṣaḥābah	355
Proofs Establishing That the Ṣaḥābah Were Not Munāfiqīn	407
Proof 1	407
Proof 2	407
Proof 3	417
Proof 4	419
Fifth Proof	449
The Second Answer the Shīʿah Present to Verses Extolling the Ṣaḥābah’s Virtue	454
The Third Answer the Shīʿah Present to Verses Extolling the Ṣaḥābah’s Virtue	471
Textual Evidence	476
Appendix	502
Chapter Three - Introduction to Fadak	507
Point 1	507
Point 2	510
The testimony of the Christian historian Sir William Muir about the superiority of the Ṣaḥābah	517
The testimony of the Christian historian Godfrey Higgins	518
Historian Gibbon’s testimony:	519
Sir William Muir’s books	521
Point 3	531
Point 4	607
Point 5	660
Appendix – Imāmah	691
What is Imāmah?	699
Imāmah and Qur’ān	703
Imāmah in the First Era	708
Chapter Four - Discussion concerning Fadak	715
The Reality of Fadak, its Boundaries, and Income	715
The boundaries of Fadak according to the Shīʿah	716
How did Fadak come into Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ possession?	719

The meaning of Fay' and its recipients	725
A list of Shīṭ books written on the Fadak issue in chronological order	742
Discussion regarding the Gifting of Fadak	747
Which claim was first, inheritance or gift?	747
Clarification Regarding the Gift Claim	748
Did Rasūlullāh ﷺ gift Fadak to Fāṭimah or not?	750
Comprehensive study of the narrations attributed to the Ahl al-Sunnah by Shīṭ scholars	750
Detailed analyses of the narrations attributed to the Ahl al-Sunnah	766
'Aṭṭiyah al-'Awfī	771
Abū Sa'd al-Kalbī	772
Fuḍayl ibn Marzūq al-Kūfī	777
'Alī ibn 'Abbās al-Arzaq al-Asadī al-Kūfī	778
'Abbād ibn Ya'qūb al-Rawājīnī	778
Yaḥyā ibn Ya'lā al-Aslamī Abū Zakariyyā al-Kūfī al-Qaṭrāfī	780
'Alī ibn Mundhir al-Ṭarīqī al-Kūfī	782
Muḥammad ibn Qāsim ibn Zakariyyā al-Asadī al-Majāzī al-Kūfī – originally from Syria	783
Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn Sulaymān	783
'Abd Allāh ibn Sulaymān al-Ash'ath al-Sijistānī, Abū Bakr al-Ḥāfiẓ	783
Abū Kurayb al-Asadī	785
Abū Yaḥyā al-Taymī	787
'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Ṣāliḥ al-Azdī Abū Muḥammad al-Kūfī	788
Muḥammad ibn 'Umar al-Wāqīdī al-Madanī al-Qāḍī	788
Bishr ibn Ghiyāth al-Muraysī	791
Indications	792
The inconsistencies and contradictions of Shīṭ narrations regarding Rasūlullāh ﷺ gifting Fadak to Fāṭimah	795
The evil consequences of this inconsistency	802
A Detailed Examination of the verse <i>And give the relative his right</i>	806
Answer:	808
Context of the verse	810

The compound dhawī al-qurbā at other places in the Qur'ān	818
Adversity in the Era of Nubuwwah	826
Conclusion	840
Was Fadak in Fāṭimah's possession?	841
Did Fāṭimah claim that Fadak was gifted to her in the court of Abū Bakr or not?	843
Summary	869
Analysing the above narrations	870
Isnād 1	871
Isnād 2	873
Isnād 3	875
Isnād 4	876
Isnād 5	881
Isnād 6	881
Shī'ī narrations concerning the claim over Fadak being gifted	889
The Contradictions and Inconsistencies between Shī'ī narrations regarding the claim over Fadak being gifted	915

Moulānā Sayyid Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī al-Ḥusaynī Nadwī’s Opinion Regarding the Book and the Author

Nawāb Muḥsin al-Dowlah Muḥsin al-Mulk Munīr Nawāz Jang Sayyid Mahdī ‘Alī ibn Sayyid Ḍāmin ‘Alī al-Ḥuṣaynī (1253 A.H – 1325 A.H) hails from an ancestry of celebrated and prominent graduates, intellectuals and modern scholars of India of this age. Owing to his extensive study, sound nature and deep contemplation he accepted the creed of the Ahl al-Sunnah. On the invitation of Nawāb Mukhtār al-Mulk he went to Hyderabad in 1291 A.H and sat on high platforms and made far-reaching reformations thereby attesting to his intelligence and organizational skills. He travelled to England in 1305 A.H and saw the universities there and remained a supportive hand in the life of Sir Sayyid. In 1315 A.H (1897), he was elected as the secretary of Madrasat al-‘Ulūm Aligarh (M.A.O College) and Muḥammadan Educational Conference and remained in this position till the end of his life. The college progressed exceptionally in every field during his time.

Nawāb Muḥsin al-Mulk has an awe-inspiring overpowering personality. He has the articulacy to lecture the entire night and is a proficient writer. His book *Āyāt-e Bayyināt* is a *tour de force* in its field.

What Nawāb Muḥsin al-Mulk (Moulānā Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdī ‘Alī) has written in *Āyāt-e Bayyināt* of his eye witness observations of the Shī‘ī sect’s beliefs and attitude towards the noble Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ will have a remarkable effect on a person with sound disposition. To add on to it or to superbly debunk this marvellous work on both an emotional and intellectual level is next to impossible.

(Extracted from *Islam and the earliest Muslims: Two conflicting portraits* pg. 60, 61)

وَلَقَدْ أَنْزَلْنَا إِلَيْكَ آيَاتٍ بَيِّنَاتٍ ۖ وَمَا يَكْفُرُ بِهَا إِلَّا الْفٰسِقُونَ

And We have certainly revealed to you verses [which are] clear proofs, and no one would deny them except the defiantly disobedient.¹

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 99

Āyāt-e Bayyināt

وَقُلْ جَاءَ الْحَقُّ وَزَهَقَ الْبَاطِلُ ۗ إِنَّ الْبَاطِلَ كَانَ زَهُوقًا

And say: “Truth has come, and falsehood has departed. Indeed falsehood, [by nature], is ever bound to depart.”¹

Part 1

Nawāb Muḥsin al-Mulk Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdī `Alī Khān

Preface

The publication of *Āyāt-e Bayyināt* is the manifestation of my long-standing hope. This is the benevolent book which rescued me from falling into the dark abyss of deviation. In the beginning of the holidays of the 20th century, Shī`ī dogmas and ideologies plagued my mind. In fact, the truth is that in those days I was externally a Sunnī, but internally a Shī`ī. There were many factors that made me incline towards Shī`ism. However, two factors were extremely instrumental, viz. my household environment and my Shī`ī friends.

My family elders were somewhat devout and ascetic, but due to their gullibility and love for ignorant ṣūfī folks, they were unknowingly the victim of adulterated Sunnī beliefs. There was the custom of reciting the *Shahādah Scroll* and practicing *Ta`ziyah* in my home, just as was the popular custom in Awadh. I was brought up in this environment. I myself was and am today extremely emotionally affected by the painful martyrdom of Sayyidunā Ḥuṣayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ — which happened at the hands of a group of Muslims.

May Allāh forgive me, for I harboured evil thoughts about Sayyidunā Mu`āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and wicked words regarding him would come out from my mouth. The Shī`ah gained courage from this ill-behaviour of mine and found a fertile land; hence they planted the seed and began watering it. In those days, one lawyer

1 Sūrah Banī Isrā`īl: 81

from Jarwal — the district of Bahraich in Lucknow — who was known as Khaṭīb al-Īmān, was widely renowned and accepted by a certain group of Shīʿah; due to his refutation of the Ahl al-Sunnah and his verbose speeches. On one side, my Shīʿī friends began taking me to his gatherings, and on the other side they supplied me with material like *Khurshīd Khāwar*, *Shab Hāy Peshā* and tons of such controversial books to read. Since I was ignorant of the fundamental differences between Shīʿah and Sunnī — such as *Imāmah*, *Tahrīf al-Qurʿān*¹ and reviling the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ — I was emotionally captivated by the bombastic speeches of the Shīʿī lecturers and affected by their philosophical scrutiny and logical proofs regarding the incident of Karbala, thus falling into further deviation due to the emotional dogmas of love for the Ahl al-Bayt. Such a time came wherein I made preparations to announce my acceptance of Shīʿism. However, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى had something else planned for me as my reformation was decreed at the hands of a ṣūfī elder.

The incident goes thus that my family was deeply affected by Sayyid Muḥammad Nūr al-Ḥasan Shāh ʿUrf Achumiyā — a ṣūfī elder from Sandila, Hardoi — who we would call Dādā Miyā and whom my family would consult in important affairs. When he came to my house one day, I reluctantly divulged my intention to him in secret. There was an exchange of words for a while. Then after attentively listening to me he said: “It looks like you have only attended Shīʿī gatherings and read their books which have left a devastating effect on your heart and mind. Changing your creed is no ordinary thing. Before taking this huge step, read the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah on this subject and then ponder and reflect deeply over these two sects and judge according to your conclusion thereof.” I suggested that maybe such books of the Ahl al-Sunnah are very rare since the only books that have crossed my sight are regarding Rasūlullāh’s صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ sīrah, the pious and fiqh. He gave me a puzzled look and remarked: “You did not find them or you never made an effort to look for them? To claim this while living in Lucknow is bemusing. Lucknow is the heart of Shīʿī - Sunnī polemics. Moulānā ʿAbd al-Shakūr Kākorwī has done extensive work in this field especially regarding the Shīʿah

1 Adulterating verses of the Qurʿān

belief of Taḥrīf al-Qur’ān, concerning which he has written fabulous books. Had you made an effort, you would have certainly stumbled upon his books.” I said: “Moulānā, he is a scholar with Wahhābī Deobandī ideologies. Why should we read his books?” He retorted: “What does Deobandism and Barelwism have to do with Shī’ī - Sunnī polemics? Both of us accept the al-Khulafā’ al-Rāshidīn as rightful and deserving khulafā’, and both of us honour and revere the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Hence, we both are responsible in answering the allegations of the Shī’ah in this regard. I myself have read a number of Moulānā ‘Abd al-Shakūr’s books. Shabbu Miyā is one of my father’s disciples in Sandila who has a strong passion for Shī’ī - Shī’ah polemics. He has a library of books in this field. I will mention you to him when I go to Sandila after 8-10 days and I will send some books for you with someone who is coming this way. After reading those books, come to Sandila. I will arrange a meeting with him for you.”

About 15-20 days after this conversation, a friend of mine came with a stack of books and a letter which read:

I have sent you 7 books, viz. *Āyāt-e Bayyināt*, *Naṣīḥat al-Shī’ah*, *Tanbīh al-Ḥā’irīn*, *Abū al-A’immah ki Ta’līm*, *Qīṣṣah Qirtās ka Kufr Shikan Fayṣlā*, *Qātilān Ḥusayn ka Khānā Talāshī* and *Munāẓarah Amrūhā*. Read the books in the sequence I have penned them. Make a point to read *Āyāt-e Bayyināt* very carefully since such an ‘ālim has written this book who was previously a Shī’ī and after pondering over the doctrines and laws of both sects became a Sunnī. If your heart is still not yet satisfied after reading these books, then refer to Moulānā ‘Abd al-Shakūr or come to me if you like. I will arrange a meeting with Shabbū Miyā for you.

I began studying *Āyāt-e Bayyināt*. As I paged through the book, the passages of my mind lit up. I felt as if I was in an abyss of darkness all this time. Then, I studied the other books as well. It was a great misfortune for me that during the period that I was studying these books, Moulānā ‘Abd al-Shakūr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ passed away and the desire to meet him remained in my heart. Nonetheless, I had the opportunity to sit in the company of his successor, the Imām of the Ahl al-Sunnah, Moulānā ‘Abd

al-Salām al-Fārūqī and Moulānā ‘Abd al-Awwal al-Fārūqī from whom I received guidance and direction.

In those days, I had the thought that just as I was the victim of Shīism, many servants of Allah who sit in the company of the Shīah are becoming Shīī or half Shīī due to their ignorance of this corrupt creed. Hence, books such as *Āyāt-e Bayyināt* and *Naṣīḥat al-Shīah* ought to be published and propagated on a large scale. When I mentioned to Moulānā ‘Abd al-Awwal رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ that *Āyāt-e Bayyināt* has not been published in India since 1934 and that I have the intention of publishing it, he became extremely happy and directed me to translate the Persian texts therein. I also expressed my desire to translate it myself. Unfortunately, I was inundated with business work and notwithstanding the persistence of Moulānā; I was unable to complete this task. Time passed on and these two scholars left this world to meet Allah. I was in utter despair that maybe I will never be able to complete this mammoth task but Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى intended to take work from a sinful person like me. Two years ago, my friends Doctor Ḥabīb Fikrī — previously a lecturer on Arab culture in Lucknow University — and Muḥammad Ya‘qūb Mantū gave me such courage that I prepared myself for this task notwithstanding my inability, incompetence and lack of means. The thought of translation hit me. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى had destined this honour for Moulānā ‘Abd al-Samī‘ al-Qāsimī — a lecturer at Dār al-Muballighīn Lucknow. May Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى reward him abundantly for he expertly completed this work without any remuneration.

With regards to the publication of the book, I consulted Moulānā ‘Abd al-‘Alīm al-Fārūqī who enriched me with his remarkable advises and lent a supporting hand to me. Moulānā did not hesitate in providing assistance whether financial or editorial whenever the need arose.

Although I tried to be brief, much time has been taken. Nevertheless, a few points need to be penned for the readers of this book. Moulānā Muḥammad Manzūr Nu‘mānī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ has written *Irānī Inqilāb¹ Imām Khumaynī awr Shī‘iyyat*, where he

1 The Iranian Revolution

describes the Shī'ī creed and the beliefs and ideologies of Imām Khomeini. On page 198 under the heading, *Fārūq A'zam's day of martyrdom*; the greatest festival, the most heinous example of fabrication against Rasūlullāh ﷺ, he has reproduced a narration from *Zād al-Ma'ād* of Majlisī where he determines the 9th of Rabī' al-Awwal to be Sayyidunā 'Umar's ﷺ day of martyrdom extolling shocking virtues of this day. He further has declared this day as the greatest festival for the Shī'ah. Sayyid Muḥammad Hamdānī — a Shī'ī mujtahid from Kashmir — has written a response to Moulānā Nu'mānī's book titled *Ā'inā Hidāyat*. The legitimacy and worth of this response is questionable, but this is not the place to criticise it. Anyways, it is important to point out a deceit of his.

He displays much deceit and dishonesty in his response to this narration on page 396 of his book but has not commented about the presence or absence of this narration in Majlisī's book. He spoke such a blatant lie which is only befitting for the taqīyyah monger Shī'ah. He writes addressing Moulānā Nu'mānī:

You should realise that the Shī'ah celebrate the 9th of Rabī' al-Awwal as the birthday of Muḥammad ﷺ.

The Shī'ah should themselves decide as to whether they celebrate this day as the birthday of Rasūlullāh ﷺ or the festival of Zahrā'. Hamdānī has absolutely no shame to speak such a blatant lie in his old age.

کعبہ کس منہ سے جاوگے غالب
شرم تم کو مگر نہیں اتی

Ghālib! What face will you show by the Ka'bah?

You have absolutely no shame!

In order to make the readers aware, it is imperative that I state: Nowadays the Shī'ah are continuing their old despicable habit of adulterating textual evidence. Recently in Pakistan, Muḥammad Ḥasan Ja'farī has translated *Majālis al-Mu'minīn* of Qāḍī Nūr Allāh Shostarī, which Akbar Ḥuṣayn Jīwānī Trust has published.

Ja'farī has omitted all those texts wherein Qāḍī has acknowledged the marriage of Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm bint 'Alī to Sayyidunā 'Umar رضي الله عنه. Similarly, in the Urdu translation of Sulaym ibn Qays al-Hilālī's book, all those texts have been removed where the author admits to Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه pledging allegiance at the hands of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه.

A man with deficient knowledge such as me has stumbled over these discrepancies in the Shīrī books with a mere cursory glance. If the scholars were to scrutinise them, they will find hundreds if not thousands of such discrepancies.

The first time this book was published and distributed was in 1870 (1286 A.H) in Mirzāpūr when the author was 33 years old. The second print of the first chapter concerning the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah was published by Mustafā'ī Printers Lucknow in 1884 (1301 A.H) concerning which Moulānā Mujīb Allāh رحمته الله composed this couplet:

از فیض طبع مہدی دین المعی عصر
مطبوع شد رسالہ بے مثل و لا جواب
نام کتاب و نیز سن طبع اے معجب
ایات بینات رقم ساز با کتاب

From the grace of the contemporary academic printers, an unprecedented and unanswerable book has been published.

The book's name and the year of publication, O Mujīb is Āyāt-e Bayyināt, the code number of the book.

(Āyāt (875) + Bayyināt (426) = 1301 A.H)

Thereafter Mustafā'ī Printers published the second chapter concerning the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah in 1887 (1304 A.H) as well as the second chapter regarding Fadak in 1898 (1315 A.H). The third edition of the first chapter concerning the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah was published in January 1934 (1353 A.H) on the request of Ḥāfiẓ Ma'sūm 'Alī رحمته الله by United Press Lucknow to keep the name of the author

alive. After Pakistan was made, many editions of it were printed there. However, India did not print it for a long time. Now after 72 years, Idārah Ishā'at-e Haq is acquiring the privilege of publishing it.

I am indebted to all those who have assisted at whatever level in the publication of this book. I feel it my obligation to specially thank Moulānā Anwār al-Ḥaḡ al-Qāsimī — a teacher at Dār al-Muballighīn Lucknow — who helped tremendously in researching and locating the references of the Shī'ī books. May Allah ﷻ reward all these sincere and loving people abundantly and make this book a means of the guidance of all the misguided. Āmīn!

The dust of the feet of the Ṣaḡābah and Ahl al-Bayt ﷺ

Shaykh Muḡammad Firāsāt

7 December 2006

Foreword and Biography of the Author

Nawāb Muḥsin al-Mulk enjoys an outstanding rank among the associates of Sir Sayyid. He became his successor, developing and establishing the mission initiated by Sir Sayyid. His actual name is Maḥdī 'Alī and his lineage meets up with the famous twelver sayyids. One branch of this family went to Ottawa and lived there. Maḥdī 'Alī's father, Mīr Ḍāmin 'Alī, was of the sayyids of that family and although deprived of worldly affluence, he was still considered one of the nobles of the town. Maḥdī 'Alī's mother's lineage linked with a family of sayyids whose educational legacy came down many generations. Accordingly, Muḥsin al-Mulk's maternal grandfather, Mawlānā Maḥmūd 'Alī, was a great scholar who was first the Head Chairman and later elevated to being the Minister of Tonk district.

In this poor, yet knowledgeable family, Nawāb Muḥsin al-Mulk was born in 1837 (1253 A.H) in Ottawa. He was sent to the maktab in his childhood, where he acquired his primary Islamic education. Due to his remarkable intellect, effort and determination; in a short span of time he reached such a height of scholastic capacity that he began frequenting the lessons of great scholars, thus completing his course at the age of eighteen. On one hand, he performed exceptionally well in the science of Persian oratory and literature, while on the other hand he acquired certificates in Arabic, Arabic literature, ḥadīth and tafsīr. He did not officially study English, but due to his zeal and enthusiasm he learnt as much that he was able to read and fully understand the English newspaper.

He was hardly eighteen years of age when he took up a governmental position in order to assist his father in earning. He worked as a clerk in an office in lieu of 10 rupees per month. Owing to his hard work, capability and intelligence, he grew very quickly until he assumed the high post of Deputy Collector. He was so proficient in his work that the high ranking majors and officers began revering him. Not only this, in fact the government gifted him with a robe and the Collector praised him in these words:

I can openly declare that there is no one more intelligent, capable and honest in the UP province than Muḥsin al-Mulk.

His remarkable competence became so famous that the army general offered him a distinguished position. He therefore moved to Hyderabad Deccan in 1874 and earned a monthly salary of 1200 rupees. He attained an outstanding rank in affluence and nobility. It is famous regarding his financial dealings:

Maḥdī ‘Alī accomplished that work in Deccan which Todar Mal accomplished in India in the time of King Akbar and Lieutenant Governor Mister Thomson accomplished in UP. Owing to his superb planning, the government became affluent and the populace were happy and content.

His services were recognised to this extent that he was chosen as Revenue Secretary in 1876 and Financial and Political Secretary in 1884, and awarded titles as Muḥsin al-Dowlah, Muḥsin al-Mulk and Munīr Nawāz Jang by the royalty. 3000 rupees per month were stipulated as his wages. He travelled to England around this time and met with Prime Minister Gladstone. Plots were devised against him in 1893 due to which he resigned in order to save his life, settling on 800 rupees pension per month and travelled to Aligarh. There he met the late Sir Sayyid and began community service and administration of the college. Sir Sayyid passed away in 1898. He was then elected as secretary of the college. He remained in this position and worked tirelessly and diligently for the success and development of the Muslims. In his time, the battle between Urdu and Hindi raged. He openly supported Urdu.

Amīr Ḥabīb Allāh came to India in 1906 and was warmly welcomed at Aligarh College. Amīr was astonished and amazed at the college’s administration. He thus awarded the college with 20 000 rupees and stipulated a yearly amount as well. In short, in Muḥsin al-Mulk’s time the MAO College was financially established and its authority, awe and honour was confirmed. Muslims were given political rights and their political stance was recognised.

However, the tireless struggles and exertions which Muḥsin al-Mulk endured to raise the nation to this pedestal weakened his physique and health, and he was afflicted with different sicknesses. His diabetes worsened. In this condition he went to Shamlah and made efforts to expand the rights of Muslims living there. It was here that he met Viceroy and other officials. It was in September 1907 that he travelled to Shamlah and in October his sickness intensified. Viceroy commanded his special doctor to tend to him, but who can cure the sickness of death? His final moments approached and on the 8th of Ramaḍān 1325 corresponding to the 16th of October 1907 he journeyed to meet the Almighty. Many have composed couplets regarding the date of death.

محسن الملک اہ ز دنیا برفت
 خلق شد از رحلتش اندوہ گیں
 سال وفاتش شدہ ملہم زغیب
 انجمن ارائے بہشت بریں

Muḥsin al-Mulk has left this world.

His departure has grieved the creation.

The year of his demise as inspired from the unseen association

The ideas of the lofty paradise: 1325 A.H

Muḥsin al-Mulk opened his eyes for the first time in a poor home. Thus, he was forced to work at a very tender age. But the intelligence awarded to him by Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى raised him to a lofty pedestal. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى favoured him with unimaginable wealth, seated him on a high pedestal, awarded him with grand titles and placed his love in the hearts of the people. His was an embodiment of piety, love and sympathy for people. He made serving the community the object of his life. No arrogance or fame crept into his heart in his entire life. He was kind and sincere to everyone, but would display a special type of informality, sincerity and love to his society and regarded helping them as his duty. The bulk of his income was spent on the poor, needy, orphans and widows. He stipulated allowances for many people in such a undisclosed way that besides Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى,

and the giver and taker, no one knew about it. Hence, the amount of people he was helping was unknown as long as he remained in Hyderabad. However, when he resigned and left, his beneficiaries began crying and mourning due to which their large number was identified.

When he began residing in Aligarh, his wages decreased considerably. Notwithstanding this, he did not close his hand of generosity but left it unrestricted, just as before, only to close upon his demise.

All his acquaintances recognised and were full of praise for his exceptional qualities and traits. His character was impeccable to such an extent that his foe found not a blemish therein. Accordingly, Nawāb Surūr Jang who openly opposed him during his stay in Hyderabad wrote these words about him in his book, My Life:

He was merciful and had confidence. His words were sweet and effective.
He was prepared to display kindness to everyone and his subordinates remained loyal to him right until his death.

It is famous about Urdu poets, and this has a lot of truth, that they praise affluent people in their greed for gifts and rewards. However, there is an exception to this. Dāgh Dehlawī enjoyed every type of honour in Hyderabad and had no ulterior motive from Muḥsin al-Mulk. Nevertheless, his outstanding qualities forced him to say:

مہدی کو اگر خیر زماں کہتے ہیں
یا محسن الملک ان کو یہاں کہتے ہیں
زیبا بے کہیں محسن عالم اے داغ
جو جاہلیے کہنا وہ کہاں کہتے ہیں

If they say that Mahdī is the best of his time
Or they say he is the benefactor of the nation
It is proper. O Dāgh! Even the benefactor of the universe
Can be claimed by whoever wishes to proclaim

This praise is untainted and these words are the product of the poet's emotions.

The service Muḥsin al-Mulk provided to his people was unadulterated and not for fame. He remained restless for the progress of his people and spent the major portion of his life pursuing this objective. Hence, in his last sickness he travelled to Shamlah for the advancement of the people and made efforts to increase the rights of Muslims. For this reason, he met with Viceroy and other officials. The burning desire in his heart for the progress and success of his people had an effect on others as well.

He had a great concern for Islamic education. His studying career began with Islamic education. Therefore, he understood it to be of vital importance that all the citizens receive Islamic education from childhood, because the effects it has on the heart and mind have a lifelong effect. He did not consider it a waste of time like the *bright thinkers* of today. He understood that this was the best and most effective way for a person to tread the straight path and to maintain balance in his life. This does not mean that he considered secular education as redundant and superfluous. The major portion of his life was spent in systemizing MAO College where secular education is taught and after which young Muslims can enter the domain of life.

Although Muḥsin al-Mulk began working in an office just after completing his studies and earning at a tender age, he remained engrossed with knowledge. The strong attachment to reading books which he developed in his young days remained till death. He studied so extensively that his intellectual reputation was recognised to be higher than his contemporaries. His writings testify to his deep knowledge. The subject matter and manner of deduction in his work *Tahdhīb al-Akhlāq* depicts his profound knowledge. He had a passion for Islamic knowledge but did not restrict himself to this circle but deeply studied other religions as well. Thus, Mawlānā Dhakā' Allāh writes regarding him:

An outstanding quality of Mawlānā Mahdī 'Alī is that he was actually an expert in religion. He was not only acquainted with the different sects of

Muslims like Sunnī, Shī'ah, etc. but was aware of the realities of the religions of the world. He spent a considerable amount of his time studying English books to acquire the knowledge of the religions of the world and spent his own money to get some books translated. The history of all religions was on his fingertips just as his own religion. He established the superiority of Islam over other religions with full knowledge. He made efforts to remove all the doggedness and corrupt ideologies of the Muslims using the Qur'ān, ḥadīth and statements of 'ulamā' as proof.

The outcome of him studying different religions in depth is that at the age of 23 he renounced the Shī'ī creed and became a staunch Sunnī. He writes in the foreword of *Āyāt-e Bayyināt*:

I am a million times grateful to my Allah, the Majestic and Great, that I am one of those fortunate few who out of hope for their salvation, soundly contemplated upon the doctrines of both creeds thus finding the religion of the Ahl al-Sunnah in conformity to Divine Speech; and the Imāmiyyah creed contrary to it. I did not regret forsaking the creed of my forefathers, separating from my family and folk and abandoning the beliefs of the Imāmiyyah scholars — who are wolves in sheep's skin — and entered into the true religion of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah.

Nawāb Muḥsin al-Mulk began his writing career when he began working. His first book was *Milād Sharīf*, which was printed in 1860. He wrote two books during his studies regarding law, viz. *Qānūn Māl* and *Qānūn Fowj Dārī*.

After resigning from Hyderabad, he began writing exclusive articles as a journalist in Sir Sayyid's magazine *Tahdhīb al-Akhlāq*. The articles published in this magazine together with being religious and historical also display his foresight and deep knowledge. Rām Bābū Saksīnā writes regarding his articles:

Most of the articles in *Tahdhīb al-Akhlāq* written by his pen are religious and historical, whose actual objective is only to make the contemporary Muslims — who are in an abyss of humiliation and destruction — gain

success in every field, i.e. intellectually, morally and politically by following in the footsteps of their righteous forefathers. There is no doubt that all these articles depict his deep knowledge, foresight and sound nature.

Besides these articles, many of his books such as *Āyāt-e Bayyināt*, *Kitāb al-Muḥīṭ wa al-Sūq*, *Taqīd awr ‘Amal bi al-Ḥadīth* and *Majmū‘ah Taqādir* have been published. *Āyāt-e Bayyināt* enjoys the highest rank among them. In fact, the truth is that the reputation of the author is on account of this book.

What necessitated the writing of *Āyāt-e Bayyināt*? Listen to the answer from the author himself:

Since my friends, colleagues, brothers and family are still on their previous creed (Shī‘ism) and deem me as deviated, I present those rational proofs to them which made me loathe their creed, and reproduce those evidences which showed me the veracity of the religion of the Ahl al-Sunnah; thus convincing me to accept it. For this reason I write this book, to extol the virtues of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā‘ah. May Allāh allow my friends to have an unbiased look at it and discard their false beliefs. Āmīn.

I heard that when Nawāb Muḥsin al-Mulk forsook the religion of his forefathers and accepted the religion of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā‘ah, people made a big hue and cry about it. Some people asked his family the reason for his change of beliefs, and they were told:

Mahdī ‘Alī’s knowledge of religion is limited and inadequate. Accordingly, some people managed to convince him and brought him on to their path.

Muḥsin al-Mulk then learnt about these accusations. He thus wrote this book to remove these misconceptions. He mentions emphatically:

I did not change my religion due to insufficient knowledge. In fact, a deep study of religions obliged me to take this step.

Āyāt-e Bayyināt had just arrived into the public domain and there was a huge uproar over it, since he exposed many discrepancies and incongruities of the Shī'ah and made many objections against them therein. The opposition understood it to be of vital importance to answer him. His one colleague wrote a response in two voluminous books. He named it *Āyāt-e Muḥkamāt*, on the rhythm of *Āyāt-e Bayyināt*. The truth is that the voluminous nature of this book was due to a whole load of unnecessary drivel and large script. An objection would appear on one page under "He said" and the next page will have the response. And those very same puny and pathetic narrations were mentioned in the response which had already been debunked. If one has a look at the layout and manner of substantiation in both books, then it seems like the author of *Āyāt-e Muḥkamāt* wrote the book merely out of annoyance.

Āyāt-e Bayyināt is a unique masterpiece in its field after *Tuḥfah Ithnā 'Ashariyyah*. In *Tuḥfah*, much information has been gathered about the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah and other Shī' groups, which is definitely precious, but the approach of this book is explanatory and illustrative. Contrary to this, *Āyāt-e Bayyināt's* style is controversial and debated. A picture has been painted out by the brush of a man who is well acquainted of all the details and finer points and who made a deep study of both creeds, understanding the discrepancies and incongruities in the Shī' creed. Such points have been mentioned in this book which people are generally unaware of. For example, the ruling of Ṭīnah, learned people could not fathom the belief which is related to this. Muḥsin al-Mulk has not only made the masses aware of it but further exposed various astonishments and incredulities related to it.

The style of the book is captivating. Displays of seriousness, honour and impression is evident everywhere therein. Many solid proofs are furnished either to support or to debunk. Although the subject matter of the book is religious discussions yet it is free from dryness and monotony. In fact, at some places the author adopts a more humorous and sarcastic approach, thus enhancing its beauty.

This book is a golden gift to debaters and a precious book to study for others. It is important for everyone to read this book conscientiously and carefully to freshen his īmān and strengthen his beliefs. If it is studied properly then definitely the chances of deviating from the straight path are scant.

Thanks

Janāb Thanā' Allāh Şiddīqī

Karachi

Foreword

الحمد لله رب العلمين و الصلوة و السلام على نبيه و حبيبه سيد المرسلين محمد و اله و اصحابه و
ازواجه و امته اجمعين

Allah ﷻ sent His beloved Rasūlullāh ﷺ for our guidance, revealed His special word upon him, handed him the lantern of guidance, and out of His all-encompassing Mercy extricated us from the darkness of kufr and shirk and illuminated our hearts with the light of īmān. This is such a great favour which we can never ever express sufficient gratitude. However, shayṭān caused many Muslims to deviate, thereby darkening their hearts once again with corrupt beliefs. He caused such a split amongst us that seventy-two sects went astray, which Rasūlullāh ﷻ prophesised. Hence, we should not be content with a Muslim name, nor regard ourselves worthy of salvation just by merely proclaiming the oneness of Allah and the nubuwah of Rasūlullāh ﷻ. Instead it is of vital importance that we research every belief, and match every belief with the Qur’ān and sunnah. It is impossible not to differentiate truth from falsehood for a person who studies the Qur’ān with a sound and clean heart only for his salvation and not allowing any prejudice or hatred to creep in. It is impossible for Allāh ﷻ to abandon such a seeker of truth in the abyss of deviation. On the contrary, the one who does not seek the truth — is instead hell-bent on religious prejudice and whose only objective is to quarrel and reign supreme, who believes his religion to be true, following in the footsteps of his forefathers by saying, “Indeed, we found our fathers upon a religion, and we are in their footsteps [rightly] guided,” — will undoubtedly remain on deviation and would never be able to purify his heart from corrupt beliefs.

After this introduction, this sinful servant Mahdī ‘Alī ibn Sayyid Dāmin ‘Alī — may Allah forgive his sins — appeals to the brothers that two sects among all the sects of the Muslims are more common, viz. the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā’ah and the Shī’ah Imāmiyyah. Each believes his creed to be true and heading for salvation and labels the other as false and which leads to destruction. Thousands of books

have been authored and millions of articles have been written, but this fight has still not seen its end. Everyone remains firm on his belief. Very few are the people who searched for the truth, abandoned their forefather's religion and embraced the other to attain salvation.

I am a million times grateful to my Allah the Majestic and Great, that I am one of those fortunate few who out of hope for their salvation, soundly contemplated upon the doctrines of both creeds; thus finding the religion of the Ahl al-Sunnah in conformity to divine speech and the Shī'ah Imāmiyyah creed contrary to it. I did not regret forsaking the creed of my forefathers, separating from my family and folk and abandoning the beliefs of the Shī'ah scholars — who are wolves in sheep's skin — and entered into the true religion of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah.

Since my friends, colleagues, brothers and family are still on their previous creed (Shī'ism) and deem me as deviated, I present those rational proofs to them which made me loathe their creed, and reproduce those evidences which showed me the veracity of the religion of the Ahl al-Sunnah; thus convincing me to accept it. For this reason I write this book, to extol the virtues of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah. May Allāh allow my friends to have an unbiased look at it and discard their false beliefs. *Āmīn.*

Introduction

It should be clear to the readers that the actual contention between the two sects is the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ. The Ahl al-Sunnah regards them as righteous while the Shī'ah deem them as iniquitous. In fact, just as the Ahl al-Sunnah regard them to enjoy the loftiest rank among the ummah and to possess the most perfect and highest level of īmān, the Shī'ah deem them as the worst and most wicked to the extent of labelling them as renegades and disbelievers. Thus, in reality the truthfulness or falsehood of these two sects rests on this discussion. In other words, if in conformity with the belief of the Ahl al-Sunnah it is proven that the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ possessed the most perfect īmān and remained firm on this till the end, then undoubtedly the Ahl al-Sunnah are on truth and the Shī'ah are on falsehood. And if in contrast it is established that they have renegaded and become apostate (May Allāh forbid) then the Shī'ah are right and the Ahl al-Sunnah are wrong. Accordingly, I will firstly present the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ followed by establishing the al-khilāfah al-Rāshidah. I will then respond to all the allegations which the Shī'ah level against the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ.

Rational proofs of the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ

First Proof

Everyone knows that when Allah ﷻ sent His Rasūl صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ to the Arabs and commanded him to proclaim his nubuwah in the early stages of Makkah, all those around him were disbelievers and polytheists. His friends and folk became his enemies and belied him. Some regarded him as mad and others declared him insane (Allah forbid). In the first six years, notwithstanding calling people and displaying miracles, only a few Muslims less than forty in number accepted the message. After these six years, the numbers of Muslims began increasing, the call to Islam took a more public and open approach and Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ began openly declaring the pillars of dīn. It was at this point that the persecutions of the people of Makkah intensified to such an extent that the Muslims were forced to leave Makkah and emigrate to Madīnah. Islam began growing gradually.

Thereafter, Islam spread so rapidly that in a span of a few years the Muslim population reached the thousands and hundred thousands and multitudes upon multitudes of people entered the dīn.

A point of reflection is that those who in the very beginning embraced Islam, believed the message of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, attested to his nubuwwah and recited the shahādah without hesitation and delay, who abandoned their previous religion without consulting their family and friends, forsook their former brotherhoods and held onto the merciful teachings of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, who opposed their associates and acquaintances and carried the burden of obeying Rasūlullāh ﷺ on their shoulders; there must have been a very strong reason for such people to forsake the religion of their forefathers and adopt a completely new faith at such a sensitive time. Otherwise, we know fully well that to abandon your faith and adopt a new one is extremely difficult. To discard a life of luxury and choose a life of adversity without a strong reason is despised by all. Now if we study the reasons why the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم accepted Islam in the early stages, we will find one of two reasons viz. love for dīn and hope for salvation or greed for the world and a crave for wealth.

If we examine the first reason i.e. the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم accepted Islam hoping for salvation and left their household to attain the pleasure of Allah سبحانه وتعالى then we can never imagine that such people would later on abandon this faith and remove the love they had for Islam from their hearts. In fact, we can declare with certainty that those who accepted Islam in a hostile environment and bore hardship and sorrow for the dīn for years, only to win the pleasure of Allāh سبحانه وتعالى will never ever abandon this faith. If we examine the second reason i.e. they became Muslims out of greed for this world and due to a crave for wealth, then this is something unimaginable for a person with a speck of īmān, intelligence and shame because in the early stages of Islam there was no question of gaining worldly amenities and acquiring wealth. It is therefore established that the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم embraced Islam only hoping for their salvation in the hereafter. When their acceptance of īmān is due to this reason, it is impossible for them to turn away from this faith thereafter.

Second Proof

If we study the lives of the al-khulafā' al-Rāshidīn, the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ we attain full conviction that they would follow each and every footsteps of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and would not allow their whims and desires to feature anywhere. They continuously remained in search for the pleasure of Allah and His Rasūl صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Even their enemies could not deny that they fulfilled the responsibility of being the companions of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ in the best possible way and gladly sacrificed their lives and wealth for him. The kuffār and mushrikīn left no stone unturned in harming and causing pain to Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. When the kuffār began abusing Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, what unrelenting support the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ lent to him and what a tremendous effort they made in conveying his message! When the Arabs in general and the Quraysh in particular got ready to harm Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, his friends stood as a shield to protect him and when Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was commanded to emigrate and wage jihād, what great sacrifices were made by the Ṣaḥābah to combat the kuffār! How many goblets of the love of Allah سُبْحَانَكَ وَتَعَالَى did the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ not drink? If they had no love for Allah سُبْحَانَكَ وَتَعَالَى and Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, then why did they sacrifice their lives and wealth and why did they undergo hardships and difficulties? Think! Whose love removed the Muhājirīn from their houses and whose love infatuated the Anṣār?

دنگین کہ کرد مرگا نم این چنین
لعل و گہر کہ ریخت بدا مانم این چنین

Who coloured my eyes in this way?

And who spread pearls and precious stones in my lap?

I challenge the Shī'ah. Were the senior Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ, the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār not partners to Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ in moments of grief and adversity? Did they not sacrifice their lives, wealth and honour for Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ? Did they not forsake their friends and acquaintances? Did they not endure sufferings in the spreading of Islam? Will you acknowledge or reject such clear evidences? There is no scope for rejection so acknowledge you will have to! If you choose to

reject their sacrifices and endeavours then at least have some fairness as to what must be their lofty status in the sight of the one whom they sacrificed for? Alas! You only acknowledge, respect and adore Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.

If anyone had to be your partner in adversity, lend you support in sorrow and grief, abandon his associates and join you and sacrifice his life and wealth for you, would he not win honour in your eyes and love in your heart? If yes, then understand the same connection between Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ. Deal without biasness. When people are from all sides labelling Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ as a sorcerer and a madman thus hurting his heart, then those who are addressing him as “O Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ! O beloved of Allāh!” and when his very family is causing him harm and pain, then those who stood as a shield and protected him; what a high status must such people enjoy in his sight? O friends! If you do not shut your eyes of fairness, there will be no limit to the rank of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ. Who on this earth can ever reach their rank and attain their status? Does anyone have the ability to say, “I believe O Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ!” when he invites us to Allāh and his entire nation belies him? Does anyone have the strength to emigrate with Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and hide in the cave? Who has the capability of hosting Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and the poor Muhājirīn in his house like the Anṣār? Can a day ever come again that Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ advances to the Battle of Badr and we accompany him and Allāh سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى sends the angles to assist us announcing His happiness with us?

O brothers! That era has passed. That time remains no more. Those who were to acquire that bounty have acquired it. Those who were to be enrolled among the Muhājirīn have been enrolled and those who were to enter the domain of the Anṣār have entered that domain. A person can sacrifice a thousand lives but cannot attain the virtue of the forerunners of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār. A person can spend the entire earth’s wealth but will not be enlisted among the participants of Badr or those who pledged the allegiance of Riḍwān. The recipients of that virtue have received their virtue.

حریفان با دها خوردند و رفتند

تهی خمخانها کردند و رفتند

The warriors displayed their chivalry and have left the tavern empty.

O friends! Why do you not have love and respect for those who attained guidance and studied directly from Rasūlullāh ﷺ? Does your intelligence accept that out of hundreds of thousands who stayed in the company of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, true īmān did not affect the hearts of any and out of the innumerable persons who performed ṣalāh and participated in jihād with him, none of them remained steadfast on Islam notwithstanding that they remained in the company of Rasūlullāh ﷺ at home and on journey and heard his advices day and night and witnessed with their eyes the approach of Jibrīl عليه السلام and the revelation of Qur'ān and yet did not abandon their hypocrisy. (May Allah forbid!) All the miracles Rasūlullāh ﷺ displayed to them had absolutely no effect on them and all the supplications he made for them were unanswered?! With a little even-handedness, think, that can any Muslim have this belief and will any Muslim taint the image of his Nabī ﷺ and declare all his students and disciples as renegades and disbelievers? Think a little. If all the students of a scholar remain ignorant and all the associates remain incompetent and all the disciples of a pious person remain transgressors then will people not have evil thoughts about these people? Most definitely. Thus, to believe in the apostasy and disbelief of all the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم is actually criticising the nubuwwah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. May Allah protect us from this!

Third Proof

This fact cannot be rejected that Rasūlullāh ﷺ was sent at such a time when people had rejected the concept of towḥīd and had concocted the religion of Nabī Ibrāhīm عليه السلام. They would fight like animals. They became deaf to knowledge and wisdom, abandoned good character and became accustomed to ignorant rituals. Hence, Allah سبحانه وتعالى raised Muḥammad ﷺ to the pedestal of nubuwwah to teach the people towḥīd, to abandon shirk, to explain the method of worship,

to continue the religion of Nabī Ibrāhīm ﷺ and to instil good character. Allah left the responsibility of the guidance of mankind on his shoulders. Allah ﷻ had predestined Rasūlullāh ﷺ to be the final Rasūl and the Seal of Prophethood, hence Allah ﷻ gathered in him all the virtues, expertise and miracles and granted him all the methods of guiding and teaching which were given to the ambiyā' individually. In fact, Rasūlullāh ﷺ was bestowed with such miracles which no other nabī enjoyed and given an unprecedented concession so that no sect or group remains deprived of the blessings of his nubuwwah, no one remains unaffected by his guidance and teachings like some earlier ambiyā', no one has an excuse for not accepting Islam and no one has a chance to reject his nubuwwah. Therefore, the effect of his guidance was perfect and swift and people embraced the faith through various channels. The orators were fascinated by the eloquence of the Qur'ān, while the intellectuals were convinced by his wise teaching methods. Those who were desirous of witnessing miracles brought īmān after witnessing the same, while the brave and valiant warriors were unable to defeat him, and thus overpowered and became obedient. Thus, the object of his nubuwwah decreed by Allah was reached i.e. Islam spread across the world and dominates all false religions. However, this objective is only established through the principles of the Ahl al-Sunnah and not the Shī'ah. This is because the Ahl al-Sunnah believe that those who embraced the faith in the presence of Rasūlullāh ﷺ had perfect and complete īmān, their belief in the nubuwwah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ was firmly entrenched in their hearts and they remained firm on this till death. If one has this belief, then he has accepted that Rasūlullāh ﷺ reached his objective. On the other hand, if it is believed that they were believers externally but disbelievers internally (May Allah forbid!) and they renounced their faith just at the death of Rasūlullāh ﷺ then who can claim that Rasūlullāh ﷺ completed his mission?

The actuality is that the Shī'ī belief regarding the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ actually questions the nubuwwah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and causes doubt in the hearts of the unwary about Islam. If anyone believes that Rasūlullāh ﷺ had absolutely no effect whatsoever on the hearts of those who believed him and they were only

outwardly believers but inwardly disbelievers who became apostate upon his death, then he will never acknowledge the nubuwwah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and he would say that had Rasūlullāh ﷺ been a true Nabī, his guidance would at least had some effect and some would at least truly believe in him and out of the hundreds of thousands who accepted his message at least a few hundreds would remain steadfast. If according to your corrupt ideology, the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ did not have perfect īmān then on whom did Rasūlullāh's ﷺ guidance have effect? If all the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ besides a handful were hypocrites and renegades, then who accepted Islam and who benefitted from the teachings of Rasūlullāh ﷺ? Who abandoned shirk and accepted towḥīd on the invitation of Rasūlullāh ﷺ? Who learnt the methods of worship? Who perpetuated the religion of Muḥammad ﷺ? Who spread īmān in the world then?

O friends! It is inappropriate for you to take his name and outwardly acknowledge his nubuwwah. If you had labelled a few hundreds or a few thousands of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ as disbelievers or you had labelled those who became Muslim after Islam gained strength as hypocrites then maybe we could stomach it. But what a remorse, that you steep to such a low level to object to those who believed in the very beginning and label as hypocrites those who perpetuated the dīn of Allah and you do not regard anyone of the hundreds of thousands of people who believed Rasūlullāh ﷺ to be righteous except a meagre handful. Why should we not be stunned by such a corrupt belief and why should we not display remorse on such deviation?

Fourth Proof

We all – whether Sunnī or Shī'ah – reckon visiting Rasūlullāh ﷺ as the best fortune and the best forms of worship. And since Rasūlullāh ﷺ has passed on, we consider visiting his blessed grave and applying the sand of it on our eyes as a great fortune. If anyone has the fate of seeing Rasūlullāh ﷺ in a dream, we view him as a pious person. The reality is that as long as a person is not on a high level of piety and sincerity, he is not honoured with beholding the sight of Rasūlullāh ﷺ in his dream. It is an act of great shame that we do not

consider the piety and virtue of those who visited Rasūlullāh ﷺ, remained day and night in his blessed company for many years, beheld his beloved countenance every moment and conversed with him. They not only accompanied him physically, but shared his moments of grief and happiness. They stood as a solid support in his mission to raise the banner of Islam:

برالم با مصابرت کردند	از وطنها مهاجرت کردند
در حضر بهم خطاب او بودند	در سفر بهم رکاب او بودند
بهمپاسرار دین شنیده ازو	بهمه اثار وحی دیده ازو
بذل ارواح کرده و اموال	با نبی در شدائد و ابوال
کار شرع ارجمند ازیشان شد	پایه دین بلند ازین شان شد
بهر ایشان بشارت مطلق	رضی الله عنهم از سوی حق

They emigrated from their homelands and displayed patience on adversity

They travelled with Rasūlullāh ﷺ abroad and conversed with him at home

They witnessed all the signs of revelation and learnt all the subtleties of dīn from him

They sacrificed their lives and wealth in times of difficulty and hardship for Rasūlullāh ﷺ

The banner of Islam flew high through their efforts and the dīn gained honour

Without any terms and conditions they were awarded with the glad tidings of Allāh's happiness

In short, seeing Rasūlullāh ﷺ and staying in his company is such a lofty virtue which cannot be attained by any act of piety. Now when this is coupled with their inherent praiseworthy qualities and attributes then there can be no limit to their rank and status.

Fifth Proof

All Muslims are unanimous on the fact that Islam began and progressed in Makkah and Madīnah and these are the two most sanctified places in the world. One has the house of Allah and is the birthplace of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, while the other is his city and place of rest. The foundation of Islam was built in Makkah and it progressed in Madīnah. These places possess such sanctity that no false religion will prevail there even to such an extent that Dajjāl — the accursed — will not be able to enter them. We should now reflect over the beliefs of the inhabitants of these cities regarding the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ. Their beliefs should be understood as the basis of īmān. Through the grace of Allāh, their belief which in fact is the belief of the entire Arabian Peninsula regarding the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ is well known. If we say that they are all astray and grounded on false belief — as according to the Shī'ah — then the veracity of Islam is uncertain. Can one fathom that the birthplace and resting place of Rasūlullāh ﷺ which possess honour like the 'Arsh and Kursī of Allah, and which was the pivot of Islam; Allah سُبحانه وتعالى abandoned their inhabitants to rot on their corrupt beliefs and left all those millions of people who were born there in the past thirteen centuries misguided and made them all die on misguidance and did not allow one believer to ever live there? And until this very day, Allah سُبحانه وتعالى chooses to allow Makkah and Madīnah to be filled with such corrupt people and this very deviation and misguidance is spread all over Arabia and notwithstanding the passing of all these centuries, no true believer — without Taqiyyah — is unable to go there and unable to express his īmān for fear of his life and honour? Judgement Day is approaching and the days of this world are numbered yet Allah سُبحانه وتعالى has still not yet purified His house and the resting place from these filthy people and made true believers inhabit them. May Allah forbid!

The more we move away from the era of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, the more Islam weakens, the more the Shī'ah progress and their corrupt beliefs become more widespread. The Shī'ah dominated and ruled many countries. Nonetheless, the religion which was prevalent in Makkah, Madīnah and Arabia in the time of Rasūlullāh ﷺ is still going strong today.

ہست محفل بران قرار کہ بود

ہست مطرب بران ترانہ کہ بود

The party is still vibrant like before

And the singers are singing the very same song

We are totally flabbergasted that in thirteen centuries not even one true believer was born and lived in Makkah and Madīnah. Which city will house true believers then? If the Muslims leave the house of Allah and His rasūl, then where should they live? Brothers! There is no alternative but to accept that the inhabitants of Makkah and Madīnah follow the correct religion.

Reported Evidence Regarding the Virtues of the Ṣaḥābah

I will present three reported evidences in favour of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ:

1. The virtues mentioned in the Torah and Injīl
2. The virtues celebrated in the Qur’ān
3. The virtues stated by the infallible A’immah in the books of the Imāmiyyah.

The Virtues of the Ṣaḥābah in the Torah and Injīl

This fact is known to all — including the Shī’ah — that just as Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was prophesied in the other Divine Books, the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ were as well. This cannot be rejected for Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى declares:

مُحَمَّدٌ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ وَالَّذِينَ مَعَهُ أَشِدَّاءُ عَلَى الْكُفَّارِ رُحَمَاءُ بَيْنَهُمْ تَرَاهُمْ رُكَّعًا سُجَّدًا يَبْتَغُونَ
فَضْلًا مِنَ اللَّهِ وَرِضْوَانًا سِيمَاهُمْ فِي وُجُوهِهِمْ مِنْ أَثَرِ السُّجُودِ ذَلِكَ مَثَلُهُمْ فِي التَّوْرَةِ
وَمَثَلُهُمْ فِي الْإِنْجِيلِ كَزَرْعٍ أَخْرَجَ شَطْطَهُ فَازَرَهُ فَاسْتَغْلَظَ فَاسْتَوَى عَلَى سُوقِهِ يُعْجِبُ الزُّرَّاعَ
لِيَعْبَثَ بِهِمُ الْكُفَّارَ وَعَدَّ اللَّهُ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَعَمِلُوا الصَّالِحَاتِ مِنْهُمْ مَغْفِرَةً وَأَجْرًا عَظِيمًا ﴿٢٩﴾

Muḥammad is the Rasūl 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 is on their faces from the trace of prostration. That is their description in the Torah. And their description in the Injīl 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 Allah may enrage by them the disbelievers. Allah has promised those who believe and do righteous deeds among them forgiveness and a great reward.¹

I will now elaborate on these examples of the Torah and Injīl described by Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى in this verse.

1 Sūrah al-Fatḥ: 29

First Virtue in the Torah

It appears in the Torah:

If your very own brother, or your son or daughter, or the wife you love, or your closest friend secretly entices you, saying, “Let us go and worship other gods” (gods that neither you nor your ancestors have known, gods of the peoples around you, whether near or far, from one end of the land to the other), do not yield to them or listen to them. Show them no pity. Do not spare them or shield them. You must certainly put them to death. Your hand must be the first in putting them to death, and then the hands of all the people.¹

What Nabī Mūsā ﷺ commanded his people to do was carried out by the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ. The sternness to be directed at the kuffār was displayed by them. Hence, Allah ﷻ declares in praise of them, “*forceful against the disbelievers*”. Although the Imāmiyyah cannot reject the sternness the Ṣaḥābah had in matters of dīn, nonetheless I will — for their peace of heart — mention a few incidents of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمَا who are the arch enemies of the Shī‘ah and are labelled as *Ṣanamī Quraysh* (the Quraysh idolaters) by them. I only request you to listen to the narrations of your books and then to evaluate it in light of the verse of the Torah and Qur’ān and judge truthfully for yourselves. If embarrassment is not preventing you, then leave doggedness, animosity and corrupt beliefs aside, acknowledge their merit and enter into the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā‘ah.

Sayyidunā Abū Bakr’s Intention to kill his Father

The great Shī‘ī scholar Shaykh Ḥillī² writes in chapter six of *Tadhkirat al-Fuqahā’*:

1 Deuteronomy 13:6-9

2 Jamāl al-Dīn Ḥasan ibn Yūsuf ibn ‘Alī ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī, famous as ‘Allāmah al-Ḥillī. He was born on the 29 of Ramaḍān 648 A.H in Ḥill. He learnt uṣūl, grammar, fiqh, and ‘aqā’id from Shaykh Najm al-Dīn Abū al-Qāsim Ja’far ibn Ḥasan al-Ḥillī (Muḥaqqiq al-Ḥillī) and his father Yūsuf ibn ‘Alī ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī. He studied philosophy under Shaykh Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī. *continued...*

Abū Bakr intended to slay his father on the battlefield of Uḥud but Rasūlullāh ﷺ prevented him saying, “Spare him for someone else.”¹

Brothers! For Allah’s sake, at least have a look at your Imām’s acknowledgement of the truthfulness of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and his attestation to the sternness he displayed against the kuffār as instructed in the Torah. Leave alone being worthy of forceful against the disbelievers, is there anyone who will be prepared to kill his father and fulfil this command of the Torah? It is astonishing how the Shī‘ah and their great A’immah acknowledge this narration and attest to the fact that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was prepared to kill his father, yet they reject his truthfulness.

Sayyidunā ‘Umar Proposes to Kill his Relatives

The Shī‘ī commentators have stated in *Tafsīr Majma‘ al-Bayān*, *Manhaj al-Ṣādiqīn* and *Khulāṣā Tafsīr Jurjānī* that after the Battle of Badr was fought and many Makkans were captured, who were mostly relatives of the Muhājirīn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ, Rasūlullāh ﷺ consulted the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ regarding them; upon which Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ proposed:

continued from page 44

1 Besides these, he also sat at the feet of ‘Alī ibn ‘Umar al-Kātibī al-Qazwīnī al-Shāfi‘ī, Mulla Quṭb al-Dīn, Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Kayshī – the nephew of ‘Allāmah al-Shīrāzī and other Sunnī and Shī‘ī scholars. Yāfi‘ī has written in his history that Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī is the author of more than eighty books. To establish Shī‘ī ideologies and disprove the Ahl al-Sunnah, he wrote *Minhāj al-Kirāmah fī Ma‘rifat al-Imāmah*, a voluminous book wherein he attempted to establish the virtues, leadership and infallibility of the twelve A’immah through Qur’ānic verses and prophetic traditions. He also attempted to prove the criticism levelled against the first three khulafā’ and the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ in general by citing Qur’ān, aḥādīth and historical narration. Shaykh al-Islām Aḥmad Taqī al-Dīn Ḥāfiẓ ibn Taymiyyah wrote an irrefutable response named *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyah fī Naqḍ Kalām al-Shī‘ah wa al-Qadariyyah*, in which he exposed each and every discrepancy of *Minhāj al-Kirāmah*. According to Mowlānā Sayyid Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī Miyyā Nadwī, ‘Allāmah Ibn Tayyimah fulfilled the farḍ kifāyah responsibility of the ummah by writing this book in answer to the allegations levelled against the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ. Ibn Muṭahhar Ḥillī died on the 21 Muḥarram 726 A.H in Ḥill. (Shaykh Muḥammad Firāsāt)

Every captive should be handed over to his Muslim relative who should kill him and not consider family relationship in front of the love for Allah. Thus, ‘Aqīl should be handed to ‘Alī and Nowfal to me to be killed.

O Shīrah! Have a look at this narration in your books of tafsīr and decide whether Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is the epitome of forceful against the disbelievers or not? If you do not accept, then may Allah, grant you understanding.

Second Virtue of the Injīl

It appears in the Gospel of Matthew:

He told them another parable: “The kingdom of heaven is like a mustard seed, which a man took and planted in his field. Though it is the smallest of all seeds, yet when it grows, it is the largest of garden plants and becomes a tree, so that the birds come and perch in its branches.”

This prophecy should be compared to the one mentioned in the verse:

وَمَثَلُهُمْ فِي الْإِنجِيلِ كَزَرْعٍ أَخْرَجَ شَطْطَهُ فَازْرَهُ فَاسْتَعْلَظَ فَاسْتَوَىٰ عَلَىٰ سُوقِهِ

And their description in the Injīl is as a plant which produces its offshoots and strengthens them so they grow firm and stand upon their stalks.¹

How beautifully does this text of the Injīl corroborate the verse of the Qur’ān and confirm the virtue of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ. This parable fits the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ like a glove. They were few in number in the beginning but grew slowly to become a formidable army. When the kuffār would see their large numbers and strength, they would be shocked and enraged. The person who does not attest to their righteousness and virtue has in fact rejected the Qur’ān, Injīl and all Divine Books.

1 Sūrah al-Faṭḥ: 29

Friends! If you do not accept the Islam and īmān of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ then kindly explain who are “وَالَّذِينَ مَعَهُ” (and those with him). Who were the people with Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ which Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى is describing? Who were those who were forceful against the disbelievers? If all of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ except a handful turned renegade then who are those people by virtue of which Islam from a single seed became a large tree? How many are those whom the kuffār would become enraged with? Who can ever think that they will be enraged and astonished by a few? Why did Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى declare them as “فَأَسْتَعْلَظَ فَاَسْتَوَى عَلَى سُوْقِهِ” (so they grow firm and stand upon their stalks) if thousands did not accept Islam and were not perfect in it? Until a person does not acknowledge the virtue and large number of the Ṣaḥābah, he has not believed in this verse.

Friends! By the oath of Allah and have conviction on my words, I am totally shocked at those who claim to believe in this verse and accept the parable of the Injīl as glad tidings for Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, yet reject the virtue and large number of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ and restrict such verses and glad tidings to a few personalities. More astonishing is that they harbour hatred against the Ṣaḥābah and do not fear the warning of “لِيُعِظَ بِهِمُ الْكُفَّارَ” (so that Allah may enrage by them the disbelievers).

Verses of the Qur’ān Complimenting the Ṣaḥābah

The First Verse

كُنْتُمْ خَيْرَ أُمَّةٍ أُخْرِجَتْ لِلنَّاسِ تَأْمُرُونَ بِالْمَعْرُوفِ وَنَهَوْنَ عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ وَتُؤْمِنُونَ بِاللَّهِ ۗ وَلَوْ آمَنَ أَهْلَ الْكِتَابِ لَكَانَ خَيْرًا لَهُمْ ۗ مِنْهُمْ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ وَأَكْثَرُهُمُ الْفَاسِقُونَ ﴿١١٠﴾

You are the best nation produced (as an example) for mankind. You enjoy what is right and forbid what is wrong and believe in Allah. If only the Ahl al-Kitāb had believed, it would have been better for them. Among them are believers, but most of them are defiantly disobedient.¹

1 Sūrah Āl ‘Imrān: 110

In this verse, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى extolls the virtue and righteousness of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ directly to them. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى addresses them as being part of the best ummah and informs them that He has chosen them from the entire creation to guide people. Therefore, continue fulfilling your responsibility and service; “you enjoin what is right and forbid what is wrong.”

If a person reflects and comprehends correctly, then this verse alone is sufficient to demolish the entire edifice of the false creed of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sabā’. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى is declaring them to be the best nation who were selected for the guidance of mankind and confirming their righteous actions of enjoining good and forbidding evil. Notwithstanding this, Shī’ah regard them as the worst nation and deny their virtue and righteousness. I am totally astonished that in the light of such categorical and clear verses, they do not reconsider the corruptness of their beliefs and do not reflect a little over the words of the Qur’ān. If the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ are not the best nation, then who is Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى addressing? If there actions were not righteous, then who is Allah praising? If they did not possess true īmān, then what perfect īmān is Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى attesting to by the words “and believe in Allah”? These verses are categorical. They cannot be misinterpreted or concocted in anyway. Allah is praising their īmān and actions in clear words. It is the overwhelming compassion of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى that He is praising them directly. I am totally stunned! Do the Shī’ah regard this verse to be meaningless or is the meaning too obscure or deep that it cannot be fathomed or grasped? Or do they believe that these are not the words of the Qur’ān but rather added by the compiler of the Qur’ān to extol his, and his associates’, virtue? If it is none of the above then why do they continue believing these to be verses of the Qur’ān and continue acknowledging that they were revealed in virtue of the Ṣaḥābah, yet do not believe in their virtue and go to the extent of denying their īmān? They regard as the worst nation those whom Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى declares to be the best nation; and they regard them to enjoin evil and forbid good whereas concerning them Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى declares the opposite.

Although these categorical verses are clear and explicit and there is no need to

check their commentary, nevertheless I will quote some texts from their reliable commentaries for the benefit of the Shī'ah.

It appears on page 300 in *Tafsīr Majma' al-Bayān* of al-Ṭabarsī — the best tafsīr according to the Shī'ah (printed in 1275 by Dār al-Salṭanat in Tehran, Iran):

لما تقدم ذكر الامر و النهى عقبه تعالى بذكر من تصدى للقيام بذلك مدحهم ترغيبا فى الاقتداء بهم فقال
كنتم خير امة اخرجت للناس قيل فيه اقوال احدها ان معناها انتم خير امة

After commanding enjoining good and forbidding evil, Allah ﷻ mentioned those who stood up for this task and praised them as encouragement for others to follow in their footsteps. Thus Allah ﷻ declared, “You are the best nation.” There are a number of opinions regarding the meaning of this, one is that it means, “You all are the best nation.”

و اختلف فى المعنى بالخطاب فقيل هم المهاجرون خاصة و قيل هو خطاب للصحابة ولكنه يعم سائر الامة

There is a difference of opinion regarding the addressees. Some say that it is refers specifically to the Muhājirīn, while others feel that the address is to the Ṣaḥābah but also includes the entire ummah.

Look at this explanation and consider that it is an attestation by one of your own scholars. Allah ﷻ spoke highly about the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ so that others may emulate them. Are you carrying out this emulation? If disassociation means emulation in your vocabulary then undoubtedly you have acknowledged this verse; otherwise you have blatantly denied it.

Some ignoramuses can be deceived by the word “كنتم” in this verse by thinking that Allah is informing the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ that “You were the best nation,” and this does not mean that they remained like this till the end for it is possible that they became the worst thereafter. In response to this their great scholar Ṭabarsī answered this in his *tafsīr*:

و رابعها ان كان مزيدة دخولها كخروجها لا انها تاكيدا لوقوع الامر لا محالة لانه بمنزلة ما قد كان في الحقيقة فهي بمنزلة قوله تعالى و اذكروا اذ انتم قليل و فى موضع اخر اذ كنتم قليلا فكثيركم و نظيره قوله تعالى و كان الله غفورا رحيما لان مغفرة المستانفة كالماضية تحقيق الوقوع - مجمع البيان

It has been used to emphasise the occurrence of this matter which is undoubtedly going to happen. The Şahābah who are the best will remain the best. The example of this is when Allah ﷻ states regarding Himself:

وَكَانَ اللَّهُ غَفُورًا رَحِيمًا

Indeed, Allah is ever Forgiving and Merciful.

this does not mean that Allah ﷻ 'was' most-forgiving most merciful but is not anymore or will not be. (Rather it means that will Allah always be Most Forgiving Most Merciful.)

When the virtue of the Şahābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ has been established in this verse and there remains no scope of denying their righteousness, some chose a different methodology and testified to the adulteration of the Qur'ān. Some claim that it was actually "خَيْرَ أُمَّةٍ" instead of "خَيْرِ أُمَّةٍ" (the best nation) and Allah ﷻ is actually addressing the A'immah of the Shī'ah saying: "You are the best of the A'immah." However, the compilers of the Qur'ān (they claim) altered "خَيْرِ أُمَّةٍ" to "خَيْرِ أُمَّةٍ". Although other Shī' scholars have disliked this response but we all know the devastating effect of the above view. Accordingly, Mister Mīran Qiblah writes in chapter three of *Ḥadīqah Sulṭāniyyah*:

تغیر و نقصان در قران منحصر در چهار چیز است بکے تبدیل لفظی بلفظ إخر مثلا اینکه گفته شود بجائے کُنْتُمْ خَيْرِ أُمَّةٍ خَيْرِ أُمَّةٍ بوده لیکن بعضے از اعدائے اہل بیت اِن را تبدیل نمودہ اند

Alteration and deduction in the Qur'ān has taken place in one of four ways. One is switching a word for another, e.g. کُنْتُمْ خَيْرِ أُمَّةٍ was actually خَيْرِ أُمَّةٍ and was adulterated by those who hate the Ahl al-Bayt.

He then later acknowledges:

The first method is very rare.

I feel that instead of acknowledging *خَيْرٌ أُمَّةٍ* and then rejecting the *Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ* as being the best, it is better for them to confess to *taḥrīf al-Qur’ān* by saying that *خَيْرٌ أُمَّةٍ* was *خَيْرٌ أُمَّةٍ* so as not to reject clear verses.

It is a pity that Mīran Qiblah and his father have passed away. Otherwise, I would have gone to them myself with *Ḥadīqah Sulṭāniyyah* and *Ṣawārim* and asked that if “*كُنْتُمْ خَيْرَ أُمَّةٍ*” is the product of the adulteration of the compilers of the Qur’ān, then tell me that besides Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, which of the A’immah were alive at that time enjoining good and forbidding evil whom Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى is praising? If they accept that “*خَيْرَ أُمَّةٍ*” is correct then I will humbly ask that is it not disbelief to disassociate from those who Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى has classed as the best nation? I will open their book on page 186 to this text and ask them for an explanation:

ازاں جمله است آنچه از حضرت صادق عليه السلام ماثور است کہ فرمود این هذا القران فيہ منار الہدی و مصابیح الدجی
یعنی دریں قران انوار ہدایت و چراغہاے دور کنندہ تاریکی ضلالت و غوایت روشن است

It is narrated from the tongue of al-Ṣādiq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ that this Qur’ān contains illuminated discourses and a burning lantern to remove darkness and deviation.

I will ask them to take an oath on their *ijtihād* concerning what the Qur’ān has to say about the *Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ* regarding which the Imām says that it contains illuminated discourses and a burning lantern. If it says that they are the best nation then why do you reject it and why do you renounce light for darkness?

I will then present this text of the book:

از حضرت باقر عليه السلام منقول است کہ در ہنگامے کہ فتنہا برشما ملتمس شود و مانند پارہ شب تار پس رجوع ارید
بقران کی شفاعت کنندہ و مقبول الشفاعت ست ہر کسی کہ این را پیش نہد اللہ اورا براہ جنت می برد

It is related from Imām al-Bāqir: “When trials will be unclear and the darkness of night will envelope you, then return to the Qur’ān since it is an intercessor whose intercession is accepted.”

There is no trial greater than us regarding the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ as the best nation while you regard them as the worst. We do not believe you and vice versa. So why do we not practice on the advice of the Imām رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and return to the Qur’ān. If the Qur’ān declares them as the best nation, then tread the path to Jannah by abandoning your false creed. And if the Qur’ān declares them as the worst nation, then embrace us into your faith and extricate us from darkness. I do not know what answer they would have given me if they were alive. And I do not know what response their successors will have to offer.

The Second Verse

فَالَّذِينَ هَاجَرُوا وَأُخْرِجُوا مِنْ دِيَارِهِمْ وَأُوذُوا فِي سَبِيلِي وَقَاتَلُوا وَقُتِلُوا لَأُكَفِّرَنَّ عَنْهُمْ سَيِّئَاتِهِمْ
وَلَأُدْخِلَنَّهُمْ جَنَّاتٍ تَجْرِي مِنْ تَحْتِهَا الْأَنْهَارُ ثَوَابًا مِمَّنْ عِنْدَ اللَّهِ وَاللَّهُ عِنْدَهُ حُسْنُ الثَّوَابِ ﴿١٩٥﴾

So those who emigrated or were evicted from their homes or were harmed in My cause or fought or were killed — I will surely remove from them their misdeeds, and I will surely admit them to gardens beneath which rivers flow as reward from Allah, and Allah has with Him the best reward.¹

In this verse, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى prais the Muhājirīn and gives them the glad tidings of Jannah.

Consider the compassionate and loving address of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى to the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ and understand their virtue and rank therefrom. In what a striking manner Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى depicts their status and declares them as being perpetual inhabitants of Jannah. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى promises to forgive their errors and mistakes and to convert them into good deeds. And besides the reward for their actions, in what a generous way Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى assures them a graceful reward from His side.

1 Sūrah Āl ‘Imrān: 195

Who are the Muhājirīn who have been promised all these bounties and Jannah? Were Sayyidunā Abū Bakr, ‘Umar and ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنهم not Muhājirīn? Were they not among the Muhājirīn whom the Shī‘ah disparage? Have these personalities been excluded from this verse and discounted from the promise, “I will surely remove from them their misdeeds”?

After reciting this verse, do not waste your time and spoil your life searching for the faults of the Muhājirīn. Even if you happen to find a few faults, as long as you accept that they are Muhājirīn, your fault finding will not benefit you and will not debar them from being affirmed as inhabitants of Jannah. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى has already declared that he will forgive their sins and most definitely enter them into Jannah for they were banished and plagued with sorrow and adversity for His sake and they abandoned their friends and beloveds for His friend and beloved. Thus their emigration alone is far superior to thousands of acts of worship and a million good deeds.

The Third Verse

وَالسَّابِقُونَ الْأُولُونَ مِنَ الْمُهَاجِرِينَ وَالْأَنْصَارِ وَالَّذِينَ اتَّبَعُوهُمْ بِإِحْسَانٍ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ وَرَضُوا عَنْهُ وَأَعَدَّ لَهُمْ جَنَّاتٍ تَجْرِي تَحْتِهَا الْأَنْهَارُ خَالِدِينَ فِيهَا أَبَدًا ذَلِكَ الْفَوْزُ الْعَظِيمُ ﴿١٠٠﴾

And the first forerunners [in the faith] among the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār and those who followed them with good conduct — Allah is pleased with them and they are pleased with Him, and He has prepared for them gardens beneath which rivers flow, wherein they will abide forever. That is the great attainment.¹

In this verse, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى has announced His pleasure with the Muhājirīn and Anṣār and has given glad tidings to those who follow in their footsteps. If anyone has to reflect even a little on this verse and ponder over its meaning; he will award nothing but distinction and excellence to the Muhājirīn and Anṣār. When

1 Sūrah al-Towbah: 100

Allah ﷻ has declared that He is pleased with them and they are pleased with Him and that He has prepared gardens for them, then who can deny their virtue? The Shīrah should ponder: are the Ṣaḥābah whom they harbour hatred for not included among the Muhājirīn and Anṣār? If they are, then them being recipients of Jannah is undoubted and if not, who is Allah addressing?

Does believing in the Glorious Qur’ān mean that you are displeased with those whom Allah is pleased with and you do not regard as Muslims those whom Allah has promised Jannah? If anyone rejects this verse or objects that the names of the first three khulafā’ are not mentioned herein, so rejection of their virtue does not necessitate rejection of this verse; then I will present the testimony of Imām al-Bāqir ﷺ since he agrees that the three khulafā’ are included in this verse just as we do. Listen to it attentively from your own source. The author of *al-Fuṣūl* narrates regarding Imām al-Bāqir ﷺ:

انه قال لجماعة خاضوا في ابى بكر و عمر و عثمان الاتخبرونى انتم من الْمُهَجِرِينَ الَّذِينَ أُخْرِجُوا مِنْ دِيَارِهِمْ وَ أَمْوَالِهِمْ يَبْتَغُونَ فَضْلًا مِنَ اللَّهِ وَ رِضْوَانًا وَ يُنْصِرُونَ اللَّهَ وَ رَسُولَهُ قَالُوا لَا قَالَ فانتهم من الَّذِينَ تَبَوَّأُوا الدَّارَ وَ الْإِيمَانَ مِنْ قَبْلِهِمْ يُحِبُّونَ مَنْ هَاجَرَ إِلَيْهِمْ قَالُوا لَا قَالَ اما انتم فقد برئتم ان تكونوا احد هذين الفريقين و ان شهدانكم لستم من الذين قال الله تعالى وَ الَّذِينَ جَاءُوا مِنْ بَعْدِهِمْ يَقُولُونَ رَبَّنَا اغْفِرْ لَنَا وَ لِأَخْوَانِنَا الَّذِينَ سَبَقُونَا بِالْإِيمَانِ وَ لَا تَجْعَلْ فِي قُلُوبِنَا غِلًّا لِلَّذِينَ آمَنُوا رَبَّنَا إِنَّكَ رَءُوفٌ رَحِيمٌ

He passed by a group who were reviling Abū Bakr, ‘Umar and ‘Uthmān and questioned them, “Kindly inform me if you are among the poor Muhājirīn who were expelled from their homes and their properties, seeking bounty from Allah and (His) approval and supporting Allah and His Rasūl?” They replied in the negative. He asked further, “Are you among those who were settled in Madīnah and (adopted) the faith before them and gave sanctity to the Muhājirīn?” They replied in the negative. He then announced, “You have exempted yourselves from being among these two groups (i.e. the Muhājirīn and Anṣār). And I declare that you are not among those concerning whom Allah declared: “And those who came after them, saying, ‘Our Rabb, forgive us and our brothers who preceded us in faith and put not in our hearts [any] resentment toward those who have believed. Our Rabb, indeed You are Kind and Merciful.”

You call yourselves the Imāmiyyah and regard the words of the A'immah to be no less than the Qur'ān. I cannot fathom why you do not accept those statements which mention the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ and why you do not follow you're A'immah in this regard and why are you such liars when it comes to mentioning their virtues.

Nevertheless, by the narration of Imām al-Bāqir رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ it is established that according to him the three khulafā' are included in this verse. They are deserving of all the promises that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى promised, viz. Jannah, etc., to the Muhājirīn and Anṣār. It is also clear that Imām al-Bāqir is exempt of those who criticise these great personalities and regard them to be out of the fold of Islam. There is no excuse for this statement besides *Taqiyyah* (dissimulation)? Until when will you present the fallacious *Taqiyyah* excuse and use it as a scape goat? What a pity that even when Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى categorically praises the Muhājirīn and Anṣār, and the A'immah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ explicitly praised the three khulafā' then too the Shī'ah do not believe. What greater proof do they demand to prove the virtue of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār?

The Shī'ah sometimes create this doubt that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى only praised those Muhājirīn and Anṣār who emigrated and assisted solely for the pleasure of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and not those who carried these out for ulterior motives. We will remove this doubt in three ways.

1. When the Muhājirīn emigrated and the Anṣār assisted, what worldly gain was there for them to desire? When the Muhājirīn emigrated, did they hear that there was some type of treasure in Madīnah which they wished to seize? Did the Anṣār grant the Muhājirīn shelter and assist them because they knew that the latter had plenty wealth which the former could usurp? If they had not emigrated and assisted for Allah's sake, then for what did they do it?
2. If all the Muhājirīn had emigrated and all the Anṣār had assisted for worldly reasons, then for Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى to praise them is superfluous (Allah

forbid). If no one emigrated and assisted for the pleasure of Allah, then who does and the first forerunners among the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār refer to? And if all of them are hypocrites then regarding whom did Allah ﷻ declare His pleasure? If some had emigrated and assisted for the sake of Allah ﷻ while others had done so for worldly benefits, then when enumerating those who did it for the sake of Allah, you will only count three or four names. There is no real worth of the emigration and assistance of only three or four individuals.

3. Allah ﷻ Himself has answered this allegation and declared the Muhājirīn and Anṣār as innocent. In another two verses of the Qur’ān, Allah ﷻ has clarified that the Muhājirīn and Anṣār did everything for His sake. One verse is about the Muhājirīn while the other is about the Anṣār.

Allah ﷻ states regarding the Muhājirīn:

الَّذِينَ أُخْرِجُوا مِنْ دِيَارِهِمْ بِغَيْرِ حَقٍّ إِلَّا أَنْ يَقُولُوا رَبُّنَا اللَّهُ

(They are) those who have been evicted from their homes without right – only because they say, “Our Rabb is Allah.”¹

It is evident from this verse that the reason for emigration was that the kuffār were angry at the Islam of the Muhājirīn and their belief in Allah as their deity, hence they persecuted them and forced them to leave their homes. If after studying this verse the Shī’ah still claim that the Muhājirīn emigrated for worldly reason then this defamation is befitting for them. Such slander can never be blurted from our tongues.

Allah ﷻ states regarding the Anṣār:

1 Sūrah al-Ḥajj: 40

وَالَّذِينَ تَبَوَّءُوا الدَّارَ وَالْإِيمَانَ مِنْ قَبْلِهِمْ يُحِبُّونَ مَنْ هَاجَرَ إِلَيْهِمْ وَلَا يَجِدُونَ فِي صُدُورِهِمْ حَاجَةً مِّمَّا أُوتُوا وَيُؤْتُونَ عَلَى أَنْفُسِهِمْ وَلَوْ كَانَ بِهِمْ خَصَاصَةٌ ۚ وَمَنْ يُوقِ شُحَّ نَفْسِهِ فَأُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الْمُفْلِحُونَ ﴿٩﴾

And (also for) those who were settled in Madīnah and (adopted) the faith before them. They love those who emigrated to them and find not any want in their breasts of what the emigrants were given but give (them) preference over themselves, even though they are in privation. And whoever is protected from the stinginess of his soul — it is those who will be the successful.¹

Consider how Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى praises their assistance and acknowledges the fact that it was done for His sake. It is astonishing and shocking that notwithstanding Allah emphatically declaring the emigration of the Muhājirīn and assistance of the Anṣār to be solely for His sake, the Shī'ah blurt out such drivel that it was done for worldly motives.

Ponder a little. Do you believe or disbelieve in the Speech of Allah? Do you accept or reject His statements. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى declares them as righteous while you regard them as most wicked. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى states that He is pleased with them and they are pleased with Him, while you say the exact opposite. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى affirms that their emigration and assistance was for His sake, while you argue that it was for worldly gains. Reflect on what you are saying and doing. If it was only one or two verses, you could have interpreted them to suit your fancy, maybe. However, the entire Qur'ān is replete with their praise. Until when are you going to adulterate the meaning? The fact is that you opted for the religion of 'Abd Allah ibn Sabā' but things are not working out for you now. You cannot reject the Qur'ān and cannot accept it.

عشق چه ایسان نمود إه چه دشوار بود

ببجر چه دشوار بود یار چه ایسان گرفت

1 Sūrah al-Ḥashr: 9

How pleasant love seemed but how thorny it is

How difficult dissociation was but the lover thought it to be so easy

The Fourth Verse

لَقَدْ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ إِذْ يُبَايِعُونَكَ تَحْتَ الشَّجَرَةِ فَعَلِمَ مَا فِي قُلُوبِهِمْ فَأَنْزَلَ السَّكِينَةَ عَلَيْهِمْ
وَأَثَابَهُمْ فَتْحًا قَرِيبًا ﴿١٨﴾ وَمَعَانِمَ كَثِيرَةً يَأْخُذُونَهَا وَكَانَ اللَّهُ عَزِيزًا حَكِيمًا ﴿١٩﴾ وَعَدَّكُمْ اللَّهُ مَعَانِمَ
كَثِيرَةً تَأْخُذُونَهَا فَعَجَلَ لَكُمْ هَذِهِ وَكَفَّ أَيْدِيَ النَّاسِ عَنْكُمْ وَلِتَكُونَ آيَةً لِلْمُؤْمِنِينَ وَيَهْدِيَكُمْ صِرَاطًا
مُسْتَقِيمًا ﴿٢٠﴾ وَأُخْرَى لَمْ تَقْدِرُوا عَلَيْهَا قَدْ أَحَاطَ اللَّهُ بِهَا ۗ وَكَانَ اللَّهُ عَلَىٰ كُلِّ شَيْءٍ قَدِيرًا ﴿٢١﴾

Certainly was Allah pleased with the believers when they pledged allegiance to you, (O Muḥammad), under the tree, and He knew what was in their hearts, so He sent down tranquillity upon them and rewarded them with an imminent conquest. And much war booty which they will take. And ever is Allah Exalted in Might and Wise. Allah has promised you much booty that you will take (in the future) and has hastened for you this (victory) and withheld the hands of people from you — that it may be a sign for the believers and (that) He may guide you to a straight path. And (He promises) other (victories) that you were (so far) unable to (realise) which Allah has already encompassed. And ever is Allah, over all things, competent.¹

The background of this verse is that Rasūlullāh ﷺ intended to perform ‘umrah, and thus invited the nomad Arabs for this journey. Majority of the Arabs did not answer his call for they feared a war will break out and the Makkans would prevent the Muslims from entering Makkah. Only the sincere and loyal whose hearts brimmed with īmān accompanied Rasūlullāh ﷺ on this journey. When the Muslims approached Makkah, the Quraysh prevented them from entering. Rasūlullāh ﷺ sent Ḥarrāsh to the Makkans but they plotted to kill him. He thus returned. Thereafter Rasūlullāh ﷺ sent Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ for negotiations. The Makkans detained Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān and a rumour spread that he had been killed. Upon this, Rasūlullāh ﷺ

1 Sūrah al-Faṭḥ: 18-21

gathered those who were with him who numbered 400 to 2300 (according to different narrations) who pledged allegiance at his hands to fight the Quraysh and avenge the death of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and not to flee. All of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ readily pledged allegiance, besides the hypocrite Qayd ibn Qays¹. Since the hypocrisy of the hypocrites and the sincerity of the sincere became apparent and by the pledge the steadfastness and level of īmān of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ was displayed; hence this pledge of allegiance was called Bay‘at al-Riḍwān. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى declared regarding those who pledged allegiance:

لَقَدْ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ إِذْ يُبَايِعُونَكَ تَحْتَ الشَّجَرَةِ

Certainly was Allah pleased with the believers when they pledged allegiance to you, (O Muḥammad), under the tree.

فَعَلِمَ مَا فِي قُلُوبِهِمْ

And He knew what was in their hearts.

Had they been hypocrites, they would not have accompanied Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and pledged allegiance at such a crucial time.

فَأَنْزَلَ السَّكِينَةَ عَلَيْهِمْ

So He sent down tranquillity upon them.

To the extent that they were prepared for battle and pledged allegiance at your hands to slay and be slain.

وَأَنَابَهُمْ فَفَتَحَا قَرِيْبًا

And rewarded them with an imminent conquest.

¹ This narration is in accordance to Shīrī traditions which I have proved further on. I have quoted it from *Kashf al-Ghummah*.

From these verses the piety, sincerity and perfect faith of those who pledged allegiance to Rasūlullāh ﷺ under the tree are apparent. Allah ﷻ did not mention a word or letter of displeasure in these verses. On the contrary, Allah ﷻ announced His eternal pleasure and promised those victories which took place at the hands of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ.

We challenge the Shī'ah: is this verse part of the Qur'ān or not? If yes, then was it not revealed regarding those who pledged allegiance under the tree? If yes, then were not Sayyidunā Abū Bakr, Sayyidunā 'Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا, etc., among them? If yes, then are they not included in the rewards Allah ﷻ promised them, such as His pleasure? If not, what proof is there to exclude them? If so, then is being angry at and reviling those whom Allah ﷻ is pleased with not rejection of the verse? If you claim that they are hypocrites, then Allah ﷻ has refuted this by declaring:

فَعَلِمَ مَا فِي قُلُوبِهِمْ فَأَنْزَلَ السَّكِينَةَ عَلَيْهِمْ

And He knew what was in their hearts so He sent down tranquillity upon them.

Had they being hypocrites, why would Allah ﷻ testify to their īmān and promise them victory?

If after studying all these verses, the Shī'ah think that in spite of such clear verses in the Qur'ān regarding the virtue of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ, why have our scholars rejected their virtue? There must be a valid reason. It is not possible that all our scholars, learned, mujtahids, etc., were so ignorant to reject such emphatic verses and regard the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ as evil.

To respond to this, I will establish my claim from their reliable commentaries. I will leave for them to decide whether there scholars were ignorant or not, believers or not, truthful or not, just or bias. They should read their commentaries and come to a reasonable conclusion. Listen to what your mufasssīrīn have written.

Al-Kāshānī writes in his *Tafsīr*:

إنحضرت فرمودند بدوزخ نه رودیک کس از مومنان که در زیر شجره بیعت کردند و این را بیعت الرضوان نام نهاده اند
بجهت این که حق تعالی در حق ایشان فرمود که لَقَدْ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ إِذْ يُبَايِعُونَكَ تَحْتَ الشَّجَرَةِ

Rasūlullāh ﷺ has stated: “Those who pledged allegiance under the tree will never enter Hell.” This pledge is known as Bay‘at al-Riḍwān (the pledge of pleasure) since Allah ﷻ declared regarding those who pledged allegiance, “Certainly was Allah pleased with the believers when they pledged allegiance to you under the tree.”

If you are not satisfied with this narration and are desirous to hear the answer of your theologians and hell-bent Shī‘ah, then open your ears. Your scholars have answered this verse in two ways:

که مدلول ایت عند التحقیق رضای حق تعالی است از فعل خاص که بیعت است و کیسه منکر این نیست که بعضی از افعال حسنه مرضیه از ایشان واقعست سخن درین است که بعضی افعال قبیحه از ایشان وجود آمده که مخالف این عهد و بیعت است چنانکه در امر خلافت

1. Some have stated that it is established from this verse that Allah ﷻ was pleased and will remain pleased with this specific act i.e. their allegiance.

اینکلام معجز نظام دلالت میکند براینکه بعضی اهل بیعت رضوان نکث بیعت خوابند کرد چنانچه از ابو بکر و عمر و دیگر رابطظهور رسید بیانش اینکه بیعت باین شرط بوده است که فرار بهزیمت نه کنند در حرب ثابت بهمانند یا کشته شوند بعد ازینبیعت در بهمانسال جنگ خیبر پیش آمد ابو بکر و عمر فرار کردند و بهزیمت خوردند

2. Some are of the view that the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ perpetrated those actions after this allegiance which were contrary to it i.e. they fled the battlefield, usurped the khilāfah of the rightful khalīfah. They are thus excluded from the promise of this verse.

- a. In answer to the first contention, to think that Allah ﷻ was unhappy with the other actions of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ and only pleased with this one specific action is such a blasphemous slander

which no Muslim will ever think about. Is it possible for Allah ﷻ to declare His pleasure with the words, “certainly was Allah pleased with the believers,” if He had not been pleased with them on every account? Did Allah ﷻ declare this just to appease them and concealed all the things He was unhappy with as a form of Taqiyyah? Something to ponder deeply over is how do the Shī'ah know that Allah ﷻ was unhappy with the other actions of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ؟ How did they reach this conclusion?

It is flabbergasting that Allah ﷻ reveals only that action which He is pleased with to the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ and exposes all the other actions which He is displeased with to none other than ‘Abd Allah ibn Sabā’. Maybe the Shī'ah will answer that the evil of the Ṣaḥābah is documented in the Qur’ān which is in the care of the alleged Imām al-Mahdī. However, we cannot accept this until we see it with our own eyes and the Imām testifies to it. But is a great pity that there is absolutely no trace of the Imām nor any evidence of that alleged Qur’ān. A thousand years have passed, yet up to date the number of days and even years left for the emergence of the Imām is still a mystery.

صد شب بجز گزشت و مه من پیدا نیست

طرفه عمرے کہ بصد سال ندیدم یک ماه

Thousand nights of separation have passed and my moon (beloved) has not appeared,

The irony of life is that I have not seen the moon for a hundred years.

- b. In answer to the second contention that the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ are excluded from the promise due to their violation of the pledge; it is evident from this contention that the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ were true believers up to Bay’at al-Riḍwān. They were neither hypocrites nor disbelievers and their allegiance was sincere not hypocritical.

The author¹ of *Taqḥīb al-Makā'id*'s upcoming text proves that they were neither hypocrites nor disbelievers at the time of pledging allegiance but were included in “Certainly was Allah pleased with the believers.”

این کلام معجز نظام دلالت می کند برینکه بعضی از اهل بیعت رضوان نکث بیعت خواهند کرد

This miraculous speech indicates that some of those who pledged the allegiance of *Riḍwān* will break their allegiance.

The ‘third martyr’, *Nūr Allāh Shostarī*² states:

1 The author of *Taqḥīb al-Makā'id*'s name is Sayyid Muḥammad Qillī ibn Sayyid Muḥammad Ḥusayn. One of his pious ancestors is Sayyid Sharf al-Dīn. When Halākū Khān attacked, he emigrated from Khurāsān to India and stayed in Kathūr village in Barabanki district. Sayyid Muḥammad Qillī was born in that very village on Sunday the 5th of Dhū al-Qa'dah 1188 A.H (1774). Nawāb Shujā' al-Dowlah passed away the same month and year. The author of *Tadhkirat al-'Ulamā'* has listed him among the senior students of Moulānā Dildār 'Alī Naṣīr Ābādī known as Ghufrān Ma'āb who served as a judge and muftī in Meerut for many years after which he resigned and moved to Lucknow where he began authoring books. In those days, there was a huge uproar regarding *Tuḥfah Ithnā 'Ashariyyah*. He prepared himself to refute it — just as his teachers and other Shī'ī scholars were doing — to completely annihilate the effects of this book. He wrote an answer to chapter 8 of *Tuḥfa* in *Tashīd al-Maṭā'in wa Kashf al-Daghā'in*; an answer to chapter 1 in *Sayf Nāṣirī*; an answer to chapter 2 in *Taqḥīb al-Makā'id*; an answer to chapter 7 in *Burhān Sa'ādāt* and an answer to chapter 11 in *Maṣāri' al-Afhām*. He died on the 9th of Muḥarram 1260 A.H (1844) in Lucknow and was buried in the shrine of Ghufrān Ma'āb.

2 *Nūr Allāh* ibn Sayyid Sharīf ibn *Nūr Allāh* well known as *Shahīd Thālith* (the third martyr) amongst the Shī'ah. He was born in 1549 A.H (956) in Shostar — a city of Khoztān province of Iran. His ancestry was related to the government of Tabarstān Āmil or Mazandrān. Qāḍī *Nūr Allāh Shostarī* learned intellectual and religious sciences under his father. He learnt other sciences by Mīr Sayf al-Dīn Muḥammad and Mīr Jalāl al-Dīn. He travelled to India in 1571 due to the political unrest and was the guest of Ḥakīm Abū al-Faṭḥ Gaylānī in Fatehpur Sikri. Ḥakīm Abū al-Faṭḥ Gaylānī introduced him to Akbar (1556–1605). Since Qāḍī *Nūr Allāh* had a high level of education, capability and a sound temperament, Akbar appointed him as judge in Lahore in 1586. This was the first time in history that a Shī'ī was appointed as a judge in India. In 1591, Akbar sent Qāḍī *Nūr Allāh* and Qāḍī 'Alī to Kashmir to investigate the mismanagement and financial malpractice there. Qāḍī *Nūr Allāh* was appointed as the judge of the Agra army in 1599. In 1603, he had intention to return to Iran but Akbar prevented him. *continued...*

مدلول ایت عند التحقیق رضائے حق تعالیٰ است از ازاں فعل خاص کہ بیعت است و کسی منکر این نیست کہ بعضی از افعال حسنه مرضیه ازین شان واقع است

The purport of the verse is His pleasure with a specific action i.e. pledging allegiance. No one denies that they did carry out pleasing actions.¹

This proves that their allegiance was a good deed. Thus, the belief that the senior Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ were hypocrites from the very beginning is falsified and it is proven that they were true believers at the revelation of the verse declaring His happiness.

Let us move on. Let us study their lives to determine the action which violated their pledge and the time when this happened, whether prior or after the demise of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. According to what Nūr Allāh Shostarī and the author of *Taqīb al-Makā'id* have written, it is clear that this violation took place in front of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ i.e. they did not remain steadfast at the Battle of Khaybar and fled.

Our answer is that although the fort of Khaybar was not conquered at the hands of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and Sayyidunā 'Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمَا, this does not necessitate fleeing. Where did the Shī'ah prove fleeing from? And if for argument's sake they

continued from page 63

1 He wrote few books prior to coming to India and wrote on various sciences after coming to India. He continued writing on tafsīr, ḥadīth, isometrics, logic, philosophy, history, etymology, Arabic grammar and many other subjects. He wrote approximately 104 books. *Majālis al-Mu'minīn*, *Iḥqāq al-Ḥaq* and *Maṣā'ib al-Nawāṣib* are among his well-known works. *Iḥqāq al-Ḥaq* was written in refutation of 'Allāmah Rozbahā's *Ibtāl al-Bāṭil*, which had been written in refutation of 'Allāmah Ḥillī's *Kashf Ḥaq*.

He was killed during the reign of Jahangir (1605-1627) on Friday the 18th of Jumādā al-Thānī 1019 corresponding to the 7th of December 1610. The author of Ṣaḥīfah Nūr Sayyid Ṣaḡhīr Ḥusayn Zaydī has written concerning the reason for his murder that Jahangir was infuriated at him because he wrote disrespectful words about Khājah Ajmerī — whom Akbar and Jahangir held in high esteem — and it was believed that he wrote a treatise in which he spoke offensively about Shaykh Salīm — after whom the king was named Salīm. In short, he was killed due to his blasphemy against pious saints. His grave is in Agra in the vicinity of Dayalbagh. Sayyid Muḥammad Manṣūr Ḥusaynī Nayshāpūrī build a tomb on it in 1774, 164 years after Qāḍī's murder.

fled from the Battle of Khaybar and violated the pledge, then it devolves upon the Shī'ah to furnish a verse to prove their fleeing, violation of the pledge and Allah's displeasure just as we have proven the pledge and Allah's happiness from the Qur'ān. (If you cannot, then your claim is baseless!) I say with conviction that if the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ had to commit a grave mistake after the pledge of allegiance, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى would have announced His displeasure upon their fleeing and violation just as He had announced His pleasure upon their allegiance. Fleeing the battlefield and violating the pledge took place in front of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and revelation was still coming and Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام was still descending. Why is it that Allah only boasts about their good actions and conceals their faults? It is either that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى feared them so He did not expose them or that they did not commit any violation at all. Had they blundered, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى overlooked it and concealed it considering their abundant good actions.

If it is claimed that the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ perpetrated such actions after the demise of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ like usurping the khilāfah which Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى was angry with, then we say that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى would have exposed them beforehand and Allah would have never announced His happiness and declared that He knows what is in their hearts and Allah would have never sent tranquillity upon them. Is it fathomable that such giants would turn away from the truth?

I appeal to the Shī'ah to stop wasting their time in debates and to contemplate on the words of al-Kāshānī: Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ has stated, "Those who pledged allegiance under the tree will never enter Hell." This mufasssīr has left no scope for any objection. He has attested to the general glad tidings of Jannah for all those who pledged allegiance on the tongue of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. If you are not satisfied with this narration, have a look at another one for substantiation. It is written in the translation of *Kashf al-Ghummah*:

از جابر بن عبد الله انصاری روایت است که مادران روز بزار و چهار صد کس بودیم دران روز من از حضرت پیغمبر خدا صلی الله علیه و سلم شنیدم که اینحضرت خطاب به حاضران نمود و فرمود که شما بهترین اهل روع زمین اید و ما همه دران روز بیعت کردیم و کسی از اهل نکث نمود مگر قید بن قیس که این منافق بیعت خودرا شکست

Jābir ibn ‘Abd Allah Anṣārī narrates: “We were 1400 on that day (Bay‘at al-Riḍwān). I heard Rasūlullāh ﷺ addressing those present, “You are the best people on the surface of the earth.” We pledged allegiance that day. None of us broke our pledge besides Qayd ibn Qays, the hypocrite.”

Some points regarding this narration:

1. 1400 Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ were present at Bay‘ah al-Riḍwān whose īmān has been verified by Allah ﷻ and regarding whom Allah ﷻ has announced His pleasure.
2. Rasūlullāh ﷺ has stated that they are the best of the nation.
3. Besides one hypocrite, no one broke his pledge.

Have an unbiased look at this narration and reflect over the ‘honesty’ and ‘fairness’ of Qāḍī Nūr Allāh and the Sayyid Muḥammad Qillī. Just look at how they adulterate the verse of Allah and reject categorical verifications under the disguise of love for the Ahl al-Bayt. Even if for argument’s sake we acknowledge the errors of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ, then too the words of Qāḍī Nūr Allāh hold no weight since ‘Allāmah al-Kāshānī has written in his *Tafsīr* that Rasūlullāh ﷺ has stated, “Those who pledged allegiance under the tree will never enter Hell.” What answer do you have to this besides Taqiyyah?

It is appropriate to mention at this juncture that if anyone objects saying that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ did not participate in Bay‘ah al-Riḍwān hence he is excluded therefrom. The answer is that Rasūlullāh ﷺ had so much of love for Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ that notwithstanding his absence, Rasūlullāh ﷺ included him in the bay‘ah by declaring his hand as the hand of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

فلما انطلق عثمان لقي ابا بن سعيد فتأخر عن السرح فحمل عثمان بين يديه و دخل عثمان فاعلمهم و كانت المناوشة فجلس سهل بن عمرو عند رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم و جلس عثمان فى عسكر المشركين و بايع رسول الله المسلمين و ضرب صلى الله عليه و سلم باحدى يديه على الاخرى لعثمان

قيل طوبى لعثمان قد طاف بالبيت و سعى بين الصفا و المروة و احل فقال رسول الله ما كان يفعل فلما جاء عثمان قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم اطفت بالبيت فقال ما كنت لاطوف بالبيت و رسول الله لم يطف به ثم ذكر القصة و ما كان فيها الحديث – كتاب الروضة

When ‘Uthmān left, he met Abbān ibn Sa‘īd. He thus got delayed in saddling (the conveyance). He then escorted ‘Uthmān in front of him until ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه entered. ‘Uthmān informed them and there was a skirmish. Sahl ibn ‘Amr sat by Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم whilst ‘Uthmān sat in the army of the polytheist. Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم placed his one hand on the other for ‘Uthmān. It was said: “How fortunate is ‘Uthmān! He has performed ṭawāf around the Ka‘bah and ran between al-Safā and al-Marwah and came out of Iḥrām.” Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم said: “He would not have done that.” When ‘Uthmān returned, Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم asked him whether he had performed ṭawāf around the Ka‘bah. He replied: “It was not appropriate for me to perform ṭawāf when Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم had not performed it.” He then narrated the entire incident.

Correspondingly, Moulānā ‘Alī Bakhsh Khān has written in one article which I quote verbatim:

Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم declared his hand to be the hand of ‘Uthmān in order for him to acquire the honour of Bay‘at al-Riḍwān. A ḥadīth appears in Rowḍāh of al-Kulaynī that Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم took pledges from all the Muslims. He then placed his one hand on the other hand for the pledge of ‘Uthmān since he was (hostage) by the polytheists.

Besides emphatic forgiveness and divine pleasure from this ḥadīth, another fine point comes to mind. The hand of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم was understood as the hand of ‘Uthmān and the hand of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم is that hand which was termed as the Hand of Allah metaphorically.

يَدُ اللَّهِ فَوْقَ أَيْدِيهِمْ ؕ

The hand of Allah is over their hands.

Thus, a balanced person will term ‘Uthmān as the hand of Allah or the hand of Nabī. Or are you still adamant that this is exclusively for Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه?

This ḥadīth even ascertains that Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم had full trust in the friendship and support of his friends. When the people said that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه is lucky since he has the opportunity to perform ṭawāf of the Ka‘bah, Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم said that it is impossible for him to perform ṭawāf without him. And this was the case as Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه did not perform ṭawāf without Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم. This has been compiled in a couplet by the author of *Ḥamlah Ḥaydarī*:

طلب کرد پس اشرف انبياء ز اصحاب عثمان صاحب حيا

The most honoured messenger told the modest ‘Uthmān (to evaluate the situation in Makkah)

با وبهم بهما گفت خير البشر کزان پيشتتر گفته بد با عمر

The best man (Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم) said to ‘Uthmān the exact same thing he said to ‘Umar before

بيو سيد عثمان زمين در زمان بمقصود رواں شد چون نير از کجاں

‘Uthmān immediately took up the task and moved swiftly to fulfil his objective like an arrow out of a bow

چو اورفت از اصحاب روز دگر بگفتند چندی به خير البشر
خوشا حال عثمان با احترام که شد قسمتش حج بيت الحرام
رسول خدا چوں شنيد اين سخن بيا سخ چنين گفت با انجمن
به عثمان نداريم ما اين گجاں که تنها کند طوف ایں ایتاں

After he left, the Ṣaḥābah told the best man, on the second day: “How lucky is ‘Uthmān! He has the fortune of performing ṭawāf in the ḥaram.” When Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم heard this, he announced to the entire crowd: “I do not think that ‘Uthmān will perform ṭawāf around the Ka‘bah without us.”¹

1 *Ḥamlah Ḥaydarī* vol. 1 pg. 207 line 2

The same author writes that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ reached Makkah and told Abū Sufyān, “Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ intends to perform ṭawāf.” He responded, “This is not possible. But if your desire then you may perform ṭawāf.” Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ refused, upon which Abū Sufyān had him imprisoned.

نجوشیدش اینگه بدل مهر خون	به عثمان چنین گفت این سرنگوں
که گر میل داری توطوف حرم	بکن مانعت نیست کس زین حشم
و لیکن محال ست این یرے گراف	که اید محمد برائے طواف
چو بشنید عثمان از و این سخن	چنین داد پاسخ یان ابر من
که طوف حرم یرے رسول خدا	نباشد بر پیر و انش روا
ازین گفته سفیان بر اشفقت پیش	بگرد انداز سوی او روی خویش
به فرمود پس بادگر مشرکان	که عثمان و این ده کس از پیروان
نیا بند رفتن به نزد رسول	اگر شاد باشند ازین گر ملول
چون عثمان از و این حکایت شنید	علاجه به جز صبر کردن ندید
مقید نمودندش اعدائے دین	بیان نجاتش کم بعد ازین

Love’s blood boiled at that moment, so Abū Sufyān told ‘Uthmān, “Perform ṭawāf if you wish. There is no obstacle for you to attain this honour. However, it is impossible for Muḥammad to perform ṭawāf.” When ‘Uthmān heard this, he immediately retorted, “It is not permissible for his followers to perform ṭawāf without him.” Abū Sufyān was enraged with this and turned his face away. He addressed the polytheists, “Do not allow ‘Uthmān and his accomplices to return to Muḥammad whether they are pleased or not.” Upon hearing this, ‘Uthmān found no option but to bear patiently. Thus, the enemy imprisoned him. I will narrate the story of his release hereafter.¹

We beseech the Shī’ah to have a neutral approach to how their mufassirīn, muḥaddithīn and historians write regarding the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ and how they acknowledge their steadfastness, patience and īmān. Yet they harbour hatred and brand those as renegades and disbelievers whose īmān and Islam satisfied

1 *Ḥamlah Ḥaydarī* vol. 1 pg. 207 line 22

Rasūlullāh ﷺ; the thought of their deviation did not cross his mind; they remained obedient to Rasūlullāh ﷺ in adversity and calamity and their steadfastness and patience was praised by Allah ﷻ. May Allah forbid! I cannot understand how the Shī'ah brand such truthful Muslims and solid believers as hypocrites and how they reject such clear verses and authentic narrations. After studying these verses and aḥādīth, is it possible for a person to doubt the greatness of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ and is it possible for the thought of hypocrisy and apostasy to cross his mind?

It is strange that Allah ﷻ did not suffice on using ambiguous terms to refer to them but rather stated categorically and emphatically, thus removing the doubts of all those who reject. Had Allah ﷻ only customarily praised those who brought īmān on Rasūlullāh ﷺ, the rejecters would have had scope for interpolation. Conversely, when Allah ﷻ clearly states that He is pleased with those who pledged allegiance at the hands of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and even mentions the place, under the tree, and further states that they have not pledged allegiance at the hands of Rasūlullāh ﷺ but rather at Allah's hands, now who can doubt the īmān and lofty character of such persons? It could be assumed that only a few had pledged allegiance who had not turned apostate according to the Shī'ah. However, when the Shī'ī scholars have acknowledged the fact that there were 1400 Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ present and that Allah ﷻ revealed these verse in their favour and further attested that no one broke his pledge except one hypocrite; it is totally baffling that such corrupt ideologies are still believed regarding these personalities. If anyone thinks that the Shī'ah have absolutely no conviction on the Speech of Allah, the aḥādīth of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and the statements of their A'immah then it is acceptable. Had they had conviction, they would not hold such filthy beliefs.

It is our fervent supplication that Allah ﷻ grants you a spark of īmān so that you yourselves can recognise the corruptness of your beliefs and understand for yourselves that which we explain to you. Analyse these beliefs and see if they have even a spark of īmān. If there is, then show me!

نالہ حزنیت کو یہ اتسینیت کو
لاف عشق بازی چند عشق رانشا نیہاست

Who hears your grief, misery and sighs
Very few will recognise the signs of love in love

The Fifth Verse

لَوْلَا كِتَابٌ مِّنَ اللَّهِ سَبَقَ لَمَسَّكُمْ فِيمَا أَخَذْتُمْ عَذَابٌ عَظِيمٌ ﴿٦٨﴾

If not for a decree from Allah that preceded, you would have been touched for what you took by a great punishment.¹

The reason of this verse's revelation is that after the Battle of Badr was won and the mushrikīn were captured, Rasūlullāh ﷺ consulted the Ṣaḥābah as to what to do with the captives. Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was of the opinion that they should be ransomed and set free. Sayyidunā 'Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ viewed that they should be killed by their own relatives not considering anyone's love in front of the love of Allah. Rasūlullāh ﷺ opted for the view of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and accepted ransom and freed them. This verse was then revealed. This narration is accepted by the Shī'ī scholars and mufasssīrīn.

It is written in *Tafsīr Khulāṣat al-Manhaj* of al-Kāshānī:

روز بدر ہفتاد تن اسیر شدند و از جملہ ایشانعباس و عقیل بودند حضرت در باب ایشانبا اصحاب مشاورہ کرد ابو بکر کہ از مہاجرین بود گ فت یا رسول اللہ اکابر و اصغر اینقوم اقارب و عشائر تواند اگر ہر یک بقدر طاق و استطاعت فدائے بدید باشد کہ روزے بدولت اسلام برسد الخ

Seventy people were captured at the Battle of Badr including 'Abbās and 'Aqīl. Rasūlullāh ﷺ consulted the Ṣaḥābah regarding them. Abū Bakr — who was from the Muhājirīn — said: "O Rasūlullāh ﷺ! All of these are your tribesmen and family. If everyone ransoms himself according to his financial capacity, then hopefully one day they will be favoured with Islam."

1 Sūrah al-Anfāl: 68

It appears in *Majma' al-Bayān* of al-Ṭabarsī that Rasūlullāh ﷺ addressed his companions regarding the captives of Badr, “If you wish, you can kill them and if you wish, you may set them free.” Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ said, “O Rasūlullāh ﷺ! They persecuted you and exiled you. Thus, they should be slain. Hand over ‘Aqīl to ‘Alī for assassination and so and so over to me. All of these are the leaders of Quraysh.” Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ said, “O Rasūlullāh ﷺ! These are your tribesmen and family. Ransom should be accepted from them and they should be freed.” Rasūlullāh ﷺ practiced on this view. Upon this, this verse was revealed. Rasūlullāh ﷺ mentioned, “Had the divine punishment descended, no one would have been spared besides ‘Umar and Sa’d ibn Mu‘adh.”

Some points from these narrations acknowledged by the Shīrī scholars.

- Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمَا were amongst the Muhājirīn and the participants of Badr.
- Rasūlullāh ﷺ consulted them.
- Sayyidunā ‘Umar’s رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ sternness on the kuffār and his non-consideration of family and kinfolk in the path of Allah.

The benefit of these points is that when it is established that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمَا were among the Muhājirīn, then all the virtues regarding them announced by Allah ﷻ which we have narrated above are established for them. Secondly, the view of some Shīrī scholars that the three khulafā’ are not among the Muhājirīn has been rebutted. Sayyid Muḥammad Qillī has written in response to trick no. 92 in the chapter of the tricks of the Shīrah of Shāh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz’s رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ *Tuḥfah*:

اصحاب ثلاثه از مهاجرين اولين نبودند

The three companions, viz. Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, and ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, were not among the first Muhājirīn.

Thirdly, the Shī'ī belief that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and Sayyidunā 'Umar رضي الله عنهما were hypocrites from the very beginning (Allah forbid), they never accepted īmān from their hearts and they had evil intentions has been falsified. Janāb Mīran Qiblah writes in chapter 3 of *Ḥadīqah Sulṭāniyyah*:

سيرت شيخين دلالت بر خبث سريرت آنها دارد که در وقت کتمان از حضرت نبوی در خواست اظهار دعوت نموده و در فکر اضرار إِنْحضرت برمی آمدند و در وقت اعلان از نصرت دست می کشیدند فاعتبروا يا اولی الابصار

The biography of Shaykhayn¹ depicts their evil nature. They requested to propagate Islam when it was supposed to be kept secret and always tried to harm Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم. And when it was time for the propagation of dīn, they abandoned assisting and helping Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم.

Had Mīran Qiblah been alive, I would have asked him that if Shaykhayn's رضي الله عنهما intention was evil and they did not assist Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم at the time of need, then why did they participate in Badr? Why did Allah grant victory at their hands? Why did Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم consult them? And why do your forefathers al-Kāshānī and al-Ṭabarsī include them among the Muhājirīn and the consulting members?

O Muslims! Just look at the īmān, intelligence and shame of these Shī'ah! What evil thoughts they harbour against Shaykhayn رضي الله عنهما — who loved Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم with every hair on their bodies, who sacrificed all their wealth on Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم and who were resolute to propagate Islam day in and day out! They think that their intention for their resoluteness was that Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم begins propagating and is thus harmed and killed. What a shame on such a filthy belief!

Nonetheless, let Mīran Qiblah and his forefathers say what they want. They can never reject the fact that Shaykhayn رضي الله عنهما were among the Muhājirīn and participants of Badr.

1 Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and Sayyidunā 'Umar رضي الله عنهما

My stance is proven from this that when they are from the Muhājirīn, they are deserving of all those merits and excellences which Allah ﷻ has mentioned throughout the Qur’ān regarding the Muhājirīn. And when they have participated in Badr, they are included in the promise Allah ﷻ made to the participants of Badr, i.e. Allah ﷻ has pardoned them of all sin. This is also accepted by the Shī’ah. ‘Allāmah al-Kāshānī comments on the following verse in *Khulāṣat al-Manhaj* in the following words:

مَا كَانَ لِنَبِيٍّ أَنْ يَكُونَ لَهُ أَسْرَى

It is not for a nabī to have captives (of war)

اگر نہ حکمی و فرمانے می بود از خدا تعالی کہ پیشی گرفته شدہ اثبات اِن در لوح محفوظ کہ بے نبی صریح عقوبت نہ فرماید یا اصحاب بدر را عذاب نکند

Had the decree and command of Allah ﷻ not been in the *Lowḥ al-Mahfūz*¹ from before that He would not have punished without clear-cut prohibition or that He would not have punished the participants of Badr.

In the same light, it is recorded in *Majma‘ al-Bayān* that Rasūlullāh ﷺ stated:

لعل الله اطلع على اهل بدر فغفر لهم فقال اعملوا ما شئتم فقد غفرت لكم

Allah gazed at the participants of Badr and forgave them declaring: “Do as you please. I have forgiven you.”

It appears in *Tafsīr Khulāṣat al-Manhaj*:

خدا نے تعالیٰ بدریوں را وعدہ مغفرت دادہ و ایشان را بخطاب مستطاب اعملوا ما شئتم فقد غفرت لكم نوازش فرمودہ

When all the participants of Badr’s entry into Jannah is confirmed on the blessed tongue of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and Allah’s words, “do as you

1 The Divine Protected Tablet.

please. I have forgiven you,” is established, what doubt remains that all the senior Ṣaḥābah especially the three companions are undoubtedly going to Jannah.

Friends! I have still not yet understood the basis of the Shī‘ī creed. If it based on the Speech of Allah, then Qur’ān is replete with virtues of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ. If it is based on the aḥādīth of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, then their high mention has been made there. If it based on the narrations of the A’immah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ then they have spoken highly about their qualities. If it based on your commentaries and your books then their virtue is established there as well. What other source do you want us to present of the Ṣaḥābah’s رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ virtues and what other proof should we furnish? The truth is that if you were honest and unbiased, you would have accepted the Qur’ān, aḥādīth and the statements of the A’immah. When you are bereft of īmān and fairness and choose to follow ‘Abd Allah ibn Sabā’, then why should you abandon the beliefs and teachings of your instructor? What a great pity and grief that the accursed Jew died 1200 years ago and his bones have decayed, yet the Shī‘ah do not forget what he taught them and do not move away from the path he showed them. You can explain to them till the cows sing and present a million verses and aḥādīth, but nothing holds weight in front of the word of their tutor. They can concoct and misinterpret the Qur’ān, fabricate aḥādīth, reject the statements of their A’immah but will never dare to forget the statements of their forefather. Whatever corrupt beliefs they have today is the product of that accursed man’s brain washing. Every evil practice of theirs is the order of that wretched. How beautiful is the saying:

بلب زدود دل ایپی که داشتیم دارم

نشستنی بر رایپی که داشتیم دارم

I had switched off the lamps of my heart

I had wiped my seats

The Sixth Verse

وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَهَاجَرُوا وَجَاهَدُوا فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ وَالَّذِينَ آوَا وَنَصَرُوا أُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ حَقًّا
لَهُمْ مَغْفِرَةٌ وَرِزْقٌ كَرِيمٌ ﴿٧٤﴾

And those who have believed and emigrated and fought in the cause of Allah and those who gave shelter and aided — it is they who are the believers, truly. For them is forgiveness and noble provision.¹

True believers will never doubt the īmān and Islam of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār and their forgiveness and definite entry into Jannah after reading this verse since Allah ﷻ has declared: “Those who have believed and emigrated and fought in the cause of Allah and those who gave shelter and aided — it is they who are the believers, truly. For them is forgiveness and a noble provision.”

After hearing this testimony of Allah ﷻ who can doubt their īmān and who can question their forgiveness? The party of ‘Abd Allah ibn Sabā’ should ponder that when Allah ﷻ testifies to the īmān of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār by declaring that they are most certainly true believers and grants them glad tidings of forgiveness and a splendid sustenance, then why do they entertain doubts in their hearts regarding such pure personalities and why do they utter such vile words regarding them?

كَبُرَتْ كَلِمَةً تَخْرُجُ مِنْ أَفْوَاهِهِمْ

Grave is the word that comes out of their mouths.²

To remove the doubt of he who thinks that this verse excludes those Muhājirīn and Anṣār whom the Shī’ah regard to be impious, I reproduce the text of *Majma’ al-Bayān* — a reliable tafsīr according to the Shī’ah. Have a look at page 452 of this

1 Sūrah al-Anfāl: 74

2 Sūrah al-Kahf: 5

copy printed in Tehran in 1275. The commentator writes:

ثم عاد سبحانه الى ذكر المهاجرين و الانصار و مدحهم و الثناء عليهم فقال الذين امنوا و هاجروا و
جاهدوا فى سبيل الله اى صدقوا الله و رسوله و هاجروا من ديارهم و اوطانهم يعنى من مكة الى المدينة
و جاهدوا مع ذلك فى اعلاء دين الله و الذين اووا و نصروا اى ضموا اليهم و نصروا النبى اولئك هم
المؤمنون حقا اى اولئك الذين حققوا ايمانهم بالهجرة و النصرة

In these verses, Allah ﷻ has mentioned the Muhājirīn and Anṣār yet again and praised and applauded them.

وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَهَاجَرُوا وَجَاهَدُوا فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ

They bore witness to Allah and His Rasūl ﷺ and emigrated from their homes and towns i.e. from Makkah to Madīnah and they waged jihād to elevate the dīn of Allah.

وَالَّذِينَ أُوُوا وَنَصَرُوا

They granted refuge to the Muhājirīn in their homes and assisted Rasūlullāh ﷺ.

أُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ حَقًّا

These people are definitely true Muslims for they have attested to their īmān by emigrating and assisting.

If the Shī'ah do not acknowledge the virtue of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār after looking at this commentary, then this is only doggedness and deviation. If the Shī'ah could only present a few verses in response to these categorical āyāt and clear glad tidings and only furnish one verse of the Qur'ān proving the vileness of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم, just as we have proven their virtue and status through the Qur'ān, then we would have understood them to be excused, to an extent. But sadly, the reality is that we verify the virtue of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār by

verses of the Qur’ān, the aḥādīth of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and the statements of their A’immah recorded in their books, but they reject all of this and present some fabrications of some liars and practice on the statements of those whom the A’immah expelled and cursed and labelled as liars and deceivers, which we will prove later on, Allah willing. The neutral can decide whether we believe in and testify to the Qur’ān or the Shī’ah of ‘Abd Allah ibn Sabā’.

Friends! For argument’s sake let us accept that our belief regarding the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم is false (Allah forbid) and the belief of the Shī’ah is correct, and on the Day of Qiyāmah Allah سبحانه وتعالى questions us regarding our false belief then we will present His speech and say humbly:

O Rabb of the universe! You are just. Your justice in respect of the Shī’ah creed is part of the principles of īmān. You judge between us fairly. This is Your book which You revealed upon Your Nabī ﷺ for our guidance and named it a clear book and did not allow any ambiguity or obscurity therein. You mentioned everything clearly and protected it from adulteration and alteration. Our Rabb! We put Your book in front of us and believed in everything that You stated therein. You have enumerated so many virtues and merits of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār that we were forced to have good beliefs about them and had conviction on their īmān and Islam and on their lofty status and virtues due to Your testimony in this regard. You mentioned regarding them:

الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَهَاجَرُوا وَجَاهَدُوا فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ بِأَمْوَالِهِمْ وَأَنْفُسِهِمْ ۗ أَعْظَمَ دَرَجَةً عِنْدَ اللَّهِ

The ones who have believed, emigrated and striven in the cause of Allah with their wealth and their lives are greater in rank in the sight of Allah.¹

You stated at another place:

1 Sūrah al-Towbah: 20

وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَهَاجَرُوا وَجَاهَدُوا فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ وَالَّذِينَ أَوْوُوا وَتَصَرَّوْا أُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ
الْمُؤْمِنُونَ حَقًّا

And those who have believed and emigrated and fought in the cause of Allah and those who gave shelter and aided — it is they who are the believers, truly.¹

You promised them:

لَهُمْ مَغْفِرَةٌ وَرِزْقٌ كَرِيمٌ

For them is forgiveness and noble provision.²

You ensured them:

لَيَرْزُقَنَّهُمُ اللَّهُ رِزْقًا حَسَنًا

Allah will surely provide for them a good provision.³

In short, when we opened Your book, we did not find a page empty of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār's mention. You did not speak badly about them in even one verse, hence we had no doubt at all about their righteousness. When we desired to know the Qur'an's testimony in their favour, we found:

أُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ حَقًّا

It is they who are the believers.

When we searched the Qur'an for their ending, we found:

أُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الْمُفْلِحُونَ

It is they who are the triumphant.⁴

1 Sūrah al-Anfāl: 74

2 Ibid

3 Sūrah al-Ḥajj: 58

4 Sūrah al-Nūr: 51

When You — Who is totally independent — filled Your Speech with their virtues and excellences and said repeatedly in their favour,

رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ وَرَضُوا عَنْهُ

Allah is pleased with them and they are pleased with Him.¹

You emphasized their following upon us, encouraged their love and cautioned regarding harbouring hatred and malice for them. Hence, we were forced to love them, admire them and follow them. You did not create us among those concerning whom You declared:

الَّذِينَ أُخْرِجُوا مِنْ دِيَارِهِمْ وَأَمْوَالِهِمْ يَبْتَغُونَ فَضْلًا مِّنَ اللَّهِ وَرِضْوَانًا

Those who were expelled from their homes and their properties, seeking bounty from Allah and (His) approval.²

You did not include us in the group the praise of whom You celebrated:

وَالَّذِينَ تَبَوَّأُوا الدَّارَ وَالْإِيمَانَ مِنْ قَبْلِهِمْ يُحِبُّونَ مَنْ هَاجَرَ إِلَيْهِمْ

And (also for) those who were settled in Madīnah and (adopted) the faith before them. They love those who emigrated to them.³

You created us after them and announced regarding us:

وَالَّذِينَ جَاءُوا مِنْ بَعْدِهِمْ يَقُولُونَ رَبَّنَا اغْفِرْ لَنَا وَلِإِخْوَانِنَا الَّذِينَ سَبَقُونَا بِالْإِيمَانِ وَلَا تَجْعَلْ فِي قُلُوبِنَا غِلًّا لِلَّذِينَ آمَنُوا

And (there is a share for) those who came after them, saying, “Our Lord, forgive us and our brothers who preceded us in faith and

1 Sūrah al-Towbah: 100

2 Sūrah al-Ḥashr: 8

3 Sūrah al-Ḥashr: 9

put not in our hearts (any) resentment toward those who have believed.”¹

How could we ever not love such leaders and harbour hatred for them?

This is Your book concerning which You pronounced:

﴿۹﴾ اِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّكْرَ وَاِنَّا لَهُ لَحٰفِظُوْنَ

Indeed, it is We who sent down the Qur’ān and indeed, We will be its guardian.²

Due to this promise, we believed the Qur’ān to be unadulterated and continued believing in it. If these statements regarding the Muhājirīn and Anṣār are present in Your book, then what is our error and sin? We believed to be righteous those whom You declared to be righteous and loved those who You praised. If these words have some other meaning and purport, we were unaware. We understood Your book to be clear and apparent as You have stated and did not believe it to be filled with ambiguity and conundrums.

We do not know that if we present this excuse to Allah, then upon which crime of ours will He — the Most Just — punish us and how will He not regard us to be believers? We have full conviction that Allah سُبْحٰنَهُ وَتَعَالٰى will grant us salvation due to such beliefs and will grant us a share of His benevolent sustenance.

Friends! You have heard our answer. Now make some preparations for yours. If your belief regarding the Ṣaḥābah turns out to be false and Allah سُبْحٰنَهُ وَتَعَالٰى holds you accountable on the Day of Qiyaamah, what answer will you give? According to us, you will have no answer but to say:

1 Sūrah al-Ḥaṣhr: 10

2 Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 9

O Allah ﷻ! We disregarded Your Book because the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ of Rasūlullāh ﷺ adulterated and interpolated it. It was not the same way as You had revealed it. The original script was with the Imām. We were unable to locate him and we had no sign or clue of his whereabouts. So why practice on the ‘Uthmānī script and why believe in an adulterated Qur’ān? We did not consider it for a moment. Forget memorising it, we never cared to even recite it. We busied ourselves in supplicating for the emergence of the Imām and sacrificed our lives to have a glimpse at the original Qur’ān which he had. O Allah ﷻ! It is not our fault. You concealed him so secretly that even his shadow was not visible. We sent him thousands of entreaties but he answered none. We dispatched innumerable requests to him via Khidr and Ilyās over the water but not one was responded to. We asked great mujtahids who all replied that we should await him and supplicate for his emergence. Until now, he has not emerged. We awaited him lifelong, but there was no emergence or appearance. There was not even a trace of him.

شام تک تو امد جاناں کا کہہ بیجا انتظار
وہ نہ آیا وعدہ اپنا یاں برابر ہو گیا

You stretched his grand appearance till evening
Your promise did not materialise or was demolished

We travelled from India to Surrī for the absent Imām, but were unable to locate him and witness his appearance. What were we to do without the Imām and why should we have treaded the straight path? We believed whatever those who saw the Imām told us and regarded it as the truth and never turned away from it.

If Allah ﷻ hears such a ridiculous excuse and scolds:

O wretched fools! When I was the protector of My speech and I declared:

أَنَا نَحْنُ نَرْتَلْنَا الذُّكْرَ وَأَنَا لَهُ لَحْفِظُونَ ﴿٩﴾

Indeed, it is We who sent down the Qur'ān and indeed, We will be its guardian.¹

Then who had the capability to adulterate or interpolate it? Who told you that My speech was adulterated?

Maybe you will answer:

We heard from Zurārah and Shayṭān al-Ṭāq informed us.

If Allah ﷻ had to then question you:

O wretched! Was I truthful or Zurārah? Was My Rasūl truthful or Shayṭān al-Ṭāq?"

I do not know what will be your answer. According to me, you will have no option but to acknowledge your crime and then there will be no sentence for you except,

فَاعْتَرَفُوا بِذَنبِهِمْ ۖ فَسُحِقًا لِأَصْحَابِ السَّعِيرِ

And they will admit their sin, so (it is) alienation for the companions of the Blaze.²

All the verses I have mentioned until now prove the virtue and merit of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār in general. I now wish to present those verses which depict the excellence of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه.

The Seventh Verse

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا مَا لَكُمْ إِذَا قِيلَ لَكُمْ أَنْفِرُوا فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ أَتَأْتَلْتُمْ إِلَى الْأَرْضِ ۗ أَرْضَيْتُمْ بِالْحَيَاةِ الدُّنْيَا مِنَ الْآخِرَةِ ۗ فَمَا مَتَاعُ الْحَيَاةِ الدُّنْيَا فِي الْآخِرَةِ إِلَّا قَلِيلٌ ﴿٣٨﴾ ۗ أَلَا تَنْفِرُوا يُعَذِّبُكُمْ عَذَابًا

1 Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 9

2 Sūrah al-Mulk: 11

الْيَمَاءِ ۖ وَيَسْتَبِدِلْ قَوْمًا غَيْرَكُمْ وَلَا تَضُرُّهُ شَيْئًا ۗ وَاللَّهُ عَلَىٰ كُلِّ شَيْءٍ قَدِيرٌ ﴿٣٩﴾ ۖ أَلَا تَتَضَرَّوهُ
فَقَدْ نَصَرَهُ اللَّهُ إِذْ أَخْرَجَهُ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا ثَانِيَ اثْنَيْنِ إِذْ هُمَا فِي الْغَارِ إِذْ يَقُولُ لِصَاحِبِهِ لَا تَحْزَنْ إِنَّ اللَّهَ
مَعَنَا ۗ فَأَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ سَكِينَتَهُ عَلَيْهِ وَأَيَّدَهُ بِجُنُودٍ لَّمْ تَرَوْهَا وَجَعَلَ كَلِمَةَ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا السُّفْلَىٰ ۗ وَكَلِمَةُ
اللَّهِ هِيَ الْعُلْيَا ۗ وَاللَّهُ عَزِيزٌ حَكِيمٌ ﴿٤٠﴾

O you who have believed¹, what is (the matter) with you that, when you are told to go forth in the cause of Allah, you adhere heavily to the earth? Are you satisfied with the life of this world rather than the hereafter? But what is the enjoyment of worldly life compared to the hereafter except a (very) little. If you do not go forth, He will punish you with a painful punishment and will replace you with another people, and you will not harm Him at all. And Allah is over all things competent. If you do not aid the Nabī — Allah has already aided him when those who disbelieved had driven him out (of Makkah) as one of two, when they were in the cave and he said to his companion, “Do not grieve; indeed Allah is with us.” And Allah sent down his tranquillity upon him and supported him with angels you did not see and made the word of those who disbelieved the lowest, while the word of Allah — that is the highest. And Allah is Exalted in Might and Wise.²

After Rasūlullāh ﷺ returned from Ṭā'if and Ḥunayn and stayed for a few days in Madīnah, he made intention to wage jihād against the Romans. This was very hard for some due to the intense heat, the arduous and long journey, the approach of the dates' ripening season and the overwhelming fear of the Romans. Allah ﷻ revealed these verses to encourage jihād and explained to the people in various ways. Allah ﷻ says in the first verse:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا مَا لَكُمْ إِذَا قِيلَ لَكُمْ انْفِرُوا فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ أَتَأْتَلْتُمْ إِلَى الْأَرْضِ ۚ أَرْضَيْتُمْ بِالْحَيَاةِ
الدُّنْيَا مِنَ الْأٰخِرَةِ ۗ فَمَا مَتَاعُ الْحَيَاةِ الدُّنْيَا فِي الْآخِرَةِ إِلَّا قَلِيلٌ ﴿٣٨﴾

1 The recipients of this address are those few who displayed laxity with regards to going in jihād and not all the Muhājirīn and Anṣār. To address all and to target a few is common in Arabic language. Otherwise, Sayyidunā 'Alī ﷺ and the Banū Hāshim will all be included in this address.

2 Sūrah al-Towbah: 38-40

O you who have believed, what is (the matter) with you that, when you are told to go forth in the cause of Allah, you adhere heavily to the earth? Are you satisfied with the life of this world rather than the hereafter? But what is the enjoyment of worldly life compared to the hereafter except a (very) little.¹

Allah ﷻ has indicated the insignificance of this world and encouraged jihād in this verse.

الَّا تَنْفِرُوا يُعَذِّبُكُمْ عَذَابًا أَلِيمًا ۖ وَ يَسْتَبْدِلْ قَوْمًا غَيْرَكُمْ وَلَا تَضُرُّهُ شَيْئًا ط وَاللَّهُ عَلَىٰ كُلِّ شَيْءٍ قَدِيرٌ ﴿٣٩﴾

If you do not go forth, He will punish you with a painful punishment and will replace you with another people, and you will not harm Him at all. And Allah is over all things competent.²

Allah ﷻ is independent and will protect His Rasūl ﷺ. Allah ﷻ confirms this with the words:

الَّا تَضُرُّهُ فَقَدْ نَصَرَهُ اللَّهُ إِذْ أَخْرَجَهُ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا ثَانِيَ اثْنَيْنِ إِذْ هُمَا فِي الْغَارِ إِذْ يَقُولُ لِصَاحِبِهِ لَا تَحْزَنْ إِنَّ اللَّهَ مَعَنَا ۗ فَأَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ سَكِينَتَهُ عَلَيْهِ وَأَيَّدَهُ بِجُنُودٍ لَّمْ تَرَوْهَا وَجَعَلَ كَلِمَةَ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا السُّفْلَىٰ ۗ وَكَلِمَةُ اللَّهِ هِيَ الْعُلْيَا ۗ وَاللَّهُ عَزِيزٌ حَكِيمٌ ﴿٤٠﴾

If you do not aid the Nabī (then he is not in need of your help since Allah is his helper) — Allah has already aided him when those who disbelieved had driven him out (of Makkah, and he had no army to assist him) as one of two, when they were in the cave and he said to his companion (who grieved that the enemy might see their hiding place and harm Rasūlullāh ﷺ. At such a time when even the strongest of men shake, Rasūlullāh ﷺ was fully composed and said to his companion), “Do not grieve; indeed Allah is with us.” And Allah sent down his tranquillity upon him

1 Sūrah al-Towbah: 38

2 Sūrah al-Towbah: 39

and supported him with angels (at the Battle of Badr) you did not see and made the word of those who disbelieved the lowest, while the word of Allah — that is the highest. And Allah is Exalted in Might and Wise.¹

All the mufasssīrīn whether Shī'ī or Sunnī are unanimous that “إِذْ أَخْرَجَهُ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا” (when those who disbelieved had driven him out) refers to the time of hijrah and the word ṣāhib in “إِذْ يَقُولُ لِصَاحِبِهِ” (and he said to his companion) refers to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. They also agree that hijrah was a time of great sensitivity, hardship, secrecy and grief. The one who participated in that time with sincerity enjoys the loftiest of stages. No one can deny that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ accompanied Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ from the time he left his home, during his stay in the cave and right up until he reached Madīnah. The only difference between us and the Shī'ah is that we regard Sayyidunā Abū Bakr's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ companionship to be out of his sincerity, thus regarding him to be the most virtuous of the Muhājirīn, while the Shī'ah regard his companionship to be based on evil intentions (Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى forbid), thus regarding him to be one of the hypocrites. I will prove the virtues and merits of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ from these verses and list the doubts of the Shī'ah after which I will answer them.

The Virtues of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ Deduced From These Verses

1. When the kuffār of Makkah agreed to kill Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى informed Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and permitted him to migrate, Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ took Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ as a companion with the command of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. Thus, if in the sight of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was not true in his īmān and strong in his Islam and was not an ardent lover of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ from his heart and soul, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى would have never permitted him to accompany Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ in such a sensitive time. If Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ did not have full conviction on his love, he would never have taken Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ with him on this journey.

1 Sūrah al-Towbah: 40

2. If Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was not prepared and happy to sacrifice his life and wealth for Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, he would not have accompanied Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ at such an arduous time and would not have put his life at risk. In fact, he would have fabricated excuses to rescue himself from joining Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ in such a difficult time.
3. From the time they left home until they reached Madīnah, the kind and gentle words spoken by Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, the manner he protected Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and the way he fulfilled the responsibility of accompanying Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ all show that he had deep rooted love for Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and had no concern for his own life and honour when it came to defending Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.
4. None of the other Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ were on that level that Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ could take as a companion on this journey and a friend in the cave besides Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. This proves the superiority of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ over all the other Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ.
5. Allah سُبحانه وتعالى loved this service of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ so much that He boasted about his friendship and loyalty in this verse to encourage others who would listen to it and prepare themselves to accompany Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. If the friendship of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was not accepted by Allah سُبحانه وتعالى and his service and companionship was not of a lofty level, then why was he mentioned as an example and why was his friendship and assistance described to motivate others?
6. By declaring “ثَانِي اِثْنَيْنِ” (as one of two), Allah سُبحانه وتعالى made it clear that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is second after Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ to discharge religious responsibilities.
7. By stating “لِصَاحِبِهِ” (his companion), Allah سُبحانه وتعالى has verified the lofty companionship of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ which none besides him attained. Hence, denying the companionship of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is in fact belying the Qur’ān.

8. The words “لَا تَحْزَنُ إِنَّ اللَّهَ مَعَنَا” (Do not grieve; indeed Allah is with us) show that Rasūlullāh ﷺ comforted Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ that just as Allah ﷻ is the protector and helper of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, He is the helper and protector of his companion as well. When it is confirmed by this verse that Allah ﷻ was with Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, then his piety and righteousness is also confirmed, since Allah ﷻ says in another verse:

إِنَّ اللَّهَ مَعَ الَّذِينَ اتَّقَوْا وَالَّذِينَ هُمْ مُحْسِنُونَ

Indeed, Allah is with those who fear Him and those who are doers of good.¹

9. Allah ﷻ sent His tranquillity upon Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. And Allah ﷻ only sends His tranquillity upon those who have true īmān and strong Islam and upon whom is Allah’s ﷻ grace. Proof for this tranquillity is

فَأَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ سَكِينَتَهُ عَلَيْهِ

And Allah sent down his tranquillity upon him.

10. By pondering over these verses, the lofty status of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is learnt because these verses were revealed to inspire and warn those who were lax in going for jihād. Allah ﷻ explained to these persons, warned them and declared His independence. Firstly, Allah ﷻ explained to them by exposing the insignificance of this world followed by warning them of the descent of punishment and replacing them with another nation. At the end, Allah ﷻ mentions His independence and His Rasūl’s disinterest. To substantiate this independence and disinterest, the example of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was presented coupled with mention of his loyalty and love. Accordingly, the level of his truthfulness, friendship and companionship can be gaged from the appreciation of

1 Sūrah al-Naḥl: 128

his help and friendship by Allah **سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى** and His Rasūl **صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ** that Allah **سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى** is boasting about it to inspire and warn others.

I have briefly listed the virtues and merits of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr **رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ** deduced from these verses. I will now enumerate the objections of the Shī'ah coupled with their answers. Their objections are so ridiculous and silly; to refute them is like presenting proofs to dispute with the person who denies the rising of the sun in broad daylight. Nonetheless, we are forced to answer in compliance to the statement of the seal of the muḥaddithīn:

چوں بنائے کلام بر اصول گروییے نهاده است نا چارزمام اختیار بدست اینها داده بر جا که کشیده برند میر و دو بهر رنگ
که رنگیں کند می شود

Since the foundation of this arguments rest on the principles of one sect, thus the reigns are in their hands; they may pull wherever they desire and colour in whichever colour they wish.

Nevertheless, we hope that people with sound disposition will have a fair look at those objections and consider the doggedness and stubbornness of the Shī'ah scholars and mujtahidīn whose hearts have been veiled and whose minds have been cloaked with such deep rooted enmity that they deny such categorical statements and present fallacious interpretations to substantiate their denial of the virtue of the most virtuous **Ṣaḥābī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ**.

و ها انا اشرع في بيان هفواتهم

I begin now listing their drivel.

The Objections of the Shī'ah of 'Abd Allah ibn Sabā'

I will list the objections in the same sequence I listed the virtues so that the readers can understand the objections and doubts of the Shī'ah in contrast to every virtue.

Objection on the First Virtue

I had mentioned that Rasūlullāh ﷺ took Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ with him by the command of Allah ﷻ. The Imāmiyyah claim that neither did Allah ﷻ give permission for Rasūlullāh ﷺ to take Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ with him nor did Rasūlullāh ﷺ take him with happily. Rather, he joined Rasūlullāh ﷻ without the happiness of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and the permission of Allah ﷻ, I will quote whatever the Shī'ī scholars have written regarding this.

The great mujtahid, i.e. the qiblah and ka'bah of the Shī'ah, writes in *Dhū al-Fiqār*:

احتجاج باین ایت موقوف است که به نبوت رسد که بهجرت ابو بکر باجارت حضرت نبوی واقع شده و شیعه این را قبول نکند

To use this verse as a proof rests on whether Sayyidunā Abū Bakr's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ hijrah was with the permission of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, which the Shī'ah do not accept.¹

Qāḍī Nūr Allāh Shostarī has written the exact same thing in *Majālis al-Mu'minīn* and his other articles, as is mentioned in *Muntahā al-Kalām*:

قاضی نور الله شوستری در مجالس المومنین و بعضی از رسائل دیگر ذکر می کند که ابو بکر از منافقین بود و بر خلاف امر اقدس نبوی صلی الله علیه و سلم در اثناء راه اسیتا دو حضرت محمد صلی الله علیه و سلم بعد زجر شدید او را بهمراه گرفت تا کفار را دلالت نکند

Qāḍī Nūr Allāh Shostarī has written in *Majālis al-Mu'minīn* and his other articles that Abū Bakr was among the hypocrites. Without Rasūlullāh's ﷺ command, he stood as an obstacle on his path. After much threatening, Rasūlullāh ﷺ allowed him to come with so that he does not tell the kuffār.

1 *Dhū al-Fiqār* pg. 57 line 9

Another 'great mind' writes in another article which is related to the Ḥusayniyyah:

چون پارهٔ راه برفت دید که شخصی برابر انحضرت می آید حضرت توقف نموده چون نزدیک رسید بشناخت که ابو بکر است فرمود که اے ابو بکر که نه من امر خدا بشمار ساندم و گفتم که از خانه خود با بیرون میائید تو چرا مخالفت امر الهی کردی؟ گفت یا رسول الله که دل از بهر تو خائف بود و براساں بودم نخواستم که در خانه قرار گیرم پیغمبر صلی الله علیه و سلم متحیر ماند بواسطه اینکه امر الهی نبود که کسی در بهمراهی خود برد در ساعت حضرت جبرئیل باز رسید و گفت یا رسول الله بخدا سوگند که اگر این را می گزاری و بهمراه نه گیری کفار را از عقب تو گرفته بیاید و ترا بقتل رساند

After travelling some distance, Rasūlullāh ﷺ noticed someone approaching him. He thus stopped. When he came close, Rasūlullāh ﷺ recognised him to be Abū Bakr. Rasūlullāh ﷺ said: "O Abū Bakr! Did I not inform you of the divine command and ordered you not to leave your house? Why did you oppose the divine command?" Abū Bakr replied: "My heart was restless regarding you. Hence, I did not deem it appropriate to stay at home." Rasūlullāh ﷺ grew uneasy since it was not the command of Allah ﷻ to take someone with him. Jibrīl عليه السلام descended immediately and said: "O Rasūlullāh! By Allah ﷻ, if you leave him and do not allow him to accompany you, he will join up with the kuffār from behind and kill you." Rasūlullāh ﷺ was thus forced to take him with and went to the cave.

In short, it is evident from this objection that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه left his home with the intention of getting Rasūlullāh ﷺ captured and prevented him from continuing his journey. Notwithstanding Rasūlullāh's ﷺ prohibition for him to leave his house, he disobeyed the order and became an obstacle in his path with the intention to harm Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Rasūlullāh ﷺ with the instruction of Jibrīl عليه السلام was forced to take him with. Had he not taken him, he would have definitely brought the kuffār to capture Rasūlullāh ﷺ.

Those with sound understanding can think over this. What a shame! What is the need to think over this? The absurdity of this objection is evident and its

preposterousness is clear from its words and meanings. I will nevertheless write about the fallaciousness of this objection and establish the farcicality of the claim that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ came to harm Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and have him captured.

1. Ponder! At that time, was Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ the friend or enemy of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ? If he was his friend, then what is the meaning of harming and getting him captured? If he was his enemy, then why did he not go with the other enemies like Abū Jahl etc. to the house of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ to kill him? Why did he separate himself from them?
2. Did Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ inform Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ of his emigration, the time he will leave his house and the plan to hide in the cave or not? If he did not, then how did Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ manage to locate Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ on his path and stop him so precisely? If Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had informed Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ beforehand, then was taking him with not part of the plan? If it was not, then what was the benefit of disclosing the secret to the enemy besides apprehending harm? If this was part of the plan, then the objection is baseless.
3. If we for argument's sake except that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ stood as an obstacle on Rasūlullāh's صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ pathway with the intention to kill him and was so firm on his evil intention that Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام feared his intent, thus immediately descending from sidrah and informing Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ,

يا رسول الله بخدا سوگند که اگر این را می گزاری و بپرهانه گیری کفار را از عقب تو گرفته بیاید و ترا بقتل رساند

O Rasūlullāh! By Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, if you leave him and do not allow him to accompany you, he will join up with the kuffār from behind and kill you.

Moreover, we are unaware as to whether Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was alone or he had a kāfir accomplice and whether he was armed or not. It cannot be said that another kāfir was present since the Shī'ah do not

accept this. And if Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ had no kāfir accomplice then it is puzzling that being fully aware of the bravery and strength of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, he goes singlehanded without any weapons to capture and kill Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and does not take any accomplices. If it is said that he only prevented Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ in order to spy on him which is clear from the words “he will join up with the kuffār from behind”. Now, it is not known whether the kuffār were so close from where Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ stood that he could just shout out to them or whether they were some distance away that he had to go to call them. If they were close, then amazingly Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ did not shout out and call them and remained silent. Why? And if they were far away, why did he not run to tell Abū Jahl etc. as soon as he saw Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ? What was he waiting for? More astonishing is that Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام advised Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ to take that enemy along but did not advise him, “Wait a little. When he goes to inform or to call your enemy then get away and by the time he returns, you would reach your destination.” Only Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى knows what happened to Jibrīl — Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى forbid — that at such a crucial time he advises Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ to take along his enemy but did not advise of a plan to save himself from him!

4. It is amazing that when Sayyidunā Abū Bakr’s رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ sole purpose was to capture Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, then why did he accompany Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and hide in the cave? Why did he not devise a plot to capture Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ? The unbiased should think that just as Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ had intercepted Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and intended to kill him, if it had been Abū Jahl or any other kāfir of the Quraysh, then what would he have done if he had spotted Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and what would Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ do? If anyone thinks that he would spare Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ or that Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ would allow him to accompany him then I would accept the thought of the Shī’ah regarding Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to be correct. I am totally shocked at how the Shī’ah’s intelligence has been shadowed. They cannot even understand that hijrah was such a time that

all the kuffār of Makkah were out to assassinate Rasūlullāh ﷺ and surrounded his house to reach their goal but none of them was aware that Rasūlullāh ﷺ had already left. All were under the misconception that Rasūlullāh ﷺ was asleep therein. The person to accompany Rasūlullāh ﷺ at this time; they think that he was the enemy? If this companion did not accompany Rasūlullāh ﷺ with his explicit command and happiness then would he not have been part of that group who surrounded his house in order to kill him or the one to intercept Rasūlullāh ﷺ without a clue or sign?

Whatever I have written thus far is in accordance to Shīṭ narrations, yet they even prove the truthfulness and friendship of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. I will now prove my claim using reported evidences instead of rational proofs, and I will debunk this objection from reliable Shīṭ books and confirm that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ accompanied Rasūlullāh ﷺ in accordance to divine revelation and with the happiness and consent of Rasūlullāh ﷺ.

Al-Kashānī the commentator who is among the high ranking Shīṭ scholars writes in *Khulāṣat al-Manhaj*:

امير المومنين را بر جانے خود خوابانيد و خود از خانه ابو بكر برفاقت او در بهماں شب بيرون امده باين غار متوجه شد

He made Amīr al-Mu'minīn sleep on his bed; left his home the very night accompanied by Abū Bakr and went towards the cave.

The Shīṭah should compare the words of this mufasssīr,

خود از خانه ابو بكر برفاقت او در بهماں شب بيرون امده

He left his home the very night accompanied by Abū Bakr

to the words of Mullā Shostarī,

ابو بكر از منافقين بود و بر خلاف امر اقدس نبوى صلى الله عليه و سلم در اثناء راه اسيتا دو حضرت محمد صلى الله عليه و سلم بعد زجر شديد اورا بيمراه گرفت

Abū Bakr was among the hypocrites. Without Rasūlullāh's ﷺ command, he stood as an obstacle on his path. After much threatening, Rasūlullāh ﷺ allowed him to come with) and decide who is speaking the truth.

If the Shī'ah are not happy with one narration and do not accept it, then listen to another narration of not any ordinary scholar or mujtahid but of a special Imām.

It is written in Sūrah al-Baqarah of *Tafsīr Imām al-'Askarī* عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام. If I do not quote the original text of this tafsīr, no one will believe that such a narration is recorded in the *Tafsīr* of Imām Ḥasan al-'Askarī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ which conforms to Shī'ī narrations. Hence, I quote his text verbatim from *Muntahā al-Kalām*:

ان الله تعالى اوحى اليه يا محمد ان العلى الاعلى يقراء عليك السلام يقول لك ان ابا جهل و المأمن قريش قد بروا عليك قتلك الى ان قال و امرتك ان تصتجب ابا بكر فانه ان انسك و ساعدك و ارزرك و ثبت على تعاهدك و تعافدك كان فى الجنة من رفقاتك و فى عرفاتها من خلصائك الى ان قال قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم ابي بكر ارضيت ان تكون معى يا ابا بكر تطلب كما اطلب و تعرف بانك انت الذى تحملنى على ما ادعيه فتحمل على انواع العذاب قال ابو بكر يا رسول الله اما انا لو عشت عمر الدنيا اعذب جميعا اشد العذاب لا ينزل على موت مريح و لا فرح و كان ذلك فى محبتك لكان ذلك اشنعم فيها و انا مالك لجميع ممالك ملوكها فى مخالفتك و هل انا و مالى و ولدى الافدائك فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم لا جرم ان اطلع الله على قلبك و وجد ما فيه موافقا لما جرى على لسانك جعلك بمنزلة السمع و البصر و الرأس من الجسد و بمنزلة الروك من البدن كعلى الذى هو منى كذلك و على فوق ذلك لزيادة فضائله و شرف خصاله يا ابا بكر ان من عاهد الله ثم لم يبتك و لم يغير و لم يحسد من فد ابانه الله على التفصيل و هو معنا فى الرفيق الاعلى

Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام came to Rasūlullāh ﷺ and said: "Allah ﷻ sent you salām and states that the Quraysh especially Abū Jahl have made a firm intention to kill you. Thus, leave 'Alī on your place for he is like Ismā'īl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام who will sacrifice his life and let Abū Bakr accompany you because if he is harmonious and remains steadfast on his pledge, he will be your companion in Jannah; in fact in the highest stages of Jannah." Rasūlullāh ﷺ thus informed 'Alī of the situation who was happy to sacrifice his life. Thereafter, he turned to Abū Bakr and said: "O Abū Bakr! Are you pleased

to travel with me on this journey notwithstanding that the kuffār of the Quraysh will be out to kill you just as they are out to kill me? It is common that you instigated me to do this and due to you accompanying me various types of afflictions might come your way.” Abū Bakr said: “O Rasūlullāh! I am such a person that if due to love for you I am afflicted with the worst of afflictions until Qiyāmah it is better in my sight than abandoning you and accepting the kingdom of the world. May my life, wealth and family be sacrificed for you. Where will I go leaving you?”

کف یا بہر زہینے کہ رسد تو نازنین را
بلب خیال بوسم ہمہ عمراں زہیں را

Whichever piece of land the foot of a beloved like you touches
I will continue kissing it lifelong thinking it to be lips

Hearing this Rasūlullāh ﷺ commented: “If your tongue conforms to your heart then certainly Allah ﷻ will give you the status of my sight and hearing and you will have such a connection with me just as the connection between the head and body and the body and soul.”

After studying this narration I am unable to understand the reason for the Shī‘ah blurting out, “without the permission of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, Abū Bakr ﷺ stopped him from continuing.” Imām al-‘Askarī ﷺ himself is attesting to the fact that Rasūlullāh ﷺ took Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ﷺ along in accordance to divine command and revelation. Reflect over the words of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ﷺ and Rasūlullāh ﷺ and realise the deep love Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ﷺ possessed for Rasūlullāh ﷺ and the compassion Rasūlullāh ﷺ had for him by likening him with his sight and hearing and his soul and heart.

It is interesting to know that when Moulānā Ḥaydar ‘Alī ﷺ extracted this ḥadīth from the *Tafsīr* of Imām Ḥasan al-‘Askarī and wrote a response to Subḥān

1 Moulānā Ḥāfiẓ Ḥaydar ‘Alī Faizabadī ibn Muḥammad Ḥasan was born in Faizabad (UP) where he acquired knowledge from the Shī‘ī scholars there like Moulānā Najf ‘Alī, Mirzā Faṭḥ ‘Alī and Ḥakīm Mīr Nawāb. He then moved to Delhi where he learnt under Shāh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz Muḥaddith Dehlawī ﷺ,

‘Alī Khān, the latter lost his senses and was dumbfounded. And it was appropriate for him to lose his senses because if the statement of the Imām verifies that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ emigrated with Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ in accordance to divine revelation and Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ likened Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ to his sight and hearing then there remains no doubt in the falsehood of the Shī‘ī creed.¹

It is interesting to read the letter Subḥān ‘Alī Khān wrote after seeing this narration to Moulānā Nūr al-Dīn — the apple of the eye of *Shahīd Thālith* — which *Risālat al-Makātīb* quoted verbatim in *Riwāyat al-Tha‘ālīb wa al-Gharābīt* (line 9 page 189 printed in 1268). I will also quote that text verbatim for the benefit of those interested.

لكن اشكال بهمين ست كه ناصب احاديث طريفة اماميه را النقاط کرده بالفعل پنج جز و بغلط از كتاب ابرام بصارت العين باچه نام دارد فرستاده دران حديثے مبسوط از تفسير منسوب به حضرت امام حسن عسکری عليه السلام بقصه بجز جر مدح ابو بکر نقل کرده پس اگر تاليفش و تاليف بنده بدست کسی از متمذهبين بمذبيعه غير اسلام افتد واحسرنا و والسفاه يعنى معاذ الله حکم يتعارض و تسا قطا کند مدير عالم جلت قدرته زمان ظهور صاحب الامر و الزمان رود برساند تا اين اختلاف از ميان بر خيزد

One problem is that one nāṣībī located a narration from the Shī‘ī chain and compiled a book of 5 volumes named *Ibrām Baṣārat al-‘Ayn* and sent it to

continued from page 96

1 Shāh Rafī‘ al-Dīn Dehlawī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and Moulānā Rashīd al-Dīn Khān Dehlawī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. He was outstanding among his contemporaries in debating and the science of belief. He had a deep understanding of Shī‘ī books. In his era, ‘Allāmah Ḥakīm Subḥān ‘Alī Khān (d. 1268 A.H) the Shī‘ah centre pillar wrote an extremely harsh book in Persian in response to which Moulānā wrote a thoroughly verified book named *Muntahā al-Kalām* which sent a shiver down the spines of the Shī‘ī scholars. All the mujtahidīn from India until Iran could not produce a response to this book. Finally, Moulānā Ḥamid Ḥusayn Lucknowī — a Shī‘ī mujtahid d. 1206 A.H — in answer to *Muntahā al-Kalām*, according to him, wrote a voluminous book which he named *Istiqṣā‘ al-Afhām*. However, the truth is that this was a response to only 34 pages of *Muntahā al-Kalām*. He did not answer the beginning 500 pages and the 300 odd pages after this. Moulānā Ḥaydar ‘Alī Faizabadī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ wrote other splendid books in refutation of Shī‘ism like *Izālat al-Ghayn ‘an Baṣārat al-‘Ayn* (6 volumes), *Nikāḥ Umm Kulthūm*, *‘Amman Ikrāj Ahl Bayt al-Fātimah*, etc. He passed away in 1881 in Hyderabad and was buried there. (Shaykh Muḥammad Firāsāt)

me. He quoted therein a lengthy narration referenced to the *Tafsīr* of Imām Ḥasan al-‘Askarī عليه السلام which is in praise and admiration of Abū Bakr in the hijrah incident. If his book and my book have to get into the hands of any non-Muslim then how remorseful and how regretful that he will apply the ruling of *ta‘aruf* and *tasāquf* (i.e. when two things contradict then both are unreliable.) May Allah سبحانه وتعالى expose the Imām quickly so that this difference can be settled.

Subḥān ‘Alī Khān can have thousands of regrets and make millions of supplications for the emergence of the Imām but he is unable to belie Imām Ḥasan al-‘Askarī رحمته الله and is incapable of refuting the virtues of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr Ṣiddīq رضي الله عنه established from the Imām’s statement.

Brothers! Evaluate the situation. When the Imām رحمته الله is affirming that Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم took Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه along in accordance to divine revelation and Mullā Nūr Allāh Shostarī and his obstinate colleagues claim that Abū Bakr posed as an obstacle to Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, should we accept the statement of the Imām or the words of Mullā Nūr Allāh Shostarī? The reality is that Mullā Shostarī outwardly claimed love for the A‘immah but inwardly labelled them as liars and tainted imān and Islam under the guise of Shī‘ism.

دامن فشان گزشت و او را بهانه ساخت

خاکم یاد داد و صبا را بهانه ساخت

He shook the skirt and made it an excuse

He made the dust fly and blamed the wind for it

If are you not satisfied with this narration and it is difficult for Persian and Urdu people to locate this *Tafsīr* then listen to the narration of a book which is easily available and whose author is a famous extremist Shī‘ī. Have a look at it and have a little self-honour and amaze over how the friendship and loyalty of Rasūlullāh’s صلى الله عليه وسلم companion in the cave is acknowledged by his own mujtahidīn and scholars notwithstanding their enmity, hatred and doggedness. The antidote of

their sickness of hatred is written in their own books. If this disease of yours is still not treated and you destroy yourself thereby then it is your choice. Study this narration of *Ḥamlah Ḥaydariyyah*:

چو سالم بحفظ جہاں افریں	چنین گفت راوی کہ سالار دین
بسوئے سرائے ابو بکر رفت	ز نزدیک این قوم پر مکر رفت
کہ سابق رسولش خبر داده بود	پے ہجرت او نیز اِمادہ بود
بگوشش ندائے سفر در کشید	نبی بر در خانہ اش چون رسید
زخانہ بروں رفت و ہمراہ شد	چوں بو بکر زان حال اِگاہ شد
نبی کند نعلین از پائے خویش	گرفتند پس راہ بر تپ بہ پیش
پئے خودز دشمن نہفتن گرفت	بسر پنچہ این راہ رفتن گرفت
قدوم فلک سای مجروح گشت	برفتند چندی ز دامان دشت
ولے زیں حدیث ست جائے شگفت	ابو بکر اِنکہ بدوشش گرفت
کہ بار نبوت تواند کشید	کہ در کس چنان قوت اید پدید
چو اِ گردید پیدا نشان سحر	برفتند القصہ چندے دگر
ز چشم کسان دور یکسوز راہ	بجستند جائیکہ باشد پناہ
کہ خواندی عرب غار ثورث لقب	بدید ند غارے دران تیرہ شب
ولے پیش بنہاد بو بکر پائے	گرفتند در خوف این غار جائے
قبارا بدید و این را بجید	بہر جا کہ سوراخ یار خنہ دید
یکے رخنہ نگرفته ماند از قضا	بدیں گو نہ تاشد تمام این قبا
کف پائے خودرا نمود استوار	براں رخنہ گویند این یار غار
کہ دور از خرمدی نہاید بسے	نیا مدجز او این شگرف از کیسے
چنان دید سورا خپار اتمام	بغار اندروں در شب تیرہ فام
یکے کامد افزوں بروپا فشرد	دران تیرہ شب یک بیک چوں شہرد
بدینساں چوں بر داخت از رفت و رو	نیا مد چینی کارے از غیر او
نشستند یکجا بہم ہر دو یار	در اِمد رسول خدا ہم بغار

The narrator relates: “When Rasūlullāh ﷺ passed peacefully and unharmed by that deceiving and cunning people in Allah’s protection and went to the house of Abū Bakr, he was already prepared to emigrate since Rasūlullāh ﷺ had already informed him. Once Rasūlullāh ﷺ reached his house, he whispered to him to prepare for journey. After Abū Bakr learnt about this, he left his home and accompanied Rasūlullāh ﷺ and they began their journey to Madīnah. Rasūlullāh ﷺ removed his

sandals from his blessed feet to hide away from the enemy and began tip toeing. The blessed feet of Rasūlullāh ﷺ were injured due to walking barefoot like this in the desert. Thus, Abū Bakr lifted Rasūlullāh ﷺ on to his shoulders. However, there is uncertainty here for how can a person have so much strength to lift the weight of nubuwwah. Nevertheless, they continued walking ahead. When the light of dawn began to appear, they searched for a place which was out of people’s sight and away from the pathway wherein they could hide. A cave appeared in that night’s darkness which the Arabs call the Cave of Thowr. They made this cave their sanctuary. First, Abū Bakr stepped in and closed all the holes he found by tearing his shawl and covering them. Like this, his entire shawl was finished yet one hole remained open. It is said that the cave companion placed his foot on that hole. However, this is something astonishing and beyond comprehension as to how did he manage to see all those holes in the cave in the darkness of night? To locate all the holes on such a dark night and place his foot on the last hole is not possible for anyone besides him. Rasūlullāh ﷺ then entered the cave and both companions stayed therein.”¹

It is learnt from this narration that Rasūlullāh ﷺ himself went to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr’s ﷺ house and took him along. All the services Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ﷺ rendered, viz. lifting Rasūlullāh ﷺ on his shoulders, going first into the cave and cleaning it, tearing his shawl and closing all the holes and closing the last hole with the sole of his foot all display deep love and affection not hypocrisy and hatred. If these services rendered by him on the night of hijrah are signs of hypocrisy, what are the signs of love and affection then?

It is appropriate to note that the claim made by some Shī’ah that Rasūlullāh ﷺ prevented all the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ from leaving their houses and that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ﷺ violated this command is totally erroneous. This is because their own historians acknowledge that Rasūlullāh ﷺ allowed all the other Ṣaḥābah ﷺ to proceed before him and only kept two persons behind, viz. Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ for him to sleep in his place and Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ﷺ

1 *Ḥamlah Ḥaydarī* vol. 1 pg. 47 line 16 to pg. 48 line 2

to accompany him on the journey. Which other Ṣaḥābā remained behind whom Rasūlullāh ﷺ prevented from leaving his house and who he addressed:

نه من امر خدا بشمار ساندم و گفتم که از خانه خود با بیرون میائید تو چرا مخالفت امر الهی کردی

I informed you of the command of Allah not to leave your house. Why did you violate this divine commandment?

This fact that all the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ emigrated beforehand and only Sayyidunā ‘Alī and Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ﷺ remained behind is verified by the acknowledgement of the Shī‘ī historians. Accordingly it appears in *Ḥamlah Ḥaydariyyah*:

چنین داد فرمان ز لطف و کرم	حبیب خدا چون بدید این ستم
نہاں یکیک از چشم اعدا روند	کہ اصحاب ہجرت بہ یثرب کند
برفتند پنہاں بدنبال ہم بدنبال ہم	نہادند یاران بفرمان قدم
علی ماند و ابو بکر و خیر الانام	بدینگونہ رفتند یاران تمام

When Allah’s beloved saw this oppression and persecution, out of his compassion and kindness he commanded all the Ṣaḥābah to emigrate to Madīnah in secrecy from the enemy. The friends of Nabī ﷺ left in secrecy to comply with this command. Like this all the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ left and only ‘Alī, Abū Bakr ﷺ and Rasūlullāh ﷺ remained behind.

It is proven beyond doubt that Rasūlullāh ﷺ allowed Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ﷺ to accompany him by the permission and command of Allah ﷻ and Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ﷺ fulfilled this responsibility in a proficient way.

Objection to the Second Virtue

I mentioned in the second virtue that if Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ﷺ was not the ardent lover of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and not happy to sacrifice his life and wealth for Rasūlullāh ﷺ, he would not have accompanied Rasūlullāh ﷺ on such an arduous journey.

The Shīʿī scholars object that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr’s ﷺ intention was not sincere. Accordingly, the author of *Dhū al-Fiqār*:

بم چیں باتفاق فریقین شرط ترتب ثواب بر ہجرت صحت نیت ست الی قوله پس مادا میکہ مارا علم بہ صحت نیت
ابو بکر بہ ثبوت نہ رسد دخول اورا در مدلول این ایہ متیقن نہی شود و تا متیقن نہ شود احتجاج باین ایہ بر علو مرتبت
او نہی تواندشد

With the consensus of both sects, sincerity is a condition for one to be rewarded for emigrating. Thus, until we are not certain about the sincerity of Abū Bakr, his inclusion in the virtue of this virtue is not certain. When this is uncertain, this verse cannot be used to prove his virtue.

Qāḍī Nūr Allāh writes in *Iḥqāq al-Ḥaq*:

و قد ظهر من جزعه و بکائه ما یكون من مثله فساد الحال فی الاختفا الی قوله فافضلیتہ فی الغار یفتخر بها
لابی بکر لولا المکابرة و اللداد

From his (i.e. Abū Bakr) fear and weeping it is clear that his internal condition was evil and his intention was corrupt.

The answer to this objection has already been given in the *Tafsīr* of Imām Ḥasan al-ʿAskarī عليه السلام which was mentioned previously. When Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم asked him:

ارضیت ان تكون معی یا ابا بکر تطلب کما اطلب الی قوله قال ابو بکر یا رسول الله اما انا لو عشت عمر
الدنيا اعذب جميعا اشد العذاب

“Abū Bakr! Are you pleased to travel with me on this journey notwithstanding that the kuffār of the Quraysh will be out to kill you just as they are out to kill me?” Abū Bakr said: “O Rasūlullāh! If due to accompanying you I am afflicted with the worst of afflictions until Qiyāmah then I accept it.”

What do we learn from here? Did Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه have a good or bad intention? Since the reality of intention is visible from actions and the state of the heart is learnt from behaviours and deeds, so the service rendered by Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه on the night of hijrah shows his good intention or bad intention?

Objection to the Third Virtue

I stated under the third virtue that from the time they left home until they reached Madīnah, the kind and gentle words spoken by Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه show that he had deep rooted love for Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم. The Shī'ah object that the actions of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه display his hypocrisy and hatred. I will therefore list his services on the night of hijrah so that it becomes certain that the assistance offered by Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه can only be offered by a true lover and no one else.

1. When Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم and Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه began the journey, the latter would watch here and there. Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم asked, “O Abū Bakr! What is the matter?” Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه replied: “O Rasūlullāh! My only purpose is to protect you.”

The author of *Muntahā al-Kalām Riyāḍ al-Nazrah* writes the gist of this in the following words:

چون صدیق بہمراہ انحضرت بارشاد شریف متوجہ غار شد گایے پیش می رفت و گایے در عقب و زمانے بہ جانب راست توجہ می کرد و ساعتے بہ طرف چپ قطع راہ می نمود حضرت پر سید کہ اے ابو بکر گایے ترا چہیں ندیدہ بودم چہ افتاد کہ در رفتن راہ اختلاف می کنی عرض کرد کہ مقصود من نگاہبانی حضرت از شر دشمنان است مبادا کہ ازین جہات در رسند و حضرت را از راہ تا غار بردوش برد

When Abū Bakr walked towards the cave (of Thowr) by the command of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, he would sometimes walk ahead of him, sometimes behind him, sometimes to his right and sometimes to his left. Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم asked: “O Abū Bakr! I did not see you doing this before. Why are you moving all over while walking?” Abū Bakr replied: “My purpose is your protection. The enemy should not come from these directions and harm you.” He then carried Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم on his shoulders till they reached the cave.

2. When Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه learnt that Rasūlullāh's صلى الله عليه وسلم feet were tired, he lifted Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم on his shoulders — without Rasūlullāh

ﷺ saying a word — until they reached the cave. How fortunate is Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ on whose shoulders Rasūlullāh ﷺ placed his blessed foot! I have already quoted this from Ḥamlah Ḥaydariyyah.

3. When they reached the cave, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ entered the cave first and cleaned it and closed all the holes. He then called Rasūlullāh ﷺ and made him sleep on his thigh. I have already quoted this above. Qāḍī Nūr Allāh Shostarī also acknowledges that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ entered the cave first.¹
4. A snake bit that foot of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ which he placed on the last hole. Rasūlullāh ﷺ comforted him thereafter.
5. As long as they remained in the cave, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr's رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ son would bring food from home and feed Rasūlullāh ﷺ.
6. Rasūlullāh ﷺ ordered two camels from Sayyidunā Abū Bakr's رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ son which he brought. Rasūlullāh ﷺ mounted one and allowed Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ to mount with him while 'Āmir — the shepherd of Bayt al-Ḥarām and driver — mounted the other. I will pen these points down just as the author of Ḥamlah Ḥaydariyyah did.

Proof for Point 4

رسیدند کفار باہے بران
کہ بر روی سوراخ بود استوار
و زان جرح افغان و شد بلند
رسیدند اعدا مکن راز فاش
کہ از زخم افعی نیا بے گزند

چوں شد کار پردا ختہ این چنان
در اندم کف پائے این یار غار
رسیدش زدندان مارے گزند
بیمبر با و گفت ایستہ باش
مخور غم مگر دان صدرا بلند

1 The Arabic text is as follows:

کیا قال ان قوله تعالى ثانی اثین بیان حال رسول الله صلی الله علیه و سلم باعتبار دخوله فی الغار ثانیاً و دخول ابی بکر
اولاً کیا نقل فی السیر

When everything transpired in this manner, the kuffār followed the footprints and reached (the cave). At that time, a snake had bitten the foot of the cave companion (Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه) which he had placed on the hole. He scam aloud due to the pain. Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم told him, “Keep silent. The enemy is here. Do not disclose the secret. Do not grieve and do not scream because the snake bite will not harm you.”¹

Proof for Point 5

بسر برد ایں شہ بفرقان رب	بغار اندرون تاسہ روز و سہ شب
بہ بردی دران دران غار اِب و طعام	شدی پور بو بکر ہنگام شام
حبیب خدای جہان را خیر	نمودی ہم از حال اصحاب شر

Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم remained for three days and three nights in the cave in conformity to the divine command. Abū Bakr’s son would bring food and drink to the cave at night. He would also inform the beloved of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم of the condition of the plotters (kuffār).²

Proof for Point 6³

کہ اے چون پدر اہل صدق و صفا	نبی گفت پس پور بو بکر را
کہ مارا رساند بہ یترب دیار	دو جمازہ باید کنوں راہ وار
بدنبال کاری کہ فرمودہ بود	برفت از برش پور بو بکر زود
برو کرد رازے نبی اشکار	بم از اہل دین بدیکی جملہ دار
دو جمازہ پھر پیہر پر	بگفتش فلاں روز وقت سحر
دو جمازہ در دم مہیا نمود	از و جملہ دار ایں سخن چوں شنود
رسول خدا عازم راہ گشت	تہی شد ازاں قوم ایں کوہ دشت
دو جمازہ اوردہ بد جملہ دار	بصبح چہارم بر امد ز غار
ابو بکر را کرد با خود قرین	نشست از بریک شتر شاہ دین
بہراہ او گشت عامر سوار	بر امد بران دیگرے جملہ دار

1 *Hamlah Haydarī* pg. 48 line 5

2 *Hamlah Haydarī* vol. 1 pg. 40 line 20

3 I will answer the objections against the fourth, fifth and sixth virtue while answering the objections of the other virtues

Rasūlullāh ﷺ told Abū Bakr’s son, “O truthful and faithful one like your father!¹ There is now a need for two camels which can take us to Madīnah.” Abū Bakr’s son moved swiftly to complete the task. There was a driver among the believers. He disclosed to him Nabī’s ﷺ secret and told him to take two camels for Rasūlullāh ﷺ on a certain morning. When the driver heard this, he immediately arranged two camels. When the desert was clear from that nation (the road was clear), Rasūlullāh ﷺ began his journey. He left the cave on the fourth morning while the driver had brought two camels. Rasūlullāh ﷺ mounted one camel and let Abū Bakr mount with him while the driver ‘Āmir mounted the other camel and left with them.²

Objection 7 to the Seventh Virtue

I mentioned previously that by the words “صَاحِبِهِ” (his companion), the companionship of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is proven. This status has been attained by none besides him since Allah ﷻ did not specifically mention the companionship of any other person. The Shī‘ah scholars object to this in various ways.

Firstly, the word “صَاحِبِهِ” means companion, and no virtue is proven from this word. In fact, Allah ﷻ has referred to a kāfir being the “صَاحِبِ” of a believer. Allah ﷻ says:

قَالَ لَهُ صَاحِبُهُ وَهُوَ يُحَاوِرُهُ أَكَفَرْتَ بِالَّذِي خَلَقَكَ مِنْ تُرَابٍ

His companion said to him while he was conversing with him, “Have you disbelieved in He who created you from dust?”³

1 The Shī‘ah should ponder over this couplet. How clearly Rasūlullāh ﷺ mentions the truthfulness and sincerity of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

2 Ḥamlah Ḥaydarī vol. 1 pg. 48 line 24

3 Sūrah al-Kahf: 37

At another place, Allah ﷻ relates that Nabī Yūsuf عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام said to his companions in the jail who were disbelievers:

يُصَاحِبِي السِّجْنِ

O [my] two companions of prison.¹

Forget any virtue being proven from this word, Islam cannot even be proven. And īmān is necessary for the technical companionship to be established which Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ did not possess.

The answer to the first verse is that definitely in the verse:

قَالَ لَهُ صَاحِبُهُ وَهُوَ يُحَاوِرُهُ

His companion said to him while he was conversing with him.

Allah referred to a kāfir as the ṣāḥib of a believer but Allah couples that with humiliating him and exposing his disbelief by stating:

أَكْفَرْتَ بِالَّذِي خَلَقَكَ مِنْ تُرَابٍ

Have you disbelieved in He who created you from dust?

On the other hand, when Allah referred to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ as ṣāḥib, such a word is mentioned which indicates love and comfort. Allah says quoting Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, “لَا تَحْزَنُ إِنَّ اللَّهَ مَعَنَا” (Do not grieve; indeed Allah is with us.) Is there any semblance between the two?

The answer to the second verse is that the word ṣāḥib in

يُصَاحِبِي السِّجْنِ

1 Sūrah Yūsuf: 39

is connected to “السَّجْنِ” (prison) and not to Nabī Yūsuf عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, whereas in the verse under discussion the word ṣāḥib is connected to Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

With regards to Sayyidah Abū Bakr’s رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ accepting īmān, it is verified through authentic Shīṭī narrations. Qāḍī Nūr Allāh Shostarī writes in *Majālis al-Mu’minīn*:

خالد بن سعيد از سابقین اولین بوده اسلام او مقدم بر اسلام ابو بکر بلکه ابو بکر به برکت خوابی که او دیده بود مسلمان شده بود بالجمله سب اسلام خالد این بود که در خواب دیده بود که بر کنار ایتشی افروخته ایستاده است و پدر اومی خوابد که او را در ایش اندازه که ناگاه رسالت پناه گریبان او گرفته بجانب خود کشید و باو گفت که بجانب من بیانا یاتش نیفتی خالد ازین خواب خوفناک بیدار شد و قسم یاد کرد که این خواب میں صحیح ست و اِنگاه متوجه خدمت حضرت رسالت گردید در راه ابو بکر باو ملاقات نمود و از حال او پرسید خالد صورت واقعه را باو بیان نمود ابو بکر نیز باو موافقت کرد و بخدمت انحضرت اِمد ندو بشف اسلام فائز گردیدند

Khālid ibn Saʿd is among the first forerunners and accepted Islam before Abū Bakr. The reality is that due to the blessings of the dream of Khālid, Abū Bakr accepted Islam. The story of Khālid ibn Saʿd’s Islam is that he saw himself in a dream standing on the edge of a blazing fire. His father was about to fling him into the fire when Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ suddenly caught hold of his shirt and pulled him towards himself saying, “Come to me so that you do not fall into the fire.” Khālid woke up from this nightmare and said on oath that his dream was true. He thus went Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Abū Bakr met him en route and asked his condition. Khālid narrated his dream. Abū Bakr joined him and both of them came to Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and were blessed with the wealth of Islam.¹

Those who read this narration can come to a sensible conclusion that the person who accepts Islam due to divine inspiration and whom Allah inspired to accept īmān through a true dream, who can blurt out regarding him that he was ignorant about īmān? For Allah’s sake, honestly assess this statement of Qāḍī Nūr Allāh Shostarī: “Abū Bakr accepted Islam due to the blessings of the dream that Khālid saw with the statement of Mujtahid², “It is the consensus of the Shīṭī scholars that

1 Urdu translation of *Majālis al-mu’minīn* by Qāḍī Nūr Allāh Shostarī pg. 384

2 Mujtahid refers to Moulānā Sayyid Dildār ‘Alī Nāṣirābādī/Nasirabadī. His father’s name is Sayyid Muḥammad Mu’īn. He was born in Nasirabad (Jā’is) near Raebareli in 1166 A.H (1753). *continued...*

Abū Bakr did not accept īmān from the very beginning.”¹

continued from page 108

1 He gained preliminary knowledge in his hometown after which he went to Raebareli and Ilahabad to study secondary knowledge. He studied logical and traditional sciences under Moulānā Bāb Allah in Raebarel, Sayyid Ghulām Ḥusayn Daknī in Ilahabad and Moulānā Ḥaydar ‘Alī Sandelwī ibn Mullā Ḥamd Allah in Sandela near Lucknow. After completing his studies in India, he travelled to Iraq and Iran at the government’s expense and studied under Mullā Sayyid Muḥammad Bāqir Bahbahānī (d. 1208 A.H) and Sayyid Mahdī Ṭabāṭabā’ī (d. 1212 A.H). Moulānā Dildār ‘Alī got permission from the teachers of Najaf, Karbala and Sāmūrā and then travelled to Iran where he sat in the lessons of Sayyid Mahdī ibn Hidāyat Allah Iṣfahānī. He also travelled to Qum and Mashhad and benefitted from the scholars there. (*Maṭla’ Anwār* pg. 220, 221)

In 1194, he returned to Lucknow and was pronounced a mujtahid and a leader of the Shī’ah by the scholars of Farangi Mahal. The author of the Shī’i book *Tadhkirat al-‘Ulamā’*, Sayyid Mahdī ibn Sayyid Najaf Riḍwī said that Sayyid Dildār ‘Alī was the first Indian mujtahid.

Sayyid Dildār ‘Alī’s forefathers were from the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā’ah. (*Muqaddamah Waqā’i’ Dil Pazīr* pg. 102) Moulānā Sayyid Muḥammad Makhdūm Ḥusaynī — the author of *Towḍīḥ al-Sa’adat* — stated that Sayyid Dildār ‘Alī’s early forefathers were Sunnī and were from the lineage of Ja’far “al-Kadhāb”. Since Ja’far ibn ‘Alī testified to his brother Ḥasan al-‘Askarī عليه السلام leaving no offspring after his death — whilst the twelvers believe in the birth of the (bogus) twelfth Imām — he was hence labelled a *kadhāb* (great liar), whereas in reality he was a very pious man.

Through the efforts of Moulānā Muḥammad ‘Alī Faizabadī and Shāh ‘Alī Akbar Mowdūdī Ilahabadī (d. 1210 A.H), the secretary of state Sarfarāz al-Dowlah Nawāb Ḥasan Riḍā Khān arranged for Zuhr Ṣalāh to be performed in congregation at his place on Friday the 13th of Rajab 1200 A.H, corresponding to the 13th of May 1786, and performed Zuhr and ‘Aṣr Ṣalāh behind Moulānā Dildār ‘Alī. Two weeks thereafter on the 27th of that very month, Ṣalāt al-Jumu’ah was performed in congregation behind Moulānā Dildār ‘Alī. Moulānā Ḥakīm ‘Abd al-Ḥayy Marḥūm — the former caretaker of Nadwat al-‘Ulamā’ Lucknow and the author of *Nazhat al-Khawāṭir* — has written: “Owing to the efforts of Shāh ‘Alī Akbar Chishtī Mowdūdī and Mullā Muḥammad ‘Alī Faizabadī, Nawāb Ḥasan Riḍā Khān established the Jumu’ah and congregational prayer behind Moulānā Sayyid Dildār ‘Alī on the 13th of Rajab 1200 A.H. This was the first day that the Shī’ah made their own Jumu’ah and congregation in the middle of India.” (*Gul Ra’nā* pg. 153, 154)

Moulānā Dildār ‘Alī has written many books. The author of *Maṭla’ Anwār* has enumerated the names of twenty-seven of his books amongst which are six books and treatises which he wrote in reply to Shāh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz Dehlawī’s عليه السلام classic *Tuḥfah Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah*. *Ṣawārim al-Ilāhiyyāt*, *Ḥusām al-Islām* and *Iḥyā’ al-Sunnah* are answers to the following chapters of *Tuḥfah*, viz. *Ilāhiyyāt*, *Nubuwwah*, *Ākhirah*, and *Ḥujjah*. *Dhū al-Fiqār* is an answer to chapter 12 of *Tuḥfah*. *continued...*

¹Their enmity and hatred have blinded them to such an extent that they reject the īmān of such a truthful person whom Allah guided towards Islam by means of a true dream.

Mujtahid said that he rejected īmān. I will answer this in different ways.

1. We have to prove that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه understood the nubuwwah of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم to be true and accepted his invitation from his heart — whether Mujtahid refers to this as Islam or īmān. All praise is due to Allah, this has been proven from the acknowledgement of Qāḍī Nūr Allāh Shostarī. And if Mujtahid has differentiated between īmān and Islam in this way that īmān refers to believing with the heart while Islam refers to verbal acknowledgement and he rejects the īmān of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه thinking that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه did not accept the nubuwwah of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم from his heart, then the attestation of the third martyr is sufficient for his rebuttal.

ابو بكر به برکت خوابے کہ او دیدہ بود مسلمان شدہ بود

Abū Bakr accepted Islam due to the blessings of the dream that Khālid saw.

2. I accept that there is a difference between īmān and Islam and that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr's رضي الله عنه Islam — not his īmān — is proven by the narration of the third martyr. Nevertheless, I will prove Sayyidunā Abū

continued from page 109

1 Proof of imāmah appears at the end of *Ṣawārim*. *Risālah Ghaybat* is a refutation of the statements of Shāh رحمۃ اللہ علیہ regarding the absent 12th Imām. *Asās al-Uṣūl* and *ʿImād al-Islām* are among his famous works. Moulānā Dildār 'Alī made great efforts in Western India to spread and establish Shī'ism. The bloom of Shī'ism today in Oudh is the fruits of his efforts. He passed away on the eve of the 19th of Rajab 1235 A.H corresponding to the 3rd of May 1820 in Ghāzī al-Dīn Ḥaydar Lucknow. His eldest son, 'the king of the scholars', Sayyid Muḥammad performed the Salāt al-Janāzah and buried him in his prayer room. From then, Moulānā Dildār 'Alī has been called Ghufrān Ma'āb. (Shaykh Muḥammad Firāsāt)

Bakr's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ īmān from the statement of Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī al-Murtaḍā رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ which utterly razes the entire argument of Mujtahid ṣāhib to the ground. The believers should listen to this from their heart and regret over the ignorance of their seniors. 'Allāmah al-Ḥillī writes in *Sharḥ Tajrīd*:

قال عليه السلام يوما على المنبر انا الصديق الاكبر انا القاروق الاعظم اسلمت قبل ان اسلم ابو بكر و
امنتم قبل ان امنتم

'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ announced on the pulpit one day: "I am al-Ṣiddīq al-Akbar (the most truthful). I am al-Fārūq al-A'ẓam (the greatest criterion). I accepted Islam before Abū Bakr accepted Islam and believed before he believed."

'Allāmah al-Ḥillī has certified the Islam and the īmān of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ on the tongue of Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. If Mujtahid's statement was not falsified by Nūr Allāh Shostarī's statement, then his statement that "Abū Bakr did not accept īmān from the very beginning" is most definitely debunked by the statement of Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. And all praise belongs to Allah for this.

Furthermore, it is realised from this narration that the Islam and īmān of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was so honoured, revered and famous that Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ boasts that he brought Islam and īmān prior to him. Had Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ not been perfect in Islam an īmān or a hypocrite or he accepted īmān for worldly benefits, Allah forbid, as claimed by the Shī'ah then why does Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ boast about accepting īmān before him?

3. The fallaciousness of the Shī'ī scholars' statement that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ brought Islam only externally and according to the fortune tellers he became a Muslim out of greed for the khilāfah is proven from this verse. Qāḍī's testimony wherein he testified to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ being among the first forerunners debunks everything what he wrote before that and after. No one should think that Qāḍī's statement has only falsified the

statement of the Shī'ī scholars and mujtahidīn. In fact, it has also refuted the statement of the Shī'ī Imām Mahdī since he also claims that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه accepted īmān out of greed for the world and he would hear about the kingdom and dominance of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم from the Jews, thus he accordingly pronounced the kalimah externally. Mullā Bāqir Majlisī has quoted in *Biḥār al-Anwār* with reference to *Risālah Raj'iyah* on the authority of Shaykh Ṣadūq Muḥammad ibn Bābuwayh al-Qummī:

اسلام ابو بكر طوعا نبود اما برائے طمع دنیا زیرا که ایشان با کفره یهود مخلوط بودند الی قوله چون حضرت دعوی رسالت فرمود ایشان از گفته یهود به ظاہر کلمتین گفتند و در باطن کافر بودند

Abū Bakr was forced to accept Islam and it was polluted with worldly greed since he had met the disbelieving Jews. When Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم announced his nubuwwah, he (Abū Bakr) pronounced the two kalimahs (clauses) externally in accordance to what the Jews told him but he was a disbeliever internally.¹

In conclusion, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr's رضي الله عنه Islam and īmān has been thoroughly proven. When this has been thoroughly proven, then by the word ṣāḥib, it is verified by the Qur'ān that he was the Ṣaḥābī of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم thus making him deserving of the virtues and status of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم which the Shī'ah also accept. Notwithstanding this, if a person denies his Ṣaḥābiyyat and does not accept his virtues, he has rejected the Qur'ān.

Objection 8 to the Eight Virtue

I stated above that when Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه saw that the kuffār had come to the mouth of the cave, he was extremely grieved and worried that Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم should not be harmed. Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم consoled him:

1 This is one of those narrations which majority of Shī'ī books have whose ludicrousness and stupidity is laughable. Further on, I will quote the entire narration and please the believers where I will write about the īmān of Shaykhayn.

لَا تَحْزَنُ إِنَّ اللَّهَ مَعَنَا

Do not grieve; indeed Allah is with us.

The word “مَعَنَا” has a first person plural pronoun thus including Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in Allah’s togetherness. Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ included Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in this union. The Shī’ah object to this in different ways.

1. Was Sayyidunā Abū Bakr’s رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ grief obedience or disobedience? If it is obedience, then Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ forbade obedience and if it is disobedience then Sayyidunā Abū Bakr’s رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ disobedience is established.
2. Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ had no conviction on the words of Allah سُبحانه وتعالى and His Rasūl صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. He witnessed many signs of protection in the cave like the dove, spider, etc. but yet did not have conviction on Allah’s سُبحانه وتعالى protection. He began crying aloud out of fear. Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ tried to scold and warn him, but he continued crying and screaming.
3. The object of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr’s رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ crying and screaming was so that the kuffār could hear him and capture Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ continued explaining to him and forbidding him from crying but he was adamant and he wished to expose his evil and corrupt intentions in the guise of crying. In fact, some intellectuals have exaggerated it to this extent that when his crying did not work and the kuffār did not hear his voice, he put his foot out of the cave so that the kuffār can notice it and thus enter the cave. Immediately, the snake bit him with Allah’s سُبحانه وتعالى command and he was forced to pull his foot back into the cave. When Sayyidunā Abū Bakr’s رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ aim was not met by putting out his foot i.e. the kuffār did not capture Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ from the cave, he began harming Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ in a different way. He began speaking about Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and exposed his grief over his loneliness. Hence, Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ told him: “Do not grieve over ‘Alī’s loneliness. Allah is with me and ‘Alī.”

4. They take two meanings from “Allah is with us”. One is that “Allah is with me and ‘Alī رضي الله عنه.” The second is that Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم informed Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, “Allah is with us i.e. Allah is aware of my piety and your wickedness. I will be rewarded for my piety while you will be punished for your evil.”

After hearing these points, every person is flabbergasted and flummoxed and cannot possibly awaken from his astonishment. Are these objections or the rise of madmen; answers or the fall of crazy folk? In fact, those who possess intelligence will not believe that these words came out of the mouth of a scholar or mujtahid. Whoever doubts this should open up *Iḥqāq al-Ḥaq*, *Majālis al-Mu’minīn*, etc., and see for himself with what vigour and force the third martyr wrote these arguments, how Mullā Mashhadī boasted over them and how proud was Sayyid Muḥammad Qillī with the answer of the seal of the muḥaddithīn. In fact, he sternly criticised Shāh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz رحمته الله since he did not quote the arguments of Qāḍī Nūr Allāh Shostarī verbatim. He expresses his anger in these words:

ناصری رامی بایست که این عبارت جناب قاضی را نقل می کرد تراشیدن تقریرے از طرف خود نسبت دادن بطرف شیعیان و بعد ازان بجواب این مشغول شدن از اعظم مکائد این ناصبی ست

It was appropriate for the nāṣibī (Sunnī) to quote Qāḍī’s entire text and thereafter object to it. To fabricate a text and link it to the Shī’ah and thereafter answer it himself is the greatest deception of that Sunnī.

I have written the gist of those arguments. Nonetheless, I will quote the actual texts also. I humbly request the Shī’ah to judge unbiasedly as to whether one should be proud of such arguments or feel ashamed of them. According to me, if such ludicrous arguments are related to any intelligent and modest person, he will feel ashamed and embarrassed. I am ignorant of the wisdom and pearls presented by Qāḍī and Mullā in these arguments which they and their followers are so proud of. I find nothing in them which is not laughable and ridiculous. There is no word therein which is not free from stupidity and foolishness.

زیائے تابسرش ہر کجا کہ می نگرم
کرشمہ دامن دل می کشد کہ جا اینجاست

From head to toe wherever you look
It is evident that it is nothing but impurity

In my opinion, Shāh رحمه الله has done a great favour to Qāḍī and Mullā by not quoting their words verbatim, thus saving them from disgrace and embarrassment. Since the Shī'ah are hell-bent on humiliating them, I am forced to quote those texts. I deem that to answer such rubbish is a waste of time. Nonetheless, for the benefit of the foolish, I will pen something.

With regards to the first objection of whether Sayyidunā Abū Bakr's رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ grief was obedience or disobedience. If it was obedience, then why did Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ forbid it and if it was disobedience then Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ being a sinner is established from the Qur'ān.

A counter charge to the above would be that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى عَمَّا يُشْرِكُونَ addressed Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ:

لَا تَخَفْ إِنَّكَ أَنْتَ الْأَعْلَى

Fear not. Indeed, it is you who are superior.¹

Allah also addressed Nabī Lūṭ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ:

وَلَا تَحْزَنْ إِنَّا مُنْجُوكَ وَاهْلِكَ

Grieve not. Indeed, we will save you and your family.²

1 Sūrah Ṭāhā: 68

2 Sūrah al-'Ankabūt: 32,33

Allah ﷻ even addressed Rasūlullāh ﷺ:

فَلَا يَحْزُنُكَ قَوْلُهُمْ

So let not their speech grieve you.¹

It is learnt from here that Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام and Nabī Lūṭ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام had fear and Rasūlullāh ﷺ was grieved over the statements of the kuffār. Allah ﷻ stated: “Do not fear,” and “Do not grieve,” to console and comfort them.

We ask the Shī'ah. Was the fear of those ambiyā' obedience or disobedience? If it was obedience then Allah ﷻ prohibited such obedience. And if it was disobedience then the infallible ambiyā' were sinners. Your answer to the above is our exact answer to your allegation.

Qāḍī Nūr Allāh Shostarī wrote in *Majālis al-Mu'minīn* while mentioning some beneficial incidents of Shaykh al-Mufīd in answer to the argument of Abū al-Ḥasan Khayyāṭ — the leader of the mu'tazilah: “The infallibility of the ambiyā' is proven by rational proof. Thus whatever is related to them; the apparent meaning is not meant while Abū Bakr's infallibility is not proven hence the apparent meaning is applicable when referring to him.” This is his text:

مضمون این آیات نهی است لیکن انبیاء را زارتکاب قبیحی که فاعل این مستحق ذم میشود بواسطه دلیل عقلی که بر عصمت انبیاء اجتناب ایشان از گناهای قائم گشت موجب عدول از ظواهر شده از طوایب این آیات عدول می کنم و بر گاه اتفاق حاصل باشد در آنکه ابو بکر معصوم نه بود واجب است که اجرای نهی که درشان این واقع شده به ظواهر آنکه فتح حال ابو بکر ست بماند

The purport of these verses is prohibition. And for the ambiyā' to perpetrate an evil action is impiety since the perpetrator of an evil action is worthy of reproach. A rational proof is available to prove the infallibility of the ambiyā' and their restraint from sins. I thus turn away from the apparent meaning of these verses. There is unanimity that Abū Bakr was

1 Sūrah Yāsīn: 76

not infallible. The prohibition issued was to depict Abū Bakr's condition which is intact on its place.

I say in response to this that to deem fear as disobedience is erroneous. Moreover, the ambiyā's fear and the subsequent consolation of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى; there is no need to shy away from the apparent meaning of this prohibition. In fact, to regard fear as disobedience is actually intentionally criticising the ambiyā' and giving support to those who do not accept the infallibility of the ambiyā'. Moreover, fear is an emotional state which no human is free from whether he be a nabī, an imām or a saint and for which Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى will not take a person to account. Thus, Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ and Nabī Hārūn عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ were commanded to explain to Fir'awn and invite him to īmān. They were fearful and said:

رَبَّنَا إِنَّا نَخَافُ أَنْ يُفْرِطَ عَلَيْنَا أَوْ أَنْ يَطْغَىٰ

Our Rabb, indeed we are afraid that he will hasten (punishment) against us or that he will transgress.¹

Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى comforted them declaring:

لَا تَخَافَا إِنِّي مَعَكُمَا

Fear not. Indeed, I am with you both.²

Ponder for a moment. When Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ and Nabī Hārūn عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ feared notwithstanding being ambiyā' and Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى does not reproach their fear and their nubuwwah is not affected in the least, then what sin did Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ commit by fearing whereas he is unanimously neither a Nabī nor infallible? Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ just comforted Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ by saying, "do not grieve; indeed Allah is with us."

1 Sūrah Ṭāhā: 45

2 Sūrah Ṭāhā: 46

I puzzle at the understanding of the third martyr who has included the fear and grief of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ in the list of sins thereby levelling an accusation against all the ambiyā’ then turned away from the apparent meaning of fear without any need whereas the word fear in relation to the ambiyā’ appears many times in the Qur’ān and the mufasssīrīn have taken the apparent meaning and none have regarded fear as a sin, disobedience or a defect. Nothing happens by the ridiculous statement of the third martyr. Thus ‘Allāmah al-Ṭabarsī — a great Shī’ī researcher — has written under the commentary of

فَأَوْجَسَ مِنْهُمْ خِيفَةً

He perceived fear from them.¹

فلما امتنعوا عن الأكل خاف منهم و ظن انهم يريدون سوءا فقالوا اى قالت الملائكة لا تخف يا ابراهيم

When the angels did not partake of the food, Nabī Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ developed fear for them and thought that they intended evil. They i.e. the angels thus said: “Do not fear, O Ibrāhīm!”

To understand the words of comfort and consolation used to remove fear which appears in the Qur’ān and aḥādīth as prohibition is a grave mistake. Otherwise, if it is understood that wherever the word **لَا** — a word of negative command — appears, prohibition from the forbidden is meant or wherever a thing is mentioned then to think its existence as necessary then thousands of objections will be levelled against the A’immah which the Shī’ah will not be able to answer besides presenting the misleading argument of infallibility. For instance, it is recorded in ‘*Ilal al-Sharā’i*’ that Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ addressed Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ:

يا على لا تتكلم عند الجماع و لا تنظر الى فرج امراتك و لا تجامع امراتك بشهوة امرأة غيرك

O ‘Alī! Do not speak during intercourse, do not look at your wife’s genitalia and do not cohabit with your wife with the passion for another woman.

1 Sūrah al-Dhāriyāt: 28

If someone asks: “Would Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ do these actions or not?” If not, then the rule: the prohibition of something shows its existence, is disproved. And if he used to do it, then was this action permissible or not. If it was obedience, why did Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ forbid it? And if it was disobedience, then the infallible Imām being sinful is proven.

If someone says that the Imām was infallible so we turn away from the apparent meaning although this prohibition is prohibition from disobedience, then we are forced to say that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was protected hence we turn away from the apparent meaning.

Friends! Why do you corrupt such an obvious thing with obstinacy and hatred? Think unbiasedly for a moment. If a friend is grieved over the harm of his friend and the latter consoles him by saying, “Do not fear. Allah is our helper,” then is this comforting and consoling or reprimanding and reproaching? If it is comforting, then understand “Do not grieve; indeed Allah is with us,” to be the same. Do not manipulate the verses of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and do not think that the usage of the word **لَا** is for prohibition and reproach. In fact, it sometimes comes for mercy and compassion. If someone deeply studies the words of the Qur’ān, he will realise that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى has used **لَا** out of compassion and love. Accordingly, Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ commanded Rasūlullāh سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى:

لَا تُحْرِكْ بِهِ لِسَانَكَ لِتَعْجَلَ بِهِ

Move not your tongue with it, (O Muḥammad), to hasten with recitation of the Qur’ān.¹

فَلَا تَذْهَبْ نَفْسُكَ عَلَيْهِمْ حَسْرَتٍ

So do not let yourself perish over them in regret.²

1 Sūrah al-Qiyāmah: 16

2 Sūrah al-Fāṭir: 8

Will Qāḍī regard these words as reproach and censure and the actions of movement of the tongue and regretting as disobedience and thereafter turn away from the apparent meaning due to the infallibility of Rasūlullāh ﷺ? If he regards that these words are used for compassion and love, he will realise the absurdity of his above stance.

The second objection was that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ had no conviction in Allah سبحانه وتعالى and His Rasūl صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and thus began wailing and screaming notwithstanding witnessing the many signs of protection. The answer to this is that firstly the wailing and screaming of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is not proven. The Qur’ān mentions ḥuzn (grief) and the meaning of grief does not include screaming and wailing. If the Shī’ah have a special dictionary in which they define the words used for the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ differently, then I am unaware of it. Ḥuzn means to grieve and not to wail and scream as Nūr Allāh Shostarī defines it in *Iḥqāq al-Ḥaq*:

حتی غلبته بکائه و تراید قلقه و انزعاجه

Until he starting weeping uncontrollably and his dread and panic increased.

Besides this, have a look at the commentaries of the Shī’ah themselves and see how they defined ḥuzn. Mufasssir al-Kāshānī has translated it in *Khulāṣat al-Manhaj* as:

چون گفت بیغمبر بار خود را اندوه مخور

When Rasūlullāh ﷺ told his cave companion, “Do not grieve.”

‘Allāmah al-Ṭabarsī states:

لا تحزن ای لا تخف

Do not grieve i.e. do not fear.

I am utterly confused at how Qāḍī managed to pull out wailing and screaming from ḥuzn.

I have already explained above that fear is an emotional state which affects everyone including the ambiyā' and A'immaḥ and it is not disobedience. To reiterate it, Sayyidunā Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ told Allah سُبحانه وتعالى:

أَخَافُ أَنْ يَقْتُلُونِ

I fear they will kill me.¹²

1 Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ: 33

2 It should be noted that Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ did not fear on only one occasion but on many occasions. Firstly, when he heard a voice from the unseen, "Indeed, I am Allah," he grew fearful. Allah سُبحانه وتعالى comforted him:

أَنْتِي لَا يَخَافُ لَدَيَّ الْمُرْسَلُونَ

Indeed, in My presence the messengers do not fear.

(Sūrah al-Naml: 10)

Secondly, when he challenged Fir'own's magicians and they displayed their ropes as snakes, Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ feared. Allah سُبحانه وتعالى informs us:

فَأَوْجَسَ فِي نَفْسِهِ خِيفَةً

And he sensed within himself apprehension.

(Sūrah Ṭāhā: 67)

Allah سُبحانه وتعالى stated to remove his fear:

قُلْنَا لَا تَخَفْ إِنَّكَ أَنْتَ الْأَعْلَى

Fear not. Indeed, it is you who are superior.

(Sūrah Ṭāhā 20:68)

Whereas Allah سُبحانه وتعالى had already promised Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ:

أَنْتُمْ وَمَنْ أَتَّبَعَكُمْ الْغَالِبُونَ

You and those who follow you will be the predominant.

(Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ: 35)

continued ...

Allah ﷻ replied:

لَا تَخَفُ إِنَّكَ مِنَ الْأَمِينِينَ

Fear not. Indeed, you are of the secure.¹

The Shī'ah scholars have accepted the fear of Nabī Mūsā عليه السلام at such an instance which they cannot reject. Accordingly, to prove the superiority of Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه over Sayyidunā Mūsā عليه السلام they say that when Sayyidunā Mūsā عليه السلام emigrated from Egypt to Madyan, he was fearful.

فَخَرَجَ مِنْهَا خَائِفًا يَتَرَقَّبُ

So he left it, fearful and anticipating (apprehension).²

While Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه slept peacefully and worryless on Rasūlullāh's ﷺ bed on the night of hijrah. Had he been a little fearful, he would never have been able to sleep.

If the Shī'ah are still not satisfied and do not resist from criticising Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه for being fearful, I will show that Rasūlullāh ﷺ himself was also

continued from page 121

Thirdly, when Nabī Mūsā عليه السلام feared that Fir'own and his army will kill him saying:

فَأَخَافُ أَنْ يَقْتُلُونِ

And I fear they will kill me.

(Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ: 33)

Allah consoled him saying, "Do not fear." There was no need for Nabī Mūsā عليه السلام to fear in front of all these divine promises. Thus, if fear shows unhappiness with Allah's ﷻ promise, then Nabī Mūsā عليه السلام is more reproachable than Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه and just like the Shī'ah criticise Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, those who deny nubuwwah can criticise the ambiyā' to a greater extent. (Allah ﷻ forbid!)

1 Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ: 31

2 Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ: 21

fearful in their books. The author of *Taqḥīb al-Makā'id* writes in answer to scheme 87:

اگر خوف قتل و قتل نہ بود پیغمبر خدا صلی اللہ علیہ و سلم چرا مخفی بیرون رفت و حال اینکہ سب ہجرت فرمودن
رسول خدا صلی اللہ علیہ و سلم محض خوف قتل بود

If Rasūlullāh ﷺ did not fear being killed, he would not have left secretly. The reality is that Rasūlullāh's ﷺ emigration was only out of fear of being killed.

O Allah! I cannot understand how the Shī'ah regard the fear and grief of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ as disbelief whereas they acknowledge the fear and grief of the ambiyā' and state that the emigration of the leader of the ambiyā' was only due to fear (Allah forbid and forgive us for quoting such blasphemy). According to our belief, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was not superior to Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام that he would not fear, nor was he calmer than Rasūlullāh ﷺ such that he would not fear blood being spilt. It is the belief of Shī'ah to say that Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام was fearful and they do not think that attributing fear of bloodshed to Rasūlullāh ﷺ as a defect; but they will never dare to even think of Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ having such fear and will rather deem such fear to be Taqiyyah as Sayyid Muḥammad Qillī writes:

تقیہ بجهت خوف ہلاکت جان خود نبود بلکہ بجهت خوف ہتک عرض و ناموسش بوده الی قولہ کہ دانستی کہ خوف
حضرت امیر المؤمنین نہ از ہلاکت جان بود بلکہ خوف ہتک و ناموس

'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ did not observe Taqiyyah out of fear for death, rather he practiced it to protect the honour of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. As you know, Amīr al-Mu'minīn did not fear his death but rather feared humiliation.

In conclusion, after studying all the above narrations it is clarified that the accusation of fear against Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is incorrect since if it is said that he feared being killed, then such fear was experienced by the ambiyā' according to the Shī'ī scholars and if it is said that he was not fearful of this but instead fearful of humiliation then such fear was felt by Amīr al-Mu'minīn

Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ who according to the Shī‘ah was superior to all the ambiyā’ and greater than all the Messengers.

The Qur’ānic verses, the sayings of the A’immah and the Shī‘ī scholars’ statements testify that Nabī Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام — the friend of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى — Nabī Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام — who would speak to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى — Sayyidunā Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ — the special beloved of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى — and Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ — who was Rasūlullāh’s صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ ‘waṣī’, the lion of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and superior and greater than all the ambiyā’ — were not spared from fearing being killed and humiliation. Now if Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is not spared from fear and apprehension, then why the astonishment? On the other hand, I am puzzled at how the Shī‘ī scholars have blurted out such drivel due to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr’s رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ fear on one night and regarded his fear to be the product of his disbelief and hypocrisy notwithstanding the fact that it is their strong belief that all the A’immah lived in fear an apprehension from birth till death and all of them — from the first to the last — practiced Taqīyyah. None of the twelve A’immah lived without fear. None of them passed a moment without apprehension. To such an extent that they considered Taqīyyah as the greatest component of īmān which is based solely on fear and accepted this as a saying of Imāmah:

التقية ديني و دين ابائي

Taqīyyah is my dīn and the dīn of my forefathers.

Thus, the A’immah — in whose hands is life and death, who can live until they wish, who control the angels and can order them as they wish, whose sight has such a tremendous effect that if they glance at a mountain it will burst, who have such might in their arms that if they lift one arm eighty thousand jinn will be killed, who possess the knowledge of the past and future, who possess such miracles that if they throw the staff from their hands it will turn into a mighty serpent and if they point towards the disbelievers and hypocrites they all will melt — notwithstanding such might and power and miracles lived in such fear their entire lives such that they were unable to proclaim their Imāmah. They never

spoke the truth out of fear for their lives and honour. If they wished to whisper some secret to someone very close, they did it behind closed doors. They taught knowledge to their students in constant fear and if any Nāṣibī had to question them, they would reject it. They cursed and pronounced their exemption from their sincere friends. Yet the Shī'ah do not criticise their fear at all and do not cast doubts on their Imāmah and virtue. In fact, they regard such fear as the best worship and proclaim Taqīyah as the dīn of the A'immaḥ. On the other hand, they ridicule Sayyidunā Abū Bakr's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ fear on one night so much that they take his fear and apprehension to be a sign of his disbelief and hypocrisy, whereas Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ did not have the choice of life and death, the angels were not under his control, he did not possess knowledge of the past and future and did not have the power to kill eighty thousand jinn. How the Shī'ah differentiated between the A'immaḥ's fears and Sayyidunā Abū Bakr's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ fear is unknown. Why is the fear of the A'immaḥ considered a virtue while the fear of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ a vice?

بہ میں تفاوت راہ از کجاست تا بہ کجا

What is the difference between the two?

Anyways, if the apparent meaning of the fear of the ambiyā' and the A'immaḥ is not regarded as suggested by the Shī'ah due to their infallibility, then too their object is not attained since the fear of the mu'minīn is also established from the Qur'ān:

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ قَالُوا رَبُّنَا اللَّهُ ثُمَّ اسْتَقَامُوا تَتَنَزَّلُ عَلَيْهِمُ الْمَلَائِكَةُ أَلَّا تَخَافُوا وَلَا تَحْزَنُوا وَأَبْشِرُوا بِالْجَنَّةِ الَّتِي كُنتُمْ تُوعَدُونَ ﴿٣٠﴾

Indeed, those who have said, “Our Rabb is Allah” and then remained on a right course — the angels will descend upon them, (saying), “Do not fear and do not grieve but receive good tidings of Jannah, which you were promised.”¹

1 Sūrah Ḥā Mīm Sajdah: 30

This proves that the mu'minīn with strong īmān also fear and grieve.

Allah ﷻ commands the mu'minīn in another verse:

وَلَا تَحْزَنُوا وَأَنْتُمْ الْأَعْلَوْنَ

And do not grieve, and you will be superior.¹

I am unaware as to whether words like “لَا تَحْزَنُوا” are for reprimanding the mu'minīn or for comforting them? So why then is the same address to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ regarded as a reprimand? It is amazing how these words appear copious of times to comfort and console but appears once to reproach. Yes, if the context suggests this then we will accept. But this is not the case. Just as Allah ﷻ followed “لَا تَحْزَنُوا” by some glad tidings like “أَبَشِرُوا بِالْجَنَّةِ” (receive good tidings of Paradise) and “وَأَنْتُمْ الْأَعْلَوْنَ” (and you will be superior), in the same way Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ told Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, “لَا تَحْزَنْ إِنَّ اللَّهَ مَعَنَا” (Do not grieve; indeed Allah is with us.) There is no apparent difference between the two. If “لَا تَحْزَنُوا” is used to comfort in the former then the same applies in the latter and if it is used to reprimand in the former then the same applies in the latter. Yet notwithstanding the coherence in word and context, to suggest comfort in the former and reproach in the latter is shocking and bewildering.

Nevertheless, I understand that the Shī'ah are in a tight situation. If they take the apparent meaning of the verses of the Qur'ān, then the loyalty and faith of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ will have to be acknowledged and if they acknowledge this then their whole creed will fall apart. So they have no other option but to manipulate the meanings of the Qur'ān and fabricate new meanings.

دست بے چارہ چوں بجاں نہ رسد

چارہ جز پیرمین دریدن نیست

1 Sūrah Āl 'Imrān: 139

If the poor hands cannot reach the buttons

Then there is no other option but to tear the shirt

If still someone is not fully satisfied and an intelligent person says, “I have accepted that fear is not a sin and “لا تَحْزُنْ” is used to console, however, it is proven that Abū Bakr did not have conviction on the promise of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and the protection of Allah ﷻ, otherwise he would not have feared.”

The answer to this is that the Shī'ah themselves claim that Rasūlullāh ﷺ was getting annoyed at Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ telling him to keep silent and not to disclose the secret but he refused to obey. So just like the Shī'ah, every heretic can say that Rasūlullāh ﷺ did not have conviction on the promise and protection of Allah ﷻ, otherwise he would not fear the secret being disclosed and he would not get annoyed at Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ for disclosing the secret. (Allah ﷻ forbid!) Whatever the Shī'ah answer to this heretics should be considered as our answer to them.¹

If someone ponders deeply, he will realise that it is not correct to attribute fear and grief to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ according to Shī'ī principles and beliefs since if they accede that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was really fearful then we will ask them as to whether he was afraid for his own life and fearful of him being harmed or was he afraid of Rasūlullāh ﷺ being harmed? He could not be afraid of his own life since he had already teamed up with the kuffār and wanted to disclose the secret. So if the kuffār caught him, what fear would he have? If

1 Gohar Murād whose author is a reputable Shī'ī has written that five disbelievers told Rasūlullāh ﷺ, “We give you respite till the afternoon to leave otherwise we will kill you.” Rasūlullāh ﷺ came to his home and locked the door and sat in a forlorn condition. Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام descended and consoled him, “Declare openly what you are ordered and turn away from the polytheists.” Rasūlullāh ﷺ said, “O Jibrīl! I am not concerned about this but they said they will scoff at me.” Jibrīl said, “We will suffice you with regards to the scoffers.” Rasūlullāh ﷺ requested, “Who will be close to me now?” Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام replied, “I will be and I will be sufficient for you.” The Shī'ah should have a look at this narration and judge soundly that when Rasūlullāh ﷺ out of fear for his life closed the door and remained in his house with sorrow and is not satisfied even after the consolation of Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, then notwithstanding accepting such narrations they criticise the fear of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.

he was afraid of being harmed by the kuffār then two things are deduced from here. Firstly, the kuffār hated Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and were prepared to kill him due to his īmān and companionship of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. This proves our very first claim. Secondly, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ did not intend to disclose the secret because he would not risk his life and disclose it to those who he himself was afraid of. If he feared Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ being harmed then such fear is better than years of ease and may thousand comforts be sacrificed for such a fear. Do the Shī'ah regard such fear as a defect or disbelief? We regard such fear as rewardable, nay superior to thousand faiths. It was this very fear of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ that displays his complete conviction on the life and protection of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. But when he saw that the king of all other dīnī and worldly kings is shining in a narrow dark cave. The moon of nubuwwah is concealed in the cave just as the moon is concealed by the clouds sometimes. The one whose status is recognised by the Owner of the Thrown and Kursī is sitting in a constrained place. This condition of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was breaking the heart of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ to pieces and making him restless. Sayyidunā Abū Bakr's رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ going into the cave first, cleaning it, covering all the holes by tearing pieces of his shawl, then calling Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and making him sleep on his lap all bear witness to this. In such a frightening situation, when he saw the kuffār at the mouth of the cave then the fear that passed through his heart out of concern for the well-being of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ only he is aware of. Or the lover whose beloved is afflicted with harm in his presence and the enemy is attacking him, let someone see the condition of that poor lover. Is he restless or calm? Yes, but the one who is oblivious of the reality of love can do nothing but criticise the fear and worry of a true lover.

Brothers! Create some love for Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ in your hearts and then see if you will accuse those who were his die hearts. But how can you understand the reality when you have not an iota of love.

تو نازنین جہانے و ناز پروردہ

تراز سوز دردن نیاز ماچہ خیر

و دل بہ مہر نگارے نہ بستہ ای مہ

تراز حالت عشاق بے نواچہ خبر

O you brought up in the lap of luxury

What do you know about those who burn in love?

O beloved! When you have not given your heart to any lover

What will you know about the condition of an intense lover?

O Shī'ah! Have a little mercy and contemplate over the astuteness of what your third martyr says about the grief and sorrow of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضی اللہ عنہ.

و قد ظہر من جزعہ و بکائہ ما یکون من مثله فساد الحال

Corrupt intentions are apparent from his anxiety and wailing.

He wrote this trying to disgrace Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضی اللہ عنہ but his writing was humiliated and his whole argument was demolished. At the end, he pondered over these things and then rejected it being genuine fear and grief and deemed it as fake.

It is hoped from the sound explanation that they will pay attention to this with their hearts and congratulate the Shī'ah for their sorcerous words but pay no attention to it. Why do you abandon one claim and claim something else? Why do you acknowledge something only to reject it later on? This matter does only pertain to this discussion but it applies to every big and small matter. Just wait until the discussions on khilāfah and Imāmah come, how these people will change their approach and how they will beautify their arguments with new decorations.

شاید دلربائی من میکنداز برای من

نقش و نگار و رنگ و بو تازه بتازہ نوبہ نو

Our charming beloved is making for us various new colours, smells and designs.

When the Shī'ah realised that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr's ﷺ grief and fear proves that he possessed love for Rasūlullāh ﷺ, they abandoned this and claimed that he had no fear at all but made a tantrum just to disclose the secret as it appears in *Risālah Ḥusayniyyah*:

غو غایش از جزع و فزع و فریاد برائے ایں بود کہ مشرکان را اطلاع گرداند و اینا بدانند کہ دریں غار ست

His wailing and screaming hysterically was only to let the polytheist know that they were in the cave.

Khaḍir Mashhadī writes:

و ایضا مما اشتهر من لدغ الحية اياه انما كان يمد رجله يريد اظهار امره

The famous incident of the snake-bite was actually because he exposed his foot from the cave in order to reveal the secret.

When Sayyidunā Abū Bakr's ﷺ purpose was not fulfilled by his wailing and screaming, he exposed his foot so that the kuffār might see it and enter the cave. Allah ﷻ commanded the snake to bite his foot. He thus was forced to desist from revealing Rasūlullāh's ﷺ secret.

I am unable to answer such an absurd claim and incapable of debunking such a 'wise' explanation. Even if all the humans and jinn from East to West gather, they cannot untie such a knot. In reality, the anger displayed by Sayyid Muḥammad Qillī on Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīz for not quoting the texts of his seniors verbatim is totally correct. Had he quoted those texts verbatim, what doubt would remain about the reality of the Shī'ah and how would anyone prove the virtue of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ﷺ?

Friends! Deal justly and look at the 'depth of knowledge' of the Shī'ī mujtahidīn and their 'wise' and 'researched' statements.

Objection 9 on the Ninth Virtue

I mentioned previously that when Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was worried and anxious, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى sent His tranquillity upon him which Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى describes in the verse:

فَأَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ سَكِينَتَهُ عَلَيْهِ

And Allah sent down His tranquillity upon him.¹

The Shī'ah object to this is many ways.

Firstly, the pronoun in “عليه” (upon him) refers to Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and not to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. So this means that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى sent down His tranquillity upon Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

The answer to this is that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ experienced fear and anxiety, not Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. If the pronoun refers to Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, the meaning of the verse would be: “When Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ grew fearful and anxious, Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ consoled him saying, ‘Do not grieve for Allah is with us.’ Thus Allah sent down His tranquillity upon Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.” Who would not laugh and be puzzled at such incoherence and disjointedness that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ fears, Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ consoles him and Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى sends His tranquillity upon Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

If the Shī'ah claim that Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was also fearful, hence Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى sent His tranquillity upon him, we will say that when the Shī'ah criticise Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ of cowardice due to his fear, then how will they judge this fear of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ? Nonetheless, if we accept that Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was fearful and Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى sent down His tranquillity upon him, then the text of the verse should be different. Instead of

1 Sūrah al-Towbah: 40

إِذْ يَقُولُ لِصَاحِبِهِ لَا تَحْزَنْ إِنَّ اللَّهَ مَعَنَا ۗ فَأَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ سَكِينَتَهُ عَلَيْهِ

When he said to his companion, “Do not grieve; indeed Allah is with us.”
And Allah sent down his tranquillity upon him.

It should read:

فَأَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ سَكِينَتَهُ عَلَيْهِ فَقَالَ لِصَاحِبِهِ لَا تَحْزَنْ إِنَّ اللَّهَ مَعَنَا

Allah ﷻ revealed His tranquillity upon Rasūlullāh ﷺ (and Rasūlullāh ﷺ was fully composed), he then told his companion, “Do not grieve; indeed Allah is with us.”

Otherwise, the meaning which the Shī'ah are claiming does not fit. This is due to the fact that from the first sentence this meaning is quite clear that Rasūlullāh ﷺ saw Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ sad so he said, “Do not grieve; indeed Allah is with us.” Thus, due to this consolation of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, Allah ﷻ sent his tranquillity upon Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ so that his grief disappears.

Thus, O friends, think! Does our explanation conform to the verse or your explanation?

Secondly (the Shī'ah assert), if Allah ﷻ intended to send down tranquillity upon Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, He would have mentioned him with Rasūlullāh ﷺ. This is due to the fact that Allah ﷻ never ever mentioned sending down His tranquillity in exclusion of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Thus, Qāḍī Nūr Allāh Shostarī writes in the beneficial incidents of Shaykh al-Mufīd with much fervour thinking his answer to be the essential answer:

چون این سخن را گوش ناصبان شنید باعث حیرت ایشان گردید و در حیلہ خلاصی از آن جان ایشان بلب رسیدہ

When these facts reached the ears of the Sunnī, they were amazed and their souls came to their throats in an effort to save themselves from them.

Sayyid Muḥammad Qillī has quoted it verbatim in his book and boasts about it. We thus quote the text verbatim and plead to the sound minded to look at how Qāḍī extracted a fake pearl from his shell and gifted it to his followers displaying it to be a priceless and precious pearl of the crown. No one evaluates whether his pearl is genuine or fake.

إنّجہ کاشف صحت بیان مذکور تواند بود اینست کہ مقدمان مشائخ ما رضوان اللہ علیہم افادہ فرمودہ اند کہ خدا نے تعالیٰ ہر گز در بیچ جای کہ یکے از اہل ایمان با حضرت پیغمبر ہودہ اند انزال سکینہ نہ نمود الا انکہ نزول اِن را شامل جمع ایشان داشتہ چنانچہ در بعضی آیات فرمودہ وَیَوْمَ حُجَّینِ اِذْ اَعَجَبْتُمْ کَثْرَتَکُمْ فَلَمْ تُغْنِ عَنْکُمْ شَیْئًا وَصَافَتْ عَلَیْکُمُ الْاَرْضُ بِمَا رَحَبَتْ ثُمَّ وَاَلَّیْتُمْ مُدْبِرِیْنَ ثُمَّ اَنْزَلَ اللّٰهُ سَکِیْنَتًا عَلٰی رَسُوْلِهِ وَ عَلٰی الْمُؤْمِنِیْنَ و چون بانحضرت غیر از ابو بکر در غار نبود لاجرم خدای تعالیٰ انحضرت را در نزول سکینہ منفرد ساخت و اور یان مخصوص گردانید و ابو بکر را باو شرکت نداد و گفت فَانزَلَ اللّٰهُ سَکِیْنَتًا عَلَیْهِ وَاَیَّدُوْهُ بِجُنُوْدٍ لَّمْ تَرَوْهَا پس اگر ابو بکر مومن می بود بایستہ کہ خدای تعالیٰ درین ایتہ اورا جاری مجری مومنان می نمود و در عموم سکینہ داخل می فرمود الی قولہ بنابر این نزول سکینہ مخصوص او شدہ باشد و ابو بکر بواسطہ ایمان از فضیلت سکینہ محروم ماندہ باشد و ایضا بہ نص قرانی با دارد ازان کہ در ایتہ غار سکینہ بر غیر رسول باشد

The proof for our above mentioned claim is that our early elders have stated regarding these verses that whenever Rasūlullāh ﷺ was accompanied by other believers then Allah ﷻ sent down a general tranquillity upon everyone and not only upon Rasūlullāh ﷺ as it is stated in some verses: *“Allah has already given you victory in many regions and (even) on the Day of Ḥunayn, when your great number pleased you, but it did not avail you at all, and the earth was confining for you with its vastness; then you turned back, fleeing. Then Allah sent down His tranquillity upon His Rasūl and upon the believers.”*¹ and in another verse, *“Then Allah sent down His tranquillity upon His Rasūl and upon the believers.”*² Since there was no one besides Abū Bakr in the cave with Rasūlullāh ﷺ, hence Allah ﷻ specially sent tranquillity on Rasūlullāh ﷺ and consoled him and did not include Abū Bakr in this tranquillity and peace declaring, *“And Allah sent down his tranquillity upon him and supported him with angels you did not see.”*³ Had Abū Bakr been a

1 Sūrah al-Towbah: 26, 27

2 Sūrah al-Fatḥ: 26

3 Sūrah al-Towbah: 40

believer, Allah would have included him in the tranquillity just as He had included other believers. The gist is that tranquillity was sent specially on Rasūlullāh ﷺ and Abū Bakr remained deprived of this tranquillity and peace due to him being a non-believer. The descent of tranquillity upon someone other than Rasūlullāh ﷺ in the cave is in contrast to Qur'ānic principles.

The crux of the above is that whenever Allah ﷻ sent down tranquillity upon the believers, He first sent down tranquillity upon Rasūlullāh ﷺ and then the believers. There is no mention of Him sending down tranquillity upon the believers only. So how can it be possible that in the cave, Rasūlullāh ﷺ was excluded and tranquillity was sent down upon Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ alone? Thus the disbelief of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is certain because had he been a believer, he would have been included with Rasūlullāh ﷺ in the tranquillity.

However, Qāḍī and his elders' claim that this is against categorical Qur'ānic statements is erroneous. This is neither found explicitly nor implicitly in any verse that Allah does not send down His tranquillity individually on anyone except Rasūlullāh ﷺ. If there is mention of sending down tranquillity upon the believers with the inclusion of Rasūlullāh ﷺ at a few places, this does not necessitate the rejection of descent of tranquillity upon the believers without including Rasūlullāh ﷺ. If for argument's sake it is accepted that the Qur'ān does not mention anything about descent of tranquillity upon the believers alone without inclusion of Rasūlullāh ﷺ then too this objection is incorrect. And by the grace of Allah, descent of tranquillity upon the believers without including Rasūlullāh ﷺ appears in the glorious Qur'ān. But unfortunately the Shī'ah never produced a ḥāfiẓ of Qur'ān and maybe Qāḍī and his elders did not have the opportunity of looking at the entire Qur'ān from cover to cover even once in their lifetime, otherwise they would not have rejected this with such conviction and would not have brazenly claimed:

خدای تعالی ہرگز در بیج جائیکہ یکے از اہل ایمان با حضرت بوده اندر انزال سکینہ نہ نمود

Whenever Rasūlullāh ﷺ was accompanied by other believers then Allah ﷻ sent down a general tranquillity upon everyone and not only upon Rasūlullāh ﷺ.

I will now show the Shī'ah two places in Sūrah al-Fatḥ where mention is made of tranquillity being sent down upon the believers without inclusion of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. If you are in doubt, open this sūrah of the Qur'ān and have a look at it for yourselves. Allah ﷻ states in the first rukū':

هُوَ الَّذِي أَنْزَلَ السَّكِينَةَ فِي قُلُوبِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ لِيَزْدَادُوا إِيمَانًا مَعَ إِيمَانِهِمْ

It is He who sent down tranquillity into the hearts of the believers that they would increase in faith along with their (present) faith.¹

Allah ﷻ states in the third rukū':

إِذْ يُبَايِعُونَكَ تَحْتَ الشَّجَرَةِ فَعَلِمَ مَا فِي قُلُوبِهِمْ فَأَنْزَلَ السَّكِينَةَ عَلَيْهِمْ

When they pledged allegiance to you, [O Muḥammad], under the tree, and He knew what was in their hearts, so He sent down tranquillity upon them.²

O believers! Read carefully over these verses. Evaluate twenty copies of the Qur'ān and see whether Rasūlullāh ﷺ has been mentioned. If from India to Iran you find one Qur'ān which mentions Rasūlullāh ﷺ in these verses, then you and Qāḍī are truthful. And if it is not found and all the copies of the Qur'āns in Iran and Kūfah have what we have stated then you can judge for yourselves whether you, Qāḍī and all his elders are truthful or untruthful.

It is of great remorse that this discussion has been carrying on for centuries yet until today no one opened Sūrah al-Fatḥ and pondered over those verses and

1 Sūrah al-Fatḥ: 4

2 Sūrah al-Fatḥ: 18

they continue boasting upon Qāḍī's false claim and its virtue and acceptance. What is of greater remorse is that there are only a handful of Shī'ah who know the names of the sūrah and they are very few who have memorised portions of the Qur'ān besides Sūrah al-Qadr and Sūrah al-ikhlāṣ; otherwise the majority of them are ignorant of the Qur'ān, by the grace of Allah. Notwithstanding their ignorance they have the audacity to present the Qur'ān as proof in front of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah who have memorised the entire Qur'ān and have it on their fingertips. This grave error of Qāḍī and his elders is due to their ignorance of the Qur'ān. But we understand them as excused and overlook their grave error.

Thirdly (the Shī'ah assert), if the pronoun of “عَلَيْهِ” in “فَأَنْزَلَ اللَّهُ سَكِينَتَهُ عَلَيْهِ” refers to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ then there would be disagreement in the pronouns since all the pronouns preceding it (e.g. أَخْرَجَهُ and لِصَاحِبِهِ) and after it (e.g. آيَهُ) refer to Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ so how can the pronoun in the middle refer to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ?

The answer to this is that a pronoun should refer to the nearest thing mentioned which is Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in this situation, since لِصَاحِبِهِ refers to him. Secondly, there will only be disagreement in the pronouns if آيَهُ is attached to اللَّهُ فَمَا نَزَلَ whereas it is joint with فَقَدْ نَصَرَهُ اللَّهُ. Hence, there is no disagreement in the pronouns.

Thirdly, disagreement in pronouns appears copiously in the Qur'ān as in

إِنَّ الْإِنْسَانَ لِرَبِّهِ لَكَنُودٌ ۖ وَإِنَّهُ عَلَىٰ ذَٰلِكَ لَشَهِيدٌ ۚ

Indeed mankind, to his Rabb, is ungrateful. And indeed, He (their Rabb) is to that a witness.¹

Thus, the objection against Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ regarding descent of tranquillity has been answered and it has been established that peace was

1 Sūrah al-Ādiyāt: 6,7

sent down upon him and all of the rubbish that Qāḍī, Mullā and their elders and followers have written and read has been debunked and the stupidity and ludicrousness has been exposed to all. It is not only us — the Ahl al-Sunnah — who deem these objections as ludicrous but sometimes the Shī'ah acknowledge it themselves as al-Ṭabarsī, the author of *Majma' al-Bayān* has written in his tafsīr:

وقد ذكرت الشيعة في تخصصص النبي في هذه الآية بالسكينة كلاما راينا الاضراب عن ذكره اخرى لثلا
ينسبنا ناسب الى شيء

The Shī'ah have written such drivel regarding the descent of tranquillity upon Rasūlullāh ﷺ alone as stated in this verse which we find appropriate to ignore so that we are not the object of anyone's criticism.

From the words of this 'Allāmah it is evident that what the Shī'ah mention is so ludicrous and laughable that he is ashamed to even mention it.

In short, the virtues of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ in this verse which we have enumerated above have been thoroughly proven and all the objections of the Shī'ah have been refuted. The context of the verse is testimony to this since if the object was not to mention the companionship and help of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ then it was not appropriate to expose his hypocrisy at such a place. The Shī'ah know this and understand this properly but due to stubbornness and doggedness upon their creed they reject such a categorical and clear verse and refuse to acknowledge the virtue of the most virtuous Ṣaḥābī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ after the truth has been made manifest. Instead they prefer to burn in the Fire of Hell by rejecting these verses. May Allah ﷻ protect us from their evil intentions and actions!

The Testimonies of the A'immaḥ Regarding the Virtues of the Ṣaḥābah

First Testimony

It is recorded in Shī'ī books from the A'immaḥ that Rasūlullāh ﷺ stated:

اصحابى كالنجوم بايهم اقتديتم اهتديتم

My Ṣaḥābah are like the stars. Whomsoever of them you follow, you will be rightly guided.

Rasūlullāh ﷺ has also mentioned:

دعوا الى اصحابى

Leave my companions for me i.e. consider the rights they enjoy due to their companionship and do not take out their faults.

The wording and meaning of the latter of the two aḥādīth is accepted by the Shīʿī scholars and the author of *Istiṣṣā' al-Afḥām*. However, there is a disagreement on the first ḥadīth. I therefore state regarding the second ḥadīth that when you accept the authenticity of it, then why do you not practice upon it? Why do you not accept that which Rasūlullāh ﷺ has said regarding his Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ? Why do you not fulfil the rights they enjoy due to their companionship of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and why do you not desist from taking out their faults and harbouring hatred for them, notwithstanding the intercession of Rasūlullāh ﷺ on their behalf?

I will present the statements of the A'immaḥ from Shīʿī sources regarding the first ḥadīth and verify its authenticity and disclose the corrupt interpretations and interpolations — both in wording and meaning — of the Shīʿah and establish their falsehood.

It is written in *Uyūn al-Akḥbār* — a recognised work amongst the Shīʿah:

حدثنا الحاكم ابو على الحسين بن احمد البيهقي قال حدثنا محمد بن يحيى الصولى قال حدثنا محمد بن موسى بن نصر الرازى قال حدثنى بى قال سئل الرضا عليه السلام عن قول النبى صلى الله عليه واله سلم اصحابى كالنجوم بايهم اقتديتم اهتديتم و عن قوله دعوا الى اصحابى فقال هذا صحيح

Someone asked 'Alī al-Riḍā عليه السلام regarding Rasūlullāh's ﷺ statement,

“my Ṣaḥābah are like the stars, whomsoever of them you follow, you will be rightly guided,” and “Leave my companions for me,” to which he replied, “This is ṣaḥīḥ.”

It is learnt from this narration that the wording of the ḥadīth, “my Ṣaḥābah are like the stars,” appears in Shīṭī books as it appears in Sunnī books. Moreover, Imām ‘Alī al-Riḍā رحمته الله and the Shīṭī scholars testify to its authenticity. This is not the only narration to verify it. In fact, Shīṭī books are replete with narrations which verify it. After studying all those narrations, it will not be possible for any Shīṭī to deny its authenticity — to deem it as a fabrication or to consider it a khabar wāḥid¹ and pay no attention to it — because Shaykh al-Ṣadūq² in *Ma‘ānī al-Akhbār*, ‘Allāmah al-Ṭabarsī in *Iḥtijāj*, Mullā Bāqir Majlisī in *Biḥār al-Anwār* and Mullā Ḥaydar Āmlī Ithnā ‘Asharī in *Jāmi‘ al-Asrār* have attested to its authenticity. It is astonishing that until the Sunnī scholars did not present this ḥadīth from Shīṭī books and did not verify its authenticity by the Imām’s statement, the early Shīṭī scholars continued to make a hue and cry over its authenticity and blackened thousands of pages to prove its forgery and falsehood to the extent that Qāḍī Nūr Allāh al-Shostarī said with such vehemence in *Iḥqāq al-Ḥaq*:

اما ما وراء من حديث اصحابي كالنجوم ففيه من اثار الوضع و البطلان مما لا يخفى

With regards to the ḥadīth, “my Ṣaḥābah are like the stars,” there are so many signs of its forgery and falsehood which are not hidden.

Sadly, Qāḍī did not think that the very same ḥadīth he is denying with such vehemence is recorded in his own books. He criticises the Ahl al-Sunnah

1 A ḥadīth narrated by one or two persons

2 His name is Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Ḥasan ibn Bābuwayḥ Qummī and his epithet is Ṣadūq. He was born in the beginning of the fourth hijrī century. He is reckoned among the senior and great muḥaddithīn of the Shī‘ah. His book *Man Lā Yaḥḍuruḥu al-Faqīh* is among the canonical four aḥādīth books regarded as authentic and important by the Shī‘ah. He has many other books as well which are regarded as reliable sources. The Shī‘ah say that there is no one who possessed such a remarkable memory and vast knowledge like him in Qumm. He passed away in 381 A.H and is buried in Ray (Shaykh Muḥammad Firāsāt)

for fabricating it whereas it is established as authentic according to his own principles from the narration of the A'immah. The only difference is that the Sunnī narrators are weak and rejected while the Shī'ī narrators are the blessed A'immah. Thus, if according to the Sunnī, the ḥadīth is inauthentic or the Sunnī have labelled the narrators as weak, then too there is no harm. If Qāḍī or anyone else has classified the ḥadīth as a fabrication and denied it notwithstanding the testimony of Imām 'Alī al-Riḍā رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ then he has destroyed his own dīn and has left the fold of imān by belying the Imām.

I will now produce the interpolations of the Shī'ī scholars concerning this ḥadīth.

The ḥadīth, “my Ṣaḥābah are like the stars,” which I have quoted from *'Uyūn al-Akḥbār* has an addition of these words:

يريد من لم يغير بعده ولم يبدل قبل كيف نعلم انهم قد غيروا و بدلوا قال لما يروونه من انه صلى الله عليه
و سلم قال ليذادون رجال من اصحابي يوم القيامة عن حوضي كما تذاذ غرائب الابل عن الماء فاقول يا
رب اصحابي اصحابي فيقال انك لا تدري ما احدثوا بعدك فيؤخذ بهم ذات شمال فاقول بعدا لهم و سحقا
افتري هذا من لم يغير و لم يبدل

He meant those Ṣaḥābah who did not change (their faith) or alter (the dīn) after his demise. Someone asked the Imām: “How do we know that the Ṣaḥābah changed and altered?” The Imām answered: “From the blessed tongue of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ who said, ‘some of my companions will be debarred from the pond of Kowthar on the Day of Resurrection just as stray camels are barred from water. I will say: Allah! These are my companions. These are my companions. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى will answer: ‘You do not know what they did after you.’ They will then be dragged towards Hell and I will say, ‘Get lost! Get lost!’”

The purpose of adding these words is to exclude some of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ from this ḥadīth due to their ‘apostasy’. Nonetheless, this will not harm us in the least since we also believe that those who turned renegade after Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ

are not included in this ḥadīth whereas the accepted Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ did not change (their faith) or alter (the dīn) and are thus not excluded from this ḥadīth. Furthermore, the Shī'ah accede to the fact that the accepted Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ are excluded from being the target of the pond ḥadīth as the author of *Istiqṣā' al-Afḥām* has written in answer to one objection of the second maslak of *Muntahā' al-Kalām*:

که هر گز حدیث حوض در حق مقبولین اصحاب کرام جناب خیر الانام صلی الله علیه و سلم وارد نیست و هر گز این حدیث بر اینها منطبق نمی تواند شد

The pond ḥadīth is not concerning the accepted Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and this ḥadīth does not apply to them at all.

I will prove in one of the discussions of this ḥadīth in the chapter of the apostasy of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ that the righteous khulafā', Muhājirīn and Anṣār رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ were the accepted Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ, Allah willing. And even if it is accepted that some of the accepted Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ were among those who changed and altered then too the purport of the ḥadīth applies to the majority of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ since the most eloquent and articulate — May Allah's سُبْحَانَكَ وَبِحَمْدِكَ salutations and peace be upon him — used such a word of similarity which not only shows virtue but depicts abundance, i.e. the word stars. By Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ stating, “my Ṣaḥābah are like the stars.” he showed their numerous number and only a foolish and dull person can understand the stars to apply to only a handful of people. Even if we accept that this ḥadīth applies to only few Ṣaḥābah — in fact only three according to the Shī'ah were saved from apostasy— then too the Shī'ah belief of the Ahl al-Bayt being compulsory to follow and following anyone else is impermissible is falsified. Moreover, it is proven that few are partners to them in being leaders, which was supposed to be exclusive to them. And no one has ever claimed this.

In short, when the Shī'ah realised that this text is superfluous and it did not save them from the clutches of the Ahl al-Sunnah, they adopted another interpretation claiming that the word “اصحاب” refers to the Ahl al-Bayt as the author of *Istiqṣā' al-Afḥām* wrote in answer to *Muntahā' al-Kalām*:

مراد از اصحاب در حدیث اصحابی کالنجوم بایم اقتدیتم ابتدیتم اهل بیت علیهم السلام اند

“My Ṣaḥābah are like the stars, whomsoever of them you follow, you will be rightly guided,” the word “اصحاب” in this ḥadīth refers to the Ahl al-Bayt.

I will debunk this claim citing a few proofs.

First proof

For the word “اصحاب” to mean family members is a distortion of its meaning, since in common usage “اصحاب” refers to friends while Ahl al-Bayt refers to household members. According to the sharḥ definition, “اصحاب” refers to those who believed in Rasūlullāh ﷺ and were his companions, while Ahl al-Bayt refer to his household members and the descendants of Sayyidah Fatimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا. In fact, it is clear from the aḥādīth and the statements of the A’immah that these words refer to two different categories of people. Wherever there is a ḥadīth or statement regarding the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, the word “اصحاب” appears and when it concerns the family of Rasūlullāh ﷺ the word “اهل بيت” or “عتره” appears. Accordingly, Rasūlullāh ﷺ has stated:

انى تارك فيكم الثقلين كتاب الله وعترتى

Indeed, I leave amongst you two weighty items; the book of Allah and my family.

مثل اهل بيتى كسفينة نوح

The likeness of my household members is like Nūḥ’s ﷺ ark.

Imām Zayn al-‘Ābidīn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ said in his supplication which is recorded in *Ṣaḥīfah Kāmilah*:

اللهم واصحاب محمد خاصة الذين احسنوا الصحابة

O Allah! And especially the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ who fulfilled the responsibility of his companionship.

If the word “اصحاب” was not specifically for the companions of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and also referred to the family and household members of Rasūlullāh ﷺ then why were the words “اهل بيت” and “عتره” specially used in these aḥādīth and why did Rasūlullāh ﷺ not say “كتاب الله و اصحابى” instead of “كتاب الله و عترتى” and “مثل” instead of “اهل بيتى كسفينة نوح”? And why would Rasūlullāh ﷺ say “سلام عليكم اهل البيت” instead of “سلام عليكم يا اصحابى” when going to the home of Sayyidah Fatimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا?

The crux of the above is that it is clear from the aḥādīth of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and the statements of the A’immah that the words “اصحاب” and “اهل البيت” refer to two different classes of people, i.e. “اصحاب” refers to the companions and friends while “اهل البيت” refers to household members. The masses and scholars have always been using these words in this way. It is shocking that in millions of aḥādīth and thousands of statements, the word “اصحاب” is used to refer to the companions of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and the word “اهل البيت” is used to refer to his household members and there is not a ḥadīth where one word is used to refer to the other except one ḥadīth, namely “my Ṣaḥābah are like the stars.”? This is in stark contrast to context and common usage. And what is stunning is that those who commit this interpolation do not regard themselves as being the victim of

يُحَرِّفُونَ الْكَلِمَ عَنْ مَوَاضِعِهِ

They distort words from their (proper) usages.¹

Deal justly! If a poor Sunnī has to say that the pure wives of Rasūlullāh ﷺ are included in the Ahl al-Bayt and are worthy of the virtue mentioned in “the likeness of my household members is like Nūḥ’s ark.” and are referred to by Ahl al-Bayt in Āyat al-Taḥīr — nay only included therein — then see how your scholars make an uproar and bring down the ceiling and scream so loud as to reach the divine Throne and label that person a khārijī, nāṣibī and enemy of the Ahl al-Bayt and accuse him of interpolation whereas for Ahl al-Bayt to mean wives is

1 Sūrah al-Mā’idah: 13

correct in common usage. On the other hand, they consider “اصحاب” to mean household members and consider friend and companion to mean brother, family and descendants and do not feel ashamed of this! Forget being ashamed; they boast and brag over such understanding! What is the cure for such understanding and the answer to such a claim?!

این سبزه چشمه و این لاله و این گل
این شرح ندارد که بگفتار در آید

This is a vegetable, this is a spring and this is a flower

They do not allow such an interpretation which can be uttered

Nonetheless, every man with a little understanding and intelligence will understand that if Rasūlullāh ﷺ meant the Ahl al-Bayt in this ḥadīth then he would have used the words Ahl al-Bayt saying:

اهل بیتهی کالنجوم

My Ahl al-Bayt are like stars.

Maybe the Shī'ah will answer that Rasūlullāh ﷺ practiced on Taqiyyah (Allah forbid) just to make the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ happy but when he came home and the Ahl al-Bayt complained then he comforted them by saying that you are meant by “اصحاب”.

Second Proof

If we do not take the Shī'ah to task for understanding the Ahl al-Bayt from “اصحاب” and accept their interpolation of the meaning, then too this ḥadīth will not fully apply to the Ahl al-Bayt according to their belief since Ahl al-Bayt refers to the twelve A'imma according to them whereas “اصحاب” refers to only those people who sat in the company of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. And the other nine besides Sayyidunā 'Alī, Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ were all born after

Rasūlullāh's ﷺ demise.¹ Hence, the word “اصحاب” cannot refer to them. Thus the ḥadīth, “my Ṣaḥābah are like the stars,” will include only Sayyidunā ‘Alī, Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ﷺ and exclude the rest of the nine from this simile and following them will not be regarded as guidance. May Allah protect us from this!

Which Muslim will say such an absurd thing and think of the A’immah in this way? Thus, it is learnt that “اصحاب” does not refer to the Ahl al-Bayt otherwise Rasūlullāh ﷺ would have used the words “اهل البيت” instead of “اصحاب” so that no Imām is excluded. It is possible for the Shī’ah to answer that although the nine Imāms who were not born in the lifetime of Rasūlullāh ﷺ are excluded from the word “اصحاب” with regards to the physical realm but are included therein with regards to the realm of souls.

Third Proof

The text which comes thereafter, i.e. “He meant those Ṣaḥābah who did not change (their faith) or alter (the dīn) after his demise,” has closed the door of such an interpretation. The Shī’ah thought that if they do not add some words to this ḥadīth and leave it at as is, then they will not be saved from the Sunni’s clutches and will be thrown into a calamity due to the authenticity of these aḥādīth; so they added these words and related it to the Imām that “اصحاب” means those who did not change or alter dīn in any way, did not turn renegade, are not going to be dragged towards Hell and are not included among those concerning whom Rasūlullāh ﷺ declared his exemption. However, these words did not harm us in any way since we also exclude those who altered dīn and turned renegade from this ḥadīth. And even if we try our best to include the righteous khulafā’, the Muhājirīn and Anṣār among the renegades, it just cannot happen which I will explain further on in the discussion of apostasy, Allah willing. But these words benefitted us handsomely and disclosed the interpolation and

1 Qāḍī Nūr Allāh Shostarī writes in *Majālis al-Mu’minīn*: According to the widely accepted view, a Ṣaḥābī is that person who met Rasūlullāh ﷺ in the state of imān.

misinterpretation of the Shī'ah, since had these words not been there they could have made themselves happy and taken “اصحاب” to mean Ahl al-Bayt but these words have forced them not to take this meaning or else the words which appear thereafter will apply to the Ahl al-Bayt, Allah forbid! Then the belief of the Shī'ah will be that only those Ahl al-Bayt are like the stars who did not change and alter dīn and did not turn renegade (to quote words of disbelief is not disbelief). So who will now claim that this ḥadīth refers to the Ahl al-Bayt and who will accuse them of changing the dīn and turning renegade? These words have proven the interpolation of the Shī'ah and have shut the door of their misinterpretation. Subḥān Allah! Glory be to Allah! How powerful is Allah that the same words they desired to use to silence us has silenced them and they attested to the text they wanted us to accept.

عدو شود سپ خیر گر خدا خواهد

خمیر مایه دوکان شیشه گرسنگست

If Allah wills, the enemy can be a cause of goodness

The original capital of a glassmaker's shop is stones

When the Shī'ah scholars understood that their claim was not established and Ahl al-Bayt cannot be meant by “اصحاب” in this ḥadīth, they were forced to reject the authenticity of this ḥadīth and opted to abandon their previous claim. However, we are extremely grateful that they did not reject the words of this ḥadīth and did not belie the text which I quoted above. Instead, they misinterpreted the meaning and denied its authenticity by casting doubts and suspicions around it. Accordingly, the author of *Istiqṣā' al-Afḥām* has written in answer to *Muntahā al-Kalām* that the questioner asked regarding two aḥādīth and Imām 'Alī al-Riḍā رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ answered by saying, “this is ṣaḥīḥ. This answer only applies to the latter ḥadīth and not the former one.

از ملا حظه این حدیث شریف ظاہر ست کہ اینچہ مخاطب در ترجمہٴ اِن گفته کہ امام رضا علیہ السلام حکم بصحت

این ہر دو حدیث نمود غیر صحیح ست زیرا کہ ہر گز تصریح بہ صحت ہر دو حدیث درین روایت صراحتہ کہ مدلول

کلام اوست مذکور نیست بلکه لفظ بهذا صحیح مذکور است و جائز است که این متعلق بهر دو حدیث بنا شد بلکه محتمل است که گو سائل در سوال از دو حدیث استفسار کرده بود مگر اینجانب در جواب یکی از آن که حدیث اخیر است بیان فرموده

After contemplating upon this ḥadīth it is apparent that the translation and meaning which the translator wrote, i.e. Imām ‘Alī al-Riḍā عليه السلام certified both aḥādīth as authentic, is incorrect since the wording does not refer to the authenticity of both the ḥadīth. He said: “This is ṣaḥīḥ.” Hence, it is very possible that these words do not apply to both the aḥādīth but only apply to the latter ḥadīth notwithstanding that the questioner asked regarding both of them.

There are three errors in this explanation. Firstly, he does not state with conviction but says that it is very possible thus belying the ḥadīth by casting doubts on it notwithstanding that it has the certification of the Imām. Secondly, this is only a possibility. When the questioner asked regarding two aḥādīth and the Imām answered by saying, “this is ṣaḥīḥ,” then definitely the Imām verified the person’s question which applied to both aḥādīth. Hence, both aḥādīth are authentic. With regards to the doubt that if the Imām wished to verify both the aḥādīth, why did he not say, “both these aḥādīth are authentic”? This is not an issue since the object of the questioner was one i.e. regarding the statements in praise of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم so to use a singular *ḥarf al-ishārah*¹ to indicate to this singular aspect does not oppose common usage. Thirdly, the questioner asked regarding two aḥādīth and the Imām said, “this is ṣaḥīḥ.” If we accept that this answer only applies to the second ḥadīth, then what is the response to the first ḥadīth? Is it possible for a person to ask regarding two aḥādīth and for the Imām to give an answer to only one and not respond to the other one at all, neither authenticating it nor criticising it, and leave the questioner hanging by using an obscure word? Maybe the Shī’ah will say that it is the practice of the A’immah not to answer a person properly and never to abandon Taqiyyah and only utter ambiguous statements. Think a little, if someone asked the Imām regarding two aḥādīth and

1 Word of reference

the Imām says, “this is ṣaḥīḥ,” then what must the person have understood? This refers to both aḥādīth or only one? If he understood that it applied to only one ḥadīth, he would have repeated the question regarding the other ḥadīth and if he understood that it applied to both the aḥādīth, then either this was the intent of the Imām or the Imām intentionally deceived him. May Allah forbid!

Nonetheless, even if we accept that the Imām’s statement only applies to the second ḥadīth, then too the Shī’ah are not saved since the subject matter of this ḥadīth is proven from other sources. If the Shī’ī scholars do not accept the authenticity of this ḥadīth, what will they do regarding other narrations? Will they continue rejecting the Imām’s statements? I will now prove the authenticity of this ḥadīth through another chain.

Mullā Ḥaydar Āmilī Ithnā ‘Asharī has written in *Jāmi‘ al-Istifṣār* that Rasūlullāh ﷺ has mentioned:

انا كالشمس و على القمر و اصحابي كالنجوم بايهم اقتديتم اهتديتم

I am like the sun; ‘Alī is like the moon and my Ṣaḥābah are like the stars.
Whichever of them you follow, you will be rightly guided.

After the Shī’ī scholars see this, I can just imagine how their hearts will come out of their mouths and how this will burn their brains. Yes, they will misinterpret it that “اصحاب” means Ahl al-Bayt but I have answered this previously already and will speak about it here as well. However, before answering it, I would like to say that when this narration is authenticated, how will you deny the ḥadīth which was approved by Imām al-Riḍā رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and recorded in *‘Uyūn al-Akḥbār* and how will you attest to the authenticity of the words which were added there, i.e. “Those who did not change or alter after him?” Listen carefully to the interpretation of this narration. The narration of Mullā Ithnā ‘Asharī is proof that “اصحاب” does not refer to the Ahl al-Bayt. This is due to the fact that the narration has likened nubuwwah to the sun, imāmah to the moonlight and the scholars’ knowledge to the stars.

و ورد فى اصطلاح القوم تسمية الولاية بالشمسية والقمرية والمراد بهما ولاية النبى و ولاية الولى و نسبة العلماء اليهما كنسبة النجوم الى القمر و الشمس الى قوله فكذلك لا يكون للعلماء قدرة و لا ظهور مع وجود الاوصياء و انوارهم من حيث الولاية و يؤيد ذلك كله ما اشار اليه النبى صلى الله عليه و اله سلم لقوله انا كالشمس و على كالقمر و اصحابى كالنجوم بايهم اقتديتم اهتديتم

It has been mentioned amongst the definitions of the sect that Wilāyah may be referred to as Shamsiyyah or Qamariyyah, and the implication thereof is the Wilāyah of Nabī ﷺ and the Wilāyah of the Walī (Alī رضي الله عنه and the A'imma) respectively. The relation of the scholars to both of them is akin to the relationship of the stars with the moon and sun... therefore the scholars will not have any ability nor recognition in the presence of the awsiyā' and their light as far as Wilāyah is concerned. Supporting this entirely is what Nabī ﷺ indicated towards when he said, "I am like the sun, 'Alī is like the moon and my Ṣaḥābah are like stars, whomsoever amongst them you will follow you will be rightly guided.

It is evident that the A'imma are included in the Awṣiyā', not in the scholars. And the example of the stars fits perfectly on the scholars, not the Awṣiyā'. Thus, it has been clarified by this 'Allāmah that "اصحاب" refers to the scholars and not to the Ahl al-Bayt in "اصحابى كالنجوم". Consequently, both our claims have been verified i.e. this ḥadīth is authentic and "اصحاب" does not refer to the Ahl al-Bayt. If this narration does not satisfy the Shī'ah and they wish to hear the attestation from their other seniors, then listen to a third chain proving the authenticity of this ḥadīth. Shaykh al-Ṣadūq has written in *Ma'ānī al-Akḥbār*:¹

1 The devastation this narration has caused to the Shī'ah by being recorded in Shī' books is indescribable. The communication between Subḥān 'Alī Khān and his brother Nūr al-Dīn is testimony to this. I will produce an extract from his article *al-Makātīb fī Ru'yat al-Tha'ālib wa al-Gharātib* printed in 1260 A.H. The extract of pg. 101 of the letter of Subḥān 'Alī Khān to Nūr al-Dīn reads: "The ḥadīth "اصحابى كالنجوم" is replete in Shī' books with Shī' chains of narrators. When such a ḥadīth's chain is found with Shī' narrators, then with which rock should we bust our heads?" Nūr al-Dīn answered, "If the chain of the stars ḥadīth gets into the hand of a nāṣibī, it will be a matter of grave concern and worry. I have seen in one of the volumes of *Bihār* that some noble A'imma wrote in answer to some of their disciples that in reality this ḥadīth is narrated from their grandfather and the wording has not been interpolated.

حدثنا محمد بن الحسن احمد الوليد رحمه الله قال حدثنا محمد بن الحسن الصفار عن الحسن بن موسى الخشاب عن غياث بن كلوب عن اسحاق بن عمار عن جعفر بن محمد عن ابيه عليهم السلام قال قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه و اله سلم ما وجد هم في كتاب الله عز و جل فالعلم لكم به لا عذر لكم في تركه ما لم يكن في كتاب الله عز و جل و كانت فيه السنة منى فلا عذر لكم في ترك سنتي ما لم يكن سنة منى فما قال اصحابي فقولوا به انما مثل اصحابي فيكم كمثال النجوم بايها اخذ اهتدى باى اقاويل اصحابي اخذتم اهتديتم و اختلاف اصحابي لكم رحمة¹

Imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ has narrated that Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ said, “Whatever you find in the Book of Allah, practicing upon it is incumbent upon you. You have no excuse to abandon it. And whatever is not found in the Book of Allah, then practice upon my Sunnah. You have no excuse to abandon my Sunnah. And if my Sunnah is not present, then say whatever my Ṣaḥābah say. The example of my Ṣaḥābah among you is like the stars. Whichever of them you hold on to, you will be rightly guided and whichever statement of theirs you follow, you will be guided aright. The differences of my Ṣaḥābah are a mercy for you.

continued from page 149

1 Although, the nawāṣib have interpolated the meaning by applying it to the renegades thus drowning in the abyss of misguidance and deviation. Do they not know that whom the seal of the Messengers صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ deemed as stars of guidance and viewed their following as a means of guidance are those whose condition remained the same in the lifetime of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and after his lifetime; not those who turned renegade and adopted disbelief after having brought Imān. I am not astonished at the fact that (in this ḥadīth) the following of certain individuals has been made compulsory. However, the reason for my astonishment is that after the changing of the ummah's condition, how will we apply the two important aspects i.e. the Qur'ān and the family of Rasūlullāh after considering that Rasūlullāh's صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ viz. Abū Dharr, Salmān, Ḥudhayfah, Miqdād and Ibn Mas'ūd are the stars of guidance; whosoever of them you will follow, you will be rightly guided? Moreover, more astonishing is that some scholars say that it refers to the Ahl al-Bayt and present few aḥādīth and narrations to support their view in conflict to what Shaykh Ibn Bābuwayh has recorded in *Hidāyah* I think. In this situation, leaving aside this difference, it will be in conflict to the first ḥadīth or else those scholars will have to admit that – May Allah forbid! – the Ahl al-Bayt are just like the Ṣaḥābah i.e. a group of them turned renegade and a group remained steadfast on their Imān whereas no one ever claimed or said such a thing. Therefore, my astonishment in this respect is more than yours. I am in deep contemplation and uneasy due to my astonishment. The worry and concern of the servants are indescribable. Nonetheless, this is a religious worry.”

No one has any objection on this narration's authenticity since 'Allāmah al-Ṭabarsī and Mullā Bāqir Majlisī have authenticated it in *Ihtijāj* and *Biḥār al-Anwār* respectively. The meaning of this narration conforms to the previous narration. In fact, the statement, "the differences of my Ṣaḥābah are a mercy for you." is an addition. It is now undoubtedly established that to deny the narration recorded in '*Uyūn al-Akḥbār* is belying Imām Mūsā al-Riḍā رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. Nonetheless, if we ignore the narration of '*Uyūn al-Akḥbār* and only accept the narration which we have reproduced from *Ma'ānī al-Akḥbār*, then too our target is not missed since the wordings in this narration support our view. I will also discuss the misconstruction and interpolation of the Shī'ī scholars in this regard and expose all their misinterpretations.

It should be noted that Shaykh al-Ṣadūq has recorded this narration just as reproduced above coupled with the following addition:

فَقِيلَ يَا رَسُولَ اللَّهِ مَنْ أَصْحَابُكَ قَالَ أَهْلُ بَيْتِي

It was asked: "O Rasūlullāh! Who are your companions?" He صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ replied: "My family."

The author of *Istiqṣā'* used these words to prove his stance when he answered the previous narration. He answered the previous narration in this manner:

پس اگر در حدیث عیون جواب انحضرت متعلق بهر دو حدیث باشد و معنائش این باشد که ازین حدیث نجوم بهم مراد اصحاب اند مخالفت و مناقضت با حدیث معانی الاخبار و امثال این لازم می آید لهذا بالبدایت قطعاً ثابت شد که جواب امام رضا علیه السلام متعلق بهر دو حدیث نیست بلکه انحضرت فقط حال حدیث دعوی اصحابی بیان فرموده و تفسیر این با صحابیکه متغیر و متبدل نه شدند نموده زنگ شیها از خواطر اهل ایماں زدوده

In '*Uyūn al-Akḥbār*, if the answer of the Imām is in answer to both the aḥādīth then this will mean that the stars in this narration refers to the Ṣaḥābah and this in contrary to the narration of *Ma'ānī al-Akḥbār*. Therefore, only this is established that Imām Mūsā al-Riḍā's رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ answer is not concerning both the aḥādīth. Rather he only mentioned the status of the ḥadīth, "دعوا لی اصحابی" (Leave my Ṣaḥābah to me.) And only those

Şahābah are meant who did not turn renegade thereafter. By saying this, he removed the rust of doubt from the hearts of the believers.

This answer is also flawed. Firstly, we know fully well that this added text is not authentic and is the alteration of Shaykh al-Şadūq who added these words so that they conform to his liking. We do not have evil thoughts of the man or slander him. In fact, his own scholars think of him in this way and regard him as a tutor in the science of interpolation. If anyone has a doubt, he should look at what Mullā Bāqir Majlisī wrote in *Biḥār al-Anwār* regarding him. In one narration, the meaning of the words “جوابى بصير” to “شاء ماشاء” is recorded. Shaykh al-Şadūq interpolated the narration and added and subtracted some words and did not quote the exact text of *al-Kāfi*. Mullā Bāqir Majlisī wrote this regarding him:

هذا الخبر مأخوذ من الكافي و فيه تغييرات عجيبة تورث سوء الظن بالصدوق و انما فعل ذلك ليوافق مذهب اهل العدل و في الكافي هكذا

This narration is extracted from *al-Kāfi*. But there are many startling alterations therein which cause doubts in the mind regarding al-Şadūq. He only did this so that it conforms to the creed of the just. The wording of the narration in *al-Kāfi* is as follows...

Mullā Bāqir Majlisī¹ then quoted the wording in *al-Kāfi*. Thus, from Mullā Bāqir Majlisī's acknowledgement, it is proven that Shaykh al-Şadūq alters the wordings

1 Mullā Muḥammad Bāqir ibn Mullā Muḥammad Taqī ibn Maqşūd 'Alī Majlisī was born in the time of Shāh 'Abbās the first in 1037 A.H in Majlis, a village near Isfahan. Some say that his grandfather Maqşūd 'Alī was a great poet who would hold *majālis* (religious gatherings) they became known as Majlisī. He was a contemporary of Shāh Sulaymān Şafawī and Sulţān Ḥusayn Şafawī. He was appointed by them as the Shaykh al-Islam and leader of religious affairs in the capital Isfahan. He wrote many books in Arabic and Persian. The Shī'ah say that after 'Allāmah al-Ḥillī, he has written the most books. Among his books, sixty are well-known. His most prolific work is the encyclopaedia *Biḥār al-Anwār* which he wrote in 25 volumes in the Arabic language. His famous commentaries of *Uşūl al-Kāfi* are *Mir'āt al-Uqūl* in Persian, *Ḥayāt al-Qulūb*, *Jalā' al-Uyūn* and *Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn*. His books hold more esteem in the eyes of the Shī'ah than anyone else's books. This can be understood from the fact that the leader of the Iranian revolution Ayatollah Rūḥ Allāh Khomeini advised the Shī'ah to read his books. He has vilified the Khulafā' Rāshidīn in the most evil manner in his books. No one among the later Shī'ah has been so vulgar in his approach in this regard. According to the famous view, he passed away in 1111 A.H. (Shaykh Muḥammad Firāsāt)

of narrations for some reason and interpolates Shī'ī aḥādīth so that they conform to his creed. So if he adds few words in this narration — which mentions the Ṣaḥābah's ﷺ virtue and which will falsify the entire creed of Shī'ism if proven authentic — then this is not something farfetched. In fact, it is obvious that he added the last sentence. Had he not done so and accepted that Rasūlullāh ﷺ stated that the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ are like the stars and to follow them is binding, then how would he save his own false religion? We thus agree with what Mullā Bāqir Majlisī has said and say the same thing regarding Shaykh al-Ṣadūq with regards to the added text in this narration:

انما فعل ذلك ليوافق مذهب اهل العدل

He only did this so that it conforms to the creed of the just.

If anyone is not satisfied with this and does not have conviction that al-Ṣadūq altered the wording as Mullā Bāqir Majlisī has said then we will prove that those wordings are added.

Proof 1

Mowlānā 'Alī Bakhsh Khān Bahādur writes in one of his articles:

Was the word “اصحاب” a mystery, a riddle, an enigma which needed an explanation? Could the listener not understand it and needed to question, “who are your Ṣaḥābah” regarding it? This question in itself is proof that the narrator has added these words.

Proof 2

The differences of the “اصحاب” are mentioned in this narration whereas according to Shī'ī principles, there are no differences among the Ahl al-Bayt. So how is it possible to take “اصحاب” to mean Ahl al-Bayt for then what will be the meaning of, “The differences of my companions are a mercy for you?” Furthermore, Shaykh al-Ṣadūq states after quoting the above narration:

قال محمد بن علي مؤلف هذا الكتاب ان اهل البيت عليهم السلام لا يختلفون و لكن يفتون الشيعة بمر
الحق و انما افتواهم بالتقية فما يختلف من قولهم فهو التقية و التقية رحمة للشيعة

Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī — the author of this book — states: “The Ahl al-Bayt عليه السلام do not differ among themselves. They issue verdicts to the Shī‘ah in accordance to the truth. However, they sometimes pass a verdict out of Taqiyyah. So the apparent contradiction in their statements is due to Taqiyyah. And Taqiyyah is a mercy for the Shī‘ah.”

Even though al-Ṣadūq and his disciples will be proud of this answer, but no intelligent person will favour such an answer. This is because Taqiyyah means to conceal the truth out of fear and to speak a lie. Who besides the Shī‘ah will regard speaking lies as mercy and state that the narration, “The differences of my companions are a mercy for you.” pertains to Taqiyyah? Nevertheless, if we accept that differences are the product of Taqiyyah then the meaning of the narration will be, “Whoever practices on any statement of my Ahl al-Bayt will find guidance even though that statement contradicts others since the differences of my Ahl al-Bayt are a mercy for you.” On the other hand, it is evident that there are innumerable aḥādīth and statements of the A‘immah which the Ahl al-Sunnah accept and the Shī‘ah regard as the product of Taqiyyah. Now when Taqiyyah is regarded as mercy, then for the Ahl al-Sunnah to practice on those statements — which the Shī‘ah have regarded as the product of Taqiyyah — is guidance through and through. If those who practice on Taqiyyah statements are in error and astray, then what is the meaning of this statement:

باي اقاويل اصحابي اخذتم اهتديتم و اختلاف اصحابي لكم رحمة

Whichever statement of theirs you follow, you will be guided aright. The differences of my Ṣaḥābah are a mercy for you?

No one should think that those statements and verdicts of the A‘immah which are the product of Taqiyyah are ambiguous and vague. They are very clear and emphatic. No one should think that when uttering those statements and passing those verdicts, the A‘immah did not understand that the questioner and listener

will be misguided. In fact, they said that intentionally and with full understanding¹ that the questioner and listener will have conviction on them and will not have any doubt whatsoever with regards to its truthfulness. The Shīṭī scholars have mentioned this very clearly. Mīr Bāqir Dāmād has mentioned in *Nabrās Īfīyā'*:

Those verdicts which the noble A'immaḥ passed in accordance to the concept of Taqīyyah, some are such that the objective behind them was to educate so that the permissibility of that action is stated and it can be practiced upon when the need arises and with the hope that mu'minīn were told the truth. Some verdicts are such that the questioner was infatuated with his false religion and steadfast like a rock on his misguided creed. Thus, the A'immaḥ gave him a verdict in accordance to his false religion since there was neither hope of his guidance nor conviction of him coming to the straight path.

When the A'immaḥ intentionally and purposefully passed a judgement in accordance to the questioner's religion, then definitely this verdict will contradict other narrations. However, on the strength of "the differences of my companions are a mercy for you," this answer is mercy for the questioner and in accordance to, "whichever statement of theirs you follow, you will be guided aright," those who practice upon this statement will be regarded as the rightly guided.

Proof 3

The author of *Istiqṣā'* has mentioned this proof to deny the narration of '*Uyūn al-Akḥbār*' that if this narration is authentic, it will contradict the narration mentioned in *Ma'ānī al-Akḥbār*. This proof is utterly pathetic because if we ignore the addition of Shaykh al-Ṣadūq then the subject matter of both the narrations will conform. The wording of the narration in '*Uyūn al-Akḥbār*' is:

اصحابی كالنجوم بايهم اقتديتم اهتديتم

My Ṣaḥābah are like the stars, whomsoever of them you follow, you will be rightly guided.

¹ The original text will be quoted in the discussion of Taqīyyah.

And the wording of the narration in *Ma'ānī al-Akhbār* is:

انما مثل اصحابي فيكم كمثل النجوم بايها اخذ اهتدى

The example of my Ṣaḥābah among you is like the stars, whichever of them you hold on to, you will be rightly guided.

We cannot understand the contradiction in meaning in these narrations. With regards to the added text i.e. “It was said to the Rasūl صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ who are your Ṣaḥābah and he replied, “My Ahl al-Bayt,” we regard it as the addition of Shaykh al-Ṣadūq which I have proven above. If we accept that Imām Mūsā al-Riḍā رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ deemed the narration “my Ṣaḥābah are like the stars, whomsoever of them you follow, you will be rightly guided,” a fabrication and unauthentic and Imām al-Bāqir رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ authenticated it, then the statements of the A’immah will be contradictory. Yes, if the narration in *Ma'ānī al-Akhbār* proved that the ḥadīth “my Ṣaḥābah are like stars,” is fabricated, we would have accepted the answer of the author of *Istiqṣā’* according to his own principles. However, when it is authenticated in this manner as well, we fail to understand the benefit the author thought he was getting by mentioning the narration of *Ma'ānī al-Akhbār* except authenticating the ḥadīth by the statement of another Imām.

Furthermore, another interesting point is that if the questioner did not ask who the Ṣaḥābah were, no one would have known that Ṣaḥābah refers to the Ahl al-Bayt. It just does not make sense that if Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ wished to mention something about the Ahl al-Bayt, then why did he use such a word which does not refer to them in common language? More amazing is that the questioner did not understand the meaning and asked regarding it. There are numerous aḥādīth which mention the word “اصحاب” but none of them have the question as to who they refer to. For instance, have a look at “اصحابي كالنجوم” which the author of *Istiqṣā’* authenticated and Imām Mūsā al-Riḍā’s attestation ends the discussion. There is no question as to who are meant by “اصحاب”. How is it possible that whenever the word “اصحاب” was used, no one asked Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ its meaning. But in this ḥadīth, it is such a mystery that the listener could not understand it and was forced to ask. This is something that will amuse children.

Proof 4

If we accept the additional text in the narration of *Ma'ānī al-Akḥbār* as Shaykh al-Ṣadūq did and that the narration of 'Uyūn al-Akḥbār contradicts the narration of Ma'ānī al-Akḥbār, then why is the narration of 'Uyūn al-Akḥbār regarded as false due to contradiction and not the narration of *Ma'ānī al-Akḥbār*? In fact, there is no need to falsify any narration. If only the last added portion is removed, the contradiction will be removed. Furthermore, I am amazed at the practice of the author of *Istiqṣā'* that he falsifies a narration due to contradiction whereas his muḥaddithīn and scholars have not mentioned such aḥādīth and statements whose contradiction is not startling. The A'imma continued to remorse over such contradictions and the later mujtahidīn died in this concern but were unable to remove such contradictions. When the level of contradiction has reached its peak and the early scholars deemed their reconciliation an impossibility notwithstanding tiring themselves in this effort, then why does this author express guilt over the contradiction of a few narrations? Shame upon *Istiqṣā'*'s author! Did he not ponder over his great scholar Ṭūsī's testimony that *Tahdhīb* has over five thousand narrations which have contradictions which cannot be reconciled notwithstanding thousands of interpretations and interpolations in the meaning? The declaration of this great scholar has been quoted by the author of *Fawā'id Madīnah*:

وقد ذكرت ما ورد عنهم عليهم السلام من الاحاديث المختلفة التي يختص الفقه في كتاب المعروف بالاستبصار و في كتاب تهذيب الاحكام ما يزيد على خمسة الاف حديث وقد ذكرت في اكثرها اختلاف الطائفة في العمل بها وذلك اشهر من ان يخفى

I have mentioned already that *Istibṣār* and *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām* have over five thousand narrations of the A'imma رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ pertaining to jurisprudence which are contradictory. I have also mentioned the differences of the people with regards to practicing upon them. And this is very apparent and cannot be concealed.

No one should think that these differences are due to the reporters. In fact, the Shī'ah themselves attest to the fact that these contradictions stem from the A'imma. Accordingly, Mullā Bāqir Majlisī has recorded in *Biḥār al-Anwār*:

عن محمد بن بشير و عزيز عن ابي عبد الله عليه السلام قال قلت له انه ليس شيء اشد على من اختلاف اصحابنا قال ذلك من قبلي

Muḥammad ibn Bashīr and ‘Azīz relate regarding Abū ‘Abd Allah (Imām Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq عليه السلام): “I told him, ‘there is nothing more burdensome upon me that our mutual differences.’ He replied, ‘This is from my side.’”

عن زرارة عن ابي جعفر قال قال سألته عن مسألة فاجابني قال ثم جاء رجل فساله عنها فاجابه بخلاف ما اجابني ثم جاء رجل آخر فأجابه بخلاف ما أجابني و اجاب صاحبي فلما خرج الرجلان قلت يا ابن رسول الله رجلان من اهل العراق من شيعتك قدما يستلان فاجبت كل واحد منهما بغير ما اجبت بالآخر فقال يا زرارة ان هذا خير لنا و ابقى لنا و لكم لو اجمعتم على امر واحد لقصدكم الناس و لكان اقل بقائنا و بقائكم فقلت لابي عبد الله شيعتكم لو حملتموهم على الاسنة او على النار لمضوا و هو يخرجون من عندكم مختلفين قال فسكت اعدت ثلاث مرات فاجابني مثل جواب ابيه

Zurārah narrates: “I asked Abū Ja‘far regarding something and he answered me. Then another person came and asked regarding the very same thing and he answered him differently to what he answered me and my friend. When both the men left, I asked him, ‘O son of Rasūlullāh! Two men from Iraq from your Shī‘ah came and asked you and you answered both of them differently?’ He said to me: “O Zurārah! This is better for us and will keep you and me around longer. If you all had to unite on one thing, the people would have not spared you and our stay here would be shortened.” I then asked Abū ‘Abd Allah (Imām Ja‘far): “Your Shī‘ah if you were to place them before spears or fire they would oblige, yet they leave your company differing with each other.” He remained silent. I repeated my question thrice upon which he answered me just as his father answered me.¹

Furthermore, no one should think that the A‘immah would give two or three different rulings with regards to one aspect. In fact, sometimes these rulings would reach seventy. *Biḥār al-Anwār* has the narration:

عن ابي عبد الله قال انى لاتكلم على سبعين وجهالى فى كلها المخرج

1 *Uṣūl Kāfī* pg. 37 Shāfī Urdu translation of *Uṣūl Kāfī* vol. 1 pg. 118

It is reported from Abū ‘Abd Allah (Imām Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq) that he said: “I apply seventy angles to one aspect. I can escape from whichever I want to.”

Until when are we going to enumerate these differences? Whoever wishes to see the fruits of this garden should peruse the section of *Biḥār al-Anwār*; the chapter regarding concealing the dīn from strangers.

Now when this is the level of contradiction and the A‘immah themselves make up seventy angles of one aspect and give their sincere Shī‘ah two opposite answers to the same question thinking this to be best for them and their Shī‘ah, then why is the author of *Istiqṣā’* so amazed at the contradiction of two narrations and trying to reconcile them? The reality is that this contradiction has been caused by the hypocrites and liars who the A‘immah did not allow to come near them, who would defame the A‘immah, who would fabricate things and relate them to the A‘immah, and from whom the A‘immah would express their exemption, curse them and label them as liars and accursed. Yet, they would still fabricate things in the names of the A‘immah. I will prove this fact further on from Shī‘ī books, Allah willing.

Second Testimony

The second testimony is from *Ṣaḥīfah Kāmilah* whose every word’s authenticity and weight is no less than the words of the Qur’ān according to the Shī‘ah. It is recorded therein that Imām Zayn al-‘Ābidīn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ would supplicate in the following manner for the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and their successors:

اللهم و اتباع الرسل و صدقوهم من اهل الارض بالغيب عند معارضة المعاندين لهم بالتكذيب و
الاشتياق الي المرسلين بحقائق الايمان .في كل دهر و زمان ارسلت فيه رسولا و اقمته لاهله دليلا من
لدن ادم الي محمد - صلي الله عليه و اله - من أئمة الهدى ، و قادة اهل التقى ، علي جميعهم السلام
، فاذكروهم منك بمغفرة و رضوان . اللهم و اصحاب محمد خاصة الذين احسنوا الصحابة و الذين ابلاوا
البلاء الحسن في نصره ، و كانفوه ، و اسرعوا الي وفادته ، و سابقوا الي دعوته ، و استجابوا له حيث
اسمعهم حجة رسالته . و فارقوا الازواج و الاولاد في اظهار كلمته ، و قاتلوا الاباء و الابناء في تثبيت
نبوته ، و انتصروا به . و من كانوا منطوين علي محبته يرجون تجارة لن تبور في مودته . و الذين هجرتهم
العشائر اذ تعلقوا بعروته ، و انتفت منهم القرابات اذ سكنوا في ظل قرابته . فلا تنس لهم اللهم ما تركوا

لك وفيك ، و ارضهم من رضوانك ، و بما حاشوا الخلق عليك ، و كانوا مع رسولك دعاء لك اليك . و اشكرهم علي هجرهم فيك ديار قومهم ، و خروجهم من سعة المعاش الي ضيقه ، و من كثرت في اعزاز دينك من مظلومهم . اللهم و اوصل الي التابعين لهم باحسان ، الذين يقولون : ربنا اغفر لنا و لآخواننا الذين سبقونا بالايمان خير جزائك . الذين قصدوا سمتهم ، و تحروا وجهتهم ، و مضوا علي شاكلتهم . لم يثنهم ريب في بصيرتهم ، و لم يختلجهم شك في قفو اثارهم ، و الايتام بهداية منارهم . مكانفين و موازين لهم ، يدينون بدينهم ، و يهتدون بهديهم ، يتفقون عليهم ، و لا يتهمونهم فيما ادوا اليهم . اللهم و صل علي التابعين من يومنا هذا الي يوم الدين و علي ازواجهم و علي ذرياتهم و علي من اطاعك منهم . صلوة تعصمهم بها من معصيتك ، و تقسح لهم في رياض جنتك ، و تمنعهم بها من كيد الشيطان ، و تعينهم بها علي ما استعانوك عليه من بر ، و تقيم طوارق الليل و النهار إلا طارقا يطرق بخير . و تبعثهم بها علي اعتقاد حسن الرجاء لك ، و الطمع فيما عندك ، و ترك التهمة فيما تحويه ايدي العباد . لتردهم الي الرغبة اليك و الرهبة منك ، و تردهم في سعة العاجل ، و تحبب اليهم العمل للاجل ، و الاستعداد لما بعد الموت . و تهون عليهم كل كرب يحل بهم يوم خروج الانفس من ابدانها . و تعافهم مما تقع به الفتنة من محذوراتها ، و كبة النار و طول الخلود فيها . و تصبرهم الي امن من مقبل المتقين .

O Allah! And those inhabitants of the earth who followed and believed in the Messengers without seeing them, in the face of the challenges of those who oppose them by denying, and those who have desire and zeal for the Messengers' (guidance) with the essence and reality of īmān. You sent to them a Messenger in every time and era and established a proof for the worthy from Adam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام to Muḥammad صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ from the guided leaders and the forerunners of the pious — May peace be upon all of them. Remember them with Your forgiveness and pleasure. O Allah! Especially the Ṣaḥābah of Muḥammad صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ who fulfilled the responsibility of companionship, bore all types of calamities to assist him and help him, left no stone unturned in supporting him, hastened to his call and answered him when he explained to them the signs of his nubuwwah. They left their wives and children in order to spread his message, fought their fathers and sons to establish his nubuwwah and aided him. And (send special mercy upon) those who are infatuated with his love seeking a transaction in which there is no diminishment in his love. And those who were shunned by their families when they held on to his rope and their relatives severed ties with them when they lived in the shade of his proximity. O Allah! Do not forget what they sacrificed for You and in Your way. Please them with Your pleasure since they gathered before You and they were

inviters to You with Your Rasūl. They are worthy of appreciation since they left the homes of their folk and abandoned prosperity for poverty, and increased in honouring the dīn despite their oppression. O Allah! Reward those abundantly who followed them in a beautiful way, those who supplicate, “O our Rabb! Forgive us and our brothers that have surpassed us with faith.” Those who followed their path, trailed their direction and walked in their footsteps. Those who had no doubt in their foresightedness and did not hesitate in emulating their ways and following their guided lamps, protecting and supporting them. Those who followed their dīn and guidance, concurred with them and did not criticise them in what they delivered to them. O Allah! Send Your salutations upon the followers from this day to the Day of Retribution and upon their wives and children and those who obey them. Such salutations which will protect them from Your disobedience, give them space in the gardens of Your paradise, safeguard them from the evil plots of Shayṭān, assist them in the good wherein they sought Your assistance, secure them from the evils that knock day and night except the one who knocks with goodness. Such salutations which will encourage them to have good hopes in You and desire for that which is by You, to abandon suspicion for that which is in the hands of slaves so that it restores them to hoping in You and fearing You. So that it makes them abstinent from working for that which is cash and temporary and puts love for those actions which are for the hereafter and prepares them for what is to come after death. Such salutations which will ease every difficulty they experience when their souls leave their bodies, grant them ease and comfort from every trial of evil — falling into Hell and remaining forever therein — and convey them to the tranquillity of the sleep of the muttaqīn.¹

O Muslims! Ponder over the words of this supplication and reflect deeply over the meaning. In what beautiful words Imām Zayn al-‘Ābidīn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ spoke about the companions of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ in his supplication. In what a wonderful manner he explained their noble traits and virtues and how he expressed their sacrifices and hardships they underwent in the path of Allah. With what deep

1 *Ṣaḥīfah Kāmilah* pg. 112 line 8

emotions he prayed for them! Which person who has a spark of īmān will doubt their virtue after listening to this supplication? Which person who believes that the Imāmah of the A’immah are part of the principles of dīn and claims to practice on their statements and actions will not admire the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ after hearing such words of praise in their favour on the Imām’s tongue?

It should not be kept secret that when we mention aḥādīth and statements (of the A’immah) extolling the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ from our books, the Shī’ah label these as fabrications and untruths. And when we present the statements of the A’immah from their own sources, they interpret them as the product of Taqiyyah. However, this supplication cannot be the product of Taqiyyah since Imām Zayn al-‘Ābidīn is supplicating to Allah سُبْحَانَكَ وَبِحَمْدِكَ in solitude. He is enumerating their virtues in privacy before Allah سُبْحَانَكَ وَبِحَمْدِكَ, sending salutations upon them and seeking Allah’s سُبْحَانَكَ وَبِحَمْدِكَ mercy for them due to the sacrifices and hardships they underwent in the path of Allah سُبْحَانَكَ وَبِحَمْدِكَ. There was no fear or apprehension for anyone at such a time, so no need for Taqiyyah. The possibility of Taqiyyah is not even present. The only certainty is that the tongue of the Imām is moist with high praises of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ. The Shī’ah should have a deep look at this supplication — from beginning to end — and should ponder over each and every word. They then should reflect that the Imām رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ is admiring them in solitude, supplicating for goodness for their followers, seeking the pleasure of Allah on their behalf and attesting to the fact that their sacrifices are a medium for drawing the happiness of Allah سُبْحَانَكَ وَبِحَمْدِكَ and a means of their religious and spiritual progress. On the other hand, those who claim to be obedient to the A’immah, who claim to follow in their footsteps and call themselves Imāmiyyah do the exact opposite. They enumerate the Ṣaḥābah’s رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ errors and evils, deem that defaming and reviling them is part of the salient features of dīn, waste their lives in finding their faults, conceal their virtues and merits and openly criticise them. And instead of praying for mercy and goodness for them, they curse them thinking this to be worship. They understand that following them leads to misguidance and waywardness, consider anyone who follows them as being out of the fold of Islam and regard those who criticise them and harbour hatred for them as being

the purest and greatest believers. I do not know what the definition of love and imān is and what the meaning of hatred and kufr is according to them. They label the Ahl al-Sunnah who practice upon the A'imma's statements and actions as khārijī and nāṣibī and consider the Shī'ah who oppose their statements and actions as the Imāmiyyah and the friends of the Ahl al-Bayt.

فاعتبروا يا اولى الابصار ان هذا الشئ عجب

Take heed O men of intelligence! Indeed this is a confusing matter!

A few pertinent points have been deduced from this supplication:

1. The Imām supplicated for the Ṣaḥābah's ﷺ goodness, sent salutations upon them and had good thoughts about them.
2. He considered those as the most superior who brought imān in the beginning and acknowledged the fact that they sacrificed and bore hardships in the path of Allah, left their homes and emigrated for Allah's ﷺ sake, left their loved ones and relatives to follow and assist Rasūlullāh ﷺ and invited people to enter into the dīn of Allah ﷻ.
3. He extolled the virtues and signs of the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ and their followers.

I will now discuss each of these aspects separately.

1. The Imām supplicated for the Ṣaḥābah's ﷺ goodness

To supplicate for the goodness of the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ and to mention their virtues is in fact obedience to the command of Rasūlullāh ﷺ since Rasūlullāh ﷺ did the same. I have already quoted the ḥadīth from 'Uyūn al-Akhbār wherein Rasūlullāh ﷺ stated:

Leave my companions for me i.e. consider the rights they enjoy due to their companionship and do not take out their faults.

I will now present more aḥādīth and statements to support this.

- a. Janāb Mīran Qiblah has written in vol. 3 of *Ḥadīqah Sulṭāniyyah* under the discussion of nubuwwah that when Rasūlullāh's ﷺ demise drew near, Rasūlullāh ﷺ mounted the pulpit and asked the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ: "What kind of a messenger was I?" Everyone replied: "May Allah reward you for all the perseverance you displayed in the path of Allah." Rasūlullāh ﷺ then said: "May Allah grant you a beautiful reward as well." This narration can be found on page 328 of this book.

Thousands of Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ were present and gathered in the Masjid to bid farewell to Rasūlullāh ﷺ and he told them: "May Allah grant you a beautiful reward as well." I do not know what this will be considered as and why do they not think good about these personalities.

- b. It is recorded in the *tafsīr* of Imām Ḥasan al-'Askarī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ:

ان رجلا ممن يبغض ال محمد و اصحابه او واحدا منهم يعذبه الله عذابا لو قسم على مثل ما خلق الله
لاهلكهم اجمعين

If anyone harbours hatred for the family of Muḥammad ﷺ or his Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ or anyone of them, Allah will punish him so severely that if it had to be distributed among all the creations of Allah, it would destroy them all.

Just as hatred for the family of Rasūlullāh ﷺ is forbidden, hatred for his Ṣaḥābah is also forbidden.

- c. Rasūlullāh ﷺ forbade reviling and cursing his Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ. It is recorded in *Jāmi‘ Akhbār* — a reliable Shī‘ī book:

قال النبي من سبني فاقتلوه و من سب اصحابي فاجلدوه

Nabī ﷺ had declared: “Whoever reviles me, kill him. And whoever reviles my Ṣaḥābah, lash him.”

- d. It is recorded in *Miftāḥ al-Sharī‘ah* and *Miftāḥ al-Ḥaḳīqah* – which is attributed to Imām Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ by Mullā Bāqir Majlisī in *Biḥār al-Anwār* and Qāḍī Nūr Allāh Shostarī, etc., that backbiting is a grave sin and slander is even worse than it. When backbiting and slandering ordinary people is a major sin, then how grave will it be with regards to the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ of Rasūlullāh ﷺ! Therefore, to have good thoughts about them is part of the fundamentals of dīn. We should keep our tongues moist with extolling their virtues and should despise the company of their enemies since this causes hypocrisy in the heart.

Notwithstanding that these narrations are present in Shī‘ī books and Rasūlullāh ﷺ and the A‘immah have supplicated for the goodness of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ, the Shī‘ah regard harbouring malice and hatred for them as the most superior form of worship and consider cursing them as a great form of obedience — whereas this curse revolts back at them. They declare their exemption from those whom Imām Zayn al-‘Ābidīn رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ, etc., sent salutations upon. The only thing on their tongues is curse — whether standing, sitting, reclining or eating. And yet they identify themselves as Imāmiyyah and not *La‘natiyyah* (cursers).

2. The Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ Bearing Hardships due to Īmān and the Superiority of Those who Brought Īmān in the Initial Stages

By this supplication of the Imām رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ, it is learnt that the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ of Rasūlullāh ﷺ bore hardships and difficulties in assisting Rasūlullāh ﷺ. They left their homes and families out of love for him and emigrated from their homelands. They fought their fathers, sons and family to establish

his nubuwwah. They accepted his invitation and gathered the creation before their Creator. The Imām has explained these virtues in such detail that no Shī'ah — no matter how dogged he may be — does not have the courage to belie or misinterpret them. *Ṣaḥīfah Kāmilah* is such a reliable book that the Shī'ah call it the Zabūr of the family of Muḥammad ﷺ. They regard its every word and letter to be authentic and accept everything contained in it. When they see the virtues extolled by the Imām, they are unable to deny them although they burn in their hearts and criticise their scholars for authenticating it.

It can be interpreted in three ways:

1. To consider that these virtues pertain to others besides the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ as was done in the ḥadīth “My Ṣaḥābah are like stars.”
2. To regard it as the product of Taqīyyah as they do with other narrations of the A'immaḥ.
3. To accept that these virtues apply to the accepted Ṣaḥābah ﷺ in exclusion of the majority of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār especially the first three righteous khulafā'.

But all the three doors of interpretation are closed and there is no other choice but to accept that these virtues apply to all the Muhājirīn and Anṣār especially the first three khulafā' ﷺ in accordance to our belief. I will prove the invalidity of these three interpretations.

The first aspect is that these virtues apply to the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ. This has not been claimed by just any Shī'ī, but their scholars have accepted it. The author of *Nuzhat Ithnā 'Ashariyyah* has attested to this in the fourth volume of his rebuttal on *Tuḥfah*.

که امامیه جمیع اصحاب را مقدوح و مجروح نمی داند بلکه بسیاری از صحابه عظام را جلیل القدر و ممدوح بلکه از اولیاء کرام می داند و مستحق رحمت و رضوان ملک منان می پندارند در صحیفه کامله که فرقه حقه این راه زبور ال محمد گویند دعائے که از حضرت سید الساجدین علیه السلام ماثور است شاید عدل این دعوی ست

According to the Shī'ah, all the Ṣaḥābah's ﷺ testimonies are not rejected, weak, and condemned. In fact, majority of the great Ṣaḥābah are reckoned as noble, praiseworthy and great saints and worthy of Allah's ﷻ mercy and pleasure. The supplication of the master of all those who prostrate ﷻ is recorded in *Ṣaḥīfah Kāmilah*, which is known as the Zabūr of the family of Muḥammad by the guided sect, which bears testimony to my claim.

The second claim is that the Imām said this out of Taqiyyah. No Shī'ī scholar has ever claimed this. And how can anyone claim this since the Imām did not enumerate these virtues in answer to any nāṣibī or khārījī or enemy of the Ahl al-Bayt or friend of the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ for him to make Taqiyyah. So the Shī'ah cannot claim that the Imām falsely praised the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ out of fear for his life or honour or to protect himself from the oppression of a nāṣibī. The Imām made this supplication when he was in private conversation with Allah ﷻ and there was no one there besides Allah ﷻ and himself. He was opening the secret file of his heart before Allah ﷻ. The Imām was supplicating and Allah ﷻ was answering. Just ponder over the great honour and respect of the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ the Imām had in his heart which was of such a high level that he could not forget them in his time of solitude. Just as he would supplicate for himself and his Ahl al-Bayt and send salutations upon the ambiyā', he would supplicate for the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ and seek Allah's ﷻ mercy and salutations to be conferred upon them. It would be sufficient for the Imām to say:

اللهم صل على محمد و آل محمد و اصحاب محمد

O Allah! Send salutations of Muḥammad, the family of Muḥammad and the Ṣaḥābah of Muḥammad.

There was no need to open files of their virtues and merits. May we be sacrificed for the love of Imām al-Sajjād ﷻ who did not suffice upon this but elucidated on the īmān and sacrifices of his grandfather's friends before Allah and prayed that mercy be sent upon them. He not only supplicated for them but begged Allah ﷻ to appreciate the Muhājirīn's sacrifices, efforts and the hardships they underwent. He supplicated:

واشكرهم على هجرهم فيك ديار قومهم

They are worthy of appreciation since they left the homes of their folk for
Your sake.

Which person after seeing these sentences and words will not have conviction in the Imām's deep love for the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم? Who will claim that enmity existed between the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم and the Ahl al-Bayt? Shame on the īmān and love of the Shī'ah! They call themselves the Imāmiyyah, claim that they have deep and sincere love for the A'imma and regard themselves as their followers yet at the same time harbour hatred for the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم and revile the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم a million times more than what the Imām praised them. If any Sunnī in emulation of the A'imma has to add "And the Ṣaḥābah of Muḥammad," in the durūd, the Shī'ah go into a fit of rage and look at him with anger labelling him a khārijī and nāṣibī on just this matter. The truth is that the amount of damage the Shī'ah caused to Islam under the guise of love for the Ahl al-Bayt has not been carried out by the enemies even. The poet said very beautifully:

إنچه به فیضی نظر دوست کرد

مشکل اگر دشمن جانے کند

The friend's graceful glances has caused more damage than the enemy
could ever cause.

With regards to the third claim that only those Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم are intended whom the Shī'ī scholars regard as pious with the exclusion of the majority of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār especially the first three khulafā'. This has been claimed by all the Shī'ī scholars and they think that this misinterpretation will solve the case. Now when the Shī'ah have accepted that these virtues apply to the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم then the only contention between us and them is that are all the Muhājirīn and Anṣār intended or not. In fact, the actual contention is whether the first three khulafā' are included or not. We claim that the virtues mentioned by the Imām apply to all the Muhājirīn and Anṣār and especially to the three khulafā'.

This is due to the fact that the praises fit them like a glove.

والذين أبلوا البلاء الحسن في نصره، وكانفوه وأسرعوا إلى وفادته، وسابقوا إلى دعوته، واستجابوا له
حيث أسمعهم حجة رسالته، وفارقوا الأزواج والأولاد في إظهار كلمته،

Those who bore all types of calamities to assist him and help him, left no stone unturned in supporting him, hastened to his call and answered him when he explained to them the signs of his nubuwwah and left their wives and children in order to spread his message.

I will prove this claim of mines. When Rasūlullāh ﷺ announced his nubuwwah in Makkah Mukarramah and made them aware of the beauty of Islam by divine command, people began embracing Islam slowly. The kuffār of the Quraysh began persecuting and torturing these people to such an extent that they severed blood and tribal relations with them, exiled them from their tribes and boycotted them. But the mu'minīn did not denounce Islam. They left everyone and held firmly onto Rasūlullāh ﷺ. It is evident that all the Muhājirīn are included in this group especially the three khulafā' who were their leaders. Who do these virtues apply to besides them? If these personalities are excluded, then who are those who accepted Islam and were persecuted by the kuffār and from which country were they and where did they live? Ask the Shī'ah about their names and biographies and see if they can present a name besides the Muhājirīn and righteous khulafā'. As far as I know, all the Shī'ah books I have studied and all their scholars who I heard take the names of only the Muhājirīn and khulafā' and include them among the believers. The only difference is that we say that their īmān was sincere whereas the Shī'ah say that it was hypocritical or out of greed for the world or due to the words of the fortune tellers. Nevertheless, the Shī'ah acknowledge that they accepted īmān outwardly and believed in the nubuwwah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. The author of Ḥamlah Ḥaydariyyah has written that Rasūlullāh ﷺ would advise and lecture and handfuls of people would believe in him. These are his couplets:

در ابطال اصنام و اثبات حق
 نہ کردی ولے کار در مشرکان
 بر این قوم ایات وعد و وعید
 کہ بگذاشتی یکدو کس پابراه
 یکے بہر دنیا کجا بود با مصطفی
 ولے بود ایندہ منظور شای
 کہ دین محمد بگیرد جہاں
 تمام اہل انکار ذلت کشند
 یکے محض بہر خدائو رسول

دگر وعظ و ارشاد بر این نسق
 نمودی حبیب خدایے جہاں
 بخواندی مدام از کلام مجید
 نمودی اثر گفتمہ اش گاہ گاہ
 و لیکن نہ جملہ زراہ یقین
 چنین ست دنیا نبود این زماں
 خیر دادہ بود ند چون کابنہاں
 ہمہ پیروانش بہ عزت رسند
 یکے کرد ازین راہ ایماں قبول

The beloved of Allah ﷺ continued to advise in order to establish the truth and wipe out idol worship. But this had no effect on the polytheists. He would recite to them the Speech of Allah ﷻ and its warnings and promises. This would sometimes affect them and few people would come to the straight path. However, all did not accept Islam with conviction. Some accepted for worldly motives while others accepted only for dīn. But this is a foolish thing to say because if someone questions, “What wealth did Rasūlullāh ﷺ possess at that time?” The reality is that he had no wealth by him at that time but prosperity was coming his way in the future. The soothsayers informed them that Muḥammad’s ﷺ dīn will be triumphant in the world, those who follow him will be honoured and those who oppose him will be disgraced. One group accepted imān out of greed for the world and another group accepted only for Allah ﷻ and His Rasūl ﷺ.

I will further on prove that all the Muhājirīn accepted imān with sincerity and none of them accepted hypocritically or due to greed for wealth or due to the soothsayers’ information. However, at this juncture I just wish to prove that the Shī’ah acknowledge the fact that the Ṣaḥābah رضی اللہ عنہم accepted Islam and they do not regard them as those who denied nubuwwah. This has been proven from the above couplets. Other scholars are also of this opinion. Thus, to quote other books is not necessary.

Furthermore, the Shī’ah scholars acknowledge that these Muslims bore hardships and were persecuted at the hands of the kuffār. They acknowledge that the same

Muhājirīn — who they label as hypocrites and renegades (May Allah forbid!) — were persecuted by the kuffār. The author has written that when the kuffār could not get their hands on Rasūlullāh ﷺ due to Abū Ṭālib's protection, they began persecuting and harassing his Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ. Here are some of his couplets:

نگہبان او بود ازین بیشتر	ولے چوں ابو طالب نامور
رسانیدی اصحاب او را شکست	بایدای او کس نمی یافت دست
کہ کردی ز اصحاب اور کس گزر	بہر کوئے و بہر برزن و بہر مہر
بہر گوئے ازار و ایذای او	نمودندے اعدای او از غلو
بدیگر ستمہائے بیرون زحد	بہ ضرب و شتم و ہمشت و لحد
نمودی برہنہ تن پاک شاں	فگندی زہر سو بسر خاک شاں
دران ریگ ققتندہ از افتاب	پس اینگہ نشاندی چنان بیشیاب
زدی تاز یانہ ر خلف و امام	بریدی ازار قوم اب و طعام
کہ اُرد بیانہش بدلہا ملال	دگر ظلمہائے بلاکت مال
بران زمرہ مومن و متقی	نمودندی اِن ناکسان شقی

When a prominent man like Abū Ṭālib was protecting Rasūlullāh ﷺ from before, no one had the courage to persecute him. Hence, they began harassing his Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ. Whichever street or pathway they would walk on, Rasūlullāh's ﷺ enemy would persecute and torture them in different ways. They would beat them, swear them, kick them and torture them in the most brutal ways. They would throw sand on them, strip them of their clothes and make them lie on the scorching sands under the burning sun. They would deprive them of food and water and lash them on their backs and chest. They would brutally oppress them in such horrific ways that the heart tremors at their mention. Such was the oppression those ignoble and wretched people would inflict on the believing pious group.

If someone asks the Shī'ah that notwithstanding your acknowledgement of the fact that the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ underwent such horrific torture at the hands of the kuffār and they bore them patiently and never abandoned Rasūlullāh ﷺ and strove day and night so that the word of Allah reigns supreme; if the qualities enumerated by the Imām's do not apply to them, then who in the world do they

apply to? If only the Shī'ah could deal justly and abandon their doggedness and reflect deeply over the words of the Imām:

الذين هجرتهم العشائر، إذ تعلقوا بعروته، وانتفت منهم القربات إذ سكنوا في ظل قرابته

Those who were shun by their families when they held on to his rope.
Their relatives severed ties with them when they lived in the shade of his proximity.

And study the Ṣaḥābah's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ biographies from their own books, they will realise that all the Muhājirīn are befitting of these praises and not one of them is excluded therefrom. If they are still not satisfied and demand a detailed proof of the īmān and Islam of the righteous khulafā' with their names, then listen attentively from your own sources.

The incident of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr's īmān

The Shī'ah acknowledge that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is among the first people to accept īmān and believe in the nubuwwah of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. I have written about the īmān of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ while discussing the verse of the cave. Here, I will only debunk all those objections which the Shī'ī scholars raise regarding Sayyidunā Abū Bakr's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ īmān.

Firstly, they claim that he heard from a soothsayer that a Messenger will be born and those who believe him and obey him will attain high ranks. Thus, he embraced Islam. The author of *Ḥamlah Ḥaydariyyah* writes in agreement to his scholars:

کہ گفتار کاہن بدل یاد داشت
کہ معیوث گردد یکے نامور
بود خاتم انبیاءے الہ
چوں او بگذرد جاننشین شوی
بیا ورد ایمان نشاں چوں بدید

ابا بکر ازاں پس برہ پاگڑ اشت
باو کاہنے دادہ بود این خبر
زبطحاز میں در ہمیں چند گاہ
تو با خاتم انبیاء بگر دے
ز کاہن چو بودش بیاد این نوید

Thereafter, Abū Bakr remained in his occupation and remembered the soothsayer's words in his heart. A soothsayer had informed him that a famous Messenger will be sent to a place near here called Baṭḥā. He will be the final Messenger of Allah. Remain with the seal of the Prophets and you will be his successor. He remembered the soothsayer's prediction. Thus, when he saw the signs of Muḥammad ﷺ, he accepted īmān.

Proof 1

If it is accepted that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ accepted īmān due to the soothsayer's prediction, then he definitely understood his words to be true. So just as he believed that he will get khilāfah after Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, he also believed the soothsayer's words that Nabī صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ is true and his dīn is true. Thus, he believed in Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and had conviction that he was the true Messenger. His belief in risālah is confirmed and this is īmān which the Shī'ah deny. They claim that he did not accept īmān from his heart. Mujtahid writes in *Dhū al-Fiqār*:

خليفة اول از اول امر از ايمان بهره نداشت اتفاق من علماء الامامية

It is the consensus of the Shī'ī scholars that Abū Bakr did not accept īmān from the very beginning.

Although Mujtahid Qiblah and Ka'bah have claimed that it is the consensus of the scholars that Abū Bakr did not accept īmān from the very beginning, he made a blunder since 'Allamah al-Ḥillī has written in *Sharḥ Tajrīd* that Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ himself said:

امنت قبل ان امن ابو بكر

I accepted īmān before Abū Bakr accepted.

When Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ acknowledges his īmān, then who will listen to Mujtahid?!

Proof 2

I am not sure as to whether the soothsayer only informed Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ of Rasūlullāh's صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ nubuwwah or other Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ were also informed and whether Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ only believed him and embraced Islam? The Shī'ah's views are diverse in this regard from what I have read in their books. Some claim that the majority of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ accepted īmān due to the soothsayer's prediction as is clear from the couplets of Ḥamlah Ḥaydariyyah quoted above. Others are of the opinion that only two persons accepted īmān due to this prediction as the author of *Nuzhat Ithnā 'Ashariyyah* has written:

و بهم اینکه قول او اگر بقول کهنه و منجمین مدفوع ست زیراکه امامیه این معنی را در حق اکثر صحابه روایت نه کرده اند بلکه در حق یک دو شخص

Moreover, his view that if the soothsayers and fortune tellers ... is debunked since the Shī'ah do not accept that the majority of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ accepted īmān due to the soothsayer's prediction but only two of them did.

If it is accepted that the majority of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ accepted īmān due to the soothsayer's prediction, then there is no reason for objection against Shaykhayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا and there is no proof that the accepted Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ according to the Shī'ah are excluded therefrom. When the Shī'ah's Ṣiddīq brought īmān due to this reason, then if the Ahl al-Sunnah's Ṣiddīq also brought īmān due to this reason then it is unsure whether he believed the soothsayer's prediction or not. If he believed it and embraced Islam then there is no deficiency in his īmān since some of the accepted Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ according to the Shī'ah read the glad tidings from early books and accepted īmān whilst others believed in the nubuwwah of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ in a dream and became Muslim. So what is the problem if Shaykhayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا brought īmān due to the soothsayer's prediction?

Proof 3

This Shī'ī view that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ accepted īmān due to the soothsayer's prediction is falsified by their scholars' statements who have stated that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ accepted īmān due to a dream. Accordingly, Qāḍī

Nūr Allah Shostarī has written in *Majālis al-Mu'minīn*:

ابو بکر بہ برکت خولے کہ او دیدہ بود مسلمان شدہ بود

Abū Bakr accepted Islam due to the blessings of the dream he saw.

Proof 4

If the Shī'ah claim that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه brought imān due to the soothsayer's prediction just to show that he did not believe in his heart then this is disproved by his biography. Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه exhausted all his efforts to propagate Islam, invited people towards Islam, explained to his friends over and over and made them obedient to Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, requested Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم to openly proclaim his message and bought many slaves and freed them for the pleasure of Allah and did not care about his financial loss in the process. All of these points are proven from Shī'ah books. Can any intelligent person accept that the person — whose sacrifices and efforts for the sake of dīn have surpassed the limits and who did not care of his life and wealth in making sure that Allah's word reigns supreme — did not believe Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم to be the true messenger and Islam to be the true religion from his heart? Only the Shī'ah can make such a preposterous statement. Otherwise, no sane person will ever accept this.

I reproduce the statement of the author of *Istiqṣā' al-Afhām* to prove that Shaykhayn رضي الله عنهما encouraged Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم to propagate Islam openly which he acceded to and they bore hardships due to this very reason. He writes:

مگر ناصبی پیغمبر خدا را کہ از خوف کفار در حصن غار اختفا فرموده و در بدو اسلام از اظهار دعوت اعلانیہ احتراز داشته تا اینکہ شیخین دل تنگ شدہ انحضرت را حت و ترغیب باظهار دعوت کردند و این حضرت بنا بر اظهار عدم مصلحت از جهت اصرار ایشان از اعلان مانع نیا مده حتی اصاب اولہما ما اصاب و قال تانبہما ایعبد العزی و اللات علانیة و یعبد اللہ سرا از خوف خدا ناکل و نجوف غیر مائل می داند

However, the nāṣibī hid Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم in the cave out of fear for the kuffār¹ and prevented Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم from propagating Islam openly in

1 Disbelievers

its beginning stages until the time came when Shaykhayn رضي الله عنهما reluctantly encouraged Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم to propagate Islam publicly. Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم did not mention the reason for it not being appropriate due to their persistence. The difficulties that Abū Bakr faced are well-known. The other (‘Umar رضي الله عنه) said: “Will Lāt and ‘Uzzā be worshipped openly while Allah سبحانه وتعالى is worshipped behind closed doors? (This can never happen!)”

Proof 5

Let us hypothetically agree that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه did not accept īmān with a sincere heart and was a kāfir (May Allah forbid!) as Mujtahid claims repeatedly. He writes in *Dhū al-Fiqār*:

اول ايمان اصحاب ثلاثة باثبات بايدر سانيد بعد از اين باين افسانه بيهوده ترنم بايد نمود زيرا كه دانستی كه مسلک اماميه درين باب اينست كه اصحاب ثلاثة از اول امر از ايمان بهره نداشتند

The first requirement is to establish the acceptance of īmān by the three companions. Then this ridiculous tale can be sung. It is the belief of the Shī‘ah that the three companions did not embrace Islam from the very beginning.

The ardent follower of Mujtahid writes in his book *Istiqṣā’ al-Afḥām*:

فان كفرهم و ارتدادهم واضح لا ستره فيه

Their disbelief and apostasy is evident. There is no uncertainty in this regard.

So if we hypothetically agree to the disbelief of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه as claimed by the Shī‘ah, this will result in the disbelief of all the Muhājirīn and Anṣār and in fact all the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم since all of them accepted him as their leader and elected him as khalīfah after Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم and pledged allegiance at his hands. Those who pledged allegiance to him and elected him as khalīfah were not ten or twenty or few hundreds or thousands. In fact, they

were in the hundred thousands. According to one narration, the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ numbered one hundred thousand at Rasūlullāh's صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ demise while according to Mullā Bāqir Majlisī's narration; they were four hundred thousand in number. If four hundred thousand people elect a kāfir as their leader, what doubt remains in their disbelief? All the Muslims pledging allegiance at Sayyidunā Abū Bakr's رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ hands at that time is acknowledged by the Shī'ī scholars. This is apparent from Sharīf al-Murtaḍā's statement recorded in volume 3 of *Bihār al-Anwār* which Mujtahid has translated in the following words:

جميع مسلمانان با ابو بكر بيعت کردند و اظهار رضا و خوشنودی باو و سکون و اطمینان بسوے او نمودند و گفتند که مخالف او بدعت کننده و خارج از اسلام ست

All the Muslims pledged allegiance to Abū Bakr and expressed their happiness and pleasure. They were comfortable and contented with him. They said that those who opposed him are innovators and out of the fold of Islam.

Glory be to Allah *سُبْحَانَكَ وَبِحَمْدِكَ يَا رَبَّ الْعَالَمِينَ!* What is the condition of Shī'ah's dīn and īmān!? Due to their hatred for Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, they falsify the dīn of Muḥammad صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and explicitly label four hundred thousand Muslims as kuffār including the Muhājirīn, Anṣār, warriors, Banū Hāshim and the Ahl al-Bayt of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. May Allah protect us from such a blasphemous statement!

Proof 6

There is no need for us to present innumerable proofs to establish Sayyidunā Abū Bakr's رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ īmān. This is because Shī'ī scholars understood that to claim his disbelief is so ridiculous that it will leave any person puzzled. Hence they rejected it and belied all of their scholars who made such a claim. I will present their statements in this regard. Qāḍī Nūr Allāh Shostarī states in *Majālis al-Mu'minīn*:

نسبت تکفیر بجناب شیخین کہ اہل سنت و جماعت بہ شیعہ نہودہ اند سنخے ست بے اصل کہ در کتب اصول ایشان از ایشان اثری نیست و مذہب ایشان ہمین ست کہ مخالفان علی فاسق اند و محاربان او کافر

The Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah's attributing to the Shī'ah the disbelief of Shaykhayn is unjustified since this is not found in Shī'ah canonical books. Nonetheless, the belief of the Shī'ah is that those who oppose Sayyidunā 'Alī عليه السلام are transgressors and those who fight him are disbelievers.

Mujtahid Qiblah and Ka'bah states in *Dhū al-Fiqār* in answer to this statement:

پوشیده نماند که این کلام بر تقدیر صحت و صدور آن از فاضل قادح مقصود ما و مفید مطلب او نمی شود زیرا که سابق گزشته که فاسق در مقابل مومن اطلاقی شده پس فرق میان کفر و فسق بهمین ست که کافر نجس ست در دنیا و مخلد ست فی النار در عقبی و فاسق که بسپ انکاریکه از ضروریات مذهب باشد مخلد در نار خواهد بود گو در دار دنیا احکام مسلمین بسپ اقرار شهادتین بر او جاری شود

It should be noted that the acceptance of the authenticity of Shostarī's statement is injurious and detrimental to our objectives. It has already been explained that the word transgressor is the antonym of believer. The difference between disbelief and transgression is that a disbeliever is impure in this world and will remain forever in Hell whereas on the other hand a transgressor will remain in Hell forever due to rejecting fundamental beliefs although Islamic rulings will apply to him in this world due to his declaration of the testimony of faith.

In this text, Mujtahid has erred or he has casually overlooked things. The text "The acceptance of the authenticity of Shostarī's statement," is not understood. Did you accept or reject this statement of Qāḍī Nūr Allāh Shostarī? To write such ambiguous words only serves to confuse us ignorant folk. If this text is found in *Majālis al-Mu'minīn*, then why cast doubts on it? And if it is not present there, he should have rejected it unambiguously which would result in blackening few pages with criticism of *Tuḥfah Ithnā 'Ashariyyah*'s author as is his practice. Maybe he never saw *Majālis al-Mu'minīn*, hence he neither accepted it nor rejected it. Anyways, the text referred to is existent. If anyone has any doubt, he may check-up *Majālis al-Mu'minīn*. Regarding Mujtahid's explanation, it is not understood since Qāḍī acknowledged that to label Shaykhayn as disbelievers is against their principles whereas Mujtahid is establishing the very same thing. So there must be an *ijtihādī* mistake on Qāḍī's part for rejecting labelling them as disbelievers or

there must be a mistake on Mujtahid's part for establishing the same. Or maybe he wishes to establish another level between kufr and īmān which is called Islam in his vocabulary which means hypocrisy, i.e. to express the kalimah outwardly but to harbour disbelief within. Thus, we have been forced to consider this third level and ponder over the proofs in its verification or rejection. We thus question Mujtahid's soul and his followers for the reason for establishing this third level. Is it to reject the īmān of the three khulafā' and acknowledge their Islam, meaning that they were proclaimers of the kalimah externally but were internally hypocrites? Or were they believers in the nubuwwah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ from their hearts just as claimed by their tongues but rejecters of the imāmah of the rightful imām, usurpers of his rights and his oppressors? And since imāmah is part of the principles of dīn, so rejection of one of the principles of dīn takes one out of the fold of Islam. Or is there another reason to fabricate this third level? Nonetheless, I cannot think of any other reason, so I will discuss the first aspect.

If the reason for rejecting the īmān of the three khulafā' is because they were proclaimers of the kalimah externally but rejecters of Towḥīd and nubuwwah internally as claimed by majority of the Shī'ah. In fact, the Shī'ah are forced to believe this since their Imām Mahdī has stated that they were proclaimers of the kalimah externally but disbelievers internally as Mullā Bāqir Majlisī has written in *Risālah Raj'iyah* with reference to the absent Imām:

ایشان از روئے گفته بیهود بظاہر کلمتین گفتند از برائے طبع اینکه شاید ولایتی و حکومتی حضرت بایشان بد و در باطن کافر بودند

They recited the kalimah outwardly due to the Jews' words with the hope that Rasūlullāh ﷺ might appoint them as governors or give them authority due to this whereas they were disbelievers internally.

I have answered this above. There is no need to repeat it. For this very reason, majority of Shī'ah scholars have rejected this view and labelled those who hold this view as nāṣibī. Accordingly, Mullā 'Abd Allāh — a Shī'ah scholar — writes in *Iḏhār al-Ḥaḡ* that to deny the īmān of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is a far cry from justice.

These are his exact words:

جواب گفتن این سخن بارتکاب اینکه در سبق بهجرت ایمان شرط ست و این شخص یعنی ابو بکر معاذ الله بیج وقت ایمان نداشته حتی قبل از سنوح ناخوشی امیر المومنین از انصاف دور است

To answer this, it should be remembered that *īmān* is a condition for being a forerunner in *hijrah* while that man (i.e. Abū Bakr, Allah forbid) was not a believer at any time. He was not a believer even before he displeased Amīr al-Mu'minīn. This stance is far from soundness.

Mullā 'Abd al-Jalīl al-Qazwīnī writes in *Naqṣ al-Faḍā'ih*:

اما ثناء خلفاء پس برل انکارے نیست بزرگانده از مهاجرین و السابقین الاولون من المهاجرین و الانصار و الذین اتبعوهم باحسان

There is no scope to deny the virtues of the *khulafā'*. They were from amongst the forerunners of the *Muhājirīn*.

He writes at another place:

اما آنچه سیرت ابو بکر و عمر و دیگر صحابه بیان کرده مجلیے ست نه مفصل این را خلاف نه کرده اند شیعه الادرجه خلافت و امامت را شیعه انکار کند دریشاں که درجه امامت نداشتند و این فقدان عصمت و نصوصیت و کثرت علمی ست اما صحابه رسول ایشاں را داند و از درجه شاں نه گزراںد

The biographies of Abū Bakr, 'Umar and other *Ṣaḥābah* have been mentioned in brief, not in detail. The *Shī'ah* do not contest this. They say regarding authority and power that these personalities did not enjoy the level of *imāmah*. The reason for this is they lacked infallibility and vast knowledge. They also believe and state that these were the companions of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and they do not strip them of their ranks.

It is recorded in *al-Ihtijāj* of Ṭabarsī that Imām al-Bāqir عليه السلام said:

لست بمنكر فضل ابى بكر و لست بمنكر فضل عمر و لكن ابا بكر افضل من عمر

I neither deny the virtue of Abū Bakr, nor the virtue of 'Umar. However, Abū Bakr was superior to 'Umar.

Who can doubt the īmān and virtue of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ after seeing these narrations and thousands of similar narrations which I will shortly reproduce? Thus, the claim that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was internally a disbeliever is falsified by the narrations of the Shīṭī scholars and the great A’immah. If someone is still in doubt, he should study the Shīṭī commentaries and narrations. Notwithstanding their deep hatred and malice for the three khulafā’, thousands of narrations and aḥādīth extolling their virtue and in their praise are found. Their commentators agree that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ would purchase slaves and set them free owing to their Islam. ‘Allāmah al-Ṭabarsī writes in *Majma’ al-Bayān*:

عن ابن الزبير قال ان الآية نزلت في ابي بكر لانه اشترى المماليك الذين اسلموا مثل بلال و عامر بن ميسرة
و غيرهما و اعتمهم

It is reported that Sayyidunā Ibn Zubayr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ said: “This verse¹ was revealed regarding Abū Bakr since he would purchase slaves who had embraced Islam like Bilāl, ‘Āmir ibn Maysarah, etc., and free them.

Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ would spend his wealth in the path of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى so Allah revealed this verse, “the righteous one will avoid it (Hell) who gives his wealth to purify himself.” The man who would purchase Muslim slaves and set them free, regarding whom Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى revealed verses and whom Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى marked as “the most righteous of people,” it is astonishing that leave alone rejecting his virtue and piety, they reject his īmān and label him a hypocrite and disbeliever. Anyways, there remains no doubt regarding Sayyidunā Abū Bakr’s رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ īmān and Islam which has been acknowledged by the Shīṭī scholars.

Concerning the third aspect, i.e. īmān means believing in the particles of faith – and imāmah is one of them – which Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ denied; hence,

1 “But the righteous one will avoid it (Hell).” It reads further: “(He) who gives (from) his wealth to purify himself. And not (giving) for anyone who has (done him) a favour to be rewarded. But only seeking the countenance of his Lord, Most High. And he is going to be satisfied.” Sūrah al-Layl: 17-21

he cannot be called a believer. I will thoroughly debunk this aspect under the discussion of Imāmah, Allah willing. Nonetheless, to include Imāmah among the particles of dīn in the early stages of nubuwwah and to reject the īmān of he who did not believe in the imāmah of the twelve A'immah at that time is stupidity according to my understanding. This is because when Rasūlullāh ﷺ proclaimed nubuwwah and invited people towards Islam, he selected belief in the oneness of Allah and his nubuwwah as the signs of īmān. No one was obliged to believe in the Imāmah of the A'immah. In fact, the Islam of Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه was accepted due to his belief in Towḥīd and nubuwwah. There was no mention of Imāmah for someone to believe or reject. If I am mistaken, the Shī'ah should prove from their own books that when Rasūlullāh ﷺ began inviting people towards Islam, he bade them to believe in the Imāmah of Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه coupled with believing in Towḥīd and nubuwwah. Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه was a youngster at that time. Rasūlullāh ﷺ did not tell anyone that just as belief in the oneness of Allah سبحانه وتعالى and his nubuwwah is necessary for īmān, it is necessary to believe in the imāmah of this youngster Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه. When Rasūlullāh ﷺ did not say this to anyone and did not include belief in Imāmah as one of the fundamentals of dīn, the acceptance or rejection of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه cannot be proven. When this is not proven, there is no deficiency in his īmān.

The Shī'ah can claim that in the last part of the era of nubuwwah when Rasūlullāh ﷺ read the sermon of Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه Imāmah at Ghadīr Khum and invited people to belief in Imāmah, then rejection of it will result in deficiency in one's īmān. However, when there is no trace of this sermon and no one was aware of the word Imāmah, then to regard it as one of the fundamentals of dīn and to label those ignorant of it as rejecters and to regard their rejection as the reason for their disbelief is compound ignorance. The Shī'ah can say that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه rejected Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه Imāmah at Ghadīr Khum from his heart and exposed this only after Rasūlullāh's ﷺ demise by assuming the position of the imām. We can hypothetically accept this, but this can only prove his apostasy — may Allah forbid! It cannot prove deficiency in his initial īmān

which he brought in the very beginning. Moreover, his acceptance of īmān from the deep recesses of his heart in the first stage of nubuwwah remains intact. With regards to his alleged apostasy due to usurping the khilāfah, I will debate this while discussing Imāmah, Allah willing.

Sayyidunā ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb’s Īmān

I have established Sayyidunā Abū Bakr’s ﷺ īmān. I will now discuss Sayyidunā ‘Umar al-Fārūq’s ﷺ īmān. Everyone is aware that Rasūlullāh ﷺ was concerned day and night about the progress of Islam and how people could enter into its fold. He was not negligent about this for a second. He would not hesitate to implement every plan to accomplish this goal. Notwithstanding his tireless efforts, only a handful of Muslims numbering less than forty embraced Islam in the first six years. Finally, Rasūlullāh ﷺ looked at this small group and supplicated to Allah ﷻ to increase it and make such a person a Muslim whose awe and honour will grant strength to this group and support to Islam and whose presence will make Islam shine very quickly. Rasūlullāh ﷺ only thought of two people from his clan who fulfil these requirements, viz. Sayyidunā ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb ﷺ and Abū Jahl. These two personalities were highly respected, honoured and eminent. However, they had deep hatred for Rasūlullāh ﷺ and schemed day and night to obliterate Islam. Rasūlullāh ﷺ supplicated to Allah ﷻ to strengthen His dīn with one of these two men and to give īmān to either ‘Umar or Abū Jahl. Consequently, Allah ﷻ accepted this supplication in favour of Sayyidunā ‘Umar ﷺ and blessed him with īmān.

The brief incident regarding Sayyidunā ‘Umar’s ﷺ īmān is that Abū Jahl who had deep hatred for Rasūlullāh ﷺ told his cronies, “Whoever will kill Rasūlullāh ﷺ and bring me his head, I will give him a thousand red camels and ample gold and silver coins.” Accordingly, Sayyidunā ‘Umar ﷺ took responsibility and went out to assassinate Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Sayyidunā ‘Umar ﷺ began walking one side while on the other side (it is as if) Allah ﷻ commanded the angels, “Pull him to My side and put him at the feet of the one he wishes to slay. See the spectacle of My power! He sets out wretched and will return blessed. He goes as

a disbeliever and will come back a pure believer. He leaves harbouring hatred for Us but will fall in the trap of Our love. He walks happily to slay our beloved and We will forcefully appoint him to kill the disbelievers. Descend to the earth and hold his hand and bring him into dīn.”

گر نیاید بخوشی موئے کشایش اربد

If he does not come happily, bring him (forcefully) by his forelock.

Thus, when Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه girded the sword to his neck and set out towards Rasūlullāh صلی الله علیه و سلم in a fit of rage, the angels began chanting and reciting these couplets:

راست شد کارے کہ من می خواستم

ہم بہ نہجارے کہ من می خواستم

إمد ایں بارے کہ من می خواستم

رفته رفته می روداں سوئے دام

The friend I desired has come

My desired work has been accomplished

He is slowly entering the trap as per my wish

Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه saw many miracles en route. He met a Muslim, who intended to kill but was told to first sort out his sister and brother-in-law who have embraced Islam, and then worry about others. Accordingly, Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه went to his sister’s home. He found the door shut and he heard the voice of recitation of the Qur’ān. He continued listening from outside. He then knocked at the door and his sister opened. He asked her to hand over to him what they had been reciting but she refused. He began assaulting his sister and brother-in-law. When his sister saw this oppression, she shouted: “O ‘Umar! Listen! We have accepted īmān and entered into the true faith. I testify that there is no deity save Allah and I testify that Muḥammad صلی الله علیه و سلم is the Rasūl of Allah. Do whatever you please.” Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه calmed down and bade them to recite some Qur’ān. They recited Sūrah Ṭāhā to him. He swooned over its eloquence and brilliance and was convinced that this is certainly the Speech

of Allah ﷻ. He immediately recited the kalimah and accepted īmān and intended to present himself to Rasūlullāh ﷺ. When the news reached the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ that Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is coming, they were struck with awe for they were well aware of his valour and intent. When Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ reached the door, no one had the courage to open it. Sayyidunā Ḥamzah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ — the uncle of Rasūlullāh ﷺ — stood up declaring: “He is one man. If he came with a good intention, well and good. Otherwise his own sword will be used on his head.” Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ entered. Rasūlullāh ﷺ himself stood up and embraced him with his mercy with such force that his eyes popped out. He then smiled at him and was pleased. Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ shouted with sincerity at the top of his voice: “I testify that there is no deity save Allah and I testify that Muḥammad ﷺ is the Rasūl of Allah.” All the Muslims shouted “Allah Akbar” out of happiness and praised and glorified Allah ﷻ for his Islam. Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ proposed: “O Rasūlullāh! Idols are being worshipped openly whereas Allah ﷻ is worshipped in secret. This cannot be. Let us go to the ḥaram and perform ṣalāh in public.” Accordingly, Rasūlullāh ﷺ accepted his request and Rasūlullāh ﷺ with the Ṣaḥābah marched to the Ka’bah with glory and splendour. Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ stood in front of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. When the disbelievers who were awaiting the head of Rasūlullāh ﷺ saw this, they asked in astonishment, “O ‘Umar! What is this?” and Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ proclaimed, “I have accepted īmān and become the follower of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Whoever obeys, well and good. And whoever opposes, here is my sword ready to slice off his head.” He showed his authority to the few present there and performed ṣalāh behind Rasūlullāh ﷺ in the ḥaram.

This is the incident of Sayyidunā ‘Umar’s رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ īmān. I have mentioned two vital points therein, viz. the supplication of Rasūlullāh ﷺ for Sayyidunā ‘Umar’s رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ īmān and the incident of his acceptance of īmān. I will verify these two points from Shī‘ī books. It is vital to write before proving the first point that majority of Shī‘ī mujtahidīn and scholars have rejected this supplication and labelled it a Sunnī fabrication. One mujtahid’s text reads:

فاروق عزتے در عرب نداشته پس این احادیث را عملائے سنیان از پیش خود بر تافته اند و حاشا که جناب پیغمبر صلی الله علیه و سلم این دعا که مخالف عقل و نقل ست بر زبان مبارک آورده نباشند

‘Umar al-Fārūq had no honour among the Arabs. The supplication to strengthen Islam by his embracing Islam has been fabricated by Sunnī scholars. This supplication is in direct conflict to rational and narrational proofs. It could have never ever been uttered by the blessed tongue of Rasūlullāh ﷺ.

This rejection is only to deceive people and protect their masses from finding out the evil of their creed. Many Shīṭī muḥaddithīn and scholars have acknowledged its authenticity. Accordingly, it has been authenticated by Faḍl ibn Shādā, Shaykh al-Ṭūsī, ‘Ālim al-Hudā and Shaykh al-Mufīd¹. Nonetheless, I will reproduce the acknowledgement of Mullā Bāqir Majlisī with a sanad from his book Biḥār al-Anwār — whose name is more honoured on Shīṭī tongues than the book of Allah ﷻ. Mullā Bāqir Majlisī narrates from Mas‘ūd ‘Ayyāshī in vol. 14 of Biḥār al-Anwār which is called *Kitāb al-Samā’ wa al-‘Ālam*:

روی العیاشی عن الباقر علیه السلام ان رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم قال اعز الاسلام بعمر بن الخطاب او بابی جهل بن هشام

Al-‘Ayyāshī narrates from al-Bāqir ﷺ that Rasūlullāh ﷺ supplicated: “Grant honour to Islam by either ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb or Abū Jahl ibn Hishām.”

1 Muḥammad ibn Nu‘mān al-Abkarī Baghdādī was born in 338 A.H. He is known as Shaykh al-Mufīd in Shīṭī circles since their absent imām gave him this title. (*Ma‘ālim al-‘Ulamā’* pg. 101) He is reckoned as a great luminary, shaykh and teacher of the Shī‘ah. All the latter scholars have benefitted from him. His expertise in jurisprudence, beliefs and ḥadīth is well-known and accepted. He was the most reliable and the greatest Shīṭī scholar of his time. He has about 200 odd books authored. (*Rowḍāt al-Jannāh* vol. 6 pg. 153) The lofty rank of Shaykh al-Mufīd according to the Shī‘ah can be evaluated from this that their twelfth absent imām would write letters to him which would reach him from an unseen avenue after he went into hiding and after the completion of the minor disappearance. Those letters which the absent Imām wrote to him are present in the major Shīṭī book *al-Iḥtijāj* of al-Ṭabarsī which confirm that he was reliable according to the absent imām. He passed away in Baghdad in 413 A.H. Sayyid Murtaḍā — the brother of Sharīf Raḍī — performed his Ṣalāt al-Janāzah.

What can we say regarding those mujtahidīn who denied this supplication and deceived their masses? We can only present their rejection and Mullā Bāqir Majlisī's acknowledgement before their followers and ask them to judge for themselves as to whether their former or latter mujtahidīn were liars.

Regarding the second aspect, i.e. the incident of Sayyidunā 'Umar's رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ īmān, I will quote some couplets from *Ḥamlah Ḥaydariyyah* and ask the sound minded to ponder deeply over it's every word and decide for themselves. The author has written such glowing words notwithstanding his enmity and hatred. No one should think that *Ḥamlah Ḥaydariyyah* is an unreliable book. In fact, Mujtahid — the Qiblah and Ka'bah of the Shī'ah — has authenticated it and Sayyid Muḥammad has edited it and added footnotes to it. The edition published by Sulṭānī publishers in Lucknow thanks to the efforts of 'Alī Dārūghah has this caption on it and has these praises in the preface:

که ہر بیت ایں بیت معجور ہست	عجب کتابے پر از نور ہست
سخن از حلاوت شود لب گزراں	بہ بزے کہ خواند فصلے از اں
دل از نور ایہاں منور شود	مشام محبان معطر شود
کہ اوردہ ہر نکتہ را بر محل	تعالی اللہ ایں باذل ے بدل
براہ دیانت قدم میزان	بوفق روایت رقم میزند
بروں نیست از جادہ احتیاط	بہ ترجیح اخبار دارد مناط
کہ افتادہ در جان اعداء قلق	بہ نہجے گرفت ست ایراد و دق
کہ پیچیدہ دروے ہواے بہشت	عجب دفتر دل کشای نوشت
معنبر چون باد بہارست ایں	معطر چون مشک تارست ایں
زہر نکتہ اش ھے شود تردماغ	زہر نکتہ سازد معطر دماغ
جگر خستگان را مسیحا ست ایں	دل ایشفتگان راتما شاست ایں
کہ گردیدہ مقبول سلطان دین	بس ست از نعوت و صفاتش ہمیں
ز حق حجت و ایتے بر عباد	فرازندہ رایت اجتہاد
کہ نام و نشان محمد ازوست	طریق شریعت موید ازوست
کہ ہندوستاں سبزہ زارست ازو	دل سنیاں داغدارست ازو

An amazing book filled with brilliance. Its every couplet is a Bayt al-Ma'mūr. In whichever gathering a portion of it is recited, its sweetness causes the

lips to stick, fragrances their noses and brightens the light of īmān in their hearts. Allah ﷻ is great! There is no one like ‘Allāmah Bādhil. He has mentioned every point at the right place. He writes in accordance to narrations and chooses the trustworthy reliable path. He is an expert in giving preference to narrations and does not step out of the boundaries of caution. He is so proficient in objecting and reprimanding that the enemy (nāṣibī/Sunnī) is utterly baffled. He wrote such an amazing and striking treatise which has the wind of Jannah in it. Fragrant like musk and pleasant like the spring breeze. Its every point perfumes the mind and its every dot brightens it. It’s a spectacle for the disturbed heart and a messiah for the weary liver. Sufficient in praise of it is that it is the favourite of Sulṭān Dīn (Sulṭān al-‘Ulamā’). It raises the flag of ijtihād and is the proof and sign of the truth against bondsmen. The path of sharīah gains support from it and the name of Muḥammad ﷺ is elevated by it. Sunnī hearts are torn by it and India has become a spring owing to it.¹

I will demonstrate the light of Sayyidunā ‘Umar’s ﷺ īmān from the book which enlightens the believers’ hearts. Whoever is not blind will witness it. I will spread Sayyidunā ‘Umar’s ﷺ Islam with the book which fragrances and perfumes the minds of the lovers. Whoever has a mind will smell it. I will prove this narration from the statement of that researcher who writes in accordance to narrations and treads the path of honesty. And with the acknowledgement of he who has caused sorrow to Sunnī hearts, I will cause the Shīah sorrow. I will wound Shīī hearts with the same speech which is a balm for their wounds. And with the authentication and acceptance of Mujtahid who has wounded Sunnī hearts, I will wound the hearts of his followers.

Brothers! Listen and look at this narration; what a brilliance it has. Smell the fragrance emanating from it. Without doubt, we also recite this couplet regarding this narration:

1 *Ḥamlah Ḥaydariyyah* vol. 1 pg. 2 preface.

که افتاده در جان اعدا قلق
زبر نقطه اش میشود تر دماغ
معنبر چون باد بهارست این

به نیچه گرفت ست ایرادو دق
زبر نکته سازد معطر دماغ
معطر چون مشک تارست این

He is so proficient in objecting and reprimanding that the enemy is utterly baffled. He wrote such an amazing and striking treatise which has the wind of Jannah in it. Fragrant like musk and pleasant like the spring breeze. Its every point perfumes the mind and its every dot brightens it.

I will reproduce this narration verbatim from this book.

بکیفیتے شد عداوت منش
نبودش دگر هیچ فکر و خیال
که اِرد کسے گر سر مصطفی
دو کوبان سبہ دیدہ و سرخ مو
دگر سیم و زر بخشش چند من
بجنبید عرق طمع در تنش
کہ از گفته خویشتن نہ گزری
بیارم بہ پیشت سر مصطفی
پس انگاہ زد در رہ کین قدم
یکی گفت با او نداری خبر
گرفت دین محمد بہ پیش
بگفتا بریزم کتون خون او
چوں اِمد بتزدیک در پیش رفت
صدائے شیندو باین گوش داد
کلاہے کہ نشیندہ بد مثل او
بہماں خواہر و جفت او بالتمام
چوں اِمد درون شور اِغاز کرد
گرفتشی حلق و بیفشرد تنگ
گرفتند خصمانہ ہم را بہ بر
گرفتند خصمانہ ہم را بہ بر
گہے این بزیر اِمدے گاہ او
فگندش بزیر و نشست از زبر
کہ نزدیک شد تا شود قبض جان

چنان بد کہ بو جہل ازان سرزنش
کہ جز قتل پیغمبر ذو الجلال
یکے روز می گفت با اشقیبا
ہزار اشتراز خود بہ بخشم باد
زدیبای مصری و برد یمن
عمر چون شیند اِن سخن گفتنش
باو گفت سو گند گرمی خوری
من امروز خدمت رسانم بجا
گرفت از ابو جہل اول قسم
یانکار چوں رفت بیرون عمر
کہ ہمیشیرہ ات نیز با جفت خویش
براشفت ابا حفص ازین گفتگو
سوی خانہ خواہر خویش رفت
بیامد بہ پیش درو ایستاد
شیند اِنکہ میخواند مرد نکو
وزد می گرفتند یاد اِن کلام
عمر زد در و خواہرش باز کرد
در افتاد باجفت خواہر بجنگ
در اِویخت داماد ہم با عمر
در اِویخت داماد ہم با عمر
زہم پوست کندند گاہ مو
ازو چوں عمر بود پر زور تر
گلویش بہ تنگی فشرد اِنچنان

بیامد دواں خواہرش نوحہ گر
 اگر شاد گردی زما در ملول
 کنوں گر کشی سر بداریم پیش
 چون بشنید ازو این حکایت عمر
 بگفتش چه دیدی تو از مصطفی
 بگفتی کلام خدا نے جلیل
 شنیدیم گردید برما یقین
 عمر گفت ازاں قول معجز اساس
 برو خواہرش ایہ چند خواند
 دلش زان شنیدن بسے نرم شد
 عمر گفت دیگر بخواں زین کلام
 ولے ہست استاد ما در نہفت
 قسم گر خوری کو کہ نیا بد زیاں
 جو بگرفت سو گندا زو خواہرش
 بد از اہل اسلام نا مشق خباب
 بر و خواند ایات پروردگار
 چون ایات معجز بیان راشنید
 بہ اسلام شد رغبتش بیشتر
 و زان پس بگشتند باہم رواں
 بدولت سرانے پیہرشدند
 یکی آمد و وید از پشت در
 بنزد نبی رفت و احوال گفت
 چنین گفت پس عم خیر البشر
 گر از راہ صدق آمدہ مرحبا
 یہ تیفہ کہ دارد حمائل عمر
 جو در باز کردند بر روئے او
 گرفتش بہ بر سرور انبیاء
 بگفتند اصحاب ہم تہنیت
 پس اصحاب دین را شد این مدعا
 بسوی حرم اشکارا روند
 رسید این سخن چون بعرض رسول

بہ گفتش چه خوابی زما ای عمر
 نبودیم دین محمد قبول
 ولے برنگردیم از دین خویش
 بدانست کو بر نگردد دگر
 کہ گشتی بد بنش چنین مبتلا
 کہ ارد باو حضرت جبرئیل
 کہ ہست این کلام جہاں افریں
 اگر یاد داری بخواں بے ہراس
 عمر گوش چون کرد حیراں بہاند
 بسو دا نے اسلام سر گرم شد
 بگفتاد گر نیست زین می بیجام
 کہ گردید پنہاں چو نامت شنفٹ
 بیاریم پیشت کہ خواند ازاں
 بیا ورد استاد خودرا برش
 بیا مد بر نزد عمر بے حجاب
 ابا حفص اسلام کرد اختیار
 ہمیش قول کاہن بخاطر رسید
 کہ این ہم شود راست چون این خبر
 بنزد رسول خدا نے جہاں
 جو در ہستہ بد حلقہ بر در زدند
 کہ استادہ باتیغ بر در عمر
 بہمانند اصحاب اندر شگفت
 کہ غم نیست بروی کشائید در
 و گر باشد اورا بخاطر دغا
 تنش را سبکبار سازم ز سر
 در آمد عمر بالب عذر گو
 نشانندش بجائیکہ بودش سزا
 وزاں بیشتر یافت دین تقویت
 کہ از خدمت سرور انبیاء
 نماز جماعت بجا اورند
 ز خیر البشر یافت عز قبول

'Umar entered into Rasūlullāh's ﷺ dīn after a few days. The incident is that such hatred was created in Abū Jahl's heart that he had no other

worry and concern but to assassinate Rasūlullāh ﷺ. One day, he told the wretched, “If anyone brings Muḥammad’s head, I will give him a thousand red camels with two humps and black eyes. I will also gift him Egyptian silk, Yemeni shawls and gold and silver.” When ‘Umar heard this, the veins of greed began swelling and he said, “If you take an oath that you will be true to your word, I will accomplish this task today (i.e. I will bring Muḥammad’s head to you).” After taking Abū Jahl’s oath, he left with the intent of killing. When ‘Umar left for the job, someone told him, “Do you know that your sister and brother-in-law have accepted Muḥammad’s ﷺ dīn?” Abū Ḥaḥṣ was infuriated and promised that he will kill them immediately. He went straight to his sister’s house and found the door locked. He stood at the door. He heard some voices so he listened to them attentively. He heard an upright man reciting a speech which he had not heard before. His sister and brother-in-law were learning this speech from him. ‘Umar knocked at the door and his sister opened. As soon as he entered, he began screaming and beating and strangling his brother-in-law. ‘Umar began to brawl with the brother-in-law. He threw him down on his face and his back. He kicked him and fisted him. He pulled his hair and skin. He was all over him. ‘Umar was stronger than him so he dropped him and sat on his chest and strangled him so severely that his soul was about to depart. His sister came running, crying and shouting, “‘Umar! What do you want from us? We have accepted Muḥammad’s ﷺ dīn whether you like it or not. If you wish to kill us, then here is our heads. But we will never forsake our dīn.” When ‘Umar heard this, he understood that they will not budge, so he asked, “What did you see in Muḥammad that you are infatuated with his dīn?” They responded, “We heard Allah’s speech which Jibrīl عليه السلام brings to him and were convinced that this is the speech of the creator of the universe.” ‘Umar bade them to recite some of that miraculous speech. His sister recited some verses which left ‘Umar astounded. His heart softened as soon as he heard that divine speech and Islam entered his mind. ‘Umar asked her to recite more. She said, “I do not remember more. Nonetheless, our teacher hid away as soon as he heard your voice. If you take an oath that you will not harm him, we will bring him out and he will recite for you.” When he took an oath, she brought her

teacher out of hiding. He was a Muslim by the name Khabbāb. He came in front of ‘Umar and recited the verses of the Almighty hearing which Abū Ḥafṣ immediately accepted Islam. When he heard these miraculous verses, the words of the sorcerer came to his mind and his desire for Islam increased. The sorcerer’s words are as true as his information. He then set out to meet Rasūlullāh ﷺ. The door was closed when he reached, so he knocked on the door. Someone peeped from the door and saw ‘Umar standing with his sword. He went to Rasūlullāh ﷺ and informed him of the situation. The Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ were anxious. Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ uncle (Sayyidunā Ḥamzah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ) said, “There is no need to worry. Open the door. If he came with a good intention then he is welcome. And if he came with a sinister intention, I will take the very sword hanging on him and severe his head from his body. When the door was opened, ‘Umar came in and apologised. Rasūlullāh ﷺ caught hold of him and sat him down in a suitable place and the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ welcomed him. Dīn was strengthened by him. The Muslims desired that Rasūlullāh ﷺ should proceed to the ḥaram and perform ṣalāh in congregation openly. Rasūlullāh ﷺ accepted their request.

Rasūlullāh ﷺ Performing Ṣalāh in Ḥaram and the Anger of the Quraysh

بساط نشاط بگیتے بچیں
 سبو بر سبو شیشہ بر شیشہ ریز
 زخورشید جام و زمہ نیم جام
 بہ دور و بہ نزدیک در ده صلا
 وزان نم بعیش مداہم فگن
 کہ جو شد ز خورشید نورم ز لب
 فروزد بدینگو نہ روشن چراغ
 بر امد رسول خدا از وثاق
 جو سوئے حرم سید المرسلین
 کہ بیرون زود از بر اسماں
 جو خورشید ہر ذرہ افروخت چہر
 بفرق بہا یوں بگسترده بر
 شیاطین ز ہمیت شدہ پاش پاش

بیا ساقی ای رشک خلد بریں
 زخم بادہ بے فکر و اندیشہ ریز
 فرود از ازیں طاق فیروزہ فام
 بکن راز پوشیدہ را برملا
 ازان مے نئے ہم بکامم فگن
 چناں مست کن زان مے بر طرب
 دریں بزم ساقی بنور ایام
 کہ کردند اصحاب چون انفاق
 روان شد بتائید دیان دین
 پالید از بس زمیں شد گماں
 زشادی برقص اندر امد سپہر
 ہمی رفت جبریل بالائی سر
 ملائک چپ و راست در دور باش

به پیشش علی صاحب ذو الفقار
 حمائل بهماں تیغ کیں بر کمر
 برفتند ز نیساں به بیت الحرام
 رسانید چون گرد موکب رسید
 نمودند باہم بسے قبل و قال
 بد و گفت این چیست ای بد گہر
 بکیں رفتی و بانباہز امدی
 پس اینگہ باو گفت اے نا بکار
 به بیند سر خویش بر پای خویش
 کہ در در چه دارند این انجمن
 نہادند پادر رہ امتناع
 ہمہ دست بردند بر تیغ کیں
 دلبران دیں مسجد ارا شدند
 نمودند یاراں باو اقتدا
 فتادند اصنام بر روئے ہم
 ادا کرد و امد سوئے خانہ باز

به پہلو رواں حمزہ نام دار
 ہمیں رفت در پیش حیدر عمر
 بگرد امدہ جمع یاراں تمام
 جدار حرم سر بعرض مجید
 چودیدند کفار زاں گونه حال
 یکی رفت از انہا بہ نزد عمر
 نہ ز انساں کہ رفتی تو باز امدی
 عمر کرد اسلام خود ایشکار
 ہران کرشما جنبداز جای خویش
 چون کفار در یافتند از سخن
 نمودند با اہل ملت نزاع
 چون دیدند این صحبت اصحاب دین
 ازاں حال کفار پس پاشدند
 بہ پیش اندر امد رسول خدا
 نبی گفت تکبیر چون در حرم
 ز تائید ایزد بمسجد نماز

Come O butler! Spread the dynamic bedding of eternal bliss. Let the wine flow from the earthen pot without fear and hesitation and fill up the glasses and mugs. Take a turquoise arch from the sky and a cup from the sun and a half a cup from the moon. Disclose the secret and give an open invitation far and wide. Drop a few droplets of that wine in my mouth as well and give me a perpetual taste of it. Intoxicate me with the wine so that my lips glitter with its heat. The butler lightens the lamp of effulgence and perfumes this gathering. When the Şaḥābah agreed, Rasūlullāh ﷺ was supported. When the leader of the Rusul (Rusul) ﷺ set off to the ḥaram, the earth began to shake and it felt that it would lift above the skies. The sky was dancing out of joy as if the sun was making its every atom brighter. Jibrīl عليه السلام was walking above shading them with his wings and the angels were on his flanks. And the shayāṭīn were crumbling out of fear. Ḥamzah was walking on the side of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and 'Alī, the owner of Dhū al-Fiḳār, was in front of him with 'Umar walking in front of him with sword hanging on his back. All the other Şaḥābah surrounded Rasūlullāh ﷺ. With this glory and splendour, they marched to the

Bayt al-Haram (Ka'bah). The walls of the Haram's head reached the Elevated Thrown. When this group reached and the kuffār saw them, they began whispering among themselves. One of them went up to 'Umar and asked, "What's this all about? You have returned a different man. You went in a fit of rage and return with this splendour?" 'Umar announced his Islam in front of all and addressed them saying, "O hopeless! If anyone of you dare moves an inch, he will find his head by his feet!" The kuffār understood what was in the hearts of these men, hence they desired to prevent them and fight them. The Muslims accompanying Rasūlullāh ﷺ divined the kuffār's evil intentions and unsheathed their swords. The kuffār saw this and retreated. Those brave men of Islam then beautified the Masjid with their prostrations. Rasūlullāh ﷺ entered first, followed by the Ṣaḥābah. As Rasūlullāh ﷺ raised his voice with takbīr, the idols toppled over. They performed ṣalāh in the Masjid with Allah's سبحانه و تعالیٰ help and then returned home.

O Shī'ah! Look at this narration and ponder over it deeply. The person who embraces Islam with such splendour, honour and glory, who can ever think that he is a hypocrite or insincere or turned apostate after bringing īmān? Will Rasūlullāh ﷺ ever be sad due to this person or consider him an enemy of Islam and a hypocrite? How quickly Allah سبحانه و تعالیٰ accepted the supplication Rasūlullāh ﷺ made on his behalf and how swiftly it became manifest that the first thing that happened after he accepted īmān is that ṣalāh was performed in congregation by the Ka'bah and the last thing that transpired was that the word of kufr in the Roman Empire, Greater Syria, Aleppo and Damascus was destroyed and the word of Allah سبحانه و تعالیٰ reigned supreme. The honour of Islam began at his hands and ended at his hands. Now this is called a supplication and this is termed acceptance.

Have a just approach and abandon your prejudice and bigotry. The personality who was the cause of 1036 kufr cities coming under the banner of Islam, thousands of temples and churches being converted into Masājid, Allah Akbar being shouted in the palaces of Kisrā and Qayṣar and their daughters becoming the slave girls of

the Muslims and who was the reason for the elimination of the darkness of kufr and the light of Islam spreading from East to West; is he a hypocrite according to you and labelled an enemy of Allah ﷻ and His Rasūl ﷺ? Then who is the friend of Allah ﷻ and the lover of Rasūlullāh ﷺ? If it had not been for Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, then what would your Qiblah and Ka’bah be while shouting “‘Alī! ‘Alī!” in Lucknow or perhaps you would have been shouting “Rām! Rām!” in Ajodhya. It is only through the blessings of Sayyidunā ‘Umar’s ﷺ shoes that you are aware of Allah’s ﷻ oneness and Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ nubuwwah, and abandoned kufr and are conscious of Islam and īmān. Shame upon your ingratitude! You have considered hatred for him as īmān. You have labelled the one who demolished kufr’s foundation and fixed Islam’s lance as a hypocrite and disbeliever. The reality is that when shayṭān saw that kufr cannot spread and people cannot be trapped in clear cut shirk after accepting Islam, he devised a plan to plant kufr in people’s heart from another angle and take them out of the fold of Islam notwithstanding their claim to be Muslims. He devised this sinister plan and established the belief of rafḍī in people’s hearts. He put the hatred of those — who helped and assisted Rasūlullāh ﷺ, who spread Islam and from whose shadow shayṭān ran away — in the hearts so that his objective can be reached and people can have an aversion to Islam or that they call themselves Muslims outwardly but have actually forsaken it. The objective of the accursed has been perfectly accomplished by the Shī’ah. The perpetual wretched has blinded their hearts to such an extent that they think evil of those great Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ and friends of Rasūlullāh ﷺ believing that hating them is īmān and swearing them is worship. The truth is that they have renounced īmān and have held onto shayṭān’s tail. Otherwise, will not the one who has a little intelligence think that if the one who accepted īmān with such glory was a disbeliever and the one who spread Islam from Arabia to the non-Arabs right until India is Islam’s enemy, then who else can be a Muslim? No doubt, he will have misgivings about Islam. The actuality is that a person cannot believe in true Islam until he does not abandon Shī’ī beliefs and does not become a pure Sunnī.

1 Shī’ism

وَاللَّهُ يَهْدِي مَنْ يَشَاءُ إِلَى صِرَاطٍ مُسْتَقِيمٍ

And Allah guides whom He wills to a straight path.¹

I feel it appropriate to mention something else to the Shī'ah at this point so that the 'beauty' of their belief becomes apparent to them and their hatred for Islam and īmān is established.

It has been proven that dīn was strengthened and Islam took root due to Sayyidunā 'Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. The author of *Ḥamlah Ḥaydariyyah* has acknowledged this notwithstanding his malice:

وزان بیشتر یافت دین تقویت

And it is evident that Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ will have ardent love for the personality who strengthened dīn. On the contrary, Shī'ī narrations suggest that Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ harboured the highest amount of hatred for him, he was extremely elated when he heard the news of his death, and he mentioned so much of virtue concerning the day Sayyidunā 'Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was martyred that so many virtues have not been mentioned about Jumu'ah, 'Īd or the Day of Ghadīr and the Ahl al-Bayt did not enjoy that abundance of blessings and favours as they enjoyed on the day Sayyidunā 'Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ passed away. Mullā Bāqir Majlisī has blackened the pages of *Zād al-Ma'ād* — considered a reliable Shī'ī book — by recording an extremely lengthy narration in section 1 of chapter 18 of this book thereby blackening his book of deeds. I will present the gist of it:

حذیفه بر پیغمبر وارد شد ، روز نهم ربیع الاول بود ، پیغمبر بمره با علی بن ابیطالب علیه السلام و حسنین علیهما السلام مشغول تناول طعام بودند ، حضرت به روی ائمان تبسم می کرد و به حسنین می فرمود: بخورید که در این روز اعمال شیعیاننان مقبول می شود ، و درستی کلام خدا ایشکار می شود اینجا که می فرماید: «فتلک بیوتهم خاویة بما ظلموا» یعنی این است خانهای ایشان که خالی گدیده ست بسپ ستمهای ایشان بخورید که این روزیست که شکسته می شود درین روز شوکت جد شما و یاری کنده جد شماو یاری کنده دشمن شما نخورید که این روزیست که بلاک میشود درین روز فرعون اهل بیت من و ستم کنده بر ایشان و غصب کنده حق ایشان بخورید که این روزیست که حق تعالی

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 213

عملہائے دشمنان شمارا باطل دہبا میگرداند حذیفہ گفت کہ یا رسول اللہ ایا در میان امت تو کسی خوابد بود کہ بہتک ایں حرمتہا نہامید حضرت فرمود کہ ای حذیفہ بتی از منافقان برایشان سر گروہ خوابد شد و دعوی ریاست درمیان یاشان خوابد کرد و مردم را بسوی خود دعوت خوابد نمود و کتاب خدا را تحریف خوابد نمود و سنت مرا تغیر خوابد گرفت و مردم را ازراہ خدا منع متصرف خوابد شد و خودرا پیشوائے مردم خواند و زیادتی بر وصی من علی بن ابی طالب خوابد کرد و مالہائے خدا را بنا حق بر خود حلال خوابد کرد و در غیر طاعت خدا صرف خوابد کرد و مراد بر اور من و وزیر من علی بن ابی طالبرا بدروغ نسبت خوابد داد و دختر مرا از خود محروم خوابد گردانید پس دختر من اورانفریں خوابد کرد و حق تعالی نفریں اورا مستجاب کرد حذیفہ گفت یا رسول اللہ چرا دعا نمی کنی حق تعالی اورا در حیات شما بلاک کندہ حضرت فرمود کہ اے حذیفہ دوست نہمید ارم کہ جرات کنیم بر قضای خدا و از و طلب کنیم تغیر امرے را کہ در علم او گزشتہ است و لیکن از حق تعالی سوال کردم کی فضیلت دبد اینروز را کہ در کار روز اورا بوجہتم میر ود بر سائر روزہا تا اینکه احترام ایں روز سنتے گرد و درمیان دوستان من و شیعیان اہل بیت من پس حق تعالی وحی کرد بسوی من کہ اے محمد صلی اللہ علیہ و سلم در علم سابق من گزشتہ است کہ دریا بد تراز اہل بیت ترا مخنہا و بلائے دنیا و ستمہائے منافقان و غضب کندگان از بندگان من ایں منافقان کہ تو خیر خیر خوابی ایشان کردی و با تو خیانت کردند و تو با ایشان راستی کردے و ایشان با تو مکر کردند و تو با ایشان صاف بودی ایشان دشمنی ترا بدل گرفتند و تو ایشان را خشنود کردی و ایشان ترا تکذیب کردند و تو ایشان را بر گزیدی و ایشان ترا در ملبہ گذاشتند و قسم یاد میکنم بحول و قوت و باد شابی خود کہ البتہ بکشایم بر رونے کسیکہ غضب کند حق علی را کہ وصی تست بعد از تو ہزار دراز پس ترین طبقات جہنم کہ ایںرا فیلقو می گویند و اورا و اصحاب اورا در قعر جہنم جادہم کہ شیطان از مرتبہ خود براو مشرف شود و اورا ... می کند و ایں منافق در روز قیامت عبرتے گردانم برائے فرعونہا کہ در زمانہائے پیغمبران دیگر بودند و برائے سائر دشمنان دین و ایشان و دوستان ایشان را بسوی جہنم برم و با دیدہائے کبود و روہائے تریں با نہایت مذلت و خواری و بہ پشیمانی ایشان را ابد الایاد در عذاب خود بدارم اے محمد نمیر سا علی بمنزلت تو مگر آنچه میر سد باو از یلابا از فرعون اور غضب کندہ حق او کہ جرات میکند بر من و کلام مرا بدل می کند و شرک بہن می اورد و مردم را منع میکند از راہ رضائے من و گو سالہ از برائے امت تو برا میکند کہ ایں ابو بکر است و کافر میشود بہن در عرش عظمت و جلال من بدرستیکہ کہ من امر کردہ ام ملائکہ بہفت اسمہاں خدرا کہ برائے شیعیان و محبان دین شما عید کند ایں روزے را کہ ایں ... کشتہ میشود امر کردم کہ کرسی کرامت مرا نصب کند در برابر بیت المعمور و ثنا کند بر من و طلب امرزش نمایند برائے شیعیان و محبان شما از فرزندان ادم و امر کردہ ام ملائکہ نویسندگان اعمال را کہ ازیں روز تا سہ روز قلم از مر دم بردازند و نہ نویسند گناہان ایشان را برائے کرامت تو وصی تو اے محمد صلی اللہ علیہ و سلم ایں روز را عیدے گردانند برائے تو و اہل بیت تو و برائے ہر کہ تابع ایشان باشد از مومنان و شیعیان ایشان و سوگند یاد میکنم بعزت و جلال خود و علو منزلت و مکان خود کو عطا کنم کسیے را کہ عید کند ایں روز را از برائے من ثواب ایںا کہہ بد در عرش احاطہ کردہ اند و قبول کنم شفاعت اور از خویشاں و زیادہ کنم مال اور اگر کشادگی دبد بر خود و بر عمال خود و دریں روز و ہر سال در ایں روز ہزار کسی از موالیان و شیعیان شما را از ایش جہنم ایزاد گردانم و اعمال ایشان را قبول کنم و گناہان ایشان را بیا مرزم حذیفہ گفت پس بر خواست حضرت رسول خدا و بخانہ ام سلمہ رفت و من بر گشتم و صاحب یقین بودم در کفر عمر تا اینکه بعد از وفات حضرت رسول دیدم کہ او چہ فتنہا برانگیخت و کفر اصلی خود را اظہار کرد و ازیں دین بر گشت و دامان بے حیائی و وقاحت برای غضب امامت و خلافت برزد و قران را تحریف کرد و ایش در خانہ وحی رسالت زد و بدعتہا در دین خدا پیدا کرد و ملت پیغمبر را تغیر داد و سنت انحضرت را بدل کرد و شہادت حضرت امیر المومنین را رد کرد و فاطمہ دختر رسول خدا را بد روغ نسبت داد و فدک را غضب کرد و پیہود و نصاری مجوس را

از خود راضی کرد و نورد بده مصطفی را نجمش آورد و رضا جوئے اہل بیت رسالت نہ کرد و جمع سنتہای رسول خدا را بر طرف کرد و تدبیر کشتن امیر المومنین کرد و جور و ستم درمیانہ مردم علانیہ کرد و ہز چہ خدا حلال کردہ بود حرام کرد و ہر چہ حرام کردہ بود حلال کرد و حکم کرد کہ از پوست شتر درہم و دینار بسازند و خرچ کند و جر بزو و شکم فاطمہ زہرا زد و بر منبر حضرت رسالت بغضب و جور بالا رفت و بر حضرت امیر المومنین افترا بست و یانحضرت معارضہ کرد رای انحضرت را بسفایت نستب داد حدیفہ گفت پس حق تعالی دعائے بر گزیدہ خود و دختر پیغمبر خود را در حق اینمنافق مستجاب گردانید و قتل او را بر و سنت کشندہ اورحمتہ اللہ جاری ساخت پس رفتیم بخدمت حضرت امیر المومنین کہ انحضرت را تہنیت و مبارک باد بگوئیم بآنکہ این منافق کشتہ شد و بعداذ حق تعالی و اصل گردید چون حضرت مرادید فرمود ای حدیفہ ایہا در خاطر داری اں روزے را کہ امدی بنزد سید من رسول و من و دو سبط من حسن و حسین نزد او نشستہ بودیم و با و طعام میخوردیم پس ترا دلالات کرد بر فضیلت این روز گفتیم بلے ای بر در رسول حضرت فرمود بخدا سو گند کہ این روزیست کہ حق تعالی دران دیدنہ ایل رسول را روشن گردانید و من برائے این روز بفتاد دو نام میدانم حدیفہ گفت کہ یا امیر المومنین میخوایم کہ اں ماہارا از تو بشوم حضرت فرمود کہ این روز استراحت ست کہ مومنای از شران منافق استراحت یافتند و روز زائل شدن کرب و غم است و روز غدیر دوم ست و روز تخفیف گناہان شیعیانست و ردوز اختیار نکوئی برائے مومنای ست و روز برداشتن قلم از شیعیانست و روز برہم شکستن بنائے کفر و عدوانست و روز عافیت ست و روز برکت ست و روز طلب کردن خونہائی مومنای ست و روز عید بزرگ خدا ست و روز مستجاب شدن دعاست و روز موقف اعظم ست و روز وفائے بعهدست و روز شرط ست و روز کندن جامہ سیاہست و روز ندامت ظالمست و روز شکستہ شدن شوکت مخالفانست و روز نفی بہوم ست و روز فتح ست و روز عرض اعلما ایں کافرست و روز ظہور قدرت خداست و روز عفو گناہان شیعیان ست و روز فرح اشانست و روز توبہ ست و روز انابت ست بسوی حق تعالی و روز زکوت بزرگ و روز قطر دوم ست و روز اندوہ باغیانست و روز گرہ شدن اہل دہان در گلولی مخالفانست و روز خوشنودی مومانست و روز عید اہل بیت ست و روز ظفر یافتن بنی اسرائیل بر فرعونست و روز مقبول شدن اعمال شیعیانست و روز پیش فرستادن تصدقات ست و روز زیادتی متوہانست و روز قتل منافق ست و روز وقت معلوم ست و روز سرور اہل بیت ست و روز مشہود ست و روز قہر بر دشمن ست و روز خراب شدن بنیان ضلالت ست و روزیست کہ ظالم انگشت ندامت بدنایں میگزد و روز بیثہ ست و روز شرفست و روز خنک شدن دلہای مومان ست و روز شہادت ست و روز در گزشتن از گناہ مومان ست و روز تازگی بوستان اہل ایمانست و روز شیرینی کام ایشانست و روز خوشی دلہای مومان ست و روز بر طرف شدن پادشاہی منافقانست و روز توفیق اہل ایمانست و روز ربائی مومان ست از شر کافران اور از مظاہر تست و روز مفخرت ست و روز یاری مظلومانست و روز یارت کردن مومانست و روز محبت کردن ایشانست و روز رسیدن برحمتہائے الہی ست و روز پاک گردانیدن اعمال ست و روز فاش کردن راز ست و روز بر طرف شدن بدعتہا ست و روز ترک کردن گناہان کبیرہ ست و روز ندا کردن بحق ست و روز عبادت ست و روز موعظت و نصیحت ست و روز انقیاد پیشوایان دین ست حدیفہ گفت کہ پس از خدمت امیر المومنین بر خاستم و گفتم اگر جرنیا ہم از اعمال و افعال خیر و اینچہ امید ثواب دارم ازایں اگر محبت این روز دانستن فضیلت این را ہر ائینہ منتہای ایزوی من خواہد بود پس محمد و یحیی راویان حدیث گفتند کہ چون این حدیث را از احمد بن اسحق شنیدیم ہر یک بر خواستیم و سر اور ابو سعیدیم و گفتیم حمد و شکر میکنیم خداوندی را کہ برانگیخت ترا از برائے ماتا آنکہ فضیلت این روز را بہار سانیدی پس بخانہای خود بر گشتیم و این روز را عید کردیم (زاد العباد از ملا باقر مجلسی متن مع فتاوی حجت الاسلام جناب مرزا محمد حسن نجفی دام ظلہ العالی علی حسن تصحیح تعادہ دودمان مصطفوی سلالہ خاندان مرتضوی مولوی سید محمد علی موسوی مطبع نول کشور لکھنؤ صفحہ ۵۷۷ تا ۵۸۳)

Ḥudhayfah ibn Yamān رضي الله عنه narrates, “I went to Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم on the 9th of Rabī al-Awwal and found Amīr al-Mu’minīn ‘Alī Murtaḍā, Imām Ḥasan and Imām Ḥusayn رضي الله عنهم by him partaking of meals. Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم was extremely happy as he addressed his grandsons, “Eat! Eat with relish. This food is blessed since today is the day when Allah سبحانه وتعالى will destroy His enemy and your grandfather’s enemy and answer the supplication of your compassionate mother. Eat with relish son since today is the day when Allah سبحانه وتعالى will accept the actions of your group and your lovers. Eat my son, eat since on this day Allah سبحانه وتعالى will destroy the Pharaoh of my household. Eat with relish son since Allah سبحانه وتعالى will destroy the actions of your enemy on this day. Eat my son, for on this day the statement of Allah will be manifested.”

فَتِلْكَ بُيُوتُهُمْ خَاوِيَةٌ بِمَا ظَلَمُوا ۗ إِنَّ فِي ذَلِكَ لَآيَةً لِّقَوْمٍ يَعْلَمُونَ ﴿٥٢﴾

So those are their houses, desolate because of the wrong they had done. Indeed in that is a sign for people who know.¹

Ḥudhayfah says that he asked, “O Rasūlullāh! Will there be such a person in your ummah?” Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم replied, “Yes. There will be a beast who will be the leader of the hypocrites. He will claim authority and hold the whip of oppression and tyranny in his hands. He will prevent people from Allah’s سبحانه وتعالى way and will interpolate the Book of Allah سبحانه وتعالى. He will change my sunnah and oppress my waṣī², ‘Alī. He will unjustly sanction Allah’s سبحانه وتعالى wealth for himself and spend it in His disobedience. He will label me and my brother, ‘Alī, as liars.” Ḥudhayfah said, “If he is so evil, why do you not curse him so that he is destroyed in your lifetime?” Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم answered, “I do not dare to interfere with Allah’s سبحانه وتعالى decree. Whatever He has ordained is in His knowledge, I do not ask Him to change it. However, I plead to Allah سبحانه وتعالى to give virtue to that day and give more honour to it than other days.” Accordingly, Allah سبحانه وتعالى accepted

1 Sūrah al-Naml: 52.

2 successor

his supplication and revealed to him, “O Rasūl! I give virtue to that day and grant ‘Alī a rank similar to yours due to the oppression he will endure. That man will display audacity, change My speech, ascribe partners to Me, prevent people from My path and appear before Me with disbelief. I have thus commanded the angels of the seven skies to ordain the day when he is killed as a day of festivity for the Shī‘ah and lovers and elevate My chair of honour to the lofty level of the Bayt al-Ma‘mūr and pray for the forgiveness of all the Shī‘ah. I have ordered all the angels to lift the pens for three days from that day from all men and not to write any sin no matter how grave the sin may be. O Muḥammad! I have made that day an ‘Īd for you and your Shī‘ah.”

O believers! Look at this filthy narration and cry over the īmān and intelligence of the Shī‘ah. It is not surprising for the earth to split and swallow them, for the lightning to strike and burn them and for a hurricane to utterly destroy them. How they have slandered Rasūlullāh ﷺ and fabricated against Allah’s ﷻ beloved in this narration! May Allah ﷻ punish that nation for this slander whose eyes are blind, whose ears are deaf and whose hearts are sealed. This verse aptly applies to them:

وَلَقَدْ ذَرَأْنَا لِجَهَنَّمَ كَثِيرًا مِّنَ الْجِنِّ وَالإِنسِ ۗ لَهُمْ قُلُوبٌ لَا يَفْقَهُونَ بِهَا وَلَهُمْ أَعْيُنٌ لَا يُبْصِرُونَ
بِهَا وَلَهُمْ أُذَانٌ لَا يَسْمَعُونَ بِهَا ۗ أُولَئِكَ كَالْأَنْعَامِ بَلْ هُمْ أَضَلُّ ۗ أُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْغَافِلُونَ ﴿١٧٩﴾

And We have certainly created for Hell many of the jinn and mankind. They have hearts with which they do not understand, they have eyes with which they do not see, and they have ears with which they do not hear. Those are like livestock; rather, they are more astray. It is they who are the heedless.¹

The fabricator of this narration has mentioned every speck of kufr and attributed every type of lie and slander against Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Who will ever believe that Rasūlullāh ﷺ is so distressed by him that he expresses such joy at his

1 Sūrah al-A‘rāf: 179.

death and regards the day of his demise to be superior to ʿĪd al-Fiṭr, ʿĪd al-Aḍḥā and ʿĪd al-Ghadīr. The same man who Rasūlullāh ﷺ supplicated for. Who Rasūlullāh ﷺ prayed for as narrated by Imām al-Bāqir رَحِمَهُ اللهُ:

اللهم اعز الاسلام بعمر بن الخطاب

O Allah strengthen Islam with ʿUmar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb.

The one in whose favour Allah ﷻ answered his supplication. The one who as soon as he accepted īmān, established the flag of Islam by the Kaʿbah and prepared Rasūlullāh ﷺ to march to the Kaʿbah. The one who spent his entire life in Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ love and obedience and in the spreading of Islam. The one who did not enjoy the pleasures of this world. The one who sacrificed his life in Allah’s ﷻ path.

And Allah ﷻ is so overjoyed that He orders that the pens which record the sins should be lifted for three days and grants permission to the Shīʿah to do whatever they wish in this period whether fornication, drinking wine, demolishing Masājīd, burning the Qurʾān and they will not be held accountable. The *Kirāman Kātībīn*¹ are on standby; not writing. If they won’t fulfil their base desires in this time then when will they?

For Allah’s ﷻ sake, apply your mind and think. Look at how far shayṭān has deviated the sect – who are enemies to their intellect and enemies to īmān – from Islam. Glory be to Allah ﷻ! Allah ﷻ is pure! What a religion and creed that on one hand people perform ṣalāh for years on end until they die, fast for thirty days in the heat and bear the pangs of hunger and thirst and travel thousands of miles withstanding all the difficulties of journey to reach the Kaʿbah and perform ḥajj while on the other hand the Shīʿah sit in their homes committing fornication and adultery, drinking wine, eating sweetmeats on the 9th of Rabīʿ al-Awwal on the name of their hero and devouring accursed food, yet the latter attains more reward than the former!?

¹ Noble scribes – the angels who write down the actions of a person.

Look at the justice of Allah ﺳُبْحَانَہُ وَتَعَالَى (according to them). Most probably it is for this reason that they believe Allah ﺳُبْحَانَہُ وَتَعَالَى to be just and regard justice as one of the five principles of dīn. If this is īmān and love for the Ahl al-Bayt, then shame and regret on such īmān and love. If believers and lovers are such people, then destruction to them:

گر ولی ابن ست لعنت بر ولی

If this is a friend, then curse on friendship.

If this fabrication is considered authentic, it will have to be accepted that Rasūlullāh ﺻَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ would observe Taqiyyah and would fear the kuffār. In fact he would fear his own friends and would not express what is in his heart out of fear. Had he not been afraid, then why did he allow such an enemy of Allah ﺳُبْحَانَہُ وَتَعَالَى and His Rasūl ﺻَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ like Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ to sit in his company upon whose demise he is over the moon and whose day of demise he considers to be superior to Jumu‘ah and ‘Īd and who he labels as the Pharaoh of his household members? Why did he take him as a companion and why does he ask his advice and opinions all the time? Can anyone fathom that Rasūlullāh ﺻَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ would practice Taqiyyah whereas it is his duty to guide mankind, convey to them the commands of Allah ﺳُبْحَانَہُ وَتَعَالَى and make them aware of good and evil? Is it possible that he could not take the name of ‘Umar out of fear for his life? Is it possible that notwithstanding understanding him to be the enemy of his dīn, he intentionally did not evict him from his company and did not expose his kufr and hypocrisy openly to the people? Leave this aside, he did not even tell the inmates of his house who asked him and spoke ambiguously all the time. Rasūlullāh ﺻَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ tells Sayyidunā Ḥudhayfah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ the whole story but does not take Sayyidunā ‘Umar’s رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ name. In fact, he does not answer him clearly when he asks. He only mentions his qualities and then remains silent. Even if he told Sayyidunā Ḥudhayfah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ his name, he commanded him to keep it secret.

The Shī‘ah are shocking! They blacken the name of Muslims. They slander Rasūlullāh ﺻَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ so nastily and are not at all ashamed of Allah ﺳُبْحَانَہُ وَتَعَالَى and His

Rasūl ﷺ. May curse be on this vile Taqiyyah from which no one is saved to the extent that they level the accusation of Taqiyyah on Rasūlullāh ﷺ whereas their scholars have declared that Rasūlullāh ﷺ does not practice Taqiyyah. In fact, he is prohibited from practicing it. I will discuss this in the Taqiyyah discussion. If Rasūlullāh ﷺ used to practice Taqiyyah and would fear the kuffār and would not speak the truth, then how did dīn continue and how did Islam spread and how did people believe in his truthfulness? Rasūlullāh ﷺ did not practice Taqiyyah in the early stages of nubuwwah, but openly mentioned the evil of the kuffār notwithstanding their persecution and did not stop badmouthing their idols and withstood all types of oppression due to this. After hijrah and after jihād was ordained, Rasūlullāh ﷺ killed the kuffār and mushrikīn and declared the blood of the one whose killing was necessary as useless and incited people to kill such persons by clearly mentioning their names. On the other hand, Rasūlullāh ﷺ did not separate Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه from his merciful embrace notwithstanding that he understood that there was no kāfir or hypocrite and no enemy of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and Rasūlullāh ﷺ greater than him. He only praised him and never ever spoke an evil word about him. It is evident from this that there was no fear greater than this. And who can practice more Taqiyyah than Rasūlullāh ﷺ?

I will present some poetry from *Ḥamlah Ḥaydariyyah* which shows that Rasūlullāh ﷺ exposed the vices of the kuffār and defamed their idols and gods and did not care the least about it. And notwithstanding people advising him otherwise, he persisted upon this.

بیارند خورشید را ترجمان
 نه بندم لب از امر پروردگار
 بجز لعن ایامے گم کرده راه
 اگر نیک داند اگر بد برند

بفر مود اگر قوم از اسمان
 گزارند بردشت من بدیه وار
 بجز طعن اصنام و وصف اله
 زمن قوم حرف دگر نشنوند

Rasūlullāh ﷺ declared, “If the people were to bring the sun and place it in my hands, I will not keep my mouth quiet and will continue defaming the idols and praising Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى as per divine command. They will only hear the defamation of deviated statues from me whether they like it or not.”

The same author writes concerning the open propagation of Rasūlullāh's ﷺ da'wah:

کمر بستہ در کار خود سخت جست	بدعوت شد اِمادہ تراز نخست
نہ تنگ اِمداز جور بیداد خلق	نیا سودیکدم زار شاد خلق
نمودے بحق قوم خود را طلب	بہ صبح و بشام و بروز و بہ شب
نہ از لعن بر زمرہ کافراں	نہ از طعن اصنام بستے زباں
نمودی ادا اشکارا نماز	نہ کردی ازاں ناکساں احتراز
در احوال اِبانے اِن گہرباں	چو در شان قومی شقاوت نشاں
بسوی نبی جبرئیل امیں	ز نزد خدائے جہاں افریں
بخواندے بر ایشاں نبی پے حجاب	رسانیدے ایات قہر و عقاب
فتادی ازاں غصہ اِتش جہاں	شدی خوں ازین غم دل مشرکاں
بدست و زباں باشہ انبیاء	تلاھے نمودندے اِن اشقیاء
نبی را ازیشاں نہ بد بیچ پاک	و لیکن بتائید بزدان پاک
خدائے جہاں را چناں می ستود	بد انساں کہ در کار خود بود

Rasūlullāh ﷺ prepared himself to propagate Islam like never before. He equipped himself to fulfil his mission with force. He did not take a break from inviting the creation to guidance and did not give up notwithstanding the persecution of the oppressive creation. He continued calling his people to the truth from morning till night. He did not stop defaming the idols and criticising the kuffār nor protect himself from those despicable lot but performed ṣalāh openly. When the Creator of the universe would reveal verses of punishment and wrath via Jibrīl عليه السلام regarding their wretchedness and their misguided statues, Rasūlullāh ﷺ would recite it to them without any hesitation which would break the mushrikīn's hearts and would infuriate them. Those wretched souls would persecute Rasūlullāh ﷺ to get revenge. However, Rasūlullāh ﷺ did not fear them for Allah's ﷻ help was with him. The person who is fully determined praises Allah ﷻ in this manner.

O Shī'ah! Ponder over the propagation, advice and invitation of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. In the early stages of nubuwwah when there were no helpers or assistants nor armies or soldiers, Rasūlullāh ﷺ did not care about his life or honour in

spreading the smallest of matters and would openly declare on the face of those whose defamation was brought by Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ from Allah ﷻ. And at the end, when thousands of people became Muslim and hundreds of thousands were at his disposal and the kings of the world were shivering, then Rasūlullāh ﷺ fears Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to such an extent that he does not mention a word about him to anyone notwithstanding his hypocrisy and disbelief. He only told Sayyidunā Ḥudhayfah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ something secretly behind closed doors and told no one else. Forget telling people, he never ever separated Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ from his blessed company and continued taking his advice and counsel and included him among those concerning whom Allah ﷻ declared:

وَشَاوِرْهُمْ فِي الْأَمْرِ

Consult them in the matter.¹

If the Shī‘ah claim that it was not Allah’s ﷻ command for this to be exposed then peace be upon that God who fears Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ that he does not expose such an important matter due to the fear of one man and emphasises on Rasūlullāh ﷺ to keep quiet about it. If someone thinks that Rasūlullāh ﷺ thought that people will not believe him but will turn away if his kufr and hypocrisy is exposed, then we do not accept this since Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ mission is to convey every single thing whether the ummah accepts or not. If Rasūlullāh ﷺ had to declare and make everyone aware of Sayyidunā ‘Umar’s رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ kufr and hypocrisy, then his job was done. And if Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ did not accept, then this would prove his misguidance. These virtues concerning the day of Sayyidunā ‘Umar’s رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ demise which Rasūlullāh ﷺ told Sayyidunā Ḥudhayfah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ are such that Rasūlullāh ﷺ ought to gather all the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ and ascend the pulpit and deliver a lecture like the lecture at Ghadīr Khum and hold Sayyidunā ‘Umar’s رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ hand telling the people, “This man is a kāfir and hypocrite and the Pharaoh of my Ahl al-Bayt, thus recognise him properly. He will oppress my Ahl al-Bayt, hold the whip of oppression and tyranny and

1 Sūrah Āl ‘Imrān: 159.

usurp the right of my brother, ‘Alī, Allah ﷻ has mentioned these virtues regarding the day of his demise.” Had Rasūlullāh ﷺ done this, he would have fulfilled the responsibility of conveying. Glory be to Allah ﷻ! Rasūlullāh ﷺ mentions such small things openly and Allah ﷻ reveals verses mentioning a small hypocrite to defame and expose him while on the other hand Allah ﷻ does not reveal one verse regarding the tyrant and hypocrite ‘Umar (May Allah forbid) and Rasūlullāh ﷺ does not speak a word. Disgrace over such warped intellect and shame upon such filthy beliefs neither the principles nor the divisions of which are sound.

شرم بایدت از خدا و رسول

نے فروعت محکم امد نے اصول

Neither the principles nor the divisions are sound

Shame on this from Allah and Rasūl

3. The Virtues and Signs of the Tābī‘īn of the Ṣaḥābah

In this supplication, just as Sayyidunā Zayn al-‘Ābidīn رَحِمَهُ اللهُ sent salutations upon the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, he supplicated for mercy for the Tābī‘īn. These are the words of the Imām:

اللهم واصل الي التابعين لهم باحسان ، الذين يقولون : ربنا اغفر لنا و لاخواننا الذين سبقونا بالايمان خیر جزائك .الذين قصدوا سمتهم ، و تحروا وجهتهم ، و مضوا علي شاكلتهم .لم يثنهم ريب في بصيرتهم ، و لم يخلجهم شك في قفو اثارهم ، و الايتمام بهداية منارهم .مكانفين و موازين لهم ، يدنون بدينهم ، و يهتدون بهديهم ، يتفقون عليهم ، و لا يتهمونهم فيما ادوا اليهم

O Allah! Reward those abundantly who followed them in a beautiful way. Those who supplicate, “O our Rabb! Forgive us and our brothers that have surpassed us with faith.” Those who followed their path, trailed their direction and walked in their footsteps. Those who had no doubt in their foresightedness and did not hesitate in emulating their ways and following their guided lamps, protecting and supporting them. Those who followed their dīn and guidance, concurred with them and did not criticise them in what they delivered to them.

It is clear from these words that the Tābi‘īn enjoy the highest rank and are superior to the rest of the ummah after the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ and their signs have been listed by the Imām رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. Accordingly, not a slight doubt remains that the group of the ummah of Muḥammad صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ who followed the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ is superior and only that group is on the original path of īmān who followed in the Ṣaḥābah’s رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ footsteps. Now we have to find out as to who were those persons who followed their footsteps. Are they the Ahl al-Sunnah or the Shī‘ah? This can be concluded by looking at the beliefs of both these sects. The Sunnī beliefs concur to what the Imām رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ has said in his supplication that they are the followers of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ and they would supplicate for their goodness and pray that mercy descends on them understanding them to be the forerunners and predecessors. They would follow their ways and looked up to them with high esteem. The Shī‘ī beliefs are in stark conflict to this. They believe the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ to be evil and criticise them and exempt themselves from them. They label them as disbelievers and hypocrites. They regard following them as kufr. They doubt their good qualities and slander them in every possible way. In short, it is incumbent upon the one who possesses īmān and intelligence to study the words of the Imām’s رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ supplication and then have a look at the beliefs of the Ahl al-Sunnah and Shī‘ah and then judge whether the Ahl al-Sunnah are upon the truth or the Shī‘ah in accordance to the Imām’s statement.

Third Testimony

It is recorded in the most reliable Shī‘ī *Tafsīr* which they attribute to Imām Ḥasan al-‘Askarī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ:

ان الله اوحى الى ادم ان الله ليفيض على كل واحد من محبي محمد و ال محمد و اصحاب محمد ما لو قسمت على كل عدد ما خلق الله من طول الدهر الى اخره و كانوا كفارا لادهم الى عاقبة محمودة و ايمان بالله حتى يستحقوا به الجنة و ان رجلا ممن يبغض ال محمد و اصحابه او واحدا منهم لعذبه الله عذابا لو قسم على مثل خلق الله لاهلكهم اجمعين

Indeed Allah ﷻ revealed to Ādam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام: “Certainly Allah ﷻ will favour everyone who loves Muḥammad صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, his family and Ṣaḥābah

to such an extent that if it were to be distributed to every creation of Allah ﷻ from the beginning of time to the end and they had been disbelievers, it would lead them to a pleasant ending and belief in Allah ﷻ so that they would be deserving of Jannah. And a man who hates the family of Muḥammad ﷺ and his Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم or anyone of them will be punished by Allah ﷻ with such a severe punishment that had it been distributed among all of Allah's ﷻ creation, it would have destroyed them all."

Fourth Testimony

It is recorded in the same *Tafsīr*:

لما بعث الله موسى بن عمران واصطفاه نجيا و فلق له البحر و نجى بنى اسرائيل و اعطاه التوراة و الالواح راى مكانه من ربه عز و جل فقال يا رب لقد اكرمتنى بكرامة لم تكرم بها احدا من قبلى فهل فى انبيائك عندك من هو اكرم منى فقال الله تعالى يا موسى اما علمت ان محمدا افضل عندى من جميع خلقى فقال موسى فهل فى ال الانبياء اكرم من الى فقال عز و جل يا موسى اما علمت ان فضل ال محمد على ال جميع النبيين كفضل محمد على جميع المرسلين فقال يا رب ان كان فضل ال محمد عندك كذلك فهل فى صحابة الانبياء عندك اكرم من اصحابى فقال يا موسى اما علمت ان فضل صحابة محمد على جميع صحابة المرسلين كفضل ال محمد على ال جميع النبيين فقال موسى ان كان فضل محمد و ال محمد و اصحاب محمد كما وصفت فهل فى امم الانبياء افضل عندك من امتى ظللت عليهم الغمام و انزلت عليهم المن و السلوى و فلت لهم البحر فقال الله يا موسى ان فضل امة محمد على امم جميع الانبياء كفضلى على خلقى

When Allah ﷻ appointed Mūsā ibn 'Imrān عليه السلام as a Rasūl, selected him for His speech, split the sea for him, saved the Banī Isrā'īl and granted him the Torāh and the Tablets, he recognised his lofty status by his Rabb and exclaimed: "O my Rabb! You have honoured me with such honour which You have not honoured anyone before me. Is there anyone among Your ambiyā' who is more honoured than me?" Allah ﷻ replied: "O Mūsā! Are you not aware that Muḥammad is superior to the entire creation according to Me?" Mūsā asked: "Is there any Rusul' family more honoured than my family?" Allah ﷻ declared: "O Mūsā! Do you not know that the superiority of Muḥammad's family upon the family of all the Rusul is like

the superiority of Muḥammad upon all the Rusul?” He then supplicated: “O my Rabb! If the superiority of Muḥammad’s family is so great, then are any of the companions of the ambiyā’ superior to my companions?” Allah ﷻ stated: “O Mūsā! Are you not aware that the superiority of Muḥammad’s Ṣaḥābah upon the companions of all the Rusul is like the superiority of Muḥammad’s family upon the family of all the Rusul?” Mūsā then questioned: “If the superiority of Muḥammad, his family and companions are as You have described, then is there anyone from the Rusul’ nations superior to my nation whom You shaded with the clouds and upon whom You sent manna and salwā, and split the sea for?” Allah ﷻ declared: “O Mūsā! The superiority of Muḥammad’s nation over the nations of the rest of the ambiyā’ is like My superiority over My creation.”

Two things are established from these two narrations:

Firstly, the one who has hatred for Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ Ṣaḥābah ﷺ is deserving of such a punishment which will destroy the entire universe while on the other hand those who love them are deserving of such a reward that will make the ending of the disbelievers pleasant. Secondly, the superiority of Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ Ṣaḥābah ﷺ upon the companions of the other Rusul is like the superiority of Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ family over the families of the rest of the Rusul. When these two things have been established, the Shī‘ah creed has been demolished and falsified since the base of their creed is hatred for the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ and considering them to be evil. Whoever hates them is a true believer and those who consider them the worst are the pure Shī‘ah.

Owing to these two narrations whose narrator is Imām Ḥasan al-‘Askarī ﷺ and which are authentic and reliable according to the Shī‘ah, the Shī‘ah have no third option. Either they accept the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ as the best, agree to their virtue and love them so that they become deserving of reward or they consider them as evil and harbour hatred for them thus becoming deserving of punishment. However, the Shī‘ah will not agree to the Ṣaḥābah’s ﷺ virtue until and unless they do not abandon their Shī‘ī creed and join up with the Ahl al-Sunnah. No one

can remain a Shī'ī by admitting the Ṣaḥābah's ﷺ virtue. All the Shī'ī scholars from 'Abd Allāh ibn Sabā's time till Mujtahid's time have wasted their entire lives trying to locate the faults of the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ, establish their evils and deny their virtues. If anyone denies this fact, he should take the pain to study Shī'ī books and will not find a page free from the Ṣaḥābah's ﷺ evils and expressing exemption from them. Mujtahid Qiblah states in *Ṣawārim*:

اما احاديث فضائل صحابه رضی الله عنهم از طريق اماميه باوجود كثر احاديث مختلفه در بر امر جزئی از جزئیات اصلیه و فرعیه اگر تمام كتب احاديث اماميه ورقا و رقا به نيت تفحص بهطالعه در ایرند مظنون اینست كه زياده از سه چهار حدیث كه سرو پادر ست نداشته باشد دست بهم نديد اما احاديث مثالب و معائب این با بلا اغراق این ست كه متجاوز از هزار حدیث باشد

Aḥādīth extolling the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ with regards to details and concerning principles and divisions are plenty. However, if every page of all the aḥādīth books of the Shī'ah are studied thoroughly, then only three to four aḥādīth (mentioning their virtue) will be found. Moreover, the quality and authenticity of these aḥādīth is questionable. On the other hand, those aḥādīth which mention the Ṣaḥābah's ﷺ evils are well over thousand in number.

O sound minded! Open your eyes and wake up from your sleep. Look at the Shī'ah. They narrated from their A'immaḥ that the status of Rasūlullāh's ﷺ Ṣaḥābah ﷺ is the highest which cannot be reached by the companions of any other Nabī and the one who loves them attains salvation while the one who hates them enters into destruction, yet they say that there is no verse, no ḥadīth and no narration mentioning their virtue and wherever this is found, it is baseless. On the contrary, there are thousands of aḥādīth exposing their evils. Even if we think for a thousand years and try to solve this puzzle, we will not be able to fathom it nor be able to unscramble it.

If the truth is that our Rasūl's ﷺ Ṣaḥābah ﷺ are the greatest to the extent that the companions of other Rusul cannot reach their rank and their hatred leads to punishment and their love is a source of reward, then it should

mean that the Sunnī's belief is true and if hundreds of thousands of aḥādīth and narrations are in their praise, then too this is little. On the contrary, if the Shī'ah's belief is correct, then it ought to be that their enmity is a means of salvation and their friendship is destruction. The truth is that Mujtahid's statement is utterly baseless and incorrect because I can extract thousands of aḥādīth and statements praising the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ from Shī'ī sources. I will prove my claim from this very treatise and extract thousands of narrations in favour of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ from Shī'ī books and present them in front of Mujtahid's followers thereby debunking his statement. If any Shī'ī is amazed as to why his scholars mention the Ṣaḥābah's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ virtue and how did they acknowledge the authenticity of those narrations in praise of them, I will present an accepted principle of Mujtahid which he has stated in his *Ṣawārim*. These are his words:

هر چند از اهل مذہبے کہ روایات مطاعن شخصی کند توقع روایات فضائل ایں شخص داشتن بیجاست و ہم چنیں بالعکس لیکن جناب حق سبحان و تعالیٰ اتماماً للحجۃ قلوب مخالفین جناب امیر المؤمنین علیہ السلام چنان مسخر گردانیدہ کہ باوجود اینکه بنا پر پیش امد و تقرب سلاطین بنی عدی و تیم و بنی امیہ اخبار فضائل ایں ہا را بسیار وضع نمودہ اند چون دروغگورا حافظہ نمی باشد ہماں مخالفین از غایت نا قباحت فہمی باعجاز جناب امیر المؤمنین باز مثالب اصحاب ثلاثہ و اتباع ایشان را ہم مذکور ساختہ اند و علماء و محدثین ایشان چنیں احادیث و اخبار را در کتب و مصنفات خود مندرج فرمودہ اند

Although it is impossible to hope that one who believes in the vices of an individual will enumerate the virtues of the same personality and vice versa, yet Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ — in order to establish His proof — has disfigured the hearts of Amīr al-Mu'minīn's opposition to the extent that notwithstanding their proximity to the kings of Banū 'Adī Taym and Banū Umayyah, they mentioned innumerable virtues of Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. And since liars cannot remember, their scholars and muḥaddithīn, owing to Amīr al-Mu'minīn's miracle, have included the vices of the three companions and their allies in their works.

We also accept this principle and declare that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ — in order to establish proof against them — has coerced the Shī'ah to narrate the virtues and merits of the Ṣaḥābah in their books from the tongues of the noble A'imma, thus we too say:

Although it is impossible to hope that one who believes in the vices of an individual will enumerate the virtues of the same personality and vice versa, yet Allah ﷻ — in order to establish His proof — has disfigured the hearts of the enemies of the great Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم to the extent that notwithstanding their propagation and belief in ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sabā’s beliefs, they praise the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم abundantly. And since liars do not remember, these enemies of Islam — due to ignorance of Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s رضي الله عنه miracle — have mentioned the virtues of the three Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم and their followers to prove their obliviousness and Shī‘ī scholars and muḥaddithīn have recorded these types of aḥādīth, incidents and biographies in their works.

Fifth Testimony

Shaykh Ibn Bābuwayh al-Qummī relates from Imām Mūsā al-Riḍā رحمته الله in *Ma‘ānī al-Akhbār*:

عن الحسن بن علي قال قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ان ابا بكر مني بمنزلة السمع وان عمر مني بمنزلة البصر وان عثمان مني بمنزلة الفؤاد

Sayyidunā Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī رضي الله عنه narrates that Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم has stated: “Indeed, Abū Bakr is like my hearing; ‘Umar’s is like my sight and ‘Uthmān’s is like my heart.”

When it has been established on the tongue of Sayyidunā Ḥasan رضي الله عنه that the three khulafā’ are like Rasūlullāh’s صلى الله عليه وسلم sight, hearing and heart then not loving them is in fact not loving Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم and hatred for them is in reality hatred for Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم.

The readers might be perplexed as to why did the Shī‘ī scholar’s record Sayyidunā Ḥasan’s رضي الله عنه narration in their books. And they are awaiting an answer now that they have narrated it and accepted its authenticity. Hence, I will mention the answer. After the words I have mentioned above, the following addition appears which is considered the answer for this narration.

فلما كان من الغد دخلت عليه و عنده امير المؤمنين و ابو بكر و عمر و عثمان فقلت له يا ابت سمعتك تقول فى اصحابك هؤلاء قولا فما هو فقال نعم ثم اشار اليهم فقال هم السمع و البصر و الفؤاد و يسالون عن ولاية وصى هذا و اشار الى على بن ابي طالب ثم قال ان الله عز و جل يقول ان السمع و البصر و الفؤاد كل اولئك كان عنه مسؤولا ثم قال و عزة ربي ان جميع امتى لموقوفون يوم القيامة و مسؤولون عن ولاية على و ذلك قول الله عز و جل و قفوههم انهم مسؤولون

The next day, I went to Rasūlullāh ﷺ and Amīr al-Mu'minīn, Abū Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthmān were present by him. I asked, "O my beloved father! I heard you say something regarding these Ṣaḥābah of yours; what was it?" Nabī ﷺ replied in the affirmative and pointed towards them saying, "They are the ears, eyes and heart and they will be questioned concerning the wilāyah of this successor of mines." He pointed to 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib and then stated, "Allah ﷻ states:

﴿۳۶﴾ إِنَّ السَّمْعَ وَالْبَصَرَ وَالْفُؤَادَ كُلُّ أُولَئِكَ كَانَ عَنْهُ مَسْئُولًا

Indeed, the hearing, the sight and the heart - about all those (one) will be questioned.¹

He further stated, "By the honour of my Rabb, my entire ummah will be stopped on the Day of Qiyāmah and will be questioned regarding the wilāyah of 'Alī as Allah ﷻ declares:

﴿۲۴﴾ وَقَفُّوهُمْ إِنَّهُمْ مَسْئُولُونَ

And stop them; indeed, they are to be questioned."²

We do not accept these words of the narration as authentic due to few factors and consider it an added fabrication.

First Proof of its Fabrication

It is proven from this narration that on the first day when Sayyidunā Ḥasan heard from Rasūlullāh ﷺ that Abū Bakr is like his hearing; 'Umar's is like his sight

1 Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl: 36.

2 Sūrah al-Ṣāffāt: 24.

and ‘Uthmān’s is like his heart, he did not ask anything. So why did he ask on the next day? If he had to ask, he should have asked immediately. If it is presumed that since these khulafā’ were present on the first day, he did not ask out of fear for them, then they were present on the second day as stated in the narration. If he feared them, he would have asked Rasūlullāh ﷺ at home as to the reality of his statement not in front of them. This clearly proves that the incident of the second day is a fabrication.

Second Proof of its Fabrication

It is learnt from this narration that Rasūlullāh ﷺ only sufficed on mentioning the resemblance and similitude on the first day. So either this was said sincerely, or out of Taqiyyah or out of jest. If it was said sincerely as we believe then the discussion is over. (What a coincidence!) If it was said out of Taqiyyah, then this proves that Rasūlullāh ﷺ practiced Taqiyyah whereas the Shī’ah do not accept this. Moreover, if Rasūlullāh ﷺ mentioned this out of Taqiyyah on the first day, then on the second day the basis of Taqiyyah was still present i.e. the presence of those khulafā’ whom Rasūlullāh ﷺ feared or wished to please. If it was said out of jest, then this will be attributing jesting and mocking to Rasūlullāh ﷺ which cannot be done except by the Shī’ah. They slander Rasūlullāh ﷺ with whatever they want.

Third Proof of its Fabrication

When Rasūlullāh ﷺ speaks, he speaks clearly and emphatically. He does not beat around the bush, does not deceive anyone and does not throw anyone into confusion. So if we accept the second day fabrication, then this is a slander against Rasūlullāh ﷺ because if Sayyidunā Ḥasan رضي الله عنه did not ask on the second day and Rasūlullāh ﷺ did not clarify, then people would remain in doubt and would consider the speech of Rasūlullāh ﷺ as truthful thus considering Sayyidunā Abū Bakr, Sayyidunā ‘Umar and Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنهم as his sight, hearing and heart as is apparent from his words. Can any possessor of īmān level such an accusation upon Rasūlullāh ﷺ? Can anyone interpret

the speech of the one who speaks clearly and unambiguously in such a way? (May Allah ﺳُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى protect us!)

The fact is that the Shī'ah have turned dīn into a joke and have changed and interpolated Rasūlullāh's ﺻَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ aḥādīth and the verses of Allah's ﺳُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى speech. They neither consider the speech of Allah ﺳُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى to be clear nor the aḥādīth of Rasūlullāh ﺻَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ to be clear. They created doubts and misgivings about everything and make it double meaning. Since the Shī'ī creed is based upon hypocrisy and lies so they consider everything to be the same and misinterpret them. Otherwise, who can say regarding Rasūlullāh ﺻَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ that he says one thing on one day and then interprets it differently the next day? Just imagine if someone had to hear Rasūlullāh's ﺻَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ words on the first day believing Rasūlullāh ﺻَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ to be the guide and understanding his words as true whereas according to the Shī'ah it was untrue and had a different meaning which Rasūlullāh ﺻَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ told Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ on the second day after he asked and that person was not present on the next day and did not hear the interpretation of those words from Rasūlullāh's ﺻَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ tongue. Now the conviction he has on those words and due to which he goes astray, who is to blame for this? That simple listener or Rasūlullāh ﺻَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ (May Allah forbid!)?

Fourth Proof of its Fabrication

What is the reason for Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ asking on the next day? Maybe the Shī'ah will say that Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ knew that those Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ concerning whom Rasūlullāh ﺻَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ gave this similitude were hypocrites and disbelievers (May Allah ﺳُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى forbid!) hence he was surprised at Rasūlullāh's ﺻَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ statement so he asked to remove his doubt. However, this is not worthy of being accepted since Rasūlullāh ﺻَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had praised and lauded these Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ abundantly and the A'immaḥ themselves have narrated these narrations which we have reproduced and will reproduce, Allah willing. So there is no reason for Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ to be perplexed at their praise? Yes, if Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ did not hear Rasūlullāh ﺻَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ praising them and did not see them by Rasūlullāh ﺻَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ then he should have been surprised. If someone claims

that Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ knew that they were hypocrites and Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ never praised them in their presence, then the answer to this will be that Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ did not have a doubt which is proven in this very narration and he understood them to be Rasūlullāh's صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ friends. The words of the narration are:

يا ابت سمعتك تقول في اصحابك

O my beloved father, I heard you saying something about your Ṣaḥābah.

If Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ did not consider them as Rasūlullāh's صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ Ṣaḥābah, then why did he use the word Ṣaḥābah? And if he considered them to be companions then there is no reason to doubt. Leaving aside the three khulafā', Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ has praised and lauded many other Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ which the Shī'ah acknowledge and their books are replete with such narrations. If Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ had a doubt, he could have asked concerning it at home in privacy. For him to ask in front of those Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ and for Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ to clearly explain a vague statement and to speak ambiguously is against Shī'ī principles and against the status of Imāmah.

Fifth Proof of its Fabrication

Besides the other praises and qualities Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ mentioned abundantly about these Ṣaḥābah, he has likened them to his hearing and sight. This does not only appear in this narration but is confirmed in other narrations as well. Shī'ī scholars write in the *Tafsīr* of Imām Ḥasan 'Askarī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ that Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ addressed Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ on the night of hijrah:

جعلك منى بمنزلة السمع والبصر والرأس من الجسد ومنزلة الروح من البدن

May Allah make you like my hearing and sight, like the head in relation to the body and the soul in relation to the body.

When Rasūlullāh ﷺ used all these words, viz. sight, hearing, head and soul in favour of him, then why should it be startling if he only uses hearing at another place and likens Sayyidunā ‘Umar and Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا to his sight and heart.

Sixth Proof of its Fabrication

The Shī‘ī scholars have made ludicrous interpretations in majority of the narrations and statements — as they have done in this narration — turning them into jokes and have far surpassed the interpolators of the Ahl al-Kitāb by makings interpolations in both wording and meaning. I will reproduce one narration as an example here:

از امام حسن عسکری علیه السلام منقول ست که بعض مخالفین از سرکشاش شان بمجلس حضرت امام جعفر صادق علیه السلام در آمد و مردے از شیعیان انحضرت گفت که ما تقول في العشرة من الصحابة چه می گوئی در حق عشره مبشره از صحابه پیغمبر شیعه گفت منگوئم در حق شان کلمه خیرے که خداوند عالم بسپ این گناہاں مرا فرد میریزد و درجات مرا بلند می فرماید پس این ناصبی گفت حمد و شکر برائے خدا ست که مرا از دشمنی تو نجات داد من گمان داشتم که تو رفض و بغض صحابه کبار داری این مرد مومن یارد گرگفت اگاه باش نہ ہر کس کہ از صحابه یکی را دشمن دارد پس براوست لعنت خدا ناصبی گفت شاید تالیلی کرده لکن بگو کہ کسیکہ عشره مبشره را دشمن دارد در حق او چه می گوئی مرد مومن گفت ہر کس کہ عشره صحابه را دشمن دارد براوست لعنت خدا و ملائکہ و تمام خلق پس این ناصبی برجست و سرش را بوسه داد و گفت بخش مرا کہ من ترا برفض متہم ساخته بودم مرد مومن گفت ہر تو چیزی نیست من این افترا از تو مواخذہ ندارم تو برادر منی این ناصبی از انجا برفت پس حضرت صادق علیه السلام فرمود کہ کلام محکمہ گفتے ہر خداست جزائے تو ہر ائینہ فرشتگان از حسن توریہ تو خوشنود شدند کہ دین خود را از اختلال نگہ داشتی و خود را از دست او برپائیدی زاد اللہ فی فی مخالفینا عمی الی عمی خداوند عالم در دشمنان ماہر نا فہمی ایشان نافہمی ہا دیگر بیفزاید کسانیکہ بمعاریض کلام اطلاع نداشتند عرض کردند کہ این مرد چه کرد در ظاہر انچہ ناصبی میگفت این ہم باو موافقت منہمود حضرت فرمودند کہ اگر شما نفہمیدید مراد او پس بدرستیکہ ما فہمیدہ ایم و حق تعالی قول اورا قبول فرمودہ ہرگاہ یکے از دوستان ما درد ست دشمنان مامی افتد خداوند عالم اور ابجوائی موافق میسازد کہ دین و ابرویش از دست این بدبختان محفوظ مہماند مراد این مرد مومن از قول او من البغض واحد من الصحابة این بود کہ ہر کہ دشمن دار دیکے از عشره را کہ این امیر مومنان علی بن ابی طالب ست بران دشمنے کندہ لعنت خدا باد او انچہ بارد گرگفت من البغض العشره فعلیہ لعنت اللہ راست گفتہ چراکہ ہر کس کہ ہمہ دہ کس را عیب میکند پس علی علیہ السلام را ہم عیب کردہ ست پس بایں جہت بلعنت خدا گرفتار میشوند

Mīran¹ Qiblah writes in chapter three of *Ḥadīqah Sulṭāniyyah* that it is narrated from Imām Ḥasan al-‘Askarī رحمته الله that once a defiant opponent came to Imām Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq رحمته الله and asked a Shī‘ī what he says regarding the ‘Asharah Mubasharah.² The Shī‘ī answered: “I will say that good word by virtue of which Allah will forgive my sins and raise my stages.” This Nāṣibī thus exclaimed: “Gratitude belongs to Allah سبحانه وتعالى. He protected me from your enmity. I thought that you were a Rāfiḍī who harbours hatred for the senior Ṣaḥābah.” The believing man then said: “Hark! May Allah’s سبحانه وتعالى curse be on the one who harbours hatred for one of the Ṣaḥābah.” The Nāṣibī said: “Maybe you made some interpretation. So tell me what you say regarding the one who harbours hatred for the ‘Asharah Mubasharah?” The Shī‘ī replied: “Whoever hates the ‘Asharah Mubasharah, may the curse of Allah سبحانه وتعالى, the angels and the entire creation be upon him.” The Nāṣibī rose and kissed the Shī‘ī’s forehead and said: “Forgive me. I believed you to be a Rāfiḍī.” The Shī‘ī said: “I do not take you to task. You are my brother.” Hearing this, the Nāṣibī left. When he left, Imām Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq رحمته الله told the Shī‘ī: “You have spoken with much clarity. May Allah سبحانه وتعالى reward you with goodness. May the angles be pleased with your beautiful ambiguity. You saved your dīn from deficiency and saved yourself from that man’s clutches. May Allah سبحانه وتعالى increase the blindness of our opponents and increase their dullness. They do not understand a thing.” When the Imām said this, those who did not understand asked: “O Imām! This believer only said what the Nāṣibī said and agreed with him.” The Imām said: “You did not understand. I have understood what he meant. When he said that may

1 Sayyid Ḥasan known as Mīran. He is the youngest son of Mowlānā Dildār ‘Alī Nasirabadī. He was born on the 14th of Rabī‘ al-Thānī 1211 A.H, October 1796. After acquiring primary knowledge, he began studying by his father. When he fell ill, he studied by his eldest brother Sayyid Muḥammad Mujtahid and when he was feeling better, he took lessons from his father again. Shāh Awadh Amjad ‘Alī Shāh founded Madrasah Sulṭāniyyah on Mowlānā’s proposal. He vowed a ring on which it was engraved, “*Ilāh Mujtahid al-‘Aṣr Sayyid al-‘Ulamā*” and made a royal proclamation that Mowlānā will be called with these titles. Mīran was unofficially appointed as the minister of education and became the religious leader of the Shī‘ah of the entire country. He wrote many books. He died on Saturday night the 17th of Ṣafar 1273 A.H corresponding to October 1856. His eldest brother Sulṭān al-‘Ulamā’ Sayyid Muḥammad Mujtahid performed his Ṣalāt al-Janāzah and he was buried in Imām Bāra Ghufrān Ma‘āb in the centre corridor in the room west of Mowlānā Dildār ‘Alī.

2 The ten Ṣaḥābah who were given glad tidings of Jannah by Rasūlullāh صلی الله علیه وسلم.

Allah’s ﷻ curse be on the one who harbours hatred for one of them, he meant Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ. The meaning of him saying that may Allah’s curse be on the one who hates all ten of them is that Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ is included in them. So the one who hates all ten of them definitely hates Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ, hence he is cursed.”

Although the Shī’ah boast over this narration and are proud about the skulduggery of their seniors, but an intelligent man will be startled and will loathe such a creed which is based upon such skulduggery and deception. It is startling that the A’immah whose mission is to guide humanity, whose Imāmah is part of dīn like nubuwwah and whose statements, actions and movements make the basis of the creed; if they are such that they do not speak clearly and regard deception and skulduggery as a means to draw Allah’s ﷻ happiness then what will be the condition of their followers? Will they not regard deception and hypocrisy as part of their salient features? I will narrate yet another more tedious narration which will reveal the deep understanding and punctiliousness of the Shī’ah and show an example of the amazing meaning they take out from clear words.

Sixth Testimony

Imām Ja’far al-Ṣādiq ﷺ has stated regarding Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and Sayyidunā ‘Umar ﷺ:

هما امامان عادلان قاسطان كانا على الحق و ماتا عليه فعليهما رحمة الله يوم القيامة

They both were just and fair rulers. They were upon the truth and passed away upon it. May Allah’s ﷻ mercy be upon them on the Day of Qiyāmah.

Few important points from this narration:

- Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and Sayyidunā ‘Umar ﷺ were rightful leaders and khalīfahs otherwise Imām Ja’far al-Ṣādiq ﷺ would not have called them imāms had they been usurpers.

- They practiced justice and fairness which falsifies all the allegations the Shī'ah level against them. Had their justice and fairness been deficient, Imām رَحِمَهُ اللهُ would not have called them just and fair.
- They were upon the truth and remained steadfast upon it till death.
- They are deserving of Allah's رَحِمَهُ اللهُ وَتَعَالَى mercy on the Day of Qiyāmah. A person who is not perfect in his īmān and piety is not deserving of Allah's رَحِمَهُ اللهُ وَتَعَالَى mercy.

The unbiased should reflect as to what greater virtue can Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and Sayyidunā 'Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمَا enjoy than what Imām Ja'far al-Šādiq رَحِمَهُ اللهُ has stated which proves their leadership, khilāfah, justice and worthiness of Allah's رَحِمَهُ اللهُ وَتَعَالَى mercy. When the Shī'ah hear any of our muḥaddithīn narrating something in praise of the Šaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ, they label it a lie and a fabrication and totally reject it. But what will they do with those narrations which their scholars have narrated and which their books have recorded either than misinterpreting and interpolating and adding a tale to it to change its meaning. Accordingly, they have perpetrated the same crime in this narration by adding a few more sentences which I will mention.

It is written regarding this narration in the article *Adillah Taqiyyah dar Thubūt Taqiyyah* which has been signed by the leader of the scholars Sayyid Muḥammad Mujtahid and printed in Ludhiyana in 1282 A.H:

The Sunnī scholars have committed treachery when narrating this narration and have only chosen those words which are outwardly in praise of Shaykhayn whereas they are inwardly filled with criticism and reproach. Accordingly, Imām Ja'far al-Šādiq رَحِمَهُ اللهُ has elucidated on the words of his statement in the very narration.

After a useless lengthy lecture, the original deceitful words of the narration have been recorded in that article:

The original narration is this that some enemies asked Imām رحمته الله regarding Shaykhayn. The Imām رحمته الله replied with Taqiyyah:

هما امامان عادلان الخ فلما انصرف الناس قال له من خاصته يا ابن رسول الله لقد تعجبت مما قلت في حق ابي بكر و عمر فقال نعم هما اماما اهل النار كما قال الله تعالى وَ جَعَلْنَاهُمْ اَئِمَّةً يَدْعُونَ اِلَى النَّارِ و اما العادلان فلعدولهم عن الحق كقوله تعالى ثُمَّ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا بِرَبِّهِمْ يَعْدِلُونَ و اما القاسطان فقد قال الله تعالى وَ اَمَّا الْقَاسِطُونَ فَكَانُوا لِجَهَنَّمَ حَطَبًا و المراد من الحق الذي كانا مستولين عليه هو امير المؤمنين حيث اذيا و غضبا حقه و المراد من موتهما على الحق انهما ماتا على عداوته من غير ندامته عن ذلك و المراد من رحمة الله رسول الله فانه كان رحمة للعالمين و سيكون خصما لهما ساخطا عليهما منتقما عنهما يوم الدين

They both were just and fair rulers. They were upon the truth and passed away upon it. May Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَ تَعَالَى have mercy be upon them on the Day of Qiyāmah. When the people left, a person from his close associates said to him: “O son of Rasūlullāh! I am amazed at what you mentioned regarding Abū Bakr and ‘Umar.” The Imām said: “Yes. They are leaders... of the inmates of Hell as Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَ تَعَالَى has stated:

وَ جَعَلْنَاهُمْ اَئِمَّةً يَدْعُونَ اِلَى النَّارِ ؕ

And We made them leaders inviting to the Fire, and on the Day of Resurrection they will not be helped.¹

With regards to “العادلان” (just), they strayed away from the truth as Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَ تَعَالَى states:

ثُمَّ الَّذِينَ كَفَرُوا بِرَبِّهِمْ يَعْدِلُونَ ﴿١٠﴾

Then those who disbelieve equate (others) with their Rabb.²

And “القاسطان” (fair) as Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَ تَعَالَى declares:

1 Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ: 41.

2 Sūrah al-An‘ām: 1.

وَأَمَّا الْقَاسِطُونَ فَكَانُوا لِجَهَنَّمَ حَطَبًا ﴿١٥﴾

But as for the unjust, they will be, for Hell, firewood.¹

The meaning of the truth that they were upon is Amīr al-Mu'minīn since they hurt him and usurped his right. The meaning of them dying upon the truth is that they died upon his hatred without regretting this. And the meaning of Allah's سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى mercy is Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ because he was a mercy for the universe and he will argue against them, be angry with them and take revenge from them on the Day of Retribution.

The gist of the above is that when the enemies left the gathering, one of the close companions of the Imām said: "I am amazed at the words you used regarding Shaykhayn." The Imām رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ replied, "I called them leaders for this reason that they will be the leaders of the inmates of Hell as Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى has called the disbelievers the leaders of the inmates of Hell: "And We made them leaders inviting to the Fire, and on the Day of Resurrection they will not be helped."² I called them "العادلان" since they strayed away from the truth as Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى has labelled the disbelievers in the same meaning, "Then those who disbelieve equate (others) with their Rabb."³

The translator writes that Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ has called Nowsherwān "العادل" in the aḥādīth books of the Ahl al-Sunnah. Sa'dī Shīrāzī has put in poetic form in his *Gulistān*:

که سید بدوران نوشیروان

در اوان عدلش بنازم چنان

I am proud of the time of his justice for Nowsherwān was the leader of his time.

1 Sūrah al-Jinn: 15.

2 Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ: 41.

3 Sūrah al-An'ām: 1.

So just as praising the justice of Nowsherwān the infidel will not benefit him, likewise it will not benefit Shaykhayn. This is one of the seventy meanings.

He called them “الفاسطان” as this means oppressors. It appears in the Qur’ān: “But as for the unjust, they will be, for Hell, firewood.”¹ The Imām then goes on to say that he said that they were upon the truth. The meaning of this is that they overpowered the truth and the truth was overpowered. And the purport of that truth which they overpowered is Amīr al-Mu’minīn. They harmed him and usurped his right. The translator writes:

The Imām رَحِمَهُ اللهُ connected the *jār majrūr* “على الحق” in this sentence to the word “مستولين” (usurpers) which is the specific *khavar* and is omitted in the text. The opinion of the majority of grammarians like Sībawayh, etc., is that when there is some evidence which points to a specific *khavar*, it is permissible to omit it. And since Imām Ja’far al-Ṣādiq رَحِمَهُ اللهُ is the most eloquent and most articulate Arab according to all the Muslims, his speech is reliable whether it is in conformity with the rules of the grammarians or not. And here due to the context, it conforms to the rules of the grammarians. Hence, there is no scope for objection. The evidence in the context is the word “على” which comes to show “استعلاء” (superiority). This comes in the meaning of overpowering and “استيلاء” (appropriation) in their vocabulary. If one studies the books of grammar, he will learn that the Arabs say:

علوت الرجل اى غلبته

I overpowered the man.

So the meaning of “They were on the truth,”:

كانا غالبين على الحق و الحق مغلوبا عنهم

They overpowered the truth and the truth was overpowered by them.

1 Sūrah al-Jinn: 15.

The Imām has said that “truth” refers to Amīr al-Mu’minīn. This is totally correct and not far-fetched at all since the word truth can refer to Allah, Rasūlullāh ﷺ, and the Imām. In fact to death, Qiyāmah, word and speech also as is obvious. So if truth means the rightful khalīfah, it makes perfect sense. There are two other reasons here which prove that truth referring to Amīr al-Mu’minīn is correct.

The first reason is that “على” means above so the meaning of “كانا على الحق” will be that those who were inherently false overpowered the truth just as the infallible Imām has said in the supplication of the Quraysh’s idols. Thus, in compliance with joining both the narrations, it is correct for the Imām to mean this. Furthermore, this type of “استعلاء” (superiority) necessitates “استيلاء” (appropriation), hence to conceal the word “مستولين” (usurpers) is correct as the infallible Imām has did. So ponder.

The second reason is that in Arabic grammar, the word “على” is used for opposition, harm and enmity as well. It is famous in Arabic grammar that in answer or in an objection they will say:

هذا لنا لا علينا

This is to our benefit, not to our harm.

It is also famous that when the army of Ḥurr met Sayyid al-Shuhadā’ on the way, Sayyid addressed Ḥurr:

اعلينا ام لنا

You came out of enmity or as our reinforcement?

Allah ﷻ declares:

لَا يُكَلِّفُ اللَّهُ نَفْسًا إِلَّا وُسْعَهَا ط لَهَا مَا كَسَبَتْ وَعَلَيْهَا مَا اكْتَسَبَتْ ط

Allah does not charge a soul except (with that within) its capacity. It will have (the consequence of) what (good) it has gained, and it will bear (the consequence of) what (evil) it has earned.¹

The author of *al-Kashāf* explains: “What he earned of goodness will benefit him and what he earned of evil will harm him.”

So taking into consideration this usage, the meaning of “على” will be that both of them were opponents and enemies to the truth. This is the same meaning intended in the next statement of the Imām. So for the Imām to mean this in this context is perfectly correct. Understand!

Then the Imām goes on to explain that when I said, “مانا على الحق” (They died on the truth.) the meaning is that they died hating the truth i.e. hatred for Amīr al-Mu’minīn was in their hearts until they died. In this context, the Imām took “على” in the meaning of hatred and enmity as explained above under reason two.

The Imām further explains that when he said “فعلیها رحمة الله يوم القيامة” (May Allah’s سُبْحَانَهُ وَبِحَمْدِهِ mercy be upon them on the Day of Qiyāmah.) the meaning of the mercy of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَبِحَمْدِهِ is Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ i.e. he will be their enemy on the Day of Qiyāmah, he will be angry with them and he will take revenge from them.”

The Imām took “على” in the meaning of hatred. And being the mercy of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَبِحَمْدِهِ is not something to doubt. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَبِحَمْدِهِ himself declares:

﴿وَمَا أَرْسَلْنَاكَ إِلَّا رَحْمَةً لِّلْعَالَمِينَ﴾ ﴿١٠٧﴾

And We have not sent you, (O Muḥammad), except as a mercy to the worlds.²

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 286.

2 Sūrah al-Ambiyā’: 107.

Anyways, the meanings of these words have been clarified in front of all. These words are not in praise of Shaykhayn رحمهما الله but rather in for criticism and reproach.

I will prove the fallaciousness of this interpretation with few proofs.

First Proof for the Fallaciousness of This Interpretation

I feel ashamed to reproduce the drivel that the author of this article has written in the footsteps of his scholars. If such misinterpretations take place in the aḥādīth, no ḥadīth will be in praise of anyone. In fact, every heretic will misinterpret the verses of the Qur’ān to suite his fancy.

A Hindu says that he told a Muslim, “My Ram Lakshmana has been mentioned in your Qur’ān.” The Muslim asked in surprise, “Where in the Qur’ān does it appear?” He replied, “The ḥurūf muqaṭṭa‘āt in the beginning of Sūrah Yūsuf. Alif refers to Allah, Lām refers to Lakshman and Rā refers to Ram.” On hearing this, the Muslim laughed.

The misinterpretation the Shī‘ah have made of Imām Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq’s رحمته الله statement is far worse than the Hindu’s misinterpretation according to me. He at least had some connection between the letters while on the other hand, what the Shī‘ī scholars have mentioned is totally disjointed. Every khārijī and nāṣibī can make such weird misinterpretations of those narrations in praise of the Ahl al-Bayt رحمهم الله. Your answer to their misinterpretations is our answer to yours.

Second Proof for the Fallaciousness of This Interpretation

This statement in praise of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and Sayyidunā ‘Umar رحمهم الله has been made by Imām Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq رحمته الله who was prohibited from Taqiyyah. He was commanded to fear no one and spread the knowledge of the Ahl al-Bayt without any fear. So why did he practice Taqiyyah? Why did he praise them in such glowing words out of fear for few nāṣibīs and then explain the original

purport to his special people after they left? What proves that the Imām رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was prohibited from practicing Taqiyyah is that Mullā Bāqir Majlisī has written in *Biḥār al-Anwār* and Mullā Muḥammad ibn Ya‘qūb al-Kulaynī has written in *al-Kāfī* that the *ṣaḥīfah* of Imām Ja‘far Ṣādiq رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ contained the following command for him:

حدث الناس و افتهم و لا تخافن الا الله و انشر علوم اهل بيتك و صدق ابائك الصالحين فانك في حرز
و امان

Narrate to the people and give them verdicts and do not fear anyone except Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَ تَعَالَى. Spread the knowledge of your Ahl al-Bayt and verify your pious forefathers. Indeed, you are under protection and in safety.

Notwithstanding this assurance from Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَ تَعَالَى and the prohibition from practicing Taqiyyah, I cannot understand what he feared due to which he praises these Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ and deceives those people. Shame on those who claim to be the Shī‘ah of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. They have defamed their A‘immah in the guise of love for them and have slandered them so viciously.

Third Proof for the Fallaciousness of This Interpretation

If any Shī‘ī says that when the additional text is part of the original narration, then why do you accept the first portion of it and reject the second portion. It is necessary to accept the entire text and understand the interpretation of the Imām to be from the Imām. The answer to this is that the accepted principle is:

اقرار العقلاء حجة على انفسهم دون الادعاء لهم

The acknowledgement of the intelligent is a proof against them, not for what they claim.

Accordingly, the portion which acknowledges the virtue of Shaykhayn is a proof against them and the misinterpretations cannot be a proof against us. Besides this, it is the habit of the Shī‘ī muḥaddithīn to manipulate texts and make them

conform to their ideologies. Mullā Bāqir Majlisī has stated regarding Shaykh al-Ṣādūq in the narration which discusses fate and destiny:

انا فعل ذلك ليوافق مذهب اهل العدل

He only did this (interpolation) so that it can conform to the religion of the just (i.e. the Shī'ah).

When they cannot be relied upon to not interpolate and change aḥādīth, then why should we accept their interpretations which are utterly ridiculous and absurd and why should we believe that these are from the A'immah? The A'immah themselves would complain and curse and reproach their 'followers' for misinterpreting their statements and narrations and transforming them. Abū 'Umar Wakshī has narrated a statement of Imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is this regard:

ان الناس اولعوا بالكذب علينا ان الله اقترض عليهم لا يريد منهم غيره و انى احدث احدهم بالحديث فلا يخرج من عندى حتى يتأوله على غير تأويله ذلك انهم لا يطلبون بحديثنا و بحبنا ما عند الله و انما يطلبون الدنيا

People have overstepped the limits in fabricating things in our name. Certainly, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى wishes to punish them, nothing else. I narrate to one of them a ḥadīth. He does not yet leave my gathering and has already misinterpreted it. This is because they do not desire what is by Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى by my statements and my love. They only desire the world.

When the Imām attests to the fact that it is the habit of those who sit by him to misinterpret his words while sitting around him, then it is not far-fetched to believe that these people have misinterpreted this statement of his.

Fourth Proof for the Fallaciousness of This Interpretation

If one ponders and contemplates over the words of the interpretation of the narration, he will realise how absurd and contrary to application they are. The

first interpretation is that the word “امامان” (leaders) means “اماما اهل النار” (leaders of the inmates of Hell). So the *muḍāf ilayh* (possessor) has been omitted. However, according to the syntax rule, it is not correct to omit the *muḍāf ilayh* except when it is *tanwīn*, or on the strength of the *muḍāf* (possessed) or due to a second *iḍāfah*. If you are in doubt, check-up *Raḍī*. Secondly, when the word “امامان” has been left *muṭlaq* (unqualified), its original meaning i.e. praise or a good quality will be meant since when a word is left *muṭlaq*, its *farḍ kāmīl* (perfect character) is intended. So how can “اماما اهل النار” be intended. This is in contrast to the verse:

وَجَعَلْنَاهُمْ أَئِمَّةً يَدْعُونَ إِلَى النَّارِ ۚ

And We made them leaders inviting to the Fire, and on the Day of Resurrection they will not be helped.¹

Since here, it is not *muṭlaq* but *muqayyad* (qualified).

Secondly, the interpretation of the word “الغاسطان” is erroneous since this word has been used in contrast to “مسلمون” (believers) in the Qur’ān. To establish a meaning, there must be the precise appropriate context, which is found in the Qur’ān and is not found in this narration. In fact, it refers to the verse:

وَاقْسُطُوا ۗ إِنَّ اللَّهَ يُحِبُّ الْمُقْسِطِينَ ﴿٩﴾

And act justly. Indeed, Allah loves those who act justly.²

Thirdly, for “الحق” (truth) to mean Sayyidunā ‘Alī Murtaḍā رضي الله عنه is contrary to normal usage and its apparent meaning. To intend his name without previous mention of the same is converting the narration into a riddle. Furthermore, to take “عل” in the meaning of “استيلاء” (appropriation) without any evidence and to make “استيلاء” (appropriation) synonymous to “استعلاء” (superiority) is forcing the

1 Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ: 41.

2 Sūrah al-Hujurāt: 9.

meaning and speaking rubbish and using analogy in vocabulary whereas this is not correct. Think, when it is said:

زيد على الحق

Does it mean that Zayd is upon the truth or that he is upon falsehood?

Fourthly, someone mentioned something interesting about the interpretation of “رحمة الله” (the mercy of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى). When the Shī'ah say “رحمة الله عليه” (May Allah’s سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى mercy be upon him) in favour of their leaders, we will understand that “على” means enmity and “رحمة الله” means Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ i.e. enemies of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. I seek Allah’s سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى forgiveness. The Shī'ah have turned the aḥādīth into a game and have ruined their fate by slandering the A'imma and making such nonsensical interpretations.

Seventh Testimony

The following statement of Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ in favour of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is recorded in Nahj al-Balāghah:

لله بلاد فلان فقد قوم الاود و داوى العمد و اقام السنة و خلف البدعة و ذهب نقي الثوب قليل العيب
اصاب خيرها و سبق شرها ادى الى الله طاعته و انقاه بحقه رحل و تركهم فى طرق متشعبة لا يهدى فيها
اتصال و لا يستيقن المهتدى

May Allah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ favour that man (i.e. Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ) who straightened crookedness, doctored spiritual maladies, established Rasūlullāh’s صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ sunnah and eradicated innovations. He left this world with a clean slate and little defects. He attained the goodness of khilāfah and left before its evil. He fulfilled the obedience of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى in a beautiful way and met the demands of piety. He left this world and left people in diverse roads than no deviant attains guidance and no guided man attains conviction.

I will reproduce all the statements of the Ahl al-Sunnah and Shī'ah regarding this statement of Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. I plea to the Shī'ah respectfully to listen to this discussion with their hearts, look carefully, abandon prejudice and bigotry and decide justly whether their scholars or the Ahl al-Sunnah scholars are on the truth. I will firstly present the text of Tuḥfah Ithnā 'Ashariyyah followed by the answer of 'Allāmah Kantorī and then the rebuttal of that answer by Mowlānā Ḥaydar 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ:

Khātam al-Muḥaddithīn¹ writes after quoting this text:

1 Khātam al-Muḥaddithīn refers to Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīz Muḥaddith Dehlawī ibn Shāh Walī Allāh Muḥaddith Dehlawī ibn Shāh 'Abd al-Raḥīm ibn Shaykh Wajīh al-Dīn. He was born from the blessed womb of Shāh Walī Allāh's second wife — the sister of Thanā' Allāh of Sonipat on Thursday, the 25th of Ramaḍān al-Mubārak 1159 A.H (1746). The name of his date of birth is Ghulām Ḥalīm. Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīz opened his eyes in a family with reputable knowledge who were recognised and unique in their knowledge, nobility and virtue.

Shaykh Muḥammad Ikrām has written regarding the family lineage of his father Shāh Walī Allāh:

Shāh Walī Allāh's lineage from his father's side goes up to Sayyidunā 'Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and from his mother's side up to Imām Mūsā al-Kāzīm رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. One of his forefathers Shaykh Muftī Shams al-Dīn came to India when the Islamic government began and lived in Rohtak. His family was outstanding in knowledge and virtue. One elder by the name Shaykh Maḥmūd left the station of judge and began leading a life of a warrior. From then, this family was renowned for their bravery and chivalry for a long time. Shāh Walī Allāh's paternal grandfather Shaykh Wajīh al-Dīn was a sword and pen. Shāh's father, Shāh 'Abd al-Raḥīm, learnt the glorious Qur'ān from his father." (*Rowḍ Kowthar* pg. 534)

Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīz acquired knowledge mainly from his father and from Shāh Muḥammad Phaltī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and Shāh Nūr Allāh Budhānwī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. He possessed exceptional intelligence and wittiness and had a remarkable memory; all given by Allah سُبْحَانَكَ يَا رَبَّ الْعَالَمِينَ. At the age of 15, he completed his studies of all common sciences from his father and began his further studies. He was only 17 when his father's shadow was lifted from him and he was made his successor. He then remained fully engaged in teaching and lecturing. His knowledge was vast. He was not only a highly qualified muḥaddith and researcher but was cognisant of the knowledge of other nations as well. He had expertise in Arabic oratory and poetry. He wrote many essays in Arabic. He wrote one letter in Arabic to his uncle Shāh Ahl Allah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ in which he described the offensive methods of the Maratha and Sikh in an eloquent way. Majority of the muḥaddithīn of India, Pakistan and Bangladesh's isnād goes up to him and to his father via him.

¹Sharīf Raḍī has manipulated this text of Amīr in Jāmi‘ *Nahj al-Balāghah* in a puzzling way. He deleted the word Abū Bakr and inserted the word “فلان”

continued from page 231

1 Mowlānā Nasīm Aḥmad Farīdī رحمته الله listed forty of his students who are mainly such luminaries who are lauded for their knowledge and practice in the entire Asia. I will list a few of his renowned students:

Shāh Rafī‘ al-Dīn, Shāh ‘Abd al-Qādir, Shāh ‘Abd al-Ghanī, Shāh Muḥammad Ishāq, Shāh Muḥammad Ya‘qūb (from Hardonwā) Shāh Muḥammad Ismā‘īl (nephew of) Mowlānā ‘Abd al-Ḥayy Budhānawī, Mowlānā Ḥaydar ‘Alī Fayzabadī — author of *Izālat al-Ghayn* and *Muntahā al-Kalām*, Mowlānā Rashīd al-Dīn Khān Dehlawī — regarding whom Shāh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz’s saying is famous, “Muḥammad Ismā‘īl took my speech and Rashīd al-Dīn took my writing.” Mowlānā Rashīd al-Dīn authored many books among which *al-Ṣawlah al-Ghaḍanfarīyyah* and *Showkat ‘Umariyyah* are his classical works. Mowlānā Shāh Faḍl al-Raḥmān Ganjmurādābādī, Mirzā Ḥasan ‘Alī Ṣaghīr Muḥaddith Lucknowī, Mowlānā Faḍl Ḥaq Khayrabādī, Muftī Ṣadr al-Dīn Āzurdah, etc.

Since Shāh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz was engaged mostly in teaching and lecturing, he did not get an opportunity to write much. Nonetheless, the books he authored were marvellous. Among his books, *Tuḥfah Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah* is very famous, very comprehensive and classical which is a blockbuster in the science of belief. He exhausted himself and exerted himself in its authoring. It will not be incorrect to call it the encyclopaedia of Shī‘ī-Sunnī polemics.

The reason for authoring *Tuḥfah Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah*

In the beginning of the book, Shāh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz has written the reason for writing this book, “The spread of Shī‘ism in our era and in our cities is so rife that probably there is no household who does not support this creed or is not affected by it. However, since the cause of this is ignorance and misunderstanding, hence this book aims to clear all doubts in this regard.”

Shāh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz had *Tuḥfah Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah* printed in 1200 A.H, November 1785. As soon as it was published, there was a huge uproar in the Shī‘ī world especially the Shī‘ī centre in Lucknow whose scholars paid attention to answer it. Shaykh Muḥammad Ikrām writes, “We only understood the real worth of *Tuḥfah Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah* when we read the biographies of the Shī‘ī scholars and saw the amount of effort they made to refute it.” Prior to the fight of independence in 1857, the greatest goal of the senior Shī‘ī scholars was to eradicate the effects of this book and many participated in this effort. Mowlānā Dildār ‘Alī, the first Mujtahid’s name is the most renowned among the Shī‘ī scholars of Lucknow who wrote six books and articles in refutation of Shāh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz’s works. Ḥakīm Mirzā Muḥammad Kāmil Dehlawī did not only write *Nazhat Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah* to answer *Tuḥfah* but sacrificed his life and took up the responsibility to remove all the effects caused by its publication. Similarly, the summary of Muftī Muḥammad Qillī Kantorī’s life looks like refutation of *Tuḥfah Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah*.

¹(someone) so that the Ahl al-Sunnah cannot use it as a proof. However, it is Amīr's miracle that these qualities clearly point to whom he intended.

continued from page 232

1 He wrote *Tash'īd al-Maṭā'in wa Kashf al-Ḍaghā'in*, *Sayf Nāsirī*, *Taqḷīb al-Makā'id*, *Maṣāri' al-Afḥām* and *Burhān Sa'ādat* to refute it. There are many other books written in its refutation e.g. it is written in Mawlānā Dildār 'Alī's successor Sayyid Muḥammad's biography that he wrote many articles to refute *Tuḥfah*. The effects of these discussions reached far and wide. Ḥakīm Ḥabīb al-Raḥmān from Dhaka writes in *Āsūdḡān Dhaka* regarding a famous Shī'ī leader Mīr Ashraf, "When the book *Tuḥfah Ithnā 'Ashariyyah* reached Dhaka, Mīr Ashraf sent ten thousand rupees to Iraq so that a refutation can be written against it." Mīr Ashraf is the great grandfather of the famous Persian poet Sayyid Muḥammad Āzād Jahāngīrī and the famous Urdu linguist Nawāb Sayyid Muḥammad. According to Ḥakīm Ḥabīb al-Raḥmān, both these men became Sunnī.

It is appropriate to mention an incident here which Muftī Intizām Allāh Shihābī has recorded on page 15 of the book *Ghadar ke Chand 'Ulamā'* extracted from page 40 of *Amīr al-Riwāyāt*:

Coupled with knowledge and virtue, the family of Shāh Walī Allāh possessed unique expertise in the Persian language. Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīz's knowledge of Persian and eloquence was common. When *Tuḥfah Ithnā 'Ashariyyah* reached Lucknow, Nawāb Āṣif al-Dowlah requested the Shī'ī mujtahidīn to write an answer to it. Among them, Mawlānā Dildār 'Alī took up the courage to answer it. However, since the language in it was astounding, Mirzā Qatīl was told to that Mujtahid will write the subjects and he should put it in his own words so that both the subjects and texts can be answered accordingly. Mirzā Qatīl declined so Mawlānā Dildār had no option but to write the answer in his own words. When Mujtahid had completed writing his answer, Nawāb presented it to Mirzā Qatīl and asked him his opinion regarding it. Mirzā Qatīl said that if you will not mind, let me tell you the truth to which Nawāb agreed. Mirzā Qatīl said, "The truth is that Mujtahid does not even know how to name his book. Shāh is presenting *Tuḥfah* and Mujtahid is presenting *Dhū al-Fiqār* in answer to it." Nawāb then asked, "Tell me about the text and language." Mirzā Qatīl said, "Where is an urchin of Jais (Mujtahid lived in Jais) and where is a prince sitting on the stairs of Delhi?"

In short, the Shī'ī scholars left no stone unturned and exhausted all of their efforts trying to remove the effects of *Tuḥfah*. A history student of religion can correctly say that the *Tuḥfah Ithnā 'Ashariyyah* stopped the rise of Shī'ism in the 18th century.

Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīz answered the angel of death on Sunday, the 7th of Shawwāl 1239 A.H at the age of 80 and left this temporary world for the everlasting one. He is buried next to his father Shāh Walī Allāh in Mehdian.

¹The commentators of *Nahj al-Balāghah* have differences of opinion in pinpointing the purport of “فادن”. Some have said that it is Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه while others say that it is Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه. However, majority of the commentators prefer the first view.

Now listen to the answers the Shī‘ah scholars have presented regarding this statement:

The First Answer of the Shī‘ah

Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه would at times mention the virtues and merits of Shaykhayn since people relied upon them and believed in their beautiful traits and wonderful administration and government. Hence, it was appropriate to praise them for the people. These words are due to the same reason.

However, this answer is not appropriate at all since no sane sound person will believe that an infallible will speak lies for an insignificant worldly gain which is

continued from page 233

1 Ḥakīm Mu‘min Khān Mu‘min who is not commonly known by his original name Ḥabīb Allāh but by the name given by Shāh رحمته الله i.e. Mu‘min Khān has said:

The choosing of this man Mowlānā ‘Abd al-‘Azīz
Unique, distinctive, matchless, only one of its kind
Why did you leave this temporary world?
Deficiency should not come in the īmān of the people
This is oppression, O sky, who did you take away from here?
What tyranny upon the hopeless O fate!
What amount of pain and grief everyone felt at the time of burial
Every honoured and lowly person threw sand on his head
When the corpse was carried, the world was overturned
Every sacred palace shall return to sand
Gathering of sorrow abounded. I was also present to console
When Mu‘min read the date, this matchless came to mind
With the hand of fate, he left without the robe
With piety, virtue, excellent, kindness and gentleness and knowledge and virtue

(Shaykh Muḥammad Firāsāt 1239)

not guaranteed i.e. to appease few people and praise those who openly disobeyed Allah and Rasūl ﷺ, abandoned Islam and turned renegade, interpolated the Book of Allah ﷻ and changed the dīn of Muḥammad ﷺ whereas it is narrated in an authentic ḥadīth:

إذا مدح الفاسق غضب الرب

When a transgressor is praised, Allah ﷻ becomes angry.

When Allah ﷻ is angered at the praise of a transgressor, then what will be the anger of Allah ﷻ when such a person is praised who interpolated the Book of Allah, changed the dīn of Allah, forgot the aḥādīth of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, usurped the rights of his successor, oppressed his children and meted out every type of tyranny and oppression on Rasūlullāh's ﷺ family. It is farfetched from the religiousness, trustworthiness, intelligence and far sightedness of the Shī'ah to relate such a hideous crime to an infallible like Amīr al-Mu'minīn ﷺ. Secondly, the necessity for such praise is not known. Which army were traitors and could not come to the straight path without speaking such lies and taking such oaths? If it was only to appease those who relied in Shaykhayn ﷺ then to praise their good administration was sufficient so that the object is accomplished and plenty of lies are not spoken. But to falsify and reject such glowing praises from the tongue of an infallible is casting doubts on his infallibility.

قوله عمده این توجیہات نزد ایشان اینست الخ قولنا این ادعا کذب محض است احتیاج این توجیہات شیعه را وقتی افتاد که در کتب شیعه بجای لفظ فلاں لفظ ابو بکر موجود می بود و چون لفظ ابو بکر در کتب شیعه موجود نیست ایشان را احتیاج بیج یک از توجیہات نیست پس آنچه ناصبی بعد تقریر این توجیہات از بذیانات خود سر کرده از جهت ابتدائی این بر فاسد از قبیل بناء الفاسد علی الفاسد باشد

‘Allāmah Kantorī wrote in refutation of *Tuḥfah Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah* regarding this interpretation that to ascribe this interpretation to the Shī'ah is a white lie since this kind of interpretation is only needed when the word “ابو بکر” appears instead of “فلاں” in Shī'ī books. Since the word “ابو بکر” is not found in any Shī'ī book, there is no need for any interpretation. The gist is

that the Sunnī have made up their own interpretation for their drivel and this is constructing something false on untruth.

This answer of ‘Allāmah Kantorī is incorrect and we will make the same claim he made against Shāh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, “This is only a false claim.” The proof for our claim is that the Shīrī scholars have themselves written that “فلان” refers to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr Ṣiddīq رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. Ibn Maytham al-Baḥrānī¹, one of the Shīrī researchers, writes in the commentary of the word “فلان” in *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah* that “فلان” either refers to Abū Bakr or ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمَا and according to him, Abū Bakr is more appropriate:

اقول ان ارادته لابي بكر اشبه من ارادته لعمر

I say that his intending Abū Bakr is more appropriate than intending ‘Umar.

A scholar with such deep knowledge like Ibn Maytham Baḥrānī — of whose knowledge and purity Mullā Bāqir Majlisī is proud — takes the word “فلان” to mean “Abū Bakr”. Notwithstanding this, ‘Allāmah Kantorī rejects it and accuses the author of *Tuḥfah* of lying. Maybe ‘Allāmah began writing a response to *Tuḥfah* but could not respond so he thought it is better to simply reject it so that the masses might revere him and regard Shāh as a liar. However, he was unaware that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى has created a Mūsā for every Pharaoh. Will the Sunnī scholars ever leave them and will they ever be spared from their clutches? They will show Ibn Maytham’s statements and declare:

لَعْنَتُ اللّٰهِ عَلَى الْكٰذِبِيْنَ ﴿٦١﴾

The curse of Allah upon the liars.²

1 His full name is Kamāl al-Dīn Maytham ibn ‘Alī Maytham al-Baḥrānī. He was born in the seventh century. It is believed that Khājah Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī learnt fiqh from Kamāl al-Dīn Maytham and Maytham learnt wisdom from him. He is a philosopher, researcher, man of wisdom and the author of the commentary of *Nahj al-Balāghah*. He died in 679 A.H and was buried in a nearby village Hilnā. (*al-Kunā wa al-Alqāb* vol. 1 pg. 419) Shaykh Muḥammad Firāsāt.

2 Sūrah Āl ‘Imrān: 61.

Besides whether the word “فلان” refers to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ or not, the interpretations of the Shī‘ah which the author of *Tuḥfah* has mentioned are established by the Shī‘ī scholars’ statements and his every word is according to their texts. Accordingly, Ibn Maytham al-Baḥrānī who is a revered Shī‘ī scholar writes in *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah* that the Shī‘ah have responded to this narration in two ways. One of the ways is what Shāh has written. This is his text:

جاء ان يكون ذلك المدح منه على وجه استصلاح من يعتقد صحة خلافة الشيخين و استجلاب قلوبهم
بمثل هذا الكلام

It is possible that this praise is to appease those who believed in the correctness of Shaykhayn’s khilāfah and to win their hearts by making such a statement.

Unfortunately ‘Allāmah Kantorī has died otherwise I would have presented this text of his leader and mujtahid in front of him and asked, “Is Shāh’s claim a blatant lie or your rejection?” I have heard that his son is living and he boasts about the book *Istiḳṣā’ al-Afḥām*. May Allah ﷻ make it such that someone presents this text to him and opens his illustrious father’s tin of worms in front of him.

The Second Answer of the Shī‘ah

Some Shī‘ī scholars have said that “فلان” refers to someone else from the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ who passed away in Rasūlullāh’s صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ lifetime before fitnah and mischief spread on the earth. ‘Allāmah Rāwindī — a Shī‘ī scholar — has preferred this view. However, after slight pondering, one will realise that this answer is useless and baseless since Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ praised him in his speech with the following words, “He left this world and people were left in diverse roads to the extent that no deviate attains guidance.” So how can this praise be for a person who passed away in Rasūlullāh’s صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ lifetime? Can someone ever fathom that notwithstanding the presence of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, someone’s death causes so much of anarchy that people are left in diverse roads? So how can Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ praise a man who passed away during Rasūlullāh’s صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ lifetime with

these words which a normal person will not say? Thus, it is evident that “فلان” refers to someone who passed away after Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ demise and after whose death people strayed into different paths. This can only refer to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr or Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه and no one else. Whichever one of the two the Shī’ah accept, our goal is attained.

‘Allāmah Kantorī has written such a puzzling answer to this portion of *Tuḥfah Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah*, i.e. he neither rejects it nor accepts it. From his words and text, it looks like he had nowhere to go and the poor fellow was caught up in a cage and could not escape and could not reply to Shāh رحمه الله.

قوله و بعضی امامیه گفته اند که مراد اینجناب ازین مرد شخصی دیگر ست از جمله صحابه رسول الخ قولنا دانستی که بنا بر تصریح ابن ابی الحدید این قول قطب راوندی ست و بیچک از امامیه و غیر امامیه پیش ازین ابی الحدید سوانے قطب الدین راوندی شرح کتاب نهج البلاغه نه نوشته

Shī’ah say that Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s statement “فلان” refers to someone else from among the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنه. You know my view that Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd has written that this is the view of Quṭb al-Dīn Rāwindī which he wrote in *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah* which no Shī’ī or non-Shī’ī has claimed.

It is apparent from this text that ‘Allāmah Kantorī accepted this view and did not reject it and label Shāh as a liar as he did in the previous one. Whether someone has stated this prior to Quṭb al-Dīn in *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah* or not is part of the discussion. The Shī’ah should ponder over their scholars’ answers. When all four directions are closed, see how they remain silent, leave the original discussion and start discussing the irrelevant. I will present the original text of Quṭb al-Dīn Rāwindī so that no Shī’ī can reject it out of ignorance or deception:

فانه قال فى الشرح انه عليه السلام يمدح بعض اصحابه بحسن السيرة و انه مات قبل الفتنة التى وقعت بعد رسول الله صلى الله عليه و اله و سلم

He has said in *Sharḥ* that he (Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه) praised the excellent qualities of one of the Ṣaḥābah who passed away before the fitnah which took place after Rasūlullāh ﷺ.

The Third Answer of the Shī'ah

Some Shī'ī scholars have said that the object of this statement of Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه was to criticise Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه, to make people aware that he did not follow in the footsteps of Shaykhayn and that plenty of fitnah and mischief spread in his time.

This answer is worse than the first two since he could have criticised Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه in a different way. He could have said openly, "Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه did not follow in the footsteps of Shaykhayn." and his objective would have been fulfilled. What was the need and benefit to lie?

Nonetheless, this much is deduced that the lives of Shaykhayn were liked by Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه. If the Shī'ah accept this, Shaykhayn's khilāfah is established. If they do not accept that Shaykhayn's lives are praiseworthy, then what is the meaning of criticising Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه for not following their evil ways? Besides this, this answer is not worthy of acceptance since there is no mention of Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه opposing Shaykhayn's ways in the text, neither explicitly nor implicitly. Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه declared this in the lecture at Kūfah. Where was Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه at that time and where was the fitnah and anarchy? If Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه wished to criticise Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه, why did he not do it explicitly?

If someone says that he feared the opposition of the people by saying it explicitly, the answer is that the thing he feared i.e. the people of Shām's opposition was already present. The people of Shām turned away from Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه only due to Sayyidunā 'Uthmān's رضي الله عنه assassination and a war was about to break out. So what more harm could an explicit statement cause? Maybe the Shī'ah have not heard this proverb:

انا الغريق فما خوفي من البلل

I am drowning. Why should I fear getting wet?

‘Allāmah Kantorī has responded to this answer mentioned in *Tuḥfah* by claiming that no Shī‘ah scholar has ever said this. He rejected it like how he rejected the first one and understood it to be Shāh’s lie.

قوله بعضی از امامیه چنین گفته اند که غرض حضرت امیر توبیخ عثمان و تعریض بر او بود الخ قولنا بیچک از امامیه این توجیه نکرده مگر این ابی الحدید در شرح این کلام این مقابله را بطرف جارودیه که از فرق زیدیه ست نسبت داده الی قوله بعض مقاله زیدیه ست نسبت داده الی قوله بعض مقاله زیدیه را بامامیه نسبت دادن کذب صریح ست

Some Shī‘ah say that Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s عليه السلام object was to criticise Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān عليه السلام. I declare that no Shī‘ah has ever made this claim. However, Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd while commenting on this has related this text to the Jārūdiyyah — a sub sect of the Zaydiyyah. To call the statements of the Zaydiyyah as one of the Shī‘ah is a blatant lie.

This response of ‘Allāmah Kantorī is false just as his first response since the Shī‘ah scholars have accepted the above answer. It looks like ‘Allāmah Kantorī has not studied these statements hence rejected them or maybe he intentionally did this to beguile the masses. If anyone wants to find out about ‘Allāmah Kantorī’s ignorance or deception, he should read the text of Ibn Maytham al-Baḥrānī in his commentary of *Nahj al-Balāghah*. I will quote his words verbatim and present them to the Shī‘ah scholars as a gift.

و اعلم ان الشيعة قد اوردوا ههنا سوالا فقالوا ان هذه الممادح التي ذكرها عليه السلام في احد هذين الرجلين ينافي ما اجمعنا عليه من تخطيتهما اخذهما المنصب الخلافة فاما ان يكون هذا الكلام من كلامه عليه السلام او ان يكون اجماعنا خطأ ثم اجابوا من وجهين احدهما لا نسلم التنافي المذكور فانه جاز ان يكون ذلك المدح منه عليه السلام على وجه استصلاح من يعتقد صحة خلافة الشيخين و استجلاب قلوبهم بمثل هذا الكلام الثاني انه جاز ان يكون مدحه ذلك لاحدهما في معرض توبيخ عثمان لوقوع الفتنة في خلافته و اضطراب الامر عليه و اساتته لببت مال المسلمين هو و بنو ابيه حتى كان ذلك سببا لثوران المسلمين من الامصار و قتلهم له و ينيه على ذلك قوله و خلف الفتنة و ذهب نقي الثوب قليل العيب اصاب خيرها و سبق شرها و قوله و تركهم في طرق متشعبة الى اخره فان مفهوم ذلك يستلزم ان الوالى بعد هذا الموصوف قد اتصف باضداد هذه الصفات و الله اعلم

Know that the Shī‘ah have posed a question here. They ask, “This praise which he (Sayyidunā ‘Alī) عليه السلام has enumerated regarding one of these

two men is in polarity to what we have unanimity upon, i.e. their error in assuming the station of khilāfah. Either these words are his words or our consensus is an error.” They then answer this in one of two ways. Firstly, we do not accept this polarity for it is possible that this praise is to appease those who believed in the correctness of Shaykhayn’s khilāfah and to win their hearts by making such a statement. Secondly, it is possible that this praise of one of them is indirectly criticising ‘Uthmān since fitnah cropped up in his khilāfah, the matter was obscure regarding him and his misappropriating the wealth of the Muslims; he and the family of his father until this became a means for the uprising of the Muslims of different cities against him and his assassination. His statement, “Fitnah began after him. He left this world with a clean slate and little defects. He attained the goodness of khilāfah and left before its evil.” and his statement, “He left people in diverse roads.” all point to this. The meaning of this necessitates that the successor after him had the opposite qualities. And Allah ﷻ knows best!

Some important points from this text of ‘Allāmah al-Baḥrānī

- ‘Allāmah Kantor’s rejection, “None of the Shī’ah made this interpretation.” Is falsified and his dishonesty is established by the acknowledgement of his mujtahid and leader.
- It is learnt that initially the word Abū Bakr or ‘Umar was in the actual lecture in place of “فادان” which was then replaced with “فادن”. Which sound intellect will accept that a man with such eloquence and oratory like Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه would use such an ambiguous word and say “فادن” instead of his real name?
- It is realised that until the time ‘Allāmah al-Baḥrānī wrote the commentary of *Nahj al-Balāghah*, all the Shī’ah understood “فادن” to mean either Sayyidunā Abū Bakr or Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه. The commentator quotes the Shī’ah’s statement:

ان هذه المماحح التي ذكرها عليه السلام في احد هذين الرجلين

This praises which he (Sayyidunā ‘Alī) ﷺ has enumerated regarding one of these two men, viz. Sayyidunā Abū Bakr or Sayyidunā ‘Umar ﷺ.

- Quṭb al-Dīn’s interpretation that “فلان” refers to someone who passed away during Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ lifetime has been debunked since had the Shī‘ī scholars accepted this interpretation and not regarded it as bunkum, there was no need for further interpretations which ‘Allāmah al-Baḥrānī mentioned on behalf of the Shī‘ah.

Although what I have written thus far is sufficient in proving our objective and establishing the uselessness and baselessness of the Shī‘ī scholars’ interpretations, I will nonetheless shed some more light on this aspect that the word “فلان” according to the Shī‘ī scholars refers to only two persons viz. Sayyidunā Abū Bakr or Sayyidunā ‘Umar ﷺ. Shāh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz ﷺ writes in *Tuhfah*:

و لهذا شارحين نبيح البلاغه از اماميه در تعيين فلان اختلاف کرده اند بعضی گفته اند که مراد ابو بکر است و بعضی گفته اند عمر است

The commentators of *Nahj al-Balāghah* among the Shī‘ah have difference of opinion in pinpointing who “فلان” refers to. Some say it refers to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ﷺ while others opt for Sayyidunā ‘Umar ﷺ.

Mullā Kamāl al-Dīn — a renowned Shī‘ī scholar — writes in *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah* that there is difference of opinion as to who “فلان” refers to.

بعض اصحابه في زمن الرسول صلى الله عليه وسلم ممن مات قبل وقوع الفتن وانتشارها وقال ابن ابي الحديد ان ظاهر الاوصاف المذكورة في الكلام يدل على انه اراد رجلا ولي امر الخلافة قبله كقوله قوم الاود و داوى العمد و لم يرد عثمان لوقوعه في الفتنة وسعها بسببه و لا ابا بكر لقصر مدة خلافته و بعد عهده عن الفتن و كان الاظهر انه اراد عمر و اقول ان ارادته لابي بكر اشبه من ارادته لعمر

Quṭb al-Dīn Rāwindī — a great scholar of the Shī‘ah — says that Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ refers to another person with the word “فلان” who passed away in

Rasūlullāh's ﷺ lifetime before fitnah appeared and spread. Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd says, "The qualities mentioned in the speech show that he intended a person who assumed khilāfah before him as he said, "He straightened crookedness and doctored spiritual maladies." He did not intend 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه since he fell into fitnah and fitnah spread due to him nor Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه due to the brief period of his khilāfah and his era being far from fitnahs. The most apparent things are that he intended 'Umar رضي الله عنه. However, my opinion is that it refers more to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه than to 'Umar رضي الله عنه."

The Shī'ah should just have a look at the opinions of their muḥaddithīn and scholars and think that notwithstanding the presence of all these narrations, someone rejects it and labels the author of *Tuḥfah* as a liar thereby pulling wool over the masses' eyes.

Sayyidunā 'Alī's رضي الله عنه declaration of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr's رضي الله عنه virtues is so clear-cut and certain that no Shī'ī tongue can criticise him after hearing it. I wish to elucidate on the virtues mentioned. It should be noted that Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه listed ten qualities of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه:

1. He extricated the creation from the darkness of deviation and showed them the straight path.
2. He remedied spiritual maladies with his advices and lectures.
3. He established Rasūlullāh's ﷺ Sunnah.
4. He arranged things so efficiently that no fitnah or mischief popped its ugly head in his time.
5. He left without the blemish of criticism.
6. He attained the goodness of khilāfah and was protected from its evil.
7. He obeyed Allah سبحانه وتعالى as He ought to be obeyed.
8. He duly fulfilled the right of fear and piety.
9. After his demise, the creation was in confusion and mayhem.
10. People differed after his demise.

Shāh writes in *Tuḥfah* to clarify these qualities:

پس درین عبارت سراسر بشارت ابو بکر را بده وصف عالی موصوف نموده

Thus, this text is explicit glad tidings for Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه since 10 of his remarkable qualities have been listed.

However, ‘Allāmah Kantori writes in response to this:

ثبت الجدار ثم انقش اول اين معنى باثبات بايدر سانيد كه مراد از لفظ فلان درين كلام ابو بكر ست بعد از ان يابن اوصاف اثبات فضل ابو بكر بايد نمود

First build the wall, then decorate it. First establish that the word “فلان” in this text refers to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه and then establish his virtue with these qualities.

Mowlānā Ḥaydar ‘Alī responds to this in *Izālat al-Ghayn*:

بحمد الله بهم بناء ديوار محكم شد و بهم نقش و نگار صورت بست و خود شرح نيج البلاغ. ان اوصاف را كه تلك عشرة كاملة عبارت از انست به همين عدد ياد کرده اند عبارت بحراني بعد از ترجيح صديق بايد شنيد

Gratitude belongs to Allah سُبْحَانَكَ رَبِّيَ عَلَىٰ. The wall is strong and it has been decorated. The commentators of *Nahj al-Balāghah* have listed the number of those qualities which are ten. Al-Baḥrānī’s text after giving credence to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه is worth a read.¹

وصفه بامور احدهما تقويمه للاود و هو كناية عن تقويمه لاجوج الخلق عن سبيل الله الى الاستقامة فيها الثاني مداراته للعدم و استعار لفظ 1
العدم للامراض النفسانية باعتبار استلزامه للاذى كالعدم و وصف المداراة لمعالجة تلك الامراض بالمواظب البالغة و الزواجر القولية و الفعلية
النافعة الثالث اقامه للسنة و لزومها الرابع تخليفه للفتنة اى موته قبلها و وجه كون ذلك مدحا له هو اعتبار عدم وقوعها بسببه و في زمانه لحسن
تدبيره الخامس ذهابه نقي الثوب و استعار لفظ الثوب لعرضه و قيامه به سلامته عن دنس المذام السادس فاعيبوه السابع اصابة خيرها و سبق شرها
و الضمير في موضعين يشبه ان يرجع الى العهود له مما هو فيه من الخلافة اى اصاب ما فيها من الخير المطلوب و هو العدل و اقامة دين الله الذى به
يكون الثواب الجزيل فى الآخرة والشرف الجليل فى الدنيا و سبق شرها اى مات قبل وقوع الفتنة فيها و سفك الدماء لاجلها الثامن اذاه الى طاعته
التاسع الفاه له بحقه اى ادى حقه خوفا من عقوبته العاشر رحيله الى الآخرة تاركا للناس بعده فى طرق متشعبة من الخيالات لا يهتدى فيها من ضل
عن سبيل الله و لا يستيقن المهتدى فى سبيل الله انه على سبيل الاختلاف طرق الضلال و كثرة المخالف له ايهادا لو فى قوله و تركهم للحلال

He enumerated many of his qualities. Firstly, straightening crookedness. Which means straightening the crookedness of the people who strayed from the path of Allah to steadfastness upon it.

¹O Muslims! See how the Shī'ah reject every virtue of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ notwithstanding their seniors' acknowledgement and are not bothered about being humiliated and disgraced. When 'Allāmah Kantorī saw these virtues and understood that these narrations cannot be answered, he was forced to reject them outright. Besides the attestation of the Shī'ī scholars that “فلان” either refers to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr or Sayyidunā 'Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا, if we hypothetically think that they did not attest to this, then too the word “فلان” would refer to none other than these two personalities. If it referred to someone else, it would be someone who passed away in Rasūlullāh's صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ lifetime as Quṭb al-Dīn Rāwindī suggests. However, when these qualities cannot be found in a personality who passed away in his lifetime, then definitely it refers to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr or Sayyidunā 'Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا. So to reject it and blacken some pages as you have blackened your book of deeds is futile and wasted. It was better to reject this narration being related to Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ or to regard it to be the product of Taqīyyah. But to leave these two paths and adopt the path of 'Allāmah Kantorī is compound ignorance. The outcome was that the same thing he rejected, I presented it from his own sources and from his own scholars and he was thus humiliated.

1 continued from page 244

Secondly, doctoring maladies. He used the word “العمد” to refer to spiritual maladies for it necessitates pain. The word “المدارة” was used to show treatment of these maladies by powerful lectures and beneficial verbal and practical admonitions. Thirdly, he established the sunnah and held firmly to it. Fourth, leaving behind fitnah i.e. passing away before its appearance. The reason for this being his virtue is that it did not appear due to him and in his era owing to his superb administration. Fifth, leaving this world with pure clothes. He used the word clothes to refer to him due to it being part of him and it was pure from the filth of blame. Sixth, having no defects. Seventh, attaining its goodness and leaving before its evil. The pronoun in both places will appropriately refer to stations like khilāfah. He attained the desired goodness i.e. justice and establishing Allah's سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى religion which brings abundant reward in the Hereafter and honour in this world. He surpassed its evil i.e. he passed away before fitnah spread and blood flowed. Eighth, he obeyed Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. Ninth, he gave Him his right i.e. he fulfilled the right of His worship fearing His punishment. Tenth, his journey to the Afterlife leaving people with diverse ideologies. The one who deviated from Allah's سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى path does not find guidance and the one who is guided does not attain conviction that he is on a path contrary to the paths of deviation and the abundance of his enemies. The “و” in “و تركهم” is to depict condition.

اے معاشر مسلمین رحمکم اللہ اکتوں کجا ماند دعا و ای لاطائله روافض کہ در مطاعن تقریر کردہ مزاراں رسائل و کتب را مثل نا مہای اعمال خود در سیاهی و تباہی گرفتند و انصاف باید داد کہ حالیا از عمدہ طعنہای رفضہ کہ در اسفار کلامیہ ایشان مبسوط ست چیزے باقیست کہ بعد شہادت جناب مرتضوی حاجت بہ رد ایں افتد پس بر سوی عاقبت ایں قوم بنا لہای جانکاه باید گریست و ریگ بیابان مذلت بر سرہای ایشان بارید ریخت

O group of Muslims! May Allah ﷻ have mercy on your situation. How can the useless and baseless proofs of the Shī'ah remain? They have listed the vices (of the Ṣaḥābah رضی اللہ عنہم) and blackened thousand books, thereby blackening their book of deeds and falling into destruction. Tell me truthfully, can all those criticisms which the Shī'ah have written in much detail remain after they are placed in front of Sayyidunā 'Alī's رضی اللہ عنہ testimony? Thus, the Shī'ah should lament over their evil ending and throw the sand of the deserts of humiliation on their heads.

If the Shī'ah are still not satisfied, we are fully prepared with numerous narrations admiring the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah رضی اللہ عنہم on the tongues of the A'immaḥ. Whoever wishes to hear, may listen.

Eighth Testimony

'Alī ibn 'Īsā al-Arbīlī¹ — a Shī'ī imām — has recorded in his book *Kashf al-Ghummaḥ fī Ma'rifat al-A'immaḥ*:

1 His full name is Bahā' al-Dīn Abū al-Ḥasan 'Alī ibn Ḥusayn Fakhr al-Dīn 'Īsā ibn Abī al-Faṭḥ al-Arbīlī. He was born the beginning of the seventh hijrī century in Arbal a town near Mosul. The Shī'ah are unanimous that 'Alī ibn 'Īsā al-Arbīlī is one of their great scholars. Al-Qummī writes regarding him:

He was a scholar, poet, linguist, wonderful artist, proficient muḥaddith, reliable and the possessor of excellent qualities and traits. He is the author of *Kashf al-Ghummaḥ fī Ma'rifat al-A'immaḥ*. He completed it in 687 A.H. He has sung many poems in praise of the A'immaḥ some of which are recorded in *Kashf al-Ghummaḥ fī Ma'rifat al-A'immaḥ*. His book *Kashf al-Ghummaḥ* is a wonderful book. He passed away in Baghdad in the year 693 A.H. (*al-Kunā wa l-Alqāb* vol. 3 pg. 14, 15, Qumm Iran)

(Shaykh Muḥammad Firāsāt)

انه سئل الامام ابو جعفر عليه السلام عن حلية السيف هل يجوز فقال نعم قد حلى ابو بكر الصديق سيفه بالفضة فقال الراوى تقول هكذا فوثب الامام عن مكانه فقال نعم الصديق نعم الصديق نعم الصديق فمن لم له الصديق فلا صدق الله قوله فى الدنيا و الاخرة

Imām Abū Ja'far رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was asked whether beautifying the sword with jewellery was permissible to which he replied, “Yes. Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq beautified his sword with silver.” The narrator said, “You say this (i.e. al-Ṣiddīq)?” The Imām sprung from his place and said, “Yes. Al-Ṣiddīq. Yes. Al-Ṣiddīq. Yes. Al-Ṣiddīq. Whoever does not regard him as al-Ṣiddīq, may Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى not confirm his statement in this world and the hereafter.”

Few points deduced from this narration:

Point One

The Imām’s رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ acknowledgement that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is al-Ṣiddīq which follows that he is the most superior of the ummah since the principles laid down in the Qur’ān is that the status of al-Ṣiddīq is next to the status of the Rusul and superior to the entire ummah as Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى has stated:

فَأُولَئِكَ مَعَ الَّذِينَ أَنْعَمَ اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِمْ مِنَ النَّبِيِّينَ وَالصِّدِّيقِينَ وَالشُّهَدَاءِ وَالصَّالِحِينَ وَحَسُنَ أُولَئِكَ رَفِيقًا ﴿٦٩﴾

Those will be with the ones upon whom Allah has bestowed favour of the prophets, the steadfast affirmers of truth, the martyrs and the righteous. And excellent are those as companions.¹

Point Two

The questioner asked regarding one aspect. It was sufficient to answer by saying “Yes” or “No”. However, the Imām رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ did not stop there but mentioned Sayyidunā Abū Bakr’s رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ action as substantiation. This proves that the Ṣaḥābah’s رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ

1 Sūrah al-Nisā’: 69.

actions are the basis of dīnī actions. This is the share of the Ahl al-Sunnah which the Shī'ah are deprived of. They do not use any Ṣaḥābī's action or statement as substantiation for any of their rulings. Therefore, the Ahl al-Sunnah are the true followers of the A'immah, not the Shī'ah.

Point Three

When the Imām رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ answered and mentioned Sayyidunā Abū Bakr's رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ name, it was not necessary to say al-Ṣiddīq. He could have just mentioned his name, period. However, the Imām had so much of love for him that his heart could not tolerate taking his name without mentioning al-Ṣiddīq. This is a clear proof of the A'immah's love for the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ. Disgrace upon the Shī'ah's understanding who regard the A'immah as enemies of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ.

Point Four

This narration suggests that the Imām was angered at the amazement of the questioner and was so enraged when he asked, "You also call him al-Ṣiddīq." that he jumped up from his place and repeated thrice. "Yes. Al-Ṣiddīq. Yes. Al-Ṣiddīq. Yes. Al-Ṣiddīq." He did not stop here but stated further, "Whoever does not regard him as al-Ṣiddīq, may Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى not confirm his statement in this world and the hereafter." It devolves upon the Shī'ah to look at this narration with a clear unbiased look and then regard themselves as liars according to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى on the strength of the Imām's testimony because they have not accepted Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ as al-Ṣiddīq.

Point Five

This narration also shows that the questioner was a Shī'ī and an enemy of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ, hence he was amazed at the Imām referring to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ as al-Ṣiddīq. Had he been a Sunnī, he would not have been amazed. So when the questioner was a Shī'ī, there was no reason to practice Taqiyyah. Yes, had the questioner been a Sunnī, nāṣibī or khārijī, there would be scope for Taqiyyah.

I will now mention the Shī'ah's statements regarding this narration followed by their rebuttal

Qāḍī Nūr Allāh Shostarī has rejected this narration in *Iḥqāq al-Haqq* and spoke a whole lot of drivel. He claims that there is no sign of this narration in *Kashf al-Ghummah*. In fact, it contradicts logic to be recorded therein since it supposed to have narrations about Rasūlullāh ﷺ and the twelve A'immaḥ, not about Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. So why will the author record this narration? The words of Qāḍī's text are:

و كذا الحال في ما نقله عن راس التعصب و الحيف من حديث حلية السيف ليس ذلك في الكتاب عنه
خبر و لا عين و لا اثر و ايضا لا مناسبة لذكر ذلك في هذا الكتاب المقصود على ذكر النبي صلى الله عليه
و اله و سلم و الائمة الاثنا عشر و ذكر اسماءهم و كناههم و اسماء اباؤهم و امهاتهم و مواليدهم و وفياتهم
و معجزاتهم كما لا يخفى على من طالع هذا الكتاب

This is the condition of the narration narrated out of prejudice and oppression, i.e. the narration of jewellery on a sword. There is no trace at all of this narration in this book. Furthermore, there is no connection of mentioning such a narration in this book whose object is to mention Nabī ﷺ and the twelve Imāms; their names, titles, father's names, mother's names, places of birth and death and their miracles as it is evident for those who studied this book.

Which Shī'ī who sees this statement will not have conviction that this narration is not present and the Sunnī are lying? However, all praise belongs to Allah ﷻ that the book *Kashf al-Ghummah* is found in the thousands in India. Whoever is in doubt should take a book and have a look whether it is present or not and test Qāḍī's truthfulness. If someone thinks that some Sunnī has added this text later on and is not satisfied by its presence in *Kashf al-Ghummah*, I will present mujtahid's book to appease him since he has acknowledged the presence of this narration in this book with the grace of Allah ﷻ. He interpreted it by saying that the author has narrated it from Ibn al-Jowzī who was a Sunnī scholar. Nevertheless, I will discuss this further. For now, I wish to prove the dishonesty of

Qāḍī Nūr Allāh Shostarī who rejected the presence of this narration. I will quote the text of Mujtahid's¹ book *Ṭa'n al-Rimāh* where he acknowledges the presence of this narration.

قال المجتهد القمقام في طعن الرواح رواية الصديق راسناد بكتب شيعيان نبوده از كتاب كشف الغمة نقل کرده چوں
اتفاق مراجعت بان کتاب شد مصنف ان که مولانا الوزير علی بن عیسی اردبیلی ست ابن جوزی که از مشابیر علما نے
اہل سنت ست روایت مذکورہ را نقل کرده

Mujtahid al-Qamqām has written in *Ṭa'n al-Rimāh* that the isnād of this narration is from Shī'ī books and he narrated it from *Kashf al-Ghummah*. After studying this book, it was learnt that this book's author is Mowlānā Wazīr 'Alī ibn 'Īsā Arbīlī and that he took the narration from Ibn al-Jowzī — a Sunnī scholar.

Qāḍī Nūr Allāh Shostarī's deceit has been established clearer than daylight from this text and his fabrication is evident from the very book who Mujtahid remembers as his leader and superior in his books. The Shī'ī scholars' practice is startling. When any narration is presented from their books, they openly reject it and label the narrator a liar and fabricator and when its authenticity and isnād is presented, they make lengthy nonsensical interpretations. Qāḍī Nūr Allāh Shostarī found this narration to be in conflict to his religion, so he rejected

1 Mujtahid refers to Sulṭān al-'Ulamā' Sayyid Muḥammad Lucknowī. He was the eldest son and successor of Mowlānā Dildār 'Alī Nasirabadī. He was born on the 17th of Ṣafar 1199 A.H (1794) in Lucknow. His father tutored him and gave him all certificates of qualification at the age of 19 in 1218 A.H. Shāh Awadh Amjad 'Alī Shāh (d. 1258 A.H) gave him the title Sulṭān al-'Ulamā' and presented to him the position of chairman. His command was considered most lofty. The amount of power and authority he received by the kings of Awadh (especially Amjad 'Alī Shāh and Wājīd 'Alī Shāh) was not even enjoyed by his father. All the Shī'ah of the thirteenth century accepted him as their greatest leader. In the time of the kings of Awadh, he was given that rank which was given to the Shaykh al-Islam in some Sunnī countries. The work of administration and advancement of the Shī'ah religion which his father started in West India was taken to completion by him. He has authored many books. *Ḍarbat Ḥaydariyyah bijawāb Showkat 'Umariyyah* (2 volumes), *Ṭa'n al-Rimāh*, *Bāriqah Ḍughaymiyyah dar baḥth Mut'ah* – in refutation to Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīz Dehlawī – *Bawāriq Mūbiqah dar baḥth Imāmat*, *Radd Tuḥfah*, etc. are well-known books. He was just over 50 years when he passed away in Lucknow on Thursday night the 22nd of Rabī' al-Awwal 1284 A.H (1867). He is buried in Imām Bāra Ghufrān Ma'āb.

it. However, when this narration was established from that book, Mujtahid was forced to acknowledge it but made a nonsensical interpretation trying to falsify it. I will now debunk this nonsensical interpretation.

The gist of Mujtahid's interpretation is that although this narration is found in *Kashf al-Ghummah*, the author narrated it from 'Allāmah Ibn al-Jowzī who is one of the renowned scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah. Hence, this narration is a Sunnī narration; not a Shī'ī one. The answer to this is probably Mujtahid did not study *Kashf al-Ghummah* from cover to cover, otherwise he would not have claimed this. Whatever the author has written is accepted by both sects and all the Shī'ī scholars have agreed to it. Accordingly, 'Allāmah Mu'izz al-Dīn Ṣadarr writes in *Imāmat*:

کتاب کشف الغمہ از تصنیفات وزیر سعید اردبیلی ست و آنچه در کتاب مستطاب مذکور ست مقبول طبائع موافق و مخالف ست

Kashf al-Ghummah is the work of Wazīr Sa'īd Arbīlī. Whatever is written therein is accepted by people of both sects.

Even though the author narrated this narration from Ibn al-Jowzī, but since he has made it his principle to only narrate that which is accepted by both sects, hence this narration is the same. And when it is accepted by both sects, it can be used against the Shī'ah who have to give an answer to it.

The author of *Istiqṣā' al-Afhām*¹ — about whose book all Shī'ah are very proud — has used his beautiful nature and answered with his deep understanding. This is his original text:

1 His name is Mīr Ḥāmid Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad Qillī ibn Muḥammad Ḥusayn ibn Ḥāmid Ḥusayn ibn Sayyid Zayn al-'Ābidīn al-Mūsawī Nayshapūrī. He was born on the 5th of Muḥarram 1246 A.H (1830) in Meerut, UP. In those days, his father was the mayor of Meerut. His journey of knowledge began on the 17th of Rabī' al-Awwal 1252 A.H. Primary and secondary sciences were taught to him by his father. He was only fifteen years of age when his father's shadow was lifted (9 Muḥarram 1260 A.H). He was in Lucknow at that time. He learnt linguistics from Mowlānā Barkat 'Alī Ḥanafī and Muftī Muḥammad 'Abbās, rational sciences from Sayyid Murtaḍā ibn Sayyid Muḥammad and fiqh and uṣūl from Sayyid Muḥammad and Sayyid Ḥusayn (Mīran) and attained certificates from them.

اول اینکه ازین کلام زر دستانی نپایت آنچه مستفاد میشود این ست که آنچه در کشف الغمہ مذکور ست انرا اہل حق ہم قبول میسازند و برو انکار این نمی پردازند و این امر اخر ست و بودن روایات کشف الغمہ از اجماعیات و اتفاقیات اہل حق و اہل خلاف کہ مخاطب مدعی نیست امر اخر زیراکہ مفہوم ثانی نیست کہ اہل حق در روایت این روایات شریک اند و از قبول کردن این روایات این معنی مستفاد نمیشود چہ قبول روایت باین وجہ ہم متصور ست کہ اہل خلاف روایت این کرده باشند و اہل حق قبول این نموده باشند و قبول گاہی باین معنی ست کہ این روایت را صحیح میدانیم و آنچه دران مذکور ست انرا حجت میگیریم و گاہی باین معنی کہ چون باین بر بعض مطالب خود احتجاج میکنیم پس برای این امر قبولش کرده یم نہ باین معنی کہ خصم باین بر ما احتجاج نماید دوم اینکه کلام زر دستانی محمول بر اصول و مقاصد این کتاب ست یعنی آنچه دران کتاب برائے احتجاج و استدلال از اہل خلاف نقل فرموده و مقصود بالذات ست مقبول اہل حق ہم ست نہ اینکه آنچه مقصود بالذات نیست محض استطراداً و تبعاً نقل شده اینہم مقبول ست و لیاقت حجیت نزد اہل حق وارد حاشا و کلا

The first thing proven from Zardastānī's words is that *Kashf al-Ghummah* is accepted and agreed upon by both sects and no one rejects it. The Sunnī understand from this that the Shī'ah accepted those narrations. However, the truth is that those narrations presented by the Sunnī are not simply accepted by the Shī'ah. The reason for this is that acceptance and agreeing means that one accepts the narration as authentic and its contents as proof while it also means to accept a narration's authenticity and use it against others. This does not mean that the opposition can use it as proof against us. Considering the second meaning, we do not accept all the narrations of *Kashf al-Ghummah*. Secondly, considering the principles and objectives of *Kashf al-Ghummah*, the meaning of Zardastānī's words is that whatever is an objective per se and is proof against the Sunnī, we the Shī'ah accept it. This does not mean that that which is not an objective and is written secondary is also accepted by the Shī'ah. Never! The Shī'ah do not accept that which is not an object.

continued from page 251

1 After completing his studies, he spent his efforts on organising and printing his father's books like *Futūḥāt Ḥaydariyyah*, *Risālah Taqīyyah*, *Tashīd al-Maṭā'in*, etc. *Istiṣā' al-Afḥām*, *Afḥām Ahl al-Mayn Radd Izālat al-Ghayn* and *'Abaqāt al-Anwār* are among his famous books. He passed away in his library in Khajwā (Shastrinagar, Lucknow) on the 18th of Ṣafar 1306 A.H corresponding to the 25th of October 1888. After his death, his corpse was brought to his house and he was buried in Imām Bāra Ghufrān Ma'āb. (*Maṭla' al-Anwār*) Shaykh Muḥammad Firāsāt

The purport of this text is unknown. It does not solve the problem which is at hand. Our stance is that the Shī'ī scholars have agreed upon whatever narration appears in *Kashf al-Ghummah* — whether the author took it from his sources or from the Sunnī. So the outcome will be that the narration under discussion is also accepted by the Shī'ī scholars whether the author extracted it from one of his scholar's books or Ibn al-Jowzī's book. This means that Mujtahid's interpretation is false. So what is the purport and meaning of the text of the author of *Istiqṣā'*? The truth is that the poor fellow was so caught up, he could not say anything or respond in any way. He was startled at the disagreement and confusion of his mujtahids and scholars and tried his utmost best to make sense of what they saying. And because you cannot present falsehood as the truth except by making ridiculous and deceptive statements, he gratified himself by speaking drivel. It is even shocking for a child to speak such rubbish. He acknowledges that whatever is in *Kashf al-Ghummah* is accepted by both sects and interprets those narrations which are detrimental to his creed by saying that the Shī'ah only accept those narrations which they use against the Sunnī, not those narrations which the Sunnī use against them or they accept those narrations which are objectives per se, not the others. He does not think, which adversary will listen to and accept such drivel? We thus debunk his text on strong grounds.

1. The author of *Istiqṣā'* has acknowledged:

که آنچه در کشف الغمه مذکور است انرا اهل حق بهم قبول میسازند و برو انکار این نمی پردازند

Whatever is in *Kashf al-Ghummah* is accepted and agreed upon by both sects and no one rejects it.

So on this premise, we say:

روایت نعم الصدیق در کشف الغمه مذکور است و آنچه در کشف الغمه مذکور است انرا اهل حق بهم قبول میسازند و برو انکار این نمی پردازند و قاضی نور الله شوستری انرا قبول نمی سازند و جناب مجتهد صاحب قبله بر دو انکار این می پردازند پس هر در قاضی و مجتهد از اهل حق بستند و مر که از اهل حق باشند انرا لازم است که این روایت قبول سازد
دو بر دو انکار این نبر دازد

The narration “Yes. Al-Şiddīq” is found in *Kashf al-Ghummah* — which is accepted by the Shī‘ah and no one rejects. Nonetheless, Qāḍī Nūr Allāh Shostarī does not accept it and Mujtahid rejects it. And both Qāḍī and Mujtahid are Shī‘ah. Hence, it is binding upon them to accept this narration and not reject it.

2. The author of *Istiqṣā’* has fabricated two meanings of acceptance:

قبول گاہی باین معنی ست کہ این روایت را صحیح میدانیم و آنچه دران مذکور ست انرا حجت میگیریم و گاہی باین معنی کہ چون یان بر بعض مطالب خود احتجاج میکنیم پس برای این امر قبولش کرده یم نہ باین معنی کہ خصم یان بر ما احتجاج نماید

The reason for this is that acceptance means that one accepts the narration as authentic and its contents as proof while it also means to accept a narration’s authenticity and use it against others. This does not mean that the opposition can use it as proof against us.

The following couplet aptly applies to his conjured meanings:

الشعر فی بطن الشاعر

The poetry is in the poet’s stomach.

I have mentioned earlier that the Shī‘ī Mu‘izz al-Dīn has stated:

و آنچه در کتاب مستطاب مذکور ست مقبول طبائع موافق و مخالف ست

Whatever is written therein is accepted by people of both sects.

So when it is accepted by both sects, then to say that we only accepted it so we can use it as proof not so that it is used against us is stupidity. The example of this is like a man who accepts the correctness of a document and agrees that he accepts whatever is written therein — whether by him or someone else. Then when the opposition uses a text therein against

him, he complains, "I only accepted it so that I can use it as proof, not so that it can be used as proof against me." What will a just person decide and what verdict will he pass? Since seeing that the author is just and his father is a Muftī, he should for himself pass a verdict for Allah's سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى sake.

3. If it is accepted that acceptance of a narration is to use it as a proof, not so that others may use it as a proof, then all arguments will end and no sect will be able to bring any narration against the other and everyone will say what the author of *Istiqṣā'* has said:

چون باین بر بعض مطالب خود احتجاج میکنیم پس برای این امر قبولش کرده یم نه باین معنی که خصم باین بر ما احتجاج نماید

Because we use the narration as proof for us, we accept it. We do not accept it because the enemy can use it as proof against us.

4. An accepted principle is when the authenticity of a narration of any sect is accepted, it is binding upon the one who accepts its authenticity to respond to it just as it is binding upon the one who narrated it. Let us leave worldly matters aside and deal with religious matters. Many aspects of the Torah and Injīl are found in our books and we accept them. Now when we have accepted the authenticity of those narrations, we are responsible to respond to them just as the Jews and Christians are responsible. If anyone objects to any narration which we have accepted, can we answer as the author of *Istiqṣā'* has answered i.e. because we use the narration as proof for us, we accept it. We do not accept it because the enemy can use it as proof against us? We cannot answer like that and if we do, no one will accept it.
5. If we narrate any text of the opposition sect and have a motive behind accepting it but do not accept a portion of it, then it is compulsory for us to take only that amount of the text which is beneficial to us and leave the rest or clearly state that we accept this portion of the narration and

reject the rest. However, if we do not do this and accept the narration without questions, then later on we cannot reject it. Similarly, if the author accepts the book *Kashf al-Ghummah* for some reason, it was binding upon him to mention his objective or to write the narration and point out the unaccepted portion. When he has not done this, then the interpretation of this author after few years will not benefit him.

6. The author of *Istiqṣā'* stated:

کلام زر دستانی محمول بر اصول و مقاصد این کتاب ست نه اینکه آنچه مقصود بالذات نیست انهم مقبول ست

The meaning of Zardastānī's words is that whatever is an objective per se is accepted by the Shī'ah. This does not mean that that which is not an objective is also accepted.

This is only a claim. It has no proof or verification. It is not worth hearing such an unverified claim. Had the author said that whatever is an objective per se in this book is accepted as well as that which is not objective per se, we would have understood. When he has not made this condition and left his statement unqualified, we will understand the *farḍ kāmīl* (perfect character) i.e. whatever is in the book whether objective per se or not is accepted.

O Shī'ah! I ask you by Allah سُبْحَانَكَ رَبِّيَ to look without prejudice at how your scholars have drowned in this discussion. They have no proof whatsoever and are just kicking up dust but cannot get to the point. Some of them reject its presence. Some accept it but say it's from Sunnī sources. Some openly reject it. Some make their own definitions of acceptance. But none of them make any sense and get to any point.

مثل الغریق ینشبث بکل حشیش

Like a drowning man will clutch at a straw.

The Second Opinion

Qāḍī Nūr Allāh Shostarī writes in *Iḥqāq al-Ḥaqq*:

اقول ذكر الصديق لاجل التخصيص و التمييز للمخاطب من غير تصديق بمضمونه

I say that mentioning al-Ṣiddīq was to single out and identify the addressee without attesting to his object.

This response is fallacious. If the Imām رَحِمَهُ اللهُ had kept quiet after mentioning the title of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ al-Ṣiddīq, the Shī'ah would have had scope to make this interpretation. However, identifying the addressee without attesting to his object is falsified by the next sentence because when the questioner asked astonishingly, “Do you also call him al-Ṣiddīq?” the Imām jumped up from his place and said, “Yes. Al-Ṣiddīq. Yes. Al-Ṣiddīq. Yes. Al-Ṣiddīq.” He did not stop there but declared, “Whoever does not regard him as al-Ṣiddīq, may Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى not confirm his statement in this world and the hereafter.” It is only appropriate for the Shī'ah to say that the Imām said this only to address the addressee and he did not attest to his object.

The Third Opinion

The Shī'ah realised that this interpretation does not work because of the sentence, “Whoever does not regard him as al-Ṣiddīq, May Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى not confirm his statement in this world and the hereafter.” They made a third interpretation that what the Imām mentioned concerning Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was done mockingly as it appears in *Iḥqāq al-Ḥaqq*:

و الاستهزاء كما فى قوله دُقْ اِنَّكَ اَنْتَ الْعَزِيْزُ الْكَرِيْمُ

This is out of jest as is in His سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى statement, “Taste! Indeed, you are the honoured, the noble!”

However, this interpretation is false since there has to be some reason to turn away from the original meaning of a word. It is not proper to turn away from the

original meaning without a reason or due to context. The context is found in the verse. Allah ﷻ is speaking about the tree of Zaqqūm and the punishment of Jahannam. And the addressees are inmates of Jahannam. Since these people were remembered with honourable titles in this world, that is why Allah ﷻ addresses them:

إِنَّ شَجَرَةَ الزَّقُّومِ ﴿٤٣﴾ طَعَامُ الْإِثْمِ ﴿٤٤﴾ كَالْمُهْلِ يَغْلِي فِي الْبُطُونِ ﴿٤٥﴾ كَغَلْيِ الْحَمِيمِ ﴿٤٦﴾
 خُذُوهُ فَاعْتِلُوهُ إِلَى سَوَاءِ الْجَحِيمِ ﴿٤٧﴾ ثُمَّ صُبُّوا فَوْقَ رَأْسِهِ مِنْ عَذَابِ الْحَمِيمِ ﴿٤٨﴾
 ذُقْ إِنَّكَ أَنْتَ الْعَزِيزُ الْكَرِيمُ ﴿٤٩﴾

Indeed, the tree of Zaqqūm is food for the sinful. Like murky oil, it boils within bellies like the boiling of scalding water. (It will be commanded), “Seize him and drag him into the midst of the Hellfire. Then pour over his head from the torment of scalding water.” (It will be said), “Taste! Indeed, you are the honoured, the noble!”¹

There is no such context in the narration which suggests that the Imām said it in jest. Firstly, the questioner was a Shī‘ī, so what was the need to tell him mockingly? Secondly, a question was not asked regarding Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه at first but rather regarding an aspect of fiqh, i.e. whether decorating the sword with jewellery is permissible. The Imām said it is permissible and provided the action of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه as proof. When the questioner was amazed at his response, the Imām repeated, “Yes. Al-Ṣiddīq.” to remove his amazement. This cannot be out of jest. Moreover, what the Imām declared thereafter cannot be regarded as jest at all. If such clear and pure words can be regarded as jesting without any reason, then every heretic will say the same thing regarding every verse and ḥadīth.

The Fourth Opinion

When the Shī‘ah realised that this interpretation is not working, they took shelter in their useless fort which protects them from every Sunnī attack and

1 Sūrah al-Dukhān: 43-49.

used their hopeless shield which safeguards them from the blows of the Nāṣibīs, i.e. Taqiyyah. It appears in *Iḥqāq al-Ḥaqq*:

او للتقية عن السائل

Or out of Taqiyyah.

Mujtahid has stated the same at the end in *Ṭa'n al-Rimāḥ*:

ولو نزلنا عن ذلك پس محمول بر تقيه خوايد بود

If we accept it, then it is out of Taqiyyah.

However, there is no scope for this interpretation since it is apparent from the text that the questioner was amongst the Shī'ah and lovers, otherwise he would not have been surprised when the Imām called Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, al-Ṣiddīq. The Imām's answering the person in rage shows clearly that the questioner was not a Sunnī from whom he should make Taqiyyah. Had the questioner been a Sunnī, then too it is against the status of Imāmah to practice Taqiyyah and praise the oppressive khulafā' out of fear for a Sunnī. Imām al-Bāqir رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and Imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ were forbidden from practicing Taqiyyah and they were commanded to spread the knowledge which Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى sent to them in the scripture without having any fear. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى guaranteed them:

فانك في حرز و امان

Indeed you are under protection and in safety.

So for the Imām to fear a Sunnī and call a usurper and a disbeliever al-Ṣiddīq notwithstanding the guarantee of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى is startling.

Besides this, the actions and lifestyle of the Imām should be studied. Was he always afraid of the Sunnī and would he praise the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ out of fear for

the Nāṣībīs or would he assume the honour of Imām and reveal his grandeur of truthfulness? If it is established that Imām رحمته الله did not expose his beliefs in front of any Sunnī and practiced Taqiyyah in front of them all, then we will accept Taqiyyah as a justification for this narration. On the other hand, if it is learnt that the Imām spoke the truth in front of great Sunnīs and revealed what was in his heart without fear, then why should we accept the Taqiyyah excuse in this narration? I will prove this point from Shīṭī books. Mullā Bāqir Majlisī writes in *Haqq al-Yaqīn*:

در زمان حضرت امام محمد باقر و امام جعفر صادق علیهما السلام که اواخر زمان بنی امیه و اوائل دولت بنی عباس بود از آن دو بزرگواران قدر از مسائل حلال و حرام و علم تفسیر و کلام و قصص انبیاء و سیر و تواریخ ملوک عرب و عجم و غیر اینها از غرائب علوم منتشر گردید که عالم را فرا گرفت و محدثان شیعه در اطراف عالم منتشر گردید و پیوسته در مناظرات و مباحثات علماء بر جمیع فرق غالب بودند و چهار هزار کس از علماء مشهور از حضرت صادق روایت کرده اند و چهار صد اصل در میان شیعه بهر سید که اصحاب باقر و صادق و کاظم علیهم السلام روایت کرده بودند الی قوله و بطریق معتبره منقولست که قتاده بصری که از مفسرین مشهوره عامه ست بخدمت حضرت امام محمد باقر علیه السلام آمد حضرت فرمود توئی فقیه اهل بصره گفت بلی حضرت فرمود و ای برتوی قتاده حق تعالی خلق افریده است که ایشان را حجتیهای خود گردانیده ست بر خلق خود پس ایشان میخپای زمین اند و خازنان علم الهی اند پس قتاده مدتی ساکن شد که یا رای سخن گفتن نداشت پس گفت بخدا سوگند که در پیش فقهای و خلفاء و پادشاهان و ابن عباس رضی الله عنه نشسته ام و دل من نزد ایشان مضطرب نشد چنانچه نزد تو مضطرب شده است حضرت فرمود می دانی که کجائی در پیش خانه نشسته که حق تعالی در شان ایشان فرموده است که فی بیوت اذن الله ان ترفع و یذکر فیها اسمہ قتاده گفت راست گفتم

Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir and Imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq lived towards the end of the reign of the Banū Umayyah and the beginning of the Banū 'Abbās. Both of these luminaries spread the knowledge of ḥalāl and ḥarām, tafsīr, 'aqā'id, stories of the Rusul, sīrah, history of the Arab and non-Arab kings, and other rare knowledge and filled the world with its fragrance. Shīṭī muḥaddithīn spread in the entire world and dominated the scholars of other sects in debates and discussions. Four thousand renowned 'ulamā' narrated from Imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq رحمته الله and four hundred Shī'ah narrated from Imām al-Bāqir, Imām al-Ṣādiq and Imām al-Kāzīm رحمته الله. It is narrated from a reliable source that the famous commentator Qatādah Baṣrī came to Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir رحمته الله who asked him, "Are you the only faqīh of Baṣrah?" He replied in the affirmative. The Imām then said, "Shame O

Qatādah! Allah ﷻ created the creation and made the A'immah His proof. Thus, these A'immah are the pegs of the earth and the trustees of divine knowledge." Qatādah remained silent for a little while and did not have the ability to speak. He then declared, "By Allah! I have sat by the jurists, 'ulamā', khulafā' and by Ibn 'Abbās but my heart was never as restless as it is when I sit by you." The Imām responded, "Do you know where you are? You are sitting in front of the house concerning which Allah ﷻ stated, "In Masjids which Allah has ordered to be raised and that His name be mentioned therein." Hearing this, Qatādah exclaimed, "You are speaking the truth."¹

So when the Imām ﷺ does not practice Taqiyyah in front of great commentators, renowned jurists and popular scholars, speaks the truth and does not waste time in using words of reproach and when his students debate the Sunnī in front of large crowds and defeat them and thousands of scholars and jurists gain knowledge from him; then why should we believe that he feared one Sunnī due to which he praised the oppressive khulafā' in such glowing terms whereas great scholars trembled when they came to his gathering and their hearts shuddered when they saw his face. Was the questioner greater than Qatādah Baṣrī or did he come with a huge force to ask the question that he does not fear Qatādah and rebukes him but fears the questioner and repeats calling Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ﷺ al-Ṣiddīq? According to us, even if a king or affluent person had to come, the Imām would not waiver in speaking the truth and would speak nothing but what is in his heart. This is not only my opinion, it is verified in Shī'ī books. Mullā Bāqir Majlisī writes in *Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn*:

در روایت دیگر معتبر وارد شده است که درسالیکه پشام بن عبد الملک بحج رفته بود در مسجد الحرام دید که مردم نزد حضرت امام محمد باقر هجوم آورده اند و از امور دین خود سوال کند عکرمه شاگرد ابن عباس از پشام پرسید که کیست اینکه نور علم از جبین او را ساطع ست میروم که او را حجل کنم چون نزدیک حضرت امد و ایستاد لرزه بر اندام اورافتاد و مضطرب شد و گفت یا بن رسول الله من در مجالس بسیار نزد ابن عباس و دیگران نشسته ام این حالت مرا عارض نشده حضرت بهماں جواب را فرمود پس معلوم شد که از معجزات امام و شواهد امامت این ست که حق تعالی محبت ایشان را در دل دوستان و مهابت ایشان را درد لپهای دشمنان می افکند

1 This narration is also found in the translation of *Ḥayāt al-Qulūb* vol. 3 pg. 187.

It appears in a reliable narration that the year Hishām ibn ‘Abd al-Malik went for ḥajj, he saw a crowd around Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir عليه السلام in Masjid ḥarām who were asking him regarding religious aspects. ‘Ikrimah — a student of Ibn ‘Abbās عليه السلام — asked Hishām, “Who is this person on whose forehead is the brilliance of knowledge. Let me go and shame him.” However, as ‘Ikrimah approached the Imām عليه السلام, he began trembling and was restless. He submitted, “O son of Rasūl! I have sat in great gatherings by Ibn ‘Abbās عليه السلام, etc., but this was never my condition.” Imām عليه السلام told him the same thing (he told Qatādah). From this we learn that from among the miracles of the Imām and the proofs of Imāmah is that Allah سبحانه وتعالى creates love in the hearts of their lovers and puts awe in the hearts of their enemies.

So when the Imām’s awe strikes on the enemy in the presence of a tyrant like Hishām ibn ‘Abd al-Malik which causes him to tremble, it is startling for the Imām to have fear for an insignificant figure.

I ponder deeply and reflect, but I cannot understand the statements of these Shī‘ah. The reality of Imāmah was not understood by the angels and the ambiyā’, so how will I ever understand it. But its clear signs are uncomprehendable to me. The Shī‘ah sometimes make the A‘immah so brave and awe inspiring that kings and tyrants do not have the audacity to speak in front of them and scholars and jurists do not have the courage to say a word. They reprimand everyone while all listen silently. No word but the truth is spoken in front of the A‘immah. And sometimes the Shī‘ah make them so scared and cowardly (May Allah forbid!) that they fear a puny fellow and if any Sunnī comes to their gathering, they remain silent and are struck with so much of awe that they do not speak a word contrary to the beliefs of that Sunnī. The reality is that these are allegations of the Shī‘ah against the A‘immah. They are the descendants of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم and his heart and liver. Their every veins pumps with their forefather’s habits and character. Their grandfather’s speech glows from their every word. Just as their external beauty is a reflection of Rasūlullāh’s صلى الله عليه وسلم beauty, similarly their internal characteristics are the reflection of his. Their hearts and tongues are like

that of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Hypocrisy, deceit, lying and Taqiyyah are defects in their lofty traits. Why would Allah ﷻ not protect those who are lanterns of brilliance from such darkness? Why will He not keep those pure A'immah who are embodiments of purity away from such filth?

O Shī'ah! Those regarding whom the verse of Taḥhīr was revealed, upon whose purity cleanliness took an oath, truthfulness is proud about their honesty, whose external and internal features are like Rasūlullāh ﷺ, whose cradle swing is Jibrīl عليه السلام, to meet whom the angels of the lofty Thrown come, on whose statements and actions lies the edifice of dīn; do you cast allegations on such pure A'immah and slander them with fear, lying and deceit? Is this the meaning of love which you possess? If this is the splendour of Imāmah, then forget the Muslims, every person will hate it and will seek protection from it. If you have doubt that your scholars and muḥaddithīn have written such things and a group of jurists had narrated them, then this doubt can be removed with slight contemplation. Contemplate over the life of those who narrate these things and who are the basis of your creed's aḥādīth. All of them were liars. The A'immah would curse them. I will prove this at its place from your sources further on, Allah willing. Then you will realise that the A'immah's external and internal was the same and they would speak what was in their hearts. If you think what I am saying is false, then study the statements of your own scholars who have written the very same thing regarding the A'immah and have established this on the strength of the A'immah's aḥādīth. Accordingly, the Shī'ī muḥaddithīn write regarding Imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ that he announced:

لا تذكروا سرنا بخلاف علانيتنا ولا علانيتنا بخلاف سرنا حسبكم ان تقولوا ما نقول وتصمتوا عما نصمت الخ

(Our external and internal are the same.) Do not consider our external contrary to our internal and vice versa. It is sufficient that you say what we say and keep silent where we have kept silent.

O Shī'ah! If you really practice upon the Imām's command and follow in his footsteps then listen to what he says and practice accordingly. He called Sayyidunā

Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, al-Ṣiddīq; so you even listen quietly and call him the same. And remain silent on that which the Imām remained silent.

The Fifth Opinion

Some Shī'ah argue that how can the Imām رحمنا الله call Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, al-Ṣiddīq; whereas this title is exclusive for Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه. Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه declared:

انا الصديق الاكبر لا يقول بعدى الا كذاب

I am the greatest Ṣiddīq. No one will say this after me except a great liar.

However, this is not beneficial for them due to some reasons.

First Proof

The answer is apparent from Sayyidunā 'Alī's رضي الله عنه statement, "No one will say this after me except a great liar." This shows that a Ṣiddīq passed before Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه which is none other than Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه al-Ṣiddīq.

Second Proof

If the Shī'ah say that there was no Ṣiddīq before Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه, I will answer this from their books. It appears in ḥadīth books such as *'Uyūn Akhbār al-Riḍā*, etc.:

ابو ذر صديق هذه الامة

Abū Dhar is the Ṣiddīq of this ummah.

When the word Ṣiddīq is used for Sayyidunā Abū Dhar رضي الله عنه, it cannot be exclusive to Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه.

Third Proof

Let us confirm whether Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was known as al-Ṣiddīq before Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ amongst the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ. Would people refer to him as al-Ṣiddīq in front of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, in fact in front of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ or not? This is proven in Shī‘ī books. One Shī‘ī scholar relates from Fuḍayl in *Manhaj al-Maqāl*:

قال سمعت ابا داود يقول حدثني بريدة الاسلمى قال سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يقول ان الجنة مشتاق الى ثلاثة فاجاء ابو بكر فقبل له يا ابا بكر انت الصديق و انت ثاني اثنين اذ هما فى الغار فلو سالت رسول الله من هؤلاء الثلاث

I heard Abū Dāwūd saying, “Buraydah al-Aslamī narrated to me that he heard Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ saying, ‘Certainly, Jannah desires three persons.’ Abū Bakr came and it was told to him, ‘O Abū Bakr! You are al-Ṣiddīq and you are the second of the two when they were in the cave. Could you please ask Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ who these three men are?’”

This narration is sufficient proof that the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ would regard Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ as al-Ṣiddīq in the time of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and would address him by it. Al-Ṣiddīq and second of the two (in the cave) had become his titles.

If any Shī‘ī is not satisfied with these narrations and requires another statement of the Imām to substantiate the narration and asks whether any Imām called Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, al-Ṣiddīq in another narration, I can present proof for that also. As long as the Shī‘ah are not fully satisfied, I will not abandon quoting narrations from their sources for their gratification and solace. There is another narration of Imām Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in the same book, *Kashf al-Ghummah*, where the Imām mentioned al-Ṣiddīq with Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ name. The narration goes as follows:

ولدنى ابو بكر الصديق مرتين

Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq gave birth to me twice.

The irony of it is that although Qāḍī Nūr Allāh Shostarī rejected the presence of the first narration in *Kashf al-Ghummah*, he kept silent with regards to the presence of this one. Until when is he going to lie and until when is he going to throw sand at the sun? He got tired of rejecting and just kept quiet.

If there is still some reservations, then the Shī'ah should have a look at Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ statements and hear the title al-Ṣiddīq for Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ from his tongue. ‘Allāmah al-Ṭabarsī — a reliable Shī'ī scholar — writes in *Ihtijāj* that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ reports:

كنا معه اى مع النبى صلى الله عليه و سلم على جبل حراء اذ تحرك الجبل فقال له قر فانه ليس عليك الا
نبى و صديق و شهيد

We were with Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ on mount ḥirā’ when it began to shake. Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ commanded it, “Remain still for there is only a Nabī, a Ṣiddīq and a martyr on you.”

It becomes manifest after studying Shī'ī books that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا were with Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ at that time. Thus, Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ said Nabī for himself, Ṣiddīq for Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and martyr for Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. If a hard bent Shī'ī says that although the Imām’s statement uses Ṣiddīq for Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ but there is a possibility of jest, Taqīyah, etc., hence they are not fully satisfied. If this address is proven from Allah’s سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى book, then no doubt will remain. We do not wish to break the heart of such a hell bent Shī'ī as well and will verify it from the Qur’ān with the acknowledgement of Shī'ī commentators. It should be noted that it is recorded in *Majma’ al-Bayān* of al-Ṭabarsī¹ — considered an extremely reliable tafsīr by the Shī'ah:

قال الله تبارك و تعالى وَالَّذِي جَاءَ بِالصُّدْقِ وَ صَدَّقَ بِهِ أُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْمُتَّقُونَ

Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى declares: “And the one who has brought the truth and (he who) believed in it — those are the righteous.”²

1 His full name is Abū ‘Alī al-Faḍl ibn al-Ḥasan Ṭabarsī. He is reckoned among the renowned scholars of the sixth century. His tafsīr is found in 5 volumes and 10 parts. (Shaykh Muḥammad Firāsāt)

2 Sūrah al-Zumar: 33.

قيل الذى جاء بالصدق رسول الله و صدق ابو بكر عن ابى العالىة و الكلبى

It is said that the one who has brought the truth is Rasūlullāh ﷺ and Abū Bakr believed in it, narrated from Abū al-‘Āliyah and al-Kalbī.

The one who believed with the most sincere heart in Rasūlullāh ﷺ is titled al-Ṣiddīq. Thus, with the grace of Allah ﷻ, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ being al-Ṣiddīq is proven from the Qur’ān. And all praise belongs to Allah ﷻ for this.

Now if the Shī‘ah do not believe and acknowledge Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ as al-Ṣiddīq notwithstanding Allah’s ﷻ book, Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ declaration and the Imām’s statements and turn away from these, I have no option but to declare what the Imām declared regarding them. Firstly, I would humble appeal to the Shī‘ah to accept Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ as al-Ṣiddīq, Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ friend, the second of the two in the cave and remember him with the title the A’immah remembered him. If they still do not listen and are adamant, I will sound the warning of the Imām and caution them of humiliation in this world and the hereafter. The Imām said a thousand years ago:

فمن لم له الصديق فلا صدق الله قوله فى الدنيا و الاخرة

Whoever does not regard him as al-Ṣiddīq, may Allah ﷻ not confirm his statement in this world and the hereafter.

Ninth Testimony

Sayyidunā ‘Umar’s Nikāḥ to Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm

It is authenticated by both reliable shī‘ī and sunnī authorities that Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ married Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا, who was the daughter of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا. The following points can be discerned from this union.

1. The contraction of this marriage indicates that no enmity existed between Sayyidunā ‘Alī and Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. In fact, they were bosom friends.

Had there been enmity, Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه would have never married his daughter — the daughter born from the blessed womb of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها — to Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه and would have never brought an enemy into his family.

2. Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه was not a kāfir, hypocrite or renegade. If this were true then Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه — the Lion of Allah سَيِّدُ حَرَامَةِ وَعَالِي, the overpowering, the desire of every wisher, the manifestation of the amazing and astonishing — would not have given his beloved daughter in his marriage. And he would have never made him his son-in-law if he did not have perfect conviction on his īmān, worship, abstinence and piety.
3. This proves that Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه did not harm Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه or Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها in any way and he did not harbour enmity or hatred for them. If this were not true then it is unfathomable that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه would have handed his daughter to someone who perpetrated these crimes.

This is such a testimony to the sincerity, unity and mutual love between Sayyidunā ‘Umar and Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه that no shī‘ī tongue can ever utter a word of hatred after this, and no amount of trickery or justification can refute this — even after endless effort. There has not been as much hue and cry as there has been in this matter. In reality, this discussion ought to be studied deeply: how the Shī‘ah have changed colours from the time of ‘Abd Allah ibn Saba’ to Mujtahid Qiblah and Ka‘bah; and what ridiculous interpretations they have given. Some have totally rejected the nikāḥ, some denied Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm رضي الله عنها was the daughter of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, and some have used the words “forcefully taken” when referring to this marriage. Some claim that Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه did not consummate the marriage with her, while others claim that it was actually a female Jinn, in the form of Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm رضي الله عنها with who Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه would have conjugal relations. Some have attributed it to Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s رضي الله عنه high level of patience while others have attributed

it to Taqiyyah. Nonetheless, everyone sings his own song and every soul has a different tale. Listening to their melody and tune does not only stun us, but in fact throws the universe out of control and into an ecstasy where everyone screams, “Congratulations! Awesome!”

اک ہم ہی تیری جال سے پستے نہیں صنم
پامال کبک بھی تو ہوئے کوہسار میں

We do not dance to your tune only, O idol

The partridge was also violated in the mountain

I will now mention the various views of the Shī‘ī scholars:

First View

Some bigoted Shī‘ah have rejected this nikāḥ entirely and declare the narration to be baseless. Mujtahid¹ Qiblah and Ka‘bah writes in one article:

و انتساب تزوج حضرت ام کلثوم باین الخطاب بہ ثبوت نرسیده و مثل سید مرتضی کہ قریب العہد از زمان ائمہ
معصومین بود و غیر ایشان انکار بلیغ ازاں نمودہ اند

There is no proof of the nikāḥ of ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb to Umm Kulthūm bint Fāṭimah. Sayyid Murtaḍā, etc. who lived close to the era of the infallible A‘immah have totally rejected the existence of this nikāḥ.

However, this claim of the Mujtahid is falsified with the following proofs.

Proof One

Mujtahid’s statement that Sayyid Murtaḍā, who lived close to the era of the A‘immah, has rejected this nikāḥ is incorrect. The reason being that there are two Sayyid Murtaḍās. One is Abū al-Qāsīm — brother of Sharīf al-Raḍī, and the second

1 Mujtahid refers to Sayyid Muhammad the successor of Mowlānā Dildār ‘Alī.

is Sayyid Murtaḍā Rāzī — the author of *Tabṣirat al-‘Awām*. The first is among the early shī‘ī theologians and scholars, who was born in 355 A.H — according to what the third martyr has written in *Majālis al-Mu‘minīn*. The second was born well after him. So the Sayyid Murtaḍā concerning whom Mujtahid claims:

قريب العهد از زمان ائمه معصومين

Who lived close to the infallible A‘immah

is not a rejecter of the nikāḥ and his writings such as *Shāfi* and *Tanzīh al-Ambiyā’ wa al-A‘immah* are witness to this. The reason why Mujtahid attributed rejection of the nikāḥ to him is unknown.

And if the second Sayyid Murtaḍā is implied — and perhaps he did reject it — then this portion,

قريب العهد از زمان ائمه معصومين

Who lived close to the infallible A‘immah

is not correct. I will now present the writings of the Sayyid Murtaḍā — who lived close to the era of the infallible A‘immah — which will falsify the Mujtahid’s claim.

It should be noted that Sayyid Murtaḍā has recorded this in two books, viz. *Shāfi* in detail and *Tanzīh al-Ambiyā’ wa al-A‘immah* in brief. I will present his statement from *Nuzḥah Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah* — which is a Shī‘ī reply to *Tuḥfah Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah*:

سيد مرتضى علم الهدى در كتاب تنزيه الانبياء مي فرمايد فاما انكاحه فقد ذكرنا في كتاب الشافي الجواب عن هذا الباب مشووحا و بيننا انه عليه السلام ما اجاب عمر الى نكاح ابنته الا بعد توعد و تهدد و مراجعة و منازعة و كلام طويل ماشور اشفق معه من سوء الحال و ظهور ما لا يزال الخ

Sayyid Murtaḍā writes in his book *Tanzīh al-Ambiyā’*: “I have given a detailed answer to ‘Umar’s nikāḥ to Umm Kulthūm (which the Ahl al-

Sunnah list among his virtues) in *Kitāb al-Shāfi*. I have mentioned there that he (Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه) did not gladly accept the nikāḥ of his daughter with ‘Umar until it reached a level of dispute, intimidation, and coercion. When Amīr ‘Alī saw that the religion was in jeopardy and the rope of Taqiyah was being snatched from his hands, and Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه also pleaded with him; then only did Amīr accept this nikāḥ against his desires and choice.¹

Someone should just compare this text of Sayyid Murtaḍā in *Tanzīh al-Ambiyā’* to Qiblah’s text, “Sayyid Murtaḍā, etc. who lived close to the era of the infallible A’immah have totally rejected the existence of this nikāḥ,” and evaluate the truthfulness of this great mujtahid. If someone still does not doubt Mujtahid’s honesty after reading this, then I will prove his dishonesty on the tongue of his father. Mowlānā Dildār ‘Alī states in *Mawā’iz Ḥusayniyyah* as quoted in *Izālat al-Ghayn*:

سید مرتضی گفته ست که تزویج ام کلثوم باختیار حضرت امیر واقع نشده و احادیث بسیار مؤید قول خود ذکر کرده و
برگاہ باختیار حضرت امیر واقع نشد محل اشکال نیست

Sayyid Murtaḍā has mentioned that Umm Kulthūm’s nikāḥ did not take place with Amīr’s choice. He has quoted many aḥādīth to prove this view. When the nikāḥ did not take place with Amīr’s happiness, there is no room for objection.

It is clear from these quotes that Sayyid Murtaḍā did not reject Sayyidunā ‘Umar’s رضي الله عنه nikāḥ. In fact, he believes it to be certain and definite. Not to accept that the nikāḥ took place with Amīr’s consent and happiness is a separate matter and rejecting the incident altogether is another matter. Mujtahid’s credibility is astonishing! The fallacy of his claim needs no rebuttal. He did not even consider his own integrity and honesty!

The crux of the above is that Mujtahid’s claim that Sayyid Murtaḍā has rejected this nikāḥ has been falsified by Sayyid Murtaḍā’s own text and his father’s

1 *Tanzīh al-Ambiyā’* pg. 138 - 141

admission. However, his claim that others have rejected it is somewhat correct. Among the latter day Shīṭī scholars who have rejected this nikāḥ is Quṭb al-Aqṭāb Rāwindī — author of *Kharāyij wa Jarā'ih* — who has claimed that this nikāḥ does not reach the requirements to be established. Mujtahid Qiblah has quoted his view in *Mawā'iz Husayniyyah* the translation of which I will quote from *Izālat al-Ghayn*:

گفت عرض نمودم بخدمت حضرت صادق علیه السلام کی مخالفین بر ما حجت می آرند و میگویند که چرا علی دختر خود را بخلیفه ثانی داد پس حضرت صلوات الله علیه که تکیه کرده نشستہ بودند درست نشستہ فرمودند که ایبا چنین حرفهای گویند بدرستی که قومی چنینی زعم می کند لا یبتدون سواء السبیل

I asked Imām Ja‘far Ṣādiq, “The Sunnī use this as proof against us and question, why did Sayyidunā ‘Alī عليه السلام give his daughter to the second khalīfah?” The Imām who was reclining on a pillow sat up and said, “Do people say such things? People who think such things cannot find the straight path.”

Quṭb al-Aqṭāb’s claim is completely erroneous. This nikāḥ is proven by the narrations of the A‘immah. I will prove it from their books of ḥadīth, fiqh and polemics.

Evidence of Sayyidunā ‘Umar’s Nikāḥ to Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm

Evidence 1

Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī has acknowledged this nikāḥ in *Majālis al-Mu‘minīn* and expressed its authenticity in the following words:

اگر نبی صلی الله علیه و سلم دختر به عثمان داد ولی دختر به عمر فرستاد

If Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم married his daughter to ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه, then ‘Alī عليه السلام married his daughter to ‘Umar رضي الله عنه.¹

1 *Majālis al-Mu‘minīn* pg. 85 – Miqdād ibn Aswad

Evidence 2

Sharā'ī' is a well-known Shī'ī fiqh book. Its commentary is *Masālik*, written by Abū al-Qāsim al-Qummī. He writes while commenting on this text of *Sharā'ī'*:

يجوز نكاح العربية بالعجمي و الهاشمية غير الهاشمي و بالعكس

It is permissible for an Arab woman to marry a non-Arab man and for a Hāshimī woman to marry a non-Hāshimī man and vice versa.

He cites as proof for his verdict:

زوج علي بنته ام كلثوم من عمر

‘Alī married his daughter Umm Kulthūm to ‘Umar.

Evidence 3

Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī ibn Ismā'īl al-Shī'ī, concerning whom Imām A'zam Imāmiyyah has stated in *Khulāṣat al-Aqwāl* that he is the first person to prove the madh-hab of the Ahl al-Bayt according to the principles of the scholars of polemics, has also

1 Abū al-Qāsim al-Qummī Shaykh Zayn al-Dīn Ahmad al-‘Āmilī commonly known as the second martyr has written a commentary on *Sharā'ī' al-Islām* by the name *Masālik al-Afḥām* in 964 A.H, which is considered to be extremely reliable. While commenting on Muḥaqqiq al-Ḥillī's (d. 676 A.H) text, the second martyr has listed five couples as proof. Among these five is Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm عَلِيَّةُ. The Arabic text is:

و زوج النبي ابنته عثمان و زوج ابنته زينب بابي العاص بن ربيع و ليسا بن بنى هاشم و كذلك زوج علي ابنته ام كلثوم من عمر و تزوج عبد الله بن عمرو بن عثمان فاطمة بنت الحسين و تزوج مصعب بن الزبير اختها سكينه و كلهم من غير بنى هاشم

Nabī صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ married his daughter to ‘Uthmān and his daughter Zaynab to Abū al-‘Āṣ ibn Rabī, whereas they were not from Banū Hāshim. Similarly, ‘Alī married his daughter Umm Kulthūm to ‘Umar. ‘Abd Allah ibn ‘Amr ibn ‘Uthmān married Fāṭimah bint al-Ḥusayn and Muṣ‘ab ibn al-Zubayr married her sister, Sakīnah, whereas all of them were not from the Banū Hāshim. (*Masālik al-Afḥām* commentary of *Sharā'ī' al-Islām*, Kitāb al-Nikāḥ, bāb lawāḥiq al-‘aqd vol. 1) [Shaykh Muhammad Firāsāt]

acknowledged this nikāḥ. Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī has quoted his statement in *Majālis al-Mu'minīn*, which I will quote from *Izālat al-Ghayn*:

اورا از چند امر پر سیدند کہ از انجمله مقدمه نکاح خلیفہ ثانی است جواب داد کہ دادن دختر بہ عمر کہ جناب امیر المؤمنین را اتفاق افتاد باین جهت بود کہ اظهار شہادتین مینمود و زبان اقرار بہ فضیلت رسول می کشود و دران باب اصلاح غلظت و فظاظت او نیز منظور بود

Ask him a few questions. One is concerning the second khalīfah's nikāḥ. He answered by saying that Amīr al-Mu'minīn gave his daughter in marriage to 'Umar for this reason that 'Umar would recite the kalimah and attest to the virtue of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. His objective of giving the second daughter was to rectify his hard nature and harshness.

Evidence 4

It is written in *Majālis al-Mu'minīn* that after Sayyidunā 'Umar's ﷺ demise, Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm ﷺ married Muḥammad ibn Ja'far Ṭayyār ﷺ. This is his text:

محمد بن جعفر الطیار بعد از فوت عمر بن خطاب بشرف مصابرت حضرت امیر المؤمنین مشرف گشته ام کلثوم را کہ از روی اکراه در حبالہ عمر بود تزویج نمود

Muḥammad ibn Ja'far Ṭayyār ﷺ was blessed by being the son-in-law of Amīr al-Mu'minīn after the demise of 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb. He married Umm Kulthūm who was in the nikāḥ of 'Umar under coercion and duress.¹

Evidence 5

It is recorded in *Tahdhīb* — a renowned ḥadīth book among the Shī'ah — that Sayyidunā 'Umar ﷺ had children from Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm ﷺ. He had a son by the name Zayd ibn 'Umar. This scholar has reported this narration with a chain of narration going up to the infallible A'immaḥ:

1 *Majālis al-Mu'minīn* pg. 82 - Muhammad ibn Ja'far

عن محمد بن احمد بن يحيى عن جعفر بن محمد القمى عن القداح جعفر عن ابيه عليهم السلام قال مات ام كلثوم بنت على عليه السلام و ابنها زيد بن عمر بن الخطاب فى ساعة واحدة و لا يدرى ايهما هلك قبل فلم يورث احدهما من الاخر صلى عليهما جميعا

Muḥammad ibn Ahmad ibn Yaḥyā – from Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad al-Qummī – from al-Qaddāḥ Ja‘far – from his father عليه السلام who said, “Umm Kulthūm bint ‘Alī and her son, Zayd ibn ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, passed away at the exact same time. It was not known who passed away first, so none inherited from the other. He performed Ṣalāt al-Janāzah on both of them.”¹

Evidence 6

Sayyid Murtaḍā’s statement recorded in *al-Shāfi* and *Tanzīh al-Ambiyā’* which Kashmīrī quoted in his book, *Nuzḥah*, in reply to *Tuḥfah*, and which Mujtahid quoted in *Mawā’iz Ḥusayniyyah*, which I reproduced above:

انه عليه السلام ما اجاب عمر الى نكاح ابنته الا بعد توعد و تهديد

Indeed ‘Alī عليه السلام did not permit ‘Umar to marry his daughter except after intimidation and coercion

Evidence 7

Mullā Ya‘qūb al-Kulaynī writes in *Kitāb Shāfi* that someone enquired from Imām Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq عليه السلام concerning this nikāḥ to which he replied:

ان ذلك فرج غصبناه

This was one who was forcefully taken from us.²

1 *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām* last volume Kitāb al-Mīrāth pg. 380 – The chapter concerning the inheritance of those who drowned or perished at the same time

2 *Furū’ Kāfi* vol. 2 pg. 141 – Kitāb al-Nikāḥ; the chapter on Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm’s عليه السلام marriage

Evidence 8

It is recorded in *Maṣā'ib al-Nawāṣib* that the muḥaddithīn have attested that this nikāḥ took place under coercion and duress.

In short, narrations of the nikāḥ of Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm رضي الله عنها are profuse in Shī'ī literature, whether they pertain to ḥadīth, fiqh, or polemics, to such an extent that it cannot be denied and none can falsify such a well-established fact.

The sound minded should gauge the bigotry, prejudice and ambiguous speech of this group. Notwithstanding their A'immaḥ عليه السلام authenticating this narration, it being found in their ḥadīth books with their chains of narration, fiqhī rulings being deducted from it, its authenticity being accepted and passed on from generation to generation and thousands of pages being blackened trying to interpret it; yet some people forsake their honour and integrity, brazenly claiming it to be a lie and completely deny its existence. They do not consider, even for a moment, that if Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm رضي الله عنها was married to Sayyidunā 'Umar رضي الله عنه only for a day or a week or a month and it was not known and its occurrence had not become known; then only would there have been scope to deny it. However when Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm رضي الله عنها remained the queen of Sayyidunā 'Umar's رضي الله عنه home for years until his demise, and bore him children, his son named Zayd ibn 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb and only after his demise was she married to Sayyidunā Muḥammad ibn Ja'far al-Ṭayyār رضي الله عنه; who can now conceal such a well-established fact and who can hide the radiant sun in his hands?

All that I have mentioned above are not the statements of my scholars and are not found in my books. I have only reproduced what the Shī'ah have said and what their Muḥaddithīn and scholars have written to prove this nikāḥ did indeed take place. If anyone denies this nikāḥ after all this proof, then in fact he has denied reality.

Second View

When the senior Shī'ī scholars realised that to deny this narration is akin to throwing sand upon the sun, they focused their efforts on interpreting it and

destroying the virtue it holds by some other means. Notwithstanding their tireless efforts and abundant interpretations, it only added salt to the wound instead of healing it and intensified its detriment to the Shīʿī creed. If only they had just denied it, called their Muḥaddithīn and scholars liars and never attested to its authenticity, it would have been better. The reason is that such ridiculous interpretations have been given to this nikāḥ, that it fills the reader with a deep loathing for Shīʿism, and ignites the innate sense of honour that every Muslim possesses in his heart. The irony is that the more interpretations made, the more the unscrupulousness of their principles and beliefs became manifest.

مريض عشق پر رحمت خدا کی

مرض بڑھتا گیا جوں جوں دوا کی

May the mercy of Allah be upon the sick man infatuated with love

His sickness increased the more he took medication

The most astonishing thing is that despite their hearts having full conviction that these interpretations are useless and ludicrous, and will expose the corruptness of their creed and lead people to loathe their religion; they — the ‘learned’ and ‘noble’ — persisted upon it and the so-called ‘men of purity’ and ijtihād’ furthered their pursuits in this direction. We are utterly astounded by the statements and writings of their learned scholars. What veil has covered their intelligence? Who snatched their shame and dignity? They feel no shame in blurting out such profanity and do not feel even the slightest inkling in attributing such wicked and appalling statements to the noble Aʿimmaḥ. They destroyed the teachings of Muḥammad ﷺ and ruined the entire religion of Islam. They already labelled the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ as hypocrites and disbelievers. Only the Ahl al-Bayt were spared, for whom they claim extreme love and to acknowledge their virtues. But they have now also shattered this. They changed their virtues into vices by attributing such vile and wicked words to them. After perpetrating all of this, they still claim to be true believers. I do not know what colour and shape their imān and love will take:

He snatched away the heart, dīn and precious life

The irony of it is he still remains in ambush

I will now reproduce the statement made by the Shī'ah after attesting to the occurrence of the nikāḥ, which they have (falsely) attributed to the noble A'immah (who are indeed pure from such statements). The statement made was that Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm's ﷺ nikāḥ to Sayyidunā 'Umar ﷺ did not take place with the approval and consent of Sayyidunā 'Alī ﷺ. Rather, Sayyidunā 'Umar ﷺ coerced Sayyidunā 'Alī ﷺ in to doing so. He threatened him in every way possible, and pressured him until the situation almost reached bloodshed. It was then that Sayyidunā 'Abbās ﷺ — the uncle of Rasūlullāh ﷺ — forced the hand of Sayyidunā 'Alī ﷺ and contracted this nikāḥ, out of fear for turmoil and bloodshed. The vice of Sayyidunā 'Umar ﷺ is thus proven from this incident. I will reproduce a few narrations of the Shī'ī scholars which mention this.

First Narration

Sayyid Murtaḍā states in *Tanzīh al-Ambiyā'*:

I have given a detailed answer to 'Umar's nikāḥ to Umm Kulthūm (which the Ahl al-Sunnah list among his virtues) in *Kitāb al-Shāfi'*. I have mentioned there that he (Sayyidunā 'Alī ﷺ) did not gladly accept the nikāḥ of his daughter with 'Umar until it reached a level of dispute, intimidation, and coercion. When Amīr 'Alī saw that the religion was in jeopardy and the rope of Taqīyyah was being snatched from his hands, and Sayyidunā 'Abbās ﷺ also pleaded with him; then only did Amīr accept this nikāḥ against his desires and choice. We have already explained earlier that it is not forbidden in shar'ah to marry a girl — when forced to — to someone who it is not permissible to marry when was has freewill, especially a person like 'Umar who expressed Islam outwardly and followed all the commandments of shar'ah.

Second Narration

Mujtahid says in *Mawā'iz Ḥusayniyyah* as recorded in *Izālat al-Ghayn*:

که تزویج ام کلثوم باختر حضرت امیر واقع نشد الی قوله بالفرض اگر باختیار ہم باشد عقل این را قبیح نمی داند که نکاح با مخالفین جائز باشد بلکه عقل تجویز میکند که حضرت حق عالی مباح سازد برائے ما نکاح کردن را با کفار چه قباحیت نکاح با کفار عقلی نیست مثل قباحیت ظلم و قتل و امثال این و چه گونه عقلی باشد و حالانکه معلوم است که پیغمبر خدا صلی الله علیه و سلم دختر خود را با کفار تزویج کرده دہرگاہ حقیقت حال چنین باشد پس چه قباحیت است درینکہ جناب امیر علیہ السلام تزویج نمایند دختر خود را با کسیکہ بہ ظاہر مسلمان باشد

Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm's رضی اللہ عنہا marriage was not contracted with Sayyidunā Amīr's رضی اللہ عنہ consent. And if for argument's sake we accept that it did take place with his consent, then too the intellect does not consider it evil and inappropriate since to marry the enemy is not impermissible but in fact logically permissible since Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى has permitted us to marry non-believers because there is no evil in marrying them like oppression and killing. And how can there be any evil when Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ himself married his daughter to a kāfir. When this has taken place, then what evil can there be in Amīr رضی اللہ عنہ marrying his daughter (Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm رضی اللہ عنہا) to a person who was outwardly a Muslim?

Third Narration

Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī writes in *Maṣā'ib al-Nawāṣib*:

و صاحب استفائہ گفته کہ قائلے از اہل خلافت گفته کہ علت چیست در تزویج امیر المؤمنین علیہ السلام ابنۃ خود را بعمر بن الخطاب و مامی گوئیم کہ خبر داده اند ما را جماعتے از مشائخ ثقات از ایشان جعفر بن محمد بن مالک کوفی ست از احمد بن فضل از محمد بن ابی عمیر از عبد اللہ بن سناس گفت سوال کردم جعفر بن محمد صادق را علیہ السلام از تزویج عمر از ام کلثوم پس گفت این اول فرجے ست کہ غصب کردہ شد از ما و این خبر مشکلات این خیرست کہ روایت کردہ اند این را مشائخ مادر تزویج عمر از ام کلثوم و این این ست کہ در خبر ست کہ عمر عباس را نزد علی فرستاد و سوال کرد کہ تزویج کند ام کلثوم باؤ پس اینحضرت امتناع کرد و چون عباس باز گشت و خبر امتناع علی علیہ السلام بہ عمر رسانید پس عمر گفت اے عباس باز امد بسوی علی و اینحضرت در مقام امتناع افتاد پس خبر داد عباس عمر را و گفت اے عباس حاضر شورو جمعہ در مسجد و قریب بہ منبر باش و بشنو آنچه مذکور خواہد شد پس خوابی دانست کہ من قادرم بر قتل او اگر ارادہ کنم پس حاضر شد عباس در مسجد چون عمر از خطبہ فارغ شد گفت ای مردم درینجا مردی از اصحاب رسول خدا صلی الله علیه و سلم کہ زنا کردہ و او محصن است مطلع شدہ بران امیر المؤمنین تنہا

شهادتین یاب چه می گوئید پس مردم از هر جانب گفتند که هر گاه امیر المومنین اطلاع یافته شده چه حاجت ست که مطلع شود بران غیر او باید که امضا کند حکم خدا را در و چون از مسجد باز آمد بهاس گفت بر و نزد علی و معلوم او کن آنچه شنیدی پس اگر و الله نکند من میکنم پس عباس نزد علی رفت و آنچه شنیده بود بسمع اینحضرت رسانید علی فرمود من می دانم که این نزد او ایسان ست و من نیستم که بکنم آنچه او التماس می کند پس عباس گفت اگر نمی کنی من میکنم و قسم می دهر ترا که مخالف قول و فعل ما نهائی پس عباس نزد عمر رفت و گفت که میکند اینده اراده کرده پس جمع کرد عمر مردم را و گفت ابن عباس رضی الله عنهما عم ابی طالب ست و او امر ابنته خود ام کلثوم را بادراجع کرده و امر کرده اورا که تزویج کند از برای من پس تزویج نمود عباس رضی الله عنه و بعد از اندک مدتی نزد عمر فرستاد و اصحاب حدیث این روایت را قبول نکرده لیکن خلافتی نیست که میان ایشان درینکه عباس تزویج نموده ام کلثوم رضی الله عنهما را بعد از طول مطالعه و مدافعه پس می گوئیم کسی را که انکار کرده این حکایت را از فعل عمر اینکه تزویج عباس ام کلثوم رضی الله عنهما را نبود مگر از جهت چیزی که روایت کرده انداز مشائخ ما چنانچه حکایت کردیم و این مشاکل روایتی ست که از صادق علیه السلام کرده اند که گفته که این اول فرجی ست که از ما غصب کرده اند

The author of *Istighāthah* states that an enemy asked the reason why Sayyidunā Amīr al-Mu'minīn عليه السلام married his daughter to 'Umar. We say that a group of our reliable Mashā'ikh have informed us amongst whom is Ja'far ibn Muḥammad ibn Mālik al-Kūfī who heard from — Aḥmad ibn Faḍl who heard from — Muḥammad ibn 'Umayr who heard from — 'Abd Allah ibn Sinān who said that he asked Imām Ja'far about Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm's عليها السلام nikāḥ. Imām Ja'far answered:

ان ذلك فرج غصبناه

This was a woman who was forcefully taken from us.

This incident is similar to the incident our Mashā'ikh have narrated concerning Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm's عليها السلام nikāḥ to 'Umar. The narration goes as follows that 'Umar sent 'Abbās to 'Alī to request him to marry Umm Kulthūm to him. Amīr عليه السلام flatly refused. When Sayyidunā 'Abbās عليه السلام brought this news to 'Umar, he said, "If 'Alī does not marry his daughter to me, I will kill him." Upon hearing this, 'Abbās عليه السلام went to 'Alī عليه السلام who kept on refusing until 'Abbās عليه السلام told 'Alī عليه السلام, "If you do not marry her off then I will. And I take an oath that you will not act contrary to what I do and say." Saying this, 'Abbās عليه السلام came to 'Umar and said, "Your nikāḥ with Umm Kulthūm is confirmed. 'Umar gathered the people and announced, "This is 'Abbās — 'Alī's uncle — 'Alī has given him authority over his

daughter Umm Kulthūm and given consent to him to perform my nikāḥ with her.” Thus, Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه contracted the nikāḥ and sent her to ‘Umar’s house after some time.

After reproducing this narration, Qāḍī states in the same book:

The masters of ḥadīth do not accept this narration. However, there is no difference among them that Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه did marry Umm Kulthūm رضي الله عنها to ‘Umar after a lot of quarrel and argument. I state that whoever rejects this incident, the meaning of it is that Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه did not marry Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm to ‘Umar. However, [we accept it] due to our Mashā’ikh narrating it and it being in conformity to the narration regarding Imām al-Ṣādiq رحمته الله who stated:

ان ذلك فرج غصبناه

This was a women who was forcefully taken from us.

The gist is that it is learnt from these narrations that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه did not marry his daughter with his consent but in fact Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه married her forcefully. However, this view is false due to a number of proofs.

Proof 1

If we accept that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه did not contract the nikāḥ himself but gave the authority to Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه who contracted the nikāḥ, there remains no doubt in the validity of the nikāḥ itself. Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه is Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm’s رضي الله عنها father and Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه is her grandfather (granduncle). So if the father did not contract the nikāḥ but the grandfather did with the father’s permission, then too our objective is attained.

Proof 2

Was Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه worthy of marrying Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm رضي الله عنها or not? Had he not been worthy, then Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه — who is the

uncle of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم — would be guilty of giving Sayyidah Fāṭimah’s رضي الله عنها daughter — the granddaughter of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم — to such a person in marriage who is unworthy and bereft of īmān, and any form of abstinence and taqwā (as the Shī‘ah assume). The same allegation against Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه — according to Shī‘ī principles — will then also be directed at Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه.

Proof 3

Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه being the wakīl¹ of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه in the matter of nikāḥ is established from these narrations as well. Furthermore, the agent’s action is the client’s action according to sharī‘ah and custom. So the action of Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه should be understood as Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s رضي الله عنه action. So although Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه contracted the nikāḥ, but since he is Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s رضي الله عنه agent and deputy, it should be understood that this nikāḥ took place with Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s رضي الله عنه permission. And if Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه did not give permission to Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه and did not make him his deputy, then it was not permissible for Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه to assume this responsibility without permission. This is a severe accusation against Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه and he will be regarded as his accomplice in this usurpation. Then the nikāḥ being contracted without permission of the walī is apparent which is contrary to sharī‘ah and custom. The effects of this are well known to the intelligent.

May Allah سبحانه وتعالى grant the Shī‘ah a touch of understanding and soundness of intellect, as well as a pinch of shame and honour. They should ponder over the effects of their statements and its negatives. O Allah! They claim to be friends of the Ahl al-Bayt, they chant their virtues and greatness, yet attribute such evil to them and criticise them under the guise of love. For Allah’s sake, at least open the eyes of fairness so that you may reflect upon the accusations levelled against the A‘immah. O Shī‘ah, come out of negligence and listen to the evils they mention about the pure Ahl al-Bayt.

1 Agent, proxy

نعوذ بالله من هفواتهم و من سوء عقيدتهم اللهم احفظنا من شرور انفسهم و من سيئات اعمالهم

We seek protection in Allah ﷻ from their drivel and their corrupt beliefs. O Allah! Protect us from their evil and their wicked actions.

Proof 4

If we accept that Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ was unhappy with the nikāḥ but later permitted it after Sayyidunā ‘Abbās’s ﷺ explanation, and this permission was not out of pleasure but due to coercion, then too the same allegation is levelled against Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ which they are trying to avoid by making up this entire story. Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ thus forcefully accepted the proposal after Sayyidunā ‘Abbās’s ﷺ explanation in order to save his life and accepted to sacrifice his honour to save his life. (May Allah ﷻ forbid!) If he was not afraid of his life, then it was not necessary to accede to Sayyidunā ‘Abbās’s ﷺ proposal in a matter where one’s honour is being violated and the image of the Ahl al-Bayt is being tainted. It was rather necessary for him to persist on his refusal and to reject Sayyidunā ‘Abbās’s ﷺ proposal notwithstanding his insistence and explanations and state clearly, “O uncle! What has happened to your honour that you make such an intercession and taint the image of the Ahl al-Bayt forever? ‘Umar is a kāfir, hypocrite, renegade, usurper and treacherous. How can I ever give my daughter — from the womb of Sayyidah Fāṭimah ﷺ, who Rasūlullāh ﷺ regarded as his own children and whose sons and daughters Rasūlullāh ﷺ took as his own — to a kāfir and hypocrite thus causing pain to the soul of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and Sayyidah Fāṭimah ﷺ?”

Thereafter, if Sayyidunā ‘Umar al-Fārūq ﷺ did not like it and persisted, it was binding on Allah’s lion to show his bravery, unsheathe Dhū al-Fiḡār, display the beauty of the sword which descended from the ‘Arsh and split the usurpers into two with one strike as is they were pieces of fruit. The sword which cut Sayyidunā Jibrīl’s ﷺ wing and severed Ja‘far — the Jinn — in two was for which day? The bravery and chivalry which was shown at Badr and Ḥunayn in front of the kuffār and the power and strength which was displayed at Khaybar was reserved for which day?

For Allah’s sake, someone should ask this sect, who are enemies to their intellect, as to what greater dishonour and humiliation can there be to Allah’s lion than his pure chaste daughter being given to a kāfir and fāsiq, while the leader of the awliyā’, the spearhead of the pure, the forerunner of the ascetics, the overpowering lion of Allah, the Imām of the east and west, Amīr al-Mu’minīn Sayyidunā ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib — slayer of the kuffār, conqueror of Khaybar, destroyer of the enemies with one glance, defeater of a thousand Jinn with two strikes, whose being is the sign of Allah’s سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى power and whose presence is the example of Allah’s سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى greatness and significance, whose name caused the non-Arab kuffār to shiver, whose appearance caused the Arab warriors to tremor, Rasūlullāh’s صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ brother, the renowned husband of al-Batūl, the respected father of Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمَا — sits back and does nothing?

فروزنده شمع دین رسول	وصی نبی جفت پاک بتول
نماینده کفر از دین جدا	فشانده جان براه خدا
برارنده باب خبیر ز جای	درارنده عمر مرحب ز یای
دمانده گل زنار خلیل علیه السلام	ربانده موسی علیه السلام از رود نیل
کشاینده با بیانه فتوح	بساحل رسانده فلک نوح
بفرمان او آسمان و زمین	بپوا خواه او جبرئیل امین
قوی دست قدرت زباروی او	نه کس جز نبی بهم ترازوی او

Nabī’s waṣī and Batūl’s (Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا) husband

The glowing brilliance of the din of Rasūl

The one who sacrifices his life in Allah’s path

The one who separated dīn from kufr

The one who dropped ‘Umar Marḥab

The one who uprooted the door of Khaybar

The one who saved Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام from the river Nile

The one who made the fire of Khalīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام a garden

The one who brought Nūḥ’s عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام ship to the shore

Jibrīl Amīn is his well wisher

The earth and sky are obedient to him

No one equals him besides Rasūlullāh ﷺ

The hand of power got strength from his shoulders.¹

Can a person with such bravery and awe, with such glory and greatness be afraid of Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, and instead show no resistance and accept humiliation? Will such a man ever sacrifice his daughter — the apple of his eye? Shame on such a belief and disgrace on such slander.

گر مسلمنی بهمین ست که جافظ دارد

وای گر از پس امروز بود فردائی

If what Ḥāfīz has is Islam

Then shame if tomorrow comes after today

Proof 5

After studying the books considered reliable by the Shī‘ah, it becomes apparent that Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ did not possess the potential to be the agent or deputy of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ since he was disgraced in the eyes of the latter. Although this statement of ours will be bitter to the Shī‘ah and will be surprising to the ignorant, it is not our fault. We and our (Sunnī) scholars do not say such things, Allah ﷻ forbid, but it is the Shī‘ah scholars who state this. Accordingly, ‘Allāmah al-Ṭabarsī — a renowned Shī‘ī scholar — narrates from Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ in *al-Ihtijāj*:

ذهب من كنت اعتضد بهم على دين الله من اهل بيتي و بقيت بين حضر قريبتى العهد بجاهلية عقيل و عباس

Those people of my family upon whose strength I had reliance in the dīn of Allah have left and only two ignoble and humiliated persons remain now, who lived close to the era of ignorance, viz. ‘Aqīl and ‘Abbās.²

1 Ḥamlah Ḥaydariyyah vol. 1 pg. 5 line 3

2 *Al-Ihtijāj* of al-Ṭabarsī vol. 1 pg. 450

Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ regarded him to be ignoble, disgraced and ignorant; so why would he make him his representative, listen to him and obey him in such an important matter? Maybe this is the reason why the Shī‘ah have put the burden of the nikāḥ on Sayyidunā ‘Abbās’s رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ shoulders, since he was ignoble according to Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ statement. It is for this reason they utter such disgraceful words. However, it is surprising that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ listened to the words of such an ignoble and practiced accordingly. No Shī‘ī should think that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ only labelled him base and humiliated. In fact, if their ‘reliable’ books are studied, it will be learnt that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ cursed his and Rasūlullāh’s صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ uncle and — Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى forbid, narrating words of kufr is not kufr — he also called him illegitimate. If anyone has doubt, he should study *Rowḍat al-Kāfī* of al-Kulaynī and *Ḥayāt al-Qulūb*.

Mowlānā ‘Alī Bakhsh Khān has recorded this in one of his articles. I will quote it from there for those interested:

Mullā Bāqir Majlisī writes in *Ḥayāt al-Qulūb*:

ابو جعفر طوسی بسند معتبر روایت کرده از امام صادق که فضیله مادر عباس کنیز مادر زبیر و ابو طالب و عبد الله ابنا عبد المطلب بود عبد المطلب باو مقاربت کرده که عباس ازاں بهم رسید زبیر با عبد المطلب دعوی کرد و پر خاش بر آمد که این کنیز از مادر ما بها میراث رسیده است تویے رخصت او باو مقاربت کردی و این فرزند که بهم رسید یعنی عباس بنده ماست پس عبد المطلب اکابر قریش را به شفاعت نزد وی فرستاد که تا اینکه زبیر راضی شد که دست از عباس بر دار و بشرطیکه نامه نوشته شود که عباس و فرزندش در مجلسی که ماو فرزندان مانسته باشند نه نشیند و در بیچ امری باما شریک نشود و حصه نبرد پیش باین مضمون نامه نوشته شد و اکابر قریش مهر کردند و این نامه نزد ائمه علیهم السلام بود

Abū Ja‘far al-Ṭūsī has related with a reliable chain with reference to Imām Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq that he stated that ‘Abbās’s mother, Faḍīlah, was originally the female slave of the mother of Zubayr (Ṣafīyyah), Abū Ṭālib and ‘Abd Allah — the sons of ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib had relations with her and thus ‘Abbās was born. Zubayr told his grandfather, ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, in a harsh tone, “this is our mother’s slave girl who we inherited from her. You had relations with her without our permission. Therefore,

her son — ‘Abbās — is our slave. ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib brought the honourable men from Quraysh into the picture (and they discussed it) until Zubayr was pleased with this agreement that he withdrew his claim on condition that an agreement is signed that ‘Abbās and his son will not sit in whichever gathering he (Zubayr) and his son are present and they will not be partners with them or interfere in any of their matters and they will not claim any portion whatsoever. At the end, ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه wrote a document which was signed by the Quraysh nobles and this agreement was with the A’immah.

It is clearly apparent from this narration that Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه was the child of a slave girl and illegitimate (Allah forbid!) and a signed document stating him being the child of a slave girl was in the possession of the A’immah. Perhaps it is for this reason that Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه humiliated Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه by forcefully marrying his daughter to Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه.

When it is established through Shīṭī sources that Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه was illegitimate (and he is free from this!) then certainly him being the enemy of the Ahl al-Bayt is also established, since it is proven from scores of aḥādīth and statements that an illegitimate person’s actions are not accepted and none of them can befriend the Ahl al-Bayt. I will verify this from *Bihār al-Anwār*, *‘Ilal al-Sharā’i’*, *Iḥtijāj al-Ṭabarsī*¹ and the writings of Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī, Allah willing. Nonetheless, this fact is so common that the believers special class and general masses are aware of it and it is on their children’s tongues, as their poet says:

کہ دست غیر گرفتہ است پای مادراو

محبت شہ مردان مجوز ہے پدرے

Do not seek ‘Alī’s friendship with a man with no father,
Whose mother caught hold of someone else’s hand.

1 The name of the author is Aḥmad ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib. He lived in Ṭabarstān. He is one of the renowned early Shīṭī scholars. His book *al-Iḥtijāj* is well known and famous among them. He has been mentioned in *‘Amal al-‘Āmil* that he was a scholar, muḥaddith and is reliable. His book *al-Iḥtijāj* is a masterpiece and has many benefits. (*Rowḍāt al-Jannāt* vol. 1. Pg. 65) — Shaykh Muḥammad Firāsāt

No one among the mu'minīn should be in deception that this is the only narration regarding Sayyidah 'Abbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. In fact, there are numerous aḥādīth and narrations regarding him. Accordingly, Mullā Bāqir Majlisī states in *Ḥayāt al-Qulūb* with a reliable chain:

که حضرت امام زین العابدین فرمود که در حق عبد الله بن عباس و پدرش این آیه نازل شد من کان فی بذه اعمی فهو فی الاخرة اعمی

Imām Zayn al-Ābidīn mentioned that this verse was revealed regarding 'Abd Allah ibn 'Abbās and his father 'Abbās:

وَمَنْ كَانَ فِي هَذِهِ أَعْمَىٰ فَهُوَ فِي الْآخِرَةِ أَعْمَىٰ

And whoever is blind in this [life] will be blind in the Hereafter.¹

It is clear from this text of their books that both father and son are blind in this world and the hereafter. In fact, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ testifies to this fact. We seek Allah's forgiveness! I seek Allah's سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ forgiveness! Shī'ism is a confusing religion. No one has been spared from its arrow of criticism. They have labelled the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ as kāfir and munāfiq from before, and only the Ahl al-Bayt were left but they too were not spared from criticism and reproach. O Allah! Is Shī'ism a religion or heresy — whose founder neither cares about Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and the Ahl al-Bayt, does not he refrain from criticising the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ and does not even spare the close relatives from reproach. They label every person who comes in front of them. They declare exemption from whoever is named. They have clearly labelled some as disbelievers and subtly indicated that some others are hypocrites. They have branded some as transgressors under the guise of Taqiyyah, while others they have called illegitimate and blind. What a religion! What a creed! No one has been saved from their criticism and condemnation. Can we complain about such a modest sect for censuring the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ?

1 Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl: 72

If a believer presents the countless virtues and excellences of Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه to counter this narration in an effort to apply ointment to the wound, he should abandon such an impossible effort and observe the judgement passed by Mullā Bāqir Majlisī in *Ḥayāt al-Qulūb* who says:

بدانکه در باب احوال عباسی و مدح و ذم او احادیث متعارض است و اکثر علماء بخوبی او میل نموده اند و آنچه از احادیث ظاہر میشود اینست کہ او در مرتبہ کمال ایمان نہ بوده است

It should be known that there are contradictory aḥādīth regarding praises and reproach for ‘Abbās and majority of the scholars prefer his good. Nevertheless, what is apparent from the aḥādīth is that he did not possess a perfect level of īmān.

Majlisī has sorted out the matter and passed the verdict that he had imperfect īmān. Probably the reason for his deficient īmān is primarily deemed to be the fact that he married Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm رضي الله عنها to Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه.

Proof 6

Although the Shī‘ah have attested to Sayyidunā ‘Umar’s رضي الله عنه external Islam and his abiding to the complete sharī‘ah for the permissibility of the nikāḥ, the hole dug by their seniors regarding Sayyidunā ‘Umar’s رضي الله عنه lack of īmān cannot be closed so simply – notwithstanding their tireless efforts – without entirely abandoning the Shī‘ī creed and attesting to Sayyidunā ‘Umar’s رضي الله عنه virtue; without doing so they cannot establish the permissibility of this marriage according to Shī‘ī beliefs.

و لا يصلح العطار ما افسده الدهر

The perfume seller cannot rectify the one whom time has destroyed.

Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه was bereft of īmān and Islam and he was a munāfiq and murtad according to Shī‘ī beliefs, Allah forbid. He was the enemy of the Ahl al-

Bayt and the leader of the nawāṣib, according to them and it is not permissible for a nāṣibī to marry a Muslim woman. How then could Sayyidunā ‘Umar’s رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ nikāḥ — who was the worst kāfir, munāfiq and enemy of the Ahl al-Bayt — ever have been permissible with Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا — who enjoys greater honour, piety and nobility than the entire universe? I will prove these two points from Shīrī books, viz. that they believe Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is not a believer and that the nikāḥ of a nāṣibī to a believer is impermissible.

First Point

According to Shīrī principles, Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was not a believer. He was a kāfir, a munāfiq and an enemy of the Ahl al-Bayt. This is such an open fact which needs no chain of narration, proof or witness. Nonetheless, a few narrations will be quoted here for the benefit of the readers.

Narration 1

Mullā Bāqir Majlisī in *Zād al-Ma‘ād* relates from Ḥudhayfah ibn Yamān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ who states:

When I heard the virtues of the day of ‘Umar’s assassination from the tongue of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, I had full conviction on his kufr.

The exact text reads verbatim:

حذیفه گفت پس بر خاستم و برخاست حضرت رسول خدا و بخانه ام سلمه رفت و من برگشتم و صاحب یقین بودم در کفر عمر تا اینکه بعد از وفات حضرت رسول الله صلی الله علیه و سلم دیدم که اوچه فتنها برانگیخت و کفر اصلی خود را ظاهر کرد و از دین برگشت و دامان بے حیائی و وقاحت برانے غصب امامت و خلافت برزد و قرآن را تحریف کرد و ایش در خانه وحی و رسالت زد و برعتها در دین خدا پیدا کرد و ملت پیغمبر صلی الله علیه و سلم را تغیر داد و سنت اینحضرت را بدل کرد و نصاری و مجوسی را از خود راضی کرد و نور دیده مصطفی را بختم آورد و تدبیر کشتن امیر المؤمنین کرد و جور و ستم در میانه مردم علانیه کرد و برچه خدا حلال کرده بود حرام کرد و برچه حرام کرده بود حلال کرد الی اخر بذیانات المجلسی

Ḥudhayfah narrates, “Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and myself got up. Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ went to Umm Salamah’s house and I returned. I was convinced of

‘Umar’s kufr right until the time after Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ demise when I saw ‘Umar causing great fitnah. He exposed his inner kufr and freed himself from Islam. He displayed wickedness by usurping Imāmah and khilāfah and interpolating the Qur’ān. He set alight Sayyidah Fāṭimah’s ﷺ house. He created innovations in dīn, changed the method of Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ government, distorted his sunnah and supported the Christians and fire-worshippers. He angered Sayyidah Fāṭimah ﷺ, planned to assassinate Amīr al-Mu’minīn Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ, displayed open oppression and tyranny before the masses, permitted what Allah ﷻ forbade and forbade what Allah ﷻ permitted.”

Sayyidunā ‘Umar’s ﷺ clear-cut kufr (Allah ﷻ forbid!) is apparent from this narration. It is also established that he exposed his inner kufr, turned renegade, interpolated the Qur’ān and appeased the Christians and fire-worshippers. Hence, the claim made by some mujtahidīn that he was not out of the fold of Islam is false.

Narration 2

Mullā Bāqir Majlisī writes in *Risālah Raj‘iyyah* that Imām Mahdī answered a questioner as follows:

Abū Bakr and ‘Umar outwardly recited the kalimah and embraced Islam out of greed for the world. When they observed that Rasūlullāh ﷺ did not give them any leadership, they intended to kill Rasūlullāh ﷺ.

This is the text verbatim:

ایشان (یعنی ابو بکر و عمر رضی الله عنهما) از روئ گفته یہود بہ ظاہر کلمتین گفتند از برای اینکه شاید ولایتی و حکومتی حضرت ایشان بد بد و در باطن کافر بودند چون در آخر مایوس شدند با منافقان بر بالای عقبہ رفتند و دہن ہای خود را بستند کہ کسی ایشان را نشاسد و دیہا انداختند کہ شتران حضرت رازم و ہند و حضرت را ہلاک کند پس خدا جبرئیل را فرستاد و پیغمبر خود را از شر ایشان حفظ کرد

Both Abū Bakr and ‘Umar outwardly recited the kalimah due to the Jews’ prophecy so that they may be given leadership and authority, whereas

they were internally kāfir. When they grew despondent, they climbed the peak of ‘aqabah with the hypocrites and tied cloths over their faces so that no one may recognise them. When they reached the top, they through ropes, etc. on the roadway in order to intercept Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ camels and thus assassinate Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Allah ﷻ sent Jibrīl عليه السلام and protected Rasūlullāh ﷺ from their evil.

It is clear from the Shīrī Imām Mahdī’s statement that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنهما planned to kill Rasūlullāh ﷺ in his very lifetime due to despondency. Who can be a greater kāfir than the person who is prepared to kill the Rasūl of Allah ﷻ? When this crime is established on the tongue of the supposed Imām Mahdī, then who can reject his statement?

Narration 3

Mullā Bāqir Majlisī has narrated a narration from al-Kāfī in *Bihār al-Anwār* which states emphatically that the one who rejects the Imāmah of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه is a kāfir, who ought to be killed. I will quote this narration from *Istiḡṣā’ al-Afḥām*:

بيان قوله عليه السلام من ان يريدوا عن الاسلام اى عن ظاهره و التكلم بالشهادتين فابقاهم على ظاهر الاسلام كان صلاحا لامة ليكون لهم و لاولادهم طريق الى قبول الحق و الى الدخول فى الايمان فى كور الازمان و هذا لا ينافى ما مر و سيأتى ان الناس ارتدوا الاثثة لان المراد فيها ارتدادهم عن الدين واقعا و هذا محمول على بقاءهم على صورة الاسلام و ظاهره و ان كانوا فى اكثر الاحكام الواقعية فى حكم الكفار و خص هذا بمن لم يسمع النص على امير المؤمنين عليه السلام و لم يبغضه و لم يعاده فان من فعل شيئا من ذلك فقد انكر قول النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم ظاهرا ايضا و لم يبق له شىء من احكام الاسلام و وجب قتله

Imām Abū Ja’far (al-Bāqir) said, “Amīr رضي الله عنه did not claim Imāmah out of fear that it should not happen that the Ṣaḥābah do not accept it, abandon Islam and turn renegade. Turning renegade meaning that they outwardly abandon Islam and reject the kalimah shahādah. Hence, it was better for the ummah to leave them on their outward Islam so that this might be a means for them or their children to accept the truth and enter into imān in the upcoming years. This is not contrary to what has passed and what will

come further on that all the people turned renegade except three since the meaning there refers to their turning renegade in reality and this refers to their remaining on the outward and apparent form of Islam although they are in the sphere of the kuffār in majority of laws. Those who did not hear the emphatic command of Amīr al-Mu'minīn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and did not harbour hatred and enmity for him are excluded from this. Whoever has perpetrated any of the above has also openly rejected Rasūlullāh's صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ statement. None of the laws of Islam apply to him and it is necessary that he be killed.

The author of *Istiqṣā' al-Afḥām* himself says after quoting this narration:

اگر غرض از نقل این عبارت محض اثبات این معنی است که صاحب بحار ثلاثه و اتباع ایشان را کافر و مرتد می داند پس البته این معنی بسر و چشم مقبولست اصلاحی استنکاف و انکار نیست

Quoting this text here is only to prove that the author of *Biḥār al-Anwār* has labelled the three Ṣaḥābah and their followers as disbelievers and hypocrites. This is accepted wholeheartedly by us. There is absolutely no scope for rejection or disapproval.

Thus, the author of *Biḥār al-Anwār* and the author of *Istiqṣā' al-Afḥām* have acknowledged that the three khulafā' are kāfir, which disproves their outward Islam as well. Now there remains no scope for a middle path between kufr and īmān which they call Islam. When their kufr has been established, Allah forbid, then it means that Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا married a kāfir. So how can Sayyid Murtaḍā's statement in *Shāfi* and *Tanzīh al-Ambiyā'* be correct that Sayyidunā 'Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was outwardly a Muslim and followed the entire sharī'ah, hence there was no religious problem in marrying him. Furthermore, the statement of the author of *Nuzḥah Ithnā 'Ashariyyah* has also been debunked who in answer to *Tuḥfah* said, "no Shī'ī has said that Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ gave his daughter to a kāfir. Rather he gave his daughter to an innovator, a munāfiq and one who outwardly professes Islam. It is forbidden to marry a mushrik, not an innovator and munāfiq." This is because their alleged Imām, according to *Biḥār*

al-Anwār's narration, has emphatically declared the three khulafā' to be kāfir and worthy of assassination.

The Shī'ī scholars are startling. They adapt to the situation like chameleons. They fabricate aḥādīth according to the need. At times, they label Sayyidunā 'Umar رضي الله عنه as a kāfir and rejecter of Islam and believe that he ought to be killed, while at other times they say he outwardly expressed Islam and followed all the commands of sharī'ah.

Now that the first point, i.e. Sayyidunā 'Umar's رضي الله عنه kufr — Allah forbid — is established in accordance to Shī'ī narrations, considered reliable by them, I will now prove that it is not permissible for a believing woman to marry a nāṣībī (according to the Shī'ah) although he may express Islam outwardly; so that those who deem those narrations as false, and do not believe in his outward kufr and apply Islamic rulings to Sayyidunā 'Umar رضي الله عنه, may understand that this nikāḥ is not permissible according to their own principles.

Second Point

The Impermissibility of Marrying a Nāṣībī

روى الكليني عن الفضيل بن يسار قال سألت ابا عبد الله عن نكاح الناصب فقال لا والله ما يحل قال فضيل ثم سأله مرة اخرى فقلت جعلت فداك ما تقول في نكاحهم قال والمرأة العارفة قال ان العارفة لا توضع الا عند عارف

Al-Kulaynī has narrated from Fuḍayl ibn Yasār who said, "I asked Abū 'Abd Allah (al-Ṣādiq) رضي الله عنه regarding the nikāḥ of a Nāṣībī. He answered, 'by Allah! It is never permissible!' I then asked him on another occasion, 'may I be sacrificed for you, what do you say regarding their nikāḥ?' He asked, 'is the woman a believer?' I replied in the affirmative. He said, 'a believing woman can only be married to a believing man.'"

It is clear from this narration that according to the Imām's verdict a believing woman cannot get married except to a believing man. So either you call Sayyidunā

‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ a believer or remove Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا from the scope of īmān (Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى forbid!) In short, there are only two situations according to the Imām. There is no third option. In reality, Sayyidunā ‘Umar’s رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ perfect īmān is being established through this statement of the Imām owing to the fact that had he not been such then Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would have never allowed Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا to marry him — in any situation — even if he was compelled and coerced. Was Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ not aware of this verse?

الْخَبِيثَاتُ لِلْخَبِيثِينَ وَالْخَبِيثُونَ لِلْخَبِيثَاتِ وَالطَّيِّبَاتُ لِلطَّيِّبِينَ وَالطَّيِّبُونَ لِلطَّيِّبَاتِ ؕ

Evil women are for evil men, and evil men are for evil women. And pure women are for pure men, and pure men are for pure women.¹

Did Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ reject the ḥadīth of Imām Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ who said, “a believing woman can only be married to a believing man?” When this verse and statement of the Imām is present, how could Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ oppose it? Now that we have established the fact that this nikāḥ did not take place out of force or duress, there is no need to discuss this vile immoral statement which the Shī‘ scholars have attributed to their Imām, namely:

ان ذلك فرج غصبناه

This was a woman who was forcefully taken from us.

However, it is inappropriate to avoid this discussion so that the readers might take a lesson.

It should not be concealed that the Shī‘ Muḥaddithīn narrate that ‘someone’ asked Imām al-Ṣādiq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ regarding this nikāḥ and that is when he commented, “This was a woman who was forcefully taken from us,” the author of *Tuḥfah* writes in this regard:

1 Sūrah al-Nūr: 26

سبحان الله چه کلمه ایست که از زبان ایشان برمی آید نزدیک است که اسمان فرو افتدوز میں بشگافد اول در حق این سیده پاک بضعة الرسول فلذہ کبد البتول چه فحش و سوء ادب ست و کدام خصلت خبیثه را بد امن پاک این طابره مطهره می بندند دیگر در حق حضرت امیر و حضرت حسنین ڈه قدر بے حفاظتی اے ناموسی ثابت می کند و در حق حضرت صادق که این کلمه بر اینجناب تهمت می نمایند چه قدر بے حمیتی و بے غیرتی اعتقاد دارند این لفظ را اول بزرگان بر نبی آرنند علی الخصوص ذکر این عضو مستور الاسم و الهسی از ار قارب بلکه بزرگان خود امریست که از اذل و او باش نیز احتراز واجب می داند

What a vile and immoral statement they bring on their tongues! It is close for the sky to fall and the earth to split. Firstly, it is immorality and disrespect to Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm — the beloved daughter of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضی اللہ عنہا. What a vile way to slander that pure being! Secondly, they establish the lack of self-honour and insecurity of Sayyidunā ‘Alī and Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رضی اللہ عنہم. They slander Sayyidunā Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq of saying such filthy words. They lack self-honour. Respectable and noble people do not utter such vulgar words. Especially the word Farj (private part) which is never ever uttered by such people. Leave alone pious and noble people, even ignoble and lowly people avoid using such words.

‘Allāmah Kashmīrī has answered this in *Nuzhah* in a few ways:

مردودست بچند وجہ اول انکہ بر تقدیر تسلیم صحت روایت و محفوظ بودن این ایچہ افادہ فرمودہ تسویل و تحویل
بیش نیست

This is rejected and not worthy of acceptance due to few reasons. Firstly, if the authenticity of this narration is accepted and it was preserved as is then it is nothing more than a satanic plot and scheme.

It is learnt from this text of ‘Allāmah Kashmīrī that the authenticity of this narration is not accepted by him. Whereas to say, “if it is accepted ...” is deceiving the masses for this reason that this ḥadīth is established according to Shīrī principles in a few ways. Firstly, this narration appears with the same words from Imām al-Ṣādiq رضی اللہ عنہ in al-Kulaynī’s *al-Kāfi*, which the Shī‘ah regard as the most authentic book. Secondly, Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī has quoted this ḥadīth in many places of *Maṣā’ib al-Nawāṣib*. It is recorded at a few places in discussion five under

the discussion of Sayyidunā ‘Umar al-Fārūq and Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm رضي الله عنها and at no place does he deny it. Thus, the Persian translation of it, as it appears in *Izālat al-Ghayn* is as follows:

و اما خامسا بواسطه اینکه قول امام صادق عليه السلام که این اول فرجی ست که غصب کرده شده از ما مستلزم وقوع زنا نیست

Fifthly, Imām al-Ṣādiq’s statement, “this was a woman who was forcefully taken from us,” does not necessitate fornication.

He quotes the words of the author of *al-Istighāthah* under this discussion, the Persian translation of which is:

خبر داده اند مارا جماعته از مشائخ ثقات ما از ایشاں جعفر بن محمد بن ملک کوفی ست از احمد بن فضل از محمد بن ابی عمیر از عبد الله بن سنان گفت سوال کردم جعفر بن محمد صادق عليه السلام از تزویج عمر از ام کلثوم پس گفت این اول فرجی ست که غصب کرده شد از ما

We say that a group of our reliable Mashā’ikh have informed us, amongst whom is Ja’far ibn Muḥammad ibn Mālīk al-Kūfī who heard from — Aḥmad ibn Faḍl who heard from — Muḥammad ibn ‘Umayr who heard from — ‘Abd Allah ibn Sinān who said that he asked Imām Ja’far about Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm’s رضي الله عنها nikāḥ. Imām Ja’far answered:

ان ذلك فرج غصبناه

This was a woman who was forcefully taken from us.

Qāḍī writes thereafter:

مشاكل روايته ست که از صادق عليه السلام کرده اند که گفته که این اول فرجی ست که از ما غصب کرده اند

This is the most difficult narration of Imām Ja’far al-Ṣādiq رضي الله عنه which people have narrated, i.e. this was a woman who was forcefully taken from us.

Furthermore, Qāḍī states when mentioning Rasūlullāh's ﷺ bequest to Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه to be patient and tolerant, the Persian translation of which is:

چون عمر خواستگاری ام کلثوم نمود علی متفکر شده و گفت اگر مانع شوم اور قصد قتل من خواهد کرد و اگر قصد قتل من کند و ممانعت کنم اورا از نفس خود بیرون روم از طاعت رسول خدا صلی الله علیه و سلم پس تسلیم ابنته درین حال اصلاح بود از قتل او و بیرون رفتن از وصیت رسول خدا پس تقویض نمود امر اورا بخدا و دانسته بود که آنچه عمر غضب کرده ز اموال مسلمانان و ارتکاب کرده از انکار حق او و قعود بجای رسول خدا او تغیر احکام الهی و تبدیل فرائض خدا چنانچه گزشت اعظم است نزد حق تعالی و اقطع و اشنع ست از اغتصاب این فرج پس تسلیم کرد و صبر نمود

When 'Umar proposed for Umm Kulthūm, 'Alī was concerned and thought, "if I prevent him, he will kill me. And if he intends to kill me and I prevent him to save my life, I will not fulfil the bequest of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. So better than him killing me and disobeying Rasūlullāh's ﷺ bequest is to give my daughter." Therefore, he did this and handed over this affair to Allah سبحانه وتعالى. He knew fully well that 'Umar usurped Muslims' wealth, rejected the truth, sat at Rasūlullāh's ﷺ place, changed divine commandments and changed the rulings of Allah سبحانه وتعالى. All these were far worse in the sight of Allah than usurpation of a womb. Thus, 'Alī bore it patiently.

These words are proven from many other sources. Thus, 'Allāmah Kashmīrī saying, "if the authenticity of this narration is accepted," is only deceitful which is the salient feature of all the early Shī'ī scholars. If these words were not spoken by the Imām and were not mentioned in their books, he ought to have rejected them and if they were mentioned then he should accept them. What is the meaning of saying, "if the authenticity of this narration is accepted?"

The gist of the above is that there is absolutely no doubt in this narration's authenticity. I will now present the interpretations of the Shī'ī scholars regarding this word. 'Allāmah Kashmīrī states in *Nuzhah*:

مراد ازین کلام اینست که این نکاح اول نکاحیست که از خاندان عالیہ بغیر طیب خاطر اولیاء بطریق اجبار و اکراه بنا بر مصلحت وقت واقع شده و سب وقوع این باجبار و اکراه تعبیر از آن بغصب فرموده اند و درین معنی بیچ گونه شناعتی نیست م مع وضوح الهرام لا عبرة بالالفاظ عقد نکاحیکه بغیر طیب خاطر باشد اصلا مستلزم زنا نیست

The meaning of this statement is that this was the first nikāḥ in a reputable family which took place without the consent of the representatives, under duress and for some temporary benefit. This coercion and oppression has been referred to with the word “forcefully taken”. There is nothing unpleasant in taking this meaning. After the meaning has been explained, the words are not considered. And the nikāḥ that is contracted without consent and happiness cannot be labelled fornication.

The gist of this interpretation is that “forcefully taken” means non-happiness and the meaning of the Imām’s statement is that this is the first nikāḥ which took place in the chaste Ahl al-Bayt family without the walī’s consent under force and duress. And “forcefully taken” does not necessitate fornication. However, this interpretation is entirely incorrect since if this was meant by the Imām, he should have used the correct and appropriate words and should not have spoken such immoral words, Allah ﷻ forbid. Saying “forcefully taken” and meaning non-happiness without any reason is turning away from the original meaning of the word. Moreover, the nikāḥ which is incorrect necessitates fornication. And from the perspective of reliable Shī‘ī books like *Ghunyah*, *Tabṣirah*, *Kanz al-‘Irfān*, *Ghāyat al-Marām*, etc., it is clear that it is impermissible for a believing woman to marry a Nāṣibī. So when an ordinary believing woman cannot marry a normal Nāṣibī then how can it ever be permissible for the leader of the believing women — the daughter of the leader of the creation — to marry a kāfir and munāfiq?

It is appropriate for ‘Allāmah Kashmīrī to make the statement, “there is nothing unpleasant in taking this meaning,” undoubtedly, it is not far-fetched for the followers of the Jew — ‘Abd Allah ibn Sabā — who in the guise of love for the Ahl al-Bayt wished to destroy the principles of Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ shari‘ah, change the fundamentals of Islam and surpass the Nawāṣib and Khawārij in their greed to get worldly benefits — that Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ granddaughter, Sayyidah Fāṭimah’s daughter, Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Ḥusayn’s ﷺ sister, is taken forcefully to the house of the leader of the renegades and munāfiqīn. The usurper then proceeds to do with her as he desires and neither the lion of Allah, nor Ḥasan nor the martyr of Karbala ﷺ do anything about it and just look on. On the other hand,

we with weak *īmān* lose our senses when hearing of such a catastrophe and our hearts call out frantically for help. How can we ever possess love like the *Shī'ah* who state that the *Imām* said, “this was a woman who was forcefully taken from us,” and then still say that, “there is nothing unpleasant in taking this meaning”? They hear such vulgar and immoral words and sing about it, yet think that they are steadfast in their claim of *īmān*. They do not think such words unbefitting for the *A'imma*'s status and do not consider the damage it causes to their high reputation.

‘*Allāmah Kashmīrī* then says:

بر گاه جابرے شخصے را در طلاق دادن زوجہ اش اجبار نماید در عرف می گویند غصبت زوجته باوصف این اگر جابر عقد نکاح باین زن بکند نزد امام اعظم ابو حنیفہ کوفی زنا متحقق نمی شود و این جابر زانی نیست

When an oppressor forces someone to divorce his wife, it is said that his wife was forcefully taken. Thereafter, if the oppressor marries that woman, then this will not be regarded as fornication according to *Imām A'zam Abū Ḥanīfah al-Kūfī* رحمہ اللہ and the oppressor will not be called a fornicator.

I cannot understand how ‘*Allāmah Kashmīrī* thought that this text is in any way an answer to *Tuḥfah* because *Shāh*'s objection was according to *Shī'ī* principles not *Ḥanafī* principles. Thus, he was required to answer according to his principles. What benefit is there by citing *Imām Abū Ḥanīfah*'s principle? When they wish to follow *Abū Ḥanīfah* رحمہ اللہ in *fiqhī* rulings and find no other exit from their predicament then they practice upon *Ḥanafī* *fiqh* wholeheartedly. However, it is of no benefit to them to practice on a *fiqhī* rulings and abandon its principles and beliefs, instead just utter one statement (i.e. recite the *kalimah*) and become one with the *Ḥanafis* and attest to the virtue of *Sayyidunā 'Umar* رحمہ اللہ so that no fight remains and the *nikāḥ* incident does not have to be analysed. Simply recite:

وَ الطَّيِّبَاتُ لِلطَّيِّبِينَ

Pure women and for pure men.

However, when according to Shīrī principles, it is impermissible for a Nāṣibī to marry a believing woman, so what benefit is there for them in Abū Ḥanīfah’s رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ statement? In fact, if Shīrī narrations are studied, the evil of this action becomes manifest. It is referred to by the words, “this was a woman who was forcefully taken from us.” Shaykh al-Ṣadūq in *Ma‘ānī al-Akḥbār* has labelled Sayyidah ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ —Allah forbid, quoting kufr is not kufr — as illegitimate and the isnād goes up to the Imām:

حدثنا علي بن احمد بن موسى رضى الله عنه قال حدثنا محمد بن ابي عبد الله الكوفي عن موسى بن عمران النخعي عن عمه الحسين بن يزيد النوفلي عن علي بن ابي حمزة عن ابي بصير قال سألته عما روى عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قال ان ولد الزنا شر الثلاثة قال عليه السلام عنى به الاوسط انه شر ممن تقدمه و ممن تلاه

Abū Baṣīr relates, “I asked the Imām رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ the meaning of the ḥadīth of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, ‘an illegitimate is the worst of the three.’ The Imām replied, ‘it refers to ‘Umar who was worse than the one before him (i.e. Abū Bakr) and the one after him (i.e. ‘Uthmān).’

When the followers of such a filthy creed slander the A’immah and claim that the A’immah had labelled Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ as illegitimate then it is just befitting for them to say that Sayyidah Fāṭimah’s رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا daughter had married such a man which the Imām refers to with the words, “this was a woman who was forcefully taken from us,” thus making them worthy of their faces being blackened in both worlds.

Nevertheless, we are prepared to accept that according to Shīrī principles, Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ cannot be labelled a kāfir and he is accepted to be one who outwardly portrays Islam and follows the entire sharī‘ah and that according to them it is permissible for a Nāṣibī to marry a believing woman. However, the Shī‘ah will not deny Sayyidah ‘Umar’s رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ hypocrisy and innovation and will never accept him as a sincere believer and an ardent follower of the sunnah. If they do accept that Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was not a munāfiq and innovator, and was a true believer and ardent follower of the sunnah then what a beautiful

agreement. If they do not accept this, then all of their interpretations for Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا nikāḥ are useless and worthless since it is far worse to marry a munāfiq than to marry a kāfir. The author of *Nuzḥah Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah* has acknowledged this in the following words:

قال الفاضل الناصب چه‌ارم انکه گویند که حضرات بنات و اخوات خود بکفره فجره بزنی می دادند مثل حضرت سکیه که در نکاح مصعب بن زبیر بود و علی بذالقیاس دیگر قریبان خودرا در نکاح کفره و نواصب در آوردند چنانچه در کتاب الهیات به تفصیل شروع ست اقوال و به نستعین اگر مراد از کافر دو قول را گویند حضرات بنات و اخوات خودرا بکفره فجره میدادند مشرک است این قول کذب محض ست چه بیچک از امامیه قائل باین قول نیست و اگر مراد ازان مبتدع است به بدعتی که منجر به کفر صاحبش نه شود که اورا کافر تناول گویند یا منافق که مظہر اسلام و مسمسک به سائر شریعت مسلم و محذوری ندارد به فحواى و لانتکحوا المشرکین حتی یومنوا الاية ممنوع و محرم انکاح با مشرک ست و بر حرمت مطلق انکاح مبتدع کدائے و تزویج با منافق دلیله قائم نیست و قیاس بیکے بردگیرے مع الفارق چه منافق اگر چه حرمتش در حقیقت عظیم ترست و فسادش در شریعت شدیدتر و به فحواى ان المنافقین فی الدرک الاسفل در عقبی بعقوبت الیم گرفتار ست لیکن حکمت الہیہ داعی و مقتضی این شد که احکام منافقین و مشرکین در دار دنیا از ہم ممتاز باشد و ازینجاست که مشرکین را به فحواى فاقتلوا المشرکین حیث وجدتموہم معاقب و ماخوذ گردانیده منافقین را ازین ورطه نجات بخشیده

Fāḍil Nāṣib has stated, “The A’immah gave their daughters and sisters to transgressors and kuffār, e.g. Sakīnah was married to Muṣ’ab ibn Zubayr etc., and allowed their other relatives to be married to kuffār and Nawāṣib, the details of which appear in *Ilāhiyyāt*.” The answer I give to this is that if the word kāfir means one who professes to another faith, then the A’immah gave their daughters and sisters to transgressors and kuffār, and such a person who is mushrik; this statement is incorrect because no Shī‘ah accepts this view. And if kāfir refers to such a person who is an innovator, whose innovation has not made him kāfir, then such a person is called a kāfir on account of his receptivity (to such ideas) or a munāfiq who outwardly follows Islam and the laws of the sharī‘ah and this is not forbidden. It is only forbidden to marry the mushrikīn. There is no proof that the nikāḥ to a munāfiq or an innovator is ḥarām. To analogise one on the other is a corrupt analogy. Although a munāfiq is extremely evil and his corruption is devastating in the sharī‘ah and he will be afflicted with a painful punishment in the hereafter, nonetheless, divine wisdom has allocated different laws for the mushrikīn and the munāfiqīn. The divine

command regarding the mushrikīn is, “kill them wherever you find them,” whereas the munāfiqīn have been spared from this.

We thank ‘Allāmah Kashmīrī from our hearts and express our gratitude for writing this. He has written the very thing we intended to write. He underwent the toil we were ought to undergo and he has answered on our behalf by stating:

چه منافق اگر چه حرمتش در حقیقت عظیم ترست و فسادش در شریعت شدیدتر

Although a munāfiq is extremely evil and his corruption is devastating in the sharīah.

However, what puzzles us is what benefit is there for him by this text in answering the objection raised by the author of *Tuḥfah*? His objection is upon the fact that according to the Shī‘ah, the A‘immah had given their daughters in marriage to kuffār. ‘Allāmah Kashmīrī answers this by saying that they did not give their daughters to kuffār but rather to munāfiqīn. We counter this by saying that there is no logical reason for the prohibition of a kāfir marrying a believing woman except that it is detested in the sharīah. And this detestation is equally found in marrying a munāfiq, but even to a greater extent, which Kashmīrī acknowledged. Now the sound minded should determine whether the objection of *Tuḥfah*’s author has strengthened or has been answered by this ‘reply’. With regards to the laws in the sharīah pertaining to munāfiqīn are not as stern as those pertaining to the kuffār; the answer to this is that since the munāfiq calls himself a Muslim externally and the laws of the sharīah are based on what is apparent, hence he is saved from being killed etc. The reason for this is that knowledge of the unseen — the condition of the heart — is only known to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. Thus, the sharīah considered their external Islam and did not command their killing. However, according to Shī‘ī principles, the noble A‘immah have knowledge of the past and future, hidden things are apparent to them and they know the conditions of the hearts of man. Hence, it is mandatory upon them to steer clear from the munāfiqīn, disgrace them, harbour enmity for them and not to go even near to them, to the extent that if they seek to assist in religious affairs then

too they should not accept their assistance and should not make them partners in these affairs. If they die, they should not perform their Ṣalāt al-Janāzah and they should not seek forgiveness for them. Accordingly, Qur’ānic verses were revealed to behave sternly with those hypocrites whose hypocrisy was apparent to Rasūlullāh ﷺ or whom Allah ﷻ informed Rasūlullāh ﷺ of and stringent laws were revealed regarding them. In fact, just as the command to wage jihād against the kuffār was issued, the command to wage jihād against the munāfiqīn was issued, as stated by Allah ﷻ:

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّبِيُّ جَاهِدِ الْكُفْرَانَ وَالْمُنَافِقِينَ وَاعْلِظْ عَلَيْهِمْ وَمَا لَهُمْ جَهَنَّمَ وَبِئْسَ الْمَصِيرُ ﴿٩﴾

O Prophet, strive against the disbelievers and the hypocrites and be harsh upon them. And their refuge is Hell, and wretched is the destination.¹

The ruling applicable to the kuffār also applies to those munāfiqīn whose hypocrisy was known to the extent that waging jihād against them and being harsh to them has been commanded. Then what difference remains between marrying such munāfiqīn and marrying the kuffār? There is no other option for the Shī‘ah; they either stop labelling Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه as a munāfiq or consider this nikāḥ forbidden. They have no third option.

Although the Shī‘ī scholars have pulled wool over the eyes of the masses and ignorant and hoodwinked them by their trick that Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه externally professed Islam hence the nikāḥ was valid, but all their deceit will become manifest and all their plots will be revealed after a small assessment, i.e. we will ask a question and you should give the ruling; answer yes or no to our question.

What does Mujtahid Qiblah say regarding these two rulings?

1. A munāfiq – who changed the Book of Allah ﷻ, distorted the sunnah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, usurped the right of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها,

1 Sūrah al-Taḥrīm: 9

physically abused her to such an extent that she aborted her innocent foetus, deprived her of her right, believed her to be a liar, did not hear her claim of inheritance, usurped the right of Amīr al-Mu'minīn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, oppressed and harassed him — now wishes to marry a believing woman, is this permissible or not?

2. What is the ruling regarding a believer — who Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَعَلَى gave unique valour and nobility, whose hands have the power and strength to destroy a fort, who has the courage to battle thousand warriors — but gives his believing daughter in marriage to a munāfiq, renegade, usurper, and traitor, due to his verbal threats, is he sinful or not?

If Mujtahid Qiblah makes a hue and cry of answering these questions and does not want to give a straight forward answer, then we will ask one plain and simple question. What do the scholars of dīn and jurists of the sound sharī'ah rule regarding the following: Is a believing woman's nikāḥ to a Nāṣibī Sunnī permissible or not? Whatever answer is given to this question is sufficient to wrap up this entire discussion. Then there is no need for any interpretation or explanation. The outcome of this entire discussion rests on one or two rulings. O Shī'ah! Kindly write the verdict and end this discussion.

ادا سے دیکھ لو جاتا رہے گلہ دل کا

بس اک نگاہ پہ ٹہرا ہے فیصلہ دل کا

The heart's condition is evaluated from the external mannerism

The heart's verdict rests only on one gaze

‘Allāmah Kashmīrī then writes in answer to *Tuḥfah*:

استبعاد ذکر فرج مستور الاسم و المسمى برزبان اکابر در کمال استعجاب ست و در واقع ژاژ خائی ست کہ بیچ خر نہ
نماید چه در کلام الہی کہ چند جا ذکر این عضو مستور الاسم و المسمى جاری شده و حضرت عائشہ صدیقہ در مجالس
و محافل نام عضو مخصوص حضرت سرور عالم علیہ السلام کہ مستور الاسم ستبرزبان می بردند الخ

Shāh’s statement that the word “private part” being uttered by the Imām is far-fetched is absolute drivel which no donkey will even utter since this organ has been mentioned at many places in the Qur’ān and Sayyidah ‘Ā’ishah Ṣiddīqah has spoken about this organ before Rasūlullāh ﷺ in many gatherings.

‘Allāmah Kashmīrī is trying to say that for Shāh to state that the word “*Farj* (private part)” coming out of the Imām’s mouth is contrary to his pedestal of piety is surprising since this word has been mentioned in the Qur’ān and Sayyidah ‘Ā’ishah Ṣiddīqah رضي الله عنها has also mentioned it; so if the Imām says it then what is the problem?

The answer to this is that this is ‘Allāmah’s ignorance. The verses and aḥādīth mention this organ when explaining rulings of the sharī’ah or praising the believers, not at a contentious juncture. And there is a need to mention such words when explaining laws. So there is a specific reason to say such a word. Yes, if Shāh had to criticise those Shī’ī aḥādīth and narrations which mention that organ in order to explain laws then Kashmīrī’s response will be befitting. Whereas there are thousands of Shī’ī aḥādīth where the noble A’immah have mentioned this organ but Shāh has not objected to any of them. The reason for objecting at this one place is that even the low class people have this much self-honour and shame that if someone were to kidnap their wife or daughter, then they will not use such a word and say that their wife’s or daughter’s private part has been forcefully taken. So how is it possible for the Imām to utter such a word? In fact, if this nikāḥ took place under coercion and duress, then it was appropriate for the Imām to answer the questioner by saying, “this nikāḥ took place due to necessity, and since ‘Umar outwardly professed Islam and followed the sharī’ah, this nikāḥ was permissible.” He should not have said such loathsome words which can be misunderstood in a thousand ways — and understood totally different by those with understanding. This cannot be explained away by this word appearing in the Qur’ān or Sayyidah ‘Ā’ishah رضي الله عنها mentioning it due to some sharī’ ruling.

Third View

Some Shī'ī scholars realised that to deny this nikāḥ is to falsify their aḥādīth books; to reject the narration, “this was a woman who was forcefully taken from us,” which al-Kulaynī has narrated in *al-Kāfī* from Imām al-Ṣādiq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is to reject the Imām and to accept it without any interpretation and explanation is to forego intelligence, īmān and honour. Thus, they decided to explain the meaning differently and turn away from the literal meaning to the metaphorical meaning. But when they saw that this is of no benefit they opted for other nonsensical interpretations like patience, bequest, Taqiyah, etc. I will mention each interpretation in detail.

Interpretation 1: Patience

Some Shī'ī scholars state that the condition Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was faced by the majority of the ambiyā' and awṣiyā' who observed patience owing to which their rank was raised by Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. Nabī Lūṭ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ faced a similar situation. When the angels came to him in the form of human beings, Nabī Lūṭ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ had a doubt and he presented his daughters in front of them saying:

قَالَ يَقَوْمِ هُوَ لَاءِ بَنَاتِي هُنَّ أَطْهَرُ لَكُمْ

He said, “O my people, these are my daughters; they are purer for you.”¹

قَالَ هُوَ لَاءِ بَنَاتِي إِنْ كُنْتُمْ فَعَالِينَ ﴿٧١﴾

[Lūṭ] said, “These are my daughters - if you would be doers.”²

So when Nabī Lūṭ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ presented his daughters and spoke this shameless sentence that if you wish to do anything then my daughters are present which appears in this verse of the Qur'ān, then the Nawāṣib's objection against Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ

1 Sūrah Hūd: 78

2 Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 71

giving his daughter to Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه is baseless. The answer the Nawāṣib will give on behalf of Nabī Lūṭ عليه السلام is our answer on behalf of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī has written this in *Maṣā’ib al-Nawāṣib* and other Shī‘ah scholars have written this in their respective books. They also give the example of Nabī Ibrāhīm عليه السلام and Sayyidah Āsiyah رضي الله عنها — the wife of Fir‘awn. I will reproduce all of them and then answer them. I will quote everything the Shī‘ah have written regarding Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s رضي الله عنه patience from the book *Sayf Ṣārim*, which was printed after Mujtahid’s approval in 1267 A.H by Ja‘fariyyah Publishers, i.e. Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah Publishers. The author has written the crux of all his mujtahidīn and scholars statements. The Muslims should study this attentively and give an applause to the shame and modesty of this poor author and his mujtahidīn and scholars, and congratulate them. These are his words quoted verbatim.

It is now clear like the sun at noon that the nikāḥ of this young innocent girl to a man who outwardly professed Islam and believed in the word of Allah سبحانه وتعالى was not consummated. It was only the object of a frail aged man to display his force, cause distress and harm to and shame Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم and to demonstrate his authority and might over the one [i.e. Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه] who conquers every conqueror. Although in reality having sexual relations with the pure innocent girl which is the object of marriage did not take place as acknowledged by the aged man and it was certainly impossible due to her young age and this was known to Amīr al-Mu‘minīn externally and internally owing to knowledge of the hidden. The nikāḥ of one who outwardly professes Islam and acknowledges the Rasūl’s risālah and commands – without considering the Imām – is not forbidden in the sharī‘ah. However, in consideration of the external, in the eyes of the elite and general masses, how could one — who is the son-in-law and cousin of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, the very being of Rasūl, conqueror of Khaybar, ultimate vanquisher and addressed as, “there is no youngster except ‘Alī, there is no sword except Dhū al-Fiqār,” the leader of the Arabs and non-Arabs Amīr al-Mu‘minīn – the title which the nawāṣib like Ṣiddīq, Fārūq and Ṣiddīqah give testimony to – display his weakness and feebleness in front of the people to the extent that he hands over his innocent daughter to a frail aged man.

No disobedient nafs of any man will ever bear such shame notwithstanding the shar'ī permission except the Ambiyā' and Awṣiyā' – may greeting and blessing be upon them – who possess such patience and happiness [with the decree of Allah ﷻ] which was given by Allah ﷻ. They have such remarkable patience and tolerance due to this bestowed strength and miracle that no other man possesses such courage and ability. They have overpowered the nafs which is the highest stage and the peak of perfection of being the conqueror of every conqueror.

O Muslims! Where are you? What sleep are you in? Wake up! Come to your senses. Wake up and cry and wail over the intelligence and shame of the ignorant lad — author of *Sayf Ṣārim* — and his immature mujtahidīn and scholars. Recite eulogies over their īmān and intellect. Lament over their deplorable condition. Look at how they have lost their intelligence and shame. They display a defect as a perfection, and under the guise of love for the Ahl al-Bayt they such profanities regarding them that causes the body to shake and the heart to tremble. They consider the lack of honour as bravery and shamelessness as patience. O friends! What friends of the Ahl al-Bayt are these? They speak such drivel regarding those high ranking personalities regarding whom the verse of Taḥīr was revealed and on whose purity and chastity purity took an oath. Brothers! Do you call it patience when a munāfiq kidnaps your daughter and marries her unlawfully under duress and the A'immah عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَام just sit and look on, keep silent and do not utter a word, and observe patience and tolerance despite their divinely given strength and miracles? I take an oath in Allah ﷻ and ask your intelligence and shame — without being prejudiced and without giving preference to your religion — what the Shī'ah have called patience, is it patience in reality or is it something else? According to my understanding, they have named the lack of self-honour and the lack of shame to be patience and tolerance and they have humiliated the Ahl al-Bayt under the guise of love (Allah ﷻ forbid!) What garbage do the Shī'ah write!/? Let someone who is matchless in bravery and strength and unparalleled in affluence go to the most ignoble man's house and steal his daughter and then see whether the ignoble man will sit quietly or sacrifice his life and honour. It is incomprehensible how the Shī'ah have deemed the honour, bravery and courage

of Amīr al-Mu'minīn — the bastion of dīn, owner of Dhū al-Fiqār and the forefather of the noble A'imma — to be unequal to even the most ignoble man. They label shamelessness as patience and tolerance. The irony of it all is that they continue attributing such shameless things to him and levelling allegations against him, yet they call him the conqueror of every conqueror, the object of every seeker, the leader of the pious, slayer of the kuffār and transgressors, spearhead of the devout, addressed as, “there is no youngster except ‘Alī and there is no sword except Dhū al-Fiqār.” They have no shame from Allah ﷻ and do not consider Rasūlullāh ﷺ. The reality is that the Shī'ah have corrupted īmān and dīn and have destroyed the sharī'ah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ to the extent that even Shayṭān is ashamed. Even Shayṭān never imagined the things they plot.

I will give a brief answer to the incident of Nabī Lūṭ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ and mention the commentary of the verse. It should not be hidden that the verse's meaning is not as the Shī'ah have thought, i.e. that Sayyidunā Lūṭ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ presented his daughters without performing nikāḥ to them so that they may commit fornication with them. The meaning is that he presented his daughters to them so that they may marry them. And in that time marrying a kāfir was permissible. So there was no sharī'abomination in this. Therefore, Allah ﷻ added the following words on behalf of Nabī Lūṭ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ.

هُنَّ أَطْهَرُ لَكُمْ

They are purer for you.

There can be no purity without nikāḥ.

If any Shī'ī rejects this due to the fact that the word nikāḥ does not appear in the verse, we will respond by telling him to study the commentaries. And he should not study Sunnī commentaries; he should rely on his own commentaries. Accordingly, Amīn al-Dīn al-Ṭabarsī has written under the commentary of this verse in *Majma' al-Bayān* — considered to be a reliable commentary by the Shī'ah, which has been printed by Dār al-Salṭanat in Tehran, Iran:

قَالَ يَقَوْمَ هَؤُلَاءِ بَنَاتِي هُنَّ أَطْهَرُ لَكُمْ وَكَانَ يَجُوزُ فِي شَرْعِهِ تَرْوِيجَ الْمُؤْمِنَةِ مِنَ الْكَافِرِ

He said, “O my people, these are my daughters; they are purer for you.”
It was permissible for a believing woman to be married to a kāfir in his sharīah.

If any intelligent Shīī objects by saying that although the meaning of the words of this verse is nikāḥ, however the other verse clearly speaks about the act.

قَالَ هَؤُلَاءِ بَنَاتِي إِنْ كُنْتُمْ فَعَلِينَ ﴿٧١﴾

[Lūṭ] said, “these are my daughters — if you would be doers [of lawful marriage].”¹

We will rely upon their commentaries in this instance as well and quote the commentary they give. Al-Ṭabarsī states in *Majma' al-Bayān*:

قوله إِنْ كُنْتُمْ فَعَلِينَ كناية عن النكاح أى ان كنتم متزوجين

His statement, “if you would be doers,” refers to nikāḥ, i.e. if you are going to marry.

Since the Shīah will not be satisfied with one commentary, they should listen to another commentary. The renowned Shīī al-Kāshānī states in the commentary of this verse in *Khulāṣat al-Manhaj*:

گفت لوط اے گروہ من اینہاں دختران من اند ایشاں را بخوابید کہ ایشاں پاکیزہ اند شمار او ترویج دختران بشرط ایماں بودہ یا در شریعت او ترویج مومنات بکفار جائز بود

Lūṭ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام said, “O my people! These are my daughters. Take them, for they are purer for you.” Marriage to his daughters was on condition that they accept īmān or it was permissible for a believing woman to marry a kāfir in his sharīah.

1 Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 71

So the incident of Nabī Lūṭ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام has no resemblance to Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا nikāḥ. There is a big difference between the two. In Sayyidunā Lūṭ's عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام sharī'ah, it was permissible for a believing woman to marry a kāfir and his statement was not for fornication but for nikāḥ. On the other hand, in the sharī'ah of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ marrying a kāfir was forbidden later on and according to Shī'ī principles it is also forbidden to marry an enemy of the Ahl al-Bayt or a Nāṣibī. Besides, Nabī Lūṭ's عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام daughters were not usurped and their honour and chastity was not affected in the least whereas here the situation is the complete opposite, i.e. Sayyidunā 'Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ married her forcefully which is impermissible, took Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا to his house and kept her there for a few years and had children with her — both are poles apart.

O Shī'ah! Until when are you going to fabricate things? What interpretations are you going to give? Whatever you make up will be nothing but falsehood. The more interpretations you forge, the more allegations you will level against the Ahl al-Bayt. Study this entire discussion and tell us whether what we are saying is true or false. Stop bragging about love for the Ahl al-Bayt and openly declare your enmity for them. Study each belief and ruling of yours and decide with soundness if it exposes love or enmity for the Ahl al-Bayt. Had they had love for the Ahl al-Bayt, would they have spoken such immoral words about such pure souls and narrated such shameful things about them? I seek Allah's سُبحانه وتعالى forgiveness.

بر خرقه تو این همه داغ شراب چیست

جامی چه لاف میزنی از پاک دامنی

O goblet! What chastity are you bragging about?

What are all these wine marks on your clothes?

Sayyidunā Lūṭ's عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام incident has been appropriately answered. I will now mention something regarding Nabī Ibrāhīm's عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام story.

Some Shī'ah have said that a tyrant king kidnapped Nabī Ibrāhīm's wife, Sayyidah Sārah عَلَيْهَا السَّلَام, and he did not do anything besides observe patience and supplicate. The author of *Sayf Ṣārim* explains this in the following words, quoted verbatim:

Besides this, I will quote something briefly from Tafsīr ‘Azīzī out of necessity. You may study the above mentioned book for more details written by your guide, ‘Azīz. Sārah, the wife of Nabī Ibrāhīm عليه السلام, was extremely beautiful. Due to the oppression and tyranny of the wretched, she and her husband Nabī Ibrāhīm عليه السلام set out into the desert. They reached Egypt. The king there was a fierce tyrant whose practice it was that whenever a beautiful woman passed by, he would kill her husband, jail her brother and abduct her. A similar thing happened to him that the foot soldiers of the tyrant king came to him and asked him how the woman was related to him. Nabī Ibrāhīm عليه السلام said that she was his sister. The meaning in his heart was that she is my sister in religion and one of the descendants of Sayyidunā Ādam عليه السلام. The sound minded can understand the concept of Taqīyyah and the salient practice of the ambiyā’ at a time of constraint and necessity. The awṣiyā’ follow in the footsteps of the ambiyā’ and the mu’minīn follow in theirs. If Nāṣiḥ had any passive power, he should have thought and been ashamed at what his guide ‘Azīz has written. Nonetheless, the foot soldiers of the king left Nabī Ibrāhīm عليه السلام and forcefully took Sayyidah Sārah عليها السلام. When Nabī Ibrāhīm عليه السلام saw this, he engaged himself in ṣalāh and supplication. When Sayyidah Sārah عليها السلام reached that wretched, he fell in love with her and wanted to commit evil with her. Sayyidah Sārah عليها السلام supplicated and the effect of it was that his hands became paralysed and he was distressed. Sayyidah Sārah عليها السلام supplicated and he was cured, but still his intentions were evil. She supplicated again and the same happened. When it happened for the third time, he set her free and gave her Sayyidah Hājar عليها السلام as a gift.

We congratulate the author for mentioning this incident at this juncture and say bravo to please him. He has mentioned such an incident which is an asset to us and a proof against him. His intelligence and understanding is startling. What benefit did he see for himself in this incident? The gist of the above story is that the men of the tyrant king took Sayyidah Sārah عليها السلام — the wife of Nabī Ibrāhīm عليه السلام. When the wretched intended evil, Nabī Ibrāhīm عليه السلام and Sayyidah Sārah عليها السلام supplicated due to which his hands became paralysed, thus safeguarding her honour. In fact, such a miracle was displayed owing to which he gifted her

a slave girl, Sayyidah Hājar عَلَيْهَا السَّلَامُ. Now match this story with Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا one and see whether they are the same or not? Had the same happened with Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, i.e. when Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ took her home, Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ supplicated to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى paralysed ‘Umar’s hand to protect her honour and frighten him, and as a result of witnessing this miracle, he sent Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا untouched to Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ house and sent a slave girl as a gift as well pleading for forgiveness. Had this happened, then definitely Nabī Ibrāhīm and Sayyidah Sārah’s عَلَيْهَا السَّلَامُ story would have matched theirs whereas on the contrary Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ “forcefully” married Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, kept her in his house for eight to ten years, and had a son and a daughter with her, and she remained with him until his last breath till he passed away. She only then later married the son of Sayyidunā Ja‘far al-Ṭayyār رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا. It is surprising that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى displayed miracles to protect Sayyidah Sārah’s عَلَيْهَا السَّلَامُ honour by paralysing the tyrant king’s hand but when a munāfiq renegade abducts Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm bint Fāṭimah bint Rasūlillāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, then neither the majesty, dignity and wrath of Allah is displayed nor is a miracle shown — neither is his hand paralysed nor is the granddaughter of Rasūlillāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ protected in any way. What else can be said then that the Shī‘ī god was afraid of Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and did not protest out of fear or that he exercised patience and tolerance like the Waṣī of his Rasūl? Normal people grow restless in such situations and are prepared to sacrifice their lives, but due to the elevated position of the Imām and Waṣī, they observe patience in such situations. We seek Allah’s سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى protection from their drivel and evil beliefs.

There remains a doubt about this incident which ought to be removed. It is clear from historic narrations that when the tyrant king abducted Nabī Ibrāhīm’s عَلَيْهَا السَّلَامُ wife then he supplicated to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, who displayed a miracle by paralysing his hand whereas Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ did not supplicate after Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا was taken which would have been accepted by Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. Who would have shown a miracle.

Undoubtedly it is true that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه did not supplicate and when he remained silent on the abduction of his daughter, then what should Allah سبحانه وتعالى do? Why should he descend His wrath without someone asking and supplicating? Nonetheless, what prevented Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه from supplicating? Why did he remain silent? Why did he not lift his hands in supplication in the darkness of the night behind closed doors? If he did not confront him out of fear for his life, then this was out of necessity due to which he remained silent. But what fear was there at night behind closed doors due to which he did not supplicate? Maybe he knew that Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه used to patrol at night and keep an eye on the people and if he overheard his supplication, he might harm him and then the same thing would have happened which he tried to prevent by remaining silent, i.e. he could be killed. This fear could be understandable had it been necessary to scream when supplicating whereas it is not necessary to make an audible supplication. In fact, Allah سبحانه وتعالى hears the supplication of the hearts just as He hears the screaming of the tongue. So he could have supplicated in his heart, not with his tongue and the object would have been fulfilled. So we accept that the reason Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه did not protest was out of fear for his life. And we assumed that he did not supplicate loudly out of fear that Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه might overhear. But there seems to be no logical reason for not making supplicating from the heart. If only a Shi‘ī could tell us and remove our fear.

If an intelligent person asks, “what is the need to supplicate after the nikāḥ is contracted? Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه was not an adulterer or transgressor. So there was no need for Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه to worry about marrying his daughter to him.” Our view is exactly the same. But what to do with the narration, “this was a woman who was forcefully taken from us,” with which tears will you wash all those thousands of pages which have been blackened by making useless interpretations of this nikāḥ? If the reality is that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه was pleased with Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه and vice versa and both had confidence on each other’s īmān and sincerity hence the nikāḥ took place, then the entire

dispute is over. But then the falsehood of Shī'ism will become apparent like the sun at noon. If the Shī'ah accept what we explained as the truth, they will have no option but to abandon their religion. For this reason their scholars presented various types of interpretations which were uncalled for, and overlooked the reality. Some said he was afraid of losing his life while others said it was due to his patience and forbearance. Some presented the incident of Sayyidunā Lūṭ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام as substantiation while others used the story of Nabī Ibrāhīm's عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام wife. And others claimed that a female Jinn took the form of Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا. Nonetheless, narrating all of these stories and presenting all of these different explanations and interpretations, in fact understanding this nikāḥ to be like a carcass which becomes permissible for consumption due to necessity; what is all this for? It is simple; to make sure that it is not established that Sayyidunā 'Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was worthy of marrying Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا and Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ gave her willingly to him in marriage. What interpretations were made and what allegations were levelled against the noble Ahl al-Bayt just to reject Sayyidunā 'Umar's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ virtue! Whether it involved disgracing the Ahl al-Bayt, saying that their chaste daughters were abducted, accusing the awliyā' to be shameless — everything was tolerated and accepted, but they did not and will never ever acknowledge the virtue of Sayyidunā 'Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

Interpretation 2: Bequest

I have answered the interpretation of patience and tolerance. I will now mention the second interpretation and refute it.

When the Shī'ah realised that the patience interpretation was incorrect and that to present this reason in such a sensitive situation without any pressing need was improper, they substantiated it through another channel and created the pressing need for it, i.e. the bequest of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ bequeathed his waṣī and the first Imām to adopt nothing but patience and to endure the oppression and tyranny of the cruel khulafā'. Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ informed him of every incident that was to occur and bequeathed him to bear it patiently. So it was not possible for his waṣī to act contrary to his command

and abandon patience. This has been mentioned by Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī in his *Maṣāʾib al-Nawāṣib*, the translation of which appears in *Izālat al-Ghayn*. I will produce it verbatim:

و بعضی از جہاں ایشان گفته اند کہ چہ گنجائش دارد کہ علی تسلیم نکاح کند ابنتہ خودرا برینکہ شما وصف کردید و ما میگوئیم کہ این سخن جہل ست بہ وجود تدبیر و بیان این اینست کہ چون رسول خدا صلی اللہ علیہ و سلم وصیت کرد علی را بانچہ محتاج بود در وقت وفات و معلوم او گردانید جمیع اینچہ جاری خواہد شد از امر مستولین واحدا بعد واحد پس علی گفت مرا بچہ امر میکنی اینحضرت فرمود صبر کن تا مردم رجوع کند بسوئ تو از روی طوع پس این ہنگام قتال کن با ناکثین و قاسطین و مارقین و با احدی از ثلاثہ منازعت مکن تاخودرا بدست خود در تہلکہ نیندازی و مردم از نفاق بشقاق بر کردند پس علی علیہ السلام حافظ وصیت رسول خدا صلی اللہ علیہ و سلم بود بواسطہ حفظ دین تا مردم بہ جاہلیت برنہ گردند و چون عمر رضی اللہ عنہ خوستگاری ام کلثوم رضی اللہ عنہا نمود علی متفکر شد و گفت اگر مانع شوم او قصد قتل من خواہد من کند و ممانعت کنم اورا از نفس خود بیرون روم از اطاعت رسول خدا صلی اللہ علیہ و سلم و مخالفت وصیت او میکنم و داخل میشود در دین اچہ مذکور میکرد از آن رسول خدا صلی اللہ علیہ و سلم پس تسلیم ابنتہ درین حال اصلح بود از قتل او و بیرون رفتن از وصیت رسول خدا پس تفویض نمود امر اورا بخدا و دانستہ بود کہ اینچہ عمر غصب کرد از اموال مسلمانان و ارتکاب کردہ از انکار حق او و قعود بجای رسول خدا او تغیر احکام الہی و تبدیل فرائض خدا چنانچہ گزشت اعظم است نزد حق تعالی و اقطع و اشنع ست از اغتصاب این فرج پس تسلیم کرد و صبر نمود چنانچہ رسول خدا صلی اللہ علیہ و سلم امر نمودہ بود

Some ignoramus object that when the situation was this bad as you say, then what right did Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضی اللہ عنہ have to allow his daughter’s nikāḥ. The answer to this is that this is pure ignorance. The reality is that Rasūlullāh صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم bequeathed to Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضی اللہ عنہ important matters and at the time of his death informed him of every single thing that will transpire after him. Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضی اللہ عنہ asked, “what do you command me?” Rasūlullāh صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم answered, “observe patience until the time that people come to you to obey and follow you. Then you should wage war against the oppressors who broke the pledge and the group that abandoned dīn. Do not argue or fight with any of the three khulafā’, otherwise you will be destroyed. Steer clear from the people’s hypocrisy and differences.” Thus Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضی اللہ عنہ was in reality strictly following Rasūlullāh’s صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم bequest in order to safeguard dīn so that ignorance and kufr does not rear its ugly head once again. When ‘Umar sent a proposal for Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm رضی اللہ عنہا, Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضی اللہ عنہ pondered deeply and thought, “if I prevent him, he will kill me. If he intends killing me and I stop him to save my

life, I will disobey Rasūlullāh ﷺ and practice contrary to his bequest and this will result in deficiency in dīn.” He thought it better to give his daughter and handed the matter to Allah ﷻ notwithstanding that he was fully aware that ‘Umar usurped the Muslims’ wealth, refused to give them their dues, sat at Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ place and interpolated divine commands. These things were far worse and evil in Allah’s ﷻ sight than the usurpation of one private part. Therefore, he gave his daughter and adopted patience as per the command of Rasūlullāh ﷺ.

The gist of the above is that Rasūlullāh ﷺ bequeathed Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ not to do or say anything in the era of the three khulafā’. No matter what oppression they commit, do not act. Let them usurp what they want and do not say a word. It is for this reason that Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ did not make any noise regarding the vital matter, i.e. imāmah and khilāfah, and remained absolutely silent. The evils that spread due to Sayyidunā ‘Umar ﷺ being khalīfah are manifest. Thus, usurping the khilāfah, misusing the Muslims’ wealth, removing Amīr al-Mu’minīn from his place and sitting in the place of Rasūlullāh ﷺ were more detestable and repugnant in the eyes of Allah ﷻ than forcefully abducting Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm ﷺ. When Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ adopted patience — as was the directive of Rasūlullāh ﷺ — in such a despicable and repugnant matter, i.e. the usurpation of the khilāfah, then what is wrong if he adopted patience at the abduction of his daughter?

While writing this intricate subject, Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī displays the level of his shame and modesty in *Maṣā’ib al-Nawāṣib* by saying that Sayyidunā ‘Umar’s ﷺ claim for khilāfah and his sitting on Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ place is far worse than forcefully abducting a thousand women in the sight of Allah ﷻ, forget one. The translation of his text appears thus in *Izālat al-Ghayn*:

و آنچه دعوی کرد از برائے خود از امامت از روی ظلم و جور و تعدی و خلاف بر خدا و رسول خدا صلی اللہ علیہ و سلم و دفع امانے کہ نصب کرده اورا خدا و رسول خدا و استیلاء اور امور مسلمانان پس حکم بہ خلاف خدا و رسول اعظم ست نزد حق تعالی از اغتصاب ہزار فرج از زنان مومنای چہ جائے فرج واحد

Through oppression and tyranny ‘Umar claimed khilāfah and Imāmah, disobeyed Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ command, removed the Imām appointed by Allah ﷻ and His Rasūl and unlawfully took control of the affairs of the Muslims. Disobeying the command of Allah ﷻ and Rasūlullāh ﷺ is far worse in the sight of Allah ﷻ than usurping the private parts of a thousand believing women, leave alone one private part.

O shameful Mu’minīn and O pure Shī’ah! Look at the intricacy of this complex text of Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī and ponder over his words. What filth he writes regarding the pure A’immah and chaste daughters and with what immoral words he refers to Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm’s ﷺ nikāḥ. Glory be to Allah ﷻ! Allah ﷻ is pure! Professing love for the queen of the women Sayyidah Fāṭimah Zahrā’ ﷺ on one hand and slandering her chaste daughter on the other hand. He used such immoral and disrespectful words that the earth almost split and a lightning bolt almost fell from the sky. Such filthy words regarding such pure souls. He does not think that Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm ﷺ is the daughter of that innocent woman whose face no one saw and whose chastity and purity is proverbial. When she will pass on the Day of Qiyāmah, a caller will call out:

غضوا ابصاركم

Lower your gazes.

The chaste pure innocent daughter of Rasūlullāh ﷺ is passing. No one’s gaze will fall on her. The woman whose mother’s chastity enjoys such a lofty status in the eyes of Allah ﷻ; the Shī’ah blurt out such disgraceful and humiliating words regarding her. They use such filthy words for such a personality which will not be spoken about a normal person.

The bequest excuse is not worthy of acceptance, neither logically or transmitted. Logically, since Rasūlullāh ﷺ was sent for the guidance of mankind. It was his responsibility to protect people from misguidance and to make others — especially his successors — take up the responsibility of protecting people from

the same. So how can the intellect accept that Rasūlullāh ﷺ told Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, “even if the three khulafā’ usurp the khilāfah, snatch away your right, misuse the people’s wealth, change the Book of Allah سبحانه وتعالى, adulterate my sunnah and take away your daughters, then too do not raise any objection, remain silent and bear all of this oppression and tyranny.” Who can ever dream that Rasūlullāh ﷺ said this? Allah سبحانه وتعالى forbid! What greater slander can there be against Rasūlullāh ﷺ than this?

The excuse that Rasūlullāh ﷺ said this so that people do not abandon the external form of Islam and do not openly get involved in kufr and shirk also defies intellect. If hundreds of thousands of people who remained in Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ company, saw the development of Islam from the very beginning to the end, whole heartedly sacrificed their lives in jihād, saw thousands of miracles with their own eyes, regarding whom Allah سبحانه وتعالى revealed verses in their praise. If all these people, except a handful, are such munāfiqīn and have so weak īmān that they will abandon external Islam, expose their internal kufr and become polytheists if Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه were to combat the three khulafā’ – notwithstanding that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه is on the truth and is only fighting the three khulafā’ in order to protect the lives and wealth of the Muslims from their oppressive hands, to safeguard the dīn from interpolation and alteration and to save people from going astray – and then still too no Muslim assists him, leave alone not assisting him, they abandon him for this mistake, and even abandon the external form of Islam and choose idol worship instead; then what benefit is īmān and Islam going to give to such a group? In fact, remaining Muslims or turning kuffār is equal. So what was the need for Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ bequest and Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s رضي الله عنه firm patience because the thing he feared was already present, i.e. people abandoning īmān and Islam. Think a little that if Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه challenged the khulafā’ and sought assistance from the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم because the oppressive khulafā’ usurped his khilāfah, misused the wealth of the Muslims, changed the sunnah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and abducted the granddaughter of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, then instead of assisting him, the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم reject the kalimah and deny towḥīd and risālah then what is the use of considering their Islam? What is the difference

if such internal kuffār remain Muslims outwardly or become idol worshippers? How can such oppression and tyranny be tolerated, destruction to Allah’s ﷺ dīn be allowed and abduction of daughters be overlooked just in consideration of their outward Islam? What was the advantage of Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ bequest to his waṣī to adopt patience and tolerance?

O Shī’ah! Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm’s ﷺ nikāḥ is not a simple issue that you can say, “this was a woman who was forcefully taken from us,” and forget about it or get rid of it by ridiculous and ludicrous statements. Judge with justice! If someone’s servant or employee benefits from his master for just a few days and after his master’s demise someone usurps his master’s wealth or takes the honour of his daughter or just has the intention to do so, then if the servant or employee is loyal he will be prepared to sacrifice his life and will never allow any blemish to his master’s honour as long as he is breathing. So was there not even one out of the four hundred thousand Ṣaḥābah ﷺ who could assist Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ and protect the honour of Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ family? Okay, leave the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ and deem them as renegades and hypocrites if you wish, was there no one from the Banū Hāshim who could protect the honour of his daughter and safeguard her from a munāfiq’s tyranny? Most probably the Shī’ah will say that Rasūlullāh ﷺ made the bequest that no matter how much oppression someone does even if he abducts your daughters and snatches their honour then too do not protest. We will respond then, why was this bequest forgotten at the Battle of Shām and Ṣiffīn and why was the blood of thousands spilled? Then maybe they will say that the bequest was that nothing should be done in the era of the three khulafā’, but you should fight Sayyidunā Mu’āwiyah ﷺ. The answer to this is that they are nothing but chameleons. Whatever comes to their mind, they fabricate a narration and show their poetic skills. There must be a reason for the bequest. If the reason is that no bloodshed takes place, then thousands were killed in the fight against Sayyidunā Mu’āwiyah ﷺ. If the reason is that none will assist Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ and he might be killed unjustly, then the reality dawned in the Battle of Ṣiffīn. Thousands of Muhājirīn and Anṣār and the Ahl al-Ḥil wa l-‘aḳd assisted Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ and thousands were

martyred. Are you trying to say that those who assisted him later on would not have assisted earlier and they would not have fought the three khulafā' like how they fought Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه? It is clear like daylight that this bequest tale is fabricated and is a grave slander against Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم. If you are in doubt, we will prove it through narrated text.

No one should be under the misconception that there are only rational proofs to ascertain the falsehood of this bequest. In fact, if we carefully study the aḥādīth in Shī'ī books, the untruth of it becomes apparent. The crux of the bequest is that Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه ought to adopt patience in the era of the three khulafā' and should not complain about their oppression and tyranny. So if he adopted patience throughout their eras and did not confront them or speak harshly or abruptly to them, then we might also believe that there is some truth to this bequest. But if it is established that Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه displayed his wrath and dignity, confronted the three khulafā' and spoke harshly to them, warned them and even intended to kill them, then how can we accept that Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم made the bequest? Had he bequeathed, Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه would have definitely abided and would not have complained. On the contrary, he confronts them on petty issues and is prepared to fight them, forgetting the prophetic bequest, but then adopts patience in important matters like the usurpation of his daughter Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm رضي الله عنها. This is unfathomable for our restricted minds. Only the Shī'ah can understand this complexity.

Narration 1

There appears a narration in *Kashf al-Ghummah* from Muḥammad ibn Khālid which goes as follows. Once Sayyidunā 'Umar رضي الله عنه while delivering the khuṭbah said, “if I wish to turn you away from religious knowledge, unquestionable beliefs and the laws of the sharī'ah and command you to abandon it and follow the principles of the era of ignorance; will you obey me or not?” No one answered. After posing the question thrice, Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه said, “if we see this condition of yours and find you astray from the dīn of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, we will find another representative. If you repent, we will accept your repentance. And if you do not repent, we will

cut off your neck.” Hearing this Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه exclaimed, “all praise belongs to Allah سُبْحَانَكَ وَتَعَالَى that we still have men in our dīn that if I go astray, they will bring me back to the straight path.”

Now when Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه answers Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه so harshly and exclaims that he is prepared to kill him, then had Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه really went astray from dīn and changed the laws of the sharī‘ah then Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه would have fulfilled his pledge and killed him. So how can such a man allow his daughter to be forcefully taken by Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه and do absolutely nothing about it? The actual verbatim translation of the ḥadīth is:

روایت ست از محمد بن خالد الضبی کہ روزے عمر بن خطاب در اثناء خطبہ از حاضران سوال کرده کہ اگر من خوابم کہ شمارا از معلومات دینیہ و معتقدات یقینیہ و احکام شرعیہ محمدیہ صرف نمایم و گویم کہ از معتقدات بر گردید و رجوع نمائید بقواعد کہ در زمان جاہلیت بود شما بامن چه خوابید کرد ایا تابع در ایں خوابید شد یا مخالف من مردماں ہمہ خاموش شدند و بیچ کس جواب نگفت عمر دیگر بارا ہمیں سخن را اعادہ کرد از بیچ کس جوابی نشنید پس دیگر بار ہمیں مقاله اعادہ کرد شاه ولایت فرمود کہ ہر گاہ از تو ایں حالت مشاہدہ گرد و وترا از دین مصطفیٰ منحرف یا ہم نائب دیگر طلب کنیم و اگر توبہ کنی بوبہ ترا قبول کنیم و اگر نکنی ترا گردن زنیم عمر چون ایں سخن از شاه اولیا شنید گفت کہ در دین ما مرد ماں ہستند کہ اگر منحرف شویم مارا بطریق مستقیم مقیم و ثابت دارند

Muḥammad ibn Khālīd al-Ḍabbī narrates that during the khuṭbah one day, Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه asked those present, “if I wish to turn you away from religious knowledge, unquestionable beliefs and the laws of the sharī‘ah and command you to abandon it and follow the beliefs of the era of ignorance; what will you do to me? Will you obey me or disobey?” Everyone was silent. No one answered. Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه asked for the second time but received no response so he repeated it again. Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه stated, “when we will see this condition of yours and find you astray from the dīn of Muḥammad صلى الله عليه وسلم, we will search for another representative. If you repent, we will accept your repentance and if not, we will cut off your neck.” Hearing this statement of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه exclaimed, “our dīn still has men that if I go astray, they will bring me back to the straight path.”

Narration 2

Mullā Bāqir Majlisī has narrated a lengthy narration in *Ḥayāt al-Qulūb*, the crux of which is that Sayyidunā ‘Umar al-Fārūq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ has such awe and fear in his heart for Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ that he would tremble just at his sight. After narrating a very lengthy narration, he explains this issue in the following words:

علی بن ابراهیم از ابو وائله روایت کرده است که گفت روزی با عمر بن خطاب برای می رفتم ناگه اضطرابی در راه یافتیم و صدای از سینه او شنیده شد مانند کسی که از ترس مدبوش شود گفتم چه میشود ترا ای عمر گفت مگر نه بینی شیر بیشه شجاعت را او معدن کرم و فتوت را و کشنده طاغیان و باغیان و زینده شمشیر را عملدار صاحب تدبیر را چون نظر کردم علی بن ابی طالب را دیدم الی قوله تا این ساعت ترس او را از دل من بدر نرفته است و برگاه که او را می بینم چنین بر اساس میشوم

‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm narrated from Abū Wāthilah, “One day I was walking with Sayyidunā ‘Umar ibn Khaṭṭāb رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. While walking, he grew extremely agitated and disturbed and such a sound emanated from his chest like someone going crazy out of fear. I asked, ‘O ‘Umar, what is wrong?’ He replied, ‘do you not see the fierce lion, possessor of all virtue, subjugator of the rebellious and disobedient, the shimmering sword, the great planner?’ When I looked around, I saw Sayyidunā ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. ‘His fear and awe has not left my heart until now ... Whenever I see him, I am struck with awe and become restless.’”

What stronger ḥadīth do you want to prove that Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would be struck with awe and would tremble just at the sight of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and it would take him a long while to recover and come back to his senses? So when this is his condition by just looking at Sayyidah ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ that he loses his senses then how can it ever be fathomable that he forcefully married his daughter? Maybe the Shī‘ah will say that his awe disappeared at that time or the tables were turned.

Narration 3

Sayyid Dildār ‘Alī writes in *‘Imād al-Islam* that it is recorded in Shī‘ī books that Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ commanded His Rasūl سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى to close all the doors leading to

Masjid besides his and Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. After a few days, Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ requested Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ to ask Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى for his door to be opened. Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ replied, “it is impossible.” Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ asked, “supplicate for a gutter at least.” Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ remained silent. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى accepted his second request. Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ himself climbed up and fitted a gutter on the roof as per Sayyidunā ‘Abbās’s رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ wish. This gutter remained three years in the khilāfah of Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. One day, water from that gutter was falling and happened to fall on Sayyidunā ‘Umar’s رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ clothes who gave an order that it be removed. Accordingly, it was removed. Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ then proclaimed in anger, “if anyone fits it again, I will cut his neck off.” Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ notwithstanding his severe sickness with the help of his sons came to Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ with a plea. He said, “I had two eyes. One has gone, i.e. Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. And the other still remains, i.e. Sayyidunā ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. I could never imagine that such a calamity could befall me while you are still alive. Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ said, “go to your home and rest peacefully, see what I will do.”

ثم نادى يا قنبر على بذي الفقار فتقلده هم خرج الى المسجد و الناس حوله و قال يا قنبر اصعد و رد الميزاب الى مكانه فصعد قنبر و رده الى موضعه و قال على و حق صاحب هذا القبر و المنبر لئن قلعه قالع لاضررين عنقه و عتق الامر له بذلك و لاصلبها في الشمس حتى ينفذوا ببلغ ذلك عمر بن الخطاب فنهض و دخل المسجد و نظر الى الميزاب و هو في موضعه فقال لا يغضب احد بالحسن فيما فعله و تكفر عنه عن اليمين فلما كان من الغداة مضى على بن ابي طالب الى عمه العباس فقال له كيف اصبحت يا عم قال بالفضل النعم ما ومت لى يابن اخى فقال له يا عم طب نفسك و قر عينا فوالله لو خاضمتى اهل الارض فى الميزاب لخصمتهم ثم لقتلهم بحول الله و قوته لا ينالك ضيم و لا غم فقام العباس فقبل بين عينيه و قال يابن اخى ما خاب من انت ناصره فكان هذا فعل عمر بالعباس عم رسول الله و قد قال فى غير موطن وصية منه فى عمه ان عمى العباس بقية الابهاء و الاجداد فاحفظونى فيه كل فى كنفى و انا فى كنف عمى العباس فمن اذاه فقد اذانى و من عاداه فقد عادانى فسلمه سلمى و حربه حربى و قد اذاه عمر فى ثلث مواطن ظاهرة غير خفية منها قصة الميزاب و لولا خوفه من على عليه السلام لم يتركه على حاله

He then called out, “O Qambar! Bring me Dhū al-Fiqār.” He then girded it and left for the Masjid with people surrounding him. He ordered, “O Qambar, climb and fit the gutter at its place.” Accordingly, Qambar climbed and fitted it at its place. Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ then declared, “by the right of

the inmate of this grave and the owner of this pulpit, if anyone removes it, I will smite his neck and the one who ordered him to do it and then I will crucify them in the sun until they rot. The news reached Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه who got up and entered the Masjid. He saw that the gutter was at its place and thus exclaimed, “no one should anger Abū al-Ḥasan in what he did.” He then paid the expiation of his oath. The next day, Sayyidunā ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رضي الله عنه went to his uncle Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه and asked him, “how are you doing, o uncle?” He replied, “enjoy the greatest of pleasures as long as you live, o my nephew.” Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه said, “O uncle, may your heart be at rest and may your eyes be cooled. By Allah سبحانه وتعالى, if the entire earth had to combat me with regards to the gutter, I would have fought them and then killed them. By the strength and power of Allah سبحانه وتعالى, no sorrow or grief will afflict you.” Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه stood up and kissed him on his forehead saying, “O my nephew, whoever you help will never be unsuccessful.” This is what ‘Umar did to Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه — the uncle of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم. Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم has mentioned Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه in many of his bequests. He said, “indeed my uncle ‘Abbās is the remnant of my forefathers so consider me when dealing with him. Everyone is at my assistance and I am at my uncle ‘Abbās’s assistance. The one who harms him has indeed harmed me. The one who harbours hatred for him in fact harbours hatred for me. I give amnesty to whom he gives amnesty and I wage war against who he wages war against.” ‘Umar openly harmed him at three occasions. One of them is the gutter incident. Had it not been his fear for Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, he would not have spared him.

Mujtahid writes this narration under the allegations against Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه and says, “if ‘Umar did not fear ‘Alī, he would never allowed the gutter to be replaced in its place.” Anyways, when Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه is infuriated by such a trivial thing, i.e. the gutter, that he asks Qambar for Dhū al-Fiqār, comes to the Masjid and makes Qambar fit the gutter in front of him — notwithstanding that Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه only ruled for three years and his khilāfah was still in its youth — he did not fear him and was prepared to kill him. In fact he intended to fight the entire world if they opposed him. Then how can the intellect accept that Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم bequeathed him to be patient. If Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم really

made this bequest, then why did he forget about it in the gutter incident and why did he emerge with Dhū al-Fiqār? If Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه did not fear him, then why did he keep quiet and why did he not remove the gutter he replaced?

The Shī‘ah are confused. Sometimes they make Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه into such a brave lion and narrate incidents of his fury and anger on the most trivial things and how he is prepared to fight in minor situations while at other times they make him so scared and weak that he adopts patience in very important situations. Is it that according to the Shī‘ah, the abduction of Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm رضي الله عنها was more insignificant than Sayyidunā ‘Abbās’s رضي الله عنه gutter that he bears patiently the former but is infuriated at the latter? If only Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه kept silent about the gutter and displayed his wrath and dignity in Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm’s رضي الله عنها case by taking Dhū al-Fiqār from Qambar and emerging with the sole intent to slay Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه. This wrath and anger would be appropriate.

I do not know whether the Shī‘ah narrate the nikāḥ incident before or after the gutter one. If the nikāḥ was prior to the gutter incident, then it is very unlikely that Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه would come to Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه for help with his gutter since he was well aware that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه gave his daughter to Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه out of fear for him and said nothing. So why would Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه seek his assistance in the gutter issue? If Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه kept silent and adopted patience in his daughter’s case, then what will he say in this trivial matter? And if the nikāḥ took place after the gutter incident, then when Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه went to Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه to explain to him to give his daughter to Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه otherwise he will cause harm to him; then if Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه forgot about the gutter incident, Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه should have reminded him, “O uncle! Do you not remember what I did regarding your gutter and how I threatened ‘Umar? So why should I be afraid of him in this important matter.” He then should have asked Qambar to bring the sword and he should have gone to Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه and threatened him like how he did in the gutter incident. If he did so, then what courage would Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه have to say a word?

The Shī'ah should have a good look at these narrations and should forget about the bequest and patience story because this story has been debunked to such an extent that no one has a chance to speak a word.

Interpretation 3: Taqiyyah

Although whatever was mentioned above regarding patience has properly debunked this aspect as well, I nevertheless wish to discuss this word separately.

Some Shī'ī scholars says that Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه was commanded to observe Taqiyyah, hence he was excused and forced. He fulfilled the divine command by contracting the nikāḥ and fulfilling the divine command brings reward. The author of *Nuzhah Ithnā 'Ashariyyah* has written this theme in the following words in answer to Tuḥfah:

قائلین به تقیه می گویند که شارع فعلی را که بطریق تقیه واقع شود مقام مامور به قرار داده پس در اینجا اور دن ایں امتثال امر الہی ست و ایں معنی مقتضی اجرست

Some say on behalf of Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه that he practiced Taqiyyah. Whatever is done with Taqiyyah has been commanded by Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. Therefore, marrying Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm رضي الله عنها out of Taqiyyah was fulfilling the command of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى which is rewarding.

Similarly, Sayyid Murtaḍā who is titled “‘Ilm al-Hudā” and Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī have also mentioned that what Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه did was nothing more than Taqiyyah. This text of Nuzhah's author is the exact translation of what appears under objection four in Maṣā'ib al-Nawāṣib. The crux of these narrations is that Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه performed the nikāḥ out of Taqiyyah and since he was commanded to practice Taqiyyah, he is deserving of reward. However, the Taqiyyah interpretation is debunked due to many reasons.

Reason 1

Taqiyyah is an allegation of the Shī'ah against the noble A'imma. No Imām ever practiced Taqiyyah nor was he instructed to do so. I will prove this in the Taqiyyah discussion, Allah willing.

Reason 2

There are two reasons for practicing Taqiyyah, viz. either fear for one's life or fear for one's honour. His honour is lost by performing this nikāḥ. Hence, there can be no fear for this which may necessitate Taqiyyah. Furthermore, Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه was not commanded to practice Taqiyyah out of fear for his life. The Shī'ah scholars have accepted this as 'Allāmah Kantarī writes in *Taqīb al-Makā'id*:

شیعیان ہر گر نمی گویند کہ حضرت امیر المومنین بہ سب خوف ہلاکت جان خود ترک قتل و قتال ابو بکر کردہ بود بلکہ می گویند کہ حضرت امیر المومنین بیچک از فرائض و واجبات را ترک نہ کردہ و تقیہ بجہت خوف ہلاکت جان خود نبود بلکہ بجہت خوف ہتک عرض و ناموس بود

The Shī'ah have never ever said that Sayyidunā Amīr al-Mu'minīn did not fight and challenge Abū Bakr out of fear for his life. The Shī'ah declare that he did not abandon any farḍ or wājib. His Taqiyyah was not out of fear for losing his life but to protect his honour and reputation.

Reason 3

If we accept that Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه feared for his life, the Shī'ah will not accept this since there are plenty Shī'ah narrations which prove that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and Sayyidunā 'Umar رضي الله عنه on many occasions tried to kill Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه but were unsuccessful due to the latter's bravery. Mullā Bāqir Majlisī writes in *Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn*^{1,2}:

After Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه rebuked and scolded Abū Bakr and 'Umar regarding Fadak and confronted them, Abū Bakr called 'Umar and said, "you saw what 'Alī did today. If he does this again, all our work will be ruined." Hearing this 'Umar said, "my advice is that he be killed." Khālid ibn al-Walīd was selected for this task and the time for Fajr Ṣalāh was fixed for his assassination. Accordingly, Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه came to the Masjid for Fajr Ṣalāh and stood behind Abū Bakr to perform ṣalāh out of Taqiyyah,

1 The original text will appear in the Taqiyyah discussion

2 Quṭb al-Dīn Rāwindī has narrated a similar narration in *al-Kharā'ij wa al-Jarā'ih* pg. 123 – Mumbai print

while Khālid tied his sword and stood next to him. However, when Abū Bakr sat to recite tashahhud, he felt embarrassed and feared turmoil and recalled the sternness, influence and bravery of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and was struck with such fear that he could not complete the ṣalāh. He continued repeating tashahhud but could not make salām out of fear. Finally, he told Khālid, “do not carry out what I told you to.” After the ṣalāh, Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه asked Khālid, “what did Abū Bakr command you to do.” He replied, “he ordered me to kill you and had he not prevented me, I would have certainly killed you.” Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه went into a rage, grabbed Khālid and dropped him on to the ground. ‘Umar began screaming and the people gathered around, so Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه left Khālid and caught hold of ‘Umar’s collar reprimanding, “had it not been for Rasūlullāh’s صلى الله عليه وسلم bequest and divine fate, you would have seen who is weak; me or you.” It appears in one narration that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه picked up Khālid with one finger and throttled him so hard that he almost died. Khālid defecated, his legs trembled and he did not say a word. Whoever came close to help him, the lion of Allah سبحانه وتعالى gave him such a stern look that he returned out of fear. Finally, Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه came and saved Khalid by taking an oath.

O Shī’ah! Look at this narration and admire the bravery and chivalry of Rasūlullāh’s صلى الله عليه وسلم waṣī. Then have a look at Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm’s رضي الله عنها nikāḥ. Now think, had the nikāḥ taken place forcefully against the will of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, then it is impossible that Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه or anyone else had the ability to frighten Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and take his daughter while Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه says nothing out of fear. If Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه warned him and threatened to kill him, then why did Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه keep quiet? Why did he not pick Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه up with one finger and drop him on the ground and if anyone came to assist, why did he not look at him angrily? If we accept Mullā Bāqir Majlisī’s narration, then all of this does not seem to make any sense to us. How could Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه be so scared and incapable in the incident of Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm’s رضي الله عنها nikāḥ that he remains silent and allows his innocent daughter to be taken away?

If you still do not have full conviction, I will bring another narration to prove the bravery of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. Mullā Bāqir Majlisī writes in *Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn*:

بعد از غضب فدک حضرت امیر المومنین به ابو بکر نامه نوشت جر نهایت شدت و حدت و تهدید و وعید بسیار در آن درج نمود چون ابو بکر نامه را خواند بسیار ترسید و خواست که فدک را و خلافت را بر دور کند

After Abū Bakr usurped Fadak, Sayyidunā Amīr al-Mu‘minīn رضي الله عنه wrote him an extremely harsh letter wherein he sternly threatened and warned him. Abū Bakr was overcome with fear after reading the letter to the extent that he intended to surrender Fadak and the khilāfah.

This also is clear proof that just by one harsh letter of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه is so frightened that he is prepared to give up Fadak and the khilāfah. So what stopped Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه in Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm’s رضي الله عنها case from writing to Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه reminding him of his bravery and chivalry and frightening him by mentioning the harshness and sternness he displayed previously? There is no Shī‘ī narration stating that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه wrote a letter or threatened Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه. Even if he only did this, then too it would have been sufficient. However, Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s رضي الله عنه silence in such a sensitive situation that does not make sense and the reason of practicing Taqiyyah in such a crucial matter is unfathomable. Probably there is a mystery from the mysteries of Imāmah here which we cannot possibly grasp. No one can understand the mysteries of Imāmah besides a close angel, a deputed Nabī and a perfect believer. Mullā Bāqir Majlisī has stated this in *Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn*:

غائب احوال و خفا یای اسرار ایشان را خلق نمیداند و تاب شنیدن آنها ندارد مگر ملک مقررے یا پیغمبر مرسلے یا مومن کاملے که حق تعالی دل اورا امتحان کرده باشد و بنور ایمان منور گردانیده باشد

The creation do not know about the secrets and mysteries of the A‘immah and do not have the capacity to even hear them besides a close angel, a deputed Nabī or a perfect believer whose heart Allah سبحانه وتعالى has tested and lit up with the light of imān.

At this juncture, a ḥadīth of Imām al-Bāqir رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ comes to mind which al-Kulaynī has related through a reliable isnād concerning the ten signs of an Imām. He writes that the ninth sign is that the excretion of the Imām smells like musk and that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى has appointed the earth to swallow it.¹

Shame on the Shī'ah that when it comes to the Imām's excretion then they believe that the earth swallows it and it does not have a stench but in fact releases a musk scent but when it comes to the heart of the Imām then they say that someone usurped her. O Shī'ah! Why does the earth swallow the Imām's excretion and why did Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى put the scent of musk in it? For this reason that excretion is impure. If it stays on the ground, insects will spread, stench will spread and people will have an aversion to it. And since it has a connection with the Imām — although it is a far connection. Hence, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى commanded the earth to swallow the excretion to show the Imām's virtue. So why is Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا — a part of the queen of all women and a part of Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ — so cheap in Allah's سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى sight that He did not protect her and safeguard her from the clutches of a usurper? Did she not have any connection with Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and with Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا? Was the honour of Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ not blemished by her honour being taken? Was the reputation of the A'immaḥ not tainted by her being abducted?

Brothers! Ponder deeply!. Reflect! Have some shame! Do not be prejudiced! Your only option is to acknowledge that Sayyidunā 'Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was worthy of marriage, otherwise how are you going to answer this allegation?

Fourth View

When the Shī'ah realised that all their interpretations viz. patience, bequest, taqiyyah have failed, some of them made a new claim and rejected the consummation of the marriage. The author of *Sayf Ṣārim* says:

1 *Uṣūl Kāfi* pg. 246; *al-Shāfi tarjamah Kāfi* vol. 2 pg. 394

Although in reality having sexual relations with the pure innocent girl which is the object of marriage did not take place as acknowledged by the aged man and it was certainly impossible due to her young age and this was known to Amīr al-Mu'minīn externally and internally owing to knowledge of the internal.

The same author writes after a few pages:

If the people of īmān wish to see clearly for themselves, they may read authentic books like *Mawā'iz Ḥusayniyyah Janāb Ghufrān Ma'āb* etc., and it will be manifest that sexual relations between husband and wife never took place. No doubt, it is established through authentic narrations of the pure Ahl al-Bayt that outwardly Amīr al-Mu'minīn was grieved and distressed. However, sexual relations with the innocent girl never took place. Rather, through a miracle of the kindest creator, a female Jinn in the form of the innocent girl was handed over and the innocent girl was hidden from the eyes of people until the old man lived. Detailed books have added emphasis.

Since the author of *Sayf Ṣārim* gave reference to distinguished books, many have an interest to see these books and find out what subtleties and mysteries their seniors have written. Hence, I will quote their great scholars' statements and will not leave the readers in suspense.

Quṭb al-Aqṭāb Rāwindī has made a claim in *Kharā'ij wa Jarā'ih* which Mowlānā Dildār 'Alī Qiblah has explained in the following words in *Mawā'iz Ḥusayniyyah*:

گفت عرض نمودم بخدمت حضرت علیه السلام که مخالفین بر ما حجت می آرند و میگویند که چرا علی دختر خود را به خلیفه ثانی پس حضرت صلوة الله علیه تکیه کرده نشستند بودند درست نشسته فرمودند که ای چنین حرفهای گویند بدرستی که قومی چنین زعم می کند لا یتدون سواء السبیل سبحان الله حضرت امیر را این قدر قدرت نبود که حائل شود میان خلیفه و دختر خود دروغ میگویند که هرگز چنین نبود بدرستی که چون خلیفه ثانی پیغام عقد را به حضرت امیر داد حضرت انکار نمودند پس خلیفه ثانی عباس گفت که اگر دخت علی را بمن عقد نمی کنی سقایت و زمزم از دست تو میگیرم پس عباس بخدمت امیر آمده حقیقت حال را می گفت حضرت انکار نمودند چون عباس باز الحاح نمود حضرت امیر باعجاز خود جنبه را از اهل نجران طلبیدند و او یهودیه بود پس او بموجب امر بصورت ام کلثوم مثل

گردید و حضرت امیر ام کلثوم را باعجاز خود از نظریا مستور گردانیدند پس تا مدت در از جنیه پیش او ماندنا اینکه یک روز به بعضی از قرائن دریافت نمود که زن او ام کلثوم نیست بلکه از بنی ادم بهم نیست گفت ندیدم ام ساحر تر از بنی باشم کسی را و چون خواست که این امر را اظهار نمایند خود کشته شد پس جنیه بخانه خود رفت و ام کلثوم ظاهر گردید ... انتہی

I asked Imām Ja'far Ṣādiq عليه السلام, “the Ahl al-Sunnah use this as proof against us and question why Sayyidunā ‘Alī عليه السلام gave his daughter to the second khalīfah?” The Imām who was reclining on a pillow sat up and said, “do people say such things? People who think such things cannot find the straight path. Did Amīr not have the power to come in between the second khalīfah and his daughter? Those who say this are liars. What actually transpired was that when the second khalīfah sent a proposal to Amīr, he flatly refused. The second khalīfah threatened Sayyidunā ‘Abbās عليه السلام, “if ‘Alī does not marry his daughter to me, I will take away from you the service of giving water and zam zam [to the pilgrims].” Thereupon, Sayyidunā ‘Abbās عليه السلام came to Amīr عليه السلام and told him what happened but Amīr عليه السلام refused. Thereafter, due to the persistence of Sayyidunā ‘Abbās عليه السلام, Amīr عليه السلام — as a miracle — requested for a female Jinn, who was Jewess from the inhabitants of Najrān. She took the form of Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm عليها السلام with Amīr’s عليه السلام command and Amīr عليه السلام hid Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm عليها السلام away from the people as a form of a miracle. Like this the Jinn stayed with the second khalīfah for a long time. One day the second khalīfah found out by some sign that his wife was not Umm Kulthūm and was not even a human being to which he commented, “I never saw anyone practice more witchcraft than the Banū Hāshim. When he intended to reveal this, he was killed. The Jewess Jinn went to her home and Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm عليها السلام emerged.

O Shī'ah! Clap hands at the knowledge and intelligence of Quṭb al-Aqṭāb and Dildār ‘Alī and thank them. They have solved the entire problem by one subtlety and have answered the objections of the Sunnī Nawāṣib by one intricacy. They have rejected that Sayyidunā ‘Umar عليه السلام had relations with her to protect her honour and chastity and have claimed that Sayyidunā Amīr عليه السلام performed a miracle by ordering a female Jinn to take the form of Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm

ﷺ. In fact, all the objections of the Nawāṣib have been completely debunked by this explanation. Now, no one can say a word about Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm’s ﷺ chastity. No one can say that Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ was weak. No one can claim the virtue of the second khalīfah and no one can point a finger at the honour and nobility of the Ahl al-Bayt. However, it is worthy to ask regarding this explanation that the child begotten from this nikāḥ — Sayyidunā Zayd ibn ‘Umar ﷺ who passed away after puberty — was he from the Jinn who took her form or from Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm ﷺ?

Addendum

Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm’s ﷺ Nikāḥ

By Shaykh Muḥammad Firāsat

After the verified and detailed response presented by the author ﷺ concerning Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm bint ‘Alī’s ﷺ nikāḥ to Sayyidunā ‘Umar ﷺ and the method he adopted in proving its authenticity through the noble A’immah’s statements and the Shī’ī scholars’ testimonies; no one — who wishes to understand this incident with sincerity and honesty — can reject the occurrence of this nikāḥ. To reject this nikāḥ is to deny the sun in broad daylight.

It is far worse that the guardians and custodians of this religion those who are known as *fakhr al-muḥaqqiqīn* (pride of the researchers) and *Ayatollahs* (signs of Allah) are victim to this. The truth is that such people intentionally present plain and simple topics in such philosophical and theoretical complex ways with the intent of throwing the masses into utter confusion. The glorious Qur’ān has spoken about these very people:

﴿ ٤٢ ﴾ وَلَا تَلْبِسُوا الْحَقَّ بِالْبَاطِلِ وَتَكْتُمُوا الْحَقَّ وَأَنْتُمْ تَعْلَمُونَ

And do not mix the truth with falsehood or conceal the truth while you know [it].¹

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 42

A few days back, a friend sent two books on this topic for me to read. The first book is written by Fakhr al-Muḥaqqiqīn of the Shī'ah, the former principal of Iṣlāḥ, Mowlānā Sayyid 'Alī Ḥaydar (d. 1380 A.H) exclusively on this topic with the title 'Aqd Umm Kulthūm. The second book is the ideological work of Mowlānā Sayyid Kalb Jawād ibn Mowlānā Kalb 'Ābid which he wrote in reply to Mowlānā Muḥammad Manẓūr Nu'mānī's رَحِمَهُ اللهُ book *Īrānī Inqilāb Imām Khomeini awr Shī'yyat* by the name *Iran kā Islāmī Inqilāb Fitnah Wahhābiyyat awr Shī'yyat*.

The above author has discussed Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm's رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا nikāḥ on page 225 of this book but did not present any new proof. He just gave a summary of the proofs of Fakhr al-Muḥaqqiqīn. It is also understood from Mowlānā Sayyid 'Alī Ḥaydar's book that prior to him, his respected father — Sayyid al-Mutakallimīn (leader of the theologians) and Ayatollahs of the universe — Sayyid 'Alī Aẓhar Qiblah had written two books on this topic, viz. *Kanz Maktūm fī Ḥill 'Aqd Umm Kulthūm and Raf' al-Wuthūq 'an Nikāḥ al-Fārūq*. The author must have wrote his book thinking these books to be insufficient.

Mowlānā Sayyid 'Alī Ḥaydar in this book tries to prove that Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm bint 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا was the daughter of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ but stumbles at every step. He writes at one place, “how could Sayyidunā Amīr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ marry his daughter to 'Umar? Was he not aware of this verse of the Qur'ān:

الْخَبِيثَاتُ لِلْخَبِيثِينَ وَالْخَبِيثُونَ لِلْخَبِيثَاتِ ۖ وَالطَّيِّبَاتُ لِلطَّيِّبِينَ وَالطَّيِّبُونَ لِلطَّيِّبَاتِ ۗ

Evil women are for evil men, and evil men are for evil women. And pure women are for pure men, and pure men are for pure women.¹

Fakhr al-Muḥaqqiqīn means that when Allah's سُبْحَانَكَ وَعَالٍ emphatic command has been revealed in the glorious Qur'ān, then how can a man like Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ — an ardent follower of the sharī'ah — marry a believing woman to a munāfiq?

1 Sūrah al-Nūr: 26

Whether Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s ﷺ honour was shielded from that blemish (what he deems as a blemish) by his proof or not, is a different story. However, he has blemished the honour of Rasūlullāh ﷺ who according to the Shī‘ah married two munāfiqs and remained married to them until his demise. So either Rasūlullāh ﷺ was ignorant of this verse or he opposed it intentionally, Allah ﷻ forbid, this is impossible. So now you have to accept them both (i.e. Sayyidah ‘Ā’ishah and Sayyidah Ḥaḥḥah ﷺ) as true believers which is contrary to Shī‘ī belief. It is an amazing divine phenomena of revenge that whenever a person rejects realities, he deliberately or inadvertently demolishes his own principles.

Fakhr al-Muḥaqqiqīn writes the crux of his entire research at the end of the book under the heading, the actual reality of this slander.

Immediately after the demise of Abū Bakr, his daughter was born in 13 A.H whose name was kept Umm Kulthūm. See *al-Istī‘āb, Tārīkh Ṭabarī, Tārīkh Kāmil*, etc. And since his wife Asmā’ married Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ thereafter, she brought this daughter to his house. All the mentioned incidents are with regard to this Umm Kulthūm — the daughter of Abū Bakr and Asmā’. Just because she stayed in Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s ﷺ house, people thought that she was his daughter. The historians and Muḥaddithīn of the Ahl al-Sunnah were affected by the unlimited schemes and plots of the Banū Umayyah and mistakenly took Umm Kulthūm — the daughter of Abū Bakr and Asmā’ — as the daughter of Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ and Sayyidah Fāṭimah ﷺ since she also lived in Amīr’s house.¹

A few points are taken out from this text of Mowlānā Sayyid ‘Alī Ḥaydar.

1. The Umm Kulthūm who was married to Sayyidunā ‘Umar ﷺ was not the daughter of Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ but the daughter of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ﷺ.

1 Ḥaḍrat Umm Kulthūm pg. 166/167

2. Her mother's name was not Fāṭimah but Sayyidah Asmā' bint 'Umays رضي الله عنها.¹
3. This Umm Kulthūm came with her mother Asmā' to Amīr's رضي الله عنه house.
4. The historians and muḥaddithīn of the Ahl al-Sunnah mistakenly took Umm Kulthūm — the daughter of Abū Bakr and Asmā' — as the daughter of Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه and Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها.

The entire foundation upon which Mowlānā Sayyid 'Alī Ḥaydar erected his building is baseless. A novice student studying history will know that the mother of Umm Kulthūm — daughter of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه — was Sayyidah Ḥabībah bint Khārijah رضي الله عنها and not Sayyidah Asmā' bint 'Umays رضي الله عنها. There is no need to find confirmation of this from the book of any “Sunnī Nāṣibī” or the footnotes of the Banū Umayyah. In fact, you only need to look at the popular Shī'ī history book *Nāsikh al-Tawārikh* whose author is Mirzā Muḥammad Taqī Khān. He was the prime minister of Sulṭān Nāṣir al-Dīn Qāchār — the king of Iran — and received the title *Lisān al-Mulk* from the court of the king owing to his experience, excellence and appreciation.²

1 Sayyidah Asmā' bint 'Umays Khath'amīyah رضي الله عنها has the special virtue of being among the first Muhājirīn. She is among the emigrants to Abyssinia. 'Allāmah Ibn Sa'd رحمته الله and Ibn Hishām رحمته الله have stated that when Sayyidah Asmā' bint 'Umays رضي الله عنها accepted Islam there were only 30 Muslims at that time. She was first married to Sayyidunā 'Alī's رضي الله عنه elder brother Sayyidunā Ja'far Ṭayyār ibn Abī Ṭālib رضي الله عنه. She bore three sons for him, viz. 'Abd Allah, Muḥammad and 'Own. Sayyidunā Ja'far رضي الله عنه was martyred in the Battle of Mūtah. Six months later, Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم married her to his beloved companion Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه in the year 8 A.H (around the time the Battle of Ḥunayn occurred). She bore one son for him Muḥammad. After Sayyidunā Abū Bakr's رضي الله عنه demise in 13 A.H, she married Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه. At that time, Sayyidunā Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr's رضي الله عنه age was about 3. He came to Sayyidunā 'Alī's رضي الله عنه house with his mother and was nurtured by him. She bore one son for Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه by the name Yahyā. Not long after the martyrdom of Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه in 40 A.H, Sayyidah Asmā' رضي الله عنها also left this world. (Shaykh Muḥammad Firāsāt)

2 'Aqd Umm Kulthūm by Mowlānā 'Abd al-Mu'min Fārūqī pg. 27

Mirzā Muḥammad Taqī Khān writes on page 761 of *Nāsikh al-Tawārīkh* concerning Sayyidah Ḥabībah bint Khārijah رضي الله عنها:

Ḥabībah bint Khārijah bin Zayd ibn Abī Zubayr ibn Mālik ibn Imrā' al-Qays ibn Mālik ibn Tha'labah ibn Ka'b ibn Khazraj. She was the wife of Abū Bakr and was expecting at the time of his death. After his demise, she gave birth to a girl who Sayyidah 'Ā'ishah رضي الله عنها named Umm Kulthūm. 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb asked for her hand in marriage but she refused saying, "I cannot live with a strict man like 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb."

The same historian writes about the children of Sayyidah Ḥabībah bint Khārijah رضي الله عنها — wife of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه at another place:

در وقت وفات ابو بكر حامله بود پس ازوے دخترے اورد نام او ام كلثوم است

She was pregnant at the demise of Abū Bakr. She bore a girl whose name was Umm Kulthūm.¹

A shī'ī historian has demolished the entire foundation upon which Fakhr al-Muḥaqqiqīn built his building. It is established that Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm bint Abī Bakr's رضي الله عنها mother's name was not Asmā' but Sayyidah Ḥabībah bint Khārijah رضي الله عنها. Hence, when Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه married Sayyidah Asmā' bint 'Umays رضي الله عنها, there is no question of Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm bint Abī Bakr رضي الله عنها coming to his house.

کعبہ کس منہ سے جاوگے غالب شرم تم کو مگر نہیں اتی

Ghālib! What face will you show by the Ka'bah?

You have absolutely no shame!

Undoubtedly it is true that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه had a child from Sayyidah Asmā' bint 'Umays رضي الله عنها. However, it was not a girl but a boy whose name was

1 *Nāsikh al-Tawārīkh* pg. 215

Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr. Accordingly, the same historian states in the biography of Sayyidah Asmā' bint 'Umays رضي الله عنها:

She was first married to Sayyidunā Ja'far رضي الله عنه. She accompanied him in the emigration to Abyssinia. She with her husband Sayyidunā Ja'far ibn Abī Ṭālib رضي الله عنه came to Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم on the day of the Conquest of Khaybar. When Sayyidunā Ja'far رضي الله عنه was martyred, she married Abū Bakr.

These words follow:

و محمد بن ابی بکر از و متولد شد و بعد از ابو بکر علی علیه السلام اورا تزویج بست و یکی از و متولد شد

Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr was born from this union. After Abū Bakr's demise, she married Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه and bore Yaḥyā for him.¹

I will now substantiate from Shī'ī books that the Umm Kulthūm who was married to Sayyidunā 'Umar رضي الله عنه was not the daughter of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه but the daughter of Sayyidunā 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رضي الله عنه. Mirzā Muḥammad Taqī Khān writes in *Nāsikh al-Tawārīkh*:

ام کلثوم بنت علی علیه السلام عمر بن خطاب ویرا تزویج کرد و ازوے زید و رقیه متولد شد وفات ام کلثوم و پیش در وقت واحد بود و ما قصه اورا در کتاب عمر به شرح کتاب عمر نوشتیم

'Umar ibn Khaṭṭāb married Umm Kulthūm bint 'Alī رضي الله عنه. Zayd and Ruqayyah were born from this union. Umm Kulthūm and her son (Zayd) passed away at the same time. We have written his story in Kitāb 'Umar.

It has been established from the above text of *Nāsikh al-Tawārīkh* that Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm — the wife of Sayyidunā 'Umar رضي الله عنه — was the daughter of Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه. However, she being the daughter of Sayyidah Fāṭimah Zahrā' رضي الله عنها has not been established from this, therefore, I will substantiate this from Shī'ī books.

1 *Nāsikh al-Tawārīkh* gp. 718

The famous Shīrī historian of the 13th century Mirzā ‘Abbās ‘Alī Qillī Khān (who is the successor of the author of *Nāsikh al-Tawārīkh* and the prime minister of the king Qāchār of Iran) in his book *Tārīkh Ṭarāz Madhab Muẓaffarī* has titled a chapter; the incident of Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm’s ﷺ marriage to ‘Umar ibn Khaṭṭāb. This stretches from page 47 to 67 in the Iran print. He writes:

جناب ام کلثوم کبری دختر فاطمه زهرا در سرائے عمر بن خطاب بود و ازوے فرزند بیا ورد چنانکه مذکور گشت و چون عمر مقتول شد محمد بن جعفر بن ابی طالب اورا در حبالہ نکاح آورد

Sayyidah Fāṭimah Zahrā’s ﷺ daughter — Umm Kulthūm — was in ‘Umar ibn Khaṭṭāb’s house. She bore a son who has been mentioned previously. When ‘Umar was killed, Muḥammad ibn Ja‘far ibn Abī Ṭālib married her.¹

The same historian opens the discussion on whether the children of Sayyidah Fāṭimah Zahrā’s ﷺ daughters can be called the children of Rasūlullāh ﷺ or not. He writes in this discussion:

اما گفته انداز خصائص رسول خدا صلی الله علیه و اله ست که فرزندان فاطمه سلام الله علیها یان حضرت نسبت دیند لاکن در حق دختر ان دخترش این عنوان را جاری نداشته اند پس جریان امر در حق ایشان بر قانون شرع است درین که ولد در نسب با پدر می رود نه بهادر به ہمیں سپ گویند پسر شریف را اگر پدرش شریف نہ باشد شریف نمی خوانند پس فرزندان فاطمه به رسول خدا منسوب و اولاد حسن و حسین رضی الله عنہما بایشان و اینحضرت صلی الله علیه و سلم منسوب باشد و فرزندان خواہبران ایشان زینب خاتون و ام کلثوم بہ پدران خود عبد الله بن جعفر و عمر بن خطاب نسبت برند نہ بهادر و نہ برسول خدا صلی الله علیه و سلم زیراکہ ایشان فرزندان دختر بنت اینحضرت ہستند نہ فرزندان دخترش

The scholars write that this is the speciality of Rasūlullāh ﷺ that the children of Sayyidah Fāṭimah ﷺ are called his children. However, this does not apply to Sayyidah Fāṭimah’s ﷺ daughter’s daughters. The same general ruling applies to them which is according to the shar‘ī law that the child follows his father in lineage and not his mother. For this reason, if a person’s father is not noble, he will not be called noble. Therefore,

1 *Tārīkh Ṭarāz Madhab Muẓaffarī*; the chapter of the incident of Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm’s ﷺ marriage to Sayyidunā ‘Umar ibn Khaṭṭāb ﷺ

Sayyidah Fāṭimah's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا children will be called Rasūlullāh's صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ children and Ḥasanayn's¹ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا children will be theirs and Rasūlullāh's صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ children. Ḥasanayn's sisters, i.e. Zaynab and Umm Kulthūm's children will be linked to their respective fathers, i.e. 'Abd Allah ibn Ja'far and 'Umar ibn Khaṭṭāb and not to their mothers or to Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ since these are the children of Rasūlullāh's صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ daughter's daughters and not Rasūlullāh's صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ daughter's sons.²

I will now present such a Shī'ī mujtahid's authentication of this nikāḥ who is most well-known in the Shī'ī world and who the greatest Shī'ī mujtahid of the 14th century — the leader of the Iranian revolution and the highest Ayatollah Rūḥ Allah Khomeini — has emphasised the reading of his books, i.e. the renowned Shī'ī mujtahid of the 11th century Mullā Bāqir Majlisī. He has written on this topic in many of his books. He has written a detailed discussion on this in *Uṣūl al-Kāfī wa Furū' al-Kāfī*'s commentary *Mir'āt al-'Uqūl* (vol. 3 pg. 448/449 the chapter of Umm Kulthūm's marriage, old print, Iran) where he answers those who deny this nikāḥ. Towards the end of the discussion, he acknowledges this nikāḥ in the following words:

و الاصل فى الجواب ان ذلك وقع على سبيل التقية و الاضطرار

The original answer is that this nikāḥ took place due to Taqiyyah and necessity.

When it is substantiated through the acknowledgement of Shī'ī Mujtahidīn, Muḥaddithīn and historians that the Umm Kulthūm who was married to Sayyidah 'Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا was not the daughter of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and Sayyidah Asmā' bint 'Umays but the daughter of Sayyidunā 'Alī Murtaḍā and Sayyidah Fāṭimah al-Zahrā' and Ḥasanayn's biological sister رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, this claim of Mowlānā Sayyid 'Alī Ḥaydar carries absolutely no weight:

1 Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا

2 *Tārīkh Ṭarāz Madhab Muẓaffarī* with reference to Abū al-A'immaḥ kī ta'līm pg. 34/35

The historians and Muḥaddithīn of the Ahl al-Sunnah were affected by the unlimited schemes and plots of the Banū Umayyah and mistakenly took Umm Kulthūm — the daughter of Abū Bakr and Asmā’ — as the daughter of Sayyidunā ‘Alī عليه السلام and Sayyidah Fātimah عليها السلام.

The truth is that Fakhr al-Muhaqqiqīn wrote this sentence to keep the Shī‘ah masses in the dark which displays his agitation and distress. It also appeases the propensity to level every accusation against the Banū Umayyah and the Ahl al-Sunnah.

We appeal to the Shī‘ah to overcome doggedness and prejudice and ponder over the facts carefully. They have four books (which are known as the *Uṣūl Arba‘ah*) which are the most reliable and authentic of all their books.

1. *Al-Kāfi* by Muḥammad ibn Ya‘qūb al-Kulaynī al-Rāzī (d. 329 A.H)
2. *Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu al-Faqīh* by al-Shaykh Ṣadūq Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Babuwayh al-Qummī (d. 381 A.H)
3. *Al-Istibṣār* by Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī Shaykh al-Ṭā‘ifah (d. 460 A.H)
4. *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām* also by Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī Shaykh al-Ṭā‘ifah

Authentic declarations of the noble A‘immah regarding Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm’s عليها السلام nikāḥ are found in these *Uṣūl Arba‘ah* besides *Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu al-Faqīh*. Moreover, the infallible Imām has deduced laws from this nikāḥ. The scholars are familiar of what incidents the noble scholars present as examples while presenting their verdicts. The infallible Imām has used the incident of Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm عليها السلام as an example for his verdict. It appears in *Furū‘ al-Kāfi* (Nowl Kashowr Lucknow print June 1886 vol. 2 pg. 311) in the chapter regarding a woman whose husband has passed away and the marriage was consummated; where will she pass her ‘iddah and what is binding upon her:

عن سليمان بن خالد قال سألت ابا عبد الله عليه السلام عن امرأة توفى عنها زوجها ابن تعتد في بيت زوجها او حيث شاءت قال بل حيث شاءت ثم قال ان عليا صلوات الله عليه لما مات عمر اتي ام كلثوم فاخذ بيدها فانطلق الى بيتها

Sulaymān ibn Khālid says, “I asked Abū ‘Abd Allah (al-Ṣādiq) regarding a woman whose husband has passed away; will she pass her ‘iddah in her husband’s house or wherever she desires.” He replied, “wherever she desires.” He then said, “when ‘Umar passed away, ‘Alī عليه السلام came to Umm Kulthūm, took her hand and went to her home.”

This verdict of Imām Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq عليه السلام is found verbatim in *al-Istibṣār* (vol. 3; chapters concerning ‘iddah pg. 185/186, new print of Ja‘fariyyah Nukhās printers; old print of Lucknow) and *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām* (pg. 238 Kitāb al-Ṭalāq; chapter of women’s ‘iddah, old Iran print 1316). Whoever wishes may refer to it there.

There appears a narration from Imām Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq عليه السلام who narrates from his father, Imām Muḥammad Bāqir عليه السلام, in *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām* (last volume; book on inheritance pg. 380; old print Iran):

عن جعفر عن ابيه قال ماتت ام كلثوم بنت علي و ابنها زيد بن عمر بن الخطاب في ساعة واحدة لا يدري ولا يدري ايهما هلك قبل فلم يورث احدهما من الاخر صلى عليهما جميعا

Ja‘far narrates from his father who says, “Umm Kulthūm bint ‘Alī and her son Zayd ibn ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb passed away at the exact same time. It was not known who passed away first so none inherited from the other. He performed Ṣalāt al-Janāzah on both of them.”

O readers! The above narration is sufficient in removing the veil which Mowlānā ‘Alī Ḥaydar tried to put over the reality. The one who Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى has blessed with even a little sound intelligence does not have to break his head to find the truth.

It is important to ask why Muḥammad ibn Ya‘qūb al-Kulaynī — who has the honour of having only one link between him and the eleventh Imām and whose book *al-*

Kāfi has been authenticated by the (fictitious) twelfth Imām — has this title; the chapter concerning Umm Kulthūm’s marriage; in his book? Furthermore, Shaykh al-Ṭā’ifah Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan al-Ṭūsī who has related this incident in his books *al-Istibṣār* and *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām*; Sharīf al-Murtaḍā author of *Shāfi* (d. 406); Shaykh Zayn al-Dīn Ahmad al-‘Āmilī — commonly known as the second martyr (d. 964 A.H); Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī — the third martyr (d. 1019); the renowned mujtahid of the 11th century Mullā Bāqir Majlisī (d. 1111 A.H); the famous Shīṭī historian of the 13th century Mirzā Muḥammad Taqī Khān — author of *Nāsikh al-Tawārīkh* and prime minister of Sulṭān Nāṣir al-Dīn Qāchār, king of Iran; his son Mirzā ‘Abbās ‘Alī Qillī Khān — author of *Tārīkh Ṭarāz Madhab Muẓaffarī* and prime minister of the king of Qāchār, as well as the Shīṭī scholar and mujtahid of the 14th century Shaykh ‘Abbās al-Qummī author of *Muntahā al-Āmāl*; have all recorded and accepted the nikāḥ of Sayyidunā ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb to Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm bint ‘Alī رضي الله عنه in their respective books. Were all of these boot lickers of the Ahl al-Sunnah and Banū Umayyah?

Nawāb Muḥsin al-Mulk رحمته الله has stated aptly in Āyāt Bayyināt that the Shī‘ah have changed many colours in this discussion and have presented ridiculous interpretations to it. Some have rejected the nikāḥ, some have rejected Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm being the daughter of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, some have referred to this nikāḥ as abduction, some reject consummation of the marriage, some say that a Jinn from Najrān assumed the appearance of Umm Kulthūm and would come to Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه who he would have relations with, some have understood it as Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s highest level of patience and others have said it is Taqīyyah. Everyone sings a new song and everyone has a different story. There are as many stories as there are mouths, but not one of them makes sense. The Shīṭī scholars are in a predicament. This couplet of Ghālib with slight variation aptly suits them:

بوجہ وہ سر پہ رکھا ہے جو اٹھائے نہ اٹھے باب وہ ان پڑی ہے جو بنائے نہ بنے

The burden that was put on the head could not be lifted by anyone

The door that was chosen could not be fitted by anyone

وَلَقَدْ أَنْزَلْنَا إِلَيْكَ آيَاتٍ بَيِّنَاتٍ ۖ وَمَا يَكْفُرُ بِهَا إِلَّا الْفَاسِقُونَ

And We have certainly revealed to you verses [which are] clear proofs, and no one would deny them except the defiantly disobedient.¹

وَقُلْ جَاءَ الْحَقُّ وَزَهَقَ الْبَاطِلُ ۗ إِنَّ الْبَاطِلَ كَانَ زَهُوقًا

And say, “Truth has come, and falsehood has departed. Indeed is falsehood, [by nature], ever bound to depart.”²

Chapter Two

Introduction

I have written concerning Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm’s رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا nikāḥ in great detail. I will now begin mentioning the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ. The virtues already listed from reliable Shīʿī books thus far displays the power of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, that notwithstanding the Shīʿah’s deep hatred for the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ, there are countless narrations of their virtues recorded in their own books. And until you do not quote these virtues verbatim and open the books to show it to them, they will adamantly deny these virtues to the best of their abilities. Accordingly, Moulānā Dildār ‘Alī writes in his *Ṣawārim*:

اما احاديث فضائل صحابه رضی الله عنهم از طريق اماميه باوجود كثر احاديث مختلفه در بر امر جزئی از جزئیات اصلیه و فرعیه اگر تمام كتب احاديث اماميه ورقا ورفا به نیت تفحص بهطالعہ در ایرند مطنون اینست که زیاده از سه چهار حدیث که سر و پادر ست نداشته باشد دست بهم ندید اما احاديث مثالب و معائب این با بلا اغراق این ست که متجاوز از هزار حدیث باشد

Aḥādīth extolling the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah with regards to details and concerning principles and divisions are plenty. However, if every page of all the aḥādīth books of the Shīʿah are studied thoroughly, then only

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 99

2 Sūrah Banī Isrāʾīl: 81

three to four aḥādīth (mentioning their virtue) will be found. Moreover, the quality and authenticity of these aḥādīth is questionable. On the other hand, those aḥādīth which mention the Ṣaḥābah's evils are well over thousand in number.

However, this can be evaluated from our small treatise. There are more than a hundred narrations (without exaggeration) extolling the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ from reliable Shī'ī books mentioned in the first part of my book alone. I have already mentioned so many and I will now quote many more. If the Shī'ah can count to a hundred, they can count for themselves and decide whether more than a hundred narrations are found or not. They then should ponder over the answers of their scholars and display fairness — keeping in mind that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى is Omnipresent and All-seeing — and should weigh what I have written in refutation of their answers and then decide truthfully as to which pan is heavier. However, there is no cure for hatred and antagonism.

The Shī'ah harbour deep hatred and enmity for the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ and hence will never accept their virtues. They interpolate and misinterpret the words and meanings of the verse of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, the aḥādīth of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and the statements of the A'imma just to make sure that the Ṣaḥābah's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ greatness is not established. However, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى has declared:

يُرِيدُونَ أَنْ يُطْفِئُوا نُورَ اللَّهِ بِأَفْوَاهِهِمْ وَيَأْبَى اللَّهُ إِلَّا أَنْ يُتِمَّ نُورَهُ وَلَوْ كَرِهَ الْكَافِرُونَ ﴿٣٢﴾

They want to extinguish the light of Allah with their mouths, but Allah refuses except to perfect His light, although the disbelievers dislike it.¹

Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى reveals His friends' greatness from the enemies' tongues.

الفضل ما شهدت به الاعداء

What the enemy testifies to is real virtue.

1 Sūrah al-Towbah: 32

Hence, I have made a commitment to fill this part of my book with the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ from Shī'ī books to the extent that they will get tired of listening and reading and become our partners in faith. They should applaud their scholars who continue to deny the Ṣaḥābah's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ virtue notwithstanding the presence of such abundant reports. What is the worth of what their scholars have written in refutation of Sunnī books, especially the former mujtahidīn? They have in reality answered absolutely nothing and filled their books with expletives and ignorance. If anyone is in doubt, he should 'marvel' at the writings of Dildār 'Alī who transformed into an ignoramus when answering and has uttered profanity against each and every thing the scholars have written. However, the reality is that this mistake is not due to him being grounded in knowledge, but rather this mistake is the product of their behaviour, of cursing and defaming pure souls day and night which has rebounded onto them as the ḥadīth has stated. I have read many books of the Shī'ah in this science and many articles concerning 'aqā'id have passed my gaze, and I have found nothing but absurd arrogance in the majority of them. But the 'beauty' I saw in Qiblah Sayyid Dildār 'Alī's writings I did not see anywhere else. His methodology is that he firstly vilifies the opposing author and then declares his dissociation from him. Thereafter, he praises his own in-depth knowledge, expertise, and purity followed by mentioning the following regarding his writing:

گمان فقیر چنین ست کہ دریں جز و زمان چشم روزگار نظیر این کتاب ندیده و گوش بریں نشنیده

It is my humble opinion that the eyes of this era have not seen such a book and the ears of the seven heavens have not heard such a topic.

After this he discusses something completely off the topic and blackens pages after pages with such things which have absolutely no connection with the topic at hand. He begins enumerating the evils of the pious and blurts out whatever he wants regarding the friends of Allah سُبْحَانَكَ وَتَعَالَى. When he is done with this and finally pays attention to responding to the author's statements, he calls any Mu'tazilī, Shī'ī or random fellow a Sunnī scholar quoting his statements as substantiation against the opponent's views. If anyone has any misgivings, he should study *Dhū*

al-Fiqār or *Ṣawārim* and see for himself if whether what I am saying is true or not. What was the reason for cursing the pious in *Dhū al-Fiqār*? And what was achieved by quoting their poems and couplets from their elegies which the scholars do not even consider for the slightest moment in their debates and do not use as proof for any of their laws, whether primary or secondary? There was no other benefit but to lengthen his book and make it more voluminous by writing such drivel. Look at the condition of *Ṣawārim*. There is no page of it which is free from expletives. Nearly every line is blackened with obscenity and curses and every page is filled with bunkum and hogwash. Wherever he wishes to bring an opposing text as proof, he brings the rejected statements of his teacher and guide Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd¹ — the Mu‘tazilī and Shī‘ī. If any ignorant naïve Sunnī has to hear such a long name and see his lengthy Arabic text and find it in direct conflict to his religion and in conformity with the Shī‘ah, he will be perplexed and deceived into thinking that this is the writing of some great Sunnī scholar which is accepted by the ‘ulamā’ and will be cast into doubt. However, he was under the misconception that scholars too would be fooled into thinking that Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd is a Sunnī, whereas even amateur students in their first year of study are well aware that he is a Mu‘tazilī with Shī‘ī ideologies. To bring his statements as proof on behalf of the Ahl al-Sunnah is similar to quoting Zurārah and Hishām ibn Ḥakam (both Shī‘ah), and claiming them to be equally reliable in the sight of the Ahl al-Sunnah. Rather, they are brothers in light of the ḥadīth:

الكفر ملة واحدة

Kufr is one religion.

1 His name is ‘Izz al-Dīn ibn ‘Abd al-Ḥamīd ibn Abī al-Ḥasan ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd. He was born in the beginning of Dhū al-Ḥijjah in 586 A.H in Madā’in. The inhabitants of Madā’in were predominantly Shī‘ī. He also was washed away in their flood and accepted their creed. He has compiled a book on ‘aqā’id in poetic form, as is their custom, filled extremism and fanatical beliefs in its couplets. He travelled to Baghdad later in his life and veered towards i‘tizāl. The author of *Nuskhat al-Saḥar* has said, “after being an extremist Shī‘ī, he became a mu‘tazilī. He wrote a book *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah* consisting of 20 volumes for the library of the Shī‘ī minister Mu‘ayyid al-Dīn Muhammad ibn ‘Alqamī. When he completed writing it, he sent it to his brother Muwaffaq al-Dīn Abī Ṣālī who gifted him with 100 000 gold coins, a robe and a horse. (*Rowḍāt al-Jannāt* vol. 5 pg. 20/21) He died in Baghdad in the year 655 A.H. (Shaykh Muhammad Firāsāt)

Dildār ‘Alī’s book, *Ṣawārim*, is filled with such rejected statements. To top it off, he has such an ego that there remained no place left on the page when he began praising his own book. Not only does he boast about his book, he feels it below his dignity to be the opponent of Shāh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz and expresses his remorse for this. He says in the introduction of *Ṣawārim* that after writing an answer to Imām Rāzī’s book *Nihāyat al-‘Uqūl*, he does not have the desire to write another rebuttal:

چه معلوم ست و پیدا و ظاہر ست و ہویدا کہ چون شاه باز طبیعت بقید سبیرخ مضامین عالیہ خوگرفته باشد دیگر مخالفی بہمت خودرا بہ خون کرگس کندیدہ نیالاید و کیسکہ ابکارا افکار را بحالہ خود در آوردہ باشد نگاه التفات بہ طرف عجوزہ شویا نہ فرماید لیکن از انجا کہ روزگار نابہموار نمی گزارد کہ ارباب ہمہ عالیہ از دست سفلیہ ناس و بی خبردان حق ناشناس نجات یافتہ دمہ باستراحت بگزراند و ایارد شیاطین نمی شود کہ از اضلال بنی ادم دمہ تغافل نمایند قبل ازین تقریباً پنج شش سال باب دواز دہ از کتاب بعضے دوعے الاذنب در نقض مذہب عترت جناب رسالت مآب درین بلدہ کہ بالفعل محل اقامت فقیر ست بر دریافت و شبہات موبومہ و ہذیانات ملمعہ او دلہای عوام مومنین را منقبض ساخت چہال سنہاں را سر باوج مہابات رسید و این صحیفہ ملعونہ بلاشبہ عصائے کوری این کور باطنان گردید و احقر درین بات چول بدل خود رجوع می نمود نظر باین کہ مثل کتاب نہایۃ المعقول اما سنہاں را جواب گفتہ و از سر تا پای منتقض و باطل ساختہ بہر گز بہ نقض کلام نافرجام ناصب عداوت اہل بیت کہ از اول تا آخر اثر غباوت و غوایت ازان پیدا امارات بغض و عداوت عترت رسول ظاہر و ہویدا راضی نمی گردید و طرف گفتگو شدن با چنین جاہل مدبر عار دانستہ بہر گز بر خود نمی پسندید چون حال برین منوال مشاہدہ نمودم دل خود را مخاطب ساختہ گفتم کہ این مجادلہ و معارضہ کہ ترا با چنین جاہل غبی پیش آمدہ لیس اول قارورۃ کسرت فی الاسلام و طرف گفتگو شدن تو بمثال چنین نادرستان لیس ما اعجب من مجادلۃ الانبیاء الکرام و الاوصیاء الفخام مع معاصریم ہم الکفرۃ الفجرۃ اللہام چرا نظر نمی نمائی و نگاه التفات نمی فرمائی بحال جناب حضرت ابراہیم و حضرت موسی و جناب ہارون علیہ السلام کہ باین علوم و کمالات مبتلا گردیدند بہ مجادلہ نمودن بانہرود و مردود فرعون ملعون کہ از کمال جہل و غباوت باوجود ظہور اثار مخلوقیت و باوج امارات افتقار دعوی خدائی می کردند و ہم چنین نگاه کن بہ طرف جناب سید المرسلین صلی اللہ علیہ و سلم کہ بالاتفاق افضل و اکمل خلایق ست چگونہ مبتلا گردید مجادلہ جہال مشرکین قوم خود کہ بہ بسپ فرط جہالت جہادائے جندار کہ خود می تراشیدند عبادت و پرستش می نمودند و ہم چنین اند کے از خواب غفلت بیدار شود چشم بکشاد بہ بین جناب باب مدینۃ علم رسول را کہ بالاتفاق اعلم ناس بود بعد رسول خدا صلی اللہ علیہ و سلم چہ قسم مبتلا گردید بہ معارضہ و مجادلہ چند ناکس منافقین قریش و بہرگاہ حقیقت حال اینہنوں باشد ناچار عنان التفات عالی خود را بہ نقض کردن کلام مورد ملام او منعطف بایدساخت و بر استیصال ہذیانات بیہودہ او بہمت والا تہمت خود را باید گہاشت انتہی بلفظہ ملخصا

It is apparent and manifest that when a noble disposition has got accustomed to esteemed topics, he does not wish to spill the blood of virtues with his claws of courage and when he has taken a rare virgin beauty into his

wedlock then he will not lay with aged woman. Notwithstanding this, the unjust era does not leave the courageous from its ignoble clutches and instead leaves the thankless and ignorant. And Shayṭān is not negligent for a moment from leading people astray. Five or six years ago, some ordinary folk who live in this city (Lucknow) where I reside have written the twelfth chapter, the family of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, and confused the believers' hearts by their falsehood thereby causing the Sunnī's to raise their heads higher than usual. This accursed book is like a blind man's walking stick for those with blurred intelligence. I was thus prompted to write a logical treatise as an answer to utterly falsify this book. However, this book was filled with nothing but enmity for the Ahl al-Bayt from beginning to end. Hence, my heart was disinclined to it and I did not wish to engage with such ignoramus. I then told myself, "this confrontation between you and this ignorant moron is nothing new. To debate such worthless people is the same as how the noble Ambiyā' and honourable Awṣiyā' dealt with the kuffār, transgressors and wretched of their eras. Therefore, do not look at them. Do you not see that Sayyidunā Ibrāhīm عليه السلام, Sayyidunā Mūsā عليه السلام and Sayyidunā Hārūn عليه السلام notwithstanding their knowledge and expertise debated with wretched souls like Namrūd and Fir'awn, who claimed divinity. Similarly, the most superior and perfect – the Seal of the Prophets – Rasūlullāh ﷺ debated his polytheist nation who would carve idols out of rock and worship them due to compound ignorance. Wake up from your negligence and open your eyes and have a look at the city of knowledge, who possessed more knowledge than everyone after Rasūlullāh ﷺ, and who also confronted the munāfiqīn of Quraysh." When this is the reality, I will forcefully turn my lofty attention to the rebuttal and negation of this accursed book and I will completely destroy his falsehood.

These are the summarised words of Ṣawārim.

These lines are a sample of Dildār's holiness and behaviour, his ijtihād and dignity. The rest can be understood from here. However, I will not delve into this and I will not answer expletives with expletives like ordinary ignorant men. Yes, I do

ponder over his bragging and swaggering, and think that if only he could provide an answer like how he used obscenity and if only he could superbly answer Shāh’s objections like he superbly praised himself; then this praising would have been understandable and his self-praise would have been warranted. On the contrary, it is extremely disappointing that he did not display the pearl of his honourable nature in answering anything and his ijtihād and deep knowledge did not manifest itself in establishing any belief. He wrote the exact same things written by his leaders and remained silent. He quoted the same anecdotes which were passed on from generation to generation and finished his book. We are extremely disappointed that he likened himself to the courageous great Ambiyā’ and took the responsibility of Sayyidunā Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ, Sayyidunā Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ and Sayyidunā Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ on his shoulders and claimed to be the representative of the leader of the Awṣiyā’ — the door of the city of knowledge — and claimed to guide the creation and was forced to face a munāfiq ignorant opponent like Shāh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz — whose ‘ignorance’ and ‘incapability’ is not only known to the people of India but by the Arabs and non-Arabs throughout the world — and only bore this disgrace to protect the īmān and dīn of the Shī‘ah. But sadly he showed nothing and he did not fulfil his claim and listed himself among those scholars regarding whom Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ said in his khutbah:

و ان ابغض الخلق الى الله تعالى رجل قمش علماء اغار في اغباش الفتنة سماء اشياء الناس و اراذلهم
عالمًا و لم يعيش في العلم يوما سالما بكر فاستكثر مما قل منه خير مما كثر حتى اذا ارتوى من ماء اجن
و اكثر من غير طائل جلس للناس مفتيا لتخليص ما التبس على غيره فان نزلت به احدى المبهمات هبنا
لها من رائه حشو الرائي فهو من قطع الشبهات في مثل نسج العنكبوت لا يدرى اخطا ام اصاب ركاب
جهالات خباط عشوات لا يعتذر مما لا يعلم فيسلم و لا يعرض على العلم بضرر قاطع فيغنم تبكى منه
الدماء و تستحل بقضائه الفروج الحرام لاملئ و الله باصدار ما ورد عليه و لا هم اهل لما فوض اليه اولئك
الذي حلت عليهم المثالث و حقت عليهم النسيحة و البكاء ايام الحيرة الدنيا

The worst enemy of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَ تَعَالَى from the creation is the man who laps up pieces of information from here and there and rushes hastily towards the darkness of mischief and turmoil, and labels those people as scholars who have the appearances of humans but are devoid of humanity; whereas he is not occupied with knowledge for even a day. As soon as dawn breaks, he

gets involved in accumulating that which a little of is better than a lot (i.e. wealth), until when he has filled his belly with putrid water, he sits as a muftī and dares to explain complexities and intricacies with his nonsense. That person’s view has strength in its explanation which is like a spider web. He is unaware of whether he has erred or is correct. He walks like the blind and is short sighted in every matter. He neither presents his unawareness as an excuse in order to save himself from a calamity nor holds firmly onto knowledge so that it might benefit him. Much blood is spilled due to his verdicts which makes him cry and many unlawful private parts are legalised by his command. He is not worthy of answering what he is asked, nor is he capable of doing what he is tasked. He is among those upon whom punishment is about to descent and wailing for them for the entire lifetime is necessary.

Whatever I have written is substantiated by his own writings and answers. Allah willing, I will discuss all of his writings in answer to *Tuḥfah* in this book of mine and I will smite his face with his own hand using his own swords *Dhū al-Fiqār*, *Ṣawārim* and *Husām*. Whatever he has written in his books regarding whichever topic, I will quote all of it and display its beauty to his followers so that the opposition also testifies, if not with the tongue then definitely with the heart, to the Sunnī’s kalimah and recites the following verse until it reaches the skies:

وَقُلْ جَاءَ الْحَقُّ وَزَهَقَ الْبَاطِلُ ۗ إِنَّ الْبَاطِلَ كَانَ زَهُوقًا ﴿٨١﴾

And say, “Truth has come, and falsehood has departed. Indeed is falsehood, (by nature), ever bound to depart.”¹

I will now begin to mention what he wrote in this respect.

Whatever I have written thus far was concerning the Ṣaḥābah’s رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ virtues which I have written in great detail and proven from Shīʿī books and quoted the answers given by their scholars at their respective places. I will now relate those

1 Sūrah Banī Isrāʿīl: 81

declarations of the Shī'ah which they present in answer to all the verses and aḥādīth extolling the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ, coupled with quoting many narrations in their praise at different places.

The Shī'ī Answer to Verses Extolling the Virtues of the Ṣaḥābah

The general response the Shī'ah give to those verse which Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى has revealed regarding the Muhājirīn and their merits and declaring His happiness with them is that īmān and sincerity of intention are a condition for the hijrah's correctness and for one to be worthy of attaining reward for it. Accordingly, Moulānā Dildār 'Alī in compliance with his elders states in *Dhū al-Fiqār* at that juncture where Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīz has mentioned the verse:

وَالسُّبْقُونَ الْأُولُونَ مِنَ الْمُهْجِرِينَ وَالْأَنْصَارِ وَالَّذِينَ اتَّبَعُوهُمْ بِإِحْسَانٍ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ وَرَضُوا
عَنْهُ وَأَعَدَّ لَهُمْ جَنَّاتٍ تَجْرِي مِنْ تَحْتِهَا الْأَنْهَارُ خَالِدِينَ فِيهَا أَبَدًا ذَلِكَ الْفَوْزُ الْعَظِيمُ ﴿١٠٠﴾

And the first forerunners (in the faith) among the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār and those who followed them with good conduct — Allah is pleased with them and they are pleased with Him, and He has prepared for them gardens beneath which rivers flow, wherein they will abide forever. That is the great attainment.¹

بسبب بیابید دانست که باتفاق اهل اسلام در صحت هجرت و ترتب ثواب بران ایمان شرط است و ازینجاست که دلیل پیغمبر خدا که درین هجرت شریک ابو بکر بوده مشرک بود چنانچه در کتاب طبقات و اقدی تصریح یان واقع شده مقبول الهجرت نخواهد بود زیرا که باتفاق ایمان بشرط صحت عبادت است و بم چنین باتفاق فریقین شرط ترتب ثواب بر هجرت صحت نیت ست چنانچه دلالت میکند بران حدیث متواتر انما الاعمال بالنیات و لكل امرئ ما نوى و من كانت هجرته الى الله و رسوله الخ و این همه در اوائل بخاری و غیره مسطورست پس مادا میکه مارا علم به صحت نیت ابو بکر به ثبوت نه رسد دخول او در مدلول این ایه متیقن نبی شود و تا تیقن نه شود احتیاج یاین ایه بر علو مرتبه او نبی تواند شد

It should be noted that it is the consensus of the Muslims that īmān is a condition for the correctness of hijrah and attaining reward for it. Abū

1 Sūrah al-Towbah: 100

Bakr who accompanied Rasūlullāh ﷺ in the hijrah was a mushrik as Wāqidī has clearly stated in Ṭabaqāt that his hijrah was not accepted since it is unanimously agreed upon that īmān is a condition for the correctness of any form of worship. Similarly, both groups (Shīrah and Sunnī) unanimously agree that sincerity in intention is a condition for acquiring reward for hijrah. The following mutawātir ḥadīth narrated in the beginning of al-Bukhārī, etc., is testimony to this:

انما الاعمال بالنيات

Actions are judged according to their intentions.

So until we are not given verification of Abū Bakr’s sincerity of intention, the verse, “And the first forerunners (in the faith) among the Muhājirīn.” will not apply to him. And until there is no conviction of this, this verse cannot be a proof for his lofty status.¹

Moreover, Mujtahid writes at another place, where Shāh Ṣāhib has mentioned the verse:

لِلْفُقَرَاءِ الْمُهَاجِرِينَ الَّذِينَ أُخْرِجُوا مِنْ دِيَارِهِمْ

For the poor emigrants who were expelled from their homes and their properties.²

که بر فرض تسلیم فضیلت هجرت و امثال آن از اعمال مشروط است بر ایمان باجماع و اتفاق اهل اسلام و درستی نیت چنانچه بخاری در صحیح خود از لیث روایت نموده است که گفت شنیدم عمر خطاب را که بر منبر می گفت که شنیدم رسول خدا را که می فرمود انما الاعمال بالنيات و انما لكل امرئ ما نوى فمن كانت هجرته الى الله و رسوله فبجرته الى الله و رسوله و من كانت هجرته الى دنيا يصيبها او الى امرأة ينكحها فبجرته الى ما باجر اليه و ابن بزرجه دو قیما نحن فيه در معرض عدم تسلیم است

1 Dhū al-Fiqār: Majma‘ al-Bahrain publishers Ludhiyana 1281 A.H

2 Sūrah al-Ḥashr: 8

If we accept the virtue of actions like hijrah, etc., then this is conditional upon īmān and correct intention by the consensus of the Muslims. Al-Bukhārī has narrated from Layth in his *Ṣaḥīḥ* who says that he heard ‘Umar ibn Khaṭṭāb declaring on the mimbar, “I heard Rasūlullāh ﷺ saying, ‘actions are based on intentions and every person will be rewarded according to his intention. He whose hijrah was to Allah ﷻ and His Rasūl ﷺ, his hijrah will be accepted to be for Allah ﷻ and His Rasūl ﷺ. And whoever’s hijrah was to attain some worldly benefit or to marry some woman, his hijrah would be for this purpose.’” And we do not accept the presence of these two aspects (i.e. īmān and sincerity of intention).

He says at another place:

و ایضا احتجاج باین ایت موقوف ست که به ثبوت رسد که بجزت ابو بکر به اجازت حضرت نبی صلی الله علیه و سلم واقع شده و شیعه این را قبول ندارند

To use this verse as proof is dependent on it being proven that Abū Bakr’s hijrah took place with Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ permission, which the Shīah deny.¹

He writes at another place:

بجزت و نصرت مهدوح امری ست که تعلق به صحت نیت دارد و این امرے ست باطنی

Abū Bakr’s hijrah and assistance are such aspects which are connected to correctness of intention which is something internal.²

I will now debunk this view in a number of ways.

The ḥadīth which Dildār ‘Alī related from al-Bukhārī has no other benefit but virtue since intention is a condition for every action. And all the sects of Islam in fact all the religions are unanimous that no action is accepted without intention.

1 *Dhū al-Fiqār*: pg. 37 line 15

2 *Dhū al-Fiqār*: pg. 57

So what was the benefit of relating this ḥadīth besides increasing the size of the book? Maybe Mujtahid's intention was that some ignoramuses might hear this ḥadīth and fall into doubt and have this satanic thought, "this ḥadīth is regarding those who made hijrah with Rasūlullāh ﷺ or emigrated from Makkah to Madīnah a little after or before him and it was regarding them that those verses were revealed. If all of them were worthy of being rewarded, Rasūlullāh ﷺ would not have stated this ḥadīth and would not have made it conditional upon correctness of intention. So it is apparent that some Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ did not have pure intentions for hijrah." But unfortunately, no one can fall into this trap because everyone knows fully well that hijrah will never come to an end and Rasūlullāh's ﷺ ḥadīth will remain forever and that not all people will make hijrah for Allah ﷻ and His Rasūl ﷺ as the first Muhājirīn did. In fact, some will leave their homes for the world or for women as we see today with our own very eyes; some leave their countries for women while others accept Islam for worldly gain i.e. so that he might eat with the Muslims. So this ḥadīth applies to such people. Furthermore, Dildār 'Alī should have seen the reason which appears in his commentary books for this ḥadīth. He should have asked, "who does this ḥadīth apply to? Who was Rasūlullāh ﷺ referring to?" He should have kindly added this point so that we could have applauded him for his honesty and trustworthiness. But why would he write it? His object would have been lost had he done so. But since he has not written it, I will reproduce the text from *Mishkāt's* commentary by Shaykh 'Abd al-Ḥaqq Muḥaddith Dehlawī:

It should be noted that a man came to Madīnah for a woman by the name of Umm Qays. Rasūlullāh ﷺ mentioned this ḥadīth regarding him. Hence, he was known as *Muhājir Umm Qays* (migrator of Umm Qays) since he emigrated for a woman.

O Shī'ah! Applaud the holiness and honesty of Dildār 'Alī and ponder over his boasting. He has stated regarding Shāh Ṣāḥib رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in *Ṣawārim*:

می باید برگاه قابلیت این بهم نرساند بالجمله بامتحان رسیده که ناصب عداوت اهل بیت برگاه مسئله علیه که اندک وقتے داشته باشد در اثناء تحریر این دست و پاگم میکند از انجمله ست این که دران کمال انتشار و برا گندگی بکار برده لیکن

نه فهميد كه برگاه ايش قهر الهي را مورد و مستوقد گرديد بيهمه تر و خشك او خوابد رسيد و پادفنا خوابد داد و ببيج حيله
و مكر دران وقت مفيد نخوايد افتاد انتهي بلفظه ملخصا

If you have any sense then until you do not have the capability, you would not intend authoring anything. It is known from experience and experiment that the enemies of the Ahl al-Bayt's hands and feet bloat when writing trivial matters. One of those matters upon which their city went missing and they never understood that when the fire of divine wrath will rage, it will burn all their things and blow it into nothingness and then no scheme and plot will be successful.¹

Now let some just mu'min judge with fairness as to how aptly this fits Dildār 'Alī. He has written some obscure things and added a ḥadīth in between to deceive people which has nothing to do with the Muhājirīn. However, Dildār 'Alī has spoken the truth:

ما داميكه انسان برگاه شعور داشته باشد اراده تصنيف و تاليف نه نمايد ما داميكه قابليت ان بيهم نه رساند

Until a person does not have the capability, he should not intend authoring anything.

His other statement:

باتفاق اهل اسلام در صحت هجرت و ترتب ثواب بران ايمان شرط ست

It is the consensus of the Muslims that īmān is a condition for the validity of hijrah and acquiring reward for it.²

This is totally correct. There is no need to bring a Qur'ānic verse or ḥadīth in support of this. As for his to claim:

1 *Ṣawārim* Kolkata print 1218 A.H Pashtu pg. 74

2 *Dhū al-Fiḳār*: pg. 56

پس ما دامیکه مارا علم به صحت نیت ابو بکر به ثبوت نرسد دخول او در مدلول این آیت متیقن نمی شود

So until we are not given verification of Abū Bakr's sincerity of intention, the verse, "And the first forerunners (in the faith) among the Muhājirīn." will not apply to him.

We will criticise this in many ways:

1. The author of *Tuḥfah* did not say that this verse applies exclusively to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. In fact, he quoted it in favour of all the Muhājirīn. Dildār 'Alī has forgotten about everyone else and only taken Sayyidunā Abū Bakr's رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ name which is contrary to the principles of debating. Had Shāh Ṣāhib رَحِمَهُ اللهُ brought this verse exclusively in favour of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, then it would have been appropriate for him to answer accordingly. But since he did not, then this response is inaccurate.
2. If Dildār 'Alī mentioned his name thinking that since Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ has the loftiest status among the Muhājirīn, so by denying this virtue in his favour, it will be denied in favour of the rest, then we will not discuss this. We will only concentrate on this intention part. Why and how will you find out the correctness of intention? If you feel that this is an internal matter which is known to no one but Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى then we accept and we hand over his affair to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. It is certain that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى has informed you of his condition in the grave and the correctness of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr's رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ intention is now clear to you. If you wish to assess his intention from the actions he carried out during the hijrah then find out from your scholars' statements. Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ going to his house, taking him as a companion to the cave, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ carrying Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ on his shoulders en route, preparing food from home for Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ — all these are found in your own books which we have reproduced in much detail in the commentary of the verse of the cave. One only needs to flip back a few pages and have a look. If someone does not wish to take the trouble of flipping back few pages to see the entire discussion which the following aptly applies to:

درین جز و زمان چشم روزگار نظیر این بحث یعنی فضیلت صدیق اکبر از اینه غار ندیده باشد و گوش چرخ برین نشنیده

Sayyidunā Abū Bakr's رضی اللہ عنہ virtue which is apparent from verse of the cave has not been seen by the eyes of the generations and has not been heard by the ears of the skies.

Then I will reproduce a narration here which Shāh Ṣāhib رحمۃ اللہ علیہ has quoted from Mullā 'Abd Allah's *Iḏhār al-Ḥaqq* who also labels his brethren's rejection as useless and baseless:

جواب گفتن این سخن به ارتکاب این که در سبق بهجرت و نصرت ایمان شرط است و این شخص یعنی ابو بکر معاذ اللہ بیچ وقت ایمان نداشته چنین فعل از سنوح ناخوشی با امیر المومنین از انصاف دوست

It is compulsory to declare while answering this matter that the claim that īmān is a condition for hijrah and nuṣrah and Abū Bakr did not accept īmān at any time is a blatant lie which is the cause of Amīr al-Mu'mīnīn's anger and is far from fairness.

Mujtahid writes regarding this narration in *Dhū al-Fiqār*:

که پس معلوم است که یا ملا عبد الله از امامیه نبوده و یا اینکه جامع کلمات این مزخرفات را از پیش خود داخل نموده و یا مراد او از ایمان درین مقام اسلام ست و معلوم ست که خلیفه اول از اول امر از ایمان بهره نداشت باتفاق من علماء امامیه

It is apparent that either Mullā 'Abd Allah is not a Shī'ī or that the gatherer of all this rubbish has added it from his side or that here īmān refers to Islam. It is the consensus of the Shī'ī scholars that Abū Bakr did not bring īmān from the very beginning.¹

Mujtahid has written three things here:

1 *Dhū al-Fiqār*: pg. 58 line 12

Denying Mullā ‘Abd Allah as being a Shī‘ī. I will not delve into this aspect. If Mujtahid rejects all of his ‘ulamā’ being Shī‘ah, it will not affect us in the least. Although, all the scholars have cited proofs that Mullā ‘Abd Allah was a Shī‘ī, but I will accept Dildār ‘Alī’s view and understand it futile to give proofs for it. However, it is remorseful that he only rejected him being a Shī‘ī because he accepts the īmān of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم. However, this is also established from the statements of those Shī‘ī scholars who are the leaders of Dildār ‘Alī and whose statements he regards as “revelation from the skies”. Accordingly, Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī writes in *Majālis al-Mu‘minīn*:

اما اینکه تکفیر ابو بکر و عمر به شیعه نسبت نموده است مخفی ست بے اصل که در کتب اصول ایشاں ازاں اثرے
نیست و مذہب ایشاں ہمین ست کہ مخالفان علی فاسق اند و محاربان او را کافر اند

To say that the Shī‘ah declare Abū Bakr and ‘Umar as kāfir is something which has absolutely no substantiation from Shī‘ī books. Nonetheless, the Shī‘ah believe that Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s رضي الله عنه opponents are transgressors and those who waged war against him are kuffār.

When Mujtahid found no answer to this and understood it to be contrary to īmān to reject Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī being a Shī‘ī, he opted to falsify it via another channel. He answers it thus in *Dhū al-Fiqār*:

پوشیده نماند کہ این کلام بر تقدیر صحت و صدور این از فاضل قادح مقصود ما و مفید مطلوب او نمی شود زیرا کہ سابق
گزشته کہ فاسق در مقابلہ مومن اطلاقی شدہ

It should not be hidden that if this statement is accepted as true and the scholar (Shostarī) has mentioned it then this is not against our objective and is not of benefit to him since it has been explained earlier that the word fāsiq comes in polarity of mu‘min.¹

Look at the deception that he says, “If this statement is accepted as true and the scholar (Shostarī) has mentioned it,” regarding an author like Qāḍī Nūr Allah

1 *Dhū al-Fiqār*: pg. 52 line 12

Shostarī and a famous book like *Majālis al-Mu'minīn*. In actuality, he has rejected the statement by using such words. However, he could not do so emphatically out of respect for his holiness. If he had any honesty as he claims, he ought not to deceive and ought to quote the original text of *Majālis al-Mu'minīn* — which has not been distorted in the least. Shāh Ṣāhib رحمۃ اللہ علیہ was forced to quote:

که نسبت تکفیر به جناب شیخین که اہل سنت و جماعت بہ شیعه نموده اند سخنی ست پی اصل کہ در کتب اصول
ایشان از ان تری نیست

To say that the Shī'ah declare Abū Bakr and 'Umar as kāfir is something which has absolutely no substantiation from Shī'ī books.

The exact text of *Majālis al-Mu'minīn* is what I have quoted above. If anyone is in doubt, he should have a look at *Majālis al-Mu'minīn* and admire Mujtahid's deceptive statement,

بر تقدیر صحت و صدور این از فاضل

“If this statement is accepted as true and the scholar (Shostarī) has mentioned it.”

The thing which puzzles me the most is why did a scholar like Dildār 'Alī say, “if this statement is accepted as true?” Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī has vehemently denied Abū Bakr and 'Umar being kāfir in *Majālis al-Mu'minīn*. He has not mentioned his rejection in few words, but wrote an essay of it. He writes in the third majlis:

کہ از ایراد این مقدمہ دفع تو بپی ست کہ در اوہام عامہ استقرار یافتہ کہ شیعہ امامیہ تکفیر جمیع یا اکثر صحابہ می
نمایند و این معنی را مستبعد یافتہ عوام مذہب خود را تبقریر این از مذہب حق متنفر نمودہ از راہ بردہ اند و چگونه چنیس
باشد و حالانکہ افضل المحققین خواجہ نصیر الدین طوسی در کتاب تجرید فرمودہ کہ محاربوا علی کفرہ و مخالفوہ
فسقہ و ظاہر است کہ اگر صحابہ بیان حضرت محاربہ نہ کردہ اند بلکہ بقوت کثرت خیل و حشم بے نیت استعمال سیف
و علم مقام مخالفت در امدہ باستقلال غضب منصب عترت رسول متعال نمودہ ند

The object of this introduction is to remove those misconceptions which are plaguing peoples' minds that the Shī'ah label all the Ṣaḥābah or

majority of them as kuffār. It is due to this reason that many laymen begin detesting this true religion and stray away from the straight path whereas the Ṣaḥābah cannot be kuffār. Khwājah Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī has written in his book *Tajrīd* that those who fought Sayyidunā ‘Alī were kāfir and those who opposed him were transgressors. And it is manifest that majority of the Ṣaḥābah did not fight with him but on the contrary assisted him with their strength and might and conveyances. Yes, they usurped the position of being the representative of Rasūlullāh ﷺ without a fight.

It is clear from this text that Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī has with a categorical proof rejected labelling those Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ as kuffār who did not fight Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ but only opposed him. He himself writes that the reason he wrote this introduction is to remove this misconception that “the Shī‘ah regard all the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ as kuffār and due to this the masses are thrown into deception and hatred for the Shī‘ī creed is put in their hearts and they begin detesting it”. How can this be possible that the Shī‘ah call all the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ kuffār whereas the best Muḥaqqiq, Khwājah Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī, has written in his book *Tajrīd* that, those who fought Sayyidunā ‘Alī were kāfir and those who opposed him were transgressors. Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī does not stop here. He continues to prove his claim of not labelling the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ as kuffār by saying, “it is manifest that majority of the Ṣaḥābah did not fight with him but usurped the khilāfah without a fight.” Notwithstanding this verified stance of Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī, Mujtahid first says, “If this statement is accepted as true” in order to put the masses into the delusion that this is not found in *Majālis al-Mu‘minīn* and then states further:

قادح مقصود ما و مفید مطلوب او نمی شود زیرا که سابق گزشته که فاسق در مقابله مومن اطلاق شده

This is not against our objective and is not of benefit to him since it has been explained earlier that the word fāsiq comes in polarity of mu‘min i.e. it means kāfir.

Glorified is Allah سُبْحَانَكَ وَتَعَالَى. Allah سُبْحَانَكَ وَتَعَالَى is pure.

What sublime intelligence and wit.

What understanding and intelligence Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى gave Mujtahid! He puts his claim of labelling the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ as kuffār with Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī's claim of not labelling them as kuffār and audaciously and boldly declares, "Our object is the same." In fact, to understand existence and non-existence; Islam and kufr as the same is not far-fetched for him. We contemplate over his intellect and say that no doubt what you say is true, Shāh Ṣāhib رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ is ignorant who understood that Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī's text means not labelling as kāfir.

O Shī'ah! This is the level of your scholars' intelligence and expertise. Nonetheless, it is established that Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī and Muḥaqqiq Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī believe that the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ were not kuffār and they only regard those who fought him as kuffār. Now listen to what Mujtahid has to say. He states in his book *Dhū al-Fiqār*:

استنتاج نتیجه مسطوره موقوفست بریں کہ بنا بر اصول شیعہ باثبات رسانی کہ اصحاب تو از اول امر مومن اند و این از جمله ممتنعات و محالات است چه علماء ایشان بدلائل بسیار و اخبار بے شمار کفر و پیشوایان شمارا در کتب خود باثبات رسانیده و برگاه حقیقت حال چنین باشد پس کلام تو از محل اعتبار ساقط باشد

To arrive at the above conclusion is subject to the Ṣaḥābah being believers from the beginning according to Shī'ī books. And this is among the impossibilities. Our scholars have labelled your Ṣaḥābah and leaders as kuffār and munāfiqīn through countless proofs and evidences from your own books. And when this is the reality, then your view is worthless.

O Shī'ah! I take an oath on your īmān and dīn and I take an oath on the holiness and ijtihād of your 'Fountain of Elucidation'. Evaluate this text of Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī:

اما تکفیر ابو بکر و عمر بشیعہ نسبت نموده است سخنے ست بے اصل کہ در کتب اصول ایشان اثرے نیست

To say that the Shī'ah declare Abū Bakr and 'Umar as kāfir is something which has absolutely no substantiation from Shī'ī books. Nonetheless, the Shī'ah believe that Sayyidunā 'Alī's رضی اللہ عنہ opponents are transgressors and those who waged war against him are kuffār.

with this text of Mujtahid:

علماء ایشان بدلائل بسیار و اخبار بے شمار کفر و نفاق پیشوایان شمارا در کتب خود باثبات رسانیده اند

Our scholars have labelled your Ṣaḥābah and leaders as kuffār and munāfiqīn through countless proofs and evidences from your own books.

Evaluate the two! Speak the truth! Tell us which one of them is truthful and which one is a liar. Should we 'naïve' Sunnīs believe Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī who declares vehemently that this is so baseless that there is no sign of it in his canonical books or listen to Dildār 'Alī who pronounces firmly that his scholars have labelled them as kuffār through countless proofs and narrations?

This is the condition of your scholars. They cannot remain on one point. They oppose each other. The reason for this is that they speak according to the situation and practice on the couplet:

ہر سخنے موقع اور ہر نکتہ مقامی دارد

Every situation has an expression and every juncture has a point.

Where they see an opportunity to label the Ṣaḥābah رضی اللہ عنہم as kuffār, they vehemently label them and prove their kufr on the tongues of all the A'imma — from number one to number twelve. And when they see that the principles of dīn are being destroyed and Islam is leaving their hands, they flatly deny with much hue and cry that it is the slander and fabrication of the Sunnī and say that their

scholars are exempt from it. Amazing is their situation. The mind is flabbergasted at their statements, narrations and responses.

Dildār ‘Alī is not satisfied by labelling Shaykhayn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمَا as kāfir. He does not stop here. He is hell-bent on their kufr to the extent that he says clearly at one place:

قال عليه السلام من شك في كفر اعدائنا فهو كافر

Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ has stated, “the person who doubts the kufr of our enemies is a kāfir.”

O Shī’ah! Look at this text of Dildār ‘Alī and listen to what he is saying. Pronounce your exemption from poor Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī and Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī, etc., — great scholars of your creed — and label them as kāfir since they doubt the kufr of Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ enemies, “the person who doubts the kufr of our enemies is a kāfir.”

It is disappointing that when Dildār ‘Alī wrote this book and played the drum of his ijtihād and wrote this ḥadīth of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ then both these poor souls Naṣīr al-Dīn and Qāḍī had passed on, otherwise they would have heard this statement of Dildār ‘Alī and definitely labelled him as kāfir and joined our ranks.

بپر که ایشان را کافر گوید کافرست

The one who labels those (Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ) as kuffār is a kāfir.

I will at this juncture further establish Dildār ‘Alī ‘honesty’ and display his ‘deep knowledge’ and ‘piety’. Mujtahid has not only belied Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī in this narration but at other places. He unintentionally displayed him as a dunce with his emphatic terms. The author of *Tuḥfah* states in chapter twelve:

قاضی نور اللہ شوستری در مجالس المومنین خود آورده کہ مفہوم تشیع اینست کہ خلیفہ بلا فصل بعد از حضرت رسول خدا صلی اللہ علیہ و سلم مرتضی علی ست و لعن و سب در و معتبر نیستیگنجد کہ نام حضرات خلفای ثلاثہ بر زبان

شیعه جاری شود و اگر جابلان شیعه حکم به وجوب لعن کردند سخن ایشان معتبر نیست و آنچه خبث و فحش در باره ام المومنین عائشه نسبت به شیعه میکند حاشا ثم حاشا که واقع باشد چه نسبت فحش بکافه ایدمیان حرام است چه جائے حرم حضرت پیغمبر خدا صلی الله علیه و سلم و بعد از آن متصل ہمیں کلام گفته است کہ این ضعیف حدیثے در کتاب حدیث از کتب شیعه دیدہ باین مضمون کہ عائشہ در خدمت امیر از حرب توبہ کردہ ہر چند قصہ حرب متواتر است و حکایت توبہ خبر واحد و اما بنا بریں طعن کردن در حق وے جائز نیست

Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī has written in *Majālis al-Mu'minīn*, “the meaning of Shī'ism is that Sayyidunā 'Alī عليه السلام was the undisputed khalīfah after Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم and it is incorrect to curse or criticise in this matter. It is possible that the three khulafā's names will come on Shī' tongues in this matter. If an ignorant Shī' regards cursing as necessary, then his view is unreliable. It is related that the Shī'ah speak obscene about Umm al-Mu'minīn Sayyidah 'Ā'ishah عليها السلام. Allah forbid! Allah forbid! No evil can be spoken about her. When it is forbidden to swear at others, then how can the wife of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم be sworn at?” Immediately thereafter, he brings a weak ḥadīth from Shī' ḥadīth books that Sayyidah 'Ā'ishah عليها السلام repented from the battle in front of Sayyidunā 'Alī عليه السلام. “Although the incident of the battle is mutawātir and the repentance incident is a khabar wāḥid, nonetheless it is not permissible to curse and criticise Sayyidah 'Ā'ishah عليها السلام for this.”

Now listen attentively to the response of Dildār 'Alī as mentioned in *Dhū al-Fiqār*:

اما آنچه از سید نور اللہ شوستری نوشتہ پس البتہ در نقل تدلیس و تلبیس نمودہ بالجملہ سب و شتم البتہ نزدیک امامیہ در حق ہیکس از کفار و مسلم جائز نیست اما تبرا و بیزاری از اعدای دین واجب و لازم گو بحسب اتفاق اگر از زبان نگوید قباحت نباشد لیکن اگر گناہ دانستہ نگوید البتہ گنہگار بلکہ بہ نسبت ناکثین و مارقین و قاسطین اگر گناہ دانستہ نگوید از ایمان بیرون می شود چہ اور دریں صورت منکر ضروری مذہب امامیہ شدہ

Something was written with reference to Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī. Dishonesty and fraud has been practiced in quoting it. According to the Shī' sect, it is not permissible to swear, curse or utter profanity at any kāfir or Muslim. Although, it is compulsory to declare exemption from the enemies of dīn. If exemption is not declared verbally, then there is no evil in this. However, if one knows a criminal to be a sinner and does not express

exemption from him then this person himself will be a sinner, breaker of his pledge, oppressor and out of the fold of dīn. If he does not declare a sin as a sin intentionally, he has left his īmān since in this situation he has rejected the necessities of dīn.

Those with sound disposition should decide whether the author of *Tuhfah* is hoodwinking people or whether Dildār ‘Alī is guilty of this. The former quotes Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī’s text verbatim while the latter does not open *Majālis al-Mu’minīn* to verify but just slanders Shāh Ṣāḥib of being deceptive thus displaying his own deceptiveness and dishonesty.

O Shī’ah! Are you still not convinced of your scholar’s dishonesty and treachery and will you still not doubt his ijtihād notwithstanding such open crimes? *Majālis al-Mu’minīn* is neither the *Izhār al-Ḥaqq* of Mullā ‘Abd Allah which is inaccessible or can just be rejected to save face nor is it so rare that Dildār ‘Alī’s library did not have a copy of it. If Shāh Ṣāḥib رحمته الله fabricated it and slandered Qāḍī by referencing it to him whereas Qāḍī did not say or write it then it was not difficult for Dildār ‘Alī to take a copy of *Majālis al-Mu’minīn* and quote the original text. This is an amazing type of dishonesty and deception that a blind eye is turned to the book intentionally and Shāh Ṣāḥib instead is slandered. No doubt, Shāh Ṣāḥib رحمته الله committed the grave error of quoting such a narration which is contrary to Shī’ beliefs from such a scholar’s book — who is a fundamental pillar of the Shī’ah and who sacrificed his life for his religion. The reason Dildār ‘Alī opted for the slander is that he had no other option. He either would have to quote the original text and point out the changes or additions made by Shāh Ṣāḥib رحمته الله or acknowledge that what Shāh رحمته الله quoted was correct; but then what answer could he possibly give? He thus followed in the footsteps of Shayṭān al-Ṭāq¹ and neither acknowledged nor denied in order to save himself. Unfortunately, few words were written by his pen thereafter which shows the correctness of Qāḍī’s text. He writes:

1 A famous Shī’ī fabricator whose name was Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Nu’mān al-Aḥwal.

مراد سید نور الله بر جاگه گفته باشد اگر گفته باشد همین ست و عبارت ایشان بر گز آنچه فقیر گفته مخالفت ندارد

Wherever (Qāḍī) Nūr Allah wrote this if he did, then his meaning and my meaning are the same. There is no polarity between his text and my statement.

Looking at this text, the heart automatically desires to write something about Dildār ‘Alī. But I will only write:

این گل و دیگر شگفت

This is a flower and the others are thorns.

I will ask his followers, according to my feeble understanding, I find that both are poles apart. May someone kindly explain to me how this text of Qāḍī’s:

The meaning of Shī’ism is that Sayyidunā ‘Alī عليه السلام was the undisputed khalīfah after Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم and it is incorrect to curse or criticise in this matter.

is same to this text of Dildār ‘Alī’s:

It is compulsory to declare exemption from the enemies of dīn.

And how this sentence of Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī’s:

If an ignorant Shī’ī regards cursing as necessary, then his view is unreliable.

is in conformity with Dildār ‘Alī’s sentence:

If exemption is not declared verbally, then there is no evil in this. However, if one knows a criminal to be a sinner and does not express exemption from him then this person himself will be a sinner, breaker of his pledge, oppressor and out of the fold of dīn. If he does not declare a sin as a sin intentionally, he has left his īmān.

I understand from Qāḍī's text that swearing and cursing is not necessary, nor a fundamental tenet of Shī'ism and to understand it as necessary is the view of the ignorant. Whereas on the other hand, Dildār 'Alī's text is absolute that according to him cursing and swearing is necessary for Shī'ism. In fact, the one who does not express exemption does not remain a believer. Notwithstanding the polarity between the two, he audaciously claims:

There is no polarity between his text and my statement.

Now what more can be said? The pride and vanity he displayed regarding his book *Dhū al-Fiqār* would have been more excusable had he not praised it himself, but as the poet Ṣā'ib said:

ثَنَىٰ خُودِ بَخُودِ كَرْدِي نَمِي زَبِيدِ تَرَا صَائِبٌ چُونِ زَنِ پَسْتَانِ خُودِ مَالِدِ حِظُوظِ نَفْسِ كَيْ يَابِدِ

It is not befitting for you to praise yourself, Ṣā'ib!

Like when women rub their own breasts for pleasure

It was necessary to abstain from self-praise when the book itself praised its author. But now, by Allah's *سُبْحَانَكَ وَبِحَمْدِكَ* grace, his self-praise has been attested to and all the wonders of his book has been established. The Shī'ah should have a look at the book *Dhū al-Fiqār* which is filled with wise quotes. Dildār 'Alī has said regarding it in *Ṣawārim*, "When we saw the twelfth chapter of *Tuḥfah*, I thought to myself that confronting an ignorant layman is below my dignity, hence I was disinclined to answer it. But then with the thought that the noble *Ambiyā'* and honourable *Awṣiyā'* answered the *kuffār*, transgressors and wretched of their eras, I responded to it." He then says:

چنانچه بحمد الله تعالی در بهمان او ان سعادت تو امان در عرصه ده بست روز بصرف قلبی از اوقات به نقض این پر دا
ختم و بیپوده گوئی اورا به بیان واضح بر بر کس و ناکس ظاہر و لائح ساختم در رساله مذکوره باسم ذو الفقار اختصاص
داده مع جلد کتاب عماد الاسلام پیش این ناصب مولف کتاب تحفه اثنا عشریه مرسل داشتم تا شاید از خواب غفلت بیدار
شود و از سر مستی چہل مرکب بپوشیار گردد و لله الحجة البالغة کہ مدت پنج شش سال منقضی گشته کہ این رساله در
اطراف بلاد شائع و منتشر گردیده و از نظر بسیاری از فضلاء سنیان گزشتہ بہمانت و استحکام کلام کہ در اثنا نقض

شبهات و کشف عیوب مہموہات او بلا ارتکاب تکلفات و تعسفات مذکور ساختہ ام بیچکس چہ اِن ناصب عداوت اہل بیت مصنف کتاب مذکور چہ غیر او از فضلانے مذہب مسطور مجال این نیافتہ اند کہ بہ نقض اِن پردازند و در جواب اِن چیزے برنگارند و بمقتضای اینکه الحق یعلوا و لا یعلیٰ انتہی بلفظہ ملخصا

Therefore, with all thanks to Allah ﷻ, I have criticised this book and exposed its falsehood in a short span of 20 days. I have made it into a treatise and named it *Dhū al-Fiqār*. I sent it with the book *‘Imād al-Islam* to the author of *Tuḥfah Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah* so that he may wake up from his negligence and emerge from the depths of compound ignorance. All praises are only for Allah ﷻ. It has been six years since the publication of that treatise. Many Sunnī scholars have read it. It was written to remove misconceptions and to expose its flaws with strictness and firmness without prejudice and unpretentious. The author of the book (*Tuḥfah Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah*) — the nāṣibī and enemy of the Ahl al-Bayt — and the scholars of the Sunnī creed were unable to debunk it and write a response to it. Truth always remains at the top. Falsehood cannot overpower it.

The truth is that whatever Mujtahid has written regarding *Dhū al-Fiqār* is correct. The book is filled with eloquence and articulacy. His proofs are filled with wisdom; honesty and trust is apparent from every line; and there is no mention of prejudice or unpretentious. Whatever he has written is clear and true. He has displayed his deep knowledge and expertise. The only error committed was that he wrote it too fast and completed it in a short span of only twenty days whereas he ought to have written it after deep and prolonged thinking and he ought to have thought of not being disgraced and humiliated. Had he taken five or six years to write it like *Ṣawārim* and given it to some Iranian for proofreading then maybe his text would have been correct and there would be less garbage in his discussions. Just as some Multānī wrote an answer to *Ṣawārim* and proved that Mujtahid’s intelligence is synonymous to stupidity and named his book *Tanbīh al-Safīh*, a student should have written a response to *Dhū al-Fiqār* and should have sent *Tuḥfah* to his servants.

Mujtahid was hasty in writing this book and did not consider this couplet of Shaykh Sa’dī which young boys are also aware of:

Hasty works are the products of the Shayāṭīn

When I study *Dhū al-Fiḡār* and *Ṣawārim* and see his expletives, obscenity and self-praise, I think to myself, “if only he could have used his valuable time which he wasted in writing expletives and obscenity to ponder and contemplate over his answers.” At the end, I found an answer to this in his words which he wrote in *Ṣawārim*, “no one should object to my vulgarity, criticism and censure. Shāh Ṣāhib has triggered it. At the end, I am Shīṭ”:

اگر از این جانب نظر باینکه شیوه شیعیان تبرا نمودن است از اعدای دین زیاد از آنچه نوشته اند به عمل اید مستبعد نباشد

If you consider that expressing exemption is the salient feature of the Shīṭah, then it is not far-fetched to write more than what the enemies of dīn have written.¹

I will now quote Dildār ‘Alī’s response to Qāḡī Nūr Allah Shostarī’s exposition:

اما آنچه از سید نور الله نقل نموده که این ضعیف حدیثی در کتاب حدیث از کتب شیعه دیده باین مضمون که عائشه در خدمت امیر علیه السلام از حرب توبه کرده الخ اقول هر چند ازین قبیل سخنان هر گز به مسلک جناب سید نور الله شوستری نمی زبید که آنچه ایشان در تصرف حدیث امامیه بدل جهد نموده اند و جهاد سنان و قلم و سیف زبان که افضل از جهاد سیف و سنان باشد کرده اند اظهار من الشمس ست و اگر به حسب اتفاق روایتی باین مضمون بنظر ایشان رسیده باشد هر گاه در مذهب اهل اسلام روایات متضمن جسم بودن خدا و مکانی بودن او تعالی شانه مروی شده باشد لکن چون تخالف ضروری دین ست محل اعتبار نباشد پس چنین روایات بهم بشعیان ضرر نخواهد رسانیده زیرا که اگر روایت توبه او صحیح می بود جناب ائمه از و تبرا نمی نمودند و معلوم ست که جناب صادق علیه السلام بعد بر نماز عبادت دانسته از و واز غیر او که اعدائے دین می بودند تبرا می فرمودند

What has been quoted in reference to Sayyid Nūr Allah Shostarī that there is a weak ḡadīth in the Shīṭ ḡadīth books that ‘Ā’ishah came to Sayyidunā Amīr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and repented from participating in the battle etc. The answer to this is that it is not befitting for Sayyid Nūr Allah Shostarī to say such

1 *Ṣawārim* pg. 5 line 12

things. He has sacrificed his heart and soul for Shī'ī aḥādīth. The jihad with the spear of the pen and the sword of the tongue is superior to the jihad on the battlefield which he has practiced. It is manifest and according to the consensus of narrations that this topic has passed his eyes that for Allah ﷻ to have a physical body and to be in a specific place or abode has been written in Islam, but to turn away from this belief was necessary for dīn. Therefore, such narrations are unreliable according to the Shī'ah and are not detrimental to them. Had the repentance narration been authentic, the A'immaḥ would not have expressed exemption from her. And this fact is known that Sayyidunā al-Ṣādiq ﷺ would express Tabarra'¹ from her and other enemies of dīn after every ṣalāh as a form of 'ibādah.

Here too, Dildār 'Alī has displayed his honesty and denied that Sayyid Nūr Allah Shostarī has written this exposition just due to the thought that the man was a great warrior who was martyred due to his Shī'ism. He has not clearly accepted this narration and, all praise is due to Allah ﷻ, has not rejected it. Nor has he quoted it from *Majālis al-Mu'minīn* and proved Shah's interpolation. We deem his thought to be nothing but satanic whispers and he has only being deceptive by mentioning those narrations which establish a physical body or place for Allah ﷻ (glory belongs to Allah ﷻ). He claims that there are such narrations in Islam, but unfortunately we Sunnī's are deprived of them. This is the share of the early Shī'ī scholars. Hence, it was preferable for him to write 'in Shī'ism' instead of 'in Islam' so that people are not deceived. People should also understand that such narrations regarding Allah ﷻ are found in the Shī'ī creed and those who held such beliefs and attribute them to the A'immaḥ were their own Shī'ī scholars — leave alone being scholars, they were representatives of the A'immaḥ and the souls of the A'immaḥ which I will prove in another discussion. Thereafter, the latter Shī'ah rejected such narrations. So it is not improbable that the former Shī'ah accepted the repentance narration of Sayyidah 'Ā'ishah ﷺ while the latter Shī'ah reject it. Furthermore, it is important to take note of Dildār 'Alī's

1 Tabarra' is the Shī'ī practice of dissociating, renouncing and cursing those they deem to be the enemies of the Ahl al-Bayt.

slander against Sayyidunā Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ that he practiced Tabarra’, Allah سُبْحَانَ اللَّهِ وَتَعَالَى forbid! He claims that Sayyidunā al-Ṣādiq رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ would express exemption from Sayyidah ‘Ā’ishah and the khulafā’ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ after every ṣalāh believing it to be ‘ibādah whereas on the other hand Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī declares this practice to be that of the ignorant and does not regard it as part of Shī‘ism, yet Dildār ‘Alī attributes the same thing to the Imām. Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī considered his imān and said:

نسبت فحش به کافه ادمیان حرام ست چه جائے حرم حضرت پیغمبر خدا

When it is forbidden to swear at laymen, then how can the wife of Rasūlullāh ﷺ be sworn at?

The reality is that Dildār ‘Alī belies Qāḍī Nūr Allah in disguise. He is angered at a word which shows that Tabarra’ is not necessary. However, possibilities cannot erase fate. Whatever those people wrote is written, the pens have written and the ink has dried. To make up things now or cry and wail has no benefit. Munshī Subḥān ‘Alī Khān has written the truth in his letter to Moulānā Nūr al-Dīn:

البتہ مشکل ست کہ علماء ما وقت تحریر کار بہ دور اندیشی و حفظ از اعتراض حریف بہ بعض جاہانکرده اند

The difficulty is that our scholars while writing did not have far-sightedness and did not safeguard themselves from the opponents’ objections at many places.

In another letter, Munshī expresses his grief in the following words:

غرض کہ متعصبین جفا پیشہ را حقی ذائقہ عدل خود چشاند کہ مازیں تعصبات میدان مناظرہ بسیار تنگ شدہ و تناقض اخبار رگ جاں را می خراشد

In short, Allah سُبْحَانَ اللَّهِ وَتَعَالَى will make the oppressive prejudiced taste His justice and fairness. Due to their prejudices, the field of debating has becoming very constrained and contradictory narrations and aḥādīth have become a problematic obstacle for us.

He further writes:

حقیقتہ الحال اینکه بنده پیشتر با بوادید اختلاف مضامین احادیث و قصور فہم امثال ما بیچ مدانا از اسرار تفسیر اکثر آیات مصحف مجید مروی بطریق فرقة حقه اثنا عشریہ بر خود می لرزید کہ اگر مخالف دست تشبث بذیل این مرویات می زند تقصے مشکل خواهد بود بہما پیش آمد

The reality is that I have seen the contradiction of narrations in majority of places and the incomprehension of subtleties in the commentary of Qur'ānic verses which have been narrated from the true sect, the Ithnā 'Ashariyyah. I was terrified. If these narrations get into the hands of the opposition, it will be nearly impossible to save ourselves. Sadly, we are faced with this exact fear.

The gist of what we have written above is that it is firmly clarified that according to Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī, the enemies of Sayyidunā 'Alī Murtaḍā رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ are not kāfir, but *fāsiq* (transgressors). He brings Muḥaqqiq Naṣīr al-Dīn's statement as substantiation which he has written in *Tajrīd*:

His opponents are transgressors and those who fought him are kuffār.

I will now quote Dildār 'Alī's response to this which is recorded in *Dhū al-Fiqār*. He has displayed the fineness of his temperament. He says:

بر تقدیر مطلب عبارت محقق طوسی علیہ الرحمۃ کہ چیزے باشد کہ بذہن قاصر او رسیدہ وجہ استحقاق لعن ایشان منحصر در محاربه امیر المومنین نیست چہ بر تو سابق بریں ظاہر گشتہ و بہم عنقریب واضح خواهد شد کہ ہر کہ منکر یکے از ضروریات دین یا مذہب باشد ملعون ست گو محارِب نباشد و محقق طوسی علیہ الرحمۃ نگفتہ کہ کل من یا یکون محاربا لایکون ملعونا کافرا لجواز ان یکون المحمول ... الخ

It seems as though the meaning of Muḥaqqiq Ṭūsī's text has been misunderstood by Shāh's limited mind. The reason for cursing and censuring him is not because he fought against Sayyidah Amīr al-Mu'minīn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا. The reason is what was told to you before and which will be explained later that the one who rejects any one of the fundamentals of dīn is accursed although he has not fought Amīr. Muḥaqqiq Ṭūsī has not stated

that the one who did not fight him is not accursed and is not kāfir. In fact, it is possible that this also applies to him.

The words “as though” in the beginning of this exposition ‘filled with wisdom’ should be contemplated upon. It means that the meaning Shāh understood from, “his opponents are transgressors and those who fought him are kuffār.” is almost incorrect. The meaning is not that his opponents are transgressors and those who fought him are kuffār. It is not known what it means. What other meanings do these words have then?

If Shāh Ṣāḥib has erred in understanding it and no one besides Mujtahid can understand it without looking up dictionaries like *Qāmūs Ṣiḥāḥ* and *Jowharī* — such as in the words of Khuṭbah Shaqshaqiyah — then the meaning understood by Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī and his translation in Persian is the exact same. I have quoted it above verbatim. So I do not know why Dildār ‘Alī wrote “as though” when the words are so simple and the meanings are so unambiguous. Now listening to the meaning Dildār ‘Alī understands:

اما قوله ان مخالفوه فسقة فمعناه انه لا بد من ان يكون مخالفا فاسقا لا انه لا يكون الا فاسقا فانه من ضروريات مذهبنا ان بعض انواع مخالفة ينجر الى الكفر و الكفر مستلزم للفسق

Regarding Muḥaqqiq Ṭūsī’s statement, “his opponents are transgressors,” does not mean that they are only transgressors, nothing else. It is one of the fundamentals of our dīn that some opposition leads to kufr. And *fiṣq* (transgression) is a necessary attribute of kufr.

He says thereafter:

بهم ميتو اند شد که مراد محقق این باشد که مخالف علی بن ابی طالب علیه السلام ما داهی که منکر یکی از ضروریات دین نباشد مسلم فاسق است چنانچه سائر مخالفین اعنی دردار دنیا احکام اسلام بر آنها جاری می شوند مگر دردار آخرت مخلص به نار خواهد بود

It is also possible that Muḥaqqiq Ṭūsī means that the opponent of Sayyidunā ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib عليه السلام until he does not reject the fundamentals

of dīn is a Muslim fāsiq just like the rest of the opponents, i.e. Islamic laws apply to them in this world but they will remain forever in the Fire in the Hereafter.

This couplet applies to it:

المعنى فى بطن الشاعر

The meaning is in the poet's stomach.

In fact, this couplet is more apt:

توجيه القول بما لا يرضى به قائله

Interpreting a sentence with what the speaker is not happy.

Dildār 'Alī further states:

اکثر اوقات استعمال فسق در خصوص معنی خروج عن طاعة الله مع الايمان ميشود و ازين لازم منى ايد که هر جا که لفظ فاسق مستعمل شود همی معنی مراد باشد كيف و جناب حق سبحانه و تعالى ميفر مايد وَلَقَدْ اَنْزَلْنَا اِلَيْكَ اَيَّتْ بَيِّنَاتٍ وَمَا يَكْفُرُ بِهَا اِلَّا الْفٰسِقُونَ ؛ فَاُولٰٓئِكَ بِمُمْ اَلْفٰسِقُونَ و ظاهراً ست که او سبحانه تقدس و تعالى درینجا لفظ فاسق بر مرتد اطلاق کرده و امثال این آیات در کلام مجید بسیارست و ازين مبرهن می شود که این متعصب کلام محقق علیه الرحمة را درین مقام محض بر سبیل تدلیس و مغالطه ذکر نموده و بر کلام سفاقت نظام خود انرا دلیل شمرده و حالانکه کلام محقق علیه الرحمة در غایت جودت و متانت ست

Majority of the time, fisq is used in its own distinctive meaning i.e. to have imān but to disobey Allah سُبْحٰنَكَ رَبِّعَالِ. But this does not necessitate that wherever the words fāsiq appears it means this. How can this be? Allah سُبْحٰنَكَ رَبِّعَالِ has stated:

وَمَا يَكْفُرُ بِهَا اِلَّا الْفٰسِقُونَ

And no one would deny them except the defiantly disobedient.¹

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 99

They were the defiantly disobedient.¹

It is apparent from here that the word *fāsiq* here refers to a *murtad* (renegade). Such verses are copious in the glorious Qur’ān. From this it becomes apparent that this prejudiced man has misused Muḥaqqiq Ṭūsī’s statement and presented his own drivel as proof, whereas Muḥaqqiq Ṭūsī’s exposition is immaculate.

The gist of this entire text which Dildār ‘Alī has written quoting one or verses as well is that the word *fāsiq* is used in the meaning of *murtad* and *kāfir*. We accept this. However, the context is pivotal. And the context is present in those Qur’ānic verses but lacking in Muḥaqqiq Ṭūsī’s sentence. In fact, there is no way that *fāsiq* can be taken to mean *kāfir* in his text otherwise the entire meaning will be disrupted. Had he only declared, “His opponents are transgressors,” without saying, “those who fought him are *kuffār*.” Then there would be scope for *fāsiq* to mean *kāfir*. However, when he has mentioned both sects separately and mentioned separate rulings for both, then how can you take the meaning applicable to the first object as applicable to the second object? When he has spoken about two different sects, viz. 1. Those who opposed Sayyidunā ‘Alī عليه السلام. 2. Those that fought him, and mentioned two different rulings for them, viz. declaring the opponents as *fāsiq* and the fighters as *kāfir*, then if *fāsiq* is taken to mean *kāfir* here, the whole meaning will be wasted. In fact, the entire sentence will be useless and the exposition of the great learned man Muḥaqqiq Ṭūsī in a book *Tajrīd* – which is immaculate with regards to words and meanings – will be meaningless. If he meant *kāfir* by *fāsiq*, then instead of saying:

His opponents are transgressors and those who fought him are *kuffār*.

He should have said:

His opponents are *kuffār*.

1 Sūrah Āl ‘Imrān: 82

so that the fighter might be included or he could have been more emphatic and said:

His opponents and those who fought him are kuffār.

Or if he was not satisfied with kufr, and had to use the word fisq, he could have said:

His opponents and those who fought him are kuffār and transgressors.

By Muḥaqqiq abandoning all of these possibilities and mentioning a separate object for a separate subject shows clearly that the meaning of both is different. Dildār ‘Alī who tries to prove that they mean the same thing is only bluffing. Apart from this, Dildār ‘Alī should have contemplated on what Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī has written. He flatly rejected that Shaykhayn رضي الله عنه are kuffār and declared:

To say that the Shī‘ah declare Shaykhayn as kāfir is something which has absolutely no substantiation from Shī‘ī books.

He then brings the statement of Muḥaqqiq Ṭūsī in support of his claim:

Khwājah Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī has written in his book *Tajrīd* that those who opposed Sayyidunā ‘Alī were fāsiq and those who fought him were kāfir.

If fāsiq means kāfir, then Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī’s explanation will be futile and part of the drivel of crazy men. If still Mujtahid did not understand, he should have looked at the following text of Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī:

بمقتضاه حدیث حربک حربی و سلمک سلمی واقع ست و ظاہر ست کہ حضرات شیخین با امیر المومنین علیہ السلام حرب نہ نمودہ اند

And in consideration of the ḥadīth, “those who are your enemies are my enemies and those who you give amnesty to, I give amnesty to.” And it is well-known that Shaykhayn did not fight Sayyidunā Amīr al-Mu’minīn

رضي الله عنه

It is as clear as daylight from this text that here *fāsiq* does not mean *kāfir* but means:

خروج عن طاعة الله مع الايمان

Disobeying Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى while possessing *īmān*.

Now, if the followers of Dildār ‘Alī still do not ponder over his high level of *ijtihād* and call him stupid, and wail over his understanding but continue boasting over *Dhū al-Fiqār*’s solidity and rigidity then what can be said about them but this poem:

بر چه می خوابد دل تنگت بگو بیج ادایه و تریه مجو

Do not consider any etiquette or sequence

Blurt out whatever comes to your mind

If Dildār ‘Alī has been thrown into the misconception that the word *fāsiq* has been used in the Qur’ān to refer to a *kāfir* and *murtad*, then we will ask him does *fāsiq* mean *kāfir* wherever it appears? If it is so, we will ask him for this verdict. A *mujtahid* drank liquor, committed fornication and intentionally not performed *ṣalāh*; is he a *kāfir* or a *fāsiq*? Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى has pronounced in the glorious Qur’ān:

وَلَقَدْ أَنْزَلْنَا إِلَيْكَ آيَاتٍ بَيِّنَاتٍ ۖ وَمَا يَكْفُرُ بِهَا إِلَّا الْفَاسِقُونَ

And We have certainly revealed to you verses (which are) clear proofs, and no one would deny them except the defiantly disobedient.¹

I take an oath by the Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى who has created me — I do not say out of exaggeration and I do not include any prejudice — what Dildār ‘Alī has written regarding Ṭūsī’s statement is so ludicrous and ridiculous and filled with dullness.

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 99

What can I say about him? He is a mujtahid, an ocean of knowledge, the pride of the scholars and their king. How can an insignificant one like me utter anything to one so lofty? However, if this had been written by some ordinary layman, I would not have written two words to debunk it and would not have wasted one second of my valuable time since it is so ridiculous that it will not be worth the paper used to write its rebuttal. O Allah! What type of a mujtahid was this? Why do the Shī'ah boast over his knowledge and expertise? How shameful was he that he boasts over such drivel and is on cloud nine? I seek Allah's *سُبْحَانَكَ وَبِحَمْدِكَ* forgiveness!

I will now discuss the point Dildār 'Alī made that if a person rejects one of the fundamentals of dīn, he becomes a kāfir. This does not affect Ṭūsī's statement in the least. It was better for Dildār 'Alī that instead of fabricating meanings to Ṭūsī's statement and taking out such meanings which he did not even see in his wildest of dreams — and had Ṭūsī heard of such weird meanings of his statement, he would have clouted the culprit — he should have stated clearly that although Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī or Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī have written this but since it contradicts the aḥādīth of the A'immah and the consensus of the Shī'ī scholars, hence they have erred. We would have accepted this explanation perhaps. So just as we did not take Dildār 'Alī to task due to him not accepting Mullā 'Abd Allah's statement, we would have done the same here and kept silent. And this is not far-fetched. It is not necessary that the people of a religion accept each and every statement of every mujtahid and scholar especially when someone expresses his own opinion. It is only mandatory to accept Qur'ān and ḥadīth. If any scholar — be he Shī'ī or Sunnī — mentioned something in conformity with Qur'ān and ḥadīth, it will be binding upon the followers of that religion to accept what he said. Therefore, we do not harp on 'Allāmah Ṭūsī's statement. We are prepared to criticise the path Dildār 'Alī has treaded claiming it to be unanimously agreed upon and upon which he lays the foundation of his ijtihād.

Dildār 'Alī states in the beginning of the book:

پوشیده مخفی نماند که این عبارت ناصب که او درین جا التزام نموده که باینچه درین اجزاء بر شیعیان احتجاج نماید در عدم استحقاق لعن اصحاب ثلاثه و احزاب آنها از اصول مقررہ پیش شیعه باشد و اصلاً قول اہل سنت را در آن دخل

نه دہد پس بدانکہ از جملہ اصول مقررہ پیش شیعہ اثنا عشریہ اصول دین ست کہ عبارت از توحید و عدل نبوت و امامت و معاد باشد پس شکے نیست کہ امامیہ منکر یکے از اصول مذکورہ را مومن نمی داند و اور از جملہ ملا عین می انگارند اے منکر امامت را باوجود اقرار او بہ توحید و نبوت و معاد کافر نہیبد اند یعنی احکام کفار را در دنیا بر اینہا جاری نہی سارند

It should be understood that the nāṣibī enemy has written this text in this place so that he may have proof against the Shī'ah that not cursing the three Ṣaḥābah and their group is one of the fundamentals of Shī'ism. It should not be understood that the Ahl al-Sunnah's principle has anything to do with it. Among the established principles of Shī'ism is that original dīn is that which included towḥīd, nubuwwah, imāmah and Qiyāmah. The reality is this that whoever rejects any one of the above mentioned principles is not a believer according to the Shī'ah and they regard him as accursed. Although, this fact is definite that a person who rejects imāmah and believes in towḥīd, nubuwwah and the hereafter will not be regarded as a kāfir, i.e. the laws applicable to the kuffār will not apply to him in this world.

He writes at another place:

از کلام بعضے معلوم می شود کہ کفر واقعی ایشان را اجماعی می دارند

It is apparent from a few people's statements that they unanimously accept them as kāfir.¹

He writes thereafter:

ہر گاہ کہ این دانستہ شد پس بنا بریں می گوئیم کہ منشاء تبرا از اصحاب ثلاثہ و عائشہ و حفصہ و طلحہ و زبیر و معاویہ و احزاب اینہا مخالفت ہر یکے از اصول معتبرہ مقررہ نزدیک شیعہ امامیہ ست چہ باتفاق معلوم ست کہ ایشان و تبعہ ایشان با امامت ائمہ اثنا عشریہ قائل نبودند و نیستند بخوبیکہ شیعہ قائل اند و این نیز ثابت است کہ ائمہ ما علیہم السلام از اینہا تبرا فرمودہ اند و رعیت خود را حکم نمودہ اند کہ تبرا از اینہا نہایند و حکم بنفاق اینہا کند

1 *Dhū al-Fiqār*: pg. 11

To express Tabarra' from 'Ā'ishah, Ḥaḥḥah, Ṭalḥah, Zubayr, Mu'āwiyah and their comrades is for this reason that these persons were against the established reliable principles of the Shī'ah and it is known that they and their leaders did not consider the Imāmah of the twelve A'imma and did not believe in it as the Shī'ah believe. It is also established that our A'imma have expressed Tabarra' from them all and have commanded their followers to express the same from them and believe them to be hypocrites.¹

He writes in answer to introduction four:

پاید دانست که تنازع عامه با خاصه یان ماند که زن با مرد مخاصمه نماید زیرا که معلوم است که صد شام زن به یک دشنام مرد مقاومت نمی تواند کرد و مصداق این حرف این ست تطویلات بلا طائل که بکار برده و یک حرف که عدم ثبوت ایمان اصحاب ثلاثه و نظر ای ایشان از جهت عدم اعتراف بامامت ائمه اثنا عشر ست کافیت و باز بر گز احتیاج گفتگو باقی نمی ماند

It should be known that for a layman to debate with one of the elite is like a woman debating with a man. And it is apparent that a hundred expletives of a woman cannot match a man's one expletive. Useless proofs and explanations are worthless. Their not believing and acknowledging the Imāmah of the twelve A'imma is sufficient proof that the three companions and their comrades were not believers.²

He writes at yet another place:

محقق طوسی علیه الرحمة در رساله قواعد العقائد گفته اصول ایمان نزد شیعه سه چیز ست تصدیق به وحدانیت خدا در ذات اور و در افعال او و تصدیق پیغمبری پغمبران و تصدیق به امامت ائمه بعد از پیغمبران انتہی کلام المحقق رحمه الله و این کلام بر بان قاطع ست بر فساد ذہن و اعوجاج طبع این معاند مجادل که از عبارت تجرید محقق می خوابد که کفررا مخصوص بحارین گردانیده خلفاء ثلاثه خود را ازان نجات دبد و نجات متصور نیست

Muḥaqqiq Ṭūsī has written in *Qawā'id al-'Aqā'id* that there are three principles of imān according to the Shī'ah, viz. 1. Allah ﷻ is unique

1 Ibid

2 *Dhū al-Fiqār* pg. 23

in His being and attributes 2. Believing in the nubuwah of the Ambiyā' and 3. After the messengers, Imāmah is true. This text is an indisputable proof against that enemy's corrupted mind and warped disposition. The enemy's objective for quoting Muḥaqqiq Ṭūsī's text is to label only those who fought Sayyidunā 'Alī عليه السلام as kāfir and to spare the three khulafā' from it, but they cannot be spared.

Other latter Shī'ī scholars have expressed similar sentiments as Dildār 'Alī. Accordingly, the big brother Munshī Subḥān 'Alī Khān writes in response to *Īdāḥ Laṭāfat al-Maqāl*:

حالا بجواب معارضه که حضرت مخدومی فرموده اند هر چه حاضر طبع مابهر ست گزارش می رود و این است که لمحض معارضه جناب اینکه قدامت امامیه قاطبه معتقد کفر منکران امامت بوده اند و از کلام خواجه نصیر الدین طوسی و علامه حلی و میر نور الله شوستری فسق ایشان مستفاد می گردد بنده عرض میکنم که مختار جمہور امامیه اثنا عشریہ خواه از متقدمین و یا از متاخرین ہمین ست که مخالف جناب امیرالمومنین علی بن ابی طالب علیه السلام اعم من ان یكون محاربا ام لا کافر ست لیکن اطلاقی کافر بر او نظرا الی دار الاخره و سوء مال اوست نہ باعتبار در دار دنیا مثل جواز مناکحت یا مجالست و امثال این و وجه این عقیده نہ این ست کہ ملازمان خیال فرموده اند اعنی در دو حدیثیکہ مضمونش این ست کہ بعد رحلت حضرت رسالت ماب صلی الله علیه و سلم ہمگیں صحابہ مرتد شدند بجز چهار کس و جناب بزعم خود این حدیث را منافی آیات کثیره و احادیث شہیرہ فہمیدہ اند مع ان الامر لیس کذلک چنانچہ بوجه وجہ این حدیث بموقع خواهد آمد بلکہ احسن اینکه امامت بلا فصل علی بن ابی طالب علیه السلام و بمجنین امامت سائر ائمہ نزد کان ایمان نہ جز و اسلام ست و این مماثلت باعتبار دار اخرت ست یعنی منکر بریکے از اینها مخلد بچہنم ست نہ باعتبار این دار چه معترف بہ شہادتین را در دار دنیا کافر نہی گویند گو مومن نباشد

I state in response to the respected brother's article. The crux of his answer is that those who reject Imāmah have been labelled as kāfir by the former Shī'ah whereas they appear to be fāsiq from the texts of Khwājah Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī, 'Allāmah Ḥillī and Nūr Allah Shostarī. I declare that those who believe in the Twelve A'immaḥ — whether former or latter — all accept that the one who opposes Sayyidunā Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, whether he fights him or not, is a kāfir. Such a person is labelled a kāfir in terms of the hereafter for he will have a wretched ending there. However, he will not be treated as a kāfir in this world. It is permissible to marry and intermingle with him. The reason for this belief is not what the respected brother has imagined as it appears in the aḥādīth that all the

Ṣaḥābah besides four turned renegade after Rasūlullāh's ﷺ demise. The respected brother has deemed this ḥadīth to be contrary to numerous verses and aḥādīth whereas this is not the case. This ḥadīth will be written according to its context. The preferred view is that according to the Shī'ah the undisputable Imāmah of Sayyidunā 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib ﷺ and the Imāmah of the other A'imma are part of the fundamentals of dīn just as towḥīd and nubuwwah and acknowledgement of Imāmah is a pillar of dīn. It is not a part of Islam. And he being kāfir is with regards to the hereafter, i.e. the person who rejects the pillars of dīn will remain in Hell forever. And such a person, since he reads the shahādātayn, will not be labelled a kāfir in the world although he is also not a Mu'min.

The crux of this whole essay is that the three Ṣaḥābah ﷺ and their followers rejected the Imāmah of the twelve A'imma, hence they are kuffār. All the laws of kufr will not apply to them in this world since they attest to towḥīd and nubuwwah, but the laws of Islam will apply to them. However, in the hereafter, all the laws applicable to the kuffār will apply to them and they will remain in Hell forever.

I will answer this in a few ways:

1. Dildār 'Alī said regarding the three khulafā', Sayyidunā Ṭalḥah, Sayyidunā Zubayr and Sayyidah 'Ā'ishah ﷺ:

ایشان و تبعه ایشان بامامت ائمه اثنا عشر قائل نبودند

They and their followers did not believe in the Imāmah of the twelve A'imma.

However, he did not think that the twelve A'imma were not alive in their era. Besides Sayyidunā 'Alī ﷺ who was alive in their era and Sayyidunā Ḥasanayn ﷺ who were towards the last portion of their era, none of the other A'imma were born. They only appeared after all these Ṣaḥābah

ﷺ passed away. If they did not bring īmān on the twelve A’immah, then is this their fault? May Allah forbid, it cannot be the Almighty’s fault for not creating all the A’immah in their era. Glory be to Allah! Allah ﷻ is pure! What intelligence and wit Dildār ‘Alī possesses? He does not consider his words when writing and is so intoxicated with his expertise that he does not proof read it. O Mu’minīn! Deal with fairness for Allah’s ﷻ sake. Allah ﷻ has declared:

لَا يُكَلِّفُ اللَّهُ نَفْسًا إِلَّا وُسْعَهَا

Allah does not charge a soul except (with that within) its capacity.¹

Dildār ‘Alī eliminates the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ from this verse and labels them as kuffār since “they and their followers did not believe in the Imāmah of the twelve A’immah.” Applause to such understanding. Bravo to such intellect.

2. If Mujtahid refers to the being of Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ by the twelve A’immah, meaning that acknowledgement of his Imāmah at that time was like acknowledgement of the Imāmah of the twelve A’immah, which the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ denied; we will accept his corrupt explanation. The answer then is that Allah ﷻ revealed verses in praise of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār and commended their hijrah, assistance, and jihad. Allah ﷻ has stated:

وَالسُّبْقُونَ الْأَوَّلُونَ مِنَ الْمُهَاجِرِينَ وَالْأَنْصَارِ

And the first forerunners (in the faith) among the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār.²

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 286

2 Sūrah al-Towbah: 100

الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَهَاجَرُوا وَجَاهَدُوا فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ

The ones who have believed, emigrated and striven in the cause of Allah.¹

رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ وَرَضُوا عَنْهُ

Allah is pleased with them and they are pleased with Him.²

لَقَدْ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ إِذْ يُبَايِعُونَكَ تَحْتَ الشَّجَرَةِ

Certainly was Allah pleased with the believers when they pledged allegiance to you, (O Muḥammad), under the tree.³

So when these verses were revealed, was Imāmah part of the fundamentals of dīn together with toḥīd and nubuwwah? And was the person who rejected the Imāmah of Sayyidunā ‘Alī Murtaḍā رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ labelled a kāfir? If there is such a verse in the glorious Qur’ān, then please show it to us.

When these verses were revealed, there was no mention of Imāmah because Imāmah is khilāfah and khilāfah was founded after Rasūlullāh’s صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ demise. So to label those persons as kuffār who brought īmān on Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, emigrated with him and fought in jihad besides him and regarding whom Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى revealed verses before the beginning of the era of khilāfah and before the new fundamental of Imāmah came into existence is synonymous to crying over the death of chickens who have not yet hatched. No doubt, according to Shīī principles, those people can be labelled as kuffār who found the era of khilāfah and rejected the Imāmah of Sayyidunā ‘Alī Murtaḍā رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

1 Sūrah al-Towbah: 20

2 Sūrah al-Towbah: 100

3 Sūrah al-Fatḥ: 18-21

3. If any Shī'ī has to say that the three khulafā' رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ are among those who found the era of khilāfah and rejected the Imāmah of Sayyidunā 'Alī Murtaḍā رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, hence we label them as kuffār and exclude them from the virtues mentioned in the above verse. The answer is that the Shī'ī principle that the rejecter of Imāmah is a kāfir begins after the demise of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. It begins when they reject Sayyidunā 'Alī Murtaḍā's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ khilāfah and assume this position. Conversely, the glorious Qur'ān was revealed during the lifetime of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and hijrah, assistance, and jihad — whatever the Muhājirīn did took place in Rasūlullāh's صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ lifetime. Allah سُبحانه وتعالى accepted these services and revealed verses in their praise. So until they did not usurp the khilāfah and reject the Imāmah of the first Imām, what crime did they commit that deprives them of the virtues mentioned in these verses? What offence excludes the Muhājirīn and Anṣār from being among:

وَالسَّبِقُونَ الْأَوْلُونَ مِنَ الْمُهَاجِرِينَ وَالْأَنْصَارِ

The first forerunners (in the faith) among the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār.¹

4. O Allah سُبحانه وتعالى! Someone might say that Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ made Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ khalīfah in his lifetime by announcing:

من كنت مولاه فعلى مولاه

Whose guardian I am, 'Alī is his guardian.

And he made everyone acknowledge his Imāmah. The Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ then rejected Imāmah in the very lifetime of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, hence they are kuffār.

The answer to this is given in two ways:

1 Sūrah al-Towbah: 100

Firstly, when did Rasūlullāh ﷺ announce the Imāmah of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه؟ Did he establish the Imāmah of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه in the beginning stages of Islam when he announced his nubuwwah? If Rasūlullāh ﷺ had done so, then show us a sign or proof of this. To our understanding, no intelligent person, even if he be Dildār ‘Alī, will utter such rubbish. The most he will say is that Rasūlullāh ﷺ gave the khuṭbah of his khilāfah at Ghadīr Khum after Ḥajjat al-Wadā¹. The response to this is this happened in the last stages of the life of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and hardly any verses were revealed after this. Moreover, the verse:

الْيَوْمَ أَكْمَلْتُ لَكُمْ دِينَكُمْ وَأَتَمَمْتُ عَلَيْكُمْ نِعْمَتِي وَرَضِيتُ لَكُمُ الْإِسْلَامَ دِينًا ط

This day I have perfected for you your religion and completed My favour upon you and have approved for you Islam as religion.²

is testimony to the dīn being complete and perfect as acknowledged by the Shī‘ah as well. On the other hand, the verse which complements the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم is either Makkī³ or Madanī⁴ and were revealed many years before Ḥajjat al-Wadā’. Hence, the senior Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم cannot be excluded from being the addressees of these verses.

Secondly, according to the Shī‘ah, no one rejected Imāmah in Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ lifetime. Everyone accepted it outwardly and no one at that time emphatically rejected Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s رضي الله عنه khilāfah. Until a person does not reject towḥīd and nubuwwah verbally, he is not a kāfir. So the person who does not reject Imāmah verbally, how can he be a kāfir?

Therefore, the following statements of Dildār ‘Alī are ludicrous and ridiculous:

1 The final ḥajj

2 Sūrah al-Mā’idah: 3

3 Those verses which were revealed prior to hijrah

4 Those verses which were revealed after hijrah

اصحاب ثلاثه و عائشه و حفصه و طلحه و زبیر و غیرہم بہ امامت ائمہ اثنا عشر قائل نبودند

The three Ṣaḥābah, ‘Ā’ishah, Ḥaḥṣah, Ṭalḥah, Zubayr, etc. did not believe in the Imāmah of the twelve A’immah.

And his other statement:

عدم ثبوت ایمان اصحاب ثلاثه و نظر ای ایشان از جهت عدم اعتراف بامامت ائمہ اثنا عشر ست کافیت

Sufficient as proof that the three Ṣaḥābah and their like were not believers is that they did not accept the Imāmah of the twelve A’immah.

Dildār ‘Alī says:

تنازعه عامه با خاصه بیان ماند که زن با مرد مخاصمه نماید زیرا که معلوم است که صد دشنام زن به یک دشنام مرد مقاومت نمی تواند کرد

For a layman to debate with one of the elite is like a woman debating with her husband. And it is apparent that hundred expletives of a woman cannot match a man’s one expletive.

After what I have written, if a person flings his statement right back at him, it will be quite apt.

تنازعه خاصه یعنی حضرات شیعه با عامه یعنی سنیان بیان ماند که زن با مرد مخاصمه نماید زیرا که معلوم است که صد دشنام زن به یک دشنام مرد مقاومت نمی تواند کرد

For the Shī’ah to debate with a Sunnī is like a woman debating with her husband. And it is apparent that hundred expletives of a woman cannot match a man’s one expletive.

However, we will remain silent and we will not use expletives. O Shī’ah! Look at the holiness, morals and dignity of your Fountain of Guidance. When giving examples, he chooses those with expletives. If only he used a

different example, he would have maintained his dignity and morals and would not have been embarrassed in front of all.

If you have a look at *Dhū al-Fiqār*, you will see that pages after pages are blackened with the substantiation of this fundamental that according to Shī'ī scholars, the rejecter of Imāmah is a kāfir. And the size of the book has been unreasonably thickened so that people might think that he wrote a voluminous book, whereas the crux of it all is that Imāmah is a fundamental of dīn according to the Shī'ah and the one who rejects it is kāfir. However, this does not provide an answer to the objection of *Tuḥfah*'s author. The author of *Tuḥfah* does not wish to establish the īmān of all the Ahl al-Sunnah — who according to Shī'ī principles should be labelled as kuffār due to their rejection of Imāmah. He only discusses the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم and claims that they cannot be labelled as kuffār. He furnishes those verses as substantiation which are in praise of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم and brings the statements of Mullā Naṣīr al-Dīn Ṭūsī and Nūr Allah Shostarī for corroboration. But sadly, Dildār 'Alī does not consider the clear difference between the two and does not understand what the author of *Tuḥfah* wrote. He mixes the two up and answers like an amateur, “our principles show that the one who rejects the imāmah of the 12 A'imma is a kāfir.”

How can the one who rejects Imāmah be a kāfir according to your principles? If according to your principles, the one who rejects your holiness and ijtihād is a kāfir, then good for you all, but the author of *Tuḥfah* is not discussing this. The crux of what Dildār 'Alī has written is that the one who rejects Imāmah is a kāfir. However, since the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم did not reject Imāmah until after Rasūlullāh's صلى الله عليه وسلم demise, they being kuffār during Rasūlullāh's صلى الله عليه وسلم lifetime is not established according to this principle. Now when their kufr is not established, then they are definitely included in those verses which were revealed in praise of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār. Thus the Muhājirīn and Anṣār especially the three khulafā' possess the highest level of those attributes which Allah سبحانه وتعالى listed in those verses,

viz. īmān, hijrah, assistance, jihad, bay‘ah, etc. So what is the reason for excluding these individuals? And if they are excluded then only Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and three others will remain, no one else. To claim that all these verses apply to Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ alone and to exclude all the Muhājirīn and Anṣār is in fact distortion of the glorious Qur’ān.

I feel it appropriate to falsify the statement Dildār ‘Alī quoted from Muḥaqqiq Ṭūsī’s article, *Qawā‘id al-‘Aqā‘id*, which was quoted earlier when proving that Muḥaqqiq Ṭūsī regards Imāmah as one of the fundamentals of dīn, so how could he specify kufr only for those who waged war against Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.

The answer is that this statement of Muḥaqqiq Ṭūsī recorded in *Qawā‘id al-‘Aqā‘id* is contrary to the belief of the majority of Shī‘ī scholars. He writes:

اصول ایمان نزد شیعه سه چیز است تصدیق به وحدانیت خدا و تصدیق پیغمبری و تصدیق به امامت

The fundamentals of īmān according to the Shī‘ah are three, viz. belief in the oneness of Allah سُبْحَانَكَ رَبَّنَا, nubuwwah and Imāmah.

The majority of Shī‘ī scholars have written that the fundamentals of dīn are five. Dildār ‘Alī himself has stated in his book *Dhū al-Fiqār*:

از جمله اصول مقررہ پیش شیعه اثنا عشریہ اصول دین است کہ عبارت از توحید و عدل نبوت و امامت و معاد باشد

The Shī‘ah who believe in the twelve A‘immah consider the following as established fundamentals of dīn, viz. 1. Towḥīd 2. Justice 3. Nubuwwah 4. Imāmah and 5. Hereafter.¹

Muḥaqqiq Ṭūsī has forgotten two fundamentals and chosen three instead of five. If he has so much of love for ‘three’ that he only listed three

1 *Dhū al-Fiqār*: pg. 10

fundamentals of dīn, then it is not astounding if he spared the ‘three’ khulafā’ from kufr by saying, “those who opposed him were fāsiq.”

Moreover, Muḥaqqiq Ṭūsī’s statement in *Qawā‘id al-‘Aqā‘id* does not falsify his statement in *Tajrīd* since the former (i.e. the fundamentals of imān according to the Shī‘ah are three) is general while the latter (i.e. his opponents are transgressors and those who fought him are kuffār) is specific.

و ما من عام الا و قد خص

Every general rule has exceptions.

Thus, those Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ who only opposed are excluded from this verdict.

If someone objects, “when you do not accept Dildār ‘Alī’s explanation of ‘his opponents are transgressors’ then why do you give such an explanation? The answer is that we have proof for this explanation and substantiate it with the statement of another Shī‘ī Muḥaqqiq, i.e. Qāḍī Nūr Allāh Shostarī. He says in support of Muḥaqqiq Ṭūsī’s statement:

Shaykhayn did not fight against Sayyidunā Amīr al-Mu‘minīn. Rather, without unsheathing their swords they made people theirs, trampled on ‘Alī’s right and usurped his right of being Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ khalīfah.

If usurping the khilāfah necessitated kufr according to him, then why does he present the usurpation of khilāfah without a fight as substantiation of the non-kufr of those who opposed Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ? If there is any other meaning to this text of Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī, then kindly explain it.

فعلیکم البیان و علینا دفعه بالبرهان

Your task is to explain and our task is to falsify that with proof.

If someone says, “just as you have furnished another of Muḥaqqiq’s statement as proof, Dildār ‘Alī has also has furnished proof. In fact, you have furnished proof from another source whereas he has furnished proof from the same source, i.e. from Muḥaqqiq Ṭūsī’s other book.” The answer is that certainly we both have furnished proof. However, there is a difference between the two. Our explanation conforms to the words, text and the external meaning of what Muḥaqqiq has said and our proof is in support of it in clear-cut terms whereas Dildār ‘Alī’s explanation is contrary to the wording, text and the external meaning and the proof he furnishes does not clearly support what he says. The meaning we present is clear and manifest whereas the meaning presented by Dildār ‘Alī is so intricate that it contradicts the rules of Arabic grammar and etymology. If you have any doubt, place the two meanings in front of an Arabic student — who is neither Shīṭī nor Sunnī — and ask him which meaning is correct. He will definitely say that what the Sunnī is saying is correct and the meaning Dildār ‘Alī has claimed does not make any sense. Maybe only the Imām can understand such intricacies. So go to Surra Man Ra’ā¹ and ask the Imām. Until the Imām does not emerge, and does not praise Dildār ‘Alī’s understanding, far-sightedness and holy nature and does not approve of his self-made explanations, no one will accept it.

The above discussion is now complete. I will now discuss whether the senior Ṣaḥābah and the noble khulafā’ رضي الله عنهم are Muslims according to Shīṭī principles. Dildār ‘Alī acknowledges this by saying that the one who rejects Imāmah is not a kāfir, i.e. the laws of kufr do not apply to him in this world. We have quoted this earlier and supported it with quotations from *Istiqṣā’ al-Afhām*. This proves that according to the Shīṭī scholars, as he himself has stated, there are three stages:

1. Imān: The one who believes in the five fundamentals viz. towḥīd, nubuwwah, Imāmah, justice and hereafter.

1 The name of the cave where the alleged twelfth Imām is hiding.

2. Kufr: The one who rejects all the above five or one of them besides Imāmah. Neither īmān nor Islam will apply to him.
3. Islam: The one who rejects only Imāmah. He will be with the kuffār on the Day of Qiyāmah. However, the laws of kufr will not apply to him in this world.

The reason for making up these three stages is so that there remains scope to label the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم as kuffār as well as Muslims. When they see that the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم were truthful in their belief in towḥīd and nubuwwah, they were perfect in good actions, strong in dīn and had no defect in their external actions, they call them Muslims. But when they wish to criticise, defame and exclude them from the verses in praise of them, then they say that “they were not Mu’minīn,” since they rejected one of the fundamental of dīn. Hence, they invented a level between kufr and īmān and called it Islam.

Furthermore, they assumed that if anyone hears this difference, he will laugh and will call the one who made it up an idiot. The reason for this is that the fundamentals of dīn are five and all of them have been given an equal status. Four are such that if anyone rejects them or any one of them, he falls out of the fold of Islam and is regarded as a kāfir (in this world and the next, and the relevant laws apply to him) while one (i.e. Imāmah) is such that the one who rejects it is neither a kāfir nor a Mu’min, but remains a Muslim and is not out of the fold of Islam. So either this fundamental of Imāmah is not among the fundamentals but among the minor aspects; and if it is among the fundamentals, then the one who rejects it ought to be a kāfir (and not a Muslim). So they discussed this matter in order to remove its absurdity and provide a unique reason for it. But instead of concealing its stupidity, its ridiculousness was doubled. I will now mention the reason and substantiate my claim. Dildār ‘Alī writes in *Dhū al-Fiqār*:

بنا بر ورود احادیث بسیار محققین امامیه در کتب خود تصریح نهوده اند که مخالفین در عقبی حکم کفار دارند و بر گز
از جهنم بیرون نمی آیند و درین دنیا نیز در احکام کفار شریک اند اما چون علام الغیوب می دانست که دولت باطل بر
دولت حق پیش از ظهور قائم ال محمد غالب خواهد گردید و شیعیان را معاشرت مواصلت و معاملات با مخالفان ضرور

خواهد شد درین دولتهای باطل احکام اسلام را بر ایشان جاری گردانید که جان و مال ایشان محفوظ بوده باشد و حکم به طهارت ایشان به کند و ذبیحه ایشان را حلال داند و دختر از ایشان بخوابند و میراث بایشان بد بسد و از ایشان بگیرند و دیگر احکام اسلام بر ایشان جاری کند تا بر شیعیان کار دشوار نه شود در دولت ایشان و هر گاه حضرت صاحب الامر ظاهر شود حکم بت پرستان را بر ایشان جاری کند و دریمه احکام مثل سائر کفار باشند و این تفضل خداست نسبت بحال شیعیان زیرا که فرق کفار بسیار اند اگر بر سنیان نیز درین ایام احکام کفار جاری می گردید در امور مسطوره عسرتی بر شیعیان می شد که مزیدی بر این متصور نیست

Shī'ah research scholars have categorically declared in their books with reference to abundant aḥādīth that the opponents of Sayyidunā 'Alī عليه السلام are kuffār with regards to the hereafter and will never come out of Hell. They are partners to the kuffār in laws in this world as well. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى knew that before the appearance of the Imām of the time, the false government will overpower the true one and the Shī'ah will be forced to socialise and deal with their opponents. Hence, He set out laws to call the false government as Muslims for the safety of the Shī'ah's lives and wealth. They will regard the Muslims as clean, regard their slaughtered animals as ḥalāl, marry their daughters, give them inheritance, take inheritance from them and apply other laws of Islam to them so that worldly affairs are not constrained for the Shī'ah when the Sunnī are in power. When the Imām of the era makes his appearance, then the laws applicable to the idol-worshippers will be applied to the Sunnī and all laws applicable to the kuffār will apply to them. This is Allah's سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى grace and kindness upon the Shī'ah since the different sections of kuffār are in majority. If in such a time, the Sunnī are regarded as kuffār, the worldly affairs of the Shī'ah will be constrained to such an extent that it cannot be imagined.

This proves that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى knew that the poor Shī'ah will be disgraced and humiliated and the Sunnī will enjoy honour and affluence. So if the laws of kufr applied to the Sunnī then from where will the poor Shī'ah get bread and who would feed them? The Shī'ah would be forced to serve the Sunnī and remain their servants. If the laws of kufr would be applied to the Sunnī and if the Shī'ah will brand them as kuffār then all the Shī'ah would die out of hunger and the Sunnī would stop giving them food. In fact, they would be enraged and kill them. Had this happened, the Ja'farī faith would be destroyed and no one

would remain on the surface of this earth to take Allah's سُبْحَانَكَ وَبِحَمْدِكَ and His Rasūl's name. By the extermination of the Shī'ah, Allah's سُبْحَانَكَ وَبِحَمْدِكَ worship would cease to exist. Since Allah سُبْحَانَكَ وَبِحَمْدِكَ had mercy on the Shī'ah's subjugation and poverty and had sympathy on their pitiable condition, He protected the Sunnī from kufr in this world and kept them as Muslims due to the Shī'ah. But this mercy and compassion will only last until the emergence of the final Imām. When the Imām will emerge from the cave of Surra Man Ra'ā and will finally overcome the fear of the Sunnī after a good few thousands of years, then what will be the splendour and grandeur of the Shī'ah! They will enjoy authority and kingdom. Some will have the knowledge of Sayyidunā 'Abbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Someone will have the Imām's shield on his shoulders. Someone will be running to kiss Dhū al-Fiqār. Someone will be unsheathing Ṣawārim and Ṣamṣām. Someone will be running into Zurārah's cave. Someone will be searching for Hishām and Shayṭān al-Tāq. The Shī'ah's will be running everything then. People will forget about the tenth of Muḥarram. Shouts of O Imām! O Imām! will be heard in the skies. When the Shī'ah will enjoy such grandeur and might and they will need nothing from the Sunnī, the Imām will announce, "today, the verdict of Islam has come to an end and the time for open declaration of kufr has come. Now our Shī'ah have no need for the Sunnī. Hence, no one should call a sunnī a Muslim from today onwards and no one should utter the word Islam. Understand them as genuine and impure kuffār. Apply the rules of the idol-worshippers upon them. Do not eat their slaughtered animals and do not drink water from their hands. Take your swords and sickles, and butcher them. They have suppressed our Shī'ah for years and forced them to practice Taqiyyah. It was due to these wretched Sunnī that our Shī'ah had to speak lies. In fact, speaking the truth became difficult even for us Imāms and we were forced to be two-faced. These despicable people caused much harm to us and our Shī'ah. Now take full revenge. Live in peace and bliss. Beat the drums of sovereignty. Rule with might and force. And take out the thousand year old malice on the Sunnī."

O Sunnī! For Allah's سُبْحَانَكَ وَبِحَمْدِكَ sake, be grateful to the Shī'ah. It is because of them that you are saved from kufr. Allah سُبْحَانَكَ وَبِحَمْدِكَ has shown mercy upon them by not labelling you as kuffār and applying the laws of Islam upon you until the

emergence of the Imām. Had there been no Shī'ah, Allah ﷻ would not have dealt with you with such kindness and tenderness.

The reason Dildār 'Alī has proffered for not labelling the Sunnī with kufr until the Imām's emergence has removed the entire objection. All the wind has been hit out of the Sunnī. Does any Sunnī have the guts to object to it or reject his reason which has been backed by philosophical proofs? We have definitely lost and Dildār 'Alī has won.

We are unable to answer such an exposition, the strength and force of which can be gaged by its words and meanings. O Shī'ah! Listen attentively and place this reason in your hearts. Dildār 'Alī has said something very subtle and has taught you something extremely intricate. This is a proper mujtahid and a proper Muḥaqqiq! The only words which can be uttered regarding such wisdom is “we accept and we believe” and no one can refute his sound statements.

إذا قالت حذام فصدقوها فان القول ما قالت حذام

When Ḥudhām¹ speaks then believe her

Because what Ḥudhām says is the truth

When I read in *Ṣawārim* that Dildār 'Alī has boasted over *Dhū al-Fiqār* and thought his book to be unanswerable and proudly declared that no one has written a response thus far, I had a desire to study *Dhū al-Fiqār* from cover to cover to see those wise proofs and philosophical explanations he filled his book with, which no one could answer. After I studied it from beginning to ending — Allah ﷻ is witness and I do not say with exaggeration — I did not find any scholar's book more preposterous and absurd than his and do not feel it is worth a glance. He does not consider textual evidences and does not stick to the topic. He gathers

1 Ḥudhām was an Arabian woman. When she would speak, her lover would listen and would not object. A poet said this couplet regarding her, “when Ḥudhām speaks then believe her because what Ḥudhām says is the truth. No one can reject what she says.

muddled points, jumbled discussions and unnecessary discussions. Most probably it is for this reason that no one has written an answer to it. If anyone is uncertain, he should study all the texts I quoted from his book and he will confess to what I have said.

I will write one or two incidents for the Shī'ah concerning the reason Dildār 'Alī has proffered as to why Sunnīs are not labelled as kuffār. Whoever is interested should listen. Whatever I am going to say is very beneficial and worth listening. So listen attentively, O Mu'minīn!

جلوه مفت ست دیدنی دارد

سخن ماشنیدنی دارد

Our statement is worth listening to

It is a free show for those who wish to see

Firstly, according to the Shī'ah, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى has termed the Sunnī as Muslims for the sole reason that:

تا بر شیعیان کار دشوار نه شود

So that worldly affairs are not constrained for the Shī'ah.

So why did Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى not show a little more mercy on their pitiable condition by making all the idol-worshippers and kuffār their brothers? Just as how rejection of one fundamental (Imāmah) notwithstanding that it is clear-cut kufr, yet the word Islam is used for the Sunnī for their sake, so why was Islam not used for those who reject all five fundamentals, because now the true meaning of Islam which appears in the Qur'ān and aḥādīth does not remain. This is a brand new term.

Just as due to mercy upon the Shī'ah, the Sunnī could be called Muslims notwithstanding their kufr and remaining in Hell forever, similarly permission could be given for this word to be used for the rest of the kuffār so that the Shī'ah may have even more freedom.

Secondly, why were the forbidden things not made ḥalāl for the Shī'ah until the Imām's emergence, so that worldly affairs are not constrained for the Shī'ah? When for their sake, kufr and Islam were made synonymous and Allah handed himself over to them, it would be appropriate that all things be made ḥalāl for them. Then they could have drunk liquor with happiness and fulfilled their desires illicitly with women. All of the wealth of the world would be made permissible for them so they could steal anything from anyone and could live better lives. All animals even pigs could be made ḥalāl for them so that they could eat with relish. Moreover, they should not have been burdened with anything. Ṣalāh should have been waived for them, fasting should not have been made compulsory upon them so that they are not inconvenienced in the least. Although, I have thought of rather surprising and far-fetched things, but in reality the Shī'ah have made plenty of things ḥalāl for themselves. For instance, they perform ṣalāh at three times thus saving themselves from two times. They are not shackled by nikāḥ, thanks to mut'ah. They can pay any woman they desire and use her the whole night and be grateful to Allah. But it would be better for them to abandon the little injunctions of sharī'ah which are left and become genuine heretics. Then if anyone has to object, they should just quote their magnificent scholars statement:

این تفضل خداست نسبت بحال شیعیان

This is Allah's سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى grace and kindness upon the Shī'ah.

Thirdly, if in reality Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى saved the Sunnī from kufr externally due to having mercy on the Shī'ah's condition, then the condition of it lasting until the Imām's emergence is useless. The condition should rather have been until a mujtahid's emergence and Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى should have said, "This ruling is until the emergence of any mujtahid." This ruling ought to terminate the moment the Shī'ah have authority over any land to the extent that a mujtahid can assume the position of ijtihād and few thousands in pursuit of the world can gather around him and he is able to write books in rebuttal of the Sunnī.

When the cause does not remain, the effect does not remain.

It is really startling! Why is this verdict still present in Lucknow and Iran and who is awaiting the Imām's emergence there? When Mujtahid wrote *Dhū al-Fiqār* in the royal house of Lucknow and published it, he was not constrained at that time. The amount of glory, power and might the Shī'ah enjoyed at that time was not possible thereafter. Hence, he ought to have abolished that verdict. The truth is that he did abolish it, although not explicitly in writing, but he passed verdict of the kufr and impurity of the Sunnī. The situation reached the level that if any Sunnī sat on any pure Shī'ī's bedding, the latter would send it to the river for washing right away and the Shī'ah regarded the food and drink of the Sunnī as ḥarām and impure. So Mujtahid's following statement was only to beautify his book, not for practice:

حکم بظہارت ایشان بکنید و دیگر احکام اسلام بر ایشان جاری کنید

They will regard the Muslims as clean and apply other laws of Islam to them.

The sad reality is that the Shī'ah's mujtahid is just like the Christians' pope and the pundits. Just as they consider themselves as infallible and have the right to change and alter all the laws of their religions, the condition of the mujtahid is same. They think that the laws of the sharī'ah are subject to their desires. They pass verdict as they please. They label with kufr when it suites them and label with Islam when they desire. Divinity is in their hands, so they may do as they please. Their eyes will open on the Day of Qiyāmah. It will be us and the Mujtahid!

Fourthly, Dildār 'Alī has stated regarding inheritance:

میراث بایشان بدہند و ازیشان بگیرند

Give them inheritance and take inheritance from them.

And he has stated regarding nikāḥ:

دختر ایشان بخوابند اور براه دیانت دختر بایشان بدبند

Take their daughters and give them daughters out of trust.

He should have been ashamed at saying this. It is not permissible to give a Sunnī your daughter. The immorality of this can be understood by that person who turns back a few pages and reads the discussion on Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm's ﷺ nikāḥ.

It is apparent from this above discussion that Dildār 'Alī does not regard the three Ṣaḥābah ﷺ as Mu'minīn but rather as Muslims and he brings many proofs to substantiate his view. Nonetheless, his view is incorrect. His own Muḥaqqiqīn and Muḥaddithīn have branded it incorrect and fallacious. It is surprising that Dildār 'Alī neither considered this nor quoted it and acted in contradiction to his leaders by referring to the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ as Muslims. It is very regretful that he is not perfect in his Shī'ism and is not fully aware of his principles, yet he is prepared to write a book and unlawfully disgrace his fellow brethren with his stupid declarations.

Now listen to the great Shī'ī scholars' opinion concerning this topic. These scholars are neither like Mullā 'Abd Allah who Dildār 'Alī can claim to be unknown. In fact, I will present the words of such a scholar and researcher, whose holiness is acknowledged like the sixth fundamental of dīn and the rejection of his knowledge and ijtihād is equivalent to rejection of Imāmah. He is the honourable, master of both rational and reported knowledge, expert of uṣūl and furū', Muḥaqqiq, knower of the subtleties, Mullā Bāqir Majlisī. He quotes the ḥadīth regarding the apostasy of the Ṣaḥābah from *al-Kāfī* and then says:

بيان قوله عليه السلام من ان يرتدوا عن الاسلام اى عن ظاهره و التكلم بالشهادتين الى قوله و لياتى ان الناس ارتدوا الا ثلثة لان المراد منها ارتدادهم عن الدين واقعا و هذا محمول على بقاءهم على صورة الاسلام و ظاهره و ان كانوا فى اكثر الاحكام الواقعية فى حكم الكفار و خص هذا بمن لم يسمع النص

على امير المؤمنين عليه السلام ولم يبغضه ولم يعاده فان من فعل شيئا من ذلك فقد انكر قول النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم وكفر ظاهرا ايضا ولم يبق له شيء من احكام الاسلام ووجب قتله

Imām Abū Ja‘far رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ said, “Amīr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ did not claim Imāmah out of fear that it should not happen that the Ṣaḥābah do not accept it, abandon Islam and turn renegade. Turning renegade meaning that they outwardly abandon Islam and reject the Shahādah. This is not contrary to what has passed and what will come further on that all the people turned renegade except three since the meaning there refers to their turning renegade in reality and this refers to their remaining on the outward and apparent form of Islam although they are in the sphere of the kuffār in majority of laws. Those who did not hear the emphatic command of Amīr al-Mu‘minīn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and did not harbour hatred and enmity for him are excluded from this. Whoever has perpetrated any of the above has also openly rejected Rasūlullāh’s صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ statement. None of the laws of Islam apply to him and it is necessary that he be killed.

The crux of the above is that those Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ who did not hear the categorical declaration of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ appointing Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ as khalīfah and did not harbour enmity for him, the laws of Islam will apply to them although due to their allegiance to the khulafā’, majority of them will be included in the laws of the kuffār in reality. On the other hand, those who did hear the declaration of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ or harboured hatred for Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ are kuffār outwardly. None of the laws of Islam apply to them, it is not permissible to call them Muslims and it is obligatory to kill them.

If anyone is surprised that when Mullā Bāqir Majlisī has stated this, then why did Dildār ‘Alī oppose him and call the Khulafā’ Muslims? The answer is that it is our job to authenticate this narration and it is your job to decide whether Dildār ‘Alī is truthful or Mullā Bāqir Majlisī. Listen to the authentication of what we have written. The author of *Istiḳṣā’ al-Afḥām* quotes this in answer to *Muntahā al-Kalām* and then says:

اگر غرض از نقل این عبارت محض اثبات این معنی است که صاحب بحار ثلاثه و اتباع ایشان را کافر میداند پس البته این معنی بسر و چشم مقبول است اصلا جای استنکاف و انکار نیست

If the purpose of quoting this text is to prove that the author of *Biḥār al-Anwār* regards the three Ṣaḥābah and their followers as kuffār, then this meaning is accepted whole heartedly. We are not at all embarrassed of this and do not reject it.

The text of the Persian translation of *Biḥār al-Anwār* is:

این حکم یعنی بقای ظاہر اسلام مخصوص بکسی است که از رسول خدا صلی الله علیه و سلم نص بر خلافت امیر علیه السلام نشنیده و بغض و عداوت اینحضرت نداشته چه مرتکب این امور منکر قول پیغمبر صلی الله علیه و سلم است و بحسب ظاہر بم کافر است و بیچک از احکام برای او ثابت نیست و قتلش واجب است انتہی بلفظہ

This verdict i.e. remaining on external Islam is for the person who did not hear the categorical declaration of Rasūlullāh ﷺ regarding Amīr al-Mu'minīn's khilāfah and did not harbour hatred and enmity for him because the one who did perpetrate this has rejected Rasūlullāh's ﷺ declaration and is a kāfir externally as well. No ruling of Islam applies to him and it is necessary that he be killed.

If the Shī'ah act justly and abandon prejudice and bias then they will mourn over Dildār 'Alī's holiness and honesty. He quoted nearly all statements relating to this topic and deduced this conclusion:

در دار دنیا احکام اسلام بر اینها جاری می شود گو در دار آخرت مخلص بنار خواهد بود

The laws of Islam will apply to them (the Ṣaḥābah رضی اللہ عنہم) in this world. However, in the hereafter they will go to Hell forever.

However, he did not quote the statement of his Imām and 'Allāmah who declares that calling the khulafā' outward Muslims is incorrect and is in fact kufr. The Shī'ah are perplexing. They never remain steadfast on one view. Sometimes they say that the Ṣaḥābah and khulafā' were Muslims externally and the laws of Islam

applied to them while at other times they label them as kuffār and say that they ought to be killed. May Allah ﷻ make this nation taste His justice and punish them for the damage they caused to the dīn of Muḥammad ﷺ.

O Believers! Have a look at *Dhū al-Fiḡār* how brazenly it claims that outwardly the laws of Islam will apply to the three khulafā' ﷺ. Then look at *Biḡār al-Anwār* and *Istiḡā'* and see with what clarity they labelled them as kuffār. Marvel at this contradiction.

فَاعْتَبِرُوا يَا أُولِيَ الْإِبْصَارِ وَانظُرُوا إِلَى هَؤُلَاءِ الْكِبَارِ لَانَّهُمْ فِي كُلِّ واديهيمون و في كل تيه يتيهون تِلْكَ آيَةُ
اللَّهِ تَتْلُوهَا عَلَيْكَ بِالْحَقِّ فَبِأَيِّ حَدِيثٍ بَعْدَ اللَّهِ وَآيَتِهِ يُؤْمِنُونَ

Take lesson, o men of understanding. Look at these seniors. They wander in every valley and are lost in every gorge. These are the verses of Allah which We recite to you in truth. Then in what statement after Allah and His verses will they believe?¹

What we have written up until now shows that the Shī'ī scholars have difference of opinion regarding whether the Ṣaḡābah ﷺ are Muslims or kuffār. Majority label them as kuffār while some regard them as Muslims — and that too due to Allah's ﷻ merciful gaze on the Shī'ah and with the clarification that kufr and Islam are synonymous.

I will now discuss the reason for them labelling the Ṣaḡābah as kuffār.

1. Is it for this reason that they rejected the oneness of Allah ﷻ? Did they worship Lāt and 'Uzzā? Were they idol-worshippers like Abū Jahl and Abū Lahab?
2. Did they reject nubuwwah? Did they not believe Rasūlullāh ﷺ to be a true Messenger? Or did they belie Rasūlullāh ﷻ like the other kuffār?

1 Sūrah al-jāthiyah: 6

3. Did they only reject Imāmah but were perfect in towḥīd and nubuwwah?

I will discuss all three aspects separately.

Some Shī'ī scholars claim all three. They claim that from the very beginning the three khulafā' did not truly believe in the oneness of Allah سُبْحَانَكَ اللَّهُمَّ وَتَعَالي and Rasūlullāh's صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ nubuwwah. This is one of the mainstream beliefs of the Shī'ah which does not need any substantiation. Dildār 'Alī writes at many places in *Dhū al-Fiqār*, "they (Abū Bakr and 'Umar) did not believe from the very beginning."

I have already answered this in the discussion of Shaykhayn's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا īmān. I will not repeat it here. However, I will furnish more proofs for their īmān, besides those previously mentioned, so that the Shī'ah claim that the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ were hypocrites will be totally debunked.

Proofs Establishing That the Ṣaḥābah Were Not Munāfiqīn

Proof 1

It is clear that the three khulafā' and the senior Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ were Muslims and acknowledged towḥīd and nubuwwah. Hence, their 'outward' īmān cannot be rejected. Now remains the question as to whether they rejected towḥīd and nubuwwah from their hearts due to which they would be called munāfiqīn. Proof needs to be furnished for this. Otherwise every Khārijī and Nāṣibī will say the same regarding Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ — and he is pure from this. Just as you will answer the Khawārij and just as you will prove Sayyidunā 'Alī's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ īmān, understand the same to be our answer in favour of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ.

Proof 2

Had the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ been munāfiqīn, as claimed over and over by Dildār 'Alī and his seniors, Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ would have definitely dissociated from them and not allowed them to participate in his consultations and meetings. Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ would not have allowed them to fight on his side in battles and would

not have allowed them to accompany him on hijrah. Allah ﷻ would have commanded to dissociate from them and prevented Rasūlullāh ﷺ from being in their company. Allah ﷻ would have commanded jihād against them and returned them to an evil ending. Allah ﷻ has declared these very things regarding the munāfiqīn and treated them in this manner. Pity be upon Dildār ‘Alī! He has cited some of these verses in *Dhū al-Fiqār* and answered on our behalf. Dildār ‘Alī cited those verses which speak about the munāfiqīn to answer those verses which Shāh Ṣāhib listed in *Tuhfah* in favour and praise of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم. However Dildār ‘Alī did not think that his claim is falsified by the very verses he cited. Allah ﷻ has proven him a liar from his own speech. One of those verses are:

وَمِمَّنْ حَوْلَكُمْ مِنَ الْأَعْرَابِ مُنَافِقُونَ ۗ وَمِنْ أَهْلِ الْمَدِينَةِ مَرَدُوا عَلَىٰ النَّفَاقِ ۗ لَا تَعْلَمُهُمْ ۗ نَحْنُ
 نَعْلَمُهُمْ ۗ سَتُعَذِّبُهُمْ مَرَّتَيْنِ ۗ ثُمَّ يَرُدُّونَ إِلَىٰ عَذَابٍ عَظِيمٍ ﴿١٠١﴾

And among those around you of the bedouins are hypocrites, and (also) from the people of Madīnah. They have become accustomed to hypocrisy. You, (O Muḥammad), do not know them, (but) We know them. We will punish them twice (in this world); then they will be returned to a great punishment.¹

Now reflect on the words “from the people of Madīnah” and tell me how in the world does this verse apply to the three khulafā’ رضي الله عنهم who were from the people of Makkah? Furthermore, Allah ﷻ prophesises in this verse that they will be punished twice and it is apparent that this refers to worldly punishment. Besides the munāfiqīn whose hypocrisy became apparent and who were killed and humiliated, how does this verse apply to the senior Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم? Moreover, Allah ﷻ declares:

لَا تَعْلَمُوهُمْ ۗ نَحْنُ نَعْلَمُهُمْ ۗ

You, (O Muḥammad), do not know them, (but) We know them.

1 Sūrah al-Towbah: 101

Whereas according to Shīṭī principles and narrations, Rasūlullāh ﷺ was aware of the hypocrisy of the three khulafā' رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ as appears in the hadith narrated previously from Zād al-Ma'ād where it states that Rasūlullāh ﷺ informed Sayyidunā Ḥudhayfah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ about their hypocrisy.

Another verse which Dildār 'Alī presents in Dhū al-Fiḡār to counter the verses in favour and praise of the Ṣaḡḡabah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ is:

لَوْلَا كِتَابٌ مِّنَ اللَّهِ سَبَقَ لَمَسَّكُمْ فِيمَا أَخَذْتُمْ عَذَابٌ عَظِيمٌ ﴿٦٨﴾

If not for a decree from Allah that preceded, you would have been touched for what you took by a great punishment.¹

I have written the commentary of this verse previously. Nevertheless, I will shed more light on it. In fact, this verse is in praise of Sayyidunā 'Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Many kuffār were taken captives after the Battle of Badr. Rasūlullāh ﷺ consulted with his Ṣaḡḡabah regarding what should be done with the captives. Sayyidunā 'Umar and Sayyidunā Sa'd ibn Mu'ādh رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ said that they should be killed while Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was of the opinion that they be ransomed. Rasūlullāh ﷺ accordingly accepted ransom. Thereupon this verse was revealed. Shīṭī mufassirīn have attested to this themselves:

1. 'Allāmah al-Ṭabarsī writes in his commentary *Majma' al-Bayān*:

قال عمر بن الخطاب يا رسول الله كذبوك و اخرجوك فقدمهم و اضرب اعناقهم و مكن عليا من عقيل فيضرب عنقه و مكى من فلان اضرب عنقه فان هؤلاء ائمة الكفر و قال ابو بكر اهلك و قومك خذ منهم فدية يكون لنا قوة على الكفار قال ابن زيد فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم لو نزل عذاب من السماء ما نجا منكم غير عمر بن الخطاب و سعد بن معاذ

'Umar bin al-Khaṭṭāb said, "O Rasūlullāh ﷺ! They persecuted you and exiled you. Thus, they should be slain. Hand over 'Aqīl to 'Alī for assassination and so and so over to me. All of these are the leaders of

1 Sūrah al-Anfāl: 68

Quraysh.” Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه said, “O Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم! These are your tribesmen and family. Take ransom from them so that it will serve as strength for us against the kuffār.” Ibn Zayd says, “Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم stated, “had punishment from the skies descended, none of you would have been spared besides ‘Umar and Sa’d ibn Mu‘ādh.”

2. Al-Kāshānī writes in *Khulāṣat al-Manhaj*:

روز بدر پشناد تن اسیر شدند و از جمله ایشانعباس و عقیل بودند حضرت در باب ایشانبا اصحاب مشاوره کرد ابو بکر که از مهاجرین بود گ فت یا رسول الله اکابر و اصاغر اینقوم اقارب و عشائر تواند آگ ر بربیک بقدر طاق و استطاعت فدائے بدید باشد که روزے بدولت اسلام برسد الخ

Seventy people were captured in the Battle of Badr, including ‘Abbās and ‘Aqīl. Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم consulted the Ṣaḥābah regarding them. Abū Bakr — who was from the Muhājirīn — said, “O Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم! All of these are your tribesmen and family. If everyone ransoms himself according to his financial capacity, then hopefully one day they will be favoured with Islam.”

O Mu’minīn! You ought to admire Dildār ‘Alī’s deep knowledge and honesty from the depths of your heart. He brings such a verse in response to the verses in the Ṣaḥābah’s رضي الله عنهم favour that actually establishes the virtue of the second khalīfah. It is true:

الحق يعلو ولا يعلو

Truth always remains at the top. Falsehood cannot overpower it.

We also thank him for quoting this verse and applaud his scrupulousness. Nevertheless, if any of his followers are not satisfied with one narration from *Majma’ al-Bayān* and instead seek another narration in support of it, I will furnish the verification of a great Shī‘ī scholar.

3. Ibn Jamhūr, author of *Ghawālī al-La’ālī*, who is among the senior Shī‘ī scholars and renowned for his knowledge and expertise, narrates:

ان النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم اخذ سبعين اسيرا يوم البدر و فيهم العباس و عقيل بن عمه فاستشار ابا بكر فيهم فقال قومك و اهلك و استبقهم لعل الله يتوب عليهم و خذ الفدية لقوى بها احبابك فقال عمر نبذوك و اخرجوك فعذبهم و اضرب اعناقهم فانهم ائمة الكفر و لا تأخذهم الفداء مكن عليا من عقيل و حمزة من العباس و مكى من فلان و فلان فقال صلى الله عليه و سلم ان الله يلين قلوب رجال حتى تكون الين من اللبن و يقسى قلوب رجال حتى تكون اشد من الحجارة فمثلك يا ابا بكر مثل ابراهيم اذ قال قَدْ مَنُّ تَبِعَنِي فَانَّهُ مَنِّي ۚ وَ مَن عَصَانِي فَانَّكَ غَفُورٌ رَّحِيمٌ و مثلك يا عمر مثل نوح اذ قال رَبِّ لَا تَذَرْ عَلَيَّ الْاَرْضَ مِنَ الْكٰفِرِيْنَ دَبَّارًا ثم ان شتمت قتلتم و ان شتمت فاديتم و يستشهد منكم بعدتهم فقالوا بل ناخذ الفداء ما استشهد بعدتهم فاخذ كما قال صلى الله عليه و اله و سلم

Indeed, Rasūlullāh ﷺ took seventy captives at Badr. Among them were ‘Abbās and ‘Aqīl — his cousin. He sought counsel from Abū Bakr regarding them. Abū Bakr said, “They are your tribesmen and family, spare them. Hopefully, Allah ﷻ will allow them to repent. Take ransom from them so that your friends are strengthened.” ‘Umar said, “They rejected you and exiled you, hence punish them and smite their necks for they are the leaders of kufr. Do not take ransom from them. Hand over ‘Aqīl to ‘Alī and ‘Abbās to Ḥamzah and hand over so and so to me.” Rasūlullāh ﷺ commented, “Certainly, Allah softens the hearts of some men until they become softer than milk and hardens the hearts of others until they become harder than rocks. Your example, O Abū Bakr, is like Ibrahim ؑ who said:

فَمَنْ تَبِعَنِي فَانَّهُ مَنِّي ۚ وَ مَن عَصَانِي فَانَّكَ غَفُورٌ رَّحِيمٌ ﴿٣٦﴾

So whoever follows me — then he is of me; and whoever disobeys me — indeed, You are (yet) Forgiving and Merciful.¹

And your example, O ‘Umar is like Nūḥ ﷺ who said:

رَبِّ لَا تَذَرْ عَلَيَّ الْاَرْضَ مِنَ الْكٰفِرِيْنَ دَبَّارًا ﴿٢٦﴾

My Rabb, do not leave upon the earth from among the disbelievers an inhabitant.²

1 Sūrah Ibrāhīm: 36

2 Sūrah Nūḥ: 26

If you like, you may kill them and if you wish, you may set them free with ransom and that same amount of you will be martyred.” The Ṣaḥābah said, “we will take ransom and that amount of us will be martyred.” Thus, ransom was taken and they were freed.

This text which was quoted verbatim supports the text of *Majma‘ al-Bayān*. Moreover, he has mentioned this addition that after hearing what Sayyidah Abū Bakr and Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمَا had to say, Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ stated, “certainly, Allah softens the hearts of some men until they become softer than milk and hardens the hearts of others until they become harder than rocks.” He then stated further, “Your example, O Abū Bakr, is like Ibrahim عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام who said, ‘so whoever follows me — then he is of me; and whoever disobeys me — indeed, You are (yet) Forgiving and Merciful.’ And your example, O ‘Umar is like Nūḥ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام who said, ‘my Rabb, do not leave upon the earth from among the disbelievers an inhabitant.’”

O Shī‘ah! Those who your Scholars regard as munāfiqīn were such men who were prepared to kill their fathers and brothers for the sake of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, and Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ likened them to the Ambiyā’. Purity belongs to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى! Can such people be labelled as munāfiqīn? You have no shame and honour! You label those as munāfiqīn and kuffār who uprooted kufr and nifāq from Arabia.

كَبُرَتْ كَلِمَةً تَخْرُجُ مِنْ أَفْوَاهِهِمْ ۖ إِنَّ يَنْقُوتُونَ إِلَّا كَذِبًا ﴿٥﴾

Grave is the word that comes out of their mouths; they speak not except a lie.¹

If still they are not satisfied and a person fluent in Persian wants some substantiation from a Shī‘ī Persian commentary, then with Allah’s سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى grace this is also present.

1 Sūrah al-Kahf: 5

4. The Shī' al-Rāzī has narrated this discussion in his commentary from *Kanz al-Irfān* in these words:

روایت ست کہ در روز بدر بقتادان اسیر گرفته بودند از انجمله عباس و عقیل بودند حضرت رسالت صلی اللہ علیہ و الہ وسلم دریا ایشان باصحاب مشورہ فرمود ابو بکر گفت کہ اکابر و اصاغر این قوم اقارب و عشائر تواند اگر ہر یک بقدر طاقت و استطاعت فدائے بدہند باشد کہ روزے بہدایت برسند و حالا عدد و مدد مسلمانان زیادہ شود عمر گفت یا رسول اللہ ایناں تکذیب کردند تر او بیرون کردند اینہا ائمہ کفر اند ہمہ را بفرمائی تا گردند زند و مگیر ازیشاں فدیہ عقیل را بعلی سبار و عباس را بحمزہ و فلاں را بہن تا گردن زنیم اینحضرت صلی اللہ علیہ و سلم فرمود کہ حق سبحان و تعالی دلہائے مردم را اگاہ است کہ نرمی سازد و بہرتبہ کہ نرم تراز شیر ست و دیگر دلہامی باشد کہ سخت تراز سنگ است مثل تو اے ابا بکر ہماں مثل ابراہیم علیہ السلام ست کہ گفت فَمَنْ تَبِعَنِي فَاِنَّهُ مِنِّيْ وَ مَنْ عَصَانِيْ فَاِنَّكَ غَفُوْرٌ رَّحِيْمٌ و مثل تو اے عمر ہمجو مثل نوح ست وقتیکہ گفت رَبِّ لَا تَذُرْ عَلَيَّ الْاَرْضَ مِنَ الْكٰفِرِيْنَ دِيَارًا

It is narrated that the Muslims took seventy captives at Badr. Among them were 'Abbās and 'Aqīl. Rasūlullāh ﷺ sought counsel regarding them. Abū Bakr said, "they are your tribesmen and family. Everyone should ransom himself with a suitable amount. Hopefully, one day they will attain guidance and the Muslims will increase in number." 'Umar said, "O Rasūlullāh! They rejected you and exiled you. They are the leaders of the kuffār. Issue the command for their necks to be cut off and do not take ransom from them. Hand over 'Aqīl to 'Alī and 'Abbās to Ḥamzah and hand over so and so to me so that we may assassinate them." Rasūlullāh ﷺ mentioned, "Allah ﷻ knows best! He softens some hearts until they become softer than milk and hardens others until they become harder than rocks. Your example, O Abū Bakr, is like Ibrahim ؑ who said, 'so whoever follows me — then he is of me; and whoever disobeys me — indeed, You are (yet) Forgiving and Merciful.'¹ And your example, O 'Umar is like Nūḥ ؑ who said, 'my Rabb, do not leave upon the earth from among the disbelievers an inhabitant.'² If you like, you may kill them and if you wish, you may set them free with ransom and that same amount of you will be martyred." The Ṣaḥābah said, "We will take ransom and that amount of us will be martyred." Thus, ransom was taken and they were freed.

1 Sūrah Ibrāhīm: 36

2 Sūrah Nūḥ: 26

O Shī'ah! Open your eyes from negligence. Lament over your scholar's condition. Whatever he has written establishes the Ṣaḥābah's ﷺ virtue instead of their vice. All of his efforts have gone to waste. The root of the problem is what Dildār 'Alī wrote himself regarding *Dhū al-Fiqār* that it was written in a short span of just twenty days. He was too hasty, hence the devastation. Had he written after deep contemplation and reflection, he would not have committed such an open error and would not have presented verses mentioning the Ṣaḥābah's ﷺ virtue as proof against them. Whatever happened, happened, now the Shī'ah can only lament and be embarrassed.

O Shī'ah! It is for this reason that I said previously and will remind you to only bring the statements of Zurārah and Hishām as proof. For Allah's ﷻ sake, do not turn to the glorious Qur'ān and do not bring verses as proof. You are not aware of its meaning and are ignorant of the reason for its revelation. You deem it as an interpolated Qur'ān and the script of Sayyidunā 'Uthmān ﷺ. If you study it properly and reflect over its wordings, you will not be deceived. If you fail to heed my advice, you will continue falling. Whichever verse you bring to prove something, will falsify the very same thing. With such expertise of the Qur'ān, Dildār 'Alī planned to respond to Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīz, the author of *Tuḥfah*. In fact, he took it as embarrassing and humiliation for him that he had to be the opponent of one so unworthy. However, he forgot the couplet which he himself has written in *Ṣawārim*:

مشو ہم پنچہ با من گرچہ سحر سامری داری زبا نم در سخن گفتن ید بیضاست می گویم

Do not fight with us even though you possess the magic of Sāmīrī,
Our tongue is also a glowing hand.

Before ending my discussion, I wish to mention an objection that majority of the Shī'ah raise. They say that it is the accusation of the Nawāṣib that Rasūlullāh ﷺ would consult Shaykhayn and the other Ṣaḥābah ﷺ. How is it

possible for Rasūlullāh ﷺ — who receives revelation and inspiration — to consult anyone? Ignorant people are deceived by this statement thinking it to be true. They think, how could Rasūlullāh ﷺ consult Sayyidunā Abū Bakr, Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمَا, etc., whereas Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى was sending revelation upon him regarding every matter and Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام was informing him of every occurrence and Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى said concerning him:

﴿٤﴾ وَمَا يَنْطِقُ عَنِ الْهَوَىٰ ۗ ﴿٣﴾ إِنَّ هُوَ إِلَّا وَحْيٌ يُوحَىٰ ﴿٤﴾

Nor does he speak from (his own) inclination. It is not but a revelation revealed.¹

This is definitely irrational and illogical. These are only allegations which have tainted many pages.

I therefore tell such people to ponder over this verse which Dildār ‘Alī has presented in order to expose the flaws of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ and read the commentaries about it. They then should see whether consulting the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ is established or not. The first names of those who gave counsel are of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمَا. Have a look at and then have another look. Ponder deeply whether Rasūlullāh ﷺ seeking counsel from them and them giving counsel is established in your commentaries or not.

فَارْجِعِ الْبَصَرَ ۖ هَلْ تَرَىٰ مِنْ فُطُورٍ ﴿٣﴾ ثُمَّ ارْجِعِ الْبَصَرَ كَرَّتَيْنِ يَنْقَلِبْ إِلَيْكَ الْبَصَرُ خَاسِئًا وَهُوَ حَسِيرٌ ﴿٤﴾

So return (your) vision (to the sky); do you see any breaks? Then return (your) vision twice again. (Your) vision will return to you humbled while it is fatigued.²

1 Sūrah Najm: 3,4

2 Sūrah Mulk: 3,4

Subhān Allah! Glory belongs to Allah سُبْحَانَہُ وَتَعَالَى! Do Shī'ah not have any fear of Allah سُبْحَانَہُ وَتَعَالَى and any consideration for Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ to call such people munāfiqīn? Do they not fear being taken to task on the Day of Qiyāmah? Dildār 'Alī while branding such great Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْہُمْ as munāfiqīn forgot that one day revenge will be taken and one day he will have to answer before Allah سُبْحَانَہُ وَتَعَالَى. “What will I answer to Allah سُبْحَانَہُ وَتَعَالَى for writing such rubbish in my book? What face will I show to Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ after branding his Companions as munāfiqīn – those Companions from whom he sought counsel?” If only he feared. If only he had conviction that on the Day of Qiyāmah when the Book of Deeds will be handed to him and the angels of punishment will say on behalf of Allah سُبْحَانَہُ وَتَعَالَى regarding all the words of kufr written in *Dhū al-Fiqār*:

أَقْرَأُ كِتَابَكَ ۖ كَفَىٰ بِنَفْسِكَ الْيَوْمَ عَلَيْكَ حَسِيبًا

(It will be said), “Read your record. Sufficient is yourself against you this Day as accountant.”¹

What will his condition be? Neither his followers will be able to save him, nor will his ijthād come to his avail.

These people blurt out words of kufr and reject the status of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْہُمْ knowing fully well that the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللّٰهُ عَنْہُمْ enjoy a lofty status. They call themselves Muslims but speak such foul words which even the kuffār would seek protection from hearing. Without any hyperbole or any prejudice, the truth is that the amount of harm caused by the Shī'ah and Khawārij to the dīn of Muḥammad صَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ has not been caused by anyone else. They have added to the dīn such filth that Allah سُبْحَانَہُ وَتَعَالَى would not allow any Muslim to hear. Shayṭān is perplexed at their words of kufr, their rubbish and drivel. He also feels ashamed of them.

If a few scholars studied this verse of the Qur'ān and read it repeatedly, combing through it with a magnifying glass and then declare, “the verse itself does not

1 Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl: 14

speak about consulting, hence we do not believe it and we also do not believe the commentaries you have mentioned. If consulting the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ was Allah's سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى command then it would have definitely been mentioned in the verse.” The answer to this rhetoric is read the Qur’ān from cover to cover and see whether Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى issued the command of consulting the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ or not. I will now mention that verse.

Proof 3

وَلَوْ كُنْتَ فَظًّا غَلِيظَ الْقَلْبِ لَانْفَضُّوا مِنْ حَوْلِكَ فَاعْفُ عَنْهُمْ وَاسْتَغْفِرْ لَهُمْ وَشَاوِرْهُمْ فِي الْأَمْرِ

And if you had been rude (in speech) and harsh in heart, they would have disbanded from about you. So pardon them and ask forgiveness for them and consult them in the matter.¹

It is worth marvelling over how compassionately Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى commands Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ to be merciful towards the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ, to forgive and overlook their errors and mistakes and to consult with them. What a high level of mercy and compassion of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى upon the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ is manifest from this verse! What more proof do you want for the lofty status of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ? What greater proof than the verse of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى should we furnish?

I will now mention the commentary of this verse by Shīrī scholars. ‘Allāmah al-Ṭabarsī says in *Majma‘ al-Bayān*:

فاعف عنهم ما بينك وبينهم واستغفر لهم بينهم و بيني و قيل معناه فاعف عنهم فرأهم باحد و استغفر لهم من ذلك الذنب و شاورهم في الامر اى استخراج رأيهم و اعلم ما عندهم و اختلفوا في فائدة مشاورته اياهم مع استغناء ما يوحى عن تعرف صواب الراى من العباد على اقوال احدها ان ذلك على وجه التطيب لنفوسهم و التاليف لهم و الرفع من اقدارهم لتبين انهم ممن يوثق باقوالهم و يرجع الى ارائهم عن قتادة و الربيع و ابن اسحاق و ثانيها ان ذلك لتقتدى به امته فى المشاورة و لم يردھا نقيصة كما مدحوا بان امرهم شورى بينهم عن سفيان بن عيينة و ثالثها ان ذلك الامرين لاجلال اصحابه و ليقنتدى امته فى ذلك عن الحسن و الضحاك و رابعها ان ذلك ليمتحنهم بالمشاورة ليميز الناصح من الناس و خامسها ان ذلك فى امور الدنيا و مكائد الحرب و لقاء العدو و فى مثل ذلك يجوز ان يستعين بارائهم عن ابى على الجبائى

1 Sūrah Āl ‘Imrān: 159

Forgive them for what is between you and them and seek forgiveness on their behalf for what is between them and Me. It is said that the meaning is, forgive them for their fleeing at Uḥud and seek forgiveness on their behalf for this sin and consult them in the matter, i.e. ask their opinions and find out what they think. There is difference of opinion regarding the benefit of Rasūlullāh ﷺ consulting them whereas due to revelation being sent upon him, he is independent of investigating the correct opinion from fellow men. There are many views in this regard.

First view: This is to soften their hearts and bring them closer and to raise their status so that it becomes clear that their statements are reliable and their opinions should be sought. This is narrated from Qatādah, al-Rabī and Ibn Ishāq.

Second view: The reason for this is so that the ummah might follow him in consultation and do not regard it as a defect. The Ṣaḥābah ﷺ were praised for this in the verse, “Whose affair is (determined by) consultation among themselves.”¹ This is the view of Sufyān ibn ‘Uyaynah.

Third view: These two aspects are to show the greatness of his Ṣaḥābah ﷺ and so that his ummah may follow him in this. This is the opinion of Ḥasan and Ḍaḥḥāk.

Fourth view: This is to test them so that the well-wishers may be differentiated from the rest.

Fifth view: This is related to worldly matters and war tactics. It is permissible to consult them in such matters. This is the view of Abū ‘Alī al-Jubāī.

Many important points are mentioned in this commentary.

1. Allah ﷻ informs His Rasūl ﷺ that if these people commit a crime against you due to being human then forgive them and if they disobey Me then seek My forgiveness on their behalf. Glory be to Allah ﷻ! What mercy and compassion of Allah ﷻ upon the Ṣaḥābah

1 Sūrah al-Shūrā: 38

ﷺ that He intercedes to Rasūlullāh ﷺ to overlook their mistakes and commands him to intercede on their behalf so that He may forgive their sins. Shame on the Shī'ah for branding such personalities as kuffār and munāfiqīn.

2. Forgiveness for fleeing from the Battle of Uḥud is clearly established. The Shī'ah make a big hue and cry over this.
3. It is recognised that only to show their lofty status, Allah ﷻ commanded Rasūlullāh ﷺ to consult them.

If someone objects to this commentary saying that Qatādah, etc., whose views have been mentioned by the author of *Majma' al-Bayān*, are scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah. We will answer by saying that the author did not quote from anyone the portion he mentioned before listing all the different views. Furthermore, the views he listed are some of the reasons and explanations presented for consulting. If you do not accept any of these views then tell us what the view of the author is? What is the meaning of “consult them in the matter”? What is the benefit or reason of this command?

Proof 4

All Muslims know that the first battle that took place was the Battle of Badr and those who were with Rasūlullāh ﷺ on that day enjoy a lofty status. Allah ﷻ sent His angels to help them and revealed verses of the Qur'ān displaying His kindness. Those who participated in this battle enjoy the highest rank among all the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ. Now, we should ascertain as to whether those Ṣaḥābah ﷺ who the Shī'ah are labelling as kuffār and munāfiqīn fought at the side of Rasūlullāh ﷺ or against him. If any Shī'ī can prove that all the three khulafā' ﷺ were not at the side of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and did not participate in this battle, we will accept his claim. However, if we prove that they did participate in the battle and were at the service of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, then the Shī'ah should abandon Shī'ism. I will quote some highlights of the battle from *Ḥamlah Ḥaydariyyah*. Let us see what a prejudiced man like him has to write.

The author describes the scene before the battle in the following way, “When Rasūlullāh ﷺ heard that the Quraysh mushrikīn are advancing for battle, he consulted his Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم. The first to respond at that time were Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنهما who expressed their desire to fight.” Here are his couplets:

یکے انجمن ساخت با اہل دین	پس از این خبر سید المرسلین
کہ اے حق پرستان پاکیزہ کیش	بفرمود انکہ باصحاب خویش
کمر بسته بر کین و پر خاش ما	بدانید کز کعبہ اہل جفا
بیایند خودہم بروز دگر	رسیدند نزدیک امد خبر
کہ دشمن رسید از پیغ کار زار	شمارا کنوں چہست تدبیر کار
و زان پس عمر نیز قد کردر است	ب پاسخ ابو بکر از جائے خاست
قدم پیش بگذار و مارا بہ ہیں	بگفتند یا سید المرسلین
چہ ساں در پیت جاں فدا میکنم	کہ با دشمن دین چہامی کنم
بگفت اے حبیب خدای عزیز	وزاں پس زجا خاست مقدار نیز
بیاریم شمشیر بر دشمنان	بودتابتن جان و در کف توان
بفرمود در حق ایشان دعا	ازاں گشتہ خوش دل رسول خدا
کہ از راز انصار یا بد خبر	چنین خواست پس بہترین بشر
چہ گوئید اندر حق دشمنان	دگر بار فرمود کای دوستاں
چنین گفت از روی صدق و نیاز	زجا خاست این بار سعد معاذ
بدست تو روز یکہ دادیم ہست	کہ با جان و دل با ہمیں عہد دست
بہماں روز کردیم بر تو نثار	سر و مال و فرزند و خویش و تبار
برای صدق و ایمان انصار دین	پیہم بر ایشان نمود افریں

After receiving intelligence (of the advance of the Quraysh army), Rasūlullāh ﷺ had a meeting with the Muslims. Rasūlullāh ﷺ told his Ṣaḥābah, “O pure men of truth! You should know that the oppressors of Makkah have prepared to wage war against us. I have received intelligence that they have come close and will be here by tomorrow. What is your opinion since the enemy is coming for battle?” Immediately Abū Bakr stood up followed by ‘Umar. They said, “O leader of the Messengers! Go ahead. You will see what we will do to the enemies of dīn and how we will sacrifice our lives for you.” Thereafter, Miqdād stood up from his place and said, “O beloved of Allah سَيِّدَنَا مُحَمَّدًا! I will continue swinging my sword on the enemy

until I have life in my body.” Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ heart was pleased to hear this and he supplicated for them. Rasūlullāh ﷺ expressed his desire to hear the Anṣār’s opinion saying, “O friends, what do you say regarding the enemy.” Sa’d ibn Mu’ādh stood up and stated with full loyalty, “I am firmly steadfast with my soul and heart upon the promise I took at your hands. I have sacrificed all my wealth, children, family, and relatives for you from that day.” Rasūlullāh ﷺ congratulated the Anṣār for their loyalty and īmān.

O Shī’ah! Ponder over the īmān and sacrifice of the munāfiqīn and have a look at their loyalty and sincerity. Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمَا were such hypocrites that they were prepared to sacrifice their lives first. They assisted Rasūlullāh ﷺ first and displayed their sincerity and loyalty in front of all by their actions. They received the title ‘the best of Muḥājirīn’ from Allah ﷻ. O Shī’ah! Did the munāfiqīn of Madīnah who outwardly uttered the kalimah after Islam gained strength respond with the same sincerity and loyalty and assist in the same way? Did Rasūlullāh ﷺ supplicate for them and congratulate them in a similar way?

Dildār ‘Alī in his attempt to combat those verses which mention the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ cites the following verse¹:

فَإِذَا أَنْزَلَتْ سُورَةٌ مُحْكَمَةٌ وَذُكِرَ فِيهَا الْقِتَالُ رَأَيْتَ الَّذِينَ فِي قُلُوبِهِمْ مَرَضٌ يَنْظُرُونَ إِلَيْكَ نُظْرَ
الْمَعْشَىٰ عَلَيْهِ مِنَ الْمَوْتِ

They say, “Why has a sūrah not been sent down?” But when a precise sūrah is revealed and fighting is mentioned therein, you see those in whose hearts is hypocrisy looking at you with a look of one overcome by death.²

He feels that the following verse applies to the three khulafā’ رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ:

1 Dhū al-Fiqār: pg. 64

2 Sūrah Muḥammad: 20

الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَهَاجَرُوا وَجَاهَدُوا فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ بِأَمْوَالِهِمْ وَأَنْفُسِهِمْ أَكْبَرُ دَرَجَةً عِنْدَ اللَّهِ

The ones who have believed, emigrated and striven in the cause of Allah with their wealth and their lives are greater in rank in the sight of Allah.¹

He thus comments:

پس شک نیست درین که از صحابه کسانی که ایمان داشتند و هجرت و جهاد به نیت صحیح کردند لالت بر فضیلت اینها دار دو لیکن چون ایمان غاصبین حق و ولایت و هجرت اینها به نیت درست به ثبوت نرسیده استدلال بدین آیات بر فضیلت ایشان وجهی نداد لاسیما نظر باینکه او سبحان و تعالی مقارن این هر دو صفت جهاد را نیز مذکور نموده و کیفیت جهاد ایشان در جنگ احد و خیبر و حنین اظہر من الشمس ست پس ایشان را ازین آیت بهره نخواستید بود بلکه ایشان از مصداق قول او سبحانه و تعالی و من یولہم یومئذ دبره الخ حظ وافر دارند

There is no doubt that the above verse is proof for the virtue of those Şahābah who were Muslims and emigrated and waged jihād with the correct intention. However, since the imān and sincerity of intention for hijrah of those who usurped the khilāfah are not proven, it is incorrect to use this verse to prove their virtue especially considering the fact that Allah ﷻ mentioned jihād coupled with these two qualities and their jihād at the Battle of Uḥud, Khaybar, Ḥunayn, etc., are well known. Therefore, they cannot be the beneficiaries of this verse. In fact, Allah’s ﷻ statement, “indeed, those of you who turned their backs,” applies to them.

Someone should read the couplets of *Ḥamlah Ḥaydariyyah* at Dildār ‘Alī’s grave so that his soul may come to know that his entire exposition has been debunked by one of his own poets. After the demise of the senior Dildār ‘Alī, his successor — i.e. his son, Qiblah Moulānā Sayyid Muḥammad — proofread *Ḥamlah Ḥaydariyyah* and corrected it. There was hope that he would read those couplets and wake up and delete his father’s exposition. Unfortunately, he also closed the eyes of honesty and did not write these couplets as a footnote on *Dhū al-Fiqār* so that people might come to know which army were Shaykhayn رضي الله عنهما part of in the first

1 Sūrah al-Towbah: 20

jihād; the munāfiqīn or the sincere Muslims, and whether they or some others displayed to Rasūlullāh ﷺ their preparedness to fight and were they were with Rasūlullāh ﷺ in the thick of battle or not.

With regards to the Battle of Uḥud, Khaybar, etc., which Dildār ‘Alī harps upon — his pen fond of writing words like Uḥud, Fadak, Qirtās and nearly every page has these words — the Shī‘ah should have a little patience. When the second part which comprises of answers to the allegations against the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ is published, then the reality will dawn upon them and the condition of what Dildār ‘Alī has written will be known to all. Nevertheless, I will cite one verse and answer. The glorious Qur’ān speaks about the error committed by the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ at the Battle of Uḥud in the following way:

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ تَوَلَّوْا مِنْكُمْ يَوْمَ الْتَقَى الْجَمْعَيْنِ إِنَّمَا اسْتَزَلَّهُمُ الشَّيْطَانُ بِبَعْضِ مَا كَسَبُوا ۗ وَلَقَدْ عَفَا اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ ۗ إِنَّ اللَّهَ غَفُورٌ حَلِيمٌ ﴿١٥٥﴾

Indeed, those of you who turned back on the day the two armies met (in 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 All Forgiving and All Forbearing.¹

Allah ﷻ Himself has clarified the matter. To harp on this issue after Allah ﷻ has forgiven them is in fact belying Allah ﷻ. Dildār ‘Alī has perpetrated this crime and belied Allah ﷻ. We seek Allah’s ﷻ protection from this. He writes in *Dhū al-Fiḡār*:

فرار صحابه در روز احد متيقن و عفو ايشان بحیثیتی که مطلق ما وای ايشان در جهنم نه باشد مشکوک و اليقين لا يزول الا باليقين مثله

The fleeing of the Ṣaḥābah from the Battle of Uḥud is certain and their forgiveness, meaning that their abode is not Hellfire, is uncertain. A certainty is only removed by another certainty to its strength.

1 Sūrah Āl ‘Imrān: 155

Just have a proper look at his words which I have quoted briefly. Allah ﷻ emphatically declares:

وَلَقَدْ عَفَا اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ

Indeed, Allah has already forgiven them.

Whereas Dildār ‘Alī says that forgiveness is uncertain.

The person who belies Allah’s ﷻ declaration and has doubt in His speech believing it to be uncertain, who can call such a person a believer and who cannot understand such a rejecter of Qur’ānic verses to be an enemy of Allah ﷻ and Rasūlullāh ﷺ? Their condition is startling. Due to their hatred for Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ they have become so ignorant and blind that they doubt such categorical verses of the Qur’ān. Nonetheless, there is no time for this discussion here. In the chapter of *maṭā’in* (allegations) I will present this objection in great detail to the Shī’ah, Allah willing.

I will now return to the discussion of the Battle of Badr. The fervour of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār before the Battle began has been explained. I will now quote the actual battle from the same book. O believers! The author writes that when the rows had been formed and the battle was about to begin, Rasūlullāh ﷺ supplicated to Allah ﷻ. His supplication is composed in the following couplets.

Ḥamlah Haydariyyah’s couplets concerning the Battle of Badr:

بنالید و مالید رو را به خاک	پس اورد رو سوی یزدان پاک
فرستنده انبیاء بر عباد	بگفت اے نهانده عدل و داد
به حکم تو بودم نہ بر رائے خویش	تو دانی کہ من رہنمائے قریش
مکن نصرت خویش از من دریغ	کشیدم بر ایشان بہ حکم تو تیغ
کہ کردند حکم ترا انقیاد	الہی اگر این چند تنے از عباد
نہ دیدند بیش و کم دشمنان	بحکم تو بستند ہر کس میان

بیابند از دست دشمن شکست
 نه گردد پرستنده ای داد گر
 که خوابش بفرمان حق در ربود
 ز بس کرد خورشید تاریک شد
 بگفت اے بحق خلق را رهنمای
 چه فرمای اکنون برای قتال

بماند از فتح کو تا بهم دست
 بروئے زمیں تا قیامت دگر
 بایں زاری و عجز رنجیده بود
 دران دم صف خشم نزدیک شد
 ابو بکر نزد نبی داشت جای
 در آمد به تنگی سپاه ضلال

Rasūlullāh ﷺ turned towards Allah ﷻ (in supplication). He cried and placed his forehead on the ground. He supplicated, “O displayer of fairness and justice! O the One who sends Ambiyā’ to His bondsmen! You know that we are the guides of the Quraysh. We are subservient to Your command, not our opinions. We have unsheathed our swords on them by Your command. Do not withhold Your help from us. O Allah! If these few slaves of Yours — who have obeyed you, stood up to Your command and did not look at the numbers of the enemy — if they are unsuccessful and defeated by the enemies then You will not be worshipped on the earth until Qiyāmah.” Grief was dripping from this earnest supplication so that it may be fulfilled by the will of Allah ﷻ. The rows of the enemy drew close and the sun set. Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was at Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ side. He said, “O guide of the creation! The enemy have tightened the noose. What is your opinion of fighting?”

Where are the ears of īmān and eyes of justice of the Shī’ah which can hear and see these words of the author and ponder over the meaning? All the talk of nifāq and kufr will fade away into nothingness. The īmān, sincerity, hijrah and assistance of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُم will be established.

O Muslims! Have a look for Allah’s sake. What greater virtue can there be of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُم than Rasūlullāh ﷺ supplicating on their behalf to Allah ﷻ, “O Allah! These few men have prepared themselves for war only in compliance with Your command. If they are defeated and killed, no one will worship You until Qiyāmah.” What more do the Ahl al-Sunnah say? They love the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُم due to these qualities and enumerate these virtues. Rasūlullāh

صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ himself says regarding them that they are the ones who will worship You and make Your name reign supreme and if they are killed, dīn will be destroyed and no one will take Your name till Qiyāmah. So why should the Ahl al-Sunnah not believe them to be sincere believers? Why should we abandon our īmān by calling such pure souls hypocrites just due to the instigation of one Jew, ‘Abd Allah ibn Sabā?

Look at the power of Allah ﷻ. ﷻ made the author write the name of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr Ṣiddīq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ at such a place which establishes the proximity he enjoyed with Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. The author says:

ابو بكر نزد نبی جانے داشت

Abū Bakr was at Rasūlullāh’s صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ side.

Friends! Is the author of *Ḥamlah Ḥaydariyyah* a Nāṣibī or Sunnī that owing to his religion he wrote Sayyidunā Abū Bakr’s رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ name and mentioned these virtues of him out of love for him? What is the reason for this? Tell us a reason for this for Allah’s ﷻ sake. There is no other reason than this that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ enjoyed such proximity to Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ that to reject it and not write his name is like concealing the sun in broad daylight. He did not have the courage to conceal such a reality and to reject something which was well-known among the Muhājirīn and Anṣār and which is well-known up to today. O Mu’minīn! Think for a moment. Rasūlullāh’s صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ supplication in favour of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ and their condition which he mentions before Allah ﷻ, does this prove their hypocrisy? Did Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ mention such accolades of the munāfiqīn? Did he say regarding them, “if they are not successful, then You will not be worshipped until Qiyāmah?” Are you going to continue branding them as kuffār and munāfiqīn notwithstanding such categorical statements which your own people have written? Are you not going to repent from hypocrisy after hearing such accolades? If you still call them munāfiqīn notwithstanding this, then it seems that nifāq means sincerity, īmān and proximity to Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ in your terminology.

Dildār ‘Alī says repeatedly in *Dhū al-Fiqār*, etc., “the intention of Shaykhayn and their followers was corrupt. And until sincerity of intention is not proven, they have no share in being recipients of virtue.” I ask you humbly, “if the khawārij say the same thing about Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, then what answer will you give, O Shī’ah?” If you remove his name from the glorious Qur’ān and we do not remove Sayyidunā Abū Bakr’s رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ name, then definitely you are truthful and we are liars. But when no one’s name appears in the glorious Qur’ān, then just as you reject the virtues of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ notwithstanding his high status and lofty merits, the khawārij reject the virtues of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ notwithstanding his lofty status. Now ponder. Just as you prove Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ virtues from his actions and biography and his sincerity — which is an inner trait — from his external good actions, we do the same thing when it comes to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. You prove Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ truthfulness from the verse:

﴿٥٥﴾ إِنَّمَا وَلِيُّكُمُ اللَّهُ وَرَسُولُهُ وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا الَّذِينَ يُقِيمُونَ الصَّلَاةَ وَيُؤْتُونَ الزَّكَاةَ وَهُمْ رَاكِعُونَ

Your ally is none but Allah and (therefore) His Rasūl and those who have believed — those who establish prayer and give zakāh, and they bow (in worship).¹

So is our proof of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr’s رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ sincerity of intention in hijrah not the same? There is no specific specification in the verse, “your ally is none but Allah,” as there is in the verse of the cave. The following appears clearly in the verse of the cave:

أَذِيقُولُ لِصَاحِبِهِ

When he said to his companion.²

This indicates to that companion who was in the cave with him. And there is no established view that there was anyone besides Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in the

1 Sūrah al-Mā’idah: 55

2 Sūrah al-Towbah: 40

cave at that time. Decide whether your view is substantiated by the Qur’ān or our view. Examine both of them together and judge as to who is stronger in his claim and who is weaker.

! شانے کو شانے سے ملا دیکھ۔ قد میں بھی کچھ بلند ہوں گے

Let us stand shoulder to shoulder and see,
I will be taller in height.

Okay, let us leave alone the Qur’ān for now. Let us not use it as proof understanding it to be the ‘Uthmānī script (as the Shī’ah claim). Look at your books and the books of your brothers the Khawārij. Look at how many virtues of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضی اللہ عنہ you established from the books of the wretched Khawārij. Count them and put them aside. Then count the proofs we take out of the Ṣaḥābah’s رضی اللہ عنہم virtues from your books, which is three times that amount. When the Khawārij became enemies of the Ahl al-Bayt, they perpetrated the same crimes you perpetrated against the Ṣaḥābah رضی اللہ عنہم. They exclude Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضی اللہ عنہ from all the verses of virtue we seek Allah’s سُبْحَانَہُ وَتَعَالَى protection from such falsehood — just as you exclude the righteous khulafā’. They think that the verses of reproach are applicable to Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضی اللہ عنہ just as you think that they are applicable to the senior Ṣaḥābah رضی اللہ عنہم. They also reject all the qualities of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضی اللہ عنہ just as you reject the qualities of the Ṣaḥābah رضی اللہ عنہم. They cast thousands of allegations and criticisms against Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضی اللہ عنہ just as you do regarding the friends of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللہُ عَلَیْہِ وَسَلَّمَ. They take the pure name of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضی اللہ عنہ with the same disrespect you take the names of the Ṣaḥābah رضی اللہ عنہم. Weigh yourselves with the Khawārij. You both weigh exactly the same.

Be a little fair! When you have determined hatred for the Ṣaḥābah رضی اللہ عنہم as one of your beliefs and essentials of dīn, then how will you acknowledge their virtue? However, Allah works in mystical ways. Allah سُبْحَانَہُ وَتَعَالَى has exposed such praises of Rasūlullāh’s صَلَّى اللہُ عَلَیْہِ وَسَلَّمَ friends on the tongues of your own scholars and made your historians write such accolades of them that if all are gathered they will add up to more than a thousand aḥādīth and statements relating to the righteous khulafā’.

All of these thoroughly establish their īmān, sincerity, jihād and khilāfah. For example, there are more than one hundred aḥādīth and statements in this small booklet of mine which have the attestation of your scholars regarding the Ṣaḥābah's ﷺ truthfulness, khilāfah and virtue on the tongues of the A'immaḥ. When you hear all of this, do you not think, "Notwithstanding our enmity and antagonism, the Ṣaḥābah's ﷺ virtues are established from the statements of our scholars? So what status must they enjoy!" If you do not understand and are not prepared to abandon your religion due to prejudice, then you may be excused somewhat. If you do not understand, there is no cure for such warped intelligence. We proved through the Book of Allah ﷻ. We showed you clear explicit verses in favour of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār ﷺ. We established their virtues from the aḥādīth of Rasūlullāh ﷺ which are found in your books. We displayed their status and īmān from the statements of the A'immaḥ which are in accordance to your religion. We proved their good deeds with the testimony of your own historians and scholars. Yet you say that the Ṣaḥābah's ﷺ intention was corrupt and they were munāfiqīn. We cannot guide you in any way or treat your illness. Only Allah ﷻ can:

لَنَا أَعْمَالُنَا وَ لَكُمْ أَعْمَالُكُمْ

For us are our deeds, and for you your deeds.¹

فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ يُضِلُّ مَنْ يَشَاءُ وَيَهْدِي مَنْ يَشَاءُ

For indeed, Allah sends astray whom He wills and guides whom He wills.²

بہمارا کام کہ دینا تہا یارو اب اگے چاہیے تم مانو نہ مانو

Our work was to say, friends!

Further on, it is your choice to accept or not

1 Sūrah al-Shūrā: 15

2 Sūrah Fāṭir: 8

The verse which Dildār ‘Alī presented:

لَوْلَا كِتَابٌ مِّنَ اللَّهِ سَبَقَ لَمَسَّكُمْ فِيمَا أَخَذْتُمْ عَذَابٌ عَظِيمٌ ﴿٦٨﴾

If not for a decree from Allah that preceded, you would have been touched for what you took by a great punishment.¹

In what a beautiful way does this verse display the Ṣaḥābah’s ﷺ rank especially Sayyidunā ‘Umar ﷺ who was praised by Rasūlullāh ﷺ as attested to by Shī‘ī scholars. Glory be to Allah ﷻ. All of the verses he found in the Qur’ān to prove the faults of the Ṣaḥābah, have in turn proved their virtue. Now imagine those verses which are specifically in praise of them. What great virtue has been stated in them! I have completed three verses which Dildār ‘Alī has mentioned. I will now quote the fourth verse which Mujtahid has listed in *Dhū al-Fiqār* in reproach of the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ:

مَا كَانَ لِنَبِيٍّ أَنْ يَكُونَ لَهُ أَسْرَىٰ حَتَّىٰ يُثْخِنَ فِي الْأَرْضِ ۚ تُرِيدُونَ عَرَصَ الدُّنْيَا ۗ وَاللَّهُ يُرِيدُ الْآخِرَةَ ۗ وَاللَّهُ عَزِيزٌ حَكِيمٌ ۝

It is not for a prophet to have captives (of war) until he has thoroughly defeated the enemy in the land. Some Muslims desire the commodities of this world, but Allah desires (for you) the Hereafter. And Allah is Exalted in Might and Wise.²

Dildār ‘Alī’s object of writing this verse is that some people had evil thoughts about Rasūlullāh ﷺ and were not happy with his distribution. However, this does not prove his ideology that this sūrah was revealed regarding the Khulafā’ Rāshidīn or the senior Ṣaḥābah ﷺ. On the contrary, this verse proves the virtue of the participants of Badr who we have been talking about and this is acknowledged by Shī‘ī mufasssīrīn. Al-Kāshānī writes in *Khulāṣat al-Manhaj* in the commentary of this verse:

1 Sūrah al-Anfāl: 68

2 Sūrah al-Anfāl: 67

اگر نہ حکمے و فرمانے می بود از خدا نے تعالیٰ کہ پیشی گرفته شدہ اثبات ایں در لوح محفوظ کہ بے نہی صریح عقوبت نہ فرماید یا اصحاب بدر را عذاب نہ کند

Had there not been a predestined matter by Allah ﷻ which was protected in the Lowḥ al-Maḥfūz¹ that He will not punish the participants of Badr.

This verse also clearly proves the merit of the participants of Badr. Allah ﷻ has promised that He will not punish them. Dildār ‘Alī should have brought this verse into the discussion after he studied the commentary, since this commentary proves their merit. The Shī‘ī mufasssīrīn have attested to the virtue of the participants of Badr and Allah’s ﷻ promise of forgiveness for them to such an extent that there remains no scope to deny it. Thus, I will thoroughly establish this claim from other Shī‘ī commentaries.

Under the reason of revelation of the verse:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا لَا تَتَّخِذُوا عَدُوِّي وَعَدُوَّكُمْ أَوْلِيَاءَ

O you who have believed, do not take My enemies and your enemies as allies.²

Shī‘ī mufasssīrīn write that there was a Ṣaḥābī by the name of Sayyidunā Ḥāṭib ibn Abī Balta‘ah who informed the kuffār of Makkah — with the intention of protecting his family and relatives — that Rasūlullāh ﷺ intended to attack them so they should be prepared. Rasūlullāh ﷺ was accordingly informed of the entire situation via revelation. Rasūlullāh ﷺ asked him the reason for doing this. He replied, “I did not do this because I turned renegade. I did this in order to protect my family.” Rasūlullāh ﷺ accepted his excuse. Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ said, “O Rasūlullāh! Give me permission to kill him for he is a munāfiq.” Rasūlullāh ﷺ replied, “no, he is one of the participants of

1 The Divine Tablet preserved in the heavens.

2 Sūrah al-Mumtaḥinah: 1

Badr. Allah ﷻ has promised forgiveness for those who participated in Badr and declared, “do as you please. I have forgiven you.”

Hopefully, Allah ﷻ will wash his black book of deeds with the water of forgiveness.”

This is the crux of the Shīṭī mufasssīrīn’s commentary. I will quote it verbatim from *Khulāṣat al-Manhaj* — a commentary considered reliable by the Shīṭah — so that no Shīṭī has the courage to say that I have interpolated it.

حضرت رسالت مآب صلی الله علیه و سلم بطریق خفا عزیمت مکه داشت ساره کنیز ای عمرو الخ

Rasūlullāh ﷺ secretly intended to go to Makkah. Abū ‘Amr’s slave girl, Sārah went ahead ...

The forgiveness of the participants of Badr is in conformity to this narration. The same commentator writes in *Majma‘ al-Bayān*:

و ما يدريك يا عمر لعل الله اطلع على اهل بدر فغفر لهم فقال اعملوا ما شئتم فقد غفرت لكم

What do you know ‘Umar? Maybe Allah ﷻ glanced at the participants of Badr and forgiven them saying, “Do as you please for I have indeed forgiven you.”

The response Shīṭī scholars give to this narration can be gauged from the correspondence of Munshī Subhān ‘Alī Khān and Moulānā Nūr al-Dīn. The former asks:

در تفسیر مذکور از ابتداء سوره مهتحنه در مطاوی بیان حال حاطب بن ابی بلتعنه مسطور ست که جناب رسالت پناه صلی الله علیه و سلم بحق او فرمودند که اورا بحالش بگذارند و از ابل بدر ست و بدریاں را حق تعالی وعده مغفرت فرموده امید هست که نامه عصبیاں اورا به اب مغفرت بشوید انتہی خلاصه حالا عرض من ست کہ اصحاب ثلاثہ ہم از بدریاں ہستند می باید کہ ایشاں را ہم بحال ایشاں گزارشته شود و لعن و طعن بحق ایشاں کردہ نہ شود

It appears in *Tafsīr Majma‘ al-Bayān* in the beginning of Sūrah al-Mumtaḥinah regarding the Ṣaḥābī Ḥāṭib ibn Abī Balta‘ah that Rasūlullāh

ﷺ proclaimed, “Leave him alone. He is from the participants of Badr. Allah ﷻ has promised their forgiveness and pardon. Hopefully, He will wash their sins with the water of forgiveness.” On the strength of this I say that the three Ṣaḥābah were also participants of Badr. Hence, they should be left alone and should not be criticised or reproached.

Moulānā Nūr al-Dīn responds to this with ‘deep concern for dīn’:

قصه حاطب برائے خلفاء ثلاثہ بر اصول امامیہ قیاس مع الفارق ست زیرا کہ روایات جامعین اصول دلالت بران دارد کہ اینہا ہر گز باعتقاد قلب سوئے جناب ختمی میاب صلی اللہ علیہ و سلم مائل نبودند تمامی امور ایشان از صلاح و تقوی ہم در حیات شریف و ہم بعد وفات مبنی بر سہمہ وریا و اینہا کلہم معتقدین کابنبن و منجمین بودند بدلات احادیث بخلاف حاطب کہ مثل اینہا نبود الی قولہ پس عفوا حاطب مستلزم عفو از مشائخ سنیان نیست علاوہ گناہ حاطب را ملاحظہ فرمایند کہ فقط افشاء امریست بے اینکہ فرمودہ باشند کہ این راز را ہر گز فاش نہ باید کرد و ہر گاہ دختران اول و ثانی بعد منع سر حضرت را فاش کردند و توبہ شان مقبول افتاد چنانچہ از مجمع و غیرہ ظاہر ست پس عفو حاطب بطریق اولی و این ہم برائے اینکہ کفار قریش سرپرستی اہل و عیالش نہانید بخلاف حال کسانیکہ جناب ختمی میاب را بز ہر کشتند و چند معصوم را شہید کردند و ہزاران نسخ قران مجید را یاتش نہادند و اینچہ باقی گزاشتند دران ہم داد تحریف دادند

To make the analogy of Ḥāṭib’s story upon the three Khulafā’s situation is inaccurate according to Shīrī principles since those who have formulated the principles have narrations which prove that the three khulafā’ did not support Rasūlullāh ﷺ sincerely. All the piety and goodness these three displayed in Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ lifetime and after his demise was only the product of show and ostentation. They were actually believers in the fortune tellers and astrologers as proven from the aḥādīth. Ḥāṭib’s situation is different. Ḥāṭib been forgiven does not secure the forgiveness of the Sunnī’s leaders. Ḥāṭib’s only crime was that he disclosed the secret — although there was no prohibition of not disclosing it — just as their daughters disclosed Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ secret and their repentance was accepted as documented in *Majma’*, etc. Hence, Ḥāṭib’s forgiveness was more correct from this point that the kuffār of Quraysh might look after his family. On the contrary are those who poisoned Rasūlullāh ﷺ and killed him, martyred many innocent people, burned thousands of copies of the glorious Qur’ān and interpolated and changed the few that remained.

The crux of the above is that since the three khulafā's actions were filled with deceit and hypocrisy they are deprived of the virtue awarded to the participants of Badr. To claim this is like claiming that Shaykhayn ﷺ did not participate in Badr or that the battle did not take place or that Shaykhayn ﷺ were not born or that Rasūlullāh ﷺ did not announce his nubuwwah. No one besides Allah ﷻ has an answer to such antagonists.

Some Shī'ah object to this hadith saying that it is illogical for Allah ﷻ to promise

اعملوا ما شئتم فقد غفرت لكم

Do as you please for I have forgiven you.

It is impossible for Him to legalise all forbidden things for them.

The appropriate answer is that Allah ﷻ has full knowledge of every single person. He decides according to His knowledge and predestination. Allah ﷻ trusted the participants of Badr, hence He declared this.

The counter reply is, have a look at your own narrations which promise forgiveness for the Shī'ah. It is clearly written that friendship with Sayyidunā 'Alī ﷺ is sufficient. No sin can harm after it. I will prove this from many statements and declarations.

Now show a little compassion upon the participants of Badr. Allah ﷻ decided to forgive them due to the fact that they left their homes, emigrated from their homelands, severed relations with their close relatives, spent their wealth and sacrificed their lives and wealth in the path of Allah ﷻ. They were prepared to kill their own brothers and friends out of love for Allah ﷻ. To raise their status, Allah ﷻ sent angels to assist them. The first battle in Islam was won at their hands. Allah ﷻ displayed their steadfastness and sacrifice in the first battle of Islam and granted victory to Islam at their hands and opened the

door to upcoming conquests and the spreading of Islam with their swords. They were the lovers and friends of Rasūlullāh ﷺ who did all of this in front of Allah’s beloved, the leader of all the Ambiyā’ — by whose intercession Allah ﷻ will forgive major sins and pardon those who believed in towḥīd and risālāh but carried out no good actions besides this and wasted their lives in disobedience. So the warriors who fought in the first battle at the side of such a leader of dīn and such a king of the world, those who were the first to prepare themselves to sacrifice their lives at the feet of the beloved of Allah ﷻ, did not just show their readiness outwardly and hypocritically but did as they said, and upon whose fighting Rasūlullāh ﷺ implored Allah ﷻ in humility and submission, “these poor needy few have intended to sacrifice their lives only to attain Your pleasure, hence grant them victory for they are the means of making Your name reign supreme and Your dīn to spread. If they are defeated, there will be no one to worship You until Qiyāmah.” Thus, Allah ﷻ granted victory at their hands and notwithstanding their few numbers they destroyed the entire kuffār army and killed prominent leaders of the Quraysh like Abū Jahl, etc., and humiliated those who caused distress to and harassed Rasūlullāh ﷺ and banished him from Makkah and disgraced those wretched souls who forced Rasūlullāh ﷺ to leave his home after much persecution and torture and made their flesh morsels for the worms. Such warriors whose triumph sent shivers down the kuffār’s spines and their bodies began to shiver. Their īmān and strength became famous by the great monarchs of the time. In appreciation of such efforts and struggles and īmān and sincerity, Allah ﷻ — the Beneficent; the One who gives seventy to hundred times more reward for one action; the One who only out of His grace and compassion upon his slaves, accepts repentance without any action of the mouth and heart and as stated in the verse:

يُبَدِّلُ اللَّهُ سَيِّئَاتِهِمْ حَسَنَاتٍ

Allah will replace their evil deeds with good.¹

1 Sūrah al-Furqān: 70

Such an Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى promised forgiveness for such people and declared, “do as you please for I have forgiven you.” So what is so surprising? O Shī’ah! Do you not know that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى is exceedingly merciful? Do you not realise that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى is the Beneficent? Does Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى not shower His grace upon His servants? Does He not multiply the reward of their actions manifold? You acknowledge that the condition of Allah’s سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى mercy upon all people, in fact to the sinners and the kuffār is such that if a hundred year old staunch mushrik who wasted his entire life in idol-worship and kufr were to recite the kalimah sincerely and attest to towḥīd and risālah, then Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى will wipe out his hundred years of kufr and shirk just due to his one moment of īmān. So if Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى has to promise forgiveness for the friends of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and those who sacrificed their lives for him, not forgetting their īmān, sincerity, hijrah, jihad and nuṣrah, then why do you regard this as illogical? Do you not know that special actions deserve special treatment? Take for example worldly affairs. When a warrior goes with an ordinary army general to a small battle and is successful, what honour will he get and what reward will he receive from the army general? On the other hand, if he fought at the side of the king and was successful, then what bounty will he receive! If you do not differentiate between the two and regard both situations as equal, then you are not worthy of being addressed. However, if you can differentiate between the two, then why do you not accept this promise as a divine gift which was bestowed for fighting at the side of the leader of the Ambiyā’, the spearhead of the pure and the beloved of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى?

It appears in the ḥadīth that on the Day of Qiyāmah, there will be such sinners who will be rotting in Hell and for whom neither the Ambiyā’ nor the leader of the Ambiyā’ صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ will intercede due to their abundance and severity of sins. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى will show mercy upon them by taking them out of Hell and sending them to Jannah. He will write with light on their illuminated necks:

هذا عتقاء الرحمن من النيران

There are the freed slaves of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى from Hellfire.

So if Allah ﷻ out of grace granted the stamp of brilliance, “do as you please for I have forgiven you,” to His special servants who expressed their weakness and whose good actions have become manifest, then none besides the disbelievers and transgressors can be surprised by this. Turn back a few pages and look at those narrations which state then when Rasūlullāh ﷺ intended to wage jihad and asked the Muhājirīn and Anṣār رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ about it, then what answer did they give? Who of them spoke first and who stood up first besides Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ? Who kissed the feet of Rasūlullāh ﷺ saying, “O Rasūlullāh! We have already sacrificed our health and wealth for you, deserted our homes for you and abandoned our brothers and friends for you. We only have life left which we will sacrifice for you. Forget one life, we are prepared to sacrifice thousands of lives for you.”

تاصد ہزار بار بعیرم برائے تو	میخواہم ا خدا بد عاصد ہزار جاں
اے صد ہزار جان مقدس فدائے تو	من کیستیم کہ بہر تو جاں را فدا کنم

O Allah ﷻ Grant me a hundred thousand lives so that I may die for You a hundred thousand times. Who am I to sacrifice only my life for you! Hundreds of thousands of lives are sacrificed for You.

Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ did not finish speaking and Sayyidunā ‘Umar and Sayyidunā Sa’d ibn Mu’adh رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمَا stood up and declared their fervour to sacrifice their lives in a similar manner. Look at how your own historian describes the zeal, fervour, love and readiness of these great Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ. He says that when Rasūlullāh ﷺ asked:

و زان پس عمر نیز قد کردر است	بپاسخ ابو بکر از جائے خاست
قدم پیش بگذار و مارا بہ ہیں	بگفتند یا سید المرسلین
چہ ساں در پیت جاں فدا میکنم	کہ با دشمن دیں چہامی کم
بیاریم شمشیر بر دشمنان	بودتابن جان و در کف توان
چنیں گفت از روی صدق و نیاز	زجا خاست این بار سعد معاذ
بدست تو روز یکہ دادیم ہست	کہ با جان و دل با ہمیں عہد دست
بہاں روز کردیم بر تو نثار	سر و مال و فرزند و خویش و تبار

Immediately Abū Bakr stood up followed by ‘Umar. They said, “O leader of the Messengers! Go ahead. You will see what we will do to the enemies of dīn and how we will sacrifice our lives for you. We will continue swinging our swords on the enemy until we have life in our bodies.” Sa’d ibn Mu‘ādh then stood up and stated with full loyalty, “I am firmly steadfast with my soul and heart upon the promise I took at your hands. I have sacrificed all my wealth, children, family and relatives for you from that day...”

When this is the zeal, fervour, love, īmān and sincerity of the participants of Badr, then why do you puzzle at one declaration, “do as you please?” Do you not ponder over all the promises Allah ﷻ made at various places in the glorious Qur’ān. This hadith only proves forgiveness. Open the Qur’ān and have a look at what Allah ﷻ promised the Muhājirīn and Anṣār رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ وَرَضُوا عَنْهُ.

رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ وَرَضُوا عَنْهُ

Allah is pleased with them and they are pleased with Him.

أَعَدَّ لَهُمْ جَنَّاتٍ تَجْرِي تَحْتِهَا الْأَنْهَارُ خَالِدِينَ فِيهَا أَبَدًا

He has prepared for them gardens beneath which rivers flow, wherein they will abide forever.

ذَلِكَ الْمَوْزُ الْعَظِيمُ

That is the great attainment.¹

The promises of Allah ﷻ are replete in the Qur’ān but you are amazed over one promise. You overlook all their good and search for their faults. O friends! Be fair. Look at your hadith and history books. Look at what the Shī’ah of Kūfah did to Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and how they treated him. Look at what virtues your

1 Sūrah al-Towbah: 100

muḥaddithīn write about Kūfah. It was this same Shī'ah of Kūfah who abandoned Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه and made him grieve. It was this same Shī'ah of Kūfah who did not help Sayyidunā Ḥasan رضي الله عنه and pulled the rug from under his feet. It was this same Shī'ah of Kūfah who pledged allegiance at the hands of Muslim ibn 'Aqīl in the beginning but then abandoned him at the eleventh hour. Poor Muslim was alone with two innocent children and they were all martyred. It was this very Shī'ah of Kūfah who invited Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه and wrote letters to him displaying their zeal and fervour. They sent 12 000 letters to him. All the letters read, "This is from 'Alī's and your Shī'ah." What zeal they mentioned in those letters which cannot be explained. When they invited him with such zeal and expressed their deep desire, "O son of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم! Come quickly and illuminate this piece of earth. The land of Kūfah eagerly awaits your presence. Every door and wall is calling you. Every person's tongue is shouting out, 'we are present! We are present'. Every person is eagerly anticipating the arrival of the handsome man with excellent qualities. Come quickly. We are all ready to sacrifice our lives. See what we will do."

بہمہ نیزہ گرزو خنجر بدست
 زما لشکر بیکراں ساختن
 زسنگ آب و آتش برون اورند
 سر اسماں بر زمیں اورند

سہابی چون ایشفقہ پیلان مست
 زتو رایت فتح افراختن
 چو باتیغ ابینگ خون اورند
 چوں تیر از کماں در کمیں اورند

We are your warriors like intoxicated elephants, holding long spears and daggers. The flag of triumph will be raised through you. Our inestimable army is prepared for this. When we intend fighting with the sword, we will extract water and fire from rocks. When we aim with our bows and arrows on the target, we will bring the sky to the ground.

When the Imām went into battle, none supported him. They all made excuses, deceived and deserted him and allowed him to be killed. He went hungry and thirsty for three days and was then martyred. The skies and earth are emotional over this pitiable condition till Qiyāmah. Notwithstanding all of this, such virtues are mentioned of Kūfah which Makkah and Madīnah do not possess. Accordingly,

Mullā Bāqir Majlisī writes in *Tuḥfat al-Zā'irīn*:

در حدیث معتبر دیگر از حضرت امام جعفر صادق منقول است که حق تعالی عرض کرد ولایت ما را بر هر اهل شهر پس قبول نه کردند مگر اهل کوفه انتہی بلفظہ

It appears in another reliable narration reported from Imām Ja'far Ṣādiq, "Allah ﷻ presented our wilāyah to the dwellers of every city, but no one accepted besides the people of Kūfah."

It is clear from this that the rank enjoyed by Kūfah and its inhabitants is not enjoyed by Makkah and Madīnah. In fact, Mullā Bāqir Majlisī has attributed the following narration to Imām Zayn al-Ābidīn:

بقدری جای یاد کوفه نزد من بہتر است از خانہ کہ در مدینہ داشتم باشم

A foot span in Kūfah is greater than the house in Madīnah according to me.

No one should be in the deception that the residents of Kūfah were not Shī'ah.

الحدیث یفسر بعضها بعضا

Some narrations explain others.

Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī reports from Imām Ja'far Ṣādiq in *Majālīs al-Mu'minīn*. 'Abd Allah ibn Walīd narrates:

گفت در زمان بنی مروان بخدمت امام جعفر علیہ السلام رفتم إنحضرت از من و رفیقان من پرسیدند کہ شما چه کسانیدید گفتیم از اہل کوفہ ایم إنحضرت فرمودند در بیچ از یک بلاد این قدر دوست نداریم کہ در کوفہ بعد از ان فرمودند کہ اینہا العصابہ ان اللہ ہدایکم جملہ الناس و احنبتونہا و ابغضنا الناس و بايعتمونہا و خالفنا الناس و واقعتمونہا و کذبنا الناس و صدقتمونہا فاحیاکم اللہ محیانا و امامکم مہانتا

One day when the sons of Marwān were ruling, I went to Imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. The Imām asked me where I was from and I replied, "Kūfah." The Imām commented, "no city has that amount of my friends as does

Kūfah.” He said further, “Allah ﷻ has guided you — the inhabitants of Kūfah — to something which the rest of mankind is ignorant of. You loved us whereas others had enmity for us. You pledged allegiance to us. While others opposed us, you supported us. And while others belied us, you believed in us. May Allah ﷻ make you live like us and die like us.”¹

Wherever Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī quotes this narration, he comments:

بالجمله تشيع اهل كوفه حاجت به اقامت دليل ندارد

There is no need to prove that the inhabitants of Kūfah are Shī'ah.

O Mu'minīn! The same people of Kūfah whom you complain about and who martyred Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه were the residents of Kūfah — which is greater in rank than Makkah and Madīnah according to the Imām — and where the heart and soul of the Imām and whose life and death were like that of the Imām. The Kūfah which enjoys such a high rank and the people of Kūfah who enjoy such a lofty position cannot be blameworthy. Recite poetry in their praise and send mercy upon them since Kūfah is the barometer of Shī'ism. To be from Kūfah is sufficient proof of being Shī'ī. Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī writes in *Majālis al-Mu'minīn*:

كوفى بودن شخصه دليل تشيع است اگر چه ابو حنيفه كوفى باشد

Someone being from Kūfah is proof of him being Shī'ī even though Abū Ḥanīfah was from Kūfah.

O Shī'ah! The condition of those people of Kūfah whom your little children are aware of and regarding whom young illiterate boys say:

الكوفى لا يوفى

A man from Kūfah is never loyal.

1 Urdu translation of *Majālis al-Mu'minīn* pg. 120, 121

Whose deception, disloyalty and treachery is echoed on the pulpits and whose work is to allow the Imām to be martyred thirsty. This couplet aptly fits them:

خوش داشتند حرمت مہمان کربلا

از آب ہم مضائقہ کردند کوفیان

The people of Kūfah constrained the water,
thereby honouring the guests of Karbalā’.

Your scholars narrate their virtues from the noble A’immah and quote the Imām saying regarding them, “may Allah *سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى* make you live like us and may you die like us.” They say that one handful of sand of Kūfah is more beloved to the Imām than the land of Madīnah Munawwarah. They claim that the people of Kūfah are the beloveds and friends of the A’immah and due to this friendship they consider them as inhabitants of Jannah. Hearing all of this nonsense and drivel, the veins of your īmān do not swell and your pure hearts do not tremble even a little. In fact, you imitate the actions of the people of Kūfah every year thus being the focus of this verse:

مَا هَذِهِ التَّمَائِيلُ الَّتِي أَنْتُمْ لَهَا عَاكِفُونَ ﴿٥٢﴾

What are these statues to which you are devoted?¹

You display no īmān and honour in quoting those fabricated narrations and pathetic statements of your scholars. In fact, whether they are true or false, you accept them wholeheartedly. On the other hand, when you hear about the friends and Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh *صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ* and the forgiveness promised for the participants of Badr from some Sunnī, you go into a rage and the inferno of prejudice blazes in your body. The passion of Shī’ism makes your every vein swell and the intensity of your enmity changes your humours. Then all satanic whispers flood your heart; you doubt every word and object to every sentence.

1 Sūrah al-Ambiyā’: 52

Subhān Allah! You do not regard the participants of Badr to be equal in rank to the people of Kūfah and the narrations which you feel aptly apply to the latter do not apply to the former. What īmān is this? You take Rasūlullāh's ﷺ name and read 'Abd Allah ibn Sabā's kalimah? You received īmān due to the blessings of the khulafā' yet you are grateful to that accursed Jew? You deem yourself as pure and have the audacity to confront the Sunnī but belie Allah's ﷻ verses, Rasūlullāh's ﷺ aḥādīth and the A'imma's statements due to the fabrications of some evil conspirators.

Brothers! What type of dīn and īmān is this? Either you abandon Islam and become open Jews or have faith in the beliefs of the Muslim like proper Muslims. Dissociate from that preposterous creed which is founded on nothing but lies and deception and curse those who formed it. It is not befitting for such liars to make such big claims of īmān with their small filthy mouths. Being Muslim and thinking evil of Rasūlullāh's ﷻ friends is shocking. It is just lip service which has no reality. It is bereft of substance. How true is the saying:

دشمن می بودن و بهرنگ مستان زیستن

و جدو منع بادہ اے زاہد چه کافر نعمتے ست

O ascetic man! What ingratitude to a favour it is to prevent from drunkenness and liquor,

An enemy of liquor and living the life of a drunkard at the same time?

We have thoroughly established the virtue of the participants of Badr as announced by Allah ﷻ in the Qur'ān, acknowledged by Shī' scholars, and indicated by their actions. I will now quote a statement of Dildār 'Alī which he wrote in his book *Maqālah Thālīthah* — the response of which is *Izālat al-Ghayn* — so that it is known as to what is their status according to the Shī'ah. Dildār 'Alī says:

دعوی نفاق ایشاں و غدر اہل بدر

The claim of their nifāq and the deception of the participants of Badr.

و رضوان على مدعا ما سمت ما بهم يُخَدَعُونَ اللَّهَ وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَمَا يُخَدَعُونَ إِلَّا أَنفُسَهُمْ وَمَا يَشْعُرُونَ ﴿٩﴾

Our claim conforms to the pleasure of Allah ﷻ. They (think to) deceive Allah and those who believe, but they deceive not except themselves and perceive (it) not.¹

Subhān Allah! What dīn and what īmān is this? The people of Kūfah are considered loyal and the participants of Badr are considered treacherous? May Allah ﷻ make them understand or punish them for their kufr. We seek Allah’s ﷻ protection from such nonsense.

Dildār ‘Alī quotes another verse in *Dhū al-Fiqār* in opposition to the verses mentioning the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ:

وَإِذَا رَأَيْتَهُمْ تُعْجِبُكَ أَجْسَامُهُمْ وَإِنْ يَقُولُوا تَسْمَعُ لِقَوْلِهِمْ كَأَنْهُمْ خَشَبٌ مُسْتَنْدَةٌ يَحْسِبُونَ كُلَّ صَيْحَةٍ عَلَيْهِمْ هُمُ الْعَدُوُّ فَاحْذَرْهُمْ قَتَلْتَهُمُ اللَّهُ أَنْى يُؤَفِّكُونَ

And when you see them, their forms please you, and if they speak, you listen to their speech. (They are) as if they were pieces of wood propped up — they think that every shout is against them. They are the enemy, so beware of them. May Allah destroy them; how are they deluded?²

Dildār ‘Alī has been treacherous and has misinterpreted the verses. He left out the preceding and subsequent verses and merely quoted a few verses from the middle. I will quote all the verses and provide their commentary.

It should be known that these verses are part of Sūrah al-Munāfiqūn which Allah ﷻ revealed regarding the hypocrites. The following are the opening verses of the sūrah:

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 9

2 Sūrah al-Munāfiqūn: 4

إِذَا جَاءَكَ الْمُتَنَفِقُونَ قَالُوا نَشْهَدُ إِنَّكَ لَرَسُولُ اللَّهِ وَاللَّهُ يَعْلَمُ إِنَّكَ لَرَسُولُهُ وَاللَّهُ يَشْهَدُ إِنَّ
 الْمُتَنَفِقِينَ لَكَذِبُونَ ﴿١﴾ اتَّخَذُوا إِيمَانَهُمْ جُنَّةً فَصَدُّوا عَنْ سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ إِنَّهُمْ سَاءَ مَا كَانُوا يَعْمَلُونَ
 ﴿٢﴾ ذَلِكَ بِأَنَّهُمْ آمَنُوا ثُمَّ كَفَرُوا فَطُبِعَ عَلَى قُلُوبِهِمْ فَهُمْ لَا يَفْقَهُونَ ﴿٣﴾ وَإِذَا رَأَيْتَهُمْ تُحَاكِمُكَ
 أَجْسَامُهُمْ ۖ وَإِنْ يَقُولُوا تَسْمَعُ لِقَوْلِهِمْ ۖ كَانَتْهُمْ حُشْبٌ مِّنْ سِنْدَةٍ ۚ يُحْسِبُونَ كُلَّ صَاحِبَةٍ عَلَيْهِمْ ۗ هُمْ
 الْعَدُوُّ فَاحْذَرْهُمْ ۗ فَتَلَّهُمْ اللَّهُ ۗ أَنَّى يُؤْفَكُونَ ﴿٤﴾ وَإِذَا قِيلَ لَهُمْ تَعَالَوْا يَسْتَغْفِرْ لَكُمْ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ
 لَوَّارُءٌ وَسُهْمٌ وَرَأَيْتَهُمْ يُصْذَوْنَ وَهُمْ مُسْتَكْبِرُونَ ﴿٥﴾ سَوَاءٌ عَلَيْهِمْ أَسْتَغْفَرْتَ لَهُمْ أَمْ لَمْ تَسْتَغْفِرْ
 لَهُمْ لَنْ يَغْفِرَ اللَّهُ لَهُمْ ۗ إِنَّ اللَّهَ لَا يَهْدِي الْقَوْمَ الْفَاسِقِينَ ﴿٦﴾ هُمْ الَّذِينَ يَقُولُونَ لَا تُنْفِقُوا عَلَيَّ مِنْ
 عِنْدِ رَسُولِ اللَّهِ حَتَّى يَنْفَضُوا ۗ وَاللَّهُ خَزَائِنُ السَّمَوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ وَلَكِنَّ الْمُتَنَفِقِينَ لَا يَفْقَهُونَ ﴿٧﴾
 يَقُولُونَ لَنْ رَجِعَنَّ إِلَى الْمَدِينَةِ لِيُخْرِجَنَّ الْأَعَزُّ مِنْهَا الْأَذَلَّ ۗ وَاللَّهُ الْعَزِيزُ وَلِرَسُولِهِ وَلِلْمُؤْمِنِينَ وَ
 لِكِنَّ الْمُتَنَفِقِينَ لَا يَعْلَمُونَ ﴿٨﴾

When the hypocrites come to you, (O Muḥammad), they say, “We testify that you are the Rasūl of Allah.” And Allah knows that you are His Rasūl, and Allah testifies that the hypocrites are liars. They have taken their oaths as a cover, so they averted (people) from the way of Allah. Indeed, it was evil that they were doing. That is because they believed, and then they disbelieved; so their hearts were sealed over, and they do not understand. And when you see them, their forms please you, and if they speak, you listen to their speech. (They are) as if they were pieces of wood propped up — they think that every shout is against them. They are the enemy, so beware of them. May Allah destroy them; how are they deluded? And when it is said to them, “Come, the Rasūl of Allah will ask forgiveness for you,” they turn their heads aside and you see them evading while they are arrogant. It is all the same for them whether you ask forgiveness for them or do not ask forgiveness for them; never will Allah forgive them. Indeed, Allah does not guide the defiantly disobedient people. They are the ones who say, “Do not spend on those who are with the Rasūl of Allah until they disband.” And to Allah belongs the depositories of the heavens and the earth, but the hypocrites do not understand. They say, “if we return to al-Madīnah, the more honoured (for power) will surely expel therefrom the more humble.” And to Allah belongs (all) honour, and to His Rasūl, and to the believers, but the hypocrites do not know.¹

Just quoting all of these verses is a sufficient answer to Dildār ‘Alī together with his treachery and deception being disclosed. It is clear that these verses refer to the hypocrites. But when can it ever be expected from the Shī‘ah to be content with the words and meanings of the Qur’ān? Most certainly they will not keep silent upon this. Thus, I will mention the reason of the revelation of these verses from their commentaries.

It appears in the commentary of ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm Qummī¹, who is the teacher of Abū Ja‘far al-Kulaynī² that the reason of the revelation of Sūrah al-Munāfiqūn was that in 7 A.H when Rasūlullāh ﷺ was returning from the Battle of Banū Muṣṭaliq, Sayyidunā ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb’s tenant, whose name was Jahjāh, hit Anas ibn Sayyār — the adopted brother of the Anṣār at a well on the way. ‘Abd Allah ibn Ubay, a resident of Madīnah, received news of this. He was upset at this and told his people, i.e. the people of Madīnah, “for this reason I did not want the people of Quraysh to come to us. This is because of your own doing. You gave shelter to the Makkans in your houses, spent your wealth upon them and sacrificed your lives for them. You widowed your wives and orphaned your children for their sake. And now you are humiliated. If you exile them, they will go to others.” He then said:

1 The commentary of ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm Qummī is one of the earliest commentaries of the Shī‘ah. According to the Shī‘ah, the author Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Hāshim al-Qummī is the student of the eleventh Imām Ḥasan al-‘Askarī. He is reckoned among the renowned Shī‘ī scholars of the third century. It is written concerning him in *Fahrist Ṭūsī*:

على بن ابراهيم بن هاشم القمي ابو الحسن ثقة في الحديث ثبت معتمد صحيح المذهب

‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm ibn Hāshim al-Qummī Abū al- Ḥasan is reliable in hadith, well-grounded, dependable and upon the correct path. (*Fahrist Ṭūsī* Calcutta print pg. 209)

2 Abū Ja‘far Muhammad ibn Ya‘qūb ibn Ishāq al-Kulaynī al-Rāzī. He was born in Kulayn, a village near Ray, Iran in the time of Imām Ḥasan al-‘Askarī around 250 A.H. He was the student of ‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm al-Qummī and ‘Alī ibn Muhammad al-Samarrī — who is the last representative (of the hidden Imām), amongst others. *Al-Kāfi* which is considered the most comprehensive and reliable book of the four canonical works of the Shī‘ah religion was written by him. It is the belief of the Shī‘ah that the greatest speciality enjoyed by this book is that it was written in the era of the representatives of the Imām and has been authenticated by the (fictitious) twelfth Imām. He died during the reign of al-Faḍl Muṭ‘ī Allah in 329 A.H. (Shaykh Muhammad Firāsāt)

لَئِنْ رَجَعْنَا إِلَى الْمَدِينَةِ لِيُخْرِجَنَّ الْأَعَزُّ مِنْهَا الْأَذَلَّ

If we return to al-Madīnah, the more honoured (for power) will surely expel therefrom the more humble.

A youngster, Sayyidunā Zayd ibn Arqam رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, was present when he said this. He informed Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ who was grieved at receiving such news. Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ made preparation to continue the journey. Sayyidunā Sa'd ibn 'Ubādah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ came running and said, "O Rasūlullāh! This is not the time for you to depart." Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ asked him, "Have you heard what your friend said?" He answered, "O Rasūlullāh! I have no friend besides you." Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ then said, "Abd Allah ibn Ubay thinks that when we return to Madīnah, the honoured will surely expel therefrom the disgraced." Sayyidunā Sa'd ibn 'Ubādah commented, "You and your friends are the honoured ones while 'Abd Allah ibn Ubay and his friends are disgraced."

The Khazraj — who were a clan of Madīnah — began rebuking 'Abd Allah ibn Ubay who took an oath that he did not say such a thing. People told him to go to Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and seek forgiveness. He looked down in contempt. The next morning he came to Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and swore that he said nothing. He then recited the shahādah and remarked, "Zayd slandered me." People now began to rebuke Zayd. Finally, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى revealed Sūrah al-Munāfiqūn. Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ gathered the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ and recited it to them.

It is the opinion of a great commentator that this sūrah was revealed regarding the munāfiq 'Abd Allah ibn Ubay ibn Salūl. However, Dildār 'Alī did not understand the meaning nor pondered over the circumstances leading to its revelation nor looked at his commentaries. He intentionally omitted some verses before and after and presented only two. If this is the way to debate, then he ought to have written all the verses in the glorious Qur'ān which speak about the Banī Isrā'īl, Fir'awn, Namrūd and Shaddād so that his book becomes thicker and people acknowledge his deep understanding of the Qur'ān.

Dildār ‘Alī quoted these verses and stated:

و امثال این دیگر آیات ست پس لابد ست که در جمع بین الایات گفته شود که مورد آیات مناقب غیر مورد آیات ذم ست
پس بعضی صحابه انحضرت عموماً ممدوح باشند و بعضی مذموم و این عین مطلوب شیعیان است

There are many more verses such as the above. It is necessary to clarify when reconciling the verses that verses of virtue and verses of reproach were revealed regarding different people, i.e. some of Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ’s Ṣaḥābah are worthy of praise while others are worthy of censure. And this is the Shī‘ī view.¹

This false notion of Dildār ‘Alī is due to him lacking understanding of the glorious Qur’ān. The remedy for it is to study its commentary and circumstances leading to its revelation. Had he looked up the circumstances leading to its revelation and studied his own commentaries and pondered over the context of these verses, he would not have mentioned this ruling regarding reconciling verses. Those verses regarding the kuffār and munāfiqīn have nothing to do with the Muhājirīn, Anṣār and Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. These verses mentioning kufr, nifāq and laxity in dīn are with regards to the munāfiqīn. The Ṣaḥābah ﷺ are not included therein. There is polarity between the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ and the munāfiqīn; they are not synonymous. So to reconcile those verses which speak highly about the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ with those verses which rebuke the munāfiqīn is superfluous. It is akin to reconciling two opposites which is impossible according to us and possible according to you. So sit at home and reconcile these verses and fabricate principles regarding it. Then you can decide who is included and who is excluded from your fabricated imaginary principles. Allah ﷻ guiding some and misguiding others has spared us from reconciling these verses. Allah ﷻ included whom He wished among the Muhājirīn and Anṣār ﷺ and included whom He wished among the munāfiqīn.

1 Dhū al-Fiqār pg. 64

Fifth Proof

A person who believes in the Qur’ān will never use the word munāfiq when referring to the Muhājirīn and Anṣār رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ. This is due to the fact that Qur’ān is replete with verses which categorically forbid associating with the munāfiqīn, being happy with them, taking them along for jihad and listening to any of their excuses. So had the Muhājirīn and Anṣār, particularly the three khulafā’ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ, been munāfiqīn, then why would Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ not humiliate them, why would he keep them in his company, seek counsel from them and take them along for jihad? I will quote few verses to support my claim.

Verse 1: Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى declares:

يَعْتَذِرُونَ بِاللَّهِ إِذَا رَجَعْتُمْ إِلَيْهِمْ ۗ قُلْ لَا تَعْتَذِرُوا لَنْ نُؤْمِنَ لَكُمْ قَدْ نَبَّأَنَا اللَّهُ مِنْ أَحْبَابِكُمْ ۖ وَسَيَرَى
اللَّهُ عَمَلَكُمْ وَرَسُولُهُ ۗ ثُمَّ تَرَدُّونَ إِلَىٰ عِلْمِ الْغَيْبِ وَالشَّهَادَةِ فَيُنَبِّئُكُمْ بِمَا كُنْتُمْ تَعْمَلُونَ ﴿٩٤﴾
سَيَحْلِفُونَ بِاللَّهِ لَكُمْ إِذَا انْقَلَبْتُمْ إِلَيْهِمْ لِتَعْرِضُوا عَنْهُمْ ۗ فَأَعْرِضُوا عَنْهُمْ ۗ إِنَّهُمْ رِجْسٌ وَمَا وَهُمْ
بِحَبِيبٍ ۗ جَزَاءُ ۙ بِمَا كَانُوا يَكْسِبُونَ ﴿٩٥﴾ يَحْلِفُونَ لَكُمْ لِتَرْضَوْا عَنْهُمْ ۗ فَإِنْ تَرْضَوْا عَنْهُمْ فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ
لَا يَرْضَىٰ عَنِ الْقَوْمِ الْفَاسِقِينَ ﴿٩٦﴾

They will make excuses to you when you have returned to them. Say, “make no excuse — never will we believe you. Allah has already informed us of your news. And Allah will observe your deeds, and (so will) His Rasūl; then you will be taken back to the Knower of the unseen and the witnessed, and He will inform you of what you used to do.” They will swear by Allah to you when you return to them that you would leave them alone. So leave them alone; indeed they are evil; and their refuge is Hell as recompense for what they had been earning. They swear to you so that you might be satisfied with them. But if you should be satisfied with them — indeed, Allah is not satisfied with a defiantly disobedient people.¹

Here are few points deduced from the above verses:

1 Sūrah al-Towbah: 94-96

1. The munāfiqīn making excuses and Rasūlullāh ﷺ not believing them.
2. Rasūlullāh ﷺ being aware of their condition.
3. They being shortly punished in recompense of their actions.
4. The command for Rasūlullāh ﷺ to turn away from them and the prohibition of associating with them.
5. No matter how many oaths they take to please you, do not be pleased with them.
6. Their perpetual desire and concern for the humiliation of the Muslims and them being disgraced.

Try to apply one of the above points to the Muhājirīn and Anṣār رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ, and in particular to the three khulafā' رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ. Or comment about Rasūlullāh ﷺ not turning away from the three khulafā' رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ notwithstanding their hypocrisy and categorical commands for him to do so. We cannot utter disrespectful words and we can never imagine such a being (i.e. Rasūlullāh ﷺ) disobeying a divine command or observing Taqīyyah.

Verse 2: Allah سُبحانه وتعالى says:

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّبِيُّ جَاهِدِ الْكُفَّارَ وَالْمُنَافِقِينَ

O Nabī, fight against the disbelievers and the hypocrites.¹

If the Muhājirīn and Anṣār رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ were munāfiqīn, then at least tell us when and against whom did Rasūlullāh ﷺ wage jihad? Or did Rasūlullāh ﷺ not fulfil Allah's سُبحانه وتعالى command notwithstanding their nifāq?

Verse 3: Allah سُبحانه وتعالى says:

1 Sūrah al-Towbah: 73

فَإِنْ رَجَعَكَ اللَّهُ إِلَى طَائِفَةٍ مِنْهُمْ فَاسْتَأْذِنُواكَ لِلْخُرُوجِ فَقُلْ لَنْ تَخْرُجُوا مَعِيَ أَبَدًا وَلَنْ تُقَاتِلُوا مَعِيَ
عَدُوًّا ۗ إِنَّكُمْ رَضِيتُمْ بِالْقُعُودِ أَوَّلَ مَرَّةٍ فَاقْعُدُوا مَعَ الْخَلِيفِينَ ﴿٨٣﴾

If Allah should return you to a faction of them (after the expedition) and then they ask your permission to go out (to battle), say, “you will not go out with me, ever, and you will never fight with me an enemy. Indeed, you were satisfied with sitting (at home) the first time, so sit (now) with those who stay behind.”¹

After studying this verse, did Rasūlullāh ﷺ take along with him for jihad those people whom you call munāfiqīn or not? If you are unaware, turn back a few pages and have a good look at the couplets of *Ḥamlah Ḥaydariyyah* regarding the Battle of Badr.

Verse 4: Allah سبحانه وتعالى states:

يَحْذَرُ الْمُنَافِقُونَ أَنْ تَنْزَلَ عَلَيْهِمْ سُورَةٌ تُنَبِّئُهُمْ بِمَا فِي قُلُوبِهِمْ ۗ قُلِ اسْتَهْزِءُوا ۗ إِنَّ اللَّهَ مُخْرِجٌ مَّا
تَحْذَرُونَ ﴿٦٤﴾

They hypocrites are apprehensive lest a sūrah be revealed about them, informing them of what is in their hearts. Say, “Mock (as you wish); indeed, Allah will expose that which you fear.”²

Tell us whether Rasūlullāh ﷺ ever exposed the nifāq of those you regard as munāfiqīn or not? And besides to Sayyidunā Ḥudhayfah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to whom Rasūlullāh ﷺ whispered behind closed doors (as you Shī'ah allege), did Rasūlullāh ﷺ ever disclose their nifāq in a public gathering?

In short, there are plenty verses dealing with the munāfiqīn. It is not necessary to list them all here. It is sufficient for the Muslims to contemplate that if the

1 Sūrah al-Towbah: 83

2 Sūrah al-Towbah: 64

Muhājirīn and Anṣār رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُم were munāfiqīn, then why did Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ not disclose their nifāq? Why were the promises of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى not fulfilled of them being disgraced and killed? On the contrary, they were granted greater honour and status and overpowered the Roman Empire, Syria, Iran and Egypt. The beliefs of the Shī'ah are corrupt! They neither conform to the Qur'ān, nor to the ḥadīth!

Some objections remain which the Shī'ah raise against the three khulafā' in particular and against the Muhājirīn and Anṣār رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُم in general to prove their nifāq.

1. The Battle of Uḥud and Ḥunayn.
2. Sayyidunā 'Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ asking Sayyidunā Ḥudhayfah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ about his nifāq.
3. Sayyidunā 'Umar's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ reservations of the treaty of Ḥudaybiyyah.
4. Intending to kill Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ on the night of 'Aqabah.
5. Usurpation of Fadak.
6. Not giving Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ the paper and pen.
7. Usurping the khilāfah from Sayyidunā 'Alī Murtaḍā رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.
8. Harboursing enmity for Rasūlullāh's صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ family.

As well as other objections of this kind with which Dildār 'Alī has blackened the pages of *Dhū al-Fiqār*, etc. We will provide a satisfactory answer to these objections. We will not behave like Dildār 'Alī who beats around the bush and evades the issue and then continues. Allah willing, all of these objections will be answered in the discussion of the allegations against the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُم and khilāfah, seeing which the Shī'ah will impulsively declare:

﴿ ٨١ ﴾ وَقُلْ جَاءَ الْحَقُّ وَزَهَقَ الْبَاطِلُ إِنَّ الْبَاطِلَ كَانَ زَهُوقًا

And say, "truth has come, and falsehood has departed. Indeed is falsehood, (by nature), ever bound to depart."¹

1 Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl: 81

In conclusion, I have listed the verses in praise of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ and quoted what the Shī'ah say, namely: “The verses in praise of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār refer to those people who were mu'minīn whereas majority of the Ṣaḥābah, especially the three khulafā', had no īmān.” I have discussed the aspect of having no īmān i.e. it has two meanings:

1. They rejected Allah سُبحانه وتعالى and His Rasūl صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Such people are termed as munāfiqīn. I have answered all the verses which Dildār 'Alī presented and it has been firmly established that the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ were not munāfiqīn.
2. They rejected one of the fabricated fundamentals of Shī'ism, i.e. Imāmah, hence they were kuffār. I have briefly answered this by proving that when Allah سُبحانه وتعالى revealed verses in praise of them, Imāmah was not one of the fundamentals of dīn. If you can establish that Imāmah was one of the fundamentals of dīn, then go ahead.

فعلیکم البیان وعلینا دفعه بالبرهان

You task is to explain and our task is to falsify that with proof.

Only two aspects remain:

1. They rejected Imāmah after Rasūlullāh's صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ demise and usurped the right of Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.
2. They harboured enmity for the Ahl al-Bayt and usurped their rights, which is also kufr.

I will answer these objections in the discussion of Imāmah and allegations in such detail without sparing any Shī'ī proof or Sunnī scholar's answer. Meaning that I will mention all the objections and answers which are necessary not that I will quote every Shī'ī and Sunnī that ever lived in the world, which is impossible and futile. Nevertheless, I will write with such clarity that every reader can judge for

himself and there will be no need to look at narrations at many places. Anyways, few of the answers the Shī'ah generally give to the verses mentioning the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ remain. I will quote them and refute them from the Qur'ān and ḥadīth.

فَاسْتَمِعُوا لَهُ وَأَنْصِتُوا لَعَلَّكُمْ تُرْحَمُونَ

Listen to it and pay attention that you may receive mercy.¹

The Second Answer the Shī'ah Present to Verses Extolling the Ṣaḥābah's Virtue

The crux of the first answer of the Shī'ah is that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ — who is from the Muhājirīn — had a corrupt intention. Now listen to what other answers they give.

Shāh Ṣāhib quotes Mullā 'Abd Allah's answer in *Tuḥfah*:

Allah's سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى declaration of His pleasure with the Muhājirīn and Anṣār in the verse:

وَالسَّابِقُونَ الْأَوَّلُونَ مِنَ الْمُهَاجِرِينَ وَالْأَنْصَارِ

And the first forerunners (in the faith) among the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār...²

This pleasure only applies to their precedence in hijrah and assistance, i.e. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى was only pleased with this specific action. However, this does not necessitate them being deserving of Jannah since it is not compulsory for this pleasure to remain till the hereafter. Whether the pleasure remained or not is dependent on their ending.

1 Sūrah al-A'rāf: 204

2 Sūrah al-Towbah: 100

After quoting this, Shāh Ṣāḥib comments:

This explanation is not in conformity with the accepted rules and principles. Allah ﷻ praised the Muhājirīn and Anṣār, i.e. their beings. And since hijrah and assistance are mentioned as their qualities, this shows that Allah's ﷻ pleasure is largely due to these qualities, and not solely due to them.

Dildār 'Alī responds to this in *Dhū al-Fiqār*:

بنوز باثبات نه رسیده که مزاد از سبقت درین جا سبقت فی الهجرت ست پس غایت ما فی الباب علت رضا سبقت الی الاسلام یا سبقت الی الموت یا سبقت الی الهجرت لا علی الیقین خواهد بود و این علت مبهمه برائے تو بهیچ وجه مفید نمی تواند شد

All this explanation can be offered when it is established that the meaning of first forerunners among the Muhājirīn is forerunners in hijrah, whereas the purport of forerunners is not clear to us. Does it mean forerunners in Islam, or forerunners in hijrah or forerunners in death? So when this is obscure, it does not provide a meaningful purport.

Dildār 'Alī has summed up the equation. There is no scope for argumentation. The only time these virtues are applicable is when the meaning of “forerunners” is known. Does it mean forerunners in Islam, or forerunners in hijrah or forerunners in death? When there is obscurity in this, using this as proof is useless. In short, due to the reason of pleasure being obscure, no one's virtue is established. The meaning Dildār 'Alī has presented has been reached after deep contemplation and meditation. He already said before:

ایضا اینچه بعد تامل و نظر دقیق ظاہر می گرد و صفحه ۵۷ ذو الفقار تا قوله اذا جاء الاحتمال بطل الاستدلال

This becomes apparent after deep contemplation and pondering. (*Dhū al-Fiqār* pg. 57) When there is vagueness, substantiation is inoperable.

Then he supports his explanation with logical proofs that the meaning of “forerunners” is forerunners in death. It refers to those who have passed away. He says:

و ثانياً اینکه علت رضائے مهاجرین و انصار از حق تعالی مجرد بجزرت و نصرت نمی تواند شد بلکه نظر دقیق حکم می کند که رضای آنها از حق تعالی و تسلیم اوامر و نواهی او علت بجزرت و نصرت شده و این قرینه دیگر است براینکه مراد از سابقین سابقین الی الموت اند

It can never be that the reason for Allah's سُبْحَانَ رَبِّكَ رَبِّ الْعَالَمِينَ pleasure with the Muhājirīn and Anṣār is their hijrah with Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ or assisting Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Deep contemplation makes it clear that them being pleased with Allah سُبْحَانَ رَبِّكَ رَبِّ الْعَالَمِينَ and conforming to His commandments and prohibitions is the reason of their hijrah and assistance. This is the second contextual evidence that the meaning of “forerunners” is forerunners in death.

Subḥān Allah! What deep understanding! What a meaning he has taken out. Where could Shāh Ṣāḥib have such deep understanding to take out the meaning of death from “forerunners”?

We are grateful to Dildār ‘Alī for including the dead Muhājirīn and Anṣār صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. If he said that “forerunners” means Sayyidunā Ādam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام who made hijrah from Jannah first or Sayyidunā Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام who made hijrah to Madyan, then what could we have said? If he said that it meant Jibrīl and Mīkā’il since they were created first, then what say do we have? Anyways, when a person is hell-bent on fabricating and does not consider Qur’ānic words, then what force can be used upon such an insolent individual? Whatever he considers is his kindness.

No one should think that Dildār ‘Alī claimed this without proof. To blurt out drivel without proof is the practice of the ignorant like Shāh Ṣāḥib (as he claims). Dildār ‘Alī on the other hand does not say anything without proof, and he substantiates his claim by saying:

و این قرینه دیگر است براینکه مراد از سابقین اولین الی الموت اند چه موت اهل جنت و مشاهده درجات را مدخلیه تمام در رضائے آنها از حق تعالی ست

Secondly, there is another contextual evidence for “forerunners” to refer to those who passed away; since reaching Jannah, seeing their status and

enjoying themselves peacefully in Jannah are great evidences that such people are pleased with Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى.¹

Undoubtedly this is correct. Those who are living can never be pleased since they do not know whether Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى will grant them Jannah or not and even if there is assurance of Him granting them, then too due to worldly obligations they can never be pleased. After they die and Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى grants them Jannah and they enjoy the bounties of Jannah with delight then they will definitely be pleased with Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. And you wrote previously that the reason for their hijrah and assistance was that they were pleased with Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. Now what doubt remains that “forerunners” refers to those people who passed away before its revelation?

What substantiation for such a claim! Such claims and proofs are the lot of the ‘guided’ and ‘devout’. Congratulations to such a sect whose scholars possess such ‘intelligence’ and ‘understanding’.

Dildār ‘Alī has fully substantiated his book. He did not only mention one or two proofs for his every claim but substantiated each with plenty proofs so that no Sunnī has the courage to refute them. I will quote the third answer he presented to this verse. He says:

ثالثا اینکه غایت ما فی الباب آنکه ایہ علت بودن بجزرت و نصرت در باب رضائے حق تعالیٰ از اینها و رضای اینها از و تعالیٰ شانه می تواند شد و علت اعم ست از اینکه تامه باشد یا ناقصه استعمال علت ناقصه در کلام حق تعالیٰ و احادیث نبوی شیاع تمام دارد و اگر بسپ غباوت ذہن کہ داری دریں باب تامل داشته باشی پس قرن مجید را از اول بنظر بصیرت تلاوت کن و در آیات وعده و وعید تامل نماتا صدق این مقال واضح گردد

Thirdly, the reason of their hijrah and assistance mentioned in this verse could possibly be their happiness with Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and Him being pleased with them. This reason is general, whether it is complete or incomplete. Using an incomplete reason is generally found in the speech of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and the aḥādīth of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Even though you are extremely thick,

1 *Dhū al-Fiqār* pg. 59 line 4

if you ponder a little over the Qur’ān from cover to cover and contemplate over the verses of reward and punishment, the verification of my claim will be evident.¹

This means that Allah ﷻ was pleased with their hijrah and assistance although this reason is incomplete. Hence, being pleased with all their actions is not established. Shame upon him! He does not even consider for a little while the context of the Qur’ān and the literal translation of the verse and then concocts the meanings of the Qur’ān. O Allah ﷻ! Is Your speech some type of riddle or is this verse a mystery or some puzzle that Dildār ‘Alī had to resort to such despicable thoughts? There are only about four words, translate them and understand them.

O Mu’minīn! The literal translation of this verse is exactly as I wrote above. Or is it something else? Listen to the words of the verse first:

وَالسُّبْقُونَ الْأُولُونَ مِنَ الْمُهَاجِرِينَ وَالْأَنْصَارِ وَالَّذِينَ اتَّبَعُوهُمْ بِإِحْسَانٍ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ وَرَضُوا عَنْهُ وَأَعَدَّ لَهُمْ جَنَّاتٍ تَجْرِي تَحْتِهَا الْأَنْهَارُ خَالِدِينَ فِيهَا أَبَدًا ذَلِكَ الْفَوْزُ الْعَظِيمُ ﴿١٠٠﴾

And the first forerunners (in the faith) among the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār and those who followed them with good conduct — Allah is pleased with them and they are pleased with Him, and He has prepared for them gardens beneath which rivers flow, wherein they will abide forever. That is the great attainment.²

The complete and incomplete reasons that Dildār ‘Alī is presuming from such clear words, is this not taḥrīf? If such nonsensical reasons are included in Allah’s ﷻ speech, the entire Qur’ān will turn into a toy and it will be impossible to believe in any verse or command and practice accordingly. Allah ﷻ emphatically declares:

1 Dhū al-Fiqār pg. 59 line 6

2 Sūrah al-Towbah: 100

رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ وَرَضُوا عَنْهُ

Allah is pleased with them and they are pleased with Him.

Dildār ‘Alī says that this being the reason for His pleasure is incomplete. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى is not pleased with everything, He is only pleased with hijrah and assistance. And although Dildār ‘Alī did not say it clearly, he means that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى is displeased due to usurping the khilāfah and harbouring enmity for the Ahl al-Bayt. Hence, do not think this pleasure to be all-encompassing and do not think good of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ.

It is shameful that Dildār ‘Alī did not say that the Qur’ān declared, “If anyone is in doubt and does not understand the meaning of my verses then Dildār ‘Alī has explained that “forerunners” definitely means the dead because Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى informs us of their condition that they were pleased with Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. It is known that had they been alive then it was befitting for Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى to say, “They will be pleased with Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى”, using the future tense.” Dildār ‘Alī’s words are:

زیرا که جناب حق سبحانه و تعالی از حال ایشان خبر می دهد که ایشان از خدای خود راضی شدند و معلوم است که اگر اینها زنده می بودند مناسب این بود که حق تعالی بصیغه مضارع که برضون باشد این مطلب را ادا نماید نه بصیغه ماضی

This is because Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى is informing of their condition that they were pleased with Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. And it is known that had they been alive, it was necessary for Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى to use the future tense instead of using the past tense, i.e. they will be pleased. The purport is clear from this.¹

1. Dildār ‘Alī says:

It is known that had they been alive ...

1 *Dhū al-Fiqār* pg. 57 line 19

We do not know anything about this, only Dildār ‘Alī does. For bondsmen to be pleased with Allah ﷻ in this world is only far-fetched to you. We know, in fact we have certainty, that all the special bondsmen of Allah ﷻ were pleased with Him and no matter what calamities befell them, they remained pleased with Him. So Allah’s declaration “and they are pleased with Him” startles you since while living you were not pleased with Allah ﷻ. On the other hand, we have conviction in this.

2. All this complete and incomplete reasons, and past and future tense assumptions that you make, does it only apply to the poor Muhājirīn and Anṣār or to the Ahl al-Bayt as well? All the ludicrous explanations you present, all the distortions you make and useless assumptions you take out from the verses of the Qur’ān to deny the virtue of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār, if the Khawārij and Nawāṣib use these against the Ahl al-Bayt, then what answer will you provide? Whatever your answer is should be understood as ours.

3. Dildār ‘Alī has committed a grave mistake by taking out all these probabilities and assumptions. Due to his haste in writing the book, he forgets one very important point. Sayyidunā ‘Alī (رضي الله عنه) is included in the “first forerunners”. This very verse is used to prove his great virtue. It is said that he is the first man to accept Islam and the first to make hijrah. So when “forerunners” refers to the dead, and no living person is included therein, Sayyidunā ‘Alī (رضي الله عنه) is also excluded therefrom. By Allah ﷻ! They will maybe say that he was the only living person to be included whereas the others refer to the dead. And if anyone had to question the reason for this, they will adopt their old practice and wear the garb of Shī‘ism and begin using expletives like moron, imprudent, stupid and they will not listen to a thing; just as how he said regarding Shāh Ṣāhib for not understanding this incomplete nonsensical reason:

و اگر بسپ غباوت ذهن که داری درین باب تامل داشته باشی پس قرآن مجید را از اول بنظر بصیرت تلاوت کن و در آیات وعده و وعید تامل نماتا صدق این مقال واضح گردد

Even though you are extremely thick, if you ponder a little over the Qur'ān from cover to cover and contemplate over the verses of reward and punishment, the verification of my claim will be evident.

4. Dildār 'Alī's discussion of past and future tense is in fact narrowing the scope of Shī'ism, since — due to this discussion — many virtues of the Ahl al-Bayt will be lost and it will be difficult to answer such objections. Do not even talk about the rules of syntax and etymology, otherwise someone will question the verse:

﴿ ۸ ﴾ وَيُطْعَمُونَ الطَّعَامَ عَلَىٰ حُبِّهِ مِسْكِينًا وَيَتِيمًا وَأَسِيرًا ﴿ ۸ ﴾

And they give food in spite of love for it to the needy, the orphan, and the captive.¹

The verb is future tense, but the meaning is given in present tense since after fulfilment of the vow and feeding the orphans, needy and captives were these verses revealed regarding Sayyidah Fatimah and Sayyidunā Ḥasanayn رضي الله عنهما. What answer will you give then?

If someone says:

﴿ ۱۲ ﴾ فَوَقَّهْمُ اللَّهُ شَرَّ ذَلِكَ الْيَوْمِ وَلَقَّهْمُ نَضْرَةً وَسُرُورًا ﴿ ۱۹ ﴾ وَجَزَاهُمْ بِمَا صَبَرُوا جَنَّةً وَحَرِيرًا ﴿ ۱۲ ﴾

So Allah will protect them from the evil of that Day and give them radiance and happiness. And will reward them for what they patiently endured (with) a garden (in Paradise) and silk (garments).²

All the verbs are in the past tense but the meaning is given in the future tense. What answer will you give?

1 Sūrah al-Dahr: 8

2 Sūrah al-Dahr: 11-12

So even if it is assumed and your view is accepted:

مناسب این بود که حق تعالی بصیغه مضارع که یرضون باشد این مطلب را ادا نماید نه بصیغه ماضی

It was befitting for Allah ﷻ to use the future tense instead of using the past tense.

The answer to this is:

حق تعالی امرے را کہ یقینی و قطعی ست بصیغه ماضی ادا می نماید چنانکه در فضائل اہل بیت امرے را کہ بعد از قیام قیامت ظہور خواہد یافت بصیغه ماضی ادا کردہ حیث قال تبارک و تعالی فَوَفَّيْتُمُ اللّٰهُ شَرَّ ذٰلِكَ الْيَوْمِ وَلَقَّيْتُمُ نَصْرَةً وَّ سُرُورًا ہمچنین رضای سابقین اولین از مهاجرین و انصار زیرا کہ در اِخْرَتِ علو مرتبہ خود را دیدہ راضی خواہند شد بصیغه ماضی ادا کردہ و برای این حکم فرمودہ کہ رضا عنہ

Allah ﷻ uses the past tense to mention something that is certain just as He ﷻ used the past tense to mention the virtues of the Ahl al-Bayt which will be displayed on the Day of Qiyāmah:

فَوَفَّيْتُمُ اللّٰهُ شَرَّ ذٰلِكَ الْيَوْمِ وَلَقَّيْتُمُ نَصْرَةً وَّ سُرُورًا

So Allah will protect them from the evil of that Day and give them radiance and happiness.

Similarly is the case of the pleasure of the first forerunners among the Muhājirīn and Anṣār رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ. When they will see their lofty status in the hereafter they will be pleased. Allah ﷻ expressed this using the past tense and declared “and they were pleased with Him.”

If you have misgivings about the past and future tenses and taking one to mean the other is against eloquence according to you then have a look at *Mīzān al-Ṣarf* and see the meaning of (May Allah ﷻ make you fortunate) is it made you fortunate or make you fortunate. Then contemplate over why is the future tense implied whereas the word is in the past tense? Thereafter look at the footnote for your answer. It will now be time to acknowledge your error if you have any

honesty. Otherwise you will have to acknowledge it on that Day which Allah ﷻ speaks about using the past whereas that Day has not come yet. Allah ﷻ declares:

وَقَالُوا لَوْ كُنَّا نَسْمَعُ أَوْ نَعْقِلُ مَا كُنَّا فِي أَصْحَابِ السَّعِيرِ ﴿١٠﴾ فَأَعْتَرَفُوا بِذَنبِهِمْ فَسُحِقًا
لَأَصْحَابِ السَّعِيرِ ﴿١١﴾

And they will say, “if only we had been listening or reasoning, we would not be among the companions of the Blaze.” And they will admit their sin, so (it is) alienation for the companions of the Blaze.¹

The prejudice and ignorance of the Shī'ah is laughable and pathetic. Due to their hatred for the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم, they distort the meanings of the verses of the Qur'ān in such a way that even Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه is excluded therefrom. So when the Shī'ah themselves have excluded their first imām from this verse, then it is not surprising for them to exclude our three khulafā'.

It is also beneficial to mention at this juncture that Shāh Ṣāḥib has written in *Tuḥfah Ithnā 'Ashariyyah*:

If this meaning is taken from these verses regarding the Muhājirīn and Anṣār رضي الله عنهم that Allah's سبحانه وتعالى pleasure is not connected to their beings but rather to their qualities of hijrah and assistance, and complete pleasure is dependent on a good ending, then this allegation could be cast against the verse of Wilāyah which is alleged to prove the khilāfah of Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه.”

ولایت شما باین وصف متعلق ست یعنی اقامت صلوة و ایتاء زکوة در حالت رکوع و بقای این وصف مشروط است به حسن خاتمه و کذا و کذا

The qualities of his Wilāyah are that he would perform ṣalāh and pay zakāh whilst in rukū'. And the perpetuity of this quality is dependable on a good ending.

1 Sūrah al-Mulk: 10-11

Dildār ‘Alī answers this by saying:

اما آنچه دریں مقام در باب ایہ ولایت بہ ترانہ بیہودہ مترنم گردہ پس از قبیل قیاسی ست مع الفارق چه امثال جنیب
تقیادات دور از کار در ایۃ ولایت خلاف اجماع اہل اسلام پس از معرض اعتبار ساقط باشد

The drivel he has spoken regarding the verse of Wilāyah is the product of a corrupt analogy because to use such improbable rules regarding the verse of Wilāyah is against the consensus of the Muslims, hence it is unacceptable.

Dildār ‘Alī wrote nothing but these words. He just employed some vulgarity and kept silent. His claim, “to use such improbable rules regarding the verse of Wilāyah is against the consensus of the Muslims,” is extremely shocking. If Muslims refer to only the Shī‘ah then it is understandable and if it refers to all the sects of Islam, then such a claim is a blatant lie.

هَاتُوا بُرْهَانَكُمْ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ صَادِقِينَ

Produce your proof, if you should be truthful.¹

O Shī‘ah! Listen to the assumptions and misinterpretations of your scholars. Such an assumption regarding the Muhājirīn and Anṣār رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ is permissible, nay compulsory, whereas it is impossible regarding Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. If it is said that this is due to love and hatred, we will accept and comment that it is not due to īmān and fairness. Listening to such an answer, the story of King Bahrām Gūr comes to mind. Once, he shot at a hog, and through an utter fluke he removed its entire face. He began praising himself in front of a slave girl who commented, “it is due to practice and training.” He was upset at this and expelled her. She began practicing to climb the roof while carrying a calf, twice every day. When the calf grew bigger, she was still able to climb the roof while carrying it due to her practice. The king heard of this and came to witness it. Seeing it he commented, “It is due to practice and training.” The slave girl lost it and said, “when a hog is

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 111

hunted then it is not due to practice. And when I do something far greater, then it is due to practice. Is this equality?”

This is exactly the case of Dildār ‘Alī. He extracts complete and incomplete reasons from such a clear and categorical verse:

وَالسَّبِقُونَ الْأَوْلُونَ مِنَ الْمُهْجِرِينَ وَالْأَنْصَارِ

And the first forerunners (in the faith) among the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār

And his scholars restrict Allah’s *سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى* pleasure with a specific action. But when anyone challenges the verse of Wilāyah which only has the following:

يُؤْتُونَ الزَّكَاةَ وَهُمْ رُكْعُونَ

Who give zakāh while they bow (in worship).¹

It is not known who these words refer to, and the words are in plural and a singular meaning is being taken, yet they say that zakāh refers to optional charity since it is apparent that Sayyidunā ‘Alī *رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ* did not possess so much wealth that zakāh was binding upon him. Furthermore, to listen to someone while bowing, although he is a beggar and needy, is in conflict to sincerity in ṣalāh. Notwithstanding all of this, when anyone says, “those possibilities you extract from the verses extolling the virtues of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār *رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ* can also be extracted from this verses, in fact to a greater degree,” he says, “this is all drivel and contrary to consensus.” The truth is that when a person is not shackled by īmān, justice and shame, then he is at liberty to do as he pleases.

إذا القيت جلباب الحياء فقل ما شئت فان من لا حياء له لا ايمان له

When you remove the cloak of modesty, they say as you please. For indeed the person who has no modesty has no īmān.

1 Sūrah al-Mā’idah: 55

Listen to the fourth meaning Dildār ‘Alī gives to “forerunners”. He writes in *Dhū al-Fiqār*:

اقوال بعضه از علماء دلالت می کند که مراد از سبقت فی الهجرة مهاجرت بنی هاشم است از مکه

Some scholars have stated that forerunners in hijrah refer to the hijrah of the Banū Hāshim from Makkah.

What hijrah is there from Makkah to Makkah? People might be baffled by this, so let me clarify. When the kuffār persecuted Rasūlullāh ﷺ, he took refuge in the valley of Abū Ṭālib and lived there for three years. What hijrah is there from Makkah to Makkah? Dildār ‘Alī has referred to this as hijrah. This meaning has been adopted probably so that hijrah may be used for him and his ilk. Dildār ‘Alī must be moving from one spot to another quite a number of times daily. And when hijrah means changing spots, then Dildār ‘Alī and his ilk are receiving the abundant rewards of hijrah every single day.

One of the scholars whom Dildār ‘Alī has referred to is Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī — the third martyr — who writes in *Maṣā’ib al-Nawāṣib* in answer to *Nawāqid al-Rawāfiq*:

فارطمه صاحب النواقض تبعاً للجمهور من ان ابا بكر و عمر كانا من المهاجرين السابقين الاولين انما هو تحريص و زور بل السابقون الاولون هم الذين هاجروا هجرة الاولى و هي هجرة رسول الله صلى الله عليه و اله و سلم في حصاره بمكة حين هاجرت قريش بنى هاشم مع رسول الله صلى الله عليه و اله و سلم في شعب عبد المطلب اربع سنين و الامة مجتمععة على ان ابا بكر و عمر لم يكونا معهم في ذلك الموطن

The statement of the author of *Nawāqid*, in agreement with the majority, that Abū Bakr and ‘Umar were among the first forerunners of the Muhājirīn is nothing but exaggeration and falsehood. The fact is that the first forerunners are those who made the first hijrah and that is the hijrah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ while being ostracised in Makkah. When the Quraysh of the Banū Hāshim made hijrah with Rasūlullāh ﷺ to the valley of ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib for four years. The ummah is unanimous that Abū Bakr and ‘Umar were not with them in that place.

This meaning of hijrah, i.e. migrating within Makkah, is a ludicrous and laughable definition. According to me, Dildār ‘Alī erred by taking Muhājirīn and Anṣār رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُم to refer to men thereby undergoing the unnecessary inconvenience of fabricating a new meaning. He should have said that the forerunners of the Muhājirīn refers to Sayyidunā Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام since he is the first to make hijrah from Sidrat al-Muntahā to Makkah and the forerunners of the Anṣār refers to Sayyidunā ‘Izrā’īl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام who assisted the Ambiyā’ by destroying their powerful enemies and snatching their souls. Thus the true and perfect hijrah was carried out by Sayyidunā Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام and proper assistance was lent by Sayyidunā ‘Izrā’īl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام. This is verified by the Qur’ān especially the words, “Allah is pleased with them and they are pleased with Him.” No ‘ignorant’ Sunnī will have the scope to object. True pleasure is Allah’s pleasure with the angels and their pleasure with Him. Their nature is that they do not do anything contrary to Allah’s سُبْحَانَكَ وَبِحَمْدِكَ pleasure. The leading angels are Sayyidunā Jibrīl and Sayyidunā ‘Izrā’īl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام. This commentary fits so aptly; it neither contradicts the wording nor the meaning. Even the angles will applaud it.

The fifth meaning of “forerunners” given by Dildār ‘Alī:

یا بهجرت به طرف حبشه که بهراتب پیشتر از بهجرت مدینه بوده پس دریں صورت ابی بکر را شرف سبقت بهجرت صورتی بهم نخواست بود

Or hijrah to Abyssinia is meant which took place well before hijrah to Madīnah. In this instance as well, Abū Bakr is practically deprived of the fortune of being a forerunner in hijrah.¹

Dildār ‘Alī just made this claim and remained silent. However, the author of *Taqḍīb al-Makā’id* has verified this claim in answer to scheme: 91. He says:

اصحاب ثلاثه از مهاجرین اولین نبودند چنانچه در صحیح بخاری مذکور است عن ابی موسی قال بلغنا مخرج النبی و نحن باليمن فخرجنا مهاجرین الیه ... الخ

1 *Dhū al-Fiqār* pg. 57 line 7

The three Ṣaḥābah were not among the first forerunners as is stated in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*. It is related from Abū Mūsā who says, “We received news of Rasūlullāh ﷺ leaving Makkah, i.e. hijrah, while we were in Yemen. We thus migrated to him¹

The author has assumed that the benefit of quoting such an authentic ḥadīth is to dupe the people into thinking that it is established from the very *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* of the Ahl al-Sunnah that the three khulafā’ are not from the forerunners of the Muhājirīn. However, this is his blatant mistake. The only thing that is established from this ḥadīth is that Rasūlullāh ﷺ said, “O people of the ship, you have two hijrahs.” Rasūlullāh ﷺ did not declare them to be the only addressees of “the first forerunners”. No sunnī denies that the people who made hijrah to Abyssinia are Muhājirīn and no one denies their high status. That was the era of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. To travel to any country out of fear for the kuffār will definitely be included in hijrah. In fact, the ruling and reward of hijrah will remain up until Qiyāmah. However, the point of contention is which Muhājirīn and referred to in the verse:

وَالسُّبْقُونَ الْأَوَّلُونَ مِنَ الْمُهَاجِرِينَ وَالْأَنْصَارِ

And the first forerunners (in the faith) among the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār.

Does it refer to those who emigrated to Abyssinia or those who emigrated to Madīnah from Makkah? So in that lengthy ḥadīth, if there is anything to the effect that the first forerunners refer to those who emigrated to Abyssinia, then we will definitely accept.

Besides this, we will inform the Shī’ah that just as the three khulafā’ ﷺ did not emigrate to Abyssinia, similarly Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ also did not emigrate there. So the same reason or proof used to exclude the three khulafā’ ﷺ from the

1 Look at the commentary of this ḥadīth.

forerunners of the Muhājirīn will have to be applied to Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Will he also be excluded and will he also be deprived of the virtue of the Muhājirīn? We seek Allah’s سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى protection from this!

As Dildār ‘Alī has said:

مراد از هجرت به طرف حبشه که بهراتب پیشتر از هجرت مدینه بوده پس درین صورت ابی بکر را شرف سبقت هجرت
صوری بهم نخواست بود

Or hijrah to Abyssinia is meant which took place well before hijrah to Madīnah. In this instance as well, Abū Bakr is practically deprived of the fortune of being a forerunner in hijrah.

If any Khārijī uses this against Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, then we do not know what answer he has concocted for it.

Now that I have utterly destroyed Dildār ‘Alī’s web, I will now mention the proper commentary of this verse which the Shī‘ah scholars have stated, so that the fallacy of what the Shī‘ah assert may be exposed. ‘Allāmah al-Ṭabarsī writes in *Majma‘ al-Bayān*:

لما تقدم ذكر المنافقين و الكفار عقبه سبحانه بذكر السابقين الى الايمان فقال وَالسَّابِقُونَ السَّابِقُونَ اى السابقون الى الايمان و الى الطاعات و انما مدحهم بالسبق لان السابق الى الشيء تبعه غيره فيكون متبوعا و غيره تابع له فهو امام فيه و داع فيه الى الخير سبقه اليه و كذلك من سبق الى الشر يكون اسوء حالا بهذه العلة من المهاجرين الذين هاجروا من كنا فى المدينة و الى الحبشة وَالْأَنْصَارِ الى و من الانصار الذين سبقوا نظرانهم من اهل المدينة الى الاسلام و من قراؤا و الانصار برفع لم يجعلوا من السابقين و جعل السبق للمهاجرين خاصة وَالَّذِينَ اتَّبَعُوهُمْ بِإِحْسَانٍ اى افعال الخير بالدخول فى الاسلام بعدهم و سلوك مناهجهم و يدخل فى ذلك من يجىء بعدهم الى يوم القيامة رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ وَرَضُوا عَنْهُ اخبر سبحانه انه رضى عنهم و رضوا عن الله كماله لما اجزل لهم من الثواب على طاعتهم و ايمانهم به و يقينهم وَاعَدَّ لَهُمْ جَنَّاتٍ تَجْرِي تَحْتِهَا الْأَنْهَارُ خُلِدِينَ فِيهَا أَبَدًا يبقون ببقاء الله فقال ذَلِكَ الْفَوْزُ الْعَظِيمُ اى الفلاح العظيم اى الذى يصعر من جنسه كل نعيم و فى هذه الآية دلالة على فضل السابقين و مزيتهم على غيرهم لما لحقهم من انواع المشقة فى نصرة الدين فمنها مفارقة العشائر و الاقربين و منها مبانة المألوف من الدين و منها نصرة الاسلام و قلة العدو و كثرة العدو و منها السابق الى الايمان و الدعاء اليه

After mentioning the munāfiqīn and kuffār, Allah ﷻ comments on the forerunners towards īmān saying, “And the first forerunners” i.e. the forerunners towards īmān and all acts of worship. Allah ﷻ has praised their precedence since the one who initiates something is followed by others thus becoming followed and others becoming his followers. He will therefore become a leader in that and a caller towards the good he initiated. Similar is the case of the one who surpassed towards evil (and corrupts others). He will have a worse condition due to this cause. “From the Muhājirīn” those who made hijrah from Makkah to Madīnah, and to Abyssinia. “And the Anṣār,” i.e. and from the Anṣār who preceded their comrades from the inhabitants of Madīnah to Islam. The person who recites Anṣār with a raf (ḍammah) has excluded them from sābiqīn and made precedence exclusively for the Muhājirīn. “And those who followed them with good conduct,” i.e. good actions like accepting Islam after them and following their path. All those who come after them (and follow their path) until the Day of Qiyāmah will be included in this. “Allah is pleased with them and they are pleased with Him.” Allah ﷻ informed that He is pleased with them and they are totally pleased with Allah ﷻ. This is due to the tremendous reward He awarded them for their acts of worship, belief in Him and their conviction. “And He has prepared for them gardens beneath which rivers flow, wherein they will abide forever,” they will remain therein till eternity. He then states, “that is the great attainment,” i.e. such a great success that all types of bounties vanish in front of it. This verse is proof for the great virtue and superiority of the forerunners over others because they endured various trials and tribulations in assisting the dīn. For example, leaving their families and relatives, abandoning their precious items for the sake of dīn, helping Islam notwithstanding their minority and the majority of the enemy, their precedence to īmān and inviting towards it.

Listen to another commentary. The author of *Khulāṣat al-Manhaj* writes:

السابقون الاولون یعنی پیشی گزیدگان پشینیان ای اینها که سبقت گرفتند بر عامه مومنان در ایمان من المهاجرین از مهاجرین ای آنانکه از مکه هجرت کردند و به مدینه آمدند

“The first forerunners,” i.e. those Muhājirīn who surpassed the general Muslims in bringing īmān. “From the Muhājirīn,” i.e. those who emigrated from Makkah to Madīnah.

This translation of the above commentaries is sufficient to show the meaning of Muhājirīn and their virtues. There is no need to elucidate further. If you are not satisfied, I will quote another verse which speaks about hijrah. Allah ﷻ declares:

الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَهَاجَرُوا وَجَاهَدُوا فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ

The ones who have believed, emigrated and striven in the cause of Allah.¹

The commentator al-Ṭabarsī writes in *Majma' al-Bayān* while commenting on “those who migrated”:

هاجروا من ديارهم و اوطانهم يعنى من مكة الى المدينة

Emigrated from their houses and homelands, i.e. from Makkah to Madīnah.

The Third Answer the Shī'ah Present to Verses Extolling the Ṣaḥābah's Virtue

Some intellectuals have answered by saying that the pleasure Allah ﷻ declared for the Muhājirīn and Anṣār رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ in the glorious Qur'ān does not refer to all the Muhājirīn and Anṣār رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ but to only a select few, although there appears to be no exception. Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī states in his *Maṣā'ib*:

بل هم يقولون اذ شهادته تعالى لهم بالرضا و من اتبعهم باحسان يمكن ان يكون خصوصا من قول الله تعالى و ان كان يخرج الكلام للعموم و هذا في كتاب الله موجود من خطاب الخصوص و هو عموم و من خطاب العموم و هو خصوص من استقام منهم دون من لم يستقم و النظر يدلنا على ان الله عز و جل انما رضى عمن استقام فى طاعته و ان الجنة وعدها لمن سارع الى مرضياته و تجتنب عن معاصيه و من خرج عن هذه الحال كان محالا ان يستحق الرضا من الله تعالى فما لهم ايضا فى هذا الحال حجة

1 Sūrah al-Towbah: 20

In fact they say that it is possible that Allah's سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى testimony of His pleasure with them and those who follow them with good conduct is specific although the address appears to be general. And this is commonly found in the book of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى where the address is specific and the addressees are general or vice versa, i.e. the address is general and the addressees are specific to those who remained steadfast and not to those who did not. Deep reflection points to the fact that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى was only happy with those who remained steadfast on His obedience and that He promised Jannah to those who surpassed in doing those actions which pleased Him and stayed away from His disobedience. It is impossible that those who did not practice accordingly are worthy of Allah's سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى pleasure. Therefore in this case, they (the Sunnīs) do not have any proof.

Qāḍī addresses the author of *Nawāqid al-Rawāfiḍ* by saying, “what you claimed that the opinion of the Shī‘ah is that these glad tidings do not apply to the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ due to their usurpation of the khilāfah, etc. is a blatant lie. This is not what the Shī‘ah say. The answer the Shī‘ah give to the verses mentioning the Ṣaḥābah’s virtue is that it refers to a specific few. And this is found at many places in the Qur’ān that the address is general but the command is specific and vice versa. And this seems to be correct after deep reflection because Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى is only happy with those who remained steadfast on His obedience and only promised Jannah to those who surpassed in doing those actions which pleased Him and stayed away from His disobedience. It is impossible that those who did not practice accordingly are worthy of Allah’s سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى pleasure. So the Sunnī have no proof.”

At the end of this explanation, Qāḍī boasts, “all praises belong to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. We have substantiated our explanation and have utterly debunked the Sunnī’s view.” However, the reality is that this explanation is just:

كَسْرَابٌ بِقَيْعَةٍ يَحْسِبُهُ الظَّمَانُ مَاءً

Like a mirage in lowland which a thirsty one thinks is water.¹

1 Sūrah al-Nūr: 39

I will prove his mistake.

Qāḍī denies the fact that it is the Shī'ah view that the Muhājirīn and Anṣār رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ were excluded from this virtue due to their usurpation of the khilāfah. However, his explanation thereafter proves that he does hold that view. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى announces His pleasure for those who emigrated, assisted and pledged allegiance under the tree (in Ḥudaybiyyah). All of these activities had already taken place and these verses were revealed to show their acceptance. Now you have to establish one of two things. Either that the three khulafā' and the other Muhājirīn and Anṣār رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ did not participate in these activities, i.e. they did not emigrate, did not assist and did not pledge the allegiance; so that they may be excluded from these verses. Or either prove that they did such wicked actions thereafter which excludes them from being worthy of Allah's سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى pleasure. And the only two actions which the Shī'ah find is usurpation of the khilāfah and enmity for the Ahl al-Bayt. So the same thing is established which he just denied.

Furthermore, without accepting one of the two options given above, if one accepts the hijrah of the Muhājirīn, the assistance of the Anṣār رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ and the validity of their participation in Bay'at al-Riḍwān and understands that these verses were revealed in praise of the above actions, but then excludes the Muhājirīn and Anṣār رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ from this general address, then this is incorrect according to both reason and text. Why against reason? Because Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى has declared, "I am pleased with them and they are pleased with Me," Now for anyone to assume that īmān is a condition for the validity of hijrah and assistance and that the Muhājirīn and Anṣār رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ did not possess īmān is erroneous and mythical. The following verse is sufficient proof for the corruptness of their groundless assumption:

وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَهَاجَرُوا وَجَاهَدُوا فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ وَالَّذِينَ آوَوْا وَنَصَرُوا أُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ حَقًّا

But those who have believed and emigrated and fought in the cause of Allah and those who gave shelter and aided — it is they who are the believers, truly.¹

1 Sūrah al-Anfāl: 74

To exclude the Muhājirīn and Anṣār رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ when such explicit verses are present is in fact outright denial of *nuṣūṣ qatʿiyyah* (categorical statements). Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى is not saying in this verse, “those who will bring īmān and who will do good deeds, I will give them Jannah,” for in this instance, one may argue the perpetuation of the command, generalisation and speciation, etc. However, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى is informing us about an action that already happened and the īmān of a specific group and is attesting to their faith. So no one has the capacity to doubt and apply irrelevant conditions to this group. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى states categorically:

أُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ حَقًّا

It is they (i.e. the Muhājirīn and Anṣār رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ) who are the believers, truly.

This sentence is a *khabar*, not an *inshāʾ*. It is not a command. It is first-hand information. Therefore, there is no possibility of *naskh* (abrogation) because *naskh* does not relate to information. Otherwise, the incidents of Sayyidunā Ādam, Sayyidunā Mūsā, Sayyidunā Yūsuf and the other Ambiyāʾ عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَام which are mentioned by Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى in the Qurʾān will all be doubtful. People can start doubting the end result of these individuals and stop believing in these incidents. Others will assume specific and general applications thus misinterpreting and distorting the entire Qurʾān.

Not believing the Muhājirīn and Anṣār رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ to be true believers notwithstanding such categorical verses is akin to denying the nubuwah of the Ambiyāʾ, the virtue of the inhabitants of the cave and all the incidents mentioned in the Qurʾān of the past nations. If anyone objects, “I do not accept that the people of the cave had īmān. I do not know whether their intention was correct or corrupt since intention is an internal affair. And it is also possible that all the people of the cave did not possess īmān because the Qurʾān is replete with generalization and specification, i.e. the address is general but the recipients are specific.” What response will you give to such an ignorant imprudent heretic, besides informing him that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى declared in the Qurʾān in emphatic terms:

﴿ ۱۳ ﴾ أَنْهَمْ فَتَيَّةً آمَنُوا بِرَبِّهِمْ وَزِدْنَهُمْ هُدًى

Indeed, they were youths who believed in their Rabb, and We increased them in guidance.¹

Allah ﷻ informs us of their īmān and guidance in clear terms. To make such assumptions in such categorical statements and to casts doubts on the addressees is in fact denial of Allah’s ﷻ speech. Therefore, in a very similar manner, for Allah’s sake, ponder over the īmān of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār ﷺ concerning whom Allah ﷻ emphatically declares:

وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَهَاجَرُوا وَجَاهَدُوا فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ وَالَّذِينَ آوُوا وَنَصَرُوا أُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ حَقًّا

But those who have believed and emigrated and fought in the cause of Allah and those who gave shelter and aided – it is them who are the believers, truly.²

This is termed as *Jumlah Khabariyyah*, a sentence which provides information, and in this case it informs of their īmān. The person who rejects the īmān of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār ﷺ when such emphatic verses are extolled is just like the one who rejects the īmān of the people of the cave. Such a rejecter is nothing but a heretic and renegade.

ذَٰلِكَ مِنْ آيَاتِ اللَّهِ ۗ مَنْ يَهْدِ اللَّهُ فَهُوَ الْمُهْتَدِ ۗ وَمَنْ يُضِلِلْ فَلَنْ تَجِدَ لَهُ وَلِيًّا مُّرْشِدًا

That was from the signs of Allah. He whom Allah guides is the (rightly) guided, but he whom He leaves astray – never will you find for him a protecting guide.³

1 Sūrah al-Kahf: 13

2 Sūrah al-Anfāl: 74

3 Sūrah al-Kahf: 17

Textual Evidence

If you are not totally satisfied with this explanation, then listen to its approval by one of your own commentators. ‘Allāmah al-Ṭabarsī states in his *Tafsīr*:

ثم عاد سبحانه الى ذكر المهاجرين و الانصار و مدحهم و الثناء عليهم فقال الذين امنوا و هاجروا و جاهدوا في سبيل الله اى صدقوا الله و رسوله و هاجروا من ديارهم و اوطانهم يعنى من مكة الى المدينة و جاهدوا مع ذلك فى اعلاء دين الله و الذين اووا و نصروا اى ضموا اليهم و نصروا النبى اولئك هم المؤمنون حقا اى اولئك الذين حققوا ايمانهم بالهجرة و النصره

In these verses, Allah ﷻ has mentioned the Muhājirīn and Anṣār yet again and praised and applauded them.

وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَهَاجَرُوا وَجَاهَدُوا فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ

They bore witness to Allah and His Rasūl ﷺ and emigrated from their homes and towns, i.e. from Makkah to Madīnah, and they waged jihād to elevate the dīn of Allah.

وَالَّذِينَ أُوُوا وَنَصَرُوا

They granted refuge to the Muhājirīn in their homes and assisted Rasūlullāh ﷺ.

أُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ حَقًّا

These people are definitely true Muslims for they have attested to their īmān by emigrating and assisting unlike those who remained in the land of polytheism.

After such clarity and transparency, who can ever claim that the Muhājirīn and Anṣār رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ were not believers? Who can have the courage to say that hijrah refers to the hijrah to the valley of Abū Ṭālib? Or that “the first forerunners” refer to those who died first? And who can ever bring up the general and specific argument after hearing this?

The Shī'ah claim that conviction of a pleasant ending is necessary for Allah's pleasure is nothing but deception because this very pleasure is proof of a pleasant ending. If Allah ﷻ knows that this group will have an evil ending and will shortly turn renegade and will become infidels due to usurping Sayyidunā 'Alī's ﷺ khilāfah and Fadak, then it is farfetched that notwithstanding Allah's ﷻ knowledge of the unseen, He announces His pleasure and declares asserting their īmān:

أُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ حَقًّا

These people are definitely true Muslims.

A person who has such a wicked thought about Allah ﷻ is an infidel, not a Muslim.

A point worthy of contemplating is that Allah ﷻ never ever praised a munāfiq or a *murtad* (renegade) and never applauded any good action of a kāfir. Many kuffār of the past were generous and just. However, due to them being kuffār and deserving of Jahannam, Allah ﷻ did not utter a word in praise of them and did not declare His pleasure regarding any of their actions. Allah ﷻ knew fully well that these people are infidels and will be sent to Jahannam, so expressing His pleasure with them is in fact deception, we seek Allah's ﷻ protection from this. So if Allah ﷻ was pleased with the Ṣaḥābah's ﷺ hijrah, assistance, and bay'ah; and displeased with majority of their other actions and was fully aware that they will burn in Hell because of their kufr and nifāq, then what was the benefit or reason for Allah ﷻ to speak so highly of them and mention them in such glowing terms? Does Allah ﷻ also observe Taqiyyah (Allah forbid)? Or, Allah forbid, did He deceive them just to appease them and bribe them? Or is there some mistake here that without thinking of the end result, He praised the group who will turn renegade at the end and who lived as munāfiqīn? If He did not want to state clearly, then at least He should have stated, "those who emigrated and assisted – not all of them are truthful and believers and I am not pleased with them all." Or He should have said, "my pleasure is

only for those who remained steadfast till death, did not usurp the khilāfah of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and did not snatch away Fadak from Sayyidah Fatimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا and who passed away well before these painful incidents transpired.” In this way, no one would be deceived. It would not be correct then to praise the hijrah and assistance of the entire group and use this as proof for their īmān.

O Mu’minīn! Contemplate over the verses of the Qur’ān and ponder over its deeper meaning. Do not attribute deception, Taqiyyah, or Badā’ to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. I do not know what you think about the A’immah and the Messengers and Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. You do not believe anyone to be honest and transparent. You deduce deception and dishonesty from everyone’s words. Just as you level the accusation of Taqiyyah on your so called A’immah, similarly you relate deception and Badā’ to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى whereas our A’immah were always honest and transparent and our true and one Allah always spoke clearly and emphatically. Whoever Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى knew was a mu’min, he ordered Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ to keep them in his company, take their assistance and take rest at their homes. And whoever Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى knew to be munāfiq, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى clearly ordered Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ to understand them as disbelievers, not to make them partners in anything and not to allow them to sit in his company. Thus, the behaviour of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ towards people makes it very clear as to who is munāfiq and who is sincere. The companionship of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was the barometer of īmān. The difference is that according to us they were truthful while according to you they were hypocrites. So it is either one of two situations. Either Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ knew about their nifāq or their nifāq was not exposed to him. If their nifāq was exposed, then did he keep them in his company or not? If he did, then what was the reason behind keeping a munāfiq in his company? If he did not, then throw all the books of tafsīr, ḥadīth, and history into the Ganges and Jumna rivers. Just deny Rasūlullāh’s صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ birth as well and deny all the mutawātir reports. And if their nifāq was not exposed, then applaud them for their wittiness and slyness that from the day the sun of nubuwwah rose until it set, they were so cunning and witty that their nifāq was not disclosed to Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, neither by Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ informing nor by Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى revealing. May Allah protect us from this blasphemy!

Moreover, let us ponder over the number of these munāfiqīn. Were they a handful or a few thousands?

ارتدت الصحابة كلهم الا ثلاثة

All the Ṣaḥābah besides three turned renegade.

The above text shows that besides 3, all the Ṣaḥābah were munāfiqīn or kuffār or they turned renegade. And if you look at the following verse:

وَرَأَيْتَ النَّاسَ يَدْخُلُونَ فِي دِينِ اللَّهِ أَفْوَاجًا ﴿٢﴾

And you see the people entering into the religion of Allah in multitudes.¹

You will conclude that although the munāfiqīn were plenty, the true and sincere believers number nothing less than 12 000. Now were the munāfiqīn in majority or the sincere believers? If you say that the munāfiqīn were outnumbered, then it is amazing that Rasūlullāh ﷺ did not expel and humiliate them notwithstanding that the Muslims were more in number. And after Rasūlullāh ﷺ, no one dared to confront the munāfiqīn and no one assisted the ‘true successor’ the ‘rightful imām’ besides a handful. In fact, more stunning is that the flesh of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, the queen of the women ran barefoot from house to house for three days to all the Muḥājirīn and Anṣār رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ seeking their help but no one helped. She also showed them Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ turban and his cup and begged them to have mercy on Ḥasanayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا but to no avail. She was injured by the kick of the enemy and miscarried an innocent child. The munāfiq tied a rope around the neck of Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ son-in-law and began dragging him. The son-in-law begged using Allah’s ﻣُﺴْﺘَﺤَﺒَﺔُ ﻭَﻋَﻠَﺎﻯ’s name and Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ name and Sayyidah Fatimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا began screaming, “O my father! O Muḥammad!” which the angels heard. The angels came rushing from Sidrat al-Muntahā after seeing this horrific scene. The munāfiqīn said what they said and those innocent souls

1 Sūrah al-Naṣr: 2

were persecuted and tortured. Such a pitiable condition that even the enemy will feel pity and have mercy and even those who are not related will help and protect the oppressed from the oppressor. However, notwithstanding such persecutions and notwithstanding that the true sincere mu'minīn numbered 12 000 — who were neither among the Jabariyyah¹, nor the Qadariyyah², nor among the enemies of Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ — and besides them the Banū Hāshim were present with their weapons; but although they had the power, strength and ability, not a single one of the 12 000 and none from the Banū Hāshim stood up to assist the successor of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ or the daughter of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. They all just sat watching the atrocities.

On the other hand were the munāfiqīn — who had no īmān in their hearts, no strength in their bodies, no honour among the Quraysh and no virtue whatsoever — were hypocritical when they interacted with Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and who planned to assassinate him. They never unsheathed a sword in any battle and never spilt the blood of an infidel. Forget slaying, they ran away from every battle. For the 12 000 to fear such munāfiqīn and for the Banū Hāshim not to make any scene, can only be possible in one of two situations. Either they were also munāfiqīn and enemies of the Ahl al-Bayt, although they were not oppressors and usurpers — we will not speak about whether they assisted the oppressors and usurpers. Now when they are also munāfiqīn, then the true believers remain only three. Or either all that which we have quoted from you is a blatant lie and fabrication and none usurped anyone else's right and no one oppressed anyone. In fact, seeing their justice and righteousness, no one even opposed anyone. And all the Muhājirīn and Anṣār رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ were true sincere believers.

O Shī'ah! These are the only two possibilities. You have nowhere else to run. Either declare them all to be munāfiqīn or them all to be sincere believers; which they were. But to sometimes say, “they were munāfiqīn,” and sometimes, “there

1 A deviant sect who holds the opinion that the slave does not have a choice or will and that the one doing everything is Allah, and that the slave is deprived of will and ability.

2 A deviant sect who holds the view, that the slave does as he wants without the will of Allah.

were 12 000 Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ with īmān,” and sometimes, “they all turned renegade at Rasūlullāh’s صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ demise,” and on others “people repented after the third khalīfah and returned to īmān,” and similar statements — changing colours all the time to suite the occasion — is contrary to intellect, contrary to īmān, contrary to modesty and contrary to honesty. Is it fathomable that all those — who sat in Rasūlullāh’s صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ blessed company their entire lives, listened to his advices, performed ṣalāh with him and were prepared to sacrifice their live in the battles — turned renegade as soon as Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ closed his eyes from this world? And if anyone did not turn renegade, then yet when they saw the oppression and persecution being meted out against the family of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ they said or did nothing? Yet despite, such clear disbelief deserving of assassination, only after 25 years they repent and join Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ when he is the khalīfah and you accept their repentance and call them Muslims and regard them as being worthy of Jannah? What amazing beliefs you have and what amazing statements you make. This is only possible for you.

I will comment on everything I have written above in the discussion of Imāmah. I will explain with such depth, that no Shī‘ī will have anything to say other than, “you are correct!” Nonetheless, I will write some points here for the benefit of the readers.

اعلموا يا ايها الخلاقن هداكم الله

Know, O creation! May Allah guide you!

The Shī‘ah first claimed that the khilāfah of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was true and Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ declared him as his successor during his lifetime but the three khulafā’ رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ usurped his right and assumed the post of khilāfah for themselves. They (the Shī‘ah) counted khilāfah as one of the fundamentals of dīn, hence the one who rejects it is like one who rejects towḥīd and nubuwwah. From this principle, they deduced that the three khulafā’ رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ are kuffār. May Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى protect us from such blasphemy!

Since there were over 100 000 Muslims after Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ demise among whom thousands were Muhājirīn and Anṣār ﷺ and people who participated in Bay‘at al-Riḍwān, all of whom pledged allegiance at the hands of the first khalīfah, they passed the ruling of apostasy on all these persons and labelled them as kuffār.

And because they needed the statement of the Imām for this, they attributed the following statement to the noble A‘immah, “after Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ demise, all the Ṣaḥābah besides three turned renegade.” Sayyidunā ‘Alī was thus constrained and would often say, “If forty strong men assist me, I will put up a challenge.”

After claiming that all the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ apostatised, they looked in the Qur’ān and found it to be replete with praises for the Muhājirīn and Anṣār ﷺ. Therefore, they began fabricating mindboggling explanations. They said that Muhājirīn refers to those who emigrated to the valley of Abū Ṭālib or those who emigrated to Abyssinia, and Anṣār refers to those 60/70 men who presented themselves in the service of Rasūlullāh ﷺ in the earlier stages of Makkah Mukarramah and forerunners refers to those who passed away in Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ lifetime.

When they realised that there has to be someone to whom all the praises in the Qur’ān refer to, they applied them exclusively to Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ to the best of their ability. And Allah’s ﷻ promise to the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ of khilāfah was deferred to the era of Imām Maḥdī, the last era; and the power, strength and dominance of Islam which Allah ﷻ promised in the Qur’ān and which was manifested at the hands of the three khulafā’, they postponed it to the emergence of the Absent Imām. Only those verses remained which could only refer to the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ and no one else. They acknowledged that it applied to those Ṣaḥābah ﷺ who remained steadfast on īmān and whose actions were good. And after seeing many verses which speak about the great number of the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ and the dominance of Islam, they had no choice but to attest to the praiseworthy traits of a few thousands of Ṣaḥābah ﷺ. After gaining more understanding

and being caught up in the clutches of the Ahl al-Sunnah and having some shame for Allah ﷻ, Shaykh Muḥammad ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī acknowledged in *Kitāb al-Khiṣāl* that Rasūlullāh ﷺ had 12 000 Ṣaḥābah among whom 8000 were from Madīnah, 2000 were from out of Madīnah and another 2000 were freed. None of these were among the Qadariyyah, Jabariyyah, Mu‘tazilah or rationalists. All of them were very pious and righteous. They would cry day and night out of the fear of Allah ﷻ and would supplicate to Allah, “take our souls before we eat bread made out of flour.” However, the Shī‘ah did not apply their minds well in this answer. Because of the three khulafā’, they kept silent about the people of Makkah. However, the question remains: were there Muslims there or not? They chose to exclude them all notwithstanding their huge number.

When the Sunnī objected, “your creed is baffling. You label the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ — who are admired throughout the Qur’ān — as kuffār and renegades,” they presented the above narrations and said that we believe that 12 000 of them were believers and have acknowledged their īmān so that all the verses, aḥādīth and statements may refer to them. Others thought that if anyone has to ask about their names, what answer will we give? Hence, they prepared a list which has names of about 100 Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ, but that list is also laughable, with the grace of Allah ﷻ. Some are those who were kuffār at hijrah. Others were taken captive at Badr due to their kufr and were released after taking ransom from them. Others were still immature at Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ demise. And others had been humiliated and disgraced by ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and whom he labelled as treacherous and untrustworthy. Nonetheless, they prepared a list of 100 names to show people. They said regarding the rest, “Shaykh A‘zam Muhammad ibn Hasan ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī prepared a book on Asmā’ al-Rijāl¹ which had most of the Ṣaḥābah’s name, but unfortunately the Nawāṣib burnt the book. Hence, we are ignorant of their names.”

The Shī‘ah have thus made two conflicting claims. One is that all the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ (besides three) turned renegade. The other is that 12 000 Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ

1 The science which deals with the biography of narrators, their reliability and non-reliability etc.

were extremely pious and righteous. When the Ahl al-Sunnah objected to these conflicting narrations, they gave a new definition to the phrase:

All the Ṣaḥābah turned renegade save three.

They said, “What the Imām means by saying that all the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ besides three turned renegade is not that all of these are kuffār. It means that they split up into three groups. One group clearly turned renegade, i.e. they turned their backs to Islam while others rejected the fundamentals of dīn. Their apostasy is termed *Irtidād Dīnī*. The second group abandoned good character and excellent qualities, i.e. they abandoned the good behaviour, good actions and special love for the Ahl al-Bayt which they displayed in the lifetime of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and did not assist the offspring of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. This apostasy is termed *Irtidād Khuluqī*. The third group are those who usurped the rights of the Ahl al-Bayt and snatched the rights of Sayyidunā ‘Alī and Sayyidah Fatimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا and oppressed Rasūlullāh’s صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ family. This is termed *Irtidād Īmānī*, i.e. they abandoned īmān although the name Islam still applies to them externally.” With this wise explanation, they reconciled two conflicting narrations. The narration which mentions the apostasy of all the Ṣaḥābah refers to *Irtidād Dīnī* and *Irtidād Īmānī* and the narration which speaks of the 12 000 Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ, they are not included among those upon whom *Irtidād Dīnī* applies.

Thereafter, they pondered and realised that 2 of the 3 groups have left īmān in reality and only one group remains who are categorised under *Irtidād Khuluqī*. The objection against this group is why did they not assist Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and why did such a large group abandon love for the Ahl al-Bayt and why did they not fight the oppressors after seeing such clear tyranny? Then majority of them attested to the fact that indeed, there remained no one who had perfect and sincere īmān and when some people promised Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ help and he tested them, they failed the test. Therefore, due to them abandoning assisting the Ahl al-Bayt, they are also renegades and only three sincere friends remained, viz. Sayyidunā Miqdād, Sayyidunā Salmān and Sayyidunā Abū Dhar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ. Some have deleted the latter two and only counted Sayyidunā Miqdād رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ as a true

friend. They then realised that the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ took Bay'ah at Sayyidunā 'Alī's رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ hands after the three khulafā', so if they had been his opposition, why did they elect him as khalīfah on this occasion? Were there no other options to choose? In response to this, they came at another angle, i.e. firstly they turned renegade. They then returned to the truth after divine guidance came their way, they repented and remained steadfast on the right path.

Nonetheless, all of these narrations and aḥādīth are in stark conflict with one another in Shī'ī books. To believe in them is among the impossibilities according to Shī'ī principles. Their great scholars held the belief that the person who heard the categorical statement of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, yet denied khilāfah is out of the fold of Islam and should necessarily be killed. Although, they wiggled themselves out by fabricating many things and regarded about 12 000 as Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ, however, as the saying goes:

لا يصلح العطار ما افسده الدهر

The perfume seller cannot rectify what time has destroyed.

The chain of īmān which their seniors have broken cannot be joint again. Until now, no Shī'ī has answered this question. Those who usurped the rights of the Ahl al-Bayt were only three. The rest of the people were their helpers and assistants. If their assistants were few in number, then how did they manage to usurp the rights? And if they were many in number, then were some opposed to them or not? If none opposed them, then “all the Ṣaḥābah turned renegade” will fit them. And if thousands opposed them, then why did they not combat them with their tongues, swords and armies?

This shows that those who opposed the tyrannical khulafā' were very few in number to the effect that some narrations record that Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ said, “everyone forgot Rasūlullāh's صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ bequest after his demise and they abandoned īmān. I do not see anyone on whose strength I can fight the enemy.” In this instance, the claim that 12 000 persons were such who used to cry day and night, is falsified since if few thousands were alive until then, they would

have definitely helped. Or maybe they found no spare time from their crying and felt it worthless to leave their corners of worship. When Sayyidah Fatimah and Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه went out crying to every house begging for help, was this the time to cry in one corner or was it time to take out the sword and kill the usurpers and protect Rasūlullāh’s صلى الله عليه وسلم offspring from oppression?

If you assert that they supported Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه thereafter. I mean, thousands of them were killed in the Battle of Şifīn when they fought on the side of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه against Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه. But their repentance is unreliable because when they failed to assist Rasūlullāh’s صلى الله عليه وسلم beloved daughter and left her stranded at the last hour and sustained their Bay‘ah with the tyrannical khulafā’ for 25 years, then what reliance can be put on their īmān? Either leave them on apostasy or do not label them with it. But calling them mu‘minīn in the beginning, munāfiqīn in the middle and mu‘minīn at the end and including and excluding them just like a woman upon whom a revocable ṭalāq is pronounced is in fact turning dīn into a game.

In short, the Şahābah رضي الله عنهم were put into the mix and have remained therein since. Some call them kuffār and regard only three as sincere believers. Some call 12 000 as sincere mu‘minīn, just to display their piety, but then go in circles — nothing making any sense. Let us leave aside the Şahābah رضي الله عنهم for a moment and concentrate just on Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. What do they say regarding him? His condition is the same. When he pledged his Bay‘ah to the three khulafā’, then their khilāfah is established. And when their khilāfah is established then Shī‘ism is debunked. Consequently, they fabricated this lie that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه pledged allegiance unhappily. In fact:

دگر در کف خالد پهلوان
کشیدند اورا بر ابو بکر

بدست عمر بودیک ریسماں
فگندند بر گردن شیر نر

One end of the rope was in ‘Umar’s hand and the other in Khālīd — the warrior’s — hand. They tied the rope around the lion’s (Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه) neck and dragged him to Abū Bakr.

He was brought forcefully to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. And although he displayed many miracles en route, Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ removed his hand from his blessed grave and an unseen caller read out the eulogy, but no one heard. Hence, he was forced to take bay‘ah.

When they realised that using the word ‘forced’ for Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is a defect and imperfection since he is the lion of Allah سُجَّادَةٌ وَعَالٍ and is matchless in his might and valour, they developed a new approach by saying that Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ bequeathed him not to oppose and fight the three khulafā رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ and he acted accordingly. Had Rasūlullāh’s صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ bequest not been there, people would have seen the action and would have witnessed how Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ exhibits his prize Dhū al-Fiqār. However, he had no choice since he could not violate the bequest of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

When they feared that people might object as to why Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ made such a bequest, practicing upon that which will lead to the destruction of dīn, oppression upon Rasūlullāh’s صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ family and kuffār usurping the station of khilāfah, they fabricated a ḥadīth to answer this which says that Allah سُجَّادَةٌ وَعَالٍ specifically gave Sayyidunā Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام a letter for Sayyidunā ‘Alī Murtaḍā رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ which he handed over to Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and his successor. He took many oaths and promises before giving them this letter. When Sayyidunā Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام was satisfied that they will practice upon it, he gave the letter to them secretly. It was written therein, “do not lift your sword against the three khulafā;” and Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ acted accordingly.

Another objection came to mind: Why did Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ oppose the governor of Syria and why did he kill thousands of men? They made the following addition to the letter, “take up arms against the governor of Syria and the Khawārij and smite their necks.” Subḥān Allah! What a letter and what contents! The command to fight one group and remain silent regarding the other. They (the Shī‘ah) had the choice of adding whatever they wanted to the letter.

Nonetheless, when they were questioned as to why Allah ﷻ sent such a letter which had conflicting commands, they answered by saying, “Only Allah ﷻ knows the wisdom in His actions. What purpose does a bondsman have to know its wisdoms and mysteries? It is the duty of the believers to accept all His orders without questioning. It is not befitting for them to question the reality, wisdom or reason. There are thousands of verses and aḥādīth like these.”

Anyways, the benefit of this letter was that it maintained Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s ﷺ bravery coupled with providing a suitable reason for his bay‘ah and thus does not establish the three khulafā’s khilāfah.

When a Sunnī objected as to why Sayyidunā ‘Alī Murtaḍā ﷺ chose to take bay‘ah at the hands of the three khulafā’ ﷺ who were renegades according to you whereas taking bay‘ah even at the hands of a fāsiq is forbidden. Those who read Urdu eulogies will know that it is for this very reason that Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ﷺ did not take bay‘ah at Yazīd’s hands. When the latter wrote to him requesting him to take bay‘ah, he refused and said:

اس کا نہیں پیام اجل کا پیام

سب جانتے ہیں بیعت فاسق حرام ہے

Everyone knows that bay‘ah at the hands of a fāsiq is forbidden.

This prohibition is the message of death.

Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ﷺ did not take bay‘ah at the hand of Yazīd since he was a fāsiq and due to this, he was martyred and his entire family was killed in a state of hunger and thirst. So if the three khulafā’ were fāsiq, leave alone being renegades and disbelievers, then why would Sayyidunā ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib ﷺ, the overpowering lion of Allah, take bay‘ah at their hands? They answered this by saying, “You are ignorant. You are unaware of the special letter of Allah ﷻ to Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ which strongly emphasised perseverance and the command not to oppose.” When it was asked: “Why did Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ﷺ not practice upon it?” They answered, “There was a different scripture for him. He was commanded not to take bay‘ah and to be martyred. You are Sunnī,

of the Khawārij and enemies of the Ahl al-Bayt, what knowledge do you have about the lives of the A'immah? These are mysteries and secrets that even the Ambiyā' and angels do not have the capacity to fathom. Understanding of these secrets has only been given to the Shī'ah and people of Kūfah. Allah ﷻ sent a special scripture for every Imām which informed him of everything he was required to do. And every Imām practiced accordingly. Our A'immah are not like your khulafā'. They have no need to ask anyone besides Allah ﷻ. They have knowledge of the past and future. They would communicate directly with Allah ﷻ without the medium of Sayyidunā Jibrīl ﷺ. All their actions were carried out with the permission of Allah ﷻ and according to His pleasure. Just as Allah ﷻ send special scriptures and books to the Ulū al-'Azm¹ Ambiyā' from Sayyidunā Ādam ﷺ to Rasūlullāh ﷺ, similarly all the A'immah were given a special scripture. Therefore, their actions varied. If you doubt the diversity of the A'immah's actions, then you ought to doubt the differences in the different Ambiyā's faiths."

In this aspect, the Shī'ah became giants in towḥīd, ṣabr and *tawakkul* (placing their trust in Allah ﷻ). Without arguing and debating, they attributed all the A'immah's actions on the divine scriptures and made it a proof for their friendship with the Ahl al-Bayt.

This is the condition of the A'immah. Now listen to the situation of the khulafā' and Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ. Some have denied their good actions and have claimed that they did not carry out one good action. Others have acknowledged, after realising that to deny this is denying *tawātur*, that they were very dedicated to external deeds like ṣalāh, fasting, etc., and were externally very righteous. But to deprive them of virtue and reward, they invented the law of *ṭinah* (sand). They have attributed to the A'immah that it appears in the ḥadīth that Imām Bāqir رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ mentioned:

1 The resolute Ambiyā' – referring to the 5 loftiest Ambiyā' in rank, Sayyidunā Nūḥ ﷺ, Sayyidunā Mūsā ﷺ, Sayyidunā 'Īsā ﷺ, Sayyidunā Ibrāhīm ﷺ and Sayyidunā Muḥammad ﷺ.

Allah ﷻ allowed sweet water to flow on a pure piece of land for seven days. He then set aside our sand from it and created the sand of the Shī'ah from its remaining portion. Thereafter, He allowed salty water to flow on an accursed piece of land in a similar manner and created our enemies sand from there. Had they been not been separated then no Shī'ī would have ever committed a sin and all the Shī'ah would have remained sinless just like us. No Sunnī Nāṣibī enemy would have ever carried out any good deed and all of them would have remained as kuffār outwardly. However, Allah ﷻ mixed the two sands and some pure sand mixed with the impure sand. So any Shī'ī who commits sin, it is the effect of the impure sand of the Sunnī and Nawāṣib. And any Nāṣibī who carries out good deeds, it is the effect of that pure sand. On the Day of Qiyāmah when Allah ﷻ will display His justice, He will give the action to the sand it belongs to. The Shī'ah sins will be thrown on the shoulders of the Nawāṣib since these sins were the effect of the impure sand of these wretched folk. On the reverse, the Shī'ah will receive all the good actions of the Nawāṣib since these are the effects of their pure sand. The narrator says, "When I heard this, I commented, 'may I be sacrificed for you. Will the Sunnī's actions be transferred to us and our sins transferred to them?' The Imām replied, 'by Allah, this will definitely happen.'" The narrator continues, "I asked the Imām, 'is there any mention of this in the Qur'ān.' 'Is there anything that is not found in the Qur'ān,' he replied, 'reference is made to it in this verse as Allah ﷻ declares:

فَأُولَٰئِكَ يُبَدِّلُ اللَّهُ سَيِّئَاتِهِمْ حَسَنَاتٍ

For them Allah will replace their evil deeds with good.^{1,2}

Due to this feature of *tīnah* (sand), all of the good actions of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم and the Sunnī will be transferred to the Shī'ah on the Day of Qiyāmah and the Shī'ah will receive the rewards of the hijrah, assistance, jihād, etc., which are

1 Sūrah Furqān: 70

2 This text is the gist of a lengthy narration of 'Ilal al-Sharā'ī' by Shaykh al-Ṣadūq (d. 1381) Urdu translation pg. 491 - 494

mentioned extensively in Qur’ān by doing absolutely nothing while the Ṣaḥābah will be deprived despite their tireless efforts and struggles. (May Allah ﷻ protect us from such drive!!) The Ahl al-Sunnah who used to harp on the hijrah and assistance of the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ, citing these among their virtues, and who were too delighted about these are now silent after the ṭīnah story has popped up.

Only one thing remained. Allah ﷻ mentions at different places in the Qur’ān that the munāfiqīn will be humiliated and killed. And we see that the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ — despite their *nifāq* (May Allah ﷻ protect us from such blasphemy) — became khulafā’ and governors and their respect and honour increased. Thus, this promise of Allah ﷻ was not fulfilled. So either they call Allah ﷻ a liar (Allah forbid) or deny the *nifāq* of the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ.

بِسْمِ لَعْلِ بَدَسْتِ اِيْدُوْبِمِ يَارِ نِه رَنْجِدِ

To make sure that Allah’s ﷻ speech remains accurate and the *nifāq* of the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ remains intact, they invented the aspect of *Raj’ah*. *Raj’ah*¹ means that when Imām Mahdī will emerge, Rasūlullāh ﷺ will awaken and all pious and good people will rise up as well as Sayyidah Fatimah and Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ. The three khulafā’ ﷺ will then be dragged out of their graves and prosecuted. Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ on one hand will present his case of them usurping his khilāfah while Sayyidah Fatimah ﷺ on the other hand will complain of them injuring her, martyring Sayyidunā Ḥasan ﷺ and usurping Fadak. To cut a long story short, after proving them guilty, they will be hanged to death.

1 *Tuḥfat al-‘Ulūm* is an ancient book in the Urdu language which explains the beliefs and actions of the Shī’ah. The belief of *Raj’ah* has been documented therein in these brief words, “belief in *Raj’ah* is necessary, i.e. when Imām Mahdī will emerge, certain believers and certain disbelievers and munāfiqīn will be brought to life and justice will be meted out to all and the oppressors will be punished.” (*Tuḥfat al-‘Ulūm* pg. 5)

Mullā Bāqir Majlisī has quoted on page 139 of his famous book *Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn* with reference to ‘Iḥl al-Sharā’i’ of Ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī a narration from Imām Muhammad al-Bāqir ﷺ: “When our Mahdī will emerge, he will resurrect ‘Ā’ishah (Allah forbid) and lash her thus taking revenge on behalf of Fatimah ﷺ.” (Shaykh Muhammad Firāsāt)

What can be said about such rubbish and garbage which these wretched souls have written? It makes a Muslim's body shiver. In short, Allah's سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى promise will then be fulfilled and they will be utterly humiliated and their nifāq will be exposed to everyone. They write that the aspect of Raj'ah is one of the special beliefs of the true sect, i.e. Ithnā 'Ashariyyah, while other sects have been deprived of this pure belief.

Besides all of the above, the greatest disaster of this creed is that all the eleven Imāms from Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ outwardly remained on the pattern and path of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ and would always praise the latter's qualities and noble traits. When anyone asked, they would excessively praise the latter's virtues. In fact, Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ continued performing the five times daily ṣalāh behind them and giving them counsel in matters of war. He did not only compliment and applaud them during their eras of khilāfah but continued singing their praises when he was khalīfah and had full power and authority. Furthermore, he preserved all the commands and rulings issued by the previous khulafā'. He neither returned Fadak to the heirs of Sayyidah Fatimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, nor discontinued the innovation of Tarāwīḥ ṣalāh nor declared Mut'ah as permissible.

To unshackle themselves from this, they had to think of fabricating such a thing which proves the noble A'immah's opposition to the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ despite their outward conformity so that the roots of Shī'ism remain strong. For this, they invented a wonderful yet astonishing principle, i.e. one's internal conflicting one's external and speaking lies. Since such words are loathsome and reprehensible, and if they had to include it in their beliefs, then whoever would hear it would feel reservations for it, thus they disguised it with a beautiful and attractive word. They dubbed speaking lies and being hypocritical — i.e. one's internal conflicting one's external — as Taqiyyah¹. They presented this as the

1 There is a special section in *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* dedicated to Taqiyyah. The narrations of that section are sufficient to display its reality.

عن ابى عمير العجمي قال قال لى ابو عبد الله عليه السلام يا ابا عمير تسعة اشعار الدين في الدين في التقية و لا دين لمن لا تقية له و التقية في كل شيء الا في النبذ و المسح على الخفين

answer to all our questions and objections and the response to all of our doubts and reservations. However, they forgot that smart clothes cannot change one's appearance. The reality of a thing cannot be transformed by the alteration of words. No matter what beautiful names you give to falsehood and lying, its foulness will be noticeable from its actuality although you dub it as Taqiyyah and include it among the principles of dīn.

من انداز قدت رامی شناسم

بهر رنگی که خوابی جامه می پوش

No matter what colour and what garment you wear,
I am aware of your height and size.

Now to establish Taqiyyah as one of the principles of dīn, they needed the certification of an Imām. The Shī'ah are not like the Ahl al-Sunnah who regard *Qiyās* (analogy) and *Istihsān*¹ as part of dīn. With Allah's *سُبْحَانَكَ وَتَعَالَى* grace, all their beliefs and principles are nothing but the expressions of the A'imma. Their aḥādīth books are not unreliable like the 'Nawāṣib' that any Tom, Dick and Harry can authenticate the aḥādīth and term them as *ṣaḥīḥ* and sunan. Whatever

continued from page 492

Abū 'Umayr al-'Ajmī narrates, "Abū 'Abd Allah told me, 'O Abū 'Umayr, nine tenths of dīn lies in Taqiyyah. The person who does not observe Taqiyyah has no dīn. Taqiyyah can be practiced in everything besides drinking nabīdh and making masaḥ over leather socks.'"

Abū Baṣīr narrates that Imām Ja'far *رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ* said, "Taqiyyah is the dīn of Allah." I said in astonishment, "The dīn of Allah?" The Imām clarified, "Yes. By Allah, it is Allah's dīn. Indeed, Sayyidunā Yūsuf *عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام* said, 'O people of the caravan, you are thieves,' whereas none of them stole anything. And indeed Sayyidunā Ibrāhīm *عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام* said, 'I am sick,' whereas by Allah he was not ill." The Imām is saying that one person did not steal and he was called a thief; this is Taqiyyah. Another person was not sick yet he said himself to be sick; this is Taqiyyah, which the entire world calls a lie. Thus, we learn that the meaning of Taqiyyah is to lie." (Shaykh Muḥammad Firāsāt)

1 An Arabic term for juristic "preference". In its literal sense it means "to consider something good". 'Ulamā' may use it to express their preference for particular judgements in Islamic law over other possibilities.

books of aḥādīth were written by Shī'ī Muḥaddithīn were read out word by word to the Imām and it was only published when it received the authentication of the Imām and the signature of approval of the noble A'immaḥ, so that people's action conform one hundred percent with the A'immaḥ. As a result, they began fabricating aḥādīth to define Taqīyyah in the name of the A'immaḥ. They were not just satisfied on permitting it, but went to the extent of mentioning such aḥādīth which emphasise its virtue and necessity that the reward of ṣalāh and fasting fades away into nothingness before it. They made Taqīyyah as one of the fundamentals of dīn and attributed the ḥadīth to the A'immaḥ

التقية ديني و دين ابائي

Taqīyyah is my dīn and the dīn of my forefathers.

Thus labelling its rejecter as a kafir. The author of *Nawāqid al-Rawāfiḍ* erred by saying that the Shī'ah say that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه accepted Islam owing to Taqīyyah. Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shostarī became enraged by this and wrote in *Maṣā'ib al-Nawāṣib*:

The Nāṣibī is lying. No Shī'ī can ever say such a thing since Taqīyyah is the dīn of the pious and pure folk. How is it ever possible for Abū Bakr to practice Taqīyyah and be included among the pure and pious?

Taqīyyah was declared the dīn of the pious and A'immaḥ and owing to it, they were successful in extricating themselves from the clutches of the Sunnī. All the objections and proofs of the Nawāṣib were rendered null and void. The Sunnī extracted from Shī'ī sources aḥādīth of the A'immaḥ comprising of great virtues of their khulafā' and thought that they have left the Shī'ah speechless, but to their utter amazement a primary Shī'ī student, in fact an ignorant Shī'ī, answered by saying that this is the product of Taqīyyah. A young boy silenced the great debaters and jurists by this one proof. The truth of the matter is that the benefit accrued by the Shī'ah faith from the aspect of Taqīyyah and the protection it awarded them is unparalleled by any other belief.

Someone once said very aptly that “Taqiyyah in Shīism is like the electric wires of a steel railway. If the electric wires are not there, the train will not be able to move smoothly and one train will crash into another.” The trains are protected by nothing besides the electric wires. Similar is the condition of Taqiyyah. Had Taqiyyah not been part of the fundamentals of Shīism, the entire creed would have been destroyed. There would be no way to reconcile between conflicting statements, conflicting actions and narrations; and their falsehood would have been exposed. The person who invented Shīism was extremely intelligent that he protected falsehood using falsehood. Taqiyyah was the live wire. It was given such importance and significance that its virtues have been related from the first Imām right up to the last and final one, and a lofty status has been promised for those who observe Taqiyyah. Taqiyyah saved the Shīah from every type of calamity and the Shīah have been tremendously blessed by the rewards promised upon it. The Shīah had the opportunity to eat with the Sunnī and speak sweet pleasant words as long as they are in the latter’s company. They could praise them, applaud them, and even sing admiration for the three khulafā’ and Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ, thus practicing on the verse:

وَإِذَا لَقُوا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا قَالُوا آمَنَّا

And when they meet those who believe, they say, “we believe.”¹

When they return home and are in the gathering of their own folk, they close the doors, scan to see if any of the Nawāṣib are with them, then they roll with laughter and admire themselves for their deception, practicing upon the verse:

وَإِذَا حَلَوْا إِلَىٰ شُيُطَانِهِمْ قَالُوا إِنَّا مَعَكُمْ إِنَّمَا نَحْنُ مُسْتَهْزِءُونَ

But when they are alone with their evil ones, they say, “indeed, we are with you; we were only mockers.”²

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 14

2 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 14

Then they can begin disassociating themselves. One may curse himself while another may congratulate himself; in both conditions being worthy of reward as promised in the narrations from their A'immaḥ. By virtue of Taqiyyah, i.e. the deception displayed in front of the Sunnī, and by virtue of the cursing and disassociation after coming home, they receive such a reward which will not be acquired by performing thousand ṣalāḥ and observing a thousand fasts. And if any sin was committed, then too do not grieve since the aspect of ṭīnah is there. The reward of the ṣalāḥ and fasting carried out by the Sunnī will not be received by them but is exclusively for the Shī'ah. Did Allah ﷻ not declare:

مَنْ عَمِلَ صَالِحًا فَلِنَفْسِهِ

Whoever does righteousness — it is for his (own) soul.¹

They established their religion on such beliefs. They termed heresy and sacrilege as Shī'ism, thus becoming the epitome of the verse:

فِي قُلُوبِهِمْ مَرَضٌ ۖ فَزَادَهُمُ اللَّهُ مَرَضًا ۗ وَلَهُمْ عَذَابٌ أَلِيمٌ

In their hearts is disease, so Allah has increased their disease; and for them is a painful punishment.²

The truth is that when a person learns of such fundamentals and beliefs, he is left dumbfounded. He is speechless due to its incongruence. An observer is left flabbergasted. O Allah! Is Shī'ism a religion or heresy? What is this? Such fundamentals, the preposterousness of which cannot be concealed behind any veil. Such beliefs whose absurdity is apparent. There is no need for any proof to establish their falsehood. Why did they invent such principles? Allah ﷻ created them as men and gave them intelligence just like the rest of us. But the irony of it is that they are pleased with such principles and are proud of such

1 Sūrah Ḥā Mīm Sajdah: 46

2 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 10

beliefs. They attribute themselves to the noble A'immah and rest their weight on the shoulders of Rasūlullāh's ﷺ offspring, who are free from such blasphemy.

When looking at their beliefs and principles, this verse of the Qur'ān comes to mind:

لَهُمْ قُلُوبٌ لَا يَفْقَهُونَ بِهَا ۖ وَلَهُمْ أَعْيُنٌ لَا يُبْصِرُونَ بِهَا ۖ وَلَهُمْ آذَانٌ لَا يَسْمَعُونَ بِهَا ۗ أُولَٰئِكَ كَالْأَنْعَامِ بَلَّغُوا أُمَّلًا ۗ

They have hearts with which they do not understand, they have eyes with which they do not see, and they have ears with which they do not hear. Those are like livestock; rather, they are more astray.¹

At one stage Taqiyyah was the scapegoat which their senior scholars formulated but the Shī'ah of recent times have severed this tail due to its needlessness. Another scapegoat was the concept of Badā'. The story behind this is when the Shī'ī leaders and founders would attend the gatherings of the noble A'immah, they would exit and inform their followers, "today the Imām said that very shortly the Shī'ah will be granted sovereignty and governance." However when the appointed time would come and there would be no sign of the promise manifesting itself, some would begin to have misgivings, because of which the leader would say, "the Imām said that Allah experienced Badā'," i.e. Allah was unaware of what was going to transpire and changed the previous decree." May Allah ﷻ forbid! When anyone would report their leaders to the Imām, the Imām would disassociate himself from them and curse them:

قاتله الله و خذله الله

May Allah ﷻ destroy him and humiliate him.

1 Sūrah al-A'rāf 7:179

Thereafter, if anyone would inform the leaders about this, the leaders would laugh uncontrollably and say, “The Imām said this to you from *Jirāb al-Nūrah*¹.” The listener would be baffled and enquire as to what is *Jirāb al-Nūrah*, and they would reply “*Taqiyyah*.”

In short, when anyone would be confused that the A’immah are cursing them and calling them devils, they would remove this confusion by claiming that the Imām practiced *Taqiyyah* and they do not know what *Taqiyyah* is. *Taqiyyah* is the *dīn* of the pious and the A’immah. One will only receive proximity to Allah ﷻ on the Day of *Qiyāmah* owing to *Taqiyyah*. When the same folk would narrate the Imām’s promise and the promise was not fulfilled, they would say that Allah experienced *Badā’*. When anyone would object to this, they would answer, “You are ignorant. There was some benefit in that. No one knows the benefit and wisdom behind it besides Allah and the Imām. Why do you have reservations about *Badā’*? It is a type of *naskh* (abrogation). Look at the laws of *sharī’ah*. Allah ﷻ changed some laws and abrogated some laws by others. So keep quiet. Do not argue about Allah’s ﷻ actions.”

Some people still had misgivings and objections. What kind of a Rabb says something today and then does not fulfil it? What relation does *Badā’* have with *naskh*? *Naskh* means that Allah ﷻ issued a command and permitted something for a certain period or a certain group and then changed that command for a certain reason and forbade the very thing. However, it was never the practice of Allah ﷻ to inform Rasūlullāh ﷺ of something or to promise him a certain victory but then fail to fulfil it. So if the Imām narrated something from Allah ﷻ or Allah ﷻ promised him something, then it must definitely occur. To remove these misgivings, the leaders made up two tablets, viz. *Lowḥ al-Mahfūz* (the divine tablet) and *Lowḥ Maḥw wa Ithbāt* (the tablet of cancellation and affirmation). They claimed, “Allah ﷻ created two tablets and wrote everything therein. What was definitely going to happen, He wrote it in *Lowḥ al-Mahfūz*. There is no alteration or modification here. The second one

1 Lit. a container of tar.

is Lowḥ Maḥw wa Ithbāt, i.e. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى adjusts what is written therein. So the alteration in the Imām's statement is because of this second Lowḥ. The Imām informed of the first happening, but that was altered by Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. The Imām was unaware that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى would change it. When people objected, "this is illogical. What is the benefit of this second Lowḥ?" They answered by presenting the same answer Dildār 'Alī wrote in *Ṣawārim*:

و از آن جمله هر گاه اینک انبیاء و اوصیاء خبر دهند از کتاب محو و اثبات و بعد از آن خبر دهند بخلاف آن بندگان را واجب باشد اذعان نمودن بآن و چون این اذعان بر نفس بسیار دشوار است موجب مزید اجر انا گردد فان افضل الاعمال احزبها و بها امتاز المسلمون الذین فازوا بدرجات البقین عن الضعفاء الذین لیس لهم قدم راسخ فی الدین

A part of the story is that when the Ambiyā' or Awṣiyā' relate something from Lowḥ Maḥw wa Ithbāt and thereafter say something different, it is compulsory for people to comply. And since it is difficult to have conviction on the latter statement, the reward for it is greater. Certainly, the greatest actions are the bitterest ones. It is by virtue of these that the true believers — who climb the high stages of conviction — are separated from the weak, who do not have a firm footing in dīn.

The crux is that believing in Badā' is the roadway to high stages and abundant reward and disbelieving in it is the proof of weak īmān. In fact, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى made Badā' to test īmān, who will believe it and who will doubt it.

Just observe in what a beautiful and intellectual way the senior Shī'ah invented the fundamentals of dīn and what beliefs they fabricated. Although Dildār 'Alī has outwardly denied the real meaning of Badā' in *Ṣawārim*, what he has written establishes the very thing all the more. Dildār 'Alī removes the doubt as to why the A'immah promised that which was not to transpire in such a classic Shī'ī manner in *Ṣawārim*:

و از آن جمله این اخبار موجب تسلیه مومنین که انتظار فرج اولیاء الله و غالب شدن حق می کشند می شود چنانچه این معنی در باب قصه نوح و در باب فرج اهل بیت مروی گشته چه اگر از اول شیعیان را خبر می دادند اینها را باینکه ممکن است که حاصل شود فرج اهل محمد عنقریب و منظور از این اخبار این بود که تا شیعیان بر دین خود ثابت بمانند و بر انتظار کشیدن متاب شوند و بعد از اینکه جناب مولانا مجلسی در باب تأیید این احتمال و مناسب این مقاله دوسته

روایت ذکر نموده گفته فمعنی قوله عليه السلام ما عند الله بمثل البدء این است که ایمان پدء از اعظم عبادات قلبیه است به جهت صعوبت ای و معارض بودن این بوساوس شیطانی و بجهت اینکه اقرار پدء در حقیقت اقرار است باینکه له الخلق و له الامر و این کمال توحید است و یا یعنی این حدیث این است که اعظم اسباب دعوی ست بطرف عبادت جناب رب العالمین انتہی

One of the wisdoms is that these narrations are to console the believers so that they await the arrival of Allah's ﷺ friends and the triumph of the truth, just as is narrated in the incident of Sayyidunā Nūḥ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, and the triumph of the Ahl al-Bayt for it was assured that the family of Muḥammad ﷺ will be victorious shortly. The object of such narrations was so that the Shī'ah remain steadfast on their dīn and gain reward by waiting. Moreover, 'Allāmah Majlisī has related a few narrations in support of it. Thus, the meaning of the Imām's statement, "there is nothing (greater) than Badā' according to Allah," is that having īmān on Badā' is one of the great acts of worship of the heart due to its complexity and the whispers of shayṭān against it. Furthermore, believing in Badā' is in fact acknowledging that the choice to create and command is solely for Allah ﷻ and this is the highest level of Towḥīd. Or the meaning of the statement is that it is one of the greatest methods of inviting to Allah's ﷻ worship.¹

It is certain that Dildār 'Alī and Mullā Bāqir Majlisī have probably never uttered a truer statement in their entire lives. We ought to thank these men from our hearts. They unwittingly stated, if the Imām had not made false promises to the Shī'ah and kept them going with these promises, majority of the Shī'ah would have turned away from their dīn and would have not remained steadfast. The only objective of making such far-fetched claims was to keep the Shī'ah on their religion. Otherwise, had the Imām stated clearly that the Shī'ah will have no dominance for the next thousand to two thousand years, the Shī'ah would have reached the throes of death due to despondency and would have sat at home sullen. They would have left a sack of pure sand, 'aqīq's ring and their prayer mats at the Imām's door and fled. Only the special Shī'ah like Zurārah, Hishām, Shayṭān al-Ṭāq, etc., would have remained without any friend or helper. Zurārah and his ilk did not allow the Shī'ah to scatter by deceiving them with false promises. Out

1 *Ṣawārim* pg. 79

of their wittiness, they immediately fabricated a new principle and invented a new belief to suite the occasion attributing it to the Imām. Will any Muslim hold such a belief? Will any Muslim attribute Badā' to Allah ﷻ? The perplexity intensifies... they did not only attribute it to Allah ﷻ but brought it to its peak as is their habit. They mentioned virtues of Badā' which they attributed to the final Imām:

ما عبد الله بمثل البداء

Badā' is the greatest cause for Allah's worship.

It is quite manifest as to how it is the greatest cause. When the Shī'ah were promised that they will be given dominance very soon, they began serving Zurārah and the others out of greed for the world. They took prayer mats made of pure sand and straw and prostrated on them, thus making signs on their foreheads. When the promise was not fulfilled after their prolonged anticipation, they grew despondent and asked Zurārah the reason. He wandered for a few days and then said that the Imām has stated that Allah had Badā', i.e. Allah changed his promise. He encouraged his followers to continue their worship, cursing and dissociation and see what progress Allah ﷻ grants them. In short, in this way he kept some foolish and ignorant people licking his boots. He pacified them with Taqīyyah and Badā' and often mixed the aspect of tīnah to keep them happy. Slowly but surely, he managed to violate the dīn of Muḥammad ﷺ and made a group his ardent followers. What had to happen, happened. Their dīn was destroyed just as he had planned.

فقد استحوذ عليهم الشيطان و استغواهم الطغيان

Shayṭān overpowered them and false deities misled them.

فصار يرى المعروف منكرا والمنكر معروفا

و كل احد منهم بعاجل حظ مشغوفا

Each one of them is pursuing his immediate benefit, thus seeing good as evil and evil as good.

O Shī'ah! Ponder deeply over the beliefs and principles of your religion and determine whether it is good or evil. If you still do not understand, then it is your choice. Observe Taqiyyah, hope for Raj'ah, accuse Allah سُبْحَانَكَ وَبِحَمْدِكَ of Badā' (Allah forbid), indulge in sin with delight by remembering the aspect of ẓīnah since you will receive all the acts of worship the Sunnī carried out and we will have to bear the burden of your sins. It is meaningless for you to undergo the difficulties of worship.

تو مشق ناز کر خون دو عالم میری گردن پر

You do your pretty effort. The blood of both the worlds is on my shoulders.

Appendix

The following is a heartfelt piece of writing and an abstract masterpiece by an author with a colourful mind, who presents unique examples, swims the ocean (of knowledge), gathers subtleties, is cognisant of the choicest fruits of the garden of eloquence and oratory, and is dominant over the contemporary poets, Muḥammad Murtaḍā Beg, known as Mirzā Muchchū Beg 'Āshiq (may Allah protect him).

Subḥān Allah! Pure is that Independent Being who declared regarding the servants who sacrificed their lives for His beloved as:

رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ وَرَضُوا عَنْهُ

Allah is pleased with them and they are pleased with Him.

and thereby manifested their lofty status. Pure is He who declared regarding all the enemies:

خَتَمَ اللَّهُ عَلَى قُلُوبِهِمْ

Allah has set a seal upon their hearts.¹

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 7

and thereby separating the good from the evil. True is that Nabī صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ who sketched out the pattern of khilāfah and superiority with the ḥadīth:

افضل الناس بعد النبي

The most superior person after the Nabī.

There is no obscurity. No doubt or misgivings remain for the searchers of the truth. His greatest achievement is that he secured the promise of Allah ﷻ to protect and safeguard His true dīn. I will now quote the saying of a pious man.

الهى و يا اكرم الاكرمين	الهى و يا احكم الحاكمين
و صل على شافع المذنبين	فصل على سيد المرسلين
و صل على صحبه الصالحين	فصل على اله الطاهرين

O my Allah and O the Most Just of those who show justice. O my Allah and O the Most Kind of those who display kindness.

Send salutations on the leader of the Messengers and send salutations on the intercessor of the sinners.

Send salutations upon his pure family and send salutations upon his noble companions.

After praising Allah ﷻ and sending salutations on the leader of the Messengers صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, a bondsman who is drenched in sins, Muḥammad Murtaḍā, the lover of Nabī's صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ family and the servant of his Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ humbly presents the following before those searching for the truth.

Look at what has happened to the dīn of Muḥammad صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. From the very beginning up till this day, in fact up until Qiyāmah, what did the enemies of Allah ﷻ desire and what do they still desire? To extinguish this burning light (of Islam) by blowing it off and to ignite the raging fire of anarchy and chaos. However, that divine light only glows and shines brighter. It does not get even a little dimmer. The enemy's heart burns, his morale is broken and his efforts

are wasted. What courage does falsehood have to move its tongue and not get slapped? No sooner does it rear its ugly head that it is repressed and crushed. It tried moving a few steps forward but fell to the ground. It tastes the dust every time and strikes its chest, mourning due to the pain and sorrow. For a thousand years now, how many skeletons were exposed and all their boasting was humbled.

In this confusing last age, there is no spare time from the worry of the world and the struggles for Hell. Not a thought about the Hereafter. It is the fourteenth century, close to Qiyāmah. Very soon, everyone will be worrying about himself. The irony of it is that knowledge of dīnī aspects is like a dream, something that was impossible and unimaginable. But, this is just our evil imagination. The world is not empty of the men of Allah ﷺ.

The exhibition of this can be witnessed by studying this unanswerable book, the second part of *Āyāt Bayyināt*, authored by the master of rational and narrational sciences, the helper of the dīn of Allah and His Rasūl ﷺ, the leader of the theologians, the king of the debaters, master of the intricacies (of this subject), the honourable Nawāb Muḥsin al-Dowlah Muḥsin al-Mulk Mowlānā Sayyid Muḥammad Mahdī ‘Alī Khān, the valiant, pro-fighter, reliable and political leader.

Allah! What subtlety in his explanation and what solid formidable writing. Like an ocean with gushing waves. It is nothing but a sample of Allah’s ﷻ greatness and divine assistance. Such a voluminous work in such a short space of time with elucidation and explanation. He left no stone unturned. He broke the opposition’s false ideologies with their own statements. One desires to salute the eloquence of his words. Although debating involves vulgarity and obscenity, yet he kept cool and composed and engaged with decorum. It is call magical words, i.e. to win the enemy over with the wand of sweet and pleasing words. Mā shā Allah! The lowest achievement of his pen is that he takes over every field he ventures in to. The beauty is that every claim is substantiated. It is to the

point, condensed. Everything is unanswerable. Every word is chosen correctly. His eloquence is marvellous. Every subtle point of his can fill an office and the articulateness is beyond one's capacity. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى is witness that the style of writing is complex. Intellect to such a level that he informs the opposition of the latter's stance. Such a remarkable memory that everything is at his fingertips. This is only the blessings of the noble Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ, not the work of some man from Qumm.

I cannot praise this book in this brief write up as the heart desires. Together with that, it is worthwhile saluting the efforts and struggles of the person who published it with the intention of benefitting everyone and to gain reward in the Hereafter, and not for any worldly motive. Who is that? The young pious boy, the prize of his family, ḥāfiẓ of the Qur'ān, my beloved and compassionate, 'Abd al-Wājid Khān. And the true successor chosen by Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى who is steadfast on the sharī'ah of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, possessor of saintly and angelic qualities, the unique Janāb Muḥammad 'Abd al-Wāḥid Khān the administrator of Muṣṭafā'ī printing press — successor of Muhammad Muṣṭafā Khān (May Allah grant him an abode in Jannat al-Firdaws). The second edition of volume 1 was printed and published with his permission in 1301 A.H which must have passed the eyes of those who have a fervour for dīn. Much attention and effort was put into the second volume but unfortunately a copy of it could not be attained. Sayyid Muḥammad Mumtāz 'Alī, chief of Kalkatrī Banaras town Sondela Awadh, made a concerted effort on Janāb Munshī Sayyid Barkat 'Alī — head commissioner of Banaras pension office — who had a copy, obtained it from him and sent the original and copy to Ḥāfiẓ 'Abd al-Wājid. The effort of Ḥāfiẓ 'Abd al-Wājid is worthy of praise. He proof-read it and printed it with the author's permission after editing it and making it reader friendly. In actual fact, the amount of effort Ḥāfiẓ 'Abd al-Wājid contributed is no less than the amount of effort contributed by the author. All thanks belongs to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى who allowed this effort to come to completion and now the second volume has also been published. We make du'ā' to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى for the author, those who made the publishing possible and those who endeavoured in its printing and publishing.

May your life span, honour and dignity be increased
By the blessings of Muḥammad and his noble family

وَقُلْ جَاءَ الْحَقُّ وَزَهَقَ الْبَاطِلُ إِنَّ الْبَاطِلَ كَانَ زَهُوقًا

And say, “Truth has come, and falsehood has departed. Indeed is falsehood, [by nature], ever bound to depart.”¹

Chapter Three

Introduction to Fadak

There is no need to delve into the allegations levelled by the Shī'ah against the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ after their virtue and lofty status has been thoroughly proven by the testimony of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, the declarations of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, and the statements of the A'immah. However, owing to the fact that the Shī'ah often cite the narrations and statements of the Ahl al-Sunnah to support their claims, thereby throwing the unwary masses into utter confusion; the scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah consider it their duty to refute these allegations and remove the deceptive guise cast over such narrations. Thus following in the footsteps of our noble scholars, we too will endeavour to refute these allegations.

Since the issue of Fadak and *Qirṭās* (the incident of the pen and paper) are the most often cited allegations, we will address these first. However, before proceeding with the actual discussion, I feel it appropriate to mention some pertinent and beneficial points. *And my capability is through the help of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى.*

Point 1

Every nabī, imām and pious man of every religion, even the noblemen amongst their tribe have been criticised by those who harbour hatred and enmity for them. Such foes have looked at their good works with eyes of scorn and condemned them. They have searched for their minor errors and raised a huge hue and cry over them, in order to cause misgivings in the hearts of their friends. Look at how

1 Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl: 81.

the Jews criticised Sayyidunā ʿĪsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ. What evil they blurted out concerning his noble and miraculous birth! They labelled his miracles as black magic and sorcery, and called his companions treacherous and ignorant. Look at how the Christians level allegations against Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ that he had greed and desire for the world. What drivel they blurt at the one who had the most perfect of character, to the extent that they regard such a guide and saviour as the one who misled the world. Have a look at how the Khawārij and Nawāṣib revile the noble Ahl al-Bayt رَحِمَهُمُ اللهُ. They label Sayyidunā ʿAlī, Sayyidah Fāṭimah—the Queen of the women—and Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُم as disbelievers, may Allah مُبِحَاةً وَعَالٍ forbid!

كَبُرَتْ كَلِمَةً تَخْرُجُ مِنْ أَفْوَاهِهِمْ إِنْ يَقُولُونَ إِلَّا كَذِبًا

Grave is the word that comes out of their mouths; they speak not except a lie.¹

They feel that harbouring enmity and disassociating from these noble souls will find them salvation. Some have gone to the extent of writing poems in praise of Ibn Muljim²—the wretched one—and have deemed the killing of Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ as the highest form of worship. ʿImrān ibn Ḥiṭṭān, the leader of the Khawārij and one of their main poets, says regarding Ibn Muljim:

يا ضربة تقى ما اراد بها الا	ليبلغ من ذى العرش رضوانا
انى لا ذكره حيننا فاحسبه	اوفى البرية عند الله رضوانا

What a blow of a devout man who only intended the pleasure of the owner of the Thrown thereby.

Whenever he comes to mind, I feel his scales of good to be the heaviest over the entire creation in the sight of Allah مُبِحَاةً وَعَالٍ.

1 Sūrah al-Kahf: 5.

2 The man who murdered Sayyidunā ʿAlī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.

It is nothing surprising for the enemy to regard a special quality as a defect.

The Shī'ah are the same. Their prejudice and corrupt ideologies have blurred their thinking and soundness of judgement and their extremism in pronouncing love for the Ahl al-Bayt has led them far from moderation. They are blind to every quality and every good action of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ. They see their every good as evil and every quality as a defect.

If anyone is baffled at how a fraction of the 'Muslims' have rejected the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ despite the innumerable verses, aḥādīth and A'imma's statements regarding the same, then he should have a look at the Jews, Christians, Nawāṣib, and Khawārij. Why is it that the Jews, who read about Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ in the Tawrah and were awaiting his arrival and recognised him like they recognised their own offspring, became his enemies when he proclaimed his Nubuwwah? They concealed his outstanding qualities and left no stone unturned in falsely accusing him? What could be the reason for the Christians, despite knowing about the glad tidings of the coming of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and hearing from their Nabī عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ

وَمُبَشِّرًا بِرَسُولٍ يَأْتِيهِ مِنْ بَعْدِي اسْمُهُ أَحْمَدٌ

A Messenger will come after me whose name will be Aḥmad.¹

and reading about this in their books day and night, still concealed these glad tidings and began giving false interpretations to those verses of the Injil?

What is the reason the Khawārij became the enemies of the Ahl al-Bayt despite having full knowledge that they are the blood and flesh of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, and the Qur'an and aḥādīth are replete with their virtues? Why do they deem

1 Sūrah al-Ṣaff: 6.

the best of creation as the worst and label them as disbelievers and sinners? The reason for the deviation of these heterodox groups is the very same reason the Shī'ah harbour enmity and hatred for the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ and level allegations against them.

إذا لم يكن للمرء عين صحيحة

فلا غر وان يرتاب و الصبح مسفر

When a man is deprived of sound eyes, there is nothing surprising for him to deny day in broad sunlight.

Point 2

If the Shī'ī objections concerning the usurpation of the Ahl al-Bayt's rights are true then this will necessitate that all of the Muhājirīn, Anṣār, and Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ lacked īmān, Islam, noble character, and even the most basic human qualities. Had the other Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ prevented the first two Khulafā' from usurping their rights, and not assisted them in their oppression upon the noble Ahl al-Bayt; then how would only two persons with a handful of henchmen be so audacious as to harm the Family of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and achieve success in that endeavour?

With regards to the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ being deprived of īmān, Islam, and noble character—which is the ultimate objective of the Shī'ah—they do not consider the dangerous and destructive consequences of such an ideology. They think that this is only an attack on the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ and thus dare to make such a claim. However, a person who Allah ﷻ has blessed with even a little intelligence and whose soundness of mind has not been obscured by prejudice and blindness will fear these destructive consequences and instead plead to be saved from its devastating effects.

The substantiation presented for the Qur'ān being the Word of Allah ﷻ and divine assistance to Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and the reason it is called a living miracle is due to its tremendous spiritual effect on the hearts of people and the great change it brought in the lives of the Arabs, coupled with the guidance of Rasūlullāh

صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. The glorious Qur’ān is that magnificent force which transformed the hearts of people and influenced them both morally and spiritually; it displayed astounding divine miracles and produced everlasting factual results. These outstanding results prove that most definitely it is the Word of Allah سُبحانه وتعالى.

The blessed Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was born in an era of spiritual starvation. He was sent to a country which had no moral training and was given the responsibility to reform a nation who had no goodness besides corrupt beliefs, evil bestial ways, rotten character, hypocrisy, and war mongering. Rasūlullāh’s صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ inspired lectures and divinely gifted address had such an amazing effect on them that it transformed them both externally and internally. Those misguided for years began treading the path of Allah سُبحانه وتعالى and those who were asleep awoke from their negligence. The *mushrik* (polytheist) became a *muwahhid* (believer in the oneness of Allah) and the disbeliever brought *īmān*. Those who worshipped idols now broke the same and those who were misguided began leading others to the right path. The prejudices of ignorance no more remained in them and family feuds and animosity was no more found in their lives. Their minds were purified from arrogance and pride and their hearts were filled with patience, reliance in Allah, forbearance, abstinence, piety, and all beautiful angelic qualities. The teachings of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ brought forth a group who were worshippers of Allah سُبحانه وتعالى; individuals blessed with purity of character, rightly guided, and pure hearted. They exterminated the remnants of shirk which once filled the entire Arabian peninsula and instead filled it with the call to one Allah سُبحانه وتعالى—who has no like and no partner. Idols went into extinction and temples were destroyed. The fires of the fire worshippers were extinguished and the trinity was broken. The false ideology of intellect-worship remained no more.

وَقُلْ جَاءَ الْحَقُّ وَزَهَقَ الْبَاطِلُ إِنَّ الْبَاطِلَ كَانَ زَهُوقًا

And say, “Truth has come, and falsehood has departed. Indeed is falsehood, [by nature], ever bound to depart.”¹

1 Sūrah Banī Isrā’īl: 81.

This proves undoubtedly that Rasūlullāh ﷺ was a true Messenger receiving divine assistance from Allah ﷻ. Otherwise, it was not humanly possible for a person to make such a spiritual and moral transformation to the Arabs, create brotherhood between such a nation who were war mongers and bent on rivalry, and purify their hearts from inherited enmity, hatred, and malice. In fact, they became role models in character and morality for the world.

The astonishing results produced by the glorious Qur'ān and the amazing effects of Rasūlullāh's ﷺ guidance compelled the enemies to acknowledge that such achievements are beyond ordinary human capacity. They were forced to admit that the message of Rasūlullāh ﷺ was truly from the Being who is unmatched and unparalleled.

Some write that the effect of the Qur'ān upon the Arabs was akin to someone having bewitched them. One of the most prejudiced Christians acknowledges that from the inception of Christianity till the time of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, spirituality never reached the heights it reached with the teachings of Islam. However, this continuous effect of the Qur'ān and this constant influence of Rasūlullāh's ﷺ companionship and guidance can only be accepted when it is our firm belief that the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ—the Muhājirīn and Anṣār who accepted the message first—were devoted and staunch Muslims, role models of morality for humanity, and perfect in their sincerity. On the other hand, according to the Shī'ah, the amazing and astounding reformation which took place in the lives of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ through the companionship and guidance of Rasūlullāh ﷺ was only temporary and the effects of the Qur'ān on them were short lived. Those hearts which were purified with the blessings of revelation and inspiration were soon spoiled with the filth of *irtidād* (apostasy) and those who were lanterns of guidance for others bid farewell to Islam. The divine light that illuminated thousands of hearts was extinguished in no time and the veil of kufr and nifāq which was removed from their hearts returned once again. The rays of the sun of nubuwwah which lit up the hearts of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ faded. The divine voice which the friends of Rasūlullāh ﷺ heard with the ears of

their hearts became silent. If this is the case, then I do not think it is correct to think that the Qur'ān produced unparalleled results nor did Rasūlullāh's ﷺ guidance and advice yield any exceptional outcome. Allah forbid! How can the raving about the beauty of Islam which reached the skies remain then?

If the Qur'ān is read with the Shīr ideology in mind then the Qur'ān will seem false, Allah ﷻ forbid! Those whose beautiful and outstanding qualities are mentioned therein will be found to be the worst of creation. When we study the Qur'ān, we find it to conform to those beliefs and thoughts we have about the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ and their noble attributes. We find that at one place Allah ﷻ has declared regarding their īmān and 'ibādah:

مُحَمَّدٌ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ وَالَّذِينَ مَعَهُ أَشِدَّاءُ عَلَى الْكُفَّارِ رُحَمَاءُ بَيْنَهُمْ تَرَاهُمْ رُكَّعًا سُجَّدًا يَبْتَغُونَ فَضْلًا
مِّنَ اللَّهِ وَرِضْوَانًا

Muḥammad 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.¹

Allah ﷻ admires them at another place:

سِيمَاهُمْ فِي وُجُوهِهِمْ مِّنْ أَثَرِ السُّجُودِ ذَلِكَ مَثَلُهُمْ فِي التَّوْرَةِ وَمَثَلُهُمْ فِي الْإِنْجِيلِ

Their mark is on their faces from the trace of prostration. That is their description in the Torah. And their description in the Gospel.²

Allah ﷻ praises them:

وَالسَّابِقُونَ السَّابِقُونَ أُولَئِكَ مِنِّي وَأُولَئِكَ سَيَرْحَمُهُ اللَّهُ إِنَّهُمْ هُمُ الْمُتَّقُونَ
عَنْهُ وَعَدَّ لَهُمْ جَنَّاتٍ تَجْرِي مِنْ تَحْتِهَا الْأَنْهَارُ خَالِدِينَ فِيهَا أَبَدًا ذَلِكَ الْفَوْزُ الْعَظِيمُ

1 Sūrah al-Faṭḥ: 29.

2 Sūrah al-Faṭḥ: 29.

And the first forerunners [in the faith] among the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār and those who followed them with good conduct - Allah is pleased with them and they are pleased with Him, and He has prepared for them gardens beneath which rivers flow, wherein they will abide forever. That is the great attainment.¹

At one place, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى sounds glad tidings; their reward for bearing inconvenience and difficulties:

فَالَّذِينَ هَاجَرُوا وَأُخْرِجُوا مِنْ دِيَارِهِمْ وَأُوذُوا فِي سَبِيلِي وَقَاتَلُوا وَقُتِلُوا لَأُكَفِّرَنَّ عَنْهُمْ سَيِّئَاتِهِمْ
وَلَأُدْخِلَنَّهُمْ جَنَّاتٍ تَجْرِي مِنْ تَحْتِهَا الْأَنْهَارُ ثَوَابًا مِمَّنْ عِنْدِ اللَّهِ وَاللَّهُ عِنْدَهُ حُسْنُ الثَّوَابِ

And their Lord responded to them, “Never will I allow to be lost the work of [any] worker among you, whether male or female; you are of one another. So those who emigrated or were evicted from their homes or were harmed in My cause or fought or were killed - I will surely remove from them their misdeeds, and I will surely admit them to gardens beneath which rivers flow as reward from Allah , and Allah has with Him the best reward.”²

At one juncture, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى confirms their īmān with His stamp of approval and promises them forgiveness and a noble provision [i.e. Jannah]:

وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا وَهَاجَرُوا وَجَاهَدُوا فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ وَالَّذِينَ آوَا وَنَصَرُوا أُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ حَقًّا
لَهُمْ مَغْفِرَةٌ وَرِزْقٌ كَرِيمٌ

But those who have believed and emigrated and fought in the cause of Allah and those who gave shelter and aided - it is they who are the believers, truly. For them is forgiveness and noble provision.³

Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى celebrates their superiority over the nations of all the other Ambiyā' in these words:

1 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 100.

2 Sūrah Āl 'Imrān: 195.

3 Sūrah al-Anfāl: 74.

كُنْتُمْ خَيْرَ أُمَّةٍ أُخْرِجَتْ لِلنَّاسِ تَأْمُرُونَ بِالْمَعْرُوفِ وَتَنْهَوْنَ عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ وَتُؤْمِنُونَ بِاللَّهِ

You are the best nation produced [as an example] for mankind. You enjoin what is right and forbid what is wrong and believe in Allah.¹

Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى consoles them by promising them khilāfah upon their perseverance in the face of adversities:

وَعَدَ اللَّهُ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا مِنْكُمْ وَعَمِلُوا الصَّالِحَاتِ لَيَسْتَخْلِفَنَّهُمْ فِي الْأَرْضِ كَمَا اسْتَخْلَفَ الَّذِينَ مِنْ قَبْلِهِمْ

Allah has promised those who have believed among you and done righteous deeds that He will surely grant them succession [to authority] upon the earth.²

Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى presents the parable of their multiplication in number in these pleasing words:

كَزَّرَعٍ أَخْرَجَ شَطْأَهُ فَأَزْرَهُ فَاسْتَغَلَّظَ فَاسْتَوَىٰ عَلَىٰ سُوْقِهِ يُعْجِبُ الزُّرَّاعَ لِيَغِيظَ بِهِمُ الْكُفَّارَ

As a plant which produces its offshoots and strengthens them so they grow firm and stand upon their stalks, delighting the sowers - so that Allah may enrage by them the disbelievers.³

He سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى boasts of their great number:

وَرَأَيْتَ النَّاسَ يَدْخُلُونَ فِي دِينِ اللَّهِ أَفْوَاجًا

And you see the people entering into the religion of Allah in multitudes.⁴

1 Sūrah Āl ‘Imrān: 110.

2 Sūrah al-Nūr: 55.

3 Sūrah al-Fatḥ: 29.

4 Sūrah al-Naṣr: 2.

Concerning their dominance and triumph:

وَأَثَابَهُمْ فَتْحًا قَرِيبًا وَمَغَانِمَ كَثِيرَةً يَأْخُذُونَهَا وَكَانَ اللَّهُ عَزِيزًا حَكِيمًا

And He rewarded them with an imminent conquest. And much war booty which they will take. And ever is Allah Exalted in Might and Wise.¹

In these verses, Allah ﷻ promises that Islam will reign supreme in the world.

On the contrary, if the Shīʿī belief is considered correct and their ideologies regarding the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم are said to be true, then the falsification of these verses is definite. And if they only apply to the Ahl al-Bayt or to those who passed away in Rasūlullāh's صلى الله عليه وسلم lifetime or to those who after remaining apostate for about thirty years then re-embraced Islam and assisted Amīr al-Mu'minīn رضي الله عنه—as is the view of the Shī'āh—then this is tantamount to altering the meaning of the Qur'ān.

و كيف يجوز لاحد من المسلمين ان يتكلم بمثل هذا و يبدل كلام الله من تلقاء نفسه و يحرفه عن موضعه
فيا حسرة عليهم لما لا يتفكرون في هذه الايات اليس فيهم رجل رشيد

How can it ever be possible for a Muslim to blurt out such drivel and change the speech of Allah سبحانه و تعالی from his side and alter its implication? Shame on them! Why do they not ponder and reflect over these verses? Is there no sane man in their midst?

If we leave aside the Qur'ānic verses and religious beliefs for a moment, and just ponder over it logically, then according to the Shīʿī creed, the religion of Islam is the weakest of all the world's religions and its leader the most unsuccessful of all leaders. The outcome of such a belief is that those very individuals who listened to the Qur'ān directly from Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم and benefitted from

1 Sūrah al-Fatḥ: 18-21.

Rasūlullāh's ﷺ companionship, who were the first to embrace Islam and spend their lives assuring that the word of Allah ﷻ reigns supreme; all with the exception of a handful reneged immediately when their leader passed away. The beautiful moral jewel of truthfulness, fidelity, and honesty which illuminated and decorated their hearts fell out from their hearts in a batting of an eye. The outcome of such a belief is that Islam—which is believed to be the best religion—is the worst religion and the ummah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, which is thought to be the most superior ummah, is in fact the most despicable one. When we look at other religions, even the Buddhists, Hindus, idol, and Fire-worshippers; and study the lives of those who were its first adherents, we do not find in any religion that the first believers forgot the guidance and advices of their leader and neglected its teachings as quickly as the first followers of Islam, as suggested by the Shī'ah. Thus, we have no choice but to understand the religion of Islam to be excluded from this natural system and to accept that its initiator's advice and guidance is so hopeless and ineffective that the effects did not last on 124 000 Muslims and did not prevent them from falling into apostasy and returning to kufr, except for a small handful. Allah forbid!

Such an absurd deduction is frowned on by the enemies, forget the Muslims. The lives of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ forced them to acknowledge not only their devotion, but their superiority over the companions of Sayyidunā Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام and Sayyidunā 'Īsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام.

The testimony of the Christian historian Sir William Muir about the superiority of the Ṣaḥābah

Any person who studies the writings of the disbelievers—notwithstanding their disbelief in nubuwwah—in favour of Islam and the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ will automatically declare that those disbelievers who gave an unprejudiced view regarding the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ are more impartial than the Shī'ah who label them as disbelievers, hypocrites, and apostates. Look at what Sir William Muir—a Christian and by no means a friend of Islam—was forced to declare after studying the incidents of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ. He writes in his book *Life of Mahomet*:

Thirteen years before the Hijrah, Mecca lay lifeless in this debased state. What a change had those thirteen years now produced! A band of several hundred persons had rejected idolatry, adopted the worship of One God, and surrendered themselves implicitly to the guidance of what they believed a Revelation from Him; praying to the Almighty with frequency and fervour, looking for pardon through His mercy, and striving to follow after good works, almsgiving, purity, and justice. They now lived under a constant sense of the omnipotent power of God, and of His providential care over the minutest of their concerns. In all the gifts of nature, in every relation of life, at each turn of their affairs, individual or public, they saw His hand. And, above all, the new existence in which they exulted was regarded as the mark of His especial grace; while the unbelief of their blinded fellow citizens was the hardening stamp of reprobation. Mahomet was the minister of life to them, the source under God of their new-born hopes; and to him they yielded an implicit submission.

In so short a period Mecca had, from this wonderful movement, been rent into two factions which, unmindful of the old landmarks of tribe and family, arrayed themselves in deadly opposition one against the other. The Believers bore persecution with a patient and tolerant spirit. And though it was their wisdom so to do, the credit of a magnanimous forbearance may be freely accorded. One hundred men and women, rather than abjure their precious faith, had abandoned home and sought refuge, till the storm should be overpast, in Abyssinian exile. And now again a still larger number, with the Prophet himself, were emigrating from their fondly loved city with its sacred Temple, to them the holiest spot on earth, and fleeing to Medina. There, the same marvellous charm had within two or three years been preparing for them a brotherhood ready to defend the Prophet and his followers with their blood.¹

The testimony of the Christian historian Godfrey Higgins

Godfrey Higgins writes in his book titled, *An apology for the life and character of the celebrated prophet of Arabia called Mohamed or the Illustrious*:

¹ *The life of Mohamet* p. 162.

Notwithstanding many striking traits of resemblance may be perceived between circumstances in the early histories of Jesus and of Mohamed, yet there are many others in which they as decidedly differ. The twelve first proselytes of Jesus are allowed to have been uneducated men, in the most humble situations of life. On the contrary, it appears that, with the exception of his slave, the first of Mohamed's proselytes were persons of high respectability; and their splendid actions as Caliphs and leaders of the Mohamedan armies, prove them to have possessed first-rate talents, and not to have been men likely to be easily deceived. In the humble characters of the first disciples of Jesus, Mr. Mosheim professes to see much glory to the Christian cause. I am obliged to confess, if I must speak the truth, that, on the contrary, it would have been full as satisfactory to me to have seen among its earliest professors men possessing such characters as those of the Antonines, of Locke, or of Newton. But this only proves how differently the same object appears to different persons.¹

Historian Gibbon's testimony:

The famous historian Gibbon writes:

The first four Caliphs systems were similar, genuine and exemplary. Their services were rendered with the highest level of sincerity and despite attaining supremacy and dominance; they spent their lives in fulfilling their religious and moral obligations. These were the very same people who accompanied Mohamet in the beginning stages before he gained authority. They took their swords and stood at his side at a time when he was the open target. They saved their lives and fled from their city. Their changing their religion from the beginning is testimony to their truthfulness and their conquests of the kingdoms of the world shows the power of their capacity.

In such a situation, can anyone believe that such persons, who bore persecution, were prepared to leave their homelands, and religiously obeyed him صلى الله عليه وسلم; this was done for a man who had all types of evil and

1 Pg. 10.

was for something contrary to their nature and to the prejudices of their early lives. No one can believe this. This is beyond the ambit of possibility.

It is beneficial for the Christians to remember that the teachings of Mohamet gave birth to such religious adherence amongst its adherents which cannot be possibly found in the first followers of Jesus and his religion spread like wild fire which is unparalleled even by the Christian religion. Consequently, in less than half a century, Islam overpowered many superpowers and grand kingdoms. When Jesus was taken to be crucified, his followers fled and left their leaders in the clutches of death. If, hypothetically, they were forbidden from protecting him, they should have stayed on for consolation and threatened his and their persecutors patiently. Adversely, the followers of Mahomet rallied around their oppressed Messenger, put their lives on the line for his protection and routed all of his enemies.

How nicely will the condition of the Shī'ah change and how beautifully their religion will be reformed if they remember the advice this Christian historian gives to his brethren. The Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ possessed stronger hearts, more perfect imān, and greater sincerity than the ḥawāriyyīn of Sayyidunā 'Īsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام and were prepared to sacrifice their lives to protect their Nabī صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. However, it is remorseful that they do not accept those historical events which even the disbelievers accept and reject those outstanding and extra-ordinary feats achieved by Islam which proves its greatness, truthfulness, and superiority.

Sir William in his book *Life of Mahomet* writes when comparing the ḥawāriyyīn of Sayyidunā 'Īsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام to the Muhājirīn and Anṣār رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ:

Both (Jesus and Mahomet) are equal when it comes to bearing difficulties and rejecting worldly desires until the era in which they can be compared. However, Mohamet's teachings of thirteen years in comparison to the former's entire lifetime brought such a transformation which is extremely exceptional in the sight of man. All the followers of Jesus bolted as soon as

they heard the sound of danger. The teachings of our Lord had no outward effect on those five hundred people who saw him, despite the deep effect it had on their hearts. None of them left their homes willingly, neither did thousands of them choose to emigrate together like the Muslims, nor did anyone display the fervour displayed by one small town's (Yathrib) new Muslims who protected their Messenger at the expense of their own blood.

Sir William Muir's books

The above-mentioned quotes were regarding the Muhājirīn and Anṣār رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُم in general. I will now quote his declaration regarding Sayyidunā Shaykhayn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمَا. He writes regarding Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ in his book titled *Annals of the Early Caliphate*:

Till the last breath, Abu Bakr did not allow the horizon of his heart and mind's clarity and power to be clouded. As we have previously mentioned, he went to office on the last day of his life, pondered over the sensitive situation, and commanded Umar, "Prepare an army as quickly as possible and despatch them to Iraq." In his last illness, these couplets came from his tongue about this fleeting world and its temporary beauty.

اون ایسا ہے جو حشمت و مال و متاع	اپنے وارث کو نہیں جاتا تے جہور انجام کار
ایک دن اس شخص کا بھی مال لوٹتا جائے گا	جس نے ہو کر بے دہرک کی ہے بہت سی لوٹت مار
لوٹت کر! جائے گا اک دن سفر سے بالضرور	گر مسافر نے سفر کوئی کیا ہے اختیار
موت کے رستے سے لیکن لوٹنا ممکن نہیں	سخت جاں فرسا ہے اور بیہت بہرا یہ راہ گزار

A person who was sitting beside his bed quoted some relative couplets of a poet of the era of ignorance. Abu Bakr was upset at this and forbid him from the same and told him to rather say:

وَجَاءَتْ سَكْرَةُ الْمَوْتِ بِالْحَقِّ ذَلِكَ مَا كُنْتَ مِنْهُ تَحِيدُ

And the intoxication of death will bring the truth; that is what you were trying to avoid.¹

1 Sūrah Qāf: 19.

His last words spoken were that he called Umar to him and passed on to him lengthy advice. He said, "This is my final bequest. Mix harshness with leniency."

After a little while, he began feeling dizzy and understood that the time to depart was nearing. He uttered these words and left this temporary world, "O Allah! Make me die a true believer. O Allah! Raise me among those whom You have blessed."

After ruling for two years and three months, Abu Bakr died on the 22nd of August 634. His wife Asma and his son Abd al-Raḥmān gave him ghusl as per his bequest. He was shrouded in the same clothes he was wearing at the time of his death because he said, "New clothes are befitting for the living while old clothes are for the dead who are going to be food for the worms."

Those who lifted the bier of Mahomet lifted his bier and he was buried beside Mahomet. The Caliph's head rested next to the shoulder of his master. Umar led his funeral prayer. There was no need to take the bier far, only the courtyard of Masjid al-Nabawī had to be crossed since Abu Bakr passed away in the very house which Mahomet allocated for him in front of his own from where one could easily gaze at the spacious courtyard of Masjid al-Nabawī. Abu Bakr passed the majority of his time as Caliph in this house. After the demise of Mahomet, however, he lived for six months at Sunh like before which was situated near Medina. He had a humble residence here which was made of leaves of date-palm tree. He would live here with his wife Habiba – whom he married upon his arrival at Medina – and her relatives. At the time of his demise, she was pregnant and gave birth to a daughter shortly thereafter.

Every morning, Abu Bakr would go barefoot to Masjid al-Nabawī where Mahomet would reside in his lifetime to fulfil the obligations of the state. Umar would fill in for him in his absence. On Friday, when he had to deliver a lecture, he would stay at home till noon. On that day, he would apply dye to his hair and beard and would take extra precaution to the cleanliness of his clothes.

He would bring fodder for the goats of his house himself and would milk them himself. In the beginning, he relied on trade for his household expenses. However, when he realised that doing so affected the affairs of the state, he left all other duties and accepted 6000 dirhams (silver coins) annually to cover his expenses.

Since Sunh was situated at a distance from Masjid al-Nabawī – where the state affairs were attended to in Mahomet’s lifetime – he thus moved residence here and also shifted the treasury here. The Islamic treasury in those days was very simple. There was neither any need for a guard to protect it nor an office for records. The tax was distributed among the poor or spent on war artillery and supplies. Spoils of war, gold and silver – no matter where it came from, village or other – was spent immediately or the next morning. Everyone’s share was equal in this distribution – whether new or old Muslim, male or female, slave or free-man. All the Arab Muslims had the same claim over the treasury. When anyone would say, “I deserve a greater share because of my early Islam,” Abu Bakr would reply, “This is the speech of Allah. Allah Himself will reward those who are more deserving in the next life. This reward or favour is only applicable to this life.”

Upon his demise, Umar opened the treasury and found only 1 gold coin which must have fallen from one of the bags. Seeing this, everyone broke down into tears and sought forgiveness for him and sent blessings upon him. The allowance he took from the treasury was on his conscience. Hence, he gave orders before his demise to sell some of his land and repay the amount he had taken.

Abu Bakr had a very soft and tolerant temperament. Umar has declared, “There is no one for whom people will sacrifice their lives more happily and willingly than Abu Bakr.” He had such a soft heart, that people gave him the nickname ‘The one with cold breath’. Besides one instance when he burnt a mischief maker, which he always regretted, no act of unkindness was displayed by him.

Abu Bakr’s royal court had the same colours of simplicity and humbleness like that of Mahomet’s This couplet aptly describes it:

Pomp and glory is a veil. The inside of this court was not a court.

There was no trace of the pomp, glory, pride and splendour generally associated with royal courts in his. He was ever ready and eager to execute affairs of the state. He would patrol the streets on most nights alone to see to the needs of the needy and hard-pressed. One night, Umar found him at the house of an old blind widow who was struggling whose need he was fulfilling. The judicial court was assigned to Umar. Then again narrations suggest that in a year's time, hardly two claimants opened a case. The words 'What an Almighty is Allah' was inscribed on the official stamp. Ali was assigned to correspondence. Abu Bakr would take help from Zayd – the scribe of Mahomet and the compiler of the Qur'an – Uthman or whichever literate person was around him when the need arose. Favouritism was never a feature in appointing his representatives to high posts and as army generals. His opinion and judgement regarding administration was always sound and correct.

Abu Bakr did not lack determination and will power. Despatching the army under the command of Usamah and protecting Medina from other disbelieving nations in such a situation when he stood alone and there were dangerous threats from all sides is evidence for his courage and pluck which proved successful in extinguishing the fire of mischief and anarchy and stopping the tidal wave of rebellion. The secret of his will power was that firm faith he had brought upon Mahomet. He would say, "Do not address me as the caliph of Allah for I am the caliph of the Messenger of Allah."

He would always be plagued with this question, "What is the command of Mahomet or what would he do had he been alive?" When practicing on the answer to this question, he would not hesitate for a second. In this way, he annihilated polythiesm and idol worship and established the foundation of Islam. Although his rule was concise, there is no one after Mahomet to whom Islam is more indebted and obliged than him. Since belief in Mahomet was imbedded firmly in his heart and this belief is strong evidence to the sincerity and truthfulness of the Messenger, therefore I have dedicated a greater portion of my book to describing his life and qualities.

Had Mahomet known from the beginning that he was an imposter, he would have been unable to make such a person a friend and devotee who was not only intelligent, bright, and smart but also simple and a votary of honesty. Abu Bakr did not have the feeling of greatness or prominence. Royal power and the reigns of authority were in his hands, yet he only utilised this power and authority for the betterment of Islam and benefit of the creation. His alertness and vigilance prevented him from being deceived, and he was too devout to deceive others.

Sir William Muir writes concerning Sayyidunā ‘Umar Fārūq رضي الله عنه:

Umar passed away on the 26th of Dhu al-Hijjah 231 A.H after 10 and half years of leadership. He was the greatest conqueror in the Islamic empire after Mahomet since it was the fruits of his intelligence and courage that in these ten years, the Levant, Egypt and Persia were conquered – which remained under Islamic rule since. Abu Bakr was successful in defeating the polythiest tribes, but the armies of Islam only reached the borders of the Levant in his time. When Umar assumed caliphate, he only had control over the Arabs. However, at his demise, he was the caliph of a great empire which included Persia, Egypt, the Levant and Byzantine – some of the most captivating and attractive countries in his empire. Despite his administration of such a great empire, there was no need for him to level his insight or power of judgement. He did not give himself a superior title than the simple title given to him by the Arab leaders. People would come from far countries, gaze at the courtyard of Masjid al-Nabawī and then ask as to where the Caliph was whereas the king wearing simple clothes was sitting right before him.

To sketch the biography of Umar needs only a few lines. Simplicity and steadfastness on his obligations were his key principles. Fulfilling all his obligations diligently without the smell of favouritism became his

1 Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه was attacked on Wednesday 26th Dhū al-Ḥijjah 23 A.H (3rd November 644) in ṣalāt al-fajr. He passed away on the 29th of Dhū al-Ḥijjah 23 A.H. He was buried on the 1st of Muḥarram 24 A.H on Saturday.

speciality. Answering for this great responsibility would be so worrying that he would often say: "I wish my mother hadn't given birth to me. I wish I was a blade of grass instead."

He had a hot temperament and got angry very quickly. During his youth and during the lifetime of Mahomet he was considered strict and orthodox. He was prepared to unsheathe his sword and it was none other than him who voiced the opinion to assassinate the prisoners after the Battle of Badr. However, time and leadership changed his strict nature into one of tolerance. His justice and fairness reached perfection. Besides his treatment of Khalid with wrath which was due to his detestation of the latter's irresponsible ill treatment of an overpowered enemy – there was no action of his which had even the smell of injustice or oppression.

Favouritism and nepotism did not feature in his appointment of army generals and governors. The appointment of all besides Mughirah and Ammar was appropriate and proper. The different groups and organisations of his empire which were delegated various tasks and responsibilities had full reliance on his power and devoutness. His powerful shoulders supported the running of the affairs of courts and state efficiently.

Complaints came from Basrah and Kufah. There seems to be some weakness in the changing and replacement of the governors at different places. Nonetheless, he kept an iron fist on the villagers and Mecca's surroundings and they did not have the pluck to cause mischief in Islam as long as he was alive. He would keep the prominent Companions with him in Medina. The reason for this was no doubt partly to gain strength from their counsel and advice and partly (as he himself said), "I do not desire to appoint them to a position lower than me thereby tainting their honour."

With whip in hand, he would patrol the streets and markets of Medina and punish the criminal there and then. It became proverbial: "Umar's whip was more frightening than the swords of others." However, coupled with this was his extreme soft heart. There are innumerable incidents about his tolerance and mercy. For example, aiding the widows and orphans. I will

mention one incident here. Once, he was travelling in Arabia in a year of famine. He passed by a nomad poor woman sitting next to a fire with her children who were howling out of extreme hunger. The poor woman put an empty pot on the stove to soothe the children. Seeing this, Umar ran to the next village and brought some meat and bread. He put the meat into the pot, cooked a delicious meal, and fed the children himself. He moved forward only after seeing them playing and laughing.

I have hope that unbiased readers will acknowledge that such incidents compelled the Christians to praise Islam and to voice the outstanding character and excellent attributes of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ. Perplexing indeed is when people who call themselves Muslims reject these incidents and declare the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ in general to be deprived of Islam and character. Remorsefully, man no matter how intelligent and academic he may be but religious bigotry and ancestral blind following has always prevented him from accepting and acknowledging the truth. They see the sun shining bright, but reject the same. Such a veil is cast over their eyes which totally blinds them. This is the very same story with the Shī'ah. The Islam and outstanding character of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ is as bright as the sun at noon; the Qur'ān testifies to the same, the enemies of Islam attest to it, yet the Shī'ah remain stubborn and prejudice and are ever willing, in fact proud to label 124000 Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ as murtaddīn and munāfiqīn.

Can the foundation of Islam be strengthened and fortified by claiming that Rasūlullāh's صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ 23 years of tireless efforts with īmān and sincerity coupled with teaching and disseminating the divine guidance with the strength and help of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, brought forth 124000 men who brought īmān outwardly but, besides four, there were no true Muslims among them who sincerely believed from their hearts in Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and his Rasūl صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and followed their commands? Leave alone that, they were not only deprived of īmān but were hard hearted oppressors and killers. As soon as Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ passed away, they began looting his house in whose shade they were brought up and began oppressing his children which they claimed that they loved and will obey. Such oppression which the eyes of the skies never witnessed before. Such wicked ideologies by

a sect of the Muslims will give the disbelievers chance to say that the objective of nubuwwah was only the establishment of a worldly empire which gathered around its originator a group of selfish, evil, and materialistic people who looted and killed out of greed for authority and kingdom. The hearts of those thousands of men who lived day and night in the company of Rasūlullāh ﷺ were not affected in the least by the teachings of the Qurʾān and by the advices of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. The relationship of sincerity, obedience, belief, and love found between a true Messenger and his followers was not found between the founder of Islam and its followers. But, both sides were desirous and ready to acquire their own objectives. Two conflicting forces were working to reach their goals. The leader desired that the kingdom and leadership established by his efforts must remain with his children and no one else must have a share in it while on the other hand his followers were desirous of receiving the fruits of their strenuous efforts and taking control of the reigns of the kingdom after their leader.

This explanation of mine is by no means an exaggeration or an unsubstantiated accusation against Shīʿī doctrines. This is nothing but the crux of those incidents which the Shīʿah firmly belief in and upon which rests the foundation of their creed. According to their thinking, nothing else is learnt but that Rasūlullāh's ﷺ aspiration from the day of his nubuwwah till his demise was only that Sayyidunā ʿAlī رضي الله عنه becomes khalīfah after him, and until the Day of Qiyāmah religion and worldly kingdom must remain in their family from generation to generation. Therefore, according to the Shīʿah, Rasūlullāh ﷺ expressed this desire of his in many different ways and left no stone unturned to reach this goal. There was no moment in privacy or in public, on journey or at home, in times of peace or battle, in health or in sickness in which Rasūlullāh ﷺ did not express this desire explicitly or implicitly and did not voice the command and message of Allah ﷻ regarding it. Rasūlullāh ﷺ also sounded grand virtues and various rewards for those who follow this command and different punishments and reprimands for those who fail to comply. Rasūlullāh's ﷺ final attempt was at Ghadīr Khum where he proclaimed this in clear words in front of a gathering of a hundred thousand men and took an undertaking from

every one of Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s ﷺ khilāfah thereby fortifying his successor in every possible way. Voices were raised with shouts of congratulations from all four sides and happiness enveloped the earth, yet astonishing is the enmity, hypocrisy, and unanimity of the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ that besides four, none of them considered this nor did anyone acknowledge the khilāfah of Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ which was established with such glory. In fact, as soon as Rasūlullāh ﷺ closed his eyes, they turned away from this covenant. The worst thing is that they actually displayed ignorance with regards to the actual incident. They unanimously agreed to the extent that it is as if the incident never transpired and Rasūlullāh ﷺ did not announce his successor publicly. If there were any remnants of this incident, then it was only Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ statement:

انى تارك فيكم الثقلين كتاب الله و عترتى

I am leaving for you the two weighty things viz. the book of Allah ﷻ and my family.

If someone acknowledged anything, then it is only this prophetic statement:

من كنت مولاه فعلى مولاه

Whose guardian I am, ‘Alī is his guardian.

And the meaning and crux of this was to love him and consider him. However, instead of loving him they displayed open hatred for him and took revenge on him. They forgot Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ bequest, threw the Qur’ān behind their backs, and broke their covenant. In this way, they renounced the dīn.

In my understanding, I do not know what reliance can be placed on nubuwwah and Sharīah since these very people – who have corrupt qualities and wicked character – are the pillars of Islam. The Qur’ān reached us through them and we learnt of Rasūlullāh ﷺ through them. They taught us of the revelation of the Qur’ān, Sayyidunā Jibrīl’s ﷺ descending, and Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ

angelic qualities. There is nothing far-fetched if such irreligious, unprincipled, tyrannical, oppressive, untrustworthy, wicked, evil, and greedy people who conspired among themselves and appointed a leader [i.e. Rasūlullāh ﷺ] whose fabricated good qualities they publicised to hoodwink people, with the sole intent of earning worldly pleasures and usurping the rights of the creation. They issued false commands in his name, fabricated principles, and publicised his nubuwwah just to deceive mankind. They fabricated the Qur’ān by some eloquent Arabs and attributed it to him.

A group who were so wicked and such masters in conspiracy that they were able to conceal a matter their leader lectured on his whole life, which the Qur’ān was revealed for, which their leader emphasised day in and day out publicly and privately, and prior to his demise announced in front of 70000 – 124000 people. An announcement which was heard by the earth and sky, trees and rocks, and man and jinn. A matter which he announced very eloquently and with much fervour and enthusiasm. The matter of the khilāfah of his successor which he established and took allegiance at Ghadīr Khum in front of everyone. In fact the words of Allah ﷻ were revealed with a stamp of approval:

الْيَوْمَ أَكْمَلْتُ لَكُمْ دِينَكُمْ وَأَتَمَمْتُ عَلَيْكُمْ نِعْمَتِي وَرَضِيتُ لَكُمُ الْإِسْلَامَ دِينًا

This day I have perfected for you your religion and completed My favour upon you and have approved for you Islam as religion.¹

Besides all of this, they concealed this matter, forget about practicing upon it, and rejected its very existence thus disbelieving in *naṣṣ jalī* (explicit categorical command), and *naṣṣ khafī* (implicit categorical command). For such people whose conspiracies are beyond human nature and who can conceal a matter publicised in front of 70000 men, it is nothing far-fetched if they fabricated this whole nubuwwah structure and appointed someone as a nabī by propagation of their baseless ideas. Even if we accept that Rasūlullāh ﷺ himself dissociated from

1 Sūrah al-Mā'idah: 3.

them, and those who propagated his commands and sharī'ah were his household members and some other special people, then too these individuals are so few in number that they do not exceed the number ten. Moreover, whatever knowledge reached the people from them was via the intermediary of the Muhājirīn, Anṣār, and other Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم. Their nature was such that they publicised what they wanted and enforced whatever they desired and though they were few, they commanded such awe that everyone else would obey them and fall into their deceptive claws. So just as it is possible that out of jealousy and hatred they concealed the imāmah (naṣṣ jalī) of Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه and fabricated aḥādīth in order to usurp the rights of the Ahl al-Bayt and draw people towards their side, then it is likely possible that they changed the entire Sharī'ah and propagated the very opposite of what Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم actually preached. It is possible that they altered the Qur'ān, modified ṣalāh, and changed the rulings of ḥajj and zakāh to suit their whims and fancies. If these are possibilities – and why should they not be since the possibilities I list form part of the belief system of the Shī'ah – then the obvious result of this will be that reliance cannot be placed on the Sharī'ah and no aspect of Islam remains credible.

If the Shī'ah, by labelling the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم as immoral and apostates, are happy with this conclusion, then it is fine. That is their problem. However, those who have faith in Islam shiver at the thought of this. They dissociate themselves from it and believe these things to be impossible.

Point 3

If those narrations the Shī'ah narrate which mention the usurpation of Fadak and oppression upon Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها are regarded as authentic, it will tarnish the reputation of Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه and the Banū Hāshim as far as their proverbial bravery, valour, and courage is concerned. One is utterly puzzled that they did not confront the oppressors and remained silent and bore watching all the atrocities like weaklings. The alleged atrocities afflicted upon Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها are not trivial. To remain silent and adopt tolerance upon them are not praiseworthy neither religiously, nor intellectually or morally. In fact, to

confront the oppressors is among the obligations of dīn. If only Fadak was usurped or wealth was stolen, then ṣabr could be adopted. But when Sayyidah Fāṭimah was allegedly physically abused, Sayyidunā Muḥassin رضي الله عنه was martyred, and Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm رضي الله عنها was abducted; it is never permissible to adopt ṣabr and remain silent in the face of such cruelties.

The Shī'ah answer this in a few ways:

Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه was forced to act in this way as this was the strict command of Allah سُبْحَانَكَ وَبِحَمْدِكَ which he could not possibly oppose. The narration appears in *Uṣūl al-Kāfi*¹ of al-Kulaynī:

حدثني موسى بن جعفر قال قلت لابي عبد الله اليس كان امير المؤمنين كاتب الوصية و رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم اطمعل عليه و جبريل و الملكة المقربون عليه السلام شهود قال فاطرق طويلا ثم قال يا ابا الحسن قد كان ما قلت و لكن حين نزل برسول الله الامر نزلت الوصية من عند الله كتابا مسجلا انزل به جبريل مع اماء الله تبارك و تعالى من الملكة فقال جبريل يا محمد باخراج من عندك الا وصيك يقبضها منا و تشهدنا بدفعك اياها اليه ضامنا لها يعني عليا فامر النبي باخراج من كان في البيت ما خلا عليا و فاطمة فيما بين السر و الباب فقال جبريل يا محمد ربك يقرئك السلام و يقول هذا كتاب ما كنت عهدت اليك و شرطت عليك و شهدت به عليك و اشهدت به عليك ملائكتي و كفى بي يا محمد شهيد قال فارتعدت مفاصل النبي و قابل يا جبريل ربي هو السلام و منه السلام و اليه يعود السلام صدق عز و جل و برهات الكتاب فدفعه اليه و امره بدفعه الى امير المؤمنين فقال له اقراه و قراه حرفا فقال يا علي هذا عهد ربي تبارك و تعالى الي و شرحه الي و امانته و قد بلغت و نصحت و اديت فقال علي و انا اشهد لك بابي انت و امي بالبلاغ و النصيحة و التصديق على ما قلت و يشهد لك به سمعي و بصري و لحمي و دمي فقال جبريل و انا لكما على ذلك من الشاهدين فقال رسول الله يا علي اخذت وصيتي و عرفتها و ضمننت لله و لى الوفاء بما فيها فقال على نعم بابي انت و امي على ضمانهما و على الله دعوتى و توفيقى على ادايتها فقال رسول الله يا علي اني اريد ان اشهد عليك بموافاتي بها يوم القيامة فقال على نعم اشهد فقال النبي ان جبريل و ميكائيل فيما بيني و بينك الان و هما حاضران معهما الملكة المقربون لاشهدهم عليك فقال نعم ليشهدوا و انا بابي و امي اشهدهم فاشهدهم رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم و كان فيما اشترط عليه النبي بامر جبريل فيما امر الله عز و جل ان قال له يا علي تفى بما فيها من موالاته من والى الله و رسوله و البراءة و العداوة لمن عادى الله و رسوله و البراءة منهم على الصبر منك على كظم الغيظ و على ذهاب حقك و غضب خمسك و انتهاك حرمك فقال نعم يا رسول الله فقال امير المؤمنين و الذى خلق الحبة و برا النسمة لقد سمعت جبريل يقول للنبي يا محمد عرفه انه ينتهك الحرمه و هي حرمه الله و حرمة رسوله صلى الله عليه و سلم و على ان تخضب لحيته من راسه بدم عبيط قال امير المؤمنين فصعقت حين فهمت

1 *Kitāb al-Hujjah* pg. 172.

الكلمة من الامين جبريل حتى سقطت على وجهي و قلت نعم قبلت و رضيت و ان انتهك الحرمة و عطلت السنن و مزق الكتاب و هدم الكعبة و خضبت لحيتي من راسي بدم عبيط صابرا محتسبا ابدا حتى اقدم عليك ثم دعى رسول الله فاطمة و الحسن و الحسين و اعدلهم مثل ما اعدلم امير المؤمنين فقالوا مثل قوله فتختمت الوصية بخواتيم من ذهب لم يمسه النار و دفعت الى امير المؤمنين فقلت لابي الحسن بابي انت و امي لا تذكر ما كان في الوصية فقال سنن الله و سنن رسوله فقلت اكان في الوصية يوتيههم و خلافهم على امير المؤمنين فقال نعم و الله شيئا شيئا و حرفا اما سمعت قول الله عز و جل إِنَّا نَحْنُ نُحْيِي الْمَوْتَى وَنَكْتُبُ مَا قَدَّمُوا وَآثَرَهُمْ وَكُلُّ شَيْءٍ أَحْصَيْنَاهُ فِي إِمَامٍ مُّبِينٍ لقد قال رسول الله لامير المؤمنين و فاطمة اليس قد فهمتنا ما قدمت به اليكما و قبلتماه فقالا بلى مقبولة و صبرنا على ما ساءنا و غاظنا

Mūsā ibn Ja'far has stated that he asked Abū 'Abd Allah, "Was not Amīr al-Mu'minīn the writer of the bequest Rasūlullāh ﷺ dictated to him and were not Jibrīl and the close angels present as witness?"

Abū 'Abd Allah kept silent for a long while and then said, "O Abū al-Ḥasan, it is as you have said. Moreover, when the command was revealed to Rasūlullāh ﷺ, a covenant from Allah ﷻ was revealed in a registered document brought by Jibrīl with the special angels of Allah ﷻ. Jibrīl said, 'O Muḥammad! Evacuate all those who are with you except your waṣī, i.e. 'Alī, who will take possession of this from us and we will be witness to handing it over to him with a solemn pledge.'

Rasūlullāh ﷺ thus ordered everyone to leave besides 'Alī. Fāṭimah was between the veil and the door.

Jibrīl said, 'O Muḥammad! Your Rabb conveys salām to you and He says that this is a document which He has not pledged upon you, nor made conditional upon you, nor made you witness over, nor made His angels witness over. In fact, He Himself is sufficient as witness O Muḥammad.'

A shudder went through the joints of al-Nabī ﷺ and he responded, 'O Jibrīl, my Rabb is al-Salām and peace is from Him and peace returns to Him. Allah – the Majestic, Powerful and Beneficent – has spoken the truth. Bring me the document.'

Jibrīl handed it over to him and he ordered that it be handed over to Amīr al-Mu'minīn. He commanded him, 'Read it' and he read it word for word.

Rasūlullāh ﷺ said, ‘O ‘Alī, this is my Rabb’s – the Blessed and High – covenant to me, His commentary and His trust. I have conveyed it, been a well-wisher, and fulfilled the obligation.’

‘Alī said, ‘I testify that you have conveyed it and you are a well-wisher and have spoken the truth, may my parents be sacrificed for you. My hearing, sight, flesh and blood testifies to this for you.’

Jibrīl added, ‘I am also a witness with you over it.’

Rasūlullāh ﷺ then said, ‘Alī, you have taken my bequest and understood it and stood guarantee for Allah and for me to fulfil what is in it.’

‘Alī replied in the affirmative and commented, ‘May my parents be sacrificed for you for its guarantee. With Allah rests my supplication and capability to fulfil it.’

Rasūlullāh ﷺ said, ‘Alī, I wish to bear witness to your fulfilment of it on the Day of Qiyāmah.’

‘Alī replied in the affirmative.

Nabī ﷺ said, ‘Indeed I make Jibrīl and Mikā’īl who are present before us with all the close angels witness upon you.’

‘Alī said, ‘Yes. They should bear witness, may my parents be sacrificed for you, and I make them witness.’

Thus Rasūlullāh ﷺ made them witness. Among the things that Rasūlullāh ﷺ instructed him with the command received by Jibrīl from Allah ﷻ was that he said, ‘O ‘Alī! Fulfil the order which is in it to befriend those who befriend Allah and His Rasūl and to dissociate and harbour enmity for those who are enemies of Allah and His Rasūl. And that you will adopt ṣabr and withhold your anger when your rights are trampled, your fifth is usurped, and you are humiliated.’

‘Alī responded in the affirmative and declared, ‘By the Being who created Jannah and created the soul, I heard Jibrīl say to Rasūlullāh ﷺ to inform me that my honour will be tarnished and this is the honour of Allah and His Rasūl ﷺ and that my beard will be soaked with blood oozing from my head.’

He continues, ‘I fell unconscious when I understood the words Jibrīl al-Amīn spoke and I fell down on my face. I said, ‘Yes, I accept and I am pleased even if I am humiliated, the sunan are discarded, the Kitāb is ripped apart, the Ka’bah is destroyed and my beard is dyed with blood from my head. I will always bear patiently, hoping for rewards until I reach Him.’

Then Rasūlullāh ﷺ called Fāṭimah, Ḥasan, and Ḥusayn and told them what he told Amīr al-Mu’minīn and they replied in a similar way. The document was signed with rings of gold which fire did not touch and it was handed over to Amīr al-Mu’minīn.”

Mūsā says that he asked Abū al-Ḥasan, “May my parents be sacrificed for you. Will you not divulge what was in the document?”

He said, “Allah’s commands and His Rasūl’s commands.”

Mūsā asked, “Was it recorded that the munāfiqīn will usurp the khilāfah?”

He replied, “Yes, by Allah! Whatever happened was recorded therein. Have you not heard the words of Allah:

إِنَّا نَحْنُ نُحْيِي الْمَوْتَىٰ وَنَكْتُبُ مَا قَدَّمُوا وَآثَارَهُمْ وَكُلَّ شَيْءٍ أَحْصَيْنَاهُ فِي إِمَامٍ مُّبِينٍ

Indeed, it is We who bring the dead to life and record what they have put forth and what they left behind, and all things We have enumerated in a clear register.”¹

1 Sūrah Yāsīn: 12.

Then Rasūlullāh ﷺ asked, “‘Alī and Fāṭimah! Have you understood what I explained to you and have you accepted and will you practice accordingly?”

They responded, “Yes indeed. We accept it and we will adopt ṣabr on whatever afflictions come our way.”

We would have accepted this answer had there been no contrary practice of Sayyidunā ‘Alī and Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنهما to it. However, we observe that on one side the Shī‘ah have elevated the ṣabr, silence, and tolerance of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه to the highest level by this alleged sealed official document from Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. And by this, they have answered all the ignorant objections the Sunnī raise due to their lack of knowledge and stupidity, i.e. why did Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه tolerate such cruelty despite his bravery and valour and why did he choose silence after seeing such brutality upon Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها. At the same time, they have narrated such incidents which clearly show the bravery, courage, and valour of the lion of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, which falsifies the alleged sealed official divine document. These contradictory narrations – like others – throw the readers into utter confusion.

One such narration is that after Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه removed Sayyidah Fāṭimah’s رضي الله عنها agent from Fadak¹ and appointed Ashja’ who persecuted the populace, they came complaining to Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. He was so angry that he went to some acquaintances there, called Ashja’ and had him killed. It was on this occasion that he spoke to Sayyidunā Khālīd ibn al-Walīd رضي الله عنه with such harshness that sent shudders down his spine after which the latter apologised and withdrew. On this occasion, he neither considered the khalīfah nor feared a battle with Sayyidunā Khālīd رضي الله عنه. On the contrary, he displayed his Hāshimī strength, his Qurayshī fury, his bravery, and the courage of a lion to the extent that not only was Sayyidunā Khālīd afraid, even Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنهما were put in their place.

1 This narration has been quoted in the discussion on the claim over Fadak. It can be viewed there.

Another narration states that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr commanded Sayyidunā Khālīd ibn al-Walīd to assassinate Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه when the latter is engaged in Ṣalāt al-Fajr. However, during ṣalāh before making salām, he changed his mind and prevented Sayyidunā Khālīd رضي الله عنه from the same postponing it to another time. When ‘Alī رضي الله عنه completed his ṣalāh, he asked Sayyidunā Khālīd رضي الله عنه as to whether he was going to fulfil the task appointed to him and the latter replied in the affirmative. Upon this, Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه choked him with his two fingers with such force that his eyes almost popped out of their sockets. He released him after persuasion from the people. Sayyidunā Khālīd رضي الله عنه however was looking for another chance to set things straight and kill Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. When he got the chance, the lion of Allah sorted him out and punished him severely. Details of this can be viewed in *Biḥār al-Anwār* and *Irshād al-Qulūb*. Since the readers will only be satisfied after reading the entire incident, I will quote it verbatim.

Mullā Bāqir al-Majlisī writes in *Kitāb al-Fitan*:

Abū Bakr sent an army with Khālīd on a mission. Everyone left Madīnah and were on its outskirts. Khālīd was wearing armour and surrounded by brave men who were given orders to obey his every command. Khālīd spotted ‘Alī returning all alone from his cultivated land without any weapons. When he came close, Khālīd had a steal lance in his hand which he picked up with the intention of striking ‘Alī on the head. The latter however snatched the lance and twisted it around the neck of the former like a necklace. After this, Khālīd returned to Abū Bakr. People tried to break it but all their attempts failed. Thereafter, blacksmiths were called. They all explained that it is impossible to take it out except by melting it with fire and there is a fear that he might lose his life. People now realised that none other than ‘Alī can save him as he put it around his neck. Allah softened steal in his hand as He had done for Dāwūd عليه السلام. Abū Bakr was forced to intercede to ‘Alī who then removed the lance by breaking it piece by piece.¹

1 *Biḥār al-Anwār* pg. 96; *Kitāb al-Kharā’ij wa al-Jarā’iḥ* pg. 123 by Quṭb al-Dīn Rāwindī.

The narration of *Irshād al-Qulūb* is as follows:

Jābir ibn ‘Abd Allah Anṣārī and ‘Abd Allah ibn ‘Abbās narrate that they were sitting with Abū Bakr during his khilāfah. It was broad daylight when suddenly Khālīd ibn al-Walīd appeared with an army. Clouds of dust rose high and the horses of the army were neighing. A millstone was wrapped around the neck of Khālīd. As soon as he came close, he alighted from his horse, entered the Masjid, and stood before Abū Bakr. People began staring at him and there was a look of extreme fear on his face. Khālīd submitted, “O son of Abū Quḥāfah! Be just. Allah put you in such a position which you are not worthy of. You have risen to this position just as a fish rises to the top of water. It only rises when it has no life left in it to move.”

Khālīd after narrating his return from Ṭā’if and his meeting with ‘Alī said, “‘Alī caught my neck with his hands and brought me down from my horse. He then dragged me and called for the mill of Ḥārith ibn Kulāh Thaqaḫī. He took the millstone and wrapped it around my neck as he pulled my neck. It was wrapped like hot pieces of iron. All my comrades just stood and watched and could not do anything. May Allah punish them! They look at ‘Alī as if he is the Angel of Death. I swear by the Being who raised the skies without any pillars, that more than 100 strong Arab men gathered to remove the millstone but were unsuccessful. Their unsuccessfulness proved that either he practiced black magic or he possesses the power of the angels.”

Abū Bakr called ‘Umar and then Qays ibn ‘Ubādah al-Anṣārī to remove the millstone but they could not. Khālīd remained in this condition with the millstone wrapped around his neck. After a few days, he returned to Abū Bakr and submitted, “‘Alī has returned now from his journey. Perspiration is dripping from his forehead and his face is red.”

Hearing this, Abū Bakr sent Aqra’ ibn Surāqah and Ashwash ibn Ashja’ to call ‘Alī to the Masjid. They went and conveyed the message to ‘Alī explaining to him that Abū Bakr is calling him for some matter which has

worried him and desires that he comes to al-Masjid al-Nabawī. ‘Alī did not respond. They said, “You are not going to respond to what we came for?”

‘Alī said, “Your method is wrong. A traveller first goes to his house, then meets with others.”

Anyways, they returned from ‘Alī. Abū Bakr with a group of people including Khālid then proceeded to the house of ‘Alī. Seeing him ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ commented, “Abū Sulaymān! What a beautiful necklace you have on your neck!”

They then began reviling one another. Abū Bakr said, “We have not come for this. We are requesting you to remove the millstone from Khālid’s neck since it is harmful for him and it has left marks on his throat. You have cooled the burning sensation in your chest.”

‘Alī retorted, “Had I willed to cool the burning sensation in my chest, the sword had the complete cure. I cannot break the millstone around his neck. He should do it himself or you should assist him.”

Anyways, Buraydah, ‘Āmir ibn Ashja‘ and ‘Ammārah begged him but to no avail. Finally, Abū Bakr said, “For Allah’s سُبْحَانَكَ رَبِّيَ and for the sake of your brother Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, have mercy on Khālid and remove the millstone.”

When Abū Bakr begged in this way, ‘Alī felt ashamed since he possessed a lot of shame. He then pulled Khālid to himself, broke a piece of the millstone and began wrapping the rest around his hand like wax. He hit Khālid on the head with the first piece and with the second piece. At this Khālid begged, “O Amīr al-Mu’minīn!”

‘Alī said, “You said this word out of force. Had you not said it, I would have sliced you into two with the third piece.”

He continued breaking the millstone until it was completely removed. All those present began shouting *Allāhu Akbar* and *Lā ilāha illa Allah* and were amazed at his tremendous strength.

There is another instance when Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه – the conqueror, the one sought by every seeker, the leader of the righteous, killer of the delinquent and lion of Allah – acted contrary to the covenant and displayed his Hāshimī power and his Qurayshī strength. He even unsheathed his sword and was prepared to kill. This happened when Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه removed the gutter from Sayyidunā ‘Abbās’s رضي الله عنه house.

The narration appears in *‘Imād al-Islām*:

فلما كان بعد ايام دخل عليه العباس فقال يا رسول الله قد علمت ما بيني وبينك من القرابة والراحم الماسة وانا ممن يدين الله بطاعتك فاسأل الله تعالى ان جعل لى بابا الى المسجد اشرف به على من سواى فقال صلى الله عليه وسلم يا عم ليس لى الى ذلك سبيل قال فميزابا يكون من دارى الى المسجد اشرف به الى القريب والبعيد فسكت النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم وكان كثير الحياء لا يذرى ما يعيد من الجواب خوف من الله تعالى وحياء من عمه فحبط جبريل فى اطال على النبى وقد علم الله نبيه ما فى نفسه من ذلك فقال يا محمد ان الله يامر ان تجيب سوال عمك وامرك ان تصب له ميزابا الى المسجد كما اراد فقد علمت ما فى نفسك وقد اجبت الى ذلك كرامة لك و نعمة منى عليك وعلى عمك العباس فكبر النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم وقال ابي الله الاكرامتكم يا بنى هاشم و تفضلكم على الخلق اجمعين ثم قام و معه جماعة من الصحابة و العباس بين يديه حتى صار على سطح بيت العباس فنصب له ميزابا الى المسجد وقال معاشر المسلمين ان الله قد شرف عمى العباس بهذا الميزاب فلا تؤذوننى فى عمى فانه بقية الاباء و الاجداد فلعن الله من اذانى فى عمى او يخسه حقه او عان عليه و لم يزل الميزاب على مدة ايام النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم و خلافة ابي بكر و ثلاث سنين من خلافة عمر بن الخطاب فلما كان فى بعض الايام و عمك العباس مرض مرضا شديدا و صعدت الجارية تغسل قميصه فجرا الماء من الميزاب الى صحن المسجد فانال بعض الماء ثوبه مرقعته الرجل فغضب غضبا شديدا و قال لغلامه اصعد و اقلع الميزاب فصعد الغلام فقلعه و رمى به الى سطح العباس و قال و الله لئن رده احدا الى مكانه لاضربن عنقه فشق ذلك على العباس و دعى بولديه عبد الله و عبيد الله و نهض يمشى متوكيا عليهما و هو يرتعد من شدة المرض و سار حتى دخل على امير المؤمنين فلما نظر اليه امير المؤمنين اتزبح لذلك و قال يا عم ما جاء بك و انت على هذه الحالة فقص عليه القصة و ما فعل معه عمر من قلع الميزاب و تهدده لمن يعيده الى مكانه و قال له يا ابن اخى انه قد كان لى عينان انظر بهما فمضت احديهما و هى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم و بقيت الاخرى و هى انت يا على و ما انى اظن اظلم و يزول ما شرفنى به رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم و انت لى فانظر فى امرى فقال يا عم ارجع الى بيتك فترى ما يسرك الله ان شاء الله تعالى ثم نادى يا قنبر على بذى الفقار فتقلده هم خرج الى المسجد و الناس حوله و قال يا قنبر اصعد و رد الميزاب الى مكانه فصعد قنبر و رده الى موضعه و قال على و حق صاحب هذا القبر و المنبر لئن قلعه قانع لاضربن عنقه و عنق الامر له بذلك و لاصلبئها فى الشمس حتى ينفذوا فبلغ ذلك عمر بن الخطاب فنهض و دخل المسجد و نظر الى الميزاب و هو فى موضعه فقال لا يغضب احد بالحسن فيما فعله و

تكفر عنه عن اليمين فلما كان من الغداة مضى على بن ابي طالب الى عمه العباس فقال له كيف اصبحت يا عم قال بالفضل النعم ما ومت لى يابن اخى فقال له يا عم طب نفسك و قر عينا فولاله لو خاضمنى اهل الارض فى الميزاب لخصمتهم ثم لقتلتهم بحول الله و قوته لا ينالك ضيم و لا غم فقام العباس فقبل بين عينيه و قال يابن اخى ما خاب من انت ناصره فكان هذا فعل عمر بالعباس عم رسول الله و قد قال فى غير موطن وصية منه فى عمه ان عمى العباس بقية الاباء و الاجداد فاحفظونى فيه كل فى كنفى و انا فى كنف عمى العباس فمن اذاه فقد اذانى و من عاداه فقد عادانى فسلمه سلمى و حربيه حربى و قد اذاه عمر فى ثلث مواطن ظاهرة غير خفية منها قصة الميزاب و لولا خوفه من على عليه السلام لم يتركه على حاله

After a few days, ‘Abbās entered and requested, “O Rasūlullāh ﷺ! You are well aware of the pleasant relation we share. I am one of those who follow the dīn of Allah ﷻ coupled with obedience to you. Ask Allah ﷻ to make me a door leading to the Masjid by virtue of which I will have more honour than those besides me.”

Rasūlullāh ﷺ said, “I do not have the ability to do so.”

‘Abbās said, “Then at least a gutter from my house to the Masjid by virtue of which I will have honour over all.”

Rasūlullāh ﷺ remained silent. He possessed a lot of modesty. He was not quick to answer out of fear for Allah ﷻ and modesty for his uncle.”

Jibrīl descended upon Nabī ﷺ and Allah was aware of what was in His Nabī’s heart. Jibrīl said, “O Muḥammad! Allah commands you to accede to the request of your uncle and orders you to erect a gutter for him to the Masjid as he wants. He knows what is in your heart and He has consented to the request out of honour for you and as a favour upon you and your uncle ‘Abbās.”

Rasūlullāh ﷺ recited takbīr and commented, “Allah ﷻ intends nothing but to honour you, O Banū Hāshim, and give you superiority over the entire creation.”

He then stood up with a group of Ṣaḥābah while ‘Abbās walked ahead of him. He climbed the roof of ‘Abbās’s house and fitted a gutter to the Masjid.

He then said, “O group of Muslims! Indeed Allah has honoured my uncle ‘Abbās with this gutter. Therefore, do not harm me as far as my uncle is concerned for his is the last of my forefathers. May Allah ﷻ curse the one who hurts me with regards to my uncle, usurps his rights, or harms him.”

The gutter remained in this position for the remainder of the life of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, the khilāfah of Abū Bakr, and three years of the khilāfah of ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb. One day, his uncle ‘Abbās fell extremely ill. The slave girl ascended the roof and washed his shirt. The water passed through the gutter into the courtyard of the Masjid and some of the water fell on ‘Umar’s clothes. ‘Umar was infuriated at this and ordered his slave to climb up and remove the gutter. The slave complied and threw the gutter onto ‘Abbās’s roof. ‘Umar then warned, “If anyone fits it again, I will cut his neck off.”

‘Abbās was extremely hurt by this. He called his sons ‘Abd Allah and ‘Ubayd Allah and walked taking support on their shoulders. He was shivering due to his severe sickness. They walked until he reached Amīr al-Mu’minīn. When the latter saw him, he was deeply hurt and asked, “O uncle, what has brought you in this condition?”

‘Abbās narrated the entire incident; how ‘Umar removed the gutter and threatened regarding refitting it. He then submitted, “O nephew, I had two eyes with which I used to see. One has gone, i.e. Rasūlullāh ﷺ, and the other still remains, i.e. you O ‘Alī. I never thought that I will be oppressed and the honour Rasūlullāh ﷺ awarded me will be taken away while you are alive. Look into this matter of mine.”

‘Alī said, “O uncle, go home. You will see how Allah will please you *In shā Allah*. He then called out, “O Qambar! Bring me Dhū al-Fiqār.”

He then girded it and left for the Masjid with people surrounding him. He ordered, “O Qambar, climb and fit the gutter at its place.”

Accordingly, Qambar climbed and fitted it at its place. ‘Alī then declared, “By the right of the inmate of this grave and the owner of this pulpit, if anyone removes it, I will smite his neck and the one who ordered him to do

it, and then I will crucify them in the sun until they rot. The news reached ‘Umar who got up and entered the Masjid. He saw that the gutter was at its place and thus exclaimed, “No one should anger Abū al-Ḥasan in what he did.”

He then paid the expiation of his oath. The next day, ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib went to his uncle ‘Abbās and asked him, “How are you doing, O uncle?”

He replied, “Enjoying the greatest of pleasures as long as you live, O my nephew.”

‘Alī said, “O uncle, may your heart be at rest and may your eyes be cooled. By Allah ﷻ, if the entire earth had to combat me with regards to the gutter, I would have fought them and then killed them. By the strength and power of Allah ﷻ, no sorrow or grief will afflict you.”

‘Abbās stood up and kissed him on his forehead saying, “O my nephew, whoever you help will never be unsuccessful.” This is what ‘Umar did to ‘Abbās – the uncle of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Rasūlullāh ﷺ has mentioned ‘Abbās in many of his bequests. He said, “Indeed my uncle ‘Abbās is the remnant of my forefathers so consider me when dealing with him. Everyone is at my assistance and I am at my uncle ‘Abbās’s assistance. The one who harms him has indeed harmed me. The one who harbours hatred for him in fact harbours hatred for me. I give amnesty to whom he gives amnesty and I wage war against whom he wages war.” ‘Umar openly harmed him at three occasions. One of them is the gutter incident. Had it not been his fear for ‘Alī, he would not have spared him.¹

There is yet another narration which mentions Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s ﷺ planning to fight and kill.

بامداد ابو بکر و عمر و گروهی از مهاجر و انصار بر در سرای علی حاضر شدند تا بر فاطمه نماز گزارند مقدار بن اسود گفت فاطمه رادوش باخاک سپردند عمر روئے بابو بکر آورد الم اقل لک انهم سيفعلون ذلک گفت نگفتم چنین خواهند کرد عباس گفت فاطمه وصیت کرد که شما بروئے نماز نه گزارید فقال عمر لا تترکون یا بنی باشم حسدکم القديم

1 *Izālat al-Ghayn*.

لنا ابا ان بذه الضغائن التي في صدوركم ان تذهب و الله لقد بهمت ان ابنشها فاصلى عليها فقال على و الله لو رمت ذلك يابن صهاك لارجعت اليك يمينك لئن سللت سيفي لا اغمده دون ازباق نفسك عمر گفت اے بنی ہاشم ای حقد حسد دیرینہ کہ از مادر خاطر دارید ہر گز ترک نخواہید کرد و این کبد و کینہ کہ در سینہ نپفتہ دارید بیچ گاہ بیرون نخواہید گذاشت سو گند باخدا نے اگر بخواہم اورا از قبر بر اِرام و بروے نماز گزارم علی گفت اے پسر صهاک سو گند باخدا نے اگر این قصد کی دست راست تو با تو باز نہ گردد چه اگر شمشیر برانگیزم تا خون تو نریزم جائے جر غلاف ندبم عمر دانست کہ علی سو گند خویش را راست کنددم فروبست در خبر است کہ مہاجر و انصار در بقیع غرقد انجمن شدند و چہل قبر یافتند کہ ہمگان ہمآئند بودند و قبر فاطمہ شناختہ نمی شد از مرد ماں نالہ و نحیب بر اِمد و یک دیگر را مورد ملامت ساختند و بسرزنش و شناعت گرفتند و گفتند پیغمبر شما جز دخترے مخلف نگذاشت و او بہرد و مدفون گشت و حاضر نشدید و نماز بروے نگذاشتید و قبر اورا نشناختید چہ بے حیت مردم کہ شمائید بعضے از بزرگان قوم گفتند زنان مسلمین حاضر ندایں قبور را بنش می کند چند کہ فاطمہ را دریا بند انگاہ بروے نماز می کنیم و دیگر باوبخاک سپاریم و قبر اوشناختہ میگردد این خبر با امیر المومنین بردند اینحضرت چون شیر خشمناک از خانہ بیرون شد چشمہا نے مبارکش گوئہ طیر خون دہاشت در گہا نے و در جشن و اِگندہ از خون بود و جامہ اصغر کہ خاص روز مقاتلہ و یوم کربہ بوددر برداشت با حمائل ذو الفقار طی طریق می فرمودند تادر بقیع در اِمد مردماں یک دیگر راہمی اِنہا نمودند کہ اینک علی بن ابی طالب ست کہ باین صفت می نگرید درمی رسد و سو گند یادمی کند کہ اگر کسے این قبور سنگی را جنبش می دید این جماعت را تا بر اِخر یا تیغ در می گزارانم این وقت عمر با گروییے اینحضرت رادیدار کرد و قال لہ مالک یا ابا الحسن و اللہ انبش قبریا و نصلین علیہا فضرِب علی بیدہ الی جوامع ثوبہ فہزہ ثم ضرب بہ الارض و قال لہ یا بن اسودا ما حقى فقد ترکته مخافة ان یرتد الناس عن دینہم و اما قبر فاطمہ فو الذى نفس علی بیدہ لئن رمت و اصحابک بشیء من ذلک لاسقینا الارض من دمآکم فان شئت فاعرض یا عمر فتلقاه ابو بکر فقال یا ابا الحسن بحق رسول اللہ و بحق من فوق العرش الاخلت عنہ فانا غیر فاعلین شیئا تکریہ

When Fāṭimah passed away, ‘Alī buried her at night. The next morning, Abū Bakr and ‘Umar accompanied by some Muhājirīn and Anṣār came to ‘Alī’s house in order to perform Ṣalāt al-Janāzah. Miqdād ibn Aswad said that she was buried the night before. ‘Umar turned to Abū Bakr and commented, “Did I not tell you that they were going to do so?”

‘Abbās said that it was Fāṭimah’s bequest that they do not perform her Ṣalāt al-Janāzah. ‘Umar complained, “O Banū Hāshim! You do not abandon your old malice. By Allah, if we want, we will exhume her body and perform Ṣalāt al-Janāzah upon her.”

Hearing this, the lion of Allah went into a rage and warned, “O son of Ḍaḥḥāk! By Allah, if you intend so, then you will cease to exist because if I have to unsheathe my sword, I will not sheathe it until I spill all your blood.” ‘Umar knowing fully well that ‘Alī will fulfil his oath remained silent.

The same incident is written in these words:

After Fāṭimah was buried, the Muhājirīn and Anṣār went to Baqī. They found 40 graves which looked alike but could not make out the grave of Fāṭimah. Some said, “We will dig up all the graves, exhume the body of Fāṭimah, and perform Ṣalāt al-Janāzah upon her.”

When ‘Alī received this news, he left his house in a fit of rage – his eyes were blood-shot red and the veins of his neck were popping out. He came to Baqī wearing a yellow garb which he wore during battles with Dhū al-Fiqār in hand. The people stared at him and commented, “Do you not see with what fury and wrath he is approaching. He has taken an oath that if anyone removes even one stone from the grave, he will kill the entire group.”

When ‘Umar and some others came before him, ‘Umar said, “O Abū al-Ḥasan, what has happened to you? We will definitely exhume the body of Fāṭimah and perform her Ṣalāt al-Janāzah.”

Hearing this, he caught hold of ‘Umar’s clothes and shook him severely and threw him onto the ground saying, “O son of the black slave girl! You usurped my right of khilāfah but I remained silent out of fear that people will turn renegade and abandon dīn. But I take an oath in the Being in whose hands ‘Alī’s life lies, if you intend to dig up the grave of Fāṭimah, I will water the earth with your blood. If you wish, advance and touch the grave.”

Upon this Abū Bakr advanced and took an oath saying, “O Abū al-Ḥasan, I give you the oath of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and the Creator of the ‘Arsh, leave ‘Umar! We will not do a thing displeasing to you.”

‘Alī let go of him. All the people left and ‘Alī returned home.¹

Although these narrations are in harmony with the bravery, valour, courage, and pluck of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه but at the same time falsify the divine document fallacy. The promise and covenant given by Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه to Rasūlullāh

1 *Nāsikh al-Tawārīkh* vol. 14 pg. 141.

ﷺ in the presence of Sayyidunā Jibrīl, Mīkā'il, and the close angels that he will adopt ṣabr even though his honour is violated, he is humiliated, and the Ka'bah is destroyed has been breached. On one side, he displays tolerance – which is beyond human capacity – in such situations when it is religiously, intellectually, and morally obligatory to vent one's anger and on the other hand, in situations which are not that drastic he displays his bravery, courage, and daring to the extent that the earth and skies shudder and the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ are left shivering. In fact, such anger and wrath is displayed that he unsheathes Dhū al-Fiḡār and is prepared to kill.

These contradictory narrations about Sayyidunā 'Alī ﷺ found in Shi'ī sources are beyond human comprehension. In fact, it seems as these are the mysteries of Imāmah which cannot be understood by the angels and the great Ambiyā', so how can other people possibly fathom it! The only thing we understand is that all these narrations are baseless and have been fabricated to suit the occasion. They are nothing more than fairy-tales. If one uses his brains just a little, he will understand that such incidents are improbable as far as the splendour of Allah, His Rasūl, and the A'immaḥ are concerned. It is unimaginable that Allah ﷻ – who commanded Rasūlullāh ﷺ to convey the pristine message and who ordered the usage of the sword to protect and uphold Islam and the Muslims – emphasises upon the khilāfah, waṣī of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, the father of the A'immaḥ, the lion of Allah not to oppose the Khulafā' and to remain absolutely silent despite their oppression and tyranny and even though the family of Rasūlullāh ﷺ are humiliated, the Ka'bah is destroyed, and the Qur'ān is desecrated.

Firstly, this alleged covenant has no connection at all with the fundamentals of Islam, Allah's ﷻ general system, Rasūlullāh's ﷺ methodology, and the objective of Imāmah. In fact, it is in stark conflict to the above. If hypothetically we believe that this covenant or bequest is true and it was sent with such splendour and honour then it is surprising that it was confined to the usurpation of Fadak and the khilāfah and was not upheld at other junctions. The splendour that surrounded it was that:

- Allah ﷻ did not trust even Sayyidunā Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام maybe out of fear that he might change something
- Allah revealed it from the ‘Arsh so that no one may open it and adulterate it like the Qur’ān
- Allah sealed it with a seal from Jannah
- Allah sent the close angels to protect it
- All persons were removed from the house even though they may be part of the Ahl al-Bayt when it was handed over to Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ waṣī
- It was introduced with such words by Sayyidunā Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام that Rasūlullāh ﷺ shivered and every joint in his body shuddered
- ‘Alī the lion of Allah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ hearing it fell unconscious out of fear
- Allah considered the weight and burden of this covenant to the extent that Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ advise and Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ approval was not sufficient and it had to be coupled with the witness of Sayyidunā Jibrīl, Sayyidunā Mikā’īl, and the other close angels and a covenant was taken upon its fulfilment – when such emphasis was laid upon it

When such emphasis was laid upon it, then it is surprising that it was confined to the usurpation of Fadak and the khilāfah and was not upheld at other junctions. This covenant was so strict that there was no permission to get angry and there was a prohibition from making a hue and cry over the severest of atrocities. Notwithstanding this, with what ease and pride they narrate incidents of its violation. In trivial matters, Amīr al-Mu’minīn not only vented his anger but unsheathed Dhū al-Fiqār and was prepared to use it and did not give two hoots about the covenant to which the angels of the heavens bore witness.

Remorse and shame on such narrations which are fabricated to suit the occasion. Their only benefit is to turn the creed into a laughing stock and to level allegations against Allah ﷻ and His Rasūl ﷺ. Their contradictory nature alone is

sufficient to prove their fallaciousness. There is no need to rebut them or falsify them further.

Furthermore, it is unfathomable as to how the contents of this covenant got divulged. How did the narrators come to know the contents which were mentioned above? To divulge its contents, was breach of trust hence it is improbable to think that the A'immah disclosed it. It is learnt from the narrations that this covenant was a secret which was not to be disclosed, hence the extensive arrangement of angels accompanying it for its protection. Firstly it was written by none other than Allah ﷻ. Secondly, it was sealed. And although there was no need for it to be sealed since Sayyidunā Jibrīl and the other angels brought it and there was no fear of its contents being disclosed, yet for extra precaution it was sealed with a seal from Jannah. Thirdly, when Sayyidunā Jibrīl عليه السلام entered, he ordered that everyone be evicted and the divine command was that none besides Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه should stay. Yes, Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها was seated behind the veil and at the end the covenant was taken from her. When such drastic measures were taken surrounding this covenant, then who disclosed its contents and how did it reach the Shī'ah? No one can ever imagine Sayyidunā 'Alī, Sayyidah Fāṭimah or Sayyidunā Ḥasanayn رضي الله عنهم disclosing such a secret covenant. After them, this document remained in the hands of the A'immah who were also commanded to conceal it. Why would Imām Mūsā al-Kāzīm رضي الله عنه or Imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq رضي الله عنه breach the trust or disclose it to anyone even if he be among their close disciples?

This narration is very mysterious and strange. Every angle of it is mystifying and every aspect of it is puzzling.

We have learnt how Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه practised upon this covenant. Now let us see the practice of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها who was also commanded with the same. It is recorded in *al-Kāfi* that 'Abd Allah ibn Muḥammad al-Ju'fī reports from Imām al-Bāqir رضي الله عنه and Imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq رضي الله عنه:

What transpired, transpired. Fāṭimah then caught hold of 'Umar's collar and pulled him to herself and exclaimed,

يا ابن الخطاب لولا انى اكره ان يصيب البلاء لا ذنب له لعلمت انى ساقسم على الله ثم اجده سريعة
الاجابة

O Ibn al-Khaṭṭāb! Had I not wanted that the sinless will fall into difficulty, I know very well that if I supplicate to Allah, He will immediately accept my supplication.¹

We learn from this narration that only due to the fact that the sinless will fall into difficulty, Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا did not curse. However, she did not remain firm on the level of ṣabr. To catch hold of a non-maḥram's collar and to pull him is far-fetched from her modesty. It is for this reason that we can classify this narration as a fabrication.

Another narration mentions something more unreal. It says that Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا caught the hands of Sayyidunā Ḥasanayn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمَا and went to the blessed grave to implore. Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ told Sayyidunā Salmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ to go and stop the daughter of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ for he sees that the walls of Madīnah were shaking. He explained, "If she opens her hair and tears her dress and implores at Rasūlullāh's صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ grave, then immediately Madīnah with its residents will sink into the earth and no one will be given respite." Sayyidunā Salmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ rushed and told her that Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ orders her to return and to adopt ṣabr and not to be the means of punishment for the ummah. Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا submitted, "If he said so, then I will return and adopt ṣabr."²

Another narration from Imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is that when Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا intended to open her hair, then Sayyidunā Salmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ recalls, "I was present by her. By Allah, I saw the foundations of the walls of the Masjid being uprooted and they were lifted so high that a man could pass underneath. I rushed to her and said, 'My master! Allah sent your honourable father as a mercy to the entire world. Do not be a means for punishment to descend.' Upon this, Sayyidah

1 *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* pg. 219.

2 *Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn*. Whoever wishes should compare this with the actual text. I felt that there was no strong need to quote it verbatim.

Fāṭimah left the Masjid and the walls returned to their places. The dust from the walls filled up in my nose.”

From here we learn that Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها did not adopt ṣabr and did not remember the covenant nor upheld it. She only withheld out of mercy for the people, or due to Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s رضي الله عنه command or Sayyidunā Salmān’s رضي الله عنه request and did not supplicate for the destruction and chastisement of the people. Had the covenant document narration being authentic, she would have adopted ṣabr and not have made such an intention or she would have stepped back after remembering the covenant, nor for other reasons.

چوں انحضرت راد ستیاری و پامردی نبود دل بر صبر نهاد و محزون و مظلوم به نشست یک روز چنان افتاد کہ فاطمہ از تقاعد امیر المومنین و در طلب حق خویش اظهار زحمت می فرمود گاہ بانک اذان بالا گرفت و مؤذن گفت اشہد ان محمدا رسول اللہ فقال لها ایسرک زوال ہذا النداء من الارض قالت لا قال فانہ لا اقول لک چوں بانک اذان فرار سید و نام رسول خدا گوش زد فاطمہ گشت علی فرمود دوست داری کہ این نام از زبانہا مہجور افتد عرض کرد دوست ندارم فرمود من بیم دارم کہ چوں دست بشمشیر کنم یکبارہ مرد ماں مشرک شوند¹

Other narrations explain that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه adopted ṣabr on seeing the tyranny of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم and remained oppressed and grieved. However, Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها was unhappy and angered at his silence and not demanding his right. One day, it so happened that Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها was complaining to him about her sorrow when the mu’adhīn called out the adhān. When they heard the words:

اشہد ان محمدا رسول اللہ

I bear witness that Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allah.

Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه addressed Fāṭimah saying:

ایسرک زوال ہذا النداء من الارض قالت لا

“Do you want this call to cease on earth?” She replied in the negative.

1 *Nāsikh al-Tawārīkh* vol. 4 pg. 52.

He explained, “If I fight for my rights, there is a fear that everyone will turn mushrik at once.”

Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ Khuṭbah Shaqshaqiyyah totally debunks the covenant narration. This is the khuṭbah the Shī‘ah consider to be equal to the glorious Qur’ān and consider doubting it equivalent to doubting the Qur’ān. Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ declares:

اما والله لقد تقمصها فلان وانه ليعلم ان محلى منها محل القطب من الرحي ينحدر عن السيل ولا يرقى الى الطير فسدلت دونها ثوبا و طويت عنها كشحا و طفقت ان ارتنى بين ان اصول بيد جذاء و اصبر على طخية عمياء يهرم فيها الكبير و يشبب فيها الصغير و يكدح فيها مؤمن حتى يلقي ربه فرايت ان الصبر على هاتا احجى فصبرت و فى العين قذى و فى الحلق شجى

Hark! By Allah, so and so has taken the reigns of khilāfah knowing fully well that the foundation of the structure of khilāfah rests on me. All knowledge, wisdom, plans, and ideas descend upon me like water flowing from a high mountain. No one can reach my perfections. I neither stretched a hand to it nor contemplated it. I pondered thoroughly over it and knew I had one of two choices. Either I fight single handed or adopt ṣabr. Adopting ṣabr in this dark situation wherein matters of the khilāfah are becoming obscure and people are falling into the abyss of deviation like blind men to such a time that men will turn white and babies will become old and believers will go through difficulties and hardships until they meet their Lord. When I pondered over these matters, I realised that to adopt ṣabr in this difficulty and hardship is more appropriate. Hence, I persevered but there is dirt in my eyes and something stuck in my throat.

‘Allāmah Faṭḥ Allah writes the translation and commentary of these lines in the following words in *Sharḥ Farsī Nahj al-Balāghah*:

پس فرو گذاشتم نزد این خلافت جامه صبر را و دست از طلب این باز داشتم و در نور دیدم ازان تپى گاه را و بیک جانب شدم يعنى اعراض نمودم ازان و اصلا التفات بجانب او نکردم و در ایستادم بفکر کردن در امر خود و جولان دادن فکر میان اینکه حمله ارام بدست بریده این کنایه ست از عدم معاون و ناصر چه در ملازمت او بیش ازد و ازده کس نبودند یا صبر نمایم و شکیبائی پیشه کنم بر ظلمتے که متصف بصفه کوری ست و این کنایه ست از شدت التباس در امور خلافت

که خلق باین مهتدی نمیشوند بحق و بواسطه این دروادی ضلالت می افتند مثل کوری که باین راه نبرند و در جاه بلاکت افتند و این چنان ظلمتی که به نهایت پیری میرسد در این بزرگ سال و بحال پیری میرسد در این خورد سال بسپ عدم انتظام امور معاش و تعب و رنج میکشند در این مومن بجهت سعی و اجتهاد در حصول حق و دفع فساد نمیرسد باین تا برسد به پروردگار خود و چو حال بریں منوال بود پس دیدم که صبر کردن درین شدت ظلمت اقرب ست بعقل و اولی و الیق ست باین بسپ انتظام اسلام بواسطه عدم معاون و کثرت معاند پس صبر کردم و ترک منازعت و محاربه نمودم در حالتی که در چشم من خاشاک بود و غبار ازان ایذامی یافتیم و متاذی می شدم و در گلو استخوان گرفته بود که ازان منغض بود عیش من این بر دو فقره کنایت انداز شدت غصه و غم و مرارت صبر و الم

“I wore the garb of ṣabr concerning the first khilāfah and did not claim anything. I did not turn my attention towards it and sat quietly on one side. I pondered; should I attack with a broken hand whereas I have no support or assistance.” At that time, there were no more than 12 persons to support him.

“Or should I bear patiently in darkness upon darkness.” This is metaphorical to a condition that I should rather tolerate in this dark condition than fight.

“A condition in which the matters of khilāfah have become obscure and the creation will not be guided by them but will rather fall into the abyss of deviation and destruction. This era of darkness seems to last so long that due to the economic instability and ill management, the young will become old and the children will become adults. A believer will work hard to remove the corruption and acquire his right until he will pass away unsuccessful. In such a situation, it felt more appropriate to adopt ṣabr as this is more intelligent. In this way, I will be able to keep Islam stable. The situation is that friends are little while foes abound. Hence, I bore patiently and did not fight notwithstanding the fact that these matters are troubling my conscious and destroying my life.” These sentences are metaphorical to describe the intense emotions of grief, anger, ṣabr and sorrow.

Ibn Maytham al-Baḥrānī writes in the commentary of the words *I pondered thoroughly over it*:

His purport is: I found two contradicting options with regards to the khilāfah, viz. either I fight those who usurped the Imāmah or I abandon it. I saw a great threat in both these options since to fight with a severed hand, i.e. without any support or assistance, is not permissible because not only will I harm myself but it causes disorder among the Muslims. And by abandoning it, there will be no differentiation between truth and falsehood. Seeing disorder is very hurtful. He then voiced his choice by choosing the latter, i.e. abandoning Imāmah and adopting ṣabr and said, “I deemed perseverance as the better option understanding it to be better for the order of the Muslims so that dīn remains established and its principles and fundamentals continue to be upheld and stability remains – which is the objective of Allah ﷻ and His Rasūl ﷺ. Had there been fighting then disorder will spread in the ranks of the Muslims and anarchy and chaos will increase since love for Islam has not yet been imbedded in the hearts of the majority and they have not yet tasted the sweetness of Islam whereas the hypocrites, enemies and mushrikīn are in the ranks of the Muslims and in every corner in the world with their full force and might.”

Although he witnessed the prevalent condition, it was impossible for him to stand up to fight for Imāmah. Adopting patience was the better option although it was also contrary to his objective and would cause deficiency in dīn according to his thinking. Had he stood up for Imāmah then dīn would be established in totality. However this harm was less than the harm caused by him fighting for and demanding Imāmah. Thus, he chose the lesser of the two evils.

Just these words which Sayyidunā ‘Alī عليه السلام mentioned in the khuṭbah is sufficient to utterly debunk the narration of the covenant and bequest. He did not withhold from fighting because he was bequeathed to do so and there was no divine instruction regarding the matter of khilāfah. He says clearly in his khuṭbah that he pondered deeply over both the options and weighed the cons of both. He found not fighting to be easier and saw the destruction of dīn in fighting. Hence, he chose the lesser of the two evils. He reached this decision solely out of his own accord. Just as an unselfish, intelligent and far-sighted person who has a

pure temperament and the benefit of people at heart, looks at both options and chooses the easier one, Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ chose not to fight. Had there been a Command from Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and a special bequest from Him, then there was no need nor was it permissible for him to use his intellect. One’s intellect has no say in front of the Command of Allah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Therefore, by means of this khuṭbah – which the Shī‘ah believe to be the most authentic speech of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and do not doubt any word or letter of it – the narration of the covenant or bequest is utterly debunked. In fact, it proves that although by him becoming the khalīfah the structure of dīn would find greater stability, nonetheless the structure of dīn remained erect by others becoming Khulafā’, people remained steadfast as Muslims, and the strength of the hypocrites, mushrikīn, and enemies had no effect on Islam.

The second reason presented for Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ not fighting and bearing every type of hardship and cruelty is that he had no supporters and helpers. No matter how brave, courageous, and daring people were, no one was prepared to assist him. He could not do anything alone. Had his supporters amounted to the participants of Badr, he would have definitely fought. The reason why he had no supporters was that as soon as Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ passed away, all the Muhājirīn, Anṣār, and the rest of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ turned murtad. Mullā Bāqir Majlisī has written this narration in *Biḥār al-Anwār* with reference to *Rijāl al-Kashshī* from Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ:

Everyone turned renegade after Rasūlullāh’s صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ demise besides three persons viz. Miqdād ibn al-Aswad, Abū Dhar al-Ghifārī, and Salmān al-Fārsī.”

The name of Sayyidunā ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ does not feature here. However, his name has been excluded from the renegades in another narration.

Abū Bakr al-Jafrī has reported that Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ has stated: “Besides three persons: Salmān, Abū Dhar, and Miqdād, everyone turned apostate.”

I asked about ‘Ammār to which he replied, “At first, he also turned away from the truth but later returned to the same.”

Thereafter the Imām said, “If you wish to know of someone who did not have the slightest of doubt and no evil thought passed his mind, then it is only Miqdād. Salmān had this fleeting thought that ‘Alī knows *al-Isṁ al-A’zam* (the greatest name of Allah). If he recites it, all his opponents will be sunk into the earth. And this was correct.”

It is recorded a little further in this narration that Abū Sāsān al-Anṣārī, Abū ‘Amrah, and Shaybarah returned to Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. In essence, those who recognised his right numbered seven.¹

‘Abd al-Malik ibn A’yan reports, “I began asking Imām Ja’far al-Ṣādiq رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ about the apostasy of the Ṣaḥābah and continued until I said that all of them were destroyed in such a situation. The Imām replied, ‘Yes, by Allah, O Ibn A’yan. All of them were destroyed.’

I asked whether those living in the East as well as those living in Arabia were destroyed to which he replied, ‘Yes, by Allah! All were destroyed besides three. However, Abū Sāsān, ‘Ammār, Shaybarah, and Abū ‘Amrah returned thereafter and they numbered seven.”

It is also reported that after pledging allegiance to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, the Muhājirīn and Anṣār expressed their desire to take bay’ah at the hands of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ but did not remain firm.

Abū Baṣīr has narrated from Imām Ja’far al-Ṣādiq رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ that the Muhājirīn and Anṣār later came to Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and submitted, “You are Amīr al-Mu’minīn and the rightful khalīfah. Extend your hand; we will take bay’ah at your hands.”

Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ responded by saying, “If you are truthful, then return tomorrow with shaven heads.”

1 *Bihār al-Anwār* Kitāb al-Fitan pg. 46, 47.

No one however shaved their heads besides Sayyidunā Salmān, Sayyidunā Miqdād, and Sayyidunā Abu Dhar رضي الله عنه. They came a second time and expressed their desire to take bay‘ah. Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه made the same request but it was not fulfilled.

The narrator says that he asked the Imām whether Sayyidunā ‘Ammār رضي الله عنه was not included among those who fulfilled the command. The Imām replied in the negative. The narrator then asked whether Sayyidunā ‘Ammār رضي الله عنه was included among the apostates to which he replied, “He thereafter fought on the side of ‘Alī.” The meaning of this is that although initially he turned apostate, he supported Sayyidunā ‘Alī and fought on his side later on due to which his imān remained intact.

Al-Kāfi has a narration from Abū al-Haytham ibn Tīhān who says that Amīr al-Mu‘minīn Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه delivered a lecture in front of the people of Madīnah wherein after praising Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and listing the virtues of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم he proclaimed:

Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم fulfilled his obligation of nubuwwah and stipulated the roads of guidance. O people, those who were deceived and recognised the deception of the deceivers but remained hell-bent on it knowingly and chose to follow their evil desires, the truth was manifest before them but they turned away from it and the clear open road was in front of them but they diverted from the same. By the Being who makes the seed grow and creates the child! Had you acquired knowledge from its source, drank sweet water, gathered virtuous deeds hoping for reward, chosen the open road of guidance and treaded it, then the clear roads would have opened before you, signs would have manifested for you, and Islam would have brightened in your eyes. You would have eaten lavishly, none of you would have suffered poverty, and neither any Muslim nor disbeliever with whom there is a pact of peace would have been oppressed. However, you treaded the path of darkness, so the world has narrowed for you despite its vastness and the doors of knowledge have been shut on your faces. You spoke from your whims and fancies and differed in your dīn. You passed rulings in

the divine religion without knowledge. You followed the misguided who misguided you and abandoned the A'immah, thus they abandoned you. You will soon reap the ills of the seeds you planted and taste the bitterness of the sins you committed. By the Being who makes the seed grow and creates the child! You know that certainly I am your companion, your ruler, and scholar. I am the one; your salvation lies in my knowledge. I am the waṣī of your Messenger ﷺ. Your Lord has chosen me. Calamities will soon befall you which you were promised and which have afflicted the nations before you. By Allah! Had I had supporters equal in number to Ṭālūt's men or the participants of Badr, I would have fought you with the sword until you returned to the truth. I will withhold myself and deal with you with softness and tenderness. O Allah! Judge between us in truth, for You are the best of judges."

After delivering this lecture, Sayyidunā 'Alī ﷺ left the Masjid and passed by a herd of sheep numbering 30. He commented, "Had I had people equal in number to these sheep who were sincere friends of Allah and Rasūlullāh ﷺ, I would have removed the son of *akalat al-dhibbān* (Abū Bakr) from leadership."

In the evening, 360 people gave him bay'ah upon death. He told them to shave their heads and meet him in the morning at Aḥjār al-Zayt (a place near Madīnah). Sayyidunā 'Alī shaved his head, but none of the others besides Sayyidunā Abū Dhar, Miqdād, Ḥudhayfah, and 'Ammār ﷺ complied. Sayyidunā Salmān ﷺ came last. Sayyidunā 'Alī ﷺ lifted his hands to the skies and supplicated, "O Allah! These people have found me weak just as the Banū Isrā'īl found Sayyidah Hārūn ﷺ to be weak. O Allah, You know what we conceal and what we reveal. Nothing in the earth or heavens is hidden from You. Grant me death on Islam and join me with the pious. I swear by the house of Allah, by those who leave the desolate areas for ḥajj and by Muzdalifah that had I not upheld the covenant which Rasūlullāh ﷺ took from me, I would have flung the opponents into the valley of death and rained upon them torrential rain from the cloud of death and sent lightning upon them. Undoubtedly, they will come to know very soon."

‘Umar ibn Thābit relates that he heard from Abū ‘Abd Allah that when Rasūlullāh ﷺ passed away, all the people turned renegade and only three remained as Muslims, viz. Salmān, Miqdād, and Abū Dhar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. Another narration states that after Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ demise, 40 men approached Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and said, “By Allah! We will never obey anyone besides you.” When Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ asked them the reason, they said, “We heard in your favour on the Day of Ghadīr.” Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ asked them if they will act accordingly and they replied in the affirmative. He ordered them to return the following day with their heads shaven. Abū ‘Abd Allah says that none besides the three came. He continues to narrate that Sayyidunā ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ came after Ṣalāt al-Zuhr. Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ hit his chest and said, “Has not the time come for you to awaken from the sleep of negligence? Go! I do not need you! You did not obey me by shaving your head. How will you obey me when it comes to fighting mountains of steal? Get out! I have no need for you.”

It is understood from these narrations that everyone turned renegade besides three. Conversely, *al-Kāfī* has a conflicting narration which suggests that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ did not claim his rights and bore all the calamities out of mercy for the people for fear that they might turn renegade. Zurārah narrates that Imām al-Bāqir رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ stated, “When people took bay‘ah at the hands of Abū Bakr and did what they did, Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ did not call them to himself out of compassion. He feared that it should not happen that people leave the fold of Islam and the kalimah shahādah, and begin worshipping idols. He desired that people do not renounce Islam and remain steadfast. Therefore, those who intentionally did not take bay‘ah at his hands and jumped on the moving wagon and pledged allegiance at the hands of Abū Bakr without knowledge and without harbouring enmity for Amīr al-Mu‘minīn, cannot be termed as kuffār because of this bay‘ah and did not leave the fold of Islam. For this very reason, ‘Alī concealed his right and pledged allegiance unwillingly.”

This narration conflicts the previous narrations which mention the apostasy of all the Muslims. It states that the reason for Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ not standing up

and claiming his rights is that he feared that this might lead to the apostasy of the people. For this reason, Mullā Bāqir al-Majlisī quotes this narration and explains: “The meaning of not renouncing Islam is that they adopted Islam outwardly and continued reciting the kalimah. Goodness for the ummah lied in them remaining on Islam so that after time passes, they or their children will accept the truth and have a chance to accept īmān. In this case, this narration does not conflict the narration which states that only three were saved. The meaning of apostasy there is that majority of them abandoned dīn in reality and the meaning here is that the outward form of Islam remained on them although they joined the kuffār in majority of aḥkām. This only applies to those who did not here the explicit appointment of Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ Imāmah and did not harbour hatred and enmity for him. If anyone did perpetrate any of the above, then he has rejected the command of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and is therefore outwardly a kāfir. No aspect of Islam applies to him and he should be necessary killed.”

Sayyid Ḥāmid Ḥasan Qiblah supports this view and states in volume 2 of *Istiḳṣā’*:

حدیث ارتدت الصحابة کلهم الا ثلاثة و امثاله هر گز اهل حق محمول بر ردت شرعی و کفر ظاهری نمی سازند چنانچه در عبارت بحار که انفا منقول شد صریح مذکور ست که مراد از ارتداد درین احادیث ارتداد در دین واقعی ست یعنی نه ارتداد از دین و ظاهراً بالجمله مراد از ارتداد در امثال این احادیث ارتداد بمعنی عام ست که منافی اسلام ظاهری نیست و در معنی عام ارتداد همه با داخل می تواند شد بهم مرتدین شرعی و بهم کسانیکه بر اسلام ظاهری با قیامند ند و از ایمان بدر رفتند

The people of the truth do not take “All the Ṣaḥābah accept three turned apostate” to refer to shar’ī irtidād and outward kufr. It appears clearly in the text of *Bihār al-Anwār* that irtidād refers to dīnī irtidād which is not in disagreement with outward Islam. All of them can be included in this general irtidād whether they committed shar’ī irtidād or renounced īmān although they remained outwardly on Islam.

The author further writes:

و توضیح مقام اینست که ارتداد را دو معنی ست یکی عام و یکی خاص اما ارتداد عام پس بمعنی لغوی ست یعنی برگشتن از چیزی و این معنی شامل ست جمیع انواع ارتداد را خواه ارتداد از اخلاف حسنه و عادات جمیله و امثال ذلک و اما

ارتداد خاص پس ارتداد شرعی است یعنی برگشتن از اسلام و اختیار کردن کفر که موجب جریان احکام حفار در دار دنیا بر صاحب این تواند شد

The explanation is that irtidād has two meanings; one is general while the other is specific. General irtidād means turning away from anything. This includes all the general types of irtidād, viz. from Islam, from īmān, from good character, or from beautiful habits and qualities. Specific irtidād refers to sharī irtidād, i.e. renouncing Islam and adopting kufr. Aḥkām applicable to the kuffār will apply to such a person in this world.

The author thereafter claims that both types of irtidād apply to the three Khulafā’:

فان كفرهم و ارتدادهم واضح لا ستره فيه

Their kufr and irtidād is as clear as daylight; it cannot be hidden.

In short, the Shī’ah have divided irtidād into two types: irtidād ḥaqīqī, i.e. turning murtad externally and internally – wherein they include the three Khulafā’ رضي الله عنهم and those who heard the alleged appointment of ‘Alī, and internal irtidād, i.e. remaining outwardly a Muslim – wherein they included those who out of ignorance and without hatred fell into deception or followed the people and took bay’ah at the hands of the three Khulafā’. These people later on were included among the Mu’minīn when they joined Amīr al-Mu’minīn.

Firstly, this division makes absolutely no sense to us since the original meaning of irtidād is to turn away from Allah, His Rasūl, and what Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم has brought. Such rejection is not established regarding the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم especially the three Khulafā’ رضي الله عنهم and their supporters. Majority of Shī’ī statements acknowledge their steadfastness on external Islam. ‘Alam al-Hudā writes in answer to the author of *al-Mughnī*:

For Qāḍī to say, “Just as Imām Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه opposed Yazīd and exposed his wrongs, Amīr should have opposed his opponents, criticised and rejected

them, and incited people against them,” is a far cry from the truth since the fear for Yazīd was nothing in comparison to the fear for the Khulafā’. Yazīd would sin and commit transgression openly and had no concern for piety. Everyone knew that he was not fit for khilāfah and Imāmah and none of the requisites of Imāmah were found in him. This is contrary to fearing a person who is the leader of his people, possesses excellent praiseworthy attributes, and is believed to be worthy of Imāmah by a large group. In fact, they considered his status to be higher than that of Imāmah. To make an analogy of the former upon the latter is corrupt.”

‘Alam al-Hudā has acknowledged here that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه was the leader of his people and respected among them. He possessed excellent qualities and people understood his level to be higher than that of Imāmah. His exact words are:

و كيف يكون الخوف من مظهر الفسق و الخلاعة و لا شبهة في ان امامته ملك و غلبة و انه لا شرط من شرائط الامامة فيه كالخوف من مقدم معظم جميل الظاهر برى اكثر الامة ان الامامة دونه و انها ادنى منازلها و ما الجمع بين الامرين الا كالجامع بين الضدين

How can fear for a man who openly commits transgression and acts of immorality – there is no doubt that his Imāmah is nothing but kingdom and dominance and that he does not possess any of the requisites of Imāmah – be similar to fear for a leader who is respected, possesses beautiful external qualities, whose status people regard to be higher than that of Imāmah, considering Imāmah as his lowest rank. To join these two is akin to joining two opposites.

Muḥaqqiq al-Jīlānī writes in *Fatḥ al-Subul*:

سپ دیگر در تقویت حسن ظن مردم بعاقیدین بیعت این شد که اینها نفوس خود را از اموال باز داشتند و شیوه زید در دنیا پیش گرفتند و رغبت بدنیا و زینت اینرا ترک کردند و قناعت بقلیل و اکل خش و لباس کرباس ملک خود ساختند در حالی که اموال برائے ایشان حاصل و دینار و کرده بودند و اینرا در میان قوم قسمت می کردند و خورا باین اصلا ابوده نمی کردند پس دلپایه مردم بایشان مائل شد و ایشان را دوست داشتند و طنون مردم بایشان نیک شد و بر کس را که در باره ایشان شبه در خاطر بود یا توفقه داشت با خود گفت که اگر ایشان بپوانے نفس مخالفت نص پیغمبر کرده

بودند بایست اهل دنیا باشند و ترک دنیا و لذات نکند تا خسران دنیا و آخرت برد و برائے ایشان نباشد و اینها اهل عقل و رای صحیح اند چگونه خسران دنیا و عقبی هر دورا پسندیده باشند پس فعل ایشان صحیح ست و کسی را شکه در صلاح ایشان باقی نماند و اعتقاد بولایت ایشان کردند و افعال ایشان بستند

People had full conviction due to which they pledged allegiance. He (Abū Bakr) distanced himself from worldly wealth, adopted abstinence from the world, had no desire for the world or its pleasures and was content with a little. He ate dry bread and wore coarse clothes. It was an era when wealth and ministers were under his control yet he would distribute the wealth among the people and would not take any garb for himself. He did not pollute himself with public funds. For this reason, people's hearts were attracted to him, they befriended him, and maintained good thoughts about him. The people who had misgivings about these Khulafā' or who hesitated to take bay'ah thought to themselves, "Had these Khulafā' opposed the laws of Rasūlullāh ﷺ then definitely they would be worldly mongers and would not have abandoned worldly pleasures and wealth. But they are neither disgraced in this world or the Hereafter." This is apparent that since these Khulafā' were intelligent and reached the correct decisions, they neither desired worldly harm nor harm in the Hereafter. For this reason, their actions remained proper and suitable. No one had the slightest doubt in their capabilities. People began believing firmly in their leadership and khilāfah and looked at their actions with a positive eye.

In light of the above, it is improper to say that the Khulafā' and their supporters renounced Islam in the meaning that they rejected Allah and His Rasūl ﷺ. It might be claimed that they did not give Sayyidunā 'Alī رضی اللہ عنہ his right of Imāmah, thus becoming rejecters, nay usurpers of Imāmah. If the Shī'ah wish to call them murtad for this reason according to their terminology of irtidād then they are at liberty. However, it makes absolutely no sense why the other Ṣaḥābah – who numbered in the thousands and who supported Sayyidunā 'Alī رضی اللہ عنہ in his khilāfah – turned away from him in the beginning and abandoned supporting him? If it is claimed that they were deceived, then this is unrealistic since Rasūlullāh ﷺ announced Sayyidunā 'Alī's رضی اللہ عنہ Imāmah with such force – according to Shī'ah belief – and publicised it to the extent that no one had the chance to present

excuses or fall into deception with regards to it. Rasūlullāh ﷺ publicly declared him as Imām in front of 70000 people in Ghadīr Khum, took a covenant from them, and made them pledge allegiance and they all congratulated him. Moreover, Rasūlullāh ﷺ elucidated on the rewards promised by Allah ﷻ for those who will uphold this covenant and the punishments for those who will violate it. He also determined this aspect of Imāmah to be an integral part of īmān and Islam just like believing in the oneness and divinity of Allah ﷻ. After this, only madmen and ignorant children will fall into deception. Not even the ignorant and bedouins could be deceived. Only those can reject such a explicit nomination and “mutawātir” fact who have not an iota of īmān, who usurped the khilāfah out of greed for the world, or who helped the usurpers for their own benefit. In this case, just as the Khulafā’ and those who helped them are out of the fold of Islam – according to the Shī’ah – similarly the rest of the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ and Muslims who supported them and who pledged allegiance to them should be out of its fold. No one’s excuse can be accepted. Even if they did not hear any explicit nomination, did not Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ proclaim publicly his khilāfah? Did he not label the Khulafā’ as oppressors and usurpers? Did he not beg the people for help? Did he not go house to house with Sayyidah Fāṭimah and Sayyidunā Ḥasanayn ﷺ asking for support? He left no stone unturned in order to acquire his right as the Shī’ah profess. In this case, no one had the chance of falling into deception and no one’s excuse will be heard.

If we hypothetically accept the excuse of them falling into deception with regards to the first khilāfah, then what excuse do they have for taking bay’ah at the hands of the usurpers and accepting the khilāfah of the second and third? The only sound explanation is that all the Muslims of that era besides three turned apostate. According to Shī’ī principles, their Islam can never be established in any way whatsoever. If the Shī’ah had remained firm upon their claim that all the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ – royals or laymen; from Makkah or Madīnah; city dwellers or village dwellers – besides three or four individuals turned renegade and no one’s excuse was accepted, then Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s ﷺ failure to oppose and his endurance of oppression and tyranny would make some sense. But the irony is

that they did not remain firm on this claim. In order to display their strength and the abundance of supporters of their creed, they mentioned such narrations which debunk this claim. These narrations suggest that those who remained steadfast upon Islam and īmān were a huge number and many tribes were his supporters and helpers.

Ṣadr al-Dīn Ḥasanī Ḥusaynī writes in *Riyāḍ al-Sālikīn Sharḥ Ṣaḥīfah Sajjādiyyah* in the fourth rawḍah wherein mention is made of the curse of Imām Zayn al-‘Ābidīn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ for the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ that at the demise of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ there were 124000 Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ. He quotes with reference to al-Khiṣāl from Imām Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ that there were 12000 Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ of which 8000 were from Madīnah, 2000 from outside Madīnah and 2000 were freed slaves who were neither from the Qadariyyah, Khawārij, Mu‘tazilah or rationalists. They would cry day and night and would supplicate for Allah سُبْحَانَكَ وَتَعَالَى to take their souls away before they eat fine bread. The tribes of Aws, Khazraj, Banū Ḥanīf, Hamdān, Mudh-ḥaj, Rabī‘ah, Muḍar, Azd, Wā‘il, Khuzā‘ah and Ṭayy were among the supporters of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and had such strong conviction, sincerity, reliance, assistance, and support that he mentioned them in his poems and praised them.

Qāḍī Nūr Allah al-Shūstarī writes in *Majālis al-Mu‘minīn* titled, *Majlis two concerning the situation of a few groups who were known to be Shī‘ah and treading the path of īmān*:

Aws and Khazraj were two large tribes of the Anṣār. They are well known and need no introduction. Their sincerity is known to all especially the connection of Sa‘d ibn ‘Ubādah Khazrajī and his noble offspring to Sayyidunā ‘Alī Murtaḍā رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.

Qāḍī Mīr Ḥusayn al-Shāfi‘ī – the commentator of *Dīwān Murtaḍwī* – says that it is reported from Sayyidunā Sa‘īd ibn Jubayr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ that when Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ prepared to battle against Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ he had 90000 supporters; 800 of which were from the Anṣār and 900 from those who took Bay‘at al-Riḍwān, concerning whom Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ affirmed:

اووا فاعطوا فوق ما وهبوا	الاورس و الخزرج القوم الذين هم
--------------------------	--------------------------------

Aws and Khazraj are the people of a nation who gave sanctuary and bestowed more than their capacity.

Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه said regarding the Hamdān:

و كنده في كحم وحى جزام	و نادى ابن هند ذا الكلاع و يخصبا
اذا ناب امر جتتي و سهامي	تيممت الهمدان الذين هم
سهام العدى فى كل يوم خصام	جزى الله الهمدان الجنان فانهم
لقلت لهمدان ادخلى بسلام	فلو كنت بوأبا على باب الجنة

When Ibn Hindah, i.e. Mu‘āwiyah, called the tribes of Dhū al-Kulā‘, Yakhṣab, and Kindah, I called the tribes of Hamdān since they are my sword and shield in the thick of battle. May Allah grant the Hamdān Jannah as a reward for they are the arrows against the enemies in every battle. Had I been the doorkeeper of Jannah, I would have told Hamdān, “Enter peacefully.”

He composed the following couplets about the tribe of Azd:

و سيف احمد من دانت له العرب	الازد سيفى على الاعداء كلهم
لا يجمعون و لا يدرون ما الهرب	قوم اذا ناجاه و اوفوا و ان غلبوا

Azd are my sword against all the enemies and the sword of Aḥmad to whom the Arabs are indebted. A tribe if they are summoned they fulfil even if they are defeated. And they do not know the meaning of fleeing.

Qāḍī has translated these couplets into Persian in the following words.

مائل بخدا از جهان سير بيمه	ياران من اند ابل شمشير بيمه
باشند بروز حرب چون شير بيمه	معنى گريختن نداند كه چيست

They are my friends who are warriors

Aloof from the world and engrossed with Allah سُبْحَانَ رَبِّيَ عَلِيمٌ

They do not know the meaning of fleeing

They are lions on the battlefield

The translation of another couplet regarding the tribe of Azd goes as follows:

که حضرت امیر المومنین علی می فرماید اے جماعت ازد بدر ستیکه من از همه شما خوشنودم و شما سرباے کار
خلافت من اید هرگز نا امید نشوید از راحت و امر زیدن و خدا نگاه دارد ایشان را از هر جا که روند پاکید شما در حالیکه
تو اید چنان که پاکست اول شما و خار چیده نشود از سر شاخ انگور

Ḥaḍrat Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī said, "O tribe of Azd, I am pleased with you. Be diligent about the establishment of my khilāfah and do not be despondent. Wherever you go, may Allah protect you with ease and comfort. Remain pure in your present state as you were pure in the past. There are no thorns on the branches of a grapevine which need to be separated.

No one can say that these praises in favour of the tribes of the Anṣār which are recorded in *Majālis al-Mu'minīn* cannot be used as proof against the Shī'ah since they have been taken from non-primary sources such as *Ansāb Sam'ānī*, etc., because Qāḍī al-Shūstarī understood these tribes to be sincere and included them among the Shī'ah of 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, thus he presented these couplets as substantiation. In this case, these couplets are proof against the Shī'ah just as the statements of their historians. The purpose of al-Shūstarī was to prove that the supporters of Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ were not few in number but comprised of many tribes. If the Shī'ah reject the view of al-Shūstarī and deem it to be incorrect and believe these tribes to be included among the enemies of the Ahl al-Bayt, then too they cannot reject the fact that there were 124000 Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ alive after the demise of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. They also cannot deny that 12000 Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ had pure beliefs and remained engaged in the worship of Allah day and night. If all of these turned renegade besides three or four, then we should perform the Ṣalāt al-Janāzah for Islam as a whole and not mention its beauty to anyone. Nevertheless, the Shī'ah cannot reject the fact that not only were the general Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ supporters of Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, but he had a huge army comprising of Muhājirīn, Anṣār, and those who followed them. This is recorded in those books which the Shī'ah regard as authentic as the Qur'ān.

Sayyidunā Amīr al-Mu'minīn wrote to Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ in a letter:

You wrote in your letter to me that nothing besides the sword will decide between us. This has amused me and surprised me. Have the sons of 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib ever feared the enemy and the sword? They are lions of the jungle and men of the battlefield. It will not be long until that which you seek will seek you and that which seems far to you will close in upon you. I am advancing with a huge army with innumerable warriors. This huge army includes the Muhājirīn, Anṣār, and their followers who are strong and their dust flies high. They have donned the garb of death. Nothing is more beloved to them than dying for Allah ﷻ and this is their hope. They are accompanied by the offspring of the participants of Badr and the swords of the Hāshim family.”¹

Mullā Faṭḥ Allāh has translated this letter into Persian in these words:

و یاد کرده در نامه خود اینکہ نیست مراد نہ مر اصحاب مرا نزد تو مگر شمشیر ایدار پس ہر ائینہ بخندہ اوردی مرا و یاران مرا پس از اشک فرو اوردن باین گفتار یعنی ہر کہ شنید این گفتار ترا از مومنین خندید از روی تعجب بعد از گریستن ایشان بر دین بچہت تصرف بے وجہ تو دارد کجا یافتہ شدند پسران عبد المطلب کہ از دشمنان واپس رفتگان بودہ باشند از جہت جہانت و شمشیر ترسانیدہ شدہ باشند و ہر اسان چہ ایشان شیر بیشہ رجولیت اند و از رو باہ صفتان چہ اندیشہ دارند پس درنگ کن اند کے تا ملحق شود بصف جنگ جہل بن بدر و این مثلی ست برائے وعید اعداء الحرب و قائلن ایں جہل بن بدر ست و او مردے بود از قشیر کہ شتران اورا بغارت بردہ بودند اور درمیان پیجا رفت بدلاوری و شتران خودا باز ستد از اعداء پس زود باشد کہ طلب کند ترا کسیکہ طلب میکنی اورا و نزدیک شد بتو اینچہ دوری می جوئی ازو و من شتا بندہ ام بجانب تو در لشکر عظیم بے شمار از مہاجرین و انصار و تابعان بہ نیکوئی کہ سخت ست انہویبے ایشان مرتفع ست غبار ایشان گویند کہ نود ہزار کس بودند و در بر کند گاہ پراہن بائے مرگ را ایں کتابہ ست از زربا و جوشنہا کہ در برداشتند ہم چون پوشش اکفان دوست ترین ملاقات کردن ایشان ست بر رحمت پروردگار خود بہ تحقیق کہ ہمرا ہست ایشان را زریہ بدریہ یعنی فزندان بدری خونخوار و سیوف ہاشمیہ یعنی شمشیر بائے ہاشمی ایشبار

You have written in your letter that the sword will decide between us. My friends and I were amused and amazed at this, i.e. your useless efforts on Islam have surprised us and made us laugh after we shed tears. Have the sons of 'Abd al-Muṭṭalib ever turned their backs from fighting their enemies? Have they ever displayed cowardice and were they ever afraid?

1 Nahj al-Balāghah vol. 2 pg. 627.

Remember that our noble men are warriors of battle and lions who are not afraid of the traits of foxes. Wait a little so that Jamal ibn Badr might frighten you in battle. This is the statement of Jamal ibn Badr who was a Qushayrī. People stole his camel. He immediately reached the enemy and managed to free it with valour and courage. Very soon, the thing which is sought will seek you and that which you see far will come to you. I am advancing swiftly with a massive army comprising of the Muhājirīn, Anṣār, and their followers. These warriors have noble actions and the dust rising from their steeds are high. These 90000 soldiers are covered in armour, wearing breastplates and have their weapons ready. Their greatest desire is to be martyred; to attain the mercy of their Lord. Remember that these warriors by me are the children of the participants of Badr and owners of the fiery hāshimī swords.

When Sayyidunā Amīr al-Mu'minīn رضي الله عنه himself speaks about a massive army comprising of the Muhājirīn, Anṣār, Ṣaḥābah, and Tābi'īn رضي الله عنهم and when he himself praises their steadfastness, bravery, courage, and fighting in the path of Allah and the commentators of *Nahj al-Balāghah* mention their number to be 90000 then how can it be fathomed that these people are not Muslims whose hearts are devoid of the light of īmān and the love for the Ahl al-Bayt? Or that they turned murtad at one stage and were enemies of the Ahl al-Bayt and denied supporting Rasūlullāh's صلى الله عليه وسلم waṣī after falling into deception? It just makes no sense that if Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه regarded the first three Khulafā' as murtad and usurpers, then why did he not fight them? Had he intended to fight them, then would these warriors, who are prepared to sacrifice their lives for him and whom he praised in his letter, not support him and fight with him against his enemies? The truth is that Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه neither regarded these Khulafā' as usurpers nor intended to fight them. He accepted them and supported and assisted them just like everyone else. He understood the unanimity of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār to be in conformity to the pleasure of Allah سبحانه وتعالى. This is not the product of our imagination. It is based on the lectures and sermons delivered by Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه which he used to prove the validity of his own khilāfah.

Do the Shī'ah not ponder over the letter written by Sayyidunā 'Alī to Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمَا? His words as recorded in *Nahj al-Balāghah* are:

و من كتاب له عليه السلام الى معاوية انه بايعنى القوم الذين بايعوا ابا بكر و عمر و عثمان على ما بايعوهم عليه فلم يكن للشاهد ان يختار و لا للغائب ان يرد و انما الشورى للمهاجرين و الانصار فان اجتمعوا على رجل و سموه اماما كان ذلك لله رضى فان خرج من امرهم خارج بطعن او بدعة رده الى ما خرج منه فان ابى قاتلوه على اتباعه غير سبيل المؤمنين و ولاه ما تولى و لعمرى يا معاوية لئن نظرت بعقلك دون هواك لتجدني أبرأ الناس من دم عثمان ، و لتعلمن أني كنت في عزلة عنه إلا أن تتجنى ، فتجن ما بدا لك . و السلام .

From the letters he wrote to Mu'āwiyah: The people have pledged allegiance to me who took bay'ah at the hands of Abū Bakr, 'Umar, and 'Uthmān on the same clauses they pledged allegiance to them. No one present has the choice to choose and no one absent has the choice to reject. Mutual counsel belongs solely to the Muhājirīn and Anṣār. If they unite on someone and appoint him as a leader, this is proof of the pleasure of Allah ﷻ. If anyone forsakes their unanimity due to criticism or innovation, they will return him to the same. If he refuses, they will fight him for following something besides the path of the Mu'minīn and Allah ﷻ will hand him over to his misguidance. O Mu'āwiyah! I swear that if you leave emotions aside and ponder deeply with your mind, you would find me the most innocent from the blood of 'Uthmān and you will most certainly come to know that I had nothing to do with it, unless you accuse me. So accuse as you desire. Peace.¹

The commentators of *Nahj al-Balāghah* have explained that this address to Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was according to those who believed that khilāfah is decided by mutual counsel and 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ practiced Taqiyyah. However this is incorrect. Firstly, there is no contextual evidence which suggests this. Secondly, had there been any explicit declaration regarding his khilāfah, this was the opportune time to voice it. This would have been the strongest and perfect proof for his claim. He could have said that his khilāfah was publicly announced by

1 *Nahj al-Balāghah* vol. 2 pg. 603.

Rasūlullāh ﷺ in Ghadīr al-Khum. He left this authentic and strong proof aside and chose such a thing as proof which he himself considers incorrect and false, and which further proves the correctness of the previous Khulafā's usurped khilāfah.

إِنَّ هَذَا لَشَيْءٌ مُّحْجَبٌ

Indeed, this is flummoxing.¹

Some explain that Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and his supporters would not have accepted this proof, hence Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ used a corrupt evidence as proof in accordance to the opposition's belief. This is also flawed due to the fact that the opposition believe in Rasūlullāh ﷺ and some of them (allegedly) had also heard the declaration. Hypothetically, if they did not accept, then the Muhājirīn and Anṣār and 90000 soldiers with him believed. When these people were prepared to sacrifice their lives and spill their blood and were ready to practice what they claimed, then would they not believe the declaration of khilāfah in his favour and would they not present it as proof against their opposition? In fact, had there been such a clear declaration, then his supporters would have most certainly presented it as verification that they are on truth by supporting him in accordance to the command of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. This would have strengthened the stance of Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and the supporters of Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would not have the courage to deny the testimony of such a massive army.

To leave aside such a strong proof and to present something false instead is actually an attack on the purity and truthfulness of Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

With regards to Taqīyyah, it was not the place or time to be observed. If those narrations of the Shī'ah are authentic wherein mention is made of Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ listing the evils of the Ṣahābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ publicly, then what fear did he have which forced him to falsely praise them? In short, if one uses his sound intellect

1 Sūrah Ṣād: 5.

then there remains no doubt that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه also believes that his khalīfah was decided by the Muhājirīn, Anṣār, and the Ahl al-Ḥall wa l-‘Aqd, and not by a declaration of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم and the Muhājirīn and Anṣār never opposed him. When his time came, the Muhājirīn and Anṣār رضي الله عنهم appointed him as khalīfah and took bay‘ah at his hands and left no stone unturned in supporting him. Every just and unbiased person will accept that if the people usurped his rights, usurped Fadak, and oppressed Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها, then definitely Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه would have confronted them and fought them and those who supported him when he assumed the position of khalīfah would have assisted him. Just as they presented their lives for sacrifice against the Amīr of Syria, they would have done the same to protect Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها and fight her oppressors and shown their love and allegiance to the Ahl al-Bayt. From this we easily come to the obvious conclusion that those narrations which speak about the incidents of torture and tyranny with much hyperbole are totally baseless and fabricated.

Besides what I have mentioned above, another point of contemplation is that the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم consisted of two massive groups, the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār. The Shī‘ah say regarding the Muhājirīn that they harboured enmity for Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه because their relatives and friends were killed at his hands in most of the battles and this grudge remained in their hearts. For this reason, the Muhājirīn did not support him but rather supported those who usurped his rights. This is nothing but a humourless joke in reality. First of all, Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه was not the only one who fought in the battles and he did not kill everyone. The Muhājirīn themselves left their relatives and friends and joined Rasūlullāh’s صلى الله عليه وسلم campaigns of jihād against the enemy and spared no effort to kill their own blood. Besides, whatever Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه did was through the command of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم so the Muhājirīn ought to have the greatest enmity for Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم and reject his nubuwwah, may Allah سبحانه وتعالى forbid. It makes no sense that they are prepared to sacrifice their lives for Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم and use their blood to light the lamps of his nubuwwah and at the same time harbour enmity for Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه whereas he only acted in accordance to the

command of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Even if we accept this for argument's sake, then too what grudge do the Anṣār have against him? He did not kill their relatives. So why do they harbour hatred for him? This hatred justification which the Shī'ah present is not found in the Anṣār. They are that noble group whom Rasūlullāh ﷺ desired till his last moments and for whose help and assistance he was grateful to the extent that he declared them as his family and bequeathed that honour and kindness be shown to them. Such people ought to have a special bond, attachment, and love for Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه; not enmity and hatred.

Do the Shī'ah not study those narrations which extol the virtues of the Anṣār and command kindness to them? Have a look at *Manhaj al-Ṣādiqīn* and *Majma' al-Bayān* of al-Ṭabarsī; what the Shī'ī commentators have written. This is not the occasion to quote all such narrations. I will, however, quote one narration from *Manhaj al-Ṣādiqīn*. He writes in the commentary of the verse:

لَقَدْ نَصَرَكُمُ اللَّهُ فِي مَوَاطِنَ كَثِيرَةٍ وَيَوْمَ حُنَيْنٍ

Allah has already given you victory in many regions and [even] on the day of Ḥunayn.¹

Rasūlullāh ﷺ gave most of the spoils of the Battle of Ḥunayn and Awṭās to *al-mu'allafat al-qulūb*², more to the Muhājirīn and a minimal amount to the Anṣār. Some of the Anṣār were saddened by this distribution and said that Rasūlullāh ﷺ gave all the spoils to his people and deprived them. Rasūlullāh ﷺ was deeply saddened when this news reached him. He thus gathered the Anṣār and said, "You were on the brink of falling into Jahannam but Allah saved you at my hands. Is this not true?"

They all replied in the affirmative. In this way, Rasūlullāh ﷺ enumerated other favours upon them and then said, "You can respond by saying that I

1 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 25.

2 To those who were inclined to accept Islam or who recently accepted Islam but their faith was still weak.

came alone and you gave me shelter and assistance; I was fearful and you granted me security; people belied me and you accepted me.”

Hearing this, the Anṣār began to sob bitterly. They caught hold of Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ leg and pleaded, “O Rasūlullāh! Our lives and wealth are at your disposal. If you wish to give your people then do so. What some of the lowly among us have said, forgive them and seek forgiveness on their behalf.”

Rasūlullāh ﷺ then raised his hands and supplicated:

اللهم اغفر للانصار و ابناء الانصار و ابناء ابناء الانصار يا معشر الانصار اما ترضون ان ينصرف الناس بالشاءة و الغنم و فى سهمكم رسول الله قالوا بلى يا رسول الله رضينا بالله و عنه و برسوله فقال الانصار كرشى و عيبتى لو سلك الناس واديا و سلك الانصار شعبا لسلكت شعب الانصار

“O Allah! Forgive the Anṣār, their children and grandchildren. O gathering of the Anṣār, are you not pleased that people will return with sheep and goats and you will return with the Rasūl of Allah?”

“Most definitely,” was their reply, “We are pleased with Allah and His Rasūl.”

He ﷺ then said, “The Anṣār are my family¹ and my close ones. If the people choose a valley and the Anṣār take a path, I will follow the path of the Anṣār.”²

Majma‘ al-Bayān of al-Ṭabarsī has the following addition:

و لولا الهجرة لكنت امرأ من الانصار اللهم ارحم الانصار و ابناء الانصار و ابناء ابناء الانصار فبكى القوم حتى اخضبت لحاهم

1 *Karish*: Family members and offspring. It is said, they are small children. *Al-‘aybah*: it is said so and so’s ‘aybah when it is his hiding place (confidant).

2 *Manhaj al-Ṣādiqīn* vol. 2 pg. 1.

“Had it not been for hijrah, I would be one of the Anṣār. O Allah! Have mercy on the Anṣār, their children and grandchildren.”

They cried so profusely that their beards were soaked with tears.¹

Al-Ihtijāj of al-Ṭabarsī has a narration from Abū al-Faḍl Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Shaybānī that in his last illness before death, Rasūlullāh ﷺ came for the ṣalāh with the support of Sayyidunā Faḍl ibn ‘Abbās and his slave Sayyidunā Thawbān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا. After the ṣalāh, he returned to his house and ordered Sayyidunā Thawbān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to remain seated by the door instructing him that if any of the Anṣār come, they should not be prevented from entering. Rasūlullāh ﷺ then fell unconscious. Meanwhile, the Anṣār came and requested to enter. The doorkeeper explained that Rasūlullāh ﷺ was unconscious and that his pure wives were by him. Hearing this, the Anṣār wept. When Rasūlullāh ﷺ heard their cries, he asked as to who they were. “The Anṣār,” was the answer. At this, Rasūlullāh ﷺ with the support of Sayyidunā ‘Alī and Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا went outside and proclaimed:

يا معشر الناس انه لم يموت نبي قط الا خلف تركة و قد تركت فيكم الثقلين كتاب الله و اهل بيتي فمن ضيعهم ضيعه الله الا و ان الانصار كرشى و عيبتي اوى اليها و انى اوصيكم بتقوى الله و الاحسان اليهم فاقبلوا من محسنهم و تجاوزوا عن مسيئتهم

O gathering! No Nabī dies but he leaves behind a legacy. I have left behind two weighty things: the Book of Allah and my household. Whoever discards them will be destroyed by Allah. Hark! The Anṣār are my family and my close ones whom I sought refuge in. I command you to fear Allah *سُبْحَانَكَ وَبِحَمْدِكَ* and be kind to them. Accept their good and forgive their mistakes.²

These are the last words of Rasūlullāh ﷺ in favour of the Anṣār رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ. Shame on those people who believe Rasūlullāh ﷺ as the Messenger of Allah *سُبْحَانَكَ وَبِحَمْدِكَ*, claim to believe in him, quote these words from his blessed tongue and narrate his bequest in favour of the Anṣār رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ; yet label these very people as renegades

1 *Majma’ al-Bayān* vol. 2 pg. 10.

2 *Al-Ihtijāj* of Ṭabarsī vol. 1 pg. 171, 172.

and enemies of the Ahl al-Bayt and declare them to be out of the fold of Islam. Can anyone believe for a moment that the Anṣār رضي الله عنه whom Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم marked as his children and family would harbour enmity for Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and abandon him without any reason and support his opponents? Would they after hearing the open declaration intend to make Sayyidunā Sa’d ibn ‘Ubādah رضي الله عنه their imām and forget Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه or completely ignore him? This is beyond imagination, forget reality.

Al-Shūstarī tries to answer this in *Iḥqāq al-Ḥaqq*:

و اما خامسا فلان قوله فلو كان الانصار سمعوه غير مسموع لانهم سمعوا ذلك النص و تذاكروه فيما بينهم لكنهم لم يجعلوا ذلك اليوم حجة على ابي بكر بشبهة اوقعها اولياء ابي بكر و غيره في قلوب الناس من ان عليا قد تقاعد عن تصدى الخلافة و التزم البيت و امسك عن احياء هذا الميت فان المذكور في المعبر من كتب السير و التواريخ انه لما توفي رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم و اشتغل على مع اصحابه من بنى هاشم و غيرهم بتجهيز النبي و تعزيتة معتقدا ان احدا لا يطمع في هذا الامر مع وجوده اوقع بعض المنحرفين عن علي في قلوب الناس انه قد تقاعد عن تصدى الخلافة بشدة ما اصابه من مصيبة النبي و سكن قريته مشتغلا بالحزن و التعزية فجاء خزيمة بن ثابت الانصارى و قال لقومه من الانصار ما سمعه من حال علي و ذكر انه لا بد ممن على هذا الامر و ليس سواه قرشى يليق بذلك فنخاف الانصار ان يشتد عليهم البلية و يلي هذا الامر قرشى فظ غليظ ينتقم منهم للثارات الجاهلية و الاضغان البدوية فتوجهوا الى سعد بن عبادة سيد الانصار و حضروا سقيفة ملتصقا منه قبول الخلافة فابى سعد عن ذلك لمكان علي و انه المخصوص بالخلافة عن الله تعالى و رسوله فلما سمع قريش بذلك و كانوا منتهرين للفرصة و السواقي الامر و عجلوا في البيعة لابي بكر فبادروا الى السقيفة لتسكين نائرة الانصار و التمسوا بيعة ابي بكر بالطوع و الاجبار فقال لهم الانصار اذا تركتم فعل الله و رسوله فليس احد منا و منكم بعد علي بن ابي طالب الى من غيره فمننا امير و منكم امير فابى ابو بكر و اصحابه عند ذلك محتجين في ذلك بان الائمة من قريش و ابي سعد عن قبول امارتهم متمسكا بان النص لذلك لغيرهم فاضطرب الحال الى ان مال قلب بشر بن سعد بن ثعلبة الانصارى زعما لابن عبادة الى ترجيح جانب قريش و موافقتهم فقوى امر قريش و باد عمر الى صفق يده على يد ابي بكر و بايعه هو و جماعة من اضرا به فتنة كما اخبر عنه هو بعد ذلك بقوله كانت بيعة ابي بكر فلتة و في الله شرها عن المسلمين

Fifthly, his statement “If the Anṣār heard it,” is non-acceptable since the Anṣār heard this declaration and would mention it among themselves. However, they did not use it as proof against Abū Bakr on that day due to the doubt created by the friends of Abū Bakr and others in the hearts of people that ‘Alī did not claim the khilāfah and remained glued to his house and withheld from reviving this dead claim. What appears in reliable

books of siyar and history is that when Rasūlullāh ﷺ passed away, and ‘Alī and his family of the Banū Hāshim got occupied with organising the ghusl and shrouding of Rasūlullāh ﷺ knowing well that no one will undertake this task in his presence, some of those who turned away from ‘Alī spread the rumour that he is not going to claim khilāfah because of the great calamity which has befallen him, i.e. the demise of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and he is engaged in grieving and mourning. Khuzaymah ibn Thābit al-Anṣārī came and said to his tribe what he had heard about ‘Alī. He mentioned the necessity of a khalīfah and that no other Qurayshī besides ‘Alī has the potential for this mammoth task. The Anṣār feared that the calamity might worsen and a Qurayshī might take over the reins of khilāfah who is hard-hearted and stony and who will take revenge from them due to his grudges and bedoiuc malice. Therefore, they turned to Sa’d ibn ‘Ubādah, the leader of the Anṣār. They proceeded to the Saqīfah and implored him to accept the khilāfah. The latter refused due to the presence of ‘Alī explaining that his khilāfah is declared from Allah ﷻ and His Rasūl ﷺ. When the Quraysh heard of this, they were waiting for an opportunity; they hastily took bay’ah at the hands of Abū Bakr and hastened to the Saqīfah to cool the tenseness of the Anṣār. They implored the Anṣār to take bay’ah at the hands of Abū Bakr, willingly or unwillingly. The Anṣār said, “When you have abandoned the command of Allah and His Rasūl, then besides ‘Alī bin Abī Ṭālib there is no person from us or you more worthy than others, so let there be a leader from us and a leader from you. Abū Bakr and his cronies refused and substantiated their claim by saying that the A’immah will be from Quraysh. On the other hand, Sa’d refused their leadership taking support from the fact that the declaration is for someone other than them. They began quarrelling and arguing. Then Bishr ibn Sa’d ibn Tha’labah al-Anṣārī’s heart inclined towards giving the Quraysh preference and agreeing with them. Thus, the Quraysh’s view was strengthened. ‘Umar rushed to put his hand into the hand of Abū Bakr and he took bay’ah followed by a group like him. This was done in haste as he acknowledged thereafter with the words, “The bay’ah of Abū Bakr happened in haste but Allah protected the Muslims from its evil.”¹

1 *Iḥqāq al-Ḥaqq* pg. 65.

و روى الشيخ الفاضل ابو السعادات الحلى فى شرح دعاء صنمى قریش انه اجتمع ابو بكر و عمر و ابو عبيدة و اخوانهم فى سقيفة بنى ساعدة يطلبون الحكم و البيعة من غير اكثرات باهل البيت و بنى هاشم و كل واحد من هؤلاء الثلاثة يرجو الحكم و الامر لنفسه و يعطفه على صاحبه فانكر عليهم الانصار و اصروا على الدفاع و الامتناع و احتجوا عليهم بما قال رسول الله فى على من التوكيد فى امامته فى مواطن شتى و امر اياهم بالتسليم عليه بامارة المؤمنين فقال ابو بكر قد كان ذلك لكن نسخه النبى بقوله انا اهل البيت كرمنا الله و اصطفانا بالنبوة و لم يرض لنا بالدنيا و ان الله لا يجمع لنا النبوة و الخلافة فصدقاه عمر و ابو عبيدة فى ذلك و عللا قعود على فى بيته و الاشتغال بتجهيز النبى دون تصدى امر الخلافة بعلمه بتحويل الامر عنه فقالت الانصار اذا لا نرضى و الله بامارة غيرنا علينا منا امير و منكم امير فذكروا عن رسول الله الائمة من قریش و شبهوا الامر على الانصار و سائر الامة و قطعوا بذلك حججهم و اخذوا بيعتهم و لما فرغ على و اصحابه عن تجهيز النبى و دفته و تكلموا فى ذلك اعتذروا تارة بان الناس بايعوا و لم يكن لهم علم بانك تنازعهم فى الامر و نكث البيعة الواقعة يورث مفاسد بين المسلمين و خلال فى ارکان الدين و تارة بانهم ظنوا انك لشدة مصيبة النبى طرحت الخلافة و الامارة فاتفق اصحاب رسول الله على تفويض الامر الى ابى بكر الى غير ذلك من الاعذار الذى سيحيى مع جوابها فى المواضع لانتق بها

Shaykh Abū al-Sa‘ādāt al-Ḥillī has narrated in *Sharḥ Du‘ā’ Ṣanamī Quraysh* that Abū Bakr, ‘Umar, Abū ‘Ubaydah, and their friends gathered in Saqīfah Banī Sā‘īdah seeking leadership and bay‘ah without many of the Ahl al-Bayt and Banū Hāshim being present. All three of these men were hoping to acquire leadership himself but were passing the buck onto his partner. The Anṣār refused vehemently. They verified their stance by quoting the statements of Rasūlullāh ﷺ regarding ‘Alī’s Imāmah on many occasions and the emphasis laid upon it. They ordered them to accept him as the leader of the Mu‘minīn. Abū Bakr said, “This was in the past but was later abrogated by Rasūlullāh ﷺ who said, ‘Verily, we are the Ahl al-Bayt. Allah honoured us and chosen us for the station of nubuwwah and was not pleased with the world for us. Allah will not join nubuwwah and khilāfah for us.’”

‘Umar and Abū ‘Ubaydah agreed with him. They further substantiated their claim by using ‘Alī’s sitting at home and engagement in the burial proceedings of Rasūlullāh ﷺ to show that he does not want khilāfah and knew fully well that it will go to someone else. The Anṣār then said, “In that case, by Allah we will not be happy with the leadership of anyone over us besides us. So let there be a leader from us and a leader from you.”

The three quoted Rasūlullāh ﷺ as saying, “The A’immah are from Quraysh.”

They thus muddled things up in front of the Anṣār and the entire ummah and destroyed the latter’s proof. Finally, they took bay’ah from them. On the other hand, when ‘Alī and his comrades were complete with the burial proceedings and spoke to the Anṣār about this, the latter presented excuses. They said that people took bay’ah and they had no knowledge that ‘Alī would fight for khilāfah. They explained that breaking the bay’ah will cause chaos and disunity among the Muslims and an imbalance in the pillars of dīn. They also said that they thought that due to the intensity of the grief of Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ demise, he renounced khilāfah and leadership, thus resulting in the consensus of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم to hand over the matter to Abū Bakr. They presented other excuses as well which will come with their answers in their appropriate places.¹

These narrations establish the fact that the Anṣār were not from the enemies of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and did not desire khilāfah themselves. The intention of Sayyidunā Sa’d ibn ‘Ubādah رضي الله عنه was only a deception. He did not conceal the declaration he heard in favour of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه but mentioned it in Saqīfah Banī Sā’idah. This shows that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه was worthy of khilāfah. However, when he was ‘duped’ into believing that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه quitted Imāmah due to extreme grief, he then said that they will not accept the Imāmah of another Qurayshī. It is for this reason that the Aws and Khazraj have been listed among the devout followers of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه in *Majālis al-Mu’minīn* and Sayyidunā Sa’d ibn ‘Ubādah رضي الله عنه – the one who claimed Imāmah – has been reckoned among his sincere supporters. Al-Shūstarī writes:

الآوس و الخزرج ذو قبيله بزرگ انداز انصار كه حال ايشان از غايت اشتهاى حاجت باظهار ندارد و اخلاص اين دو طائفه خصوصا سعد بن عباده خزرجي و اولاد امجاد او نسبت بحضرت علويه مرتضويه غايت ظهور دارد

Aws and Khazraj are two huge tribes of the Anṣār whose bravery and valour is well-known. Both these tribes especially Sa’d ibn ‘Ubādah Khazrajī’s children had genuine sincerity for ‘Alī Murtaḍā.

1 *Iḥqāq al-Ḥaq* pg. 65.

If Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ really wanted to fight and combat the usurpers for his rights, then would the Anṣār not support and help him? The level of the Anṣār’s īmān and Islam and their deep love for the noble Ahl al-Bayt has already been proven from Shī‘ī narrations.

With regards to the second group, i.e. the Quraysh included among whom are the Muhājirīn whom the Shī‘ah regard as out of the fold of Islam especially Sayyidunā Shaykhayn and their devout supporters رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ, no one can deny that after Sayyidunā Abū Bakr, Sayyidunā ‘Umar, and Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ became Khulafā’, Islam spread far and wide and progressed in their eras. Many wars were fought in their eras and the kingdoms of Kisrā and Qayṣar crumbled at their feet. These facts cannot be denied by anyone. The difference is that the Shī‘ah claim that they were devoid of īmān and were hypocrites and renegades and whatever happened in their eras does not prove their īmān. Many oppressive and worldly kings have passed who were open sinners and transgressors, yet Muslims gained victories and Islam spread accross kuffār countries in their eras. Hence, their battles are just like other kings’ battles which are fought for nothing but worldly gain; they are not included in jihād in the path of Allah. Whereas on the other hand, we the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā‘ah regard their jihād and conquests to be a verification of the correctness of their khilāfah and the fulfilment of the promise of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى:

وَعَدَ اللَّهُ الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا مِنْكُمْ وَعَمِلُوا الصَّالِحَاتِ لَيَسْتَخْلِفَنَّهُمْ فِي الْأَرْضِ كَمَا اسْتَخْلَفَ الَّذِينَ مِنْ قَبْلِهِمْ

Allah has promised those who have believed among you and done righteous deeds that He will surely grant them succession [to authority] upon the earth.¹

We see their conquests to be in conformity to this glad tiding and promise of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. It now should be ascertained whether our belief or the Shī‘ah’s belief is established as correct from reliable and authentic Shī‘ī books and the statements

1 Sūrah al-Nūr: 55.

of the noble A'immah. I will present one ḥadīth from *al-Kāfī* which will totally debunk all of the beliefs of the Shī'ah regarding the righteous Khulafā' رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ. This ḥadīth proves the īmān and good actions of these luminaries and cannot be answered academically nor intellectually.

عن علي بن ابراهيم عن ابيه عن بكير بن صالح عن القاسم بن يزيد عن ابي عمير الزبيرى عن ابي عبد الله قال قلت اخبرنى عن الدعاء الى الله و الجهاد فى سبيله ا هو يقوم لا يحل الا لهم و لا يقوم لا من كان منهم ام هو مباح لكل من وعد الله عز و جل و امن برسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم و من كان كذا فله ان يدعو الى الله عز و جل و الى طاعته و ان يجاهد فى سبيله فقال ذلك لقوم لا يحل الا لهم و لا يقوم بذلك الا من كان منهم قلت من اولئك قال من قام بشرايط الله عز و جل فى القتال و الجهاد على المجاهدين فهو الماذون له فى الدعاء الى الله عز و جل و من لم يكن بشرايط الله عز و جل فى الجهاد على المجاهدين فليس بماذون له فى الجهاد و لا الدعاء الى الله تبارك و تعالى اخبر فى كتابه ادعاء اليه و وصف الدعاة اليه فجعل ذلك لهم درجات يعرف بعضها بعضا و يستدل بعضها على بعض فاجبر انه تبارك و تعالى اول من دعا الى نفسه فدعا الى طاعته و اتباع امر فبدا بنفسه فقال وَاللّٰهُ يَدْعُوْا اِلٰى دَارِ السَّلَامِ وَيَهْدِيْ مَنْ يَّشَاءُ اِلٰى صِرَاطٍ مُّسْتَقِيْمٍ ثُمَّ نُبِيْ رَسُوْلُهُ فَقَالَ اذْعُ اِلٰى سَبِيْلِ رَبِّكَ بِالْحِكْمَةِ وَالْمَوْعِظَةِ الْحَسَنَةِ وَجَادِلْهُمْ بِالَّتِيْ هِيَ اَحْسَنُ اِنْ رَبُّكَ هُوَ اَعْلَمُ بِمَنْ ضَلَّ عَنْ سَبِيْلِهِ وَهُوَ اَعْلَمُ بِالْمُهْتَدِيْنَ اى بالقران و لم يكن داعيا الى الله عز و جل من خالف امر الله و يدعو اليه بغير ما امر فى كتابه و الدين امر لا يدعى الا به و قال فى النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم و اِنَّكَ لَتَهْدِيْ اِلٰى صِرَاطٍ مُّسْتَقِيْمٍ بقول يدعو ثم ثلث بالدعاء اليه بكتابه ايضا فقال اِنَّ هٰذَا الْقُرْآنُ يَهْدِيْ لَلَّتِيْ هِيَ اَقْوَمُ وَيُبَشِّرُ الْمُؤْمِنِيْنَ ثُمَّ ذَكَرَ مِنْ اِذْنِ فِي الدِّعَاءِ بَعْدَهُ و بعد رسوله فى كتابه فقال وَتُكَنِّ مِّنْكُمْ اُمَّةٌ يَّدْعُوْنَ اِلٰى الْخَيْرِ وَيَأْمُرُوْنَ بِالْمَعْرُوْفِ وَيَنْهَوْنَ عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ وَاُولٰٓئِكَ هُمُ الْمُفْلِحُوْنَ ثم اخبر عن هذه الامة و ممن هى و انها من ذرية ابراهيم و من ذرية اسماعيل من مكان الحرم ممن لم يعبد غير الله قط الذين وجبت لهم الدعوة دعوة ابراهيم و اسماعيل من اهل المسجد الذين اخبر عنهم فى كتابه انهم اذهب عنهم الرجس و طهرهم تطهيرا الذين وصفناهم قبل هذا فى صفة امة ابراهيم الذين عناهم الله تبارك و تعالى فى قوله اذْعُوْا اِلٰى اللّٰهِ عَلٰى بَصِيْرَةٍ اَنَا وَمَنْ اَتَّبَعَنِ يعنى اول من اتبعه على الايمان له و التصديق له و بما جاء به من عند الله عز و جل منه الامة التى بعث فيها و منها و اليها قبل الحق ممن لم يشرك بالله قط و لم يلبس ايمانه بظلم و هو الشرك ثم ذكر اتباع نبيه صلى الله عليه و سلم و اتباع هذه الامة التى وصفها فى كتابه بالامر بالمعروف و النهى عن المنكر و جعلها داعية اليه و اذن له فى الدعاء اليه فقال يَا اَيُّهَا النَّبِيُّ حَسْبُكَ اللّٰهُ وَمَنِ اتَّبَعَكَ مِنَ الْمُؤْمِنِيْنَ ثُمَّ وَصَفَ اِتِّبَاعَ نَبِيِّهِ مِنَ الْمُؤْمِنِيْنَ فَقَالَ عَزَّ وَجَلَّ رَسُوْلُ اللّٰهِ وَالَّذِيْنَ مَعَهُ اَشِدَّاءُ عَلٰى الْكٰفِرٰٓءِ رَحْمٰٓءٌ بَيْنَهُمْ تَرٰهُمْ رُكْعًا سَجِدًا يَّبْتَغُوْنَ فَضْلًا مِّنَ اللّٰهِ وَرِضْوَانًا سِيْمَاهُمْ فِيْ وُجُوْهِهِمْ مِّنْ اَثْرِ السُّجُوْدِ ذٰلِكَ مَثَلُهُمْ فِي التَّوْرٰةِ وَمَثَلُهُمْ فِي الْاِنْجِيْلِ وَقَالَ يَوْمَ لَا يُخْزِي اللّٰهُ النَّبِيَّ وَالَّذِيْنَ اٰمَنُوْا مَعَهُ نُوْرُهُمْ يَسْعٰى بَيْنَ اَيْدِيْهِمْ وَاَيْمَانُهُمْ يَقُوْلُوْنَ رَبَّنَا اٰتِنَا لَنَا نُوْرًا وَاغْفِرْ لَنَا اِنَّكَ عَلٰى كُلِّ شَيْءٍ قَدِيْرٌ يعنى اولئك المؤمنين فقال قَدْ اَفْلَحَ الْمُؤْمِنُوْنَ ثُمَّ حَلَاهُمْ وَ وَصَفَهُمْ كَيْلًا يَطْمَعُ فِي اللِّحَاقِ بِهِمْ اِلَّا مَنْ كَانَ مِنْهُمْ فَقَالَ فِيمَا حَلَاهُمْ وَ وَصَفَهُمُ الَّذِيْنَ هُمْ فِيْ صَلَاتِهِمْ خٰشِعُوْنَ وَالَّذِيْنَ هُمْ عَنِ اللِّغْوِ مُعْرِضُوْنَ وَالَّذِيْنَ هُمْ لِلرَّكٰٓةِ فٰعِلُوْنَ

وَالَّذِينَ هُمْ لِأُزواجهم حَافِظُونَ إِلَّا عَلَىٰ أَرْوَاجِهِمْ أَوْ مَا مَلَكَتْ أَيْمَانُهُمْ فَإِنَّهُمْ غَيْرُ مَلُومِينَ فَمَنْ ابْتغى وَرَاءَ ذَلِكَ فَأُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْعَادُونَ وَالَّذِينَ هُمْ لِأَمَانَاتِهِمْ وَعَهْدِهِمْ رَاعُونَ وَالَّذِينَ هُمْ عَلَىٰ صَلَوَاتِهِمْ يُحَافِظُونَ أُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْفَارِقُونَ الَّذِينَ يَرْتُونَ الْفِرْدَوْسَ هُمْ فِيهَا خَالِدُونَ وَقَالَ فِي وصفهم وحببتهم ايضاً وَالَّذِينَ لَا يَدْعُونَ مَعَ اللَّهِ إِلَهًا آخَرَ وَلَا يَقْتُلُونَ النَّفْسَ الَّتِي حَرَّمَ اللَّهُ إِلَّا بِالْحَقِّ وَلَا يَزْنُونَ ثُمَّ اخبر إنَّ اللَّهَ اشترى مِنَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ أَنفُسَهُمْ وَأَمْوَالَهُمْ بِأَنْ لَهُمُ الْجَنَّةَ يُقَاتِلُونَ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ فَيَقْتُلُونَ وَيُقْتَلُونَ وَعَدَا عَلَيْهِ حَقًّا فِي التَّوَارِثِ وَالْإِنجِيلِ وَالْقُرْآنِ ثُمَّ ذَكَرَ وفائهم له بعهدته ومبايعته فقال وَمَنْ أوفى بِعَهْدِهِ مِنَ اللَّهِ فَاسْتَبشِرُوا بِيَعِّكُمْ الَّذِي بِأَيْمَانِهِ بِهِ وَذَلِكَ هُوَ الْفَوْزُ الْعَظِيمُ فلما نزل هذه الآية إنَّ اللَّهَ اشترى مِنَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ أَنفُسَهُمْ وَأَمْوَالَهُمْ بِأَنْ لَهُمُ الْجَنَّةَ يُقَاتِلُونَ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ فَيَقْتُلُونَ وَيُقْتَلُونَ قَالَ رجل الى النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم فقال يا نبي الله اربناك الرجل ياخذ سيفه فيقتل حتى يقتل الا انه يقترب من هذه المحارم اشهد هو فانزل الله عز و جل التَّائِبُونَ الْعَابِدُونَ الْحَامِدُونَ السَّاجِدُونَ الرَّكَعُونَ السَّاجِدُونَ الْأَمْرُونَ بِالْمَعْرُوفِ وَالنَّاهُونَ عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ وَالْحَافِظُونَ لِحُدُودِ اللَّهِ وَبَشِّرِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ ففسر النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم المجاهدين من المؤمنين الذين هذه صفتهم وحببتهم بالشهادة والجنة و قال التائبون من الذنوب العابدون الذين لا يعبدون الا الله و لا يشركون به شيئاً الحامدون الذين يحمدون الله على كل حال في الشدة و الرخاء السائحون و هم الصائمون الراكعون الساجدون الذين يواظبون على الصلوات الخمس الحافظون لها و المحافظون عليها بركوعها و سجودها و الخشوع فيها و في اوقاتها الامرون بالمعروف بعد ذلك و العاملون به و الناهون عن المنكر و المنتهون عنه قال بشر من قتل و هو قائم بهذه الشروط بالشهادة و الجنة ثم اخبر تبارك و تعالى انه لامر بالقتال الاصحاب هذه الشروط فقال عز و جل اذْ لِلَّذِينَ يُقَاتِلُونَ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ وَمَا ظَلَمُوا وَاِنَّ اللَّهَ عَلَىٰ نَصْرِهِمْ لَقَدِيرٌ الَّذِي اُخْرِجُوْا مِنْ دِيَارِهِمْ بِغَيْرِ حَقٍّ اِلَّا اَنْ يَقُولُوا رَبَّنَا اللَّهُ وَذَلِكَ ان جميع ما بين السماء و الارض لله عز و جل و لرسوله و لاتباعه من المؤمنين من اهل هذه الصفة فيما كان من الدنيا في ايدى المشركين و الكفار و الظلمة و الفجار من اهل الخلاف لرسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم و المولى عن طاعتها مما كان في ايديهم ظلموا فيه المؤمنين من اهل هذه الصفات و غلبوهم عليه ما افاء الله على رسوله فهو حقهم افاء الله عليهم و رده اليهم و انما معنى الفء كلما ساء الى المشركين ثم رجع مما قد كان عليه او فيه فما رجع الى مكانه من قول او فعل فقد فاء مثل قول الله عز و جل اِنْ فَاءُوا فَاِنَّ اللَّهَ غَفُورٌ رَحِيمٌ اى رجعوا ثم قال وَاِنَّ عَزْمَ الْطَّلَاقِ فَاِنَّ اللَّهَ سَمِيعٌ عَلِيمٌ و قال وَاِنَّ طَائِفَتَانِ مِنَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ اقْتَتَلُوا فَاَصْلِحُوا بَيْنَهُمَا فَاِنَّ بَعْثَ اِخْدَاهُمَا عَلَى الْاُخْرَى فَقَاتَلُوا الْعِنَى تَبَغَّى حَتَّى تَفِيءَ اِلَى اَمْرِ اللَّهِ فَاِنَّ فَاءَتْ فَاَصْلِحُوا بَيْنَهُمَا بِالْعَدْلِ وَاَقْسَطُوا اِنَّ اللَّهَ يُحِبُّ الْمُقْسِطِينَ يعنى يقوله تفىء اى ترجع فذاك الدليل على ان الفء كل راجع الى مكانه قد كان عليه او فيه و يقال للشمس اذا زالت قد فاءت الشمس حين تفىء الفء عند رجوع الشمس الى زوالها و كذلك ما افاء الله على المؤمنين من الكفار فانما هى حقوق المؤمنين رجعت اليهم بعد ظلمهم اياهم فذلك قوله اذْ لِلَّذِينَ يُقَاتِلُونَ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ وَمَا ظَلَمُوا مَا كَانَ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ اِحْتِقَ بِهِ مَنصَرٌ و انما اذن المؤمنون الذين قاموا بشروط الايمان التى وصفناها و ذلك انه لا يكون ماذوناً له فى القتال حتى يكون مظلوماً و لا يكون مظلوماً حتى يكون مومناً و لا يكون مومناً حتى يكون قائماً بشروط الايمان التى شرط الله عز و جل على المؤمنين و المجاهدين فاذا تكاملت فيه شرائط الله عز و جل كان مومناً و اذا كان مومناً كان مظلوماً و اذا كان مظلوماً كان ماذوناً فى الجهاد بقوله عز و جل اذْ لِلَّذِينَ يُقَاتِلُونَ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ وَمَا ظَلَمُوا مَا كَانَ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ اِحْتِقَ بِهِ مَنصَرٌ و ان لم يكن

مستكملاً بشرائط الايمان فهو ظالم ممن ينبغي و يجب جهاده حتى يتوب و ليس مثله ماذونا فى الجهاد و الدعاء الى الله عز و جل لانه ليس من المؤمنين المظلومين الذين اذن لهم فى القتال فلما نزلت هذه الاية اذن للذين يقاتلون بانهم ظلموا فى المهاجرين الذين اخرجهم اهل مكة من ديارهم و اموالهم احل لهم جهادهم بظلمهم اياهم و ان لهم فى القتال فقلت فهذه الاية نزلت فى المهاجرين بظلم مشركى اهل مكة لهم فما بالهم فى قتال كسرى و قيصر و من دونهم من مشركى قبائل العرب فقال لو كان انما اذن لهم فى قتال من ظلمهم من اهل مكة فقط لم يكن لهم فى قتال جموع كسرى و قيصر و غير اهل مكة من قبائل العرب سبيل لان الذين ظلموهم غيرهم و انما اذن لهم فى قتال من ظلمهم من اهل مكة لا اخرجهم اياهم من ديارهم و اموالهم بغير حق و لو كانت الاية انما عنت المهاجرين الذين ظلمهم اهل مكة كانت الاية مرتفعة الغرض عنم بعدهم اذ لم يبق من الظالمين و المظلومين احد و كان فرضا مرفوعا عن الناس بعدهم و ليس كما ظننت و لا كما ذكرت و لكن المهاجرين ظلموا من جهتين ظلمهم اهل مكة باخراجهم من ديارهم و اموالهم فقاتلوهم باذن الله تعالى لهم فى ذلك و ظلمهم كسرى و قيصر و ما كان دونهم من قبائل العرب و العجم بما كان فى ايديهم مما كان المؤمنون احق بهم منهم فقد قاتلوهم باذن الله عز و جل لهم فى ذلك و الحجة هذه الاية يقاتل مومنو كل زمان و انما اذن الله عز و جل للمؤمنين الذين قاموا بما وصف الله عز و جل من الشرائط التى شرطها الله على المؤمنين فى الايمان و الجهاد و من كان قائماً بتلك الشرائط فهو مومن و هو مظلوم و ماذون له فى الجهاد بذلك المعنى و من كان على خلاف ذلك فهو ظالم و ليس من المظلومين و ليس بماذون له فى القتال و لا بالنهى عن المنكر و الامر بالامعروف لانه ليس من اهل ذلك و لا ماذون له فى الدعاء الى الله عز و جل لانه ليس هذا كمثل

‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm narrates from his father from Bukayr ibn Ṣālīḥ from Qāsim ibn Yazīd from Abū ‘Umayr al-Zabīrī who reports that he asked Abū ‘Abd Allah to inform him of inviting towards Allah and waging Jihād in His path; is it specific to a certain group or is it permissible for all who believe in the oneness of Allah ﷻ and his Rasūl ﷺ to call towards Allah ﷻ and His obedience and to wage Jihād in His path.

He replied, “It is only permissible for a certain group and no one else has the right to practice it.”

“Who are these people?” he asked.

The reply was, “Those who fulfil the requirements mentioned by Allah ﷻ for the mujāhidīn are permitted to call towards Allah ﷻ whereas those who do not possess these qualities are not permitted to wage jihād and call towards Allah until Allah creates in him the qualities of jihād.”

The narrator then asked him to explain these requisites and qualities. He elucidated by saying, “Certainly, Allah ﷻ has mentioned about inviting to Himself in His book and has mentioned the qualities of those who call towards Him. Allah ﷻ has made for them different levels so that they may recognise one another and be informed of one another. Allah ﷻ informed that He is the first Who called towards Himself; His obedience and fulfilling His commands. He began with Himself declaring:

وَاللَّهُ يَدْعُو إِلَى دَارِ السَّلَامِ وَيَهْدِي مَنْ يَشَاءُ إِلَى صِرَاطٍ مُسْتَقِيمٍ

And Allah invites to the Home of Peace and guides whom He wills to a straight path.¹

He mentioned His Rasūl second saying:

ادْعُ إِلَى سَبِيلِ رَبِّكَ بِالْحُكْمَةِ وَالْمَوْعِظَةِ الْحَسَنَةِ وَجَادِلْهُمْ بِالَّتِي هِيَ أَحْسَنُ إِنَّ رَبَّكَ هُوَ أَعْلَمُ بِمَنْ ضَلَّ عَنْ سَبِيلِهِ وَهُوَ أَعْلَمُ بِالْمُهْتَدِينَ

Invite to the way of your Lord with wisdom and good instruction, and argue with them in a way that is best. Indeed, your Lord is most knowing of who has strayed from His way, and He is most knowing of who is [rightly] guided.²

That person cannot be a caller towards Allah ﷻ who acts contrary to His commands and calls to Him in a manner other than what He has stipulated in His book. Dīn is following commands. No claim can be made except with it. Allah ﷻ says regarding Rasūlullāh ﷺ:

وَإِنَّكَ لَتَهْدِي إِلَى صِرَاطٍ مُسْتَقِيمٍ

And indeed, [O Muḥammad], you guide to a straight path.³

1 Sūrah Yūnus: 25.

2 Sūrah al-Naḥl: 125.

3 Sūrah al-Shūrā: 52.

He then mentioned thirdly about calling towards Him through His book:

إِنَّ هَذَا الْقُرْآنَ يَهْدِي لِلَّتِي هِيَ أَقْوَمُ وَيُبَشِّرُ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ

Indeed, this Qur'an guides (calls) to that which is most suitable and gives good tidings to the believers.¹

Allah ﷻ then mentioned who is permitted to invite after Him and His Rasūl in the Qur'an:

وَلْتَكُنْ مِنْكُمْ أُمَّةٌ يَدْعُونَ إِلَى الْخَيْرِ وَيَأْمُرُونَ بِالْمَعْرُوفِ وَيَنْهَوْنَ عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ وَأُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْمُفْلِحُونَ

And let there be [arising] from you a nation inviting to [all that is] good, enjoining what is right and forbidding what is wrong, and those will be the successful.²

He then mentioned this ummah and specified who among them. Those who are the progeny of Ibrāhīm ﷺ and Ismā'īl ﷺ, who lived by the ḥaram and who never ever worshipped anyone besides Allah. Those for whom the invitation of Ibrāhīm ﷺ and Ismā'īl ﷺ is necessary; from the people of the Masjid. Those regarding whom He ﷻ has mentioned in the Qur'an that He has removed filth from them and thoroughly purified them. Those whom we have specified before in the qualities of the ummah of Ibrāhīm. Those whom Allah ﷻ referred to in His statement:

أَدْعُوْا إِلَى اللَّهِ عَلَى بَصِيْرَةٍ أَنَا وَمَنْ اتَّبَعَنِي

I invite to Allah with insight, I and those who follow me.³

This refers to those who followed him in the very beginning by believing in him and in that which he brought from Allah ﷻ. They are the ummah

1 Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl: 9.

2 Sūrah Āl 'Imrān: 104.

3 Sūrah Yūsuf: 108.

from whom he was sent and to whom he was sent who accepted the truth and never ascribed partners to Allah ﷺ. Their imān was never blemished with shirk. Allah ﷻ then spoke about following His Nabī ﷺ and following this ummah whom he described in his Qur’ān with enjoining good and forbidding evil. He made them callers to Himself and permitted them to invite, saying:

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّبِيُّ حَسْبُكَ اللَّهُ وَمَنِ اتَّبَعَكَ مِنَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ

O Prophet, sufficient for you is Allah and for whoever follows you of the believers.¹

He then mentioned the qualities of the Muslims who followed his Nabī

ﷺ:

مُحَمَّدٌ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ وَالَّذِينَ مَعَهُ أَشِدَّاءُ عَلَى الْكُفَّارِ رُحَمَاءُ بَيْنَهُمْ تَرَاهُمْ رُكَّعًا سُجَّدًا يَبْتَغُونَ فَضْلًا مِنَ اللَّهِ وَرِضْوَانًا سِيمَاهُمْ فِي وُجُوهِهِمْ مِنْ أَثَرِ السُّجُودِ ذَلِكَ مَثَلُهُمْ فِي التَّوْرَةِ وَمَثَلُهُمْ فِي الْإِنْجِيلِ

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 is on their faces from the trace of prostration. That is their description in the Torah. And their description in the Gospel.²

And He ﷻ said:

يَوْمَ لَا يُخْزِي اللَّهُ النَّبِيَّ وَالَّذِينَ آمَنُوا مَعَهُ نُورُهُمْ يَسْعَى بَيْنَ أَيْدِيهِمْ وَبِأَيْمَانِهِمْ يَقُولُونَ رَبَّنَا أَتِمِّمْ لَنَا نُورَنَا وَاعْفِرْ لَنَا إِنَّكَ عَلَى كُلِّ شَيْءٍ قَدِيرٌ

1 Sūrah al-Anfāl: 64.

2 Sūrah al-Fatḥ: 29.

[On] the Day when Allah will not disgrace the Prophet and those who believed with him. Their light will proceed before them and on their right; they will say, “Our Lord, perfect for us our light and forgive us. Indeed, You are over all things competent.”¹

Allah ﷻ says:

فَدَأْفَلَحَ الْمُؤْمِنُونَ

Certainly will the believers have succeeded.²

Allah ﷻ thereafter listed their qualities so that no one should hope to be included in them except those who have similar qualities. He describes them:

الَّذِينَ هُمْ فِي صَلَاتِهِمْ خَاشِعُونَ وَالَّذِينَ هُمْ عَنِ اللَّغْوِ مُعْرِضُونَ وَالَّذِينَ هُمْ لِلزَّكَاةِ فَاعِلُونَ وَالَّذِينَ هُمْ لِفُرُوجِهِمْ حَافِظُونَ إِلَّا عَلَىٰ أَزْوَاجِهِمْ أَوْ مَا مَلَكَتْ أَيْمَانُهُمْ فَإِنَّهُمْ غَيْرُ مَلُومِينَ فَمَنْ ابْتَغَىٰ وَرَاءَ ذَلِكَ فَأُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الْعَادُونَ وَالَّذِينَ هُمْ لِأَمَانَاتِهِمْ وَعَهْدِهِمْ رَاعُونَ وَالَّذِينَ هُمْ عَلَىٰ صَلَوَاتِهِمْ يُحَافِظُونَ أُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الْوَارِثُونَ الَّذِينَ يَرِثُونَ الْفِرْدَوْسَ هُمْ فِيهَا خَالِدُونَ

They who are during their prayer humbly submissive. And they who turn away from ill speech. And they who are observant of zakāh. And they who guard their private parts. Except from their wives or those their right hands possess, for indeed, they will not be blamed - But whoever seeks beyond that, then those are the transgressors - And they who are to their trusts and their promises attentive. And they who carefully maintain their prayers - Those are the inheritors. Who will inherit al-Firdaws. They will abide therein eternally.³

1 Sūrah al-Taḥrīm: 8.

2 Sūrah al-Mu'minūn: 1.

3 Sūrah al-Mu'minūn: 1-11.

Allah ﷻ also mentioned regarding them:

وَالَّذِينَ لَا يَدْعُونَ مَعَ اللَّهِ إِلَهًا آخَرَ وَلَا يَقْتُلُونَ النَّفْسَ الَّتِي حَرَّمَ اللَّهُ إِلَّا بِالْحَقِّ وَلَا يَزْنُونَ

And those who do not invoke with Allah another deity or kill the soul which Allah has forbidden [to be killed], except by right, and do not commit unlawful sexual intercourse.¹

Allah ﷻ informed us:

إِنَّ اللَّهَ اشْتَرَى مِنَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ أَنْفُسَهُمْ وَأَمْوَالَهُمْ بِأَنْ لَهُمُ الْجَنَّةَ يُقَاتِلُونَ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ فَيَقْتُلُونَ وَيُقْتَلُونَ وَعَدًا عَلَيْهِ حَقًّا فِي التَّوْرَةِ وَالْإِنْجِيلِ وَالْقُرْآنِ

Indeed, Allah has purchased from the believers their lives and their properties [in exchange] for that they will have Paradise. They fight in the cause of Allah, so they kill and are killed. [It is] a true promise [binding] upon Him in the Torah and the Gospel and the Qur'an.²

Allah ﷻ then mentioned the fulfilment of their covenant and pledge:

وَمَنْ أَوْفَى بِعَهْدِهِ مِنَ اللَّهِ فَاسْتَبْشِرُوا بِبَيْعِكُمُ الَّذِي بَايَعْتُمْ بِهِ وَذَلِكَ هُوَ الْفَوْزُ الْعَظِيمُ

And who is truer to his covenant than Allah? So rejoice in your transaction which you have contracted. And it is that which is the great attainment.³

When this verse was revealed, a man stood up and asked, “O Nabī of Allah! If a person takes his sword and slays until he is slain; except that he also commits sins; is he a martyr?” Upon this Allah ﷻ revealed:

1 Sūrah al-Furqān: 68.

2 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 111.

3 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 111.

التَّائِبُونَ الْعَابِدُونَ الْحَامِدُونَ السَّائِحُونَ الرَّاكِعُونَ السَّاجِدُونَ الْأَمْرُونَ بِالْمَعْرُوفِ
وَالنَّاهُونَ عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ وَالْحَافِظُونَ لِحُدُودِ اللَّهِ وَبَشِّرِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ

[Such believers are] the repentant, the worshippers, the praisers [of Allah], those who fast, those who bow and prostrate [in prayer], those who enjoin what is right and forbid what is wrong, and those who observe the limits [set by] Allah. And give good tidings to the believers.¹

Rasūlullāh ﷺ then commentated upon the Mujāhidīn of the Mu'minīn who have these qualities and have been promised martyrdom and Jannah saying:

“The repentant from their sins. The worshippers who only worship Allah and do not ascribe any partner to Him. The praisers who praise Allah in every condition; adversity or prosperity. Those who keep fast. Those who bow and prostrate – are regular in their five times ṣalāh, protecting their ṣalāh and guarding their rukū', sujūd, concentration and performing ṣalāh on its appointed time. Those who enjoin what is right and practice accordingly. Those who forbid what is wrong and abstain accordingly. And give glad tidings to those who are killed and possess these beautiful qualities of martyrdom and Jannah.”

Allah ﷻ then explained that He commands fighting for those who possess these qualities:

أَذِنَ لِلَّذِينَ يُقَاتِلُونَ بِنَاهِمُ ظَلَمُوا وَإِنَّ اللَّهَ عَلَىٰ نَصْرِهِمْ لَقَدِيرٌ الَّذِينَ أُخْرِجُوا مِنْ دِيَارِهِمْ
بِغَيْرِ حَقٍّ إِلَّا أَنْ يَقُولُوا رَبُّنَا اللَّهُ

Permission [to fight] has been given to those who are being fought, because they were wronged. And indeed, Allah is competent to give them victory. [They are] those who have been evicted from their homes without right - only because they say, “Our Lord is Allah.”²

1 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 112.

2 Sūrah al-Ḥajj: 39-40.

The entire space between the sky and earth belongs to Allah ﷻ, His Rasūl ﷺ, and the Mu'minīn who possess these qualities. The land which is in the hands of the mushrikīn, kuffār, oppressors, transgressors, and those who oppose Rasūlullāh ﷺ belongs to the oppressed Mu'minīn who possess these qualities and who overpower them. Whatever Allah ﷻ has returned to His Rasūl is their right. The meaning of al-Fay' is to return. Whatever has gone to the mushrikīn and then has returned to its place is called Fay'. It can refer to words or actions as Allah ﷻ said:

فَإِنْ فَاءُوا فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ غَفُورٌ رَحِيمٌ وَإِنْ عَزَمُوا الطَّلَاقَ فَإِنَّ اللَّهَ سَمِيعٌ عَلِيمٌ

But if they return [to normal relations] - then indeed, Allah is Forgiving and Merciful. And if they decide on divorce - then indeed, Allah is Hearing and Knowing.¹

وَإِنْ طَائِفَتَانِ مِنَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ اقْتَتَلُوا فَأَصْلِحُوا بَيْنَهُمَا فَإِنْ بَغَتْ إِحْدَاهُمَا عَلَى الْأُخْرَى فَقَاتِلُوا الَّتِي تَبْغِي حَتَّى تَنْبَغِيَ إِلَى أَمْرِ اللَّهِ فَإِنْ فَاءَتْ فَأَصْلِحُوا بَيْنَهُمَا بِالْعَدْلِ وَأَقْسِطُوا إِنَّ اللَّهَ يُحِبُّ الْمُقْسِطِينَ

And if two factions among the believers should fight, then make settlement between the two. But if one of them oppresses the other, then fight against the one that oppresses until it returns to the ordinance of Allah. And if it returns, then make settlement between them in justice and act justly. Indeed, Allah loves those who act justly.²

This is proof that all Fay' returns to its place where it had been. It is said regarding the sun when it passes its zenith,

قد فاءت الشمس

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 226, 227.

2 Sūrah al-Ḥujurāt: 9.

Similarly, whatever Allah ﷻ returns to the Mu'minīn of the wealth of the kuffār, it is the right of the Mu'minīn which has returned to them after them being oppressed. This is the meaning of Allah's ﷻ statement:

أُذِنَ لِلَّذِينَ يُقَاتَلُونَ بِأَنَّهُمْ ظَلِمُوا

Permission [to fight] has been given to those who are being fought, because they were wronged.

Not all the Mu'minīn have rights over it. Only those Mu'minīn have been permitted who possess the qualities of īmān which we have mentioned. In short, no one has permission to wage jihād except the oppressed and you cannot be oppressed unless you are a mu'min and you cannot be a mu'min until you possess the qualities of īmān which Allah ﷻ has specified for them and the mujahidin. So when all of these qualities are found, then automatically he will be permitted to fight as Allah ﷻ says:

أُذِنَ لِلَّذِينَ يُقَاتَلُونَ بِأَنَّهُمْ ظَلِمُوا وَإِنَّ اللَّهَ عَلَىٰ نَصْرِهِمْ لَقَدِيرٌ

Permission [to fight] has been given to those who are being fought, because they were wronged. And indeed, Allah is competent to give them victory.

A person who does not possess all these qualities in totality is an oppressor who has rebelled and it is necessary to fight him until he repents. Such persons are not permitted to wage jihād or invite towards Allah ﷻ since they do not fulfil the requisites, i.e. Mu'minīn who are oppressed. When this verse was revealed regarding the Muhājirīn who were evicted from their houses and wealth by the people of Makkah, jihād against the oppressors was permitted due to their oppression.”

The narrator explains that he asked that when this verse was revealed regarding those who were oppressed by the mushrikīn of Makkah, then why they fought Kisrā and Qayṣar and other mushrikīn tribes.

The Imām explained, “Had there been only permitted to fight those who oppressed them from the people of Makkah then they would not have any right to fight the armies of Kistrā and Qayṣar and the other Arab tribes since these people did not oppress them. Yes, they were permitted to fight the people of Makkah who oppressed them by evicting them out of their homes and wealth unjustly. If the verse only referred to the Muhājirīn who were oppressed by the people of Makkah, then the verse would not apply to those after them since none of the oppressors or oppressed remain. It would then be an abrogated command for those after them. However, it is not as you think or have supposed. The Muhājirīn were oppressed from two angles, viz. the people of Makkah oppressed them by evicting them from their houses and wealth hence they fought the former; and Kistrā and Qayṣar as well as other Arab and non-Arab tribes oppressed them by withholding their wealth and power which the Mu’minīn were more deserving of, hence they fought them with the permission of Allah ﷻ. This verse gives permission to the Mu’minīn of every era to wage jihād. Yes, only those Mu’minīn are permitted who possess the conditions and qualities mentioned by Allah ﷻ, viz. īmān, jihād, etc., since they are Mu’minīn and oppressed. Those who do not possess these qualities are oppressors, not oppressed. Hence, they are not permitted to wage jihād, to enjoin good and forbid evil since they are not worthy and they are not allowed to invite towards Allah ﷻ for the same reason.¹

The narration proves that the jihād waged against Kistrā and Qayṣar was by divine command and the Muhājirīn who fought were permitted by Allah ﷻ to do so. This ḥadīth clearly states that only those are permitted to wage jihād who possess the qualities:

التَّائِبُونَ الْعَابِدُونَ الْحَامِدُونَ السَّائِحُونَ الرَّاكِعُونَ السَّاجِدُونَ الْأَمْرُونَ بِالْمَعْرُوفِ وَالنَّاهُونَ عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ وَالْحَافِظُونَ لِحُدُودِ اللَّهِ وَبَشِّرِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ

1 *Izālat al-Ghayn* vol. 2 pg. 105 – 109; *Furū’ al-Kāfi*; Kitāb al-Jihād pg. 609; *al-Shāfi* Urdu translation of *Furū’* vol. 4 pg. 547, 548.

[Such believers are] the repentant, the worshippers, the praisers [of Allah], those who fast, those who bow and prostrate [in prayer], those who enjoy what is right and forbid what is wrong, and those who observe the limits [set by] Allah. And give good tidings to the believers.¹

When the Muhājirīn were divinely permitted to wage jihād against Kistrā and Qayṣar, then their possessing these great qualities is established by the Imām’s statement. This fact can never be denied since no one will ever dare to deny the fact that the Muhājirīn fought Kistrā and Qayṣar and no one can deny that the Imām has termed their jihād as divinely permitted coupled with mentioning the proof and reason for it. Had their jihād been without divine consent, the Imām would have responded to the questioner by saying, “That was not Jihād, nor were the people divinely permitted to wage jihād.” Conversely, the Imām has emphatically declared them to be divinely permitted coupled with mentioning the proof for this in clear terms. And only those are permitted to wage jihād who possess īmān and carry out righteous acts. So the apparent logical result of the afore-mentioned is that the Imām has termed those Muhājirīn who fought against Kistrā and Qayṣar as believers and possessors of the qualities (conditions) of jihād.

The Shīṭah scholars were in a predicament to answer this ḥadīth and could not come up with any logical explanation. Dildār ‘Alī writes in *Tashīd al-Mabānī* in answer to Moulānā Ḥaydar ‘Alī:

نهایت آنچه از این حدیث ظاہر می شود این است که مهاجرین ماذون بجهاد کسری و قیصر بودند و حقیقت خلافت خلفاء از اصلا مستفاد نمی شود زیرا که در احادیث معتبره اہل سنت وارد شده کہ جناب رسالت مآب مسلمین را خبر تسلط خلفاء جور داده و امر باطاعت اینها نموده بود

The thing apparent from this ḥadīth is that the Muhājirīn were permitted to wage jihād against Kistrā and Qayṣar. This does not in any way prove the validity of the khilāfah of the Khulafā’ since it appears in the aḥādīth of Sunnī books that Rasūlullāh ﷺ informed about the dominance of tyrannical Khulafā’ and commanded that they be obeyed.

1 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 112.

This passage proves at the very least that Dildār ‘Alī has nothing against the authenticity of this ḥadīth nor against its content. And this is sufficient to prove our stance. Furthermore, the readers can ponder and draw conclusions for themselves whether Dildār ‘Alī’s answer has proven or disproven our claim which is established by this ḥadīth. When he could not find a suitable answer; he could not deny the Muhājirīn’s jihād against Kistrā and Qayṣar, he could not object to them being permitted by Allah and had not the courage to reject them fulfilling all the conditions mentioned by the Imām to be fit for this task, he turned to the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah. But by which stretch of intelligence is that going to disprove the ḥadīth? Our discussion is not whether the Khulafā’ Rāshidīn were righteous or treacherous according to Sunnī narrations. The point of contention is whether this ḥadīth does or does not prove that the Muhājirīn who fought Kistrā and Qayṣar were divinely permitted, which in turn necessitates them being righteous practicing individuals. This cannot be rejected unless you reject two obvious facts: 1. The Muhājirīn’s jihād against Kistrā and Qayṣar 2. The Imām’s statement that the Muhājirīn were divinely permitted to wage jihād. If the Shī’ah have the courage to declare that the Muhājirīn did not wage jihād and did not conquer the lands ruled by Kistrā and Qayṣar, but in fact the Iranian Shī’ah or Lucknow’s Mu’minīn were the ones who fought then we will accept our blunder. Or they are prepared to declare that the Imām did not state that the Muhājirīn were divinely permitted but were rather prevented, then too both our claim and proof will be disproven. And if not, then our assertion is correct.

Since Dildār ‘Alī fully understood that his answer is extremely weak, he gave another answer to it which is better, stronger, and unbreakable. It is that this jihād took place by the advice and consent of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. As if Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was permitted by Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and then granted permission to the Muhājirīn to wage jihād against Kistrā and Qayṣar. We also applaud this answer so that the readers do not have evil thoughts about us. No one should doubt that this is Dildār ‘Alī’s answer. I will quote the original text from *Tashīd al-Mabānī*:

و دریں مقام سرے دیگر ست کہ تعرض یان پر ضرور و این اینست کہ خلیفہ ثانی بلکہ خلفائے ثلاثہ چون برائے العین مشاہدہ بودند کہ جناب ولایت ماب افضل و اعلم صحابہ ست لہذا در اکثر امور عظام مثل جہاد و اجرائے حدود و غیرہ

بطریق مشورہ مرضی مبارک جناب امیر دریافت می نمودند چنانچہ این امر بر متتبع خبیر ظاہر و روشن ست و کلام صدق نظام خلیفہ ثانی لولا علی لہلک عمر و معضلۃ لا ابا حسن لہ کر در کتب معتمدہ اہل سنت وارد شدہ نیز دلالت صریح برآن دارد و در خصوص جہاد فارس فاضل دہلوی نیز مشورہ نمودن خلیفہ ثانی بیان حضرت مذکور ساختہ پس برین تقدیر ماذون بودن مہاجرین و انصار برائے جہاد فارس و شام و غیرہ مستغنی عن البیان ست و انجہ جناب امام جعفر صادق در باب اذن اینہا فرمودہ بسپ اذن و اذن جناب امیر بود نہ سپ حقیقت خلافت ثلاثہ

There is another subtle point here which cannot be ignored. The second khalīfah – in fact all three Khulafā’ – saw for themselves that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضی اللہ عنہ was the most superior and knowledgeable of all the Ṣaḥābah رضی اللہ عنہم. Hence, they sought his consent in important matters like jihād, legal punishments, etc., by seeking his advice. This is a well-known fact. The second Khalīfah’s truthful statement, “Had it not been for ‘Alī, ‘Umar would be destroyed,” is found in many reliable Sunnī books. This is a clear proof of taking his advice and consent. Fāḍil Dehlawī has documented ‘Umar consulting Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضی اللہ عنہ about the jihād against the Persians. Therefore, there is no need to say anything further regarding the Muhājirīn and Anṣār being permitted to wage jihād against Persia, Shām, etc. Imām Ja’far al-Ṣādiq رضی اللہ عنہ has declared with regards to permission that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضی اللہ عنہ gave permission to wage jihād but did not give permission when it came to the khilāfah of the three.

Dildār ‘Alī’s answer has given further credibility to our claim instead of refuting it. Let us analyse it logically.

Minor premise: The Muhājirīn were permitted to wage jihād

Major premise: Only those are permitted to wage jihād who possess all the qualities of imān as mentioned in verse 112 of Sūrah al-Tawbah

Conclusion: The Muhājirīn possess all the qualities of imān as mentioned in verse 112 of Sūrah al-Tawbah

And this is exactly our stance!

If Dildār ‘Alī had to reject this ḥadīth or claimed that the Muhājirīn were not permitted to wage jihād, then our claim could have been challenged. However, the man not only acknowledged this fact, he lent further support to it by saying that they were granted permission by Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. The Khulafā’ would consult him in such matters and would seek his consent. So in them being granted permission lies the permission of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه which indicates the permission of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى.

We now state that if the Muhājirīn did not possess the qualities of īmān which are necessary for the mujāhidīn, then Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه would have not permitted them to fight and would have remained aloof from those seeking to consult him. Moreover, he would have deemed their jihād a means of fitnah and anarchy and their killing to be necessary as demanded by the ḥadīth.

Dildār ‘Alī’s claim that this does not prove the validity of the three’s khilāfah is extremely perplexing. Those who possessed the qualities mentioned in the ḥadīth, i.e. perfect faith and righteous deeds, and are included in the verse of Sūrah al-Tawbah, such persons will definitely be seeking the pleasure of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and His Rasūl صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Loving the Ahl al-Bayt, helping them, and dissociating from their enemies will be their duty. This duty can only be fulfilled when the three Khulafā’ are believed to be superior to the rest of the Muhājirīn رضي الله عنهم – in accordance to our ‘aqīdah – or at least on their level. Otherwise, it is impossible to think that people who possess perfect īmān and righteous deeds will accept the leadership of men deprived of īmān and righteous deeds, who are hypocrites and renegades, enemies of the Ahl al-Bayt, and the ones who usurped their rights and harmed the beloved daughter of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Only those people will be obedient to them who are hypocrites and renegades like them. When this ḥadīth has proven that the Muhājirīn were permitted to fight jihād from Allah’s سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى side and from the side of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, which proves that they possessed perfect faith and carried out righteous deeds, the obvious conclusion will be that the leaders of this group have the same outstanding qualities and are included in the verse:

التَّائِبُونَ الْعَابِدُونَ الْحَامِدُونَ السَّائِحُونَ الرَّاكِعُونَ السَّاجِدُونَ الْأَمْرُونَ بِالْمَعْرُوفِ وَالنَّاهُونَ عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ وَالْحَافِظُونَ لِحُدُودِ اللَّهِ وَبَشِّرِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ

[Such believers are] the repentant, the worshippers, the praisers [of Allah], those who fast, those who bow and prostrate [in prayer], those who enjoy what is right and forbid what is wrong, and those who observe the limits [set by] Allah. And give good tidings to the believers.¹

All praise is due to Allah *سُبْحَانَكَ وَتَعَالَى* for this!

The Muhājirīn being granted permission from Allah *سُبْحَانَكَ وَتَعَالَى* to wage jihād from this ḥadīth has been attested to by Dildār ‘Alī’s answer. I will now present another narration which shows that the jihād which took place in the reign of the three Khulafā’ and the lands conquered by them was prophesied by Rasūlullāh *صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ* many years earlier. Rasūlullāh *صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ* deemed their conquests as his conquests. Ibn Bābawayh narrates that in the Battle of Aḥzāb which is also known as the Battle of Khandaq, a trench was dug on the proposal of Sayyidunā Salmān al-Fārsī *رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ*. While digging, they came across a huge boulder which would not break. Rasūlullāh *صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ* was informed of it. He came to the scene and gave a blow to it with a pick which resulted in a light coming out of it seeing which Rasūlullāh *صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ* exclaimed, “Allāhu Akbar! Allah has given me the keys of Shām. By Allah, I see the red castle.” He then gave a second blow which broke off a third of it seeing which he exclaimed, “Allāhu Akbar! Allah has given me the keys of Persia. By Allah, I see the white castle of Madā’in.” When he struck it for the third time and the boulder broke, he shouted, “Allāhu Akbar! Allah has given me the keys of Yemen. By Allah, I see the door of San‘ā’.”²

1 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 112.

2 This narration is recorded on page 376 of vol. 2 of *Ḥayāt al-Qulūb* printed by Nolkashor Printers and page 216 of vol. 1 of *Nāsikh al-Tawārikh* printed in Iran.

continued on next page...

¹The last words of the narration are:

بالجمله در ایام حفر خندق قطعہ از سنگی سخت پدید شد کہ مردم از شکستن این بے چارہ گشتند و سلمان این خبر بر رسول خدا برداشت جابر بن عبد اللہ انصاری گوید دریں ہنگام رسول خدا در مسجد فتح بر پشت خوابیدہ بود و از شدت جوع سنگ بر شکم مبارک بستہ داشت چہ سہ روز می رفت کہ بیج کس بطعام دست نیافت باین ہمہ جوں این قصہ بشنید متین بر گرفت و بخندق در آمد برآہ بن عازب گوید چون بامتین بر سر سنگ آمد فرمود بسم اللہ و بضرط نخستین یک ٹلت این سنگ را بیفگند و گفت اللہ اکبر و برقی از سنگ جستن کرد پیغمبر فرمود مفتاح شام مراداند سو گند باخدای کہ شام را با قصور احمر مشاہدت می کنم و در ضربت دوم ٹلت دوم را فرود آورد و ہم برقی بجست فرمود اللہ اکبر مفتاح فارس مراداند سو گند باخدای کہ قصور ایبض مدائن را می نگرم و در ضربت سیم سنگ را بجملہ پراگندہ ساخت و نیز برقی چپید و رسول خدا فرمود اللہ اکبر مفتاح یمن پیرہ من افتاد سو گند باخدائیکہ ابواب صنعاء نظارہ کنم و در ہر کرت مردم با پیغمبر موافقت می کردند و بانگ تکبیر برمی داشتند اینکا روئے با سلمان کرد و صفت کوشک مدائن را بہتامت باز گفت سلمان عرض کردید سوگند خدای کہ ترا فرستادہ این ہمہ صفت کوشک مدائن ست و گواہی می دہ کہ تو رسول خدای پیغمبر فرمود بعد از من ست من این مالک بکشایند و دقائن کسری و قیصر را نفقہ دہند

1 continued from page 596

چون این خبر بحضرت رسول رسید اصحاب خود را طلبید و بایشان مشورت کرد بفتصد نفر بودند پس سلمان گفت یا رسول اللہ جماعت قلیل در مطالہ و مبارزہ در برابر جماعت کثیر نمیتواند ایستاد حضرت فرمود پس چہ کنیم سلمان گفت خندق می کنیم بر در خود کہ حجابہ باشد میان تو و ایشان کہ ایشان از ہر جانب بر سر ماننایند و جنگ از یک جانب باشد و مادر بلاد عجم وقتیکہ لشکر گرانے متوجہ ما می شد چنین می کردیم کہ جنگ از موقع معین واقع شود پس جبریل بر حضرت رسول نازل شد و گفت رائے سلمان صوابست و باین عمل می باید کرد حضرت فرمودہ زمین را بمیروند از ناحیہ احد تا بربیع و مر بست گام و بایسے گام را بجماعے از مهاجران و انصار داد کہ حفر نہایند و امر کرد کہ بیلہا و گلنکھا آوردند و حضرت خود ابتدا کرد در حصہ مهاجران کلنگ برداشت و خود می کند حضرت امیر المومنین خاک را نقل می کرد تا اینکہ عرق کردہ مانده شد و فرمود کہ عیشے نیست مگر عیش اُخرت خداوند! بیا مرز انصار و مهاجران را و چون مردم دیدند کہ حضرت خود متوجہ کندن گردید ابنتمام بسیار کردند در کندن و خاک را نقل می کردند چون روز دوم شد باعداد آمدند بر سر خندق و حضرت در مسجد فتح نشست و صحابہ مشغول کندن شدند ناگاہ بسنگے رسید کہ کلنگ بران کار نمیکرد پس جابر بن عبد اللہ انصاری رانجدمت حضرت فرستادند کہ حقیقت حال را عرض نہاید جابر گفت کہ چون مسجد فتح رقتم دیدم کہ حضرت بر پشت خوابیدہ است در داڑی مبارک را در زیر سر گراشته و از گرسنگی برشکم خود سنگی بستہ است گفتم یا رسول اللہ سنگے در خندق پیدا شدہ کہ کلنگ دران اثر نمیکند پس بر خاست و بسرعت روانہ شد چون بیان موضع رسید ایے طلبید و از ان ایب وضو ساخت و کف ایے دردیان حکمت نشان کرد و مضمنہ نمود و بران سنگ ریخت پس کلنگ را گرفت و ضریق بران سنگ زد کہ از ان ساطع شد و از برق قصر بائے شام را دیدیم پس بارد گر کلنگ را از دو برقی ساطع شد کہ قصر بائے مدائن را دیدم پس بارد گر کلنگ راز دو برقی لامع شد کہ قصر بائے یمن را دیدم پس فرمودہ این مواضع را کہ برق بر اینہا تپاید شما فتح خوابید کرد مسلمان را از استماع این بسات شاد شدند و خدارا حمد کردند و مناقف گفتند کہ وعدہ ملک کسری و قیصر میدید و از ترس بر در خود خندق میکند پس حق تعالی ایت قل اللہ مالک الملک را برائے تکذیب و تادیب مناقف فرستاد و ابن بابویہ روایت کردہ است کہ چون کلنگ اول راز دستک شکست فرمود کہ اللہ اکبر کلید بائے شام را خدا بہن داد بخدا سو گند کہ قصر بائے سرخ این را می بینم پس کلنگ دیگر زد و ٹلت دیگر را شکست و گفت اللہ اکبر کہ کلید بائے ملک فارس را بہن داد و خدا سوگند کہ الحال قصر سفید مدائن را می بینم و چون کلنگ سوم راز دو دقایق سنگ جدا شد گفت اللہ اکبر کلید بائے یمن بہن دادند و بخدا سو گند کہ دروازہ بائے صنعاء را می بینم و کلینی بسند معتبر روایت کردہ است از حضرت صادق کہ کلنگ را از دست امیر المومنین یا سلمان گرفت و یک ضربت زد کہ سنگ بس بارہ شد فرمود کہ فتح شد بر من در این ضربت گنجہائے کسری و قیصر پس ابو بکر و عمر بایکدیگر گفتند کہ نمیتوانیم از ترس بفضا نے حاجت بردیم داد وعدہ ملک بادشاہ عجم و بادشاہ روم بہامی دید

While digging the trench, a boulder appeared which people could not break. Therefore, Salmān al-Fārsī رضي الله عنه informed Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم about it. Jābir ibn ‘Abd Allah relates that at that time, Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم was resting in Masjid al-Faṭḥ and a stone was tied to his blessed stomach out of extreme hunger for he had not eaten a morsel for the last three days. Hearing this news, Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم took his pick and came into the trench. Barā’ ibn ‘Āzib رضي الله عنه narrates that when Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم approached the boulder with pick in hand; he recited “Bismillāh al-Rahman al-Rahim” and struck it which caused a third of it to break off. Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم exclaimed, “Allāhu Akbar!”

A light beamed from the boulder seeing which Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم said, “Allah has given me the keys of Shām. By Allah, I can see the red castle.”

Upon the second strike, another third of the boulder broke off and a light beamed from it. Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم shouted “Allāhu Akbar! Allah has given me the keys of Persia. By Allah, I can see the white castle of Madā’in.”

Upon the third strike, the boulder was broken into pieces. This time also a light beamed from it and Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم exclaimed, “Allāhu Akbar! Allah has given me the keys of Yemen. By Allah, I see door of San’ā’.”

The atmosphere was such that when Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم screamed Allāhu Akbar, those around him chorused with him. Thereafter, Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم described to Salmān al-Fārsī the castles of Madā’in hearing which the latter commented, “By Allah Who has made you a true Messenger, this is the exact description of Madā’in. I testify that you are a true Messenger.”

Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم then proclaimed, “My followers will conquer all these countries after me and spend the treasures of Kisrā and Qayṣar.¹

This narration informs us of the prophecy of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم of the conquests of Shām, Persia, and Yemen and that his followers will conquer it. Moreover,

1 *Nāsikh al-Tawārīkh* vol. 1 pg. 216.

Rasūlullāh ﷺ has attributed those conquests to himself by declaring that Allah ﷻ has granted him their keys. If the khilāfah of these Khulafā' was incorrect, and they together with those who followed them and fought at their command were all hypocrites and renegades, then would Rasūlullāh ﷺ have attributed their actions to his noble being and understood their conquests as his own? Dildār 'Alī answers this in *Tash'īd al-Mabānī*:

نهایت آنچه ازین روایت ثابت می شود این ست که ملک شام و یمن و غیره در قبضه اسلام خوابد امد و ازان ظاهر نمی شود که کسانی که در ایام حکومت اینها این ممالک در قبضه خوابد امد خلیفه بحق خوابند بود زیرا که از جمله احادیث معتدیه اهل سنت ست که ان الله یؤید بذالذین بالرجل الفاجر پس اگر قوت دین و رواج شرح متین در عهد احدی دلیل حقیقت باشد لازم اید حقیقت خلافت بر بادشاه فاجر و جابر و بو خلاف مزعوم المحیب

The gist of this narration is that the countries of Shām, Yemen, etc., will fall into the hands of the Muslims. However, this is not apparent that those men – under whose rulership these countries will be conquered – are truthful and rightful Khulafā'. It is a reliable ḥadīth in Sunnī books that Allah ﷻ will aid this dīn with a transgressor. Taking this point into consideration, if the strength of Islam and the enforcement of Sharīah in an era is accepted to be proof for the correctness of the ruler of that time, it will necessitate that every transgressing and tyrannical ruler was rightful for the post of khilāfah whereas this is contrary to the answerer's thoughts.

In this answer Dildār 'Alī presented a ḥadīth of the Ahl al-Sunnah, as he did with the first ḥadīth mentioned previously, whereas he ought to answer this narration. Nevertheless, the answer he presents has – and all praise belongs to Allah ﷻ – authenticated this narration and the Sunnī ḥadīth has not benefitted him in the least. The reason for this is that when it is recorded that Rasūlullāh ﷺ exclaimed thrice that Allah ﷻ has given him the keys of a certain country and he was happy at this and shouted out the takbīr, then why would Rasūlullāh ﷺ attribute his blessed hands to the Khulafā's hands if they had been transgressors? How could he be pleased with this? How could he give glad tidings to the Ṣaḥābah رضی اللہ عنہم, “Allah ﷻ has awarded me these countries which will be

conquered by my ummah.”? That pure Rasūl صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ whose hands Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى referred to as His own and declared:

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ يُبَايِعُونَكَ إِنَّمَا يُبَايِعُونَ اللَّهَ يَدُ اللَّهِ فَوْقَ أَيْدِيهِمْ

Indeed, those who pledge allegiance to you, [O Muḥammad] – they are actually pledging allegiance to Allah. The Hand of Allah is over their hands.¹

Rebellious transgressors who changed the dīn, usurped the rights of his family members, transgressed the borders of transgression and disobedience, and entered the domain of irtidād and kufr – in fact who the Shī‘ah regard to be bereft of īmān and filled with hypocrisy from the very beginning; could he ever attribute their actions to his noble pure being, express happiness upon them, and boast about their actions which led to conquests and Islamic advancement?

More amazing is that the ḥadīth Dildār ‘Alī furnished as proof is of no benefit to him. The ḥadīth mentions, “After me there will be Khulafā’, i.e. rightful Khulafā’, followed by leaders and then oppressive kings.” So this Sunnī ḥadīth can never apply to the honourable Khulafā’.

If distorted meanings can be given to such aḥādīth and their objectives can be changed, then the aḥādīth quoted in praise of al-Mahdī that dīn will be strengthened through him and Islam will spread in the entire world, can be misinterpreted by the Khawārij. They can say the same thing about Shī‘ī narrations. They may declare that the narration:

ان الله يؤيد هذا الدين بالرجل الفاجر

Indeed Allah will aid this dīn by a transgressor.

applies to the conquests in the era of al-Mahdī thereby blackening their book of deeds. The answer the Shī‘ah give them should be understood as our answer to the Shī‘ah.

1 Sūrah al-Fatḥ: 10.

I have now established that the two groups, the Muhājirīn and Anṣār, were special Muslims and possessed remarkable sincerity. I have also shown that the answers presented by Shīrī scholars do not falsify those aḥādīth but in fact are interpretations which reach the stage of distortion of meaning.

Besides aḥādīth in praise of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār, there are many aḥādīth concerning the Khulafā' Rāshidīn رضي الله عنهم which are documented in Shīrī books which prove their īmān, sincerity, and excellent qualities. In fact, they also explain their high status in Islam and the detriment caused to dīn by their demise. I have narrated some of these narrations in the first portion of part 1 of this book, some in various places of part 2 and I will now mention some.

Such statements of Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه are recorded in *Nahj al-Balāghah* which depict the high and noble thoughts he had about Sayyidunā 'Umar رضي الله عنه. He understood him as the reference of the Arabs and their pivot, his safety as a boon, and he would give him friendly advice and compassionate counsel. At the time when Sayyidunā 'Umar رضي الله عنه intended to go himself to fight the Persians and sought counsel from Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه, the latter said:¹

1 This address is so well-known that there is no need to reproduce it verbatim. I will present the commentary of it written by Ibn Maytham al-Baḥrānī. He writes on page 306:

و قوله فكن قطبا شروع في الراى الخاص بعمر فاشار عليه ان يجعل نفسه مرجعا للعرب تتول اليه و تدور عليه و استعار له لفظ القطب و هم لفظ الرعى و رشح بالاستعارة فكنى بذلك عن جعل العرب و ربة دونه و حيطه له و لذلك قال و اصلهم دونك نار الحرب لانهم ان سلموا و غنموا لذلك الذى ينبغى و ان اتقهر و الم يكن لهم ظهر يلجأون اليه كما سبق بيانه و قوله فان كان شخصت الى قوله فيك بيان للمفسدة في تخروجه بنفسه من وجهين احدهما ان الاسلام كان في ذلك الوقت غضاد و قلوب كثير من العرب عن اسلم غير مستقرة بعد فاذا انصاف الى من لم يسلم منهم و علموا خروجه و تركه للبلاد كثر طمعهم و هاجت فتنهم على الحرمين و بلاد الاسلام فيكون ما تركه و راءه اهم يطلبه و يلتقى عليه الفرقتان من الاعداء الثانى ان الاعاجم اذا اخرج اليهم بنفسه طمعوا فيه و قالوا المقالة فكان خروجه صرح صالحهم على القتال و هم اشد عليه كلبا و اقوى فيه طمعا قوله فاما ذكرت من سير القوم الخ فهو انه قال له ان هؤلاء الفرس قد قصدوا المسير الى المسلمين و قصدهم اياهم دليل قوتهم و انا اكره ان يغزونها قبل ان نغزوهم فاجابه ان كان كرهت ذلك فان الله تعالى اشد كراهية و اقدر عليك على التغير و الازالة و هذا الجواب يدور على حرف و هو ان مسيرهم الى المسلمين و ان كان مفسدة الا ان القاءه لهم بنفسه فيه مفسدة اكبر و اذا كان كذلك فينبغى ان يدفع العظمى و يكل دفع المفسدة الاخرى الى الله تعالى فانه كان لها و مع كراهية لها فهو اقدر على ازالتها

continued on next page...

¹Divine help is not dependent on the number of soldiers. This is the dīn of Allah ﷻ which He makes dominant. Islam's army is His army, whom He aided and assisted until Islam reached this height and spread across the world. Allah ﷻ has promised us and He will fulfil this promise and help His army. The khalīfah is like the string which has pearls on it. The necklace will only remain intact as long as the string is intact. If the string has to break, the pearls will scatter all over and will not be able to be gathered again. Today, although the Arabs are few in number; yet they are numerous due to Islam and dominant due to unity. Stay as a pivot and keep

1 *Continued from page 601*

“You remain the pivot.” This is the beginning of his sincere and earnest counsel which he gave to ‘Umar. He told ‘Umar to make himself the sanctuary of the Arabs who they will return to. He used the word pivot metaphorically here to refer to ‘Umar and the word mill for the Arabs. The object of this metaphor is that the Arabs should be your ihāṭah (guard). If the Arabs return safely with booty, then the object is attained. And if they are defeated, you will be their refuge. This is in contrast to when you go with them for if they are victorious then it is great. However, if they are defeated, there remains no refuge for them to return to. This has been explained previously. He further states, “If you go out to fight, there are two negative points. Firstly, Islam has still not spread and the hearts of those Arabs who accepted Islam are still not firm. Thus if you advance to those who have not yet accepted Islam and the Arabs find out that you are no more around and you have left their cities, their greed will increase and their corruption in Muslim lands – the lands of the Ḥaramayn – will intensify. So that which you have left behind will become more sensitive and vulnerable than that which you are pursuing. Thereafter, both the enemies will unite to attack you. Secondly, when you will advance to the non-Arabs, they will develop hope and utter drivel. So your advancement will spur them on to battle. And they are more anxious and ready to fight than you.” “What you have mentioned about the intentions of the people ...” this means that, “You say that the Persians intend to attack the Muslims and their intention is proof for their strength and that you dislike them attacking you first, hence you wish to attack them. If this displeases you then it displeases Allah ﷻ all the more and He has the ultimate power to remove it.” The gist of this answer is that although Persia attacking the Muslims is a catastrophe, you going personally to engage with them is an even greater one. When this is the case, it devolves upon you to remove the major threat and hand over the minor threat to Allah ﷻ for He has the full power to remove it.

the Arabs united. The fire of war will break out between the Arabs in your absence. If you leave this land, the Arabs will gather from every nook and corner against you and the things you left behind will be more vulnerable and sensitive than the things you chasing after. When the non-Arabs will see you leaving, they will develop more courage and greed and say that the Arabs were only a handful. You say that the Persians have advanced against the Muslims; the evil of this is known better to Allah than to you. And Allah ﷻ has the power to remove what He deems as evil. You have spoken about their great numbers. Whatever jihād we waged was not on the strength of numbers but on the strength of the aid and assistance of Allah ﷻ.

There is mention of a letter of Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷻ addressed to Sayyidunā Muawiyah ﷻ which begins with:

فأراد قومنا قتل نبيينا الخ

Our nation intended to kill our Nabī ﷺ.

Ibn Maytham al-Baḥrānī writes in the commentary that this is one portion of the letter Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷻ wrote in response to Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah’s ﷻ letter wherein he sought the killers of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ﷻ. He wrote that the greatest among the Muslims was the first khalīfah, then the second, and thereafter the third. He accused Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷻ of having jealousy for them, rebelling against them, having greed for khilāfah, and delaying giving bay‘ah until he was forced like how a camel is pulled forcefully by the rope, etc. Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah ﷻ sent this letter with Abū Muslim al-Khawlānī to Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷻ. In response, Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷻ wrote a lengthy letter in which he writes the following concerning the Khulafā’:

و ذكرت ان الله اجتبي له من المسلمين اعوانا ايدهم به فكانوا في منازلهم عنده على قدر فضائلهم في الاسلام وكان افضلهم في الاسلام كما زعمت وانصحهم لله ولرسوله الخليفة الصديق وخليفة الخليفة الفاروق ولعمري ان مكانهما في الاسلام لعظيم وان المصاب بهما لجرح في الاسلام شديد يرحمهما الله وجزاهما الله باحسن ما عملا

You mentioned that Allah ﷻ chose helpers for him ﷺ from the Muslims who would assist him. Their proximity to him was proportionate to their prominence in Islam. And the most superior of them as you have determined and the one who had wished for the greatest good for Allah ﷻ and His Rasūl ﷺ was al-Khalīfah al-Ṣiddīq [i.e. Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ᷺] and then the khalīfah of the khalīfah, al-Fārūq [Sayyidunā ‘Umar ᷺]. By my life, their status in Islam is lofty and their demise is a great devastation to Islam. May Allah shower His mercy upon them and grant them the best reward for the good they have done.

It is documented in *Nahj al-Balāghah* that when the rebels surrounded the house of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ᷺, Sayyidunā ‘Alī ᷺ went to him and addressed him, “People have sent me as a messenger to you. However, I do not know what to say to you. I do not know something which you have no knowledge about and cannot tell you something you cannot fathom. You know what we know. We have not beaten you in anything which we can boast about to you. You have seen what we have seen and have heard what we have heard. You sat in the company of Rasūlullāh ﷺ like us. Ibn Abī Quḥāfah was not superior to you nor was Ibn al-Khaṭṭāb more rightful. You are closer to Rasūlullāh ﷺ for you have the privilege of being his son-in-law which they do not have.” He told him few other things and explained to him.

Our object of quoting these words at this juncture is to show that Sayyidunā ‘Alī ᷺ did not understand himself to be superior to Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ᷺ in any aspect. Instead, he stated clearly, “You know what I know. You have seen what I have seen and have heard what I have heard. You have the privilege of sitting in the company of Rasūlullāh ﷺ like me.” The original text is:

والله ما ادرى ما اقول لك ما اعرف شيئا تجهله و لا ادلك على امر لا تعرفه انك لتعلم ما نعلم و الله ما سبقناك الى شيء فتخبرك عنه و لا خلونا بشيء فنبلعك و قد رأيت كما رأينا و سمعت كما سمعنا و صحبت رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم كما صحبتنا و ما ابن ابى قحافة و لا ابن الخطاب باولى بعمل الحق منك و انت اقرب الى رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم و شيعة رحم و قد نلت من صهره ما لم ينالا

By Allah, I do not know what to say to you. I do not know something which you have no knowledge of and I cannot tell you something you cannot fathom. Indeed, you know what we know. By Allah, we have not beaten you in anything which we can boast about to you and we have nothing special which we can present to you. You have seen what we have seen and have heard what we have heard. You sat in the company of Rasūlullāh ﷺ like us. Neither Ibn Abī Quḥāfah nor Ibn al-Khaṭṭāb were more rightful than you in practicing good. You are closer to Rasūlullāh ﷺ with regards to family ties for you have the privilege of being his son-in-law which they do not have.¹

These statements of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and the narrations of the noble A’immah sourced from ‘reliable’ Shīrī books will leave no doubt in the minds of the readers that the Muhājirīn and Anṣār رضي الله عنهم were praiseworthy in the sight of Allah سبحانه وتعالى and His Rasūl صلى الله عليه وسلم. The A’immah’s tongues were moist with their virtues and praises and they supplicated to Allah سبحانه وتعالى to reward them for their good actions and sent mercy upon them. Were such people out of the fold of Islam and deprived of īmān regarding whom Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه said:

و لعمرى ان مكانهما فى الاسلام لعظيم و ان المصاب بهما لجرح فى الاسلام شديد

By my life, their status in Islam is lofty and their demise is a great catastrophe to Islam.

Can it ever be imagined that those Khulafā’ were usurpers and oppressors regarding whom he stated:

يرحمهما الله و جزاهما الله باحسن ما عملا

May Allah shower His mercy upon them and grant them the best reward for the good they have done.

1 *Nahj al-Balāghah* vol. 1 pg. 449, 450.

Can any Muslim speak disrespectfully about such men?

Can the son-in-law of Rasūlullāh ﷺ ever be a hypocrite and kāfir regarding who he said:

و الله ما سبقناك الى شيء فنخبرك عنه ولا نخلونا بشيء فنبلغكه و قد رأيت كما رأينا و سمعت كما سمعنا
و صحبت رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم كما صحبتنا و ما ابن ابى قحافة و لا ابن الخطاب باولى بعمل
الحق منك و انت اقرب الى رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم و شبيجة رحم و قد نلت من صهره ما لم
ينالا

By Allah, we have not beaten you in anything which we can boast about to you and we have nothing special which we can present to you. You have seen what we have seen and have heard what we have heard. You sat in the company of Rasūlullāh ﷺ like us. Neither Ibn Abī Qūḥāfah nor Ibn al-Khaṭṭāb were more rightful than you in practicing good. You are closer to Rasūlullāh ﷺ with regards to family ties for you have the privilege of being his son-in-law which they do not have.

How can it ever be possible for the Muhājirīn and Anṣār to renege – as is the belief of the Shī'ah – whereas Rasūlullāh ﷺ said regarding the Anṣār:

الانصار كرشى و عييتى

The Anṣār are my vital organs.

لو سلك الناس واديا و سلك الانصار شعبا لسلكت شعب الانصار

If the people had to tread a path and the Anṣār had to tread another, I would tread the path of the Anṣār.

اللهم اغفر للانصار و ابناء الانصار و ابناء ابناء الانصار

O Allah! Forgive the Anṣār, their children, and grandchildren.

And the Imām has regarded the Muhājirīn to be divinely permitted to wage jihād and to possess the qualities in the verse:

التَّائِبُونَ الْعَابِدُونَ الْحَامِدُونَ السَّائِحُونَ الرَّاكِعُونَ السَّاجِدُونَ الْأَمْرُونَ بِالْمَعْرُوفِ وَالنَّاهُونَ عَنِ الْمُنْكَرِ وَالْحَافِظُونَ لِحُدُودِ اللَّهِ وَبَشِّرِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ

[Such believers are] the repentant, the worshippers, the praisers [of Allah], those who fast, those who bow and prostrate [in prayer], those who enjoy what is right and forbid what is wrong, and those who observe the limits [set by] Allah. And give good tidings to the believers.¹

How could such people forget Rasūlullāh's ﷺ bequest, desert the Ahl al-Bayt, and fail to assist Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه who is Rasūlullāh's ﷺ rightful waṣī and undisputed khilāfah?

Only such a person can utter such drivel who in his intoxication of religious prejudice bids his intelligence and understanding farewell and begins denying categorical and historical facts. Otherwise, no man in his sane mind will utter such drivel. In fact, it can never cross the mind of an intelligent man. If the evil of such thoughts and beliefs cannot be comprehended by a person, then he is excused. We should pray that Allah سبحانه وتعالى grants him understanding and opens his heart and eyes to reality.

Point 4

To prove the ills of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم, the Shī'ī scholars presented those Sunnī narrations majority of which are fabricated or weak from books which are unreliable and non-canonical. When our 'Ulamā' rejected such narrations and labelled narrating such narrations from such books as erroneous and deceitful, the Shī'ī scholars generally objected by saying that it is the habit of the Sunnī that when a narration from their books is quoted which conflicts their principles

1 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 112.

and which they cannot answer, they reject that narration or label it as weak and slander the author of being Shī'ī or having Shī'ī ideologies thereby excluding him from their ranks. And if they cannot do this because of the narration being well-known, they take out a hundred tricks to defect that narration. Al-Shūstārī¹, Hāmid Ḥusayn, and the mujtahidīn of Lucknow have vehemently raised this objection in their respective books.

This objection of theirs is incorrect since there is no religion in the world; all the scholars of which possess pure beliefs, brilliant minds, and are perfect researchers. Nor is there any religion; all the books of which are reliable and

1 As al-Shūstārī says in *Iḥqāq al-Haqq*, "From the extremely evil habits and shameless acts of the Sunnī is that whenever the Shī'ah present any verse in praise of the Ahl al-Bayt supported by narrations in Sunnī books, the Sunnī declare such narrations as weak, or fabrications of the opponents, and sometimes mention conditions of generalisation or specification, and sometimes present ludicrous interpretations.

كانهم مفوضون في الدين موكلون في تشريع الشرع السيد المرسلين و لم يسمعوا كلام رب العالمين حيث قال قتل الخراصون الذين هم في غمرة ساهون و اما اقل حياءهم و اكثر اعتدادهم فاي خير في ذلك و اى جميل يترقب من هذا الخلف لا يرحمهم الله و لا يزيكهم و لهم عذاب اليم

As if they are given the responsibility of dīn and codifying the Sharī'ah of the leader of the Messengers. Did they not hear the statement of the Rabb of the universes when He declared: "Destroyed are the falsifiers. Who are within a flood [of confusion] and heedless." What goodness is there in their shamelessness and transgression? What virtue do they acquire what such opposition? May Allah not have mercy on them, nor purify them. And for them is an antagonising punishment.

The author of *Istighāthah* states:

بالجملة مقاصد گونه استعجاب ست از انصاف دشمنی این حضرات که خود عبارات و بفوات چنین کسان که انتساب ایشان بهم بابل حق ثابت نیست احتجاج و استدلال می نمایند و بوجدی آیند و خود از غایت جسارت و عدم استحياء احتجاج را بکلام و مرویات اکاب ائمه دین خود قبول ندارند و بسبع اصفا جانند ببنده بلکه از مزید عناد یا بے بصیرتی این علماء را گایب رافضی و شیعی قطعاً و حتماً قرار دهبند و گایب مجهول و غیر معروف گویند و گایب غیر معتبر و نا معتبر پنداندند و مجروح مطروح بودند شان ظاہر سازند چنانچه ثعلبی را بیان بیمه جلال اوصاف و امامت مفسرین تضعیف و توبیین سازند و مرویات اور اعتبارے ند ببنده و بجولے نخرند و پرده ناموسی اورا بقدر و جرحش بدر ند و ابن مغازی را با وصف ظہور محدثیت مجهول داند و ابن الصباغ مالکی سنی را توبیین و تضعیف کند و ابن حبان را از اصحاب صحاح و ائمه متبحرین ایشانست مطروح و متروک گویند و احتجاج بکلامش جائز ندارند و یحیی بن سعید بیان بیمه جلالت و امامت گویند که بیج مردست و طبرسی را ساقط الاعتبار سازند بلکه نپہمت رفض برو گزارند و از قبول روایات حاکم سر باز زند و شہرستانی را بهم مائل برفض و تشیع قرار دهبند و اخطب خوارزم را از پایه اعتبار و اعتماد ساقط سازند

authentic, and worthy of proof in religious discussions. Every religion has rituals, customs, and inspired statements together with their structure of beliefs. They have stories and tales with authentic narrations. Due to the infiltration of the greedy, ignorant, and those with corrupt ideologies, false narrations have been broadcasted with authentic ones.

Islam is a religion which has thousands of sects and millions of scholars. Every sect has authored books in support of their belief structure and principles. Many of such persons have fabricated narrations and falsely attributed statements to the elders of their religions to support their proofs. The passing of time and the severity of difference has reached such a limit that together with authentic books, a library of unreliable books is found. Many scholars have passed and many books were written by the Sunnī. Not all the scholars were of the same status nor were all the books dealing with the same subject. Some scholars were on the pinnacle of research while others fell into the dark abyss of deception and error. Many have exerted themselves in the search and spreading of truth with true sincerity while others have not had a second thought to spread falsehood and did not take the pains to sift truth from falsehood due to carnal desires or worldly desires. Some were such who had corrupt beliefs but wore the Sunnī garb and entered the ‘Ulamā’ fraternity. People were deceived by their outer appearance, knowledge, and expertise and began narrating from them. So when there is an abundance of such authors with various ideologies and various standings, our religion cannot take responsibility for all their narrations nor can anyone be stamped as approved on the basis of him being a scholar or author. Yes, the religion is most certainly responsible and guarantor for that book which has the prestige of:

لَا يَأْتِيهِ الْبَاطِلُ مِنْ بَيْنِ يَدَيْهِ وَلَا مِنْ خَلْفِهِ تَنْزِيلٌ مِّنْ حَكِيمٍ حَمِيدٍ

Falsehood cannot approach it from before it or from behind it; [it is] a revelation from a [Lord who is] Wise and Praiseworthy.¹

1 Sūrah Ḥā Mīm Sajdah: 42.

And that blessed mouth concerning which Allah ﷻ declares:

وَمَا يَنْطِقُ عَنِ الْهَوَىٰ ۖ إِنْ هُوَ إِلَّا وَحْيٌ يُوحَىٰ

Nor does he speak from [his own] inclination. It is not but a revelation revealed.¹

So all the narrations from our books cannot be presented as proof against us unless they are Qur'ānic verses or authentic aḥādīth which are free from contradiction and rarity. But the reality is that instead of the above, the Shī'ah present such narrations which are extracted from books of history, books of tafsīr, or unreliable aḥādīth books. The condition of these books is:

‘Allāmah Ibn Khaldūn has written that books of history have nothing but history. It is said that although many creditable historians wrote history books, they are filled with futile, nonsensical, and ridiculous stories. Besides the primary history books, all other history books that have been authored do not contain any isnād so one cannot ascertain whether the narrators were truthful or not and whether they followed the correct path or were people of bid'ah. And wherever the isnād is mentioned, then after thorough research it is found that most of the narrators are unreliable, obscure or unknown.

From among the early historians, some renowned like Wāqidi etc., who is known as *Imām al-Mu'arrikhīn* (leader of the historians); his books are also filled with incorrect narrations. The condition of the later historians is that each one of them is the sole narrator of such narrations and incidents. They only conveyed to us all the nonsensical and senseless narrations they found in the early books or heard from different sources. They neither scrutinised the source nor investigated their objectives. Especially those historians who were linked to a certain sect or inclined towards the same; they accepted any narration which conformed to their ideology. Their staunchness or inclination to their creed was a veil over their

1 Sūrah Najm: 3,4.

eyes and they thus fell into the calamity of accepting and narrating fabrications. Due to them trusting and having good thoughts about the narrations, they had confidence in them and did not scrutinise them thus spreading and generalising this calamity.

They had so much reliance on the narrators that they did not consider the principles of *riwāyah* (narrating aḥādīth) nor apply the rules of *dirāyah* (analysing the meaning of the narration). If the narrator was mistaken or did not convey the correct message due to a misunderstanding, then too they narrated from him verbatim. Incautiousness, love for fame, and intermingling with people of bid'ah and passion transformed history books into fairy tales. Ibn Khaldūn's statement needs no substantiation. The books of history and the stories mentioned therein are sufficient testimony to the same.

Notwithstanding this, the Shī'ah have narrated majority of the narrations of such history books and presented such fabrications as proof against us. As in the case of gifting Fadak, they extracted forgeries from *Tārīkh A'tham Kūfī*, *Tārīkh Āl 'Abbās*, *Ma'ārij al-Nubuwwah*, *Ḥabīb al-Siyar*, etc., to prove their stance. According to the *muḥaqqiqīn* (researchers) such narrations do not hold any weight in ordinary incidents, forget using them as proofs in cases which have an impact on the accepted principles and beliefs which are established in the glorious Qur'ān and noble aḥādīth.

Besides books of history, the narrations and statements found in books of tafsīr have been presented by the Shī'ah to prove their allegations against the noble Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم. However, merely a narration being found in a tafsīr book does not authenticate it since these books have been written by people of different temperaments and ideologies and they have all types of narrations; correct and incorrect, strong and weak. As Ibn Taymiyyah رحمته الله has commented:

كتب التفسير التي ينقل فيها الصحيح والضعيف مثل تفسير الثعلبي والواحدى والبغوى وابن جرير وابن
ابى حاتم لم يكن مجرد رواية واحد من هؤلاء دليلا على صحته باتفاق اهل العلم فانه اذا عرف ان تلك
المنقولات فيها صحيح و ضعيف فلا بد من بيان ان هذا المنقول من قسم الصحيح دون الضعيف

The books of tafsīr wherein authentic and weak narrations are quoted like the tafsīr of al-Tha‘labī, al-Wāḥidī, Ibn Jarīr, and Ibn Abī Ḥātim; the mere narrating of one of them are not proof for its authenticity by the consensus of the men of knowledge. This is due to the fact that when it is known that the narrations consist of both authentic and weak ones, it is necessary to ascertain whether the said narration is authentic and not weak.

‘Allāmah ‘Abd al-Ra‘ūf writes in *Fatāwā Fayḍ al-Qadīr Sharḥ Jāmi‘ Ṣaghīr*:

قال ابن الكمال كتب التفسير مشحونة بالاحاديث الموضوعية

Ibn al-Kamāl has stated that the books of tafsīr are filled with fabrications.

So until a narration or ḥadīth which is authentic according to the principles of ḥadīth is not presented, neither the statement of a mufasssīr nor the narration of a tafsīr book will be accepted as proof simply on the grounds that it is found in a tafsīr book.

The Shī‘ah also narrate from many aḥādīth books. However, one should bear in mind that all aḥādīth books are not on the same standard of authenticity and reliability. The statement of the Muḥaqqiqīn regarding all aḥādīth books besides the *al-Ṣiḥāḥ al-Sittah* is that generally their aḥādīth are not worthy to be practiced upon nor quoted. Yes, those men who are grounded in the science of *Asmā’ al-Rijāl* and are aware of the ‘*ilal* (defects/flaws) of aḥādīth and are great muḥaqqiqīn are at liberty to extract *mutābi‘āt*¹ and *shawāhid*² from them. This is the condition of those *masānīd*, *jawāmi‘* and *muṣannafāt* which were written prior to the era of al-Bukhārī and Muslim and after their era which are filled with ṣaḥīḥ, ḥasan, ḍa‘īf, ma‘rūf, gharīb, shādh, munkar, khaṭa’, ṣawāb, thābit, and maqlūb; e.g. *Musnad Abī Ya‘lā*, *Muṣannaf ‘Abd al-Razzāq*, *Muṣannaf Abī Bakr ibn Abī Shaybah*, *Musnad ‘Abd ibn Ḥumayd*, *Ṭayālīsī*, and the books of al-Bayhaqī, al-Ṭaḥāwī, and al-Ṭabarānī. The objective of these authors was to gather whatever they found without scrutinizing and analysing them. They left this job for others. Besides the above,

1 Corroborations.

2 Corroborations.

there are those books of ḥadīth which were authored at a later stage. Their authors gathered those aḥādīth which were not found in the *al-Ṣiḥāh al-Sittah* and the aḥādīth of those masānīd and jawāmi‘ which were hidden. These aḥādīth are generally on the tongues of people. However, the muḥaddithīn did not give any consideration to these books and did not quote from them. Majority of the aḥādīth are unreliable and those quoted by vociferous speakers, men of passion, men of bid‘ah, and weak narrators.

And sometimes they are the statements of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم and Tābi‘īn; quotations from the Banū Isrā’īl, and the words of men of wisdom which the narrators – intentionally or unintentionally – have labelled as aḥādīth. Or the indications of Qur’ānic verses and aḥādīth have been included as aḥādīth intentionally. Such aḥādīth are found in books like *Kitāb al-Ḍu‘afā’* of Ibn Ḥibbān, *al-Kāmil* of Ibn ‘Adiyy, Khaṭīb, Abū Nu‘aym, al-Jūzaqānī, Ibn ‘Asākir, Ibn Najjār, al-Daylamī, and *Musnad Khawārizimī*. The condition of these books is that the best aḥādīth are those which are ḍa‘īf and the worst are the ones which are fabrications, maqlūb, or munkar. The material of these books can be found in Ibn al-Jawzī’s *Kitāb Mawḍū‘āt*.

Besides these, there are those aḥādīth which were on the tongues of the Fuqahā’, Ṣūfiyyah, and historians and became famous due to this whereas there is no basis in the first few eras for such narrations. Such narrations are jumbled therein which are the fabrications of the wayward linked with isnād that cannot be criticised. Moreover, their eloquence is not far-fetched from the station of nubuwwah. This deception has caused a great disaster in Islam and has allowed the insertion of fabrications into authentic aḥādīth books. The books which have included these narrations are the favourites of the Shī‘ah and Mu‘tazilah. They present these narrations to prove their false ideologies and use them as proof against the people of truth. Those who are not well grounded in knowledge are deceived by these narrations.

Another anomaly is that some began seeking and narrating authentic aḥādīth. However, they began fabricating aḥādīth to prove their wrong beliefs attaching them to the isnād they have memorised thus succeeding in deceiving the

muḥaddithīn. Jābir al-Ju‘fī and Abū al-Qāsim Sa‘d ibn ‘Abd Allah al-Sha‘rī al-Qummī are guilty of this. They were so cunning that although they were Shī‘ī in reality, they deceived many muḥaddithīn by wrapping fabrications in authentic isnād to the extent that even al-Tirmidhī, Abū Dawud and al-Nasa‘ī have quoted Jābir al-Ju‘fī’s narrations in their books. There was a Shī‘ī by the name of Aṣḥāh who devised a plan to destroy the Sunnī. A muḥaqqiq like Yaḥyā ibn Ma‘īn termed him reliable and had confidence in him. His deception was only discovered at a later stage after thorough investigation. However, since his narrations have been included in the aḥādīth books, many people fall into deception and their beliefs are put at jeopardy since they believe his narrations to be aḥādīth whereas the reality is that they are not the words of Rasūlullāh ﷺ but the stories of a liar.

Among such people is Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd al-Mu‘tazilī¹ who together with i‘tizāl, was

1 Zubdat al-Mujtahidīn Mirzā Muḥammad Bāqir Mūsawī ibn Ḥājī Zayn al-‘Ābidīn has written in his book *Rawḍat al-Jannāt fī Aḥwāl al-‘Ulamā’ wa al-Sādāt* printed in Iran in 1307 under the biography of Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd:

عبد الحميد بن ابي الحسين بهاء الدين محمد بن محمد بن الحسين بن ابي الحديد المدائني الحكيم الاصول المعتزلي المعروف بابن ابي الحديد صاحب شرح نهج البلاغة المشهور هو من الكابر الفضلاء المتبعين و اعظم النبلاء التجريين مواليا لاهل بيت العصمة و الطهارة و ان كان في ذى اهل السنة و الجماعة منصفاً غاية الانصاف في المحاكمة بين الفريقين و معترفاً في ذلك المصاف بان الحق يدور مع والد الحسينين و ابن ابي الحديد مع تسننه قد يتوهم عن شرحه تشييعه و بالميشم بالعكس و كان مولده في غرة ذى الحجة سنة ست و ثمانين و خمس مائة فمن تصانيفه شرح نهج البلاغة عشرين مجلداً و قد احتوى هذا الشرح على ما لم يحتوى عليه كتاب من جنسه صنفه لخزاة كبت الوزير مويد الدين بن علقمى و لما فرغ من تصنيفه انقله على يد اخيه موفق الدين ابي المعالي فبعث له بباقة الف دينار و خلعه سنية و فرس فكتب الى الوزير هذه الابيات

‘Abd al-Ḥamīd ibn Abī al-Ḥusayn Bahā’ al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd al-Madā’inī al-Ḥakīm al-Uṣūl al-Mu‘tazilī commonly known as Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd author of *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah*. It is famous that he is one of the senior great scholars, a friend of the pure and chaste Ahl al-Bayt although in the guise of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa al-Jamā‘ah. He was very just in arbitration between the two groups and acknowledged that the truth is with the father of Ḥasanayn. Notwithstanding his sunniyyah, he was criticised of being Shī‘ī due to his *Sharḥ* and vice versa due to his *al-Maytham*. He was born in the beginning of Dhū al-Ḥijjah 586 A.H. Amongst his works is *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah* which is in 20 volumes. This commentary comprises of such things which books of this type do not. He wrote it for the library of al-Wazīr Mu‘ayyid al-Dīn ibn ‘Alqamī. When he finished authoring the book, he sent it with his brother Muwaffaq al-Dīn Abī al-Mu‘ālī. The receiver sent 100000 gold coins, a robe of honour and a horse.

a Shī'ī. He wrote *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah* to appease Ibn 'Alqamī Wazīr Mu'taṣim Billāh; he wrote it for the latter's library. He extracted unreliable and fabricated narrations from unknown books and the works of unreliable authors which cast doubts on the integrity of the noble Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم and lend support to the beliefs of the Shī'ah. Ibn 'Alqamī was his nurturer and close friend. As a reward for this book, he awarded him 100000 gold coins and a robe of honour. Ibn 'Alqamī was no ordinary Shī'ī. He was a hard-core Shī'ī and enemy of the Ahl al-Sunnah to such an extent that due to religious prejudice, he subtly invited Hulagu Khan to attack Baghdad and destroy the 'Abbāsīd Khilāfah. He then brought Hulagu to the khalīfah deceptively and martyred him along with the 'Ulamā' and leaders. Although Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd's work is comprehensive and scholarly and he himself is an expert and very eloquent, he was a supporter of Shī'ism. Apparently, no hard-core Shī'ī has ever gathered so much material in support of Shī'ism as Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd has. It is this very book which the Shī'ah have quoted from in the past and up until this day as proof for their beliefs. The Ahl al-Bid'ah and opposition reckon him among the senior scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah and use his narrations against us. If you study the books of the Shī'ah, you will notice that aḥādīth on the topic of *maṭā'in* (disparagement) of Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم, are all referenced to Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd. All his fabrications are used against us. So the readers of this book should be well aware that majority of narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah concerning *maṭā'in* of Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم have been extracted from the book of Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd.

The masters of the science of ḥadīth and those who review the authenticity of aḥādīth cannot be deceived. They reject fabrications just as a blacksmith differentiates between pure and fake. The muḥaddithīn have attached an isnād to every ḥadīth and have written the biographies of all the narrators so that the door of scrutinizing and reviewing aḥādīth will remain open till the Day of Qiyāmah. Furthermore, they have provided the means for distinguishing authentic narrations from fabrications. So whichever ḥadīth is presented before us, it is necessary to first examine its authenticity on the principles of ḥadīth examination. If it is found that one narrator was a fabricator or unreliable or a bid'atī narrating in support of his bid'ah, we will reject such a narration. And it is not correct for the opposition to use such a narration against us.

Aḥādīth narrations are pieces of information. Information can either be true or false. To remove the possibility of falsehood, it is necessary that the narrator be reliable, devout, and truthful. If the narrations have been narrated through many isnāds that normally it is impossible for such a large number of people to unite on falsehood, and all the narrators are free from defects which cast doubts on their narrations, then such narrations are reckoned on the highest level of authenticity. Such narrations are termed *mutawātir*. It is only such narrations which give *yaqīn* (certainty of knowledge) and upon which beliefs can be structured. Man is forced to believe them. Such narrations are very few as articulated by Ibn Ṣalāḥ:

مثال المتواتر على التفسير المتقدم يعز وجوده الا ان يدعى ذلك في حديث من كذب على متعمدا فليتبوأ
مقعده من النار

Examples of *mutawātir* on the given definition are very few in number. It can be claimed on the ḥadīth, “The one who intentionally forges a lie against me should prepare his abode in Hell.”

If a narration does not have many isnāds, but the narrators are very reliable and devout and it is narrated with at least two isnāds then its truthfulness will be given credence. Such narrations are termed *mash-hūr* and are worthy of acceptance.

If a narration has not been narrated through many isnāds and falls short of meeting the standard of *mutawātir* or *mash-hūr*, however it has an unbroken isnād and does not have any criticism together with the narrators possessing the qualities of reliability coupled with a remarkable memory, then such a narration will not provide *yaqīn* (conviction) but will provide *ẓann* (supposition). Such narrations are authentic and practice upon them is necessary. However, they cannot be the basis for beliefs since *yaqīn* is needed for this science. A narration whose narrators have been omitted or one of them was omitted – whether this was made clear or not – or any of the narrators is criticised due to some liable flaw, then such a narration will be considered *maḥʿūn* (criticised). There is a possibility that the narrator that was omitted could have been a Ṣaḥābī or a Tābīʿī. If he was a Tābīʿī, then he could be reliable or not. On the other hand, if the narrator is a liar or an

intentional fabricator or assumed a liar (i.e. although he does not intentionally fabricate aḥādīth but lies in other matters,) or he errs too often, is not cautious, is negligent, is an open transgressor, is affected by delusions, has opposed reliable narrators, is a bid'atī, or does not possess a good memory; then his narration is not worthy of acceptance. If he is a liar, then the ḥadīth will be labelled *mawḍū'* (fabricated). If he is assumed a liar, then the ḥadīth will be labelled *matrūk*. If he errs plenty or is negligent or is an open sinner, then his narration will be termed *munkar*.

An unknown narrator's narration will not be accepted since the reliability of the narrator is a necessary condition for the acceptance of a narration. When he is unknown, then how will his reliability be ascertained and how can his narration be accepted? It is for this reason that a mursal¹ ḥadīth will not be accepted according to the most correct view.

A point worthy of consideration regarding aḥādīth in general and maṭā'in of Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم in particular is that the narrator should not be an enemy of the Ahl al-Sunnah, the true religion. We do not label as kāfir the Ahl al-Bid'ah or our adversaries and we do accept the narrations of those who are devout, truthful, and intelligent, on condition that their narrations does not support their false ideologies and bid'ah. It is very possible for them to interpolate and adulterate narrations to conform to their bid'ah in order to give them credibility. Such narrations which support their bid'ah or cult will not be accepted as per rule.

The readers will see that majority of narrations concerning the maṭā'in against the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم and regarding Fadak have been narrated by those who are hard-core Shī'īs or accused of having Shī'ī ideologies. Although they are reliable due to other qualities and the muḥaddithīn have accepted their narrations, their narrations which lend support to their cult cannot be accepted both rationally and contextually. In consideration of the rules of *dirāyah* (the meanings of the aḥādīth), their narrations are criticised. If their narrations do not reach the

1 Where one link or more in the isnād is missing

standard of *dirāyah*, they will not be accepted. This is explained in *Tadrīb al-Rāwī*:

A ḥadīth which is in conflict to intellect, contextual evidence, and beliefs will be considered as *mawḍūʿ*.

It is recorded in *Faṭḥ al-Mughīth* that Ibn al-Jawzī has stated: “A ḥadīth which is irrational or is contrast to accepted beliefs should be understood to be *mawḍūʿ*. There is no need to scrutinise the reliability of the narrators. Similarly, the following narrations will not be accepted: those *aḥādīth* which mention aspects in conflict to sense and reality; those which oppose Qurʾān or *mutawātir aḥādīth* or *ijmāʿ qatī* to the extent that no interpretation can be presented to reconcile the two; the meaning is repulsive; he is the sole narrator of this narration and the subject matter is obligatory for all to know; the incident mentioned is so important and common that more people need to narrate it; or it is rejected by such a large number of people that for them all to be wrong is impossible and them planning such a rejection is improbable. These are all indications that the narration is *mawḍūʿ*.”

Moulānā Shāh ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz has written the following in *ʿUjālah Nāfiʿ ah*:

علامات وضع حدیث و کذب راوی چند چیز است اول اینکه خلاف تاریخ مشهور روایت کند دوم اینکه راوی رافضی باشد و حدیث در طعن صحابه روایت کند و یا ناصبی باشد و حدیث در مطاعن اهل بیت باشد و علی هذا القیاس سوم اینکه چیزی روایت کند که بر جمیع مکلفین معرفت ایں و عمل بران فرض باشد و او منفرد بود بروایت چهارم اینکه وقت دحال قرینه باشد بر کذب او پنجم اینکه مخالف مقتضای عقل و شرع باشد و قواعد شرعیہ ایں را تکذیب نمایند ششم اینکه در حدیث قصه باشد از امر حسی واقعی که اگر بالحقیقه متحقق می شد ہزاراں کس ایںرا نقل می کردند ہشتم رکاکت لفظ و معنی مثل لفظی روایت کند کہ بر قواعد عربیہ درست نشود یا معنی کہ مناسب شان نبوت و وقار نباشد ہشتم افراط در وعید شدید بر گناہ صغیر یا افراط در وعده عظیم بر فعل قلیل نہم اینکه بر عمل قلیل ثواب حج و عمرہ ذکر نماید دہم اینکه کسی را از عاملان خیر ثواب انبیاء موعود کند یا زدہم خود اقرار کرده باشد بوضع احادیث

There are few signs which manifest the falsehood of a narration or the forgery of a narrator. Firstly, he narrates in conflict to a well-known date. Secondly, the narrator is a *Rāfiḍī* and his narration criticises the *Ṣaḥābah* رضی اللہ عنہم or a *Nāṣibī* or *Khārijī* and his narration criticises the *Ahl al-Bayt*.

Thirdly, he is the sole narrator of such a narration which makes a practice obligatory upon all. Fourthly, there is evidence of the narrator being a liar. Fifthly, his narration is in conflict to the Sharīah and intellect and the principles of Sharīah falsify his narration. Sixthly, an observation is mentioned which if was true would have been narrated by thousands of people. Seventhly, the words of the narration are grammatically incorrect or the meaning is not befitting for the pedestal of nubuwwah. Eighthly, there is a severe punishment for a minor sin or a grand reward for a small action. Ninthly, mention is made of the reward of ḥajj and ‘umrah for a little action. Tenthly, there is a promise of reward equal to the Ambiyā’ for some good action. Eleventh, the narrator himself acknowledges fabricating the narration.

Imām al-Sakhāwī has quoted from Ibn al-Jawzī the signs of a fabrication in *Fatḥ al-Mughīth*:

Firstly, the narration is irrational or oppose to beliefs. Secondly, sense and reality belies it. Thirdly, a narration which is in stark conflict to Qur’ān, ḥadīth mutawātir, or ijmā’. Fourthly, there is mention of severe punishment or great rewards for a small action. Fifthly, the meaning is absurd. Sixthly, the inarticulacy of the narrator. Seventhly, the narrator is alone. Eighthly, the narrator is alone and the subject matter affects all. Ninthly, a great occurrence which necessitates an abundance of narrators. Tenthly, a huge group having consensus that it is a fabrication.

These principles of dirāyah mentioned by Shāh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz رحمته الله are not the product of his imagination and were not formed by him. Rather, majority of our muḥaqqiqīn have practiced upon them. Whenever a ḥadīth was found contrary to the Qur’ān, intellect, fundamental principles, or accepted beliefs, it was labelled as discarded.

Imām al-Rāzī has related, “Someone narrated from Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم that Sayyidunā Ibrāhīm عليه السلام did not lie except in three instances. I told him that such narrations should not be accepted. The narrator vehemently opposed me

saying that if we do not accept it then the narrators will be accused of lying. I said that if we do accept then Sayyidunā Ibrāhīm عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ will be accused of lying. And it is better to protect Sayyidunā Ibrāhīm from being labelled a liar than to accuse some unreliable men of the same.”

Abū Muṭīr al-Balkhī questioned Imām Abū Ḥanīfah رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ, “What do you say concerning the ḥadīth which people narrate that when a believer commits adultery/fornication, his īmān is removed from him like how a shirt is removed from the body; do you believe such narrators or doubt them or belie them? If you believe them, your belief will be like that of the Khawārij. If you doubt them, then a doubt will remain on the view of the Khawārij. And if you belie them, you will be belying many who narrate this from Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.”

Imām Abū Ḥanīfah رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ replied, “I belie all the narrators. My belying the narrators and rejecting them does not necessitate my rejection of Rasūlullāh’s صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ statement. Rejection of Rasūlullāh’s صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ statement is for someone to say that I do not accept Rasūlullāh’s صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ statement. However, when he testifies to believing in everything conveyed by Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and says that he knows fully well that Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ did not say anything contrary to what is in the Qur’ān, then in fact this is belief in Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and belief in the Qur’ān and this establishes the innocence of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ from opposing the Qur’ān. Had Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ said anything contrary to the Qur’ān, would Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى allow it? How is it possible for Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ to say anything contrary to what is mentioned in the Qur’ān? How can the person who opposes the Qur’ān be the Messenger of Allah? In short, this narration of īmān being removed by committing adultery/fornication is in conflict to the Qur’ān. To reject those who claim Rasūlullāh’s صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ opposition to the Qur’ān is not rejecting Rasūlullāh’s صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ statement nor belying him. Rather, it is rejection of the statement of the one attributing this to Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and slandering him. We believe in everything Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ said and testify to its truthfulness. At the same time, we testify that Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ did not state anything contrary to the Sharīah, nor did he command what Allah forbade, nor did he separate what Allah

commanded be joined, nor did he mention a quality of anything contrary to what Allah has mentioned. We bear witness that every statement of Rasūlullāh ﷺ was in conformity to Allah’s speech. It is for this reason that Allah سبحانه وتعالى stated: ‘Whoever obeys Allah’s Messenger has obeyed Allah.’”

No one should think that these principles only apply to the narrations of unreliable books. In fact, they apply to all aḥādīth books. The aḥādīth included in the ṣiḥāḥ are not of one level of authenticity but have varying levels. In fact, it is said about *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* and *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* which are accepted as the most authentic books of ḥadīth:

انه صحيح على ظن مصنفه و غلبة ظنه و اما السهو و النسيان فمن لوازم طبع الانسان

It is authentic according to the opinion of the author or his strongest opinion. Besides, making mistakes and forgetting is part of the nature of man.

Moreover, some of their aḥādīth and narrators have been criticised. The muḥaqqiqīn have said that al-Bukhārī has narrated from a little over 430 narrators who do not appear in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, 80 of whom have been criticised of *ḍu’f* (weakness). Muslim has narrated from 620 narrators who do not appear in *al-Bukhārī*. 160 of them have been criticised of *ḍu’f*. The narrations of ‘Ikrimah from Ibn ‘Abbās appear in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* and the narrations from Abū al-Zubayr from Jābir, Suhayl from his father, ‘Alā’ ibn ‘Abd al-Rahman from his father, and Ḥammād ibn Salamah from Thābit appear in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. These narrators have been deemed weak. Aḥādīth which have an *‘illah* (flaw) in them are 210 in total. *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* has less than 80 while *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* has the rest.¹ It is for this reason that Mullā ‘Alī Qārī has stated in *Kitāb al-Rijāl*:

و ما يقوله الناس ان من روى له الشيخان فقد جاز القنطرة هذا ايضا من التجاهل فقد روى مسلم في كتابه عن الليث عن ابي مسلم وغيره من الضعفاء فيقولون انما روى عنهم في كتابه للاعتبار والشواهد و

1 See *Muqaddamah Faḥ al-Bārī*.

المتابعات وهذا لا يقوى لان الحفاظ قالوا الاعتبار امور يتعرفون بها حال الحديث و كتاب مسلم التزم فيه الصحة فكيف يتعرف حال الحديث الذى فيه بطرق ضعيفة الى قوله و روى مسلم ايضا حديث الاسراء فيه و ذلك قبل ان يوحى اليه و قد تكلم الحفاظ فى هذه القصة و بينوا ضعفها الى قوله و قد قال الحفاظ ان مسلما لما وضع كتابه الصحيح عرضه على ابي زرعة فانكر عليه و تغيظ و قال سميت الصحيح و جعلته مسلما لاهل البدع و غيرهم انتهى و الحاصل انه صحيح على ظن مصنفه و غلبة ظنه و اما السهو و النسيان فمن لوازم طبع الانسان و قد ابي الله الا ان يصحح كتابه بقوله **إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّكْرَ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُونَ**

What people say that the person from whom Shaykhayn (al-Bukhārī and Muslim) have narrated has passed the bridge; this is due to ignorance. Muslim has narrated in his book from Layth from Abū Muslim etc., who are weak narrators. Some say that he only narrated from them in his book as *i'tibār* (consideration), *shawāhid*, and *mutābā'āt*. However, this view is not so strong. The *ḥuffāz* [of *ḥadīth*] have stated that *al-i'tibār* are aspects which ascertain the condition of a *ḥadīth*. And Muslim has taking a resolution of authenticity. So how can a narration's condition be judged which is narrated through weak chains? ...

Muslim has also narrated the *ḥadīth* of Isrā' therein and this was prior to revelation coming to him **صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ**. The *ḥuffāz* have criticised this incident and have clearly stated that it is weak. ...

Al-Ḥāfiẓ has said that when Muslim was complete with his *Ṣaḥīḥ*, he presented it to Abū Zur'ah who became angry and scolded him saying: "You have named it *al-Ṣaḥīḥ* and made it a weapon for the Ahl *al-Bid'ah* and others."

In short, it is authentic according to the opinion of the author or his strongest opinion. Making mistakes and forgetting is part of the nature of man. Allah wishes not but to authenticate His book by His declaration:

إِنَّا نَحْنُ نَزَّلْنَا الذِّكْرَ وَإِنَّا لَهُ لَحَافِظُونَ

Indeed, it is We who sent down the Qur'an and indeed, We will be its guardian.¹

1 Sūrah al-Ḥijr: 9.

The author of *Izālat al-Ghayn* has stated:

از کتب محدثین چنان بوضوح می انجامد که بعد از تحقیق در صحت یعنی روایات صحیح بخاری کلام است و بهم جنین در بعضی روایات صحیح مسلم و قبل از بی گزشته که این روایات که اهل حدیث در صحت این قبیل و قال دارند هر چند اقل قلیل است مگر در صحیح ثانی زیاده تر از اول است و برین قدر اکتفا نمی توان کرد زیرا که افاده بن اثیر در صدر جامع الاصول جائیکه فرع ثالث در طبقات مجروحین قرار داده است دلالت بران دارد که بعضی از ضاعین خود اقرار کرده اند که حدیث فدک ساخته بر مشائخ بغداد خواندیم همه با قبول کردند مگر این بی شبیه علوی که او بعلت جعل و افترا بی برد هرگز قبول نکرد عبارت این مقام این است

After studying the books of the muḥaddithīn it is learnt that after thorough research, there is some criticism on the narrations of *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*. Similarly, there is some criticism on the narrations of *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*. It has been mentioned before that those narrations; the authenticity of which has been debated by the Ahl al-ḥadīth are very few in number. However, there has been more criticism on *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* than on *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*. Only this cannot be relied upon since *Ifādah Ibn Athīr Ṣadr Jāmī' al-Uṣūl* has been declared *majrūḥ* (criticised). Some ḥadīth fabricators have attested to the fact that they presented their forged ḥadīth regarding Fadak to the Shuyūkh of Baghdad who accepted them. Ibn Abī Shaybah 'Alawī was the only one who did not accept it due to its forgery.

The Arabic text reads:

و منهم قوم وضعوا الحديث ليهوى يدعون الناس اليه فمنهم من تاب عنه و اقر على نفسه قال شيخ من شيوخ الخوارج بعد ان تاب ان هذا الاحاديث دين فانظروا من تاخذون دينكم فان كنا اذا هويتا امرنا صبرناه حديثنا و قال ابو العينا وضعت انا و الجاحظ حديث فدك و ادخلناه على الشيوخ بغداد فقبلوه الا ابن ابى شيبة العلوي فانه قال لا يشبه اخر هذا الحديث اوله و ابى ان يقبله تم بلفظه

There is a group among them who fabricated aḥādīth to invite people towards carnal desires. Some of them repented and acknowledged this. One of the elders of the Khawārij said after repenting, "Indeed, these aḥādīth are dīn. So ascertain from whom you are acquiring your dīn from. Whenever we made up something, we moulded it into a ḥadīth."

Abū al-‘Aynā has said, “Al-Jāhīz and myself fabricated the ḥadīth of Fadak and presented it to the Shukūkh of Baghdad who accepted it besides Ibn Abī Shaybah al-‘Alawī who said, ‘The end of this ḥadīth does not conform to the beginning,’ and refused to accept it.”

Imām al-Nawawī رحمته الله has written in *Sharḥ Muslim* where he rejected the statement of Shaykh Ibn Ṣalāh that all the aḥādīth of *Ṣaḥīḥayn* are unquestionably the words of Rasūlullāh صلی الله علیه و سلم:

هذا الذى ذكر الشيخ فى هذا الموضوع خلاف ما قاله المحققون والاکثرون فانهم قالوا احاديث الصحيحين التى ليست بمتواترة انما يفيد الظن فانها احاد و الاحاد انها يفيد الظن على ما تقرر و لا فرق بين البخارى و مسلم و غيرهما فى ذلك الى ان قال و لا يلزم من اجماع الامة على العمل بما فيهما اجماعهم على انه مقطوع بانه كلام النبى صلى الله عليه و سلم

What Shaykh has mentioned here is in conflict to what the muḥaqqiqīn and majority have said. They have said that the aḥādīth of *Ṣaḥīḥayn* which are not mutawātir only provide ḥann since they are khabar āḥād and khabar āḥād only provide ḥann as has been established. There is no difference between *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* and others in this regard...

The consensus of the ummah upon practicing on the aḥādīth contained in them does not necessitate their consensus of them being unquestionably the words of Rasūlullāh صلی الله علیه و سلم.

For this reason, any ḥadīth recorded in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* or *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim* which is contrary to any established tenant of the Sharī‘ah will be rejected as per consensus – due to the delusion of a narrator – or it will be given a suitable interpretation. As ‘Allāmah Rashīd al-Dīn Khān has said in *Shawkat ‘Umarīyyah*:

چیزے کی مخالف ما ستقر فى شريعة الاسلام ست باتفاق شيعه و سنى يا محكوم عليه بطلان ست بجهت وبهم راوى يا ماول ست چنانچه امام نووى در شرح صحيح مسلم در شرح ابي حديث حديث صحيح مسلم كه ظاهر او دلالت بر قدح بعضے اصحاب كبار دارد نقلا عن القاضى عياض مازنى مى فرمايد و اذا انسدت طرق تاويلها نسبنا الكذب ال روايتها

A ḥadīth which is in conflict to established aspects of Islam unanimously accepted by both Shī‘ah and Sunnī will be understood to be the delusion

of the narrator or it will be suitably interpreted. Imām al-Nawawī رحمۃ اللہ علیہ has stated in *Sharḥ Muslim* under the commentary of the ḥadīth, which casts allegations against the senior Ṣaḥābah رضی اللہ عنہم, on the strength of Qāḍī 'Iyād Māzinī, “When it cannot be interpreted, we will attribute its falsehood to the narrators.”

Although the compilers of *Ṣaḥīḥayn*, i.e. Imām al-Bukhārī and Muslim, exhausted their human efforts in gathering only authentic narrations – and for this reason their books are the most superior and high ranking among all – they were human after all. They have surpassed their contemporaries in authentication of aḥādīth. However there is scope for the taḥqīq of the muḥaqqiqīn and the ijtihād of the mujtahidīn. It is written in *Muntahā al-Kalām*:

آخر این بزرگان ہم از جملہ بشر بوده اند گو در تصحیح حدیث بغایت قصوی گو شیده باشند سیما محمد بن اسمعیل بخاری کہ او درین امور گوئے سبق از اقران و امثال ربوده لیکن بازیم جائے اجتہاد مجتہدین باقی ست مگر یادنداری کہ در بارہ چندے از روایت بعضے از علماء و فقہاء بحث دارند شارحین در جواب ایں وجوبے نقل می کند کہ بعضے ازاں خالی از غرابت نیست

After all these men were human beings. Although they exhausted all efforts to ascertain the authenticity of the aḥādīth especially Muḥammad ibn Ismā'īl al-Bukhārī who surpassed his contemporaries in this field, yet there is scope for the ijtihād of the mujtahidīn. You will remember that some Fuqahā' and 'Ulamā' have criticised their narrations. The commentators have answered these allegations with such reasons which are farfetched and improbable.

This point is not unfathomable. Besides fabrications, there are other natural causes which create the possibility of contradiction and doubts in their authenticity. The muḥaqqiqīn have mentioned eight causes.

- Misunderstanding the meaning of the ḥadīth.
- Two narrators understanding the ḥadīth differently.

- The inability of the narrator to convey the proper meaning to the audience.
- A fault in the memory of the narrator either by omitting a portion of the ḥadīth or mixing two narrations.
- A narrator commenting on a portion of the ḥadīth so that the listener may understand it properly. However, the listener misunderstood this explanation as part of the ḥadīth.
- The narrator mentioned few words of Rasūlullāh ﷺ in his speech and the listener understood the entire speech to be the words of Rasūlullāh ﷺ.
- Those differences which occur due to narrations being conveyed verbally.
- Various conditions in which the narrator saw Rasūlullāh ﷺ, heard him say something, or do something.

In *uṣūl al-fiqh* (the principles of jurisprudence), the following rule was formulated:

العقل شاهد بان خبر الواحد العدل لا يوجب اليقين لان احتمال الكذب قائم و ان كان مرجوحا و الا لزم القطع بالنقيضين عند اخبار العدلين بهما و ان خالف خبر الواحد جميع الاقيسة لا يقبل عندنا و ذلك لان النقل بالمعنى كان مستفرضا فيهم فاذا قصر فقه الراوى لم يومن من ان يذهب شىء من معانيه فيدخله شبهة زائدة تخلوا عنها القياس

Intellect bears witness that the *khobar al-wāḥid* of a reliable person does not provide *yaqīn* since the possibility of lying is present although it is predominated. Otherwise it will be necessary to believe with certainty in opposites when two reliable people give contradicting information. If the *khobar al-wāḥid* conflicts all analogies, it will not be accepted according

to us. This is because narrating the meaning was prevalent among them.¹

١ اما كلامه صلى الله عليه وسلم فيستدل منه بما ثبت انه قاله على اللفظ المروى وذلك نادر جدا انما يوجد في الاحاديث
القصار على قلة ايضا فان الغالب الاحاديث مروى بالمعنى وقد تداولتها الاعاجم والمولدون قبل تدوينها فزادوا بها
ادت اليه عباراتهم فزادوا ونقصوا ودموا واكروا وبدلوا الالفاظ بالفاظ ولهذا ترى الحديث الواحد في القصة الواحدة
مروى على اوجه شتى بعبارات مختلفة ومن ثم انكر على ابن مالك اثبات القواعد النحوية بالفاظ الواردة في الحديث قال
ابو حبان في شرح التهسيل قد اكثر هذا المصنف من الاستدلال بما وقع في الاحاديث على اثبات القواعد الكلية في لسان
العرب وما رايت احدا من المتقدمين والمتأخرين سلك هذه الطريقة غيره على ان الواضعين الاولين لعلم النحو المستقرين
للاحكام من لسان العرب كابى عمرو بن العلاء عيسى بن عمر والحليل وسيبويه من ائمة البصريين والكسائى والفراء
وعلى بن مبارك الاحمر وهشام الضرير من ائمة الكوفيين لم يفعلوا ذلك وتبعهم على هذا المسلك المتأخرون من الفريقين
وغيرهم عن نحاة الاقاليم كنحاة بغداد واهل الاندلس وقد جرى الكلام في ذلك مع بعض المتأخرين الذكيا فقال انها
ترك العلماء ذلك لعدم وثوقهم ان ذلك لفظ الرسول صلى الله عليه وسلم اذ لو وثقوا بذلك لجرى مجرى القران في اثبات
القواعد الكلية وانما كان ذلك لامريرين احدهما ان الرواة جوزوا النقل بالمعنى فتجد قصة واحدة قد جرت في زمانه لن تنقل
بتلك الفاظ جميعا نحو ما روى من قول زوجته بما معك من القران ملكتها بما معك خذها بما معك وغير ذلك من
الالفاظ الواردة في هذا القصة فنعلم يقينا انه صلى الله عليه وسلم لم يلفظ بجميع هذه الالفاظ بل لا نجزم بانه قال بعضها
او يحتمل انه قال لفظا مرادفا لهذا الالفاظ غيرها فانت الرواة المرادف لم تاتوا بلفظه اذ المعنى هو المطلوب ولا سببا مع
تقدم السماع وعدم ضبطه بالكتابة والانتكال على الحفظ فالضابط منهم من ضبط المعنى وامام الضبط اللفظ فبعيد جدا
لا سببا في الاحاديث الطوال وقال سفيان الثورى ان قلت لكم انى احدنكم كما سمعت فلا تصدقونى انما هو المعنى ومن
نظر في الحديث ادنى نظر علم اليقين انهم انما يرون بالمعنى وقال ابو حبان انما امتعت الكلام في هذه المسئلة لثلاث يقول
المبتدأ ما بال النحويين يستدلون بقول العرب وفيهم المسلم والكافر ولا يستدلون بما روى في الحديث ينقل العدول
كالبخارى ومسلم وامثالهما فمن طالع ما ذكرناه ادرك السبب الذى لاجله لم يستدل النحاة بالحديث انتهى كلام ابن حبان
وقال ابو الحسن بن الصائغ في شرح الجمل تجوز الرواية بالمعنى هو السبب عندى في ترك الائمة كسبويه الاستشهاد على
اثبات اللغة بالحديث واعتدوا في ذلك على القرن و صريح النقل عن العرب ولو لا تصريح العلماء بجواز النقل بالمعنى في
الحديث لكان الاولى في اثبات فصيح اللغة كلام النبى صلى الله عليه وسلم لانه افصح العرب

Regarding his ﷺ speech, that may be used a proof which is established that he said it verbatim as quoted. However, this is very rare. It is found seldom in short ahādīth. Majority of the ahādīth are narrated with meaning. The non-Arabs and those born and raised among Arabs (but not of pure Arab blood) received and passed on ahādīth before they were composed in books. They conveyed it as they understood it thus adding and omitting, bringing forward, repeating, and changing some words with others. It is for this reason that you will see a hadīth of one incident narrated in various ways with diverse texts. For this reason, people have criticised Ibn Mālik for establishing rules of syntax grammar by the words which appear in the ahādīth. Abū Hibbān has stated in *Sharḥ Tahsīl*, “This author has gone overboard by using as proof the words of the ahādīth to establish absolute grammatical rules in the Arabic language. I have not seen any of the earlier or later scholars taking this path besides him. *Continued on next page...*

¹When the narrator's understanding is weak, it is possible that he did away

1 Continued from page 627

Those who formed the science of syntax and formulated the rules from the Arabic spoken by the Arabs like Abū 'Amr ibn al-'Alā' 'Īsā ibn 'Umar, al-Khalīl, Sībawayh – from the Baṣrī A'immaḥ – al-Kisā'ī, al-Farā', 'Alī ibn Mubārak al-Aḥmar, Hishām al-Ḍarīr – from the Kūfī A'immaḥ – have not done this. The latter scholars of both sides and other grammar masters of the continents like the grammar masters of Baghdad and al-Andalus followed their path. There has been discussion about this with one of the later intelligent scholars who explained, 'The 'Ulamā' did not do this due to their conviction that these are not the exact words of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Had they had this conviction, it would have been like Qur'ān in establishing absolute rules. This was due to two reasons. Firstly, the narrators allowed narrating the meaning. You will find one incident that took place in his era being narrated with various wordings as was narrated, 'I marry her to you in lieu of the Qur'ān you have' 'I make you owner of her in lieu of what you have' 'take her in lieu of what you have' etc. We certainly know that Rasūlullāh ﷺ did not say all these words. In fact, we cannot say with certainty that he said one of them. It is possible that he used a synonym to these words and the narrators used the other synonym and not his exact word. The meaning is the object. Especially when the narration was heard long ago, it was not recorded in writing and one's memory was relied upon. The one who remembered, remembered the meaning. It is far-fetched that he remembered the exact words especially in lengthy narrations.'

Sufyān al-Thawrī has said, "If I tell you that I am narrating to you exactly how I heard, then do not believe me. I am only conveying the meaning." Whoever does a study of the aḥādīth will know with certainty that they conveyed the meaning. Ibn Ḥibban stated, "I have discussed this aspect in detail so that the beginner does not dispute, 'What is wrong with the syntax masters; they use the speech of the Arabs – both believer and disbeliever – as proof whereas they do not use what has been narrated in the aḥādīth by reliable narrators such as al-Bukhārī and Muslim and their like.' The person who has studied what we have mentioned now will know the reason why the *nuḥāt* (masters of syntax) did not use the aḥādīth as proof." Abū al-Ḥasan ibn al-Ṣā'igh has stated in *Sharḥ al-Jamal*, "The permissibility of conveying the meaning is the reason according to me for the A'immaḥ like Sībawayh discarding the usage of aḥādīth as evidence to prove Arabic grammar. In this matter, they relied upon the pure words of the Arabs. Had there not been the emphatic permission of the 'Ulamā' to convey the meaning in the aḥādīth, it would have been sounder to establish eloquent language through the speech of Rasūlullāh ﷺ for he was the most eloquent Arab." (*al-Iqtirāḥ of Sūyūfī* pg. 19 – 21)

with a portion of the meaning which creates an extra doubt that cannot be understood.

Doubting the aḥādīth appears to be doubting the integrity and truthfulness of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم. To remove this doubt, our muḥaqqiqīn have written regarding the righteousness of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم:

فان قيل عدالة جميع الصحابة ثابتة بالآيات و الاحاديث الواردة في فضائلهم فقلنا ذكر بعضهم ان الصحابي اسم لمن استشهر بطول صحبة النبي على طريق المتتبع له و الاخذ منه و بعضهم انه اسم لمومن راي النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم سواء طالت صحبته ام لا الا ان الجزم بالعدالة مختص بمن استشهر بذلك و الباقيون كسائر الناس فيهم عدول و غير عدول

If it is argued that the truthfulness of all the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم is established by the verses and the aḥādīth which extol their virtue, our response is that some have mentioned that a Ṣaḥābī is one whose long companionship with Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم is common in the sense that he followed him صلى الله عليه وسلم and learnt from him. Others say that a Ṣaḥābī refers to a believer who saw Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم whether his companionship was lengthy or not. Yes, conviction on their truthfulness is particular with those whose companionship is well-known. The rest are like the common masses; some are truthful and others are not.

Now that it is accepted that akhbār āḥād do not provide yaqīn – both rationally and contextually – it will naturally follow that the akhbār which contradict the Qur’ān, Sunnah mash-hūrah, or ijma’ al-ummah will not be accepted due to the reasons mentioned above even though the narrators are not unknown for the simple reason that yaqīn (conviction) cannot be removed by zann (supposition).

فكيف يعتبر خبر الواحد في معارض الكتاب و السنة المشهورة و اجماع الامة و كل حديث يخالف كتاب الله فانه ليس بحديث الرسول و انما هو مفترى و كذلك كل حديث يعارض دليلا اقوى منه فانه منقطع عنه عليه السلام لان الادلة الشرعية لا يناقض بعضها بعضا و انما التناقض من الجهل المحض

How can a khabar al-wāḥid be considered when it is in conflict to the Qur’ān, Sunnah mash-hūrah, and ijma’ al-ummah? Every ḥadīth which

contradicts the Book of Allah is not the words of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. It is only a fabrication. Similarly, every ḥadīth which contradicts a proof stronger than it cannot be attributed to Rasūlullāh ﷺ since the sharī proofs do not contradict one another. Contradiction is the product of sheer ignorance.

It is worthy to note that *al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl* (scrutinising the truthfulness of the narrators) is only necessary to ascertain the authenticity of their information relating to the Sharī'ah so that one has *ẓann* of the correctness of this information because to practice upon *ẓannī sharī* aspects is *wājib*. There is no need for *al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl* when it comes to stories and intellectual aspects until it is not ascertained that the information is possible or not. If it is established to be impossible, *al-jarḥ wa al-ta'dīl* will be redundant. To the extent that even if the information is *mutawātir*, it will not provide *yaqīn* as written in *al-Talwīḥ*:

ثم المتواتر لا بد ان يكون مستندا الى الحس سمعا او غيره حتى لو اتفق اهل الاقليم على مسئلة عقلية لم يحصل لنا اليقين حتى يقوم البرهان و قال ابن خلدون فى مقدمة تاريخه ممكن او ممتنع و اما اذا كان مستحيلا فلا فائدة للنظر فى التعديل و التجريح و لقد عد اهل النظر من المطاعن فى الخبر استحالة مدلول اللفظ و تاويله ان ياول بما لا يقبله العقل و انما كان التعديل و التجريح هو المعتبر فى صحة الاخبار الشرعية لان معظمها تكاليف انسانية اوجب الشارع العمل صدقها او صحتها من اعتبار المطابقة فلذلك و جب ان ينظر فى امكان وقوعه و صار فيها ذلك اهم من التعديل و مقدما عليه اذ فائدة الانشاء مقتبسة منه فقط و فائدة الخبر منه و من خارج بالمطابقة و اذا كان ذلك فالقانون فى تميز الحق من الباطل فى الاخبار بالامكان و الاستحالة ان ننظر فى اجتماع البشرى الذى هو العمران و نميز ما يلحقه من الاحوال الذالته و بمقتضى طبعه و ما يكون عارضا لا يعتد به

It is necessary for *mutawātir* to be supported by sense like hearing etc., to the extent that even if all the people of a continent unanimously agree on an intellectual aspect, we will not be convinced until proof is furnished. Ibn Khaldūn has mentioned in the foreword of his *Tārīkh*, “There is no need to scrutinize the narrators until it is confirmed that the information is possible or impossible. If it is impossible, then there is no benefit in scrutinizing. The intellectuals have considered the impossibility of an occurrence a flaw of the *khābar* as well as such an interpretation of it which the mind cannot accept. Scrutinizing the truthfulness is only considered to

ascertain the authenticity of akhbār shar‘iyyah for majority of such akhbār are injunctions which the Sharī‘ah has ordered to be carried out.

Its correctness and authenticity are considered in relation to reality. For this reason, it is imperative to ascertain the possibility of its occurrence. And this is more imperative than and precedes verifying the narrators. The benefit of a command is taken from the latter (possibility) only whereas the benefit of information is from the latter (possibility) and the actual occurrence. When this is the case, then the rule to differentiate true information from false information with regards to possibility or impossibility is to determine the agreement of the human who is the subject and scrutinize the conditions that affect him and his natural demands. Anomalous conditions will not be considered.

After reading what we have written regarding narrations and akhbār, then most probably the Shī‘ah will say, “When this is the condition of the books of history, tafsīr, and ḥadīth that there is no narration therein which does not have the possibility of a flaw, no khabar al-wāḥid provides conviction, and there is an abundance of fabrications which people have disseminated, then no sunnī book is worthy of consideration. Moreover, the foundation of their religion and Sharī‘ah rests on these very books especially the books of aḥādīth. So according to their own testimony, this foundation is destroyed for it is them who falsify their own books.” Some Shī‘ī scholars have written this. The author of *Istiḳṣā’* has written this at many places – explicitly and implicitly. However, this conclusion is incorrect. There is no book besides the Qur’ān which was revealed from the heavens and brought by Sayyidunā Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام and which Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ called revelation. For this reason, no book can reach the level of authenticity and conviction of that of the Qur’ān. After the Qur’ān, the highest humanly possible mammoth task of gathering authentic aḥādīth and rejecting fabrications was done by the authors of the *al-Ṣiḥāḥ al-Sittah*. They exhausted their efforts in gathering authentic aḥādīth especially Imām al-Bukhārī and Imām Muslim and moreover the former. It is for this reason that the majority of scholars have accepted its authenticity and termed it the most authentic book of all after the Qur’ān. However, to claim

that its every ḥadīth provides conviction and no narrator mentioned therein is shady, is actually claiming its equality with the Qur’ān. If there are few weak aḥādīth and some narrators who have been criticised, despite the painless efforts he undertook to gather aḥādīth, this will not affect his status in the least and will not degrade his book from the lofty position it holds. Doubts cannot be cast on his book and no one can claim that our religion’s books cannot be relied upon or trusted. In fact, if you consider the stringent rules of the muḥaddithīn and the high standard they have set for the acceptance of aḥādīth and the criteria they have laid down, it will depict the staunchness, sincerity, and truthfulness of Imām al-Bukhārī and that he was a searcher of the truth, a hater of falsehood, and one who established the religion upon firm principles. Had they not been so staunch and stringent in accepting aḥādīth and shown laxity in this regard, we would not have the level of certainty and confidence that we have now. The research of our muḥaqqiqīn and the criteria of our muḥaddithīn have confirmed that our religion is based on such a strong foundation which has no cracks.

أَلَمْ تَرَ كَيْفَ ضَرَبَ اللَّهُ مَثَلًا كَلِمَةً طَيِّبَةً كَشَجَرَةٍ طَيِّبَةٍ أَضْلُهَا ثَابِتٌ وَفَرْعُهَا فِي السَّمَاءِ

Have you not considered how Allah presents an example, [making] a good word like a good tree, whose root is firmly fixed and its branches [high] in the sky?¹

If by a few fabrication and anomalies, all the books of the religion are understood as incorrect and all the muḥaddithīn and mujtahidīn are taken as unreliable; what will be the condition of Shī’ism then? When our ‘Ulamā’ have scrutinized our books this way, they will scrutinize the Shī’ah’s books the same way. If their books are not more objectionable than ours, then definitely they will not be less. In fact, if we do not consider Arabic literacy, then too the greater part of their aḥādīth books especially those that deal with Imāmah will be proven to be unworthy of acceptance due to them being contrary to Qur’ān and intellect. However, I do not wish to enter the domain of literacy and humiliate the Shī’ah. Therefore, I will

1 Sūrah Ibrāhīm: 24.

suffice on imperative aspects. I will now show you what the Shī'ī scholars have to say about unreliable books, fabrications, slandering the A'imma, scrutinizing the narrators, giving precedence to jarḥ over ta'dīl, akhbār āḥād not providing conviction, the non-acceptance of those narrations which contradict the Qur'ān, intellect, accepted beliefs, and other aspects which we have mentioned above.

Mullā 'Alī al-Ṭahrānī writes in *Tawḍīḥ al-Maqāl fī 'ilm al-Rijāl* regarding narrations and narrators:

المراد بالحديث ما ينتهي سلسلة سنده الى النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم او احد المعصومين

The definition of al-ḥadīth is that whose chain goes back to Nabī ﷺ or one of the infallible A'imma.

و على كل واحد فوجه الحاجة الى هذا العلم استنباط الاحكام الواجب علينا او كفاية موقوف في ازماننا او مطلقا على النظر في الاحاديث لوضوح عدم كفاية غيرها و غناه عنها فلا بد من معرفة المعبر منها الذى يجوز الاستنباط منه و العمل عليه حيث تعرف ان جميعها ليست كذلك و لا ريب في حصول هذه المعرفة بالمراجعة الى علم الرجال و هذا مما لا نزاع فيه

In both cases, since deducing shar'ī aḥkām is conditional upon studying the aḥādīth. Therefore, it is necessary for the authenticity of the aḥādīth to be ascertained so that deduction of masā'il and practice upon them may be permissible. And it is a well-known fact that all aḥādīth are not of this standard. The authenticity of aḥādīth is based upon the condition of the narrators, i.e. studying 'ilm al-rijāl, and there is no difference of opinion in this regard.¹

و رابعها ان من المعلوم الوارد على طبقة اخبار مستفيضة ان في رواياتنا كانت جملة من الاخبار الموضوعه فى النبوى المعروف سكتت بعد القالة على و فى المروى عن الصادق ان لكل رجل منا رجل يكذب عليه و فى الاخر عنه انا اهل البيت صادقون لا تخلو من كذاب يكذب علينا فيسقط صدقنا بكذبه و فى الاخر ان المغيرة بن سعيد لعنه الله دس فى كتب احاديث ابى احاديث لم يحدث بها ابى فاتقوا الله و لا تقبلوا علينا ما خالف قول ربنا و سنة نبينا و عن يونس انه قال و افيت العراق فوجدت فيها قطعة من اصحاب ابى جعفر و اصحاب ابى عبد الله متواخرين فسمعت منهم و اخذت كتبهم و عرضتهم من بعدى على ابى الحسن بن

1 *Tawḍīḥ al-Maqāl* pg. 3.

الرضا فانكر منها احاديث كثيرة ان تكون من اصحاب ابى عبد الله و قال ان ابا الخطاب كذب على ابى عبد الله لعن الله على ابى الخطاب و كذلك اصحاب ابى الخطاب يدلسون من هذه الاحاديث الى يومنا هذا فى كتب اصحاب ابى عبد الله فلا تقبلوا علينا خلاف القران و فى جملة من الاخبار العلاجية ان ما خالف القران و فى بعضها ما خالفه و خالف السنة انى ما قلته و اخراج الموضوعه عما فى ايدينا من الاخبار غير معلوم و ادعاه كما ياتى غير مسموع فى العمل بالجميع من غير تميز الموضوع عن غيره بالمقدور قبيح بل منتهى عنه بهذا الاخبار ١

Fourthly, it is common knowledge that there is an abundance of fabrications. Rasūlullāh ﷺ has mentioned, “After me, those who fabricate things in my name will increase.”

It is narrated from Imām al-Şādiq رضى الله عنه, “For every one of us, there is another who fabricates in our name.”

In another narration he states, “We the Ahl al-Bayt are truthful. We are not protected from liars who will attribute lies to us, and tarnish our honesty with their falsehood.”

Another narration says, “Mughīrah ibn Sa‘īd – may Allah curse him – has added many fabrications in the aḥādīth books of my father which my father never ever said. So fear Allah! And do not accept against us that which contradicts the word of Allah and the Sunnah of our Nabī ﷺ.”

Yūnus says, “I reached Iraq and saw some of the students of Abū Ja‘far and Abū ‘Abd Allah. I listened to their aḥādīth and benefited from their books. I then presented these to Abū al-Ḥasan ibn al-Riḍā who rejected majority of the narrations from being from the students of Abū ‘Abd Allah and commented, ‘Indeed, Abū al-Khaṭṭāb has lied upon Abū ‘Abd Allah. May the curse of Allah be upon Abū al-Khaṭṭāb. Similarly, the students of Abū al-Khaṭṭāb practice deception in these aḥādīth to this day by including them in the books of the students of Abu ‘Abd Allah. So do not accept anything in our name which contradicts the Qur’ān.’”

1 *Tawdīh al-Maqāl* pg. 4.

Among his statements is that which contradicts Qur'ān and the Sunnah was not said by him. In another narration he ordered that such narrations be thrown onto the wall.

[The author comments] “We do not know if all the fabricated narrations have been removed from our books. And to make such a claim is disregarded as will come later. So to practice upon all without ascertaining authentic from fabrication is pathetic, in fact prohibited.”

ان احتمال الوضع قائم في اكثر الاخبار وجميعها او ضعف في بعض القرائن خارجية فلا بد من الرجوع في الجميع

The reason for the necessity of investigating the narrators and knowing the science of 'ilm al-rijāl is that the possibility of fabrication is found in all narrations, although in some this possibility is very slight due to external factors. However, it is necessary to study this knowledge to remove this possibility, i.e. to remove doubts from all the aḥādīth.¹

The author while mentioning other proofs for the necessity of investigating the narrators and studying 'Ilm al-Rijāl has written:

منها ان سيرة العلماء قديما وحديثا على تدوين كتب الرجال و تنقيحها و تحصيلها باشتراء و استكتاب و على مطالعتها و الرجوع اليها في معرفة احوال الرواة و العمل بها في الاعتناء برجال و الطعن في اخرين و التوقف في طائفة ثابتة حتى ان كثيرا منهم كانت له مهارة في هذا العلم كالصدوق و المفيد و الطوسي و غيرهم من مشائخ الحديث بل ربما امكن ان يقال اهتمام المتقدمين فيه كان ازيد من المتأخرين و اى عاقل يرضى بكون ذلك كله لغوا مكروها او حراما فليس الا للافتقار اليه بل ربما يظهر من عدم ارتكابهم مثل ما ذكر بالنسبة الى سائر ما يتوقف عليه الفقه ان الافتقار اليه اشد و اعظم و لعله كذلك بعد سهولة اكثر ذلك في حقهم و في زمانهم دون الرجال كيف و به يعرف ما هو الحجة في حقهم عن غيرها و منه يحصل الاطمئنان او الظن المستقر بما استفيد من الاحكام عن الاخبار و حيث ان المفضل في الافتقار النافي له على الاطلاق شاذ نادر بل غير معلوم القائل ظهر ان الافتقار على الاطلاق و بتقرير اخر ان ما سمعت منهم خصوصا بعد ملاحظة ما في كتب الاصول من الاتفاق على اشتراط في الاجتهاد يكشف قطعيا عن بنائهم على الافتقار اليه و اشتراطه في الاستنباط و عن رضا المعصوم بذلك و هل ينقص هذا من الاجماع المتكررة في كلماتهم فما مخالفته من مر فلا تقدح فيه لوضوح فساد شبهاتهم كما باتى

1 *Tawdīh al-Maqāl* pg. 4.

و بسبقهم بالاجماع و السيرة و لحوقهم عنه و منها ان سيرة الرواة و المحدثين الى زمن تاليف الكتب الاربعة بل الى تاليف الثلاثة المتأخرة الوافي و الوسائل و البحار على الالتزام بذكر جميع الرجال و جميع الاسانيد حتى ان لواحد اسقطهم او بعضهم في مقام اشار اليهم في مقام اخر كما في الفقيه و التهذيبين من التصريح بانه للتحزر عن لزوم الارسال و القطع و الرفع المنافية للاعتبار و من المعلوم ان ذلك كله لان يعرفهم الراجع الى كتبهم و يجتهدوا في احوالهم على حسب مقدوره فيميز الموثوق الجائز اخذ الرواية عن غير و الا لزم اللغوية فيعلم الافتقار و الكشف عن الاشتراط كما في ثانی تقرير الوجه السابق فلو كان بنائهم على اعتبار ما فيها من غير ملاحظة احوال الرواة للاخذ من الاصول الاربعة مائة او غيره من القرائن الاعتبار او لقطع بالصدور لكان تطويل الكتب يذكر الجميع لغوا مكروها او محرما و قد مر بطلان نفي الافتقار في الجملة فثبت الافتقار المطلق و يويد هذا الالتزام من تاخر بالرجوع الى الرجال و توصيف بعض الاخبار بالصحة و الوثوق و الاعتبار و تضعيف بعض اخر و عدم اكتفاء بعضهم بتوصيف غيره و ان كان باعرف منه بالرجال بل الخلاف بينهم في كثير من التصحيحات و التضعيفات واضح معلوم للمراجع الى كتبهم¹

It is found in the biographies of the former and latter 'Ulamā' that they authored books on rijāl, bought such books, studied them, and referenced them when investigating narrators. So will any sensible person accept that this action of theirs was futile, reprehensible, or impermissible? On the contrary, the need for this knowledge and investigating the narrators becomes even more apparent. Why should it not be so? It provides one with peace of heart and surety of those aḥādīth from which aḥkām are deduced. It is also part of the practice of the muḥaddithīn that they mention a sanad of every ḥadīth and they held on to this practice from the very beginning to the era of the authoring of the four books. They listed each and every narrator's name and if anyone was left out, they mentioned it at another place so that *irsāl*², *qaṭ'*³, and *raf* which hamper the authenticity of the ḥadīth are removed. This was only practiced so that those who will read these books and investigate them will be able to differentiate as to which narrator is reliable and which is not. Had this not been the object and had this practice been futile after the books of ḥadīth were authored, then this practice of the muḥaddithīn would be useless. If without investigating the narrators, it was sufficient to reproduce and narrate from the four

1 *Tawdīh al-Maqāl* pg. 5.

2 Missing link in the isnād.

3 Discontinuity in the isnād.

hundred aḥādīth books and there was conviction on their authenticity, then to write the names of the narrators in the books and to teach these books would be futile and reprehensible, in fact forbidden.

This author has also mentioned the objections of those who accept the books of ḥadīth and every ḥadīth mentioned therein as reliable and worthy of practice without checking the narrators. He has also mentioned their proofs and answered them. One of these are:

احدها ان المعلوم بالتواتر والاختيار المحفوظة بقرائن القطع انه كان داب القدماء فى مدة تزيد على ثلاث مائة سنة ضبط الاحاديث و تدوينها فى مجالس الائمة و غيرها و كانت مهمهم على تاليف ما يعمل به الطائفة المحققة و عرضه على الائمة و قد استمر ذلك الى زمن تاليف الكتب الاربعة حتى بقيت جملة منها بعد ذلك و هذه الاربعة منقولة من تلك الاصول المعتمدة بشهادة اربابها الثقات و لغايت بعد تاليفهم من غيرها مع تمكنهم منها و من تميز ما هو المعتمد عن غيره غاية التمكن مع علمهم بعدم اعتبار الظن فى الاحكام الشرعية مع التمكن من العم و التبين و المعلوم من و ثقافتهم و جلالتهم عدم التقصير فى ذلك كيف و اهل التواريخ لا ياخذون القصص من كتاب او شخص غير معتمد مع التمكن من الاخذ عن المعتمد فما ظن هؤلاء المشائخ العظام و على فرض اخذهم من غير الكتب المعتمدة كيف يدسلون بل يشهدون بصحة جميع ما نقلوه و كونه حجة بينهم و بين ربهم¹

Firstly, they say that it is known by *tawātur* and countless narrations and undoubtable factors that the practice of the former scholars for more than three hundred years was to memorise aḥādīth and write them down in the gatherings of the A'imma, etc. Their desire was to gather those aḥādīth upon which the true sect practices and then present it to the A'imma. This practice continued till the era in which the four books were authored and also after that era. These four books are transmitted with these reliable principles with the rectification of their reliable authors. They have separated authentic from unauthentic. Knowing fully well that *ẓann* has no credence in formulating aḥkām of the Sharī'ah and that conviction is necessary and knowing fully well their integrity and reliability, who will think that the authors of the four books fell short in gathering authentic aḥādīth? When the historians do not narrate from unreliable books and unreliable persons, then how can one doubt these great luminaries that

1 *Tawdīh al-Maqāl* pg. 7.

they fell short in narrating authentic aḥādīth? And if we hypothetically accept that they did accept unauthentic narrations, then why would they deceive by claiming that all the narrations they have gathered are authentic and their books are proof between them and Allah?¹

He answered this by stating:

و نقول فى المقام الثانى اجمالا ان ما ذكر فى هذا لوجه باجمعه غير مفيد القطع بالصدور انه لا اقل من قيام احتمال السهو والغفلة لوضوح عدم عصمة الرواة و المؤلفين للاصول و الكتب الماخوذة منها و

1

و ثانياها ان مقتضى الحكمة الربانية و شفقة الرسول و الائمة لا يضيع من فى اصلاص الرجال من الامة و يتركوا حيارى بالتجؤن الى التثبت بظنون واقبة و غيرها بل يمد لهم اصول معتبرة يعملون بها فى الغيبة كما هو الواقع و المعلوم بالتبع فى احوالهم و التأمل فى الاحاديث الكثيرة الدالة على انهم امروا اصحابهم بكتابة ما يسمعونه منهم تاليفه و العمل به فى الغيبة و الحضور بالنص عليها بقولهم سيأتى زمان لا يستأنسون فيه الا بكتبهم و فى الاحاديث الكثيرة الدالة على اعتبار تلك الكتب و الامر بالعمل بها و على انها عرضت على الائمة فمدحوها و مدحوا صاحبها و قد نص المحقق بان كتاب يونس بن عبد الرحمن و كتاب الفضل بن شاذان كانا عنده و ذكر علماء الرجال انها عرضا عليهم فما لظن بار باب الاربعة و قد صرح الصدوق مواضع بان كتاب محمد بن حسن الصفاء يشتمل على مسائل و جوابات العسكري كان عنده بخطه الشريف و كذا كتاب عبد الله بن على الجبلى المعروف على الصادق ثم رايناهم يرجحون كثيرا حديثا مرويا فى غير الكتاب المعروف على الحديث الذى فيه و هذا لا يتجه الا بانهم جازمون بكونه فى الاعتبار و صحة الصدور كالكتاب المعروف و يقرب من ذلك ما ترى من الشيخ و غيره الى زمان الاصطلاح الجديد من طرح كثير من الاخبار الصحيحة بهذا الاصطلاح و العمل كثير مما هو ضعيف عليه و كثير ما يعتمدون على طرق ضعيفة مع تمكنهم من طرق صحيحة كما صرح به صاحب المنتقى و غيره و هذا ظاهرى فى صحة تلك الاخبار بوجه اخر و دال على عدم العبرة بالاصطلاح الجديد و حصول العلم بقوله الثقة ليس بمنكر و لا يبدع فقد نص صاحب المدارك و غيره على انه يتفق كثير اصول العلم بالوقت من اذان لثقة الضابط العارف حيث لم يكن مانع من العلم و بمثله صرح كثير من علمائنا فى مواضع كثيرة و ثالثها الوجه الكثير الاخير من الوجوه المتقدمة للاستراىادى و فيه التصريح بحصول القطع العادى من شهادتهم كالعالم بان الجبلى لم ينقلب ذهبا و قال انه لاتفاق الشهادات و غيره ذلك اولى من نقل ثقته و احد كالمحقق و الشهيدين فتوى من فتاوى ابي حنيفة فى كتابه مع اننا نرى حصول العلم لنا بذلك من النقل المذكور فكيف لا يحصل بشهادة الجماعة و ذكر ايضا انه لو لم يميز لنا قبول شهادتهم فى صحة احاديث كتبهم لما جاز لنا قبولها فى مدح الرواة توثيقهم فلا يبقى حديث صحيح و لا حسن و لا موثق بل يبقى جميع اخبارنا ضعيفة و اللازم باطل فكذا الملزوم و الملازمة ظاهرة بل الاخبار بالعدالة شكل و اعظم و اولى بالاهتمام من الاخبار بنقل الاحاديث من الكتب المعتمدة فان ذلك امر محسوس و العدالة امر خفى عقلى يعسر الاطلاع عليه و لا مضر لهم عن هذا لالتزام عند الانصاف و ذكر ايضا ان علمائنا الاجلاء الثقات اذ جمعوا احاديث و شهدوا بثبوتها و صحتها لم يكن دون من اخبارهم بانهم سمعوها من المعصوم لظهور علمهم و صلاحهم و صدقهم و عدالتهم فى انه مع امكان العمل بالعلم لم يعملوا بغيره ففى الحقيقة هم يتقونها عن المعصوم و قد وردت روايات كثيرة جدا فى الامر بالرجوع الى الرواة الثقات معه اذا قالوا ان اخبر من المعصوم و ليس هذا من القياس بل عمل بالعموم و قال ايضا انهم كانوا ثقات حين شهادتهم و جب قبولها لكونها عن محسوس و هو النقل عن الكتب المعتمدة و الا كانت احاديث كتبهم ضعيفة باصطلاحهم فكيف يعملون بها

مع التسليم فلا يوجب الغنى عن الرجال على الاطلاق لوضوح وجود الاخبار المعارضة فى جملة هذه الاخبار كاختبار التقيّة و من المعلوم المدلول عليه بالاخبار العلاجية منها و غيرها توقف تميز الراجح المعتبر منها على مراجعة الرجال فاين الغنى المدعى على كل حال

Briefly, this does not prove that these aḥādīth are definitely from Rasūlullāh ﷺ and the A'immaḥ since the possibility of negligence and error still remains at the least. This is because the narrators and the books from which the aḥādīth were taken are not infallible and flawless. Even if this much is accepted, the need for 'ilm al-rijāl is realised. There are contradictory aḥādīth present like the narrations on Taqīyyah. Hence, investigating the narrators is necessary.¹

The author thereafter says:

The compilers of ḥadīth did not state that whatever they gathered in their books provides yaqīn. Rather, whether they provide yaqīn or not does not concern them. Furthermore, all the ḥadīth compilers are not unanimous when it comes to gathering aḥādīth. For example, al-Kulaynī discarded many aḥādīth which the latter scholars included. It is learnt from his biography that he was very cautious when it came to narrating and authenticating aḥādīth. Why would such people discard those aḥādīth which provide yaqīn which the latter scholars have included? Look at al-Ṣadūq; majority of the time, he relies on his Shaykh Ibn al-Walīd when it comes to authenticating or discrediting narrations. To the extent that he has declared, 'The ḥadīth which my Shaykh has declared as authentic is authentic according to me and the one he did not authenticate is discarded by me.'

Think for a moment. What does having reliance on the accrediting or discrediting of anyone affect those aḥādīth which provide yaqīn and why does he have reliance on the authenticity or weakness of a narration based on his shaykh's determination? How can those aḥādīth which provide

1 *Tawdīh al-Maqāl* pg. 9.

yaqīn be rejected simply based on his shaykh's discrediting?¹

Dildār 'Alī in *Ṣawārim* has written the principles of his school with regards to aḥādīth:

The method of the Shī'ah is that they acquire yaqīn in their belief system and principles and do not permit ḡann and taqlīd in the fundamentals of dīn. And after attaining yaqīn, they mention sam'īyyāt mutawātirah, i.e. those narrations which are mutawātir either in wording or meaning even though the narrator has corrupt beliefs. This is attained from rational proofs for further satisfaction, increase in the levels of yaqīn, further substantiation, and other benefits. It is for this reason that Shaykh al-Ṭā'ifah practiced upon the narrations of narrators with corrupt beliefs. A khabar al-wāḥid, although it is narrated by reliable narrations is not sufficient as proof when it comes to beliefs. Some of our scholars have

1

و نقول تفصيلا و ان كان ايضا جمليا انا نمنع الصغرى و الكبرى كما اشرنا الى منعها في الاجمال ففي الوجه الاول في الصغرى ان حصول القطع من المتن في غاية الندرة كذا من الاعتقاد و على فرضه على ندرة لا يلازم حصوله في غيره و الافتقار في الغالب كاف بل هو المدعى و كذا من كون الراوى ثقة لمنع حصول القطع للراوى الثقة لعدم لزومه لا في الرواية و لا في العمل فعمل اخذها ممن يثق به تعبدنا او قلنا خاصا او مطلقا و لى تسليمه محصولا لا يستلزمه لنا الاحتمال السهو و النسيان و الذهول عن القرينة او خفائها كما اوقع في كثير من الرواة فروعهم بقوله ليس كما ظننت او ليس كما تذهب او ما اراك بعد الا بهنا

And we say in detail although it is in brief. We reject both the minor and major premises as indicated in the brief discussion. The first reason in the minor premise is attaining certainty from the text is very rare. Similarly, in belief. Hypothetically accepting its rareness, it does not necessitate its attainment in others. The non-existence of this generally is sufficient, in fact it is claimed. Similarly, the narrator being reliable due to the non-attainment of conviction of the reliable narrator for he did not take it upon himself in narrating or practice. So maybe he heard if from someone reliable. Or we say specific or general. I have two clauses which occur which necessitates the possibility of error, forgetfulness, obliviousness of the context or its secrecy as happened to many narrators who say, "It was not as I thought" "It was not as I imagined" "I found out later differently."

preferred that each aspect of the *furū'* (subsidiary aspects) be necessarily supported by *mutawātir* or deduced from the Qur'ān and supported by rational proofs. Nonetheless, our practice is that when a *khobar al-wāḥid* is narrated by a reliable narrator and other requirements are found therein, then it is obligatory to practice upon it.

Dildār 'Alī has also mentioned that one of their principles is that if any *khobar* is apparently contradicting an aspect upon which there is unanimity then it is necessary that it be interpreted or discarded. Owing to this principle, he regards those narrations as rejected and false which discredit *Zurārah*, *Hishām*, etc. He says:

Indeed, there are some narrations in our religion which state the condemnation of some of our senior scholars. Due to the narrator of such narrations being weak or discredited and such narrations contradicting others which are strong and upon which there is unanimity, our scholars have regarded such narrations as unreliable.

He states further:

Intellect bears testimony to the fact that notwithstanding the narrations of condemnation of such senior scholars, the belief of our scholars in the integrity and loftiness of these senior scholars did not waver and no one, although witnessing the abundance of differences, did not contradict them. From this we learn that the reason is that the sun of their greatness and integrity was radiant in their eyes. If the *Shī'ah* list 100 people the likes of *Hishām* etc., with corrupt beliefs like *Abū al-Khaṭṭāb*, then too no flaw will come to the foundation of their true beliefs which rests upon rock-hard proofs and evidences. We do not establish *Imāmah* and the virtues of 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib and his children except from the Qur'ān, the authenticity of which is a necessity of Islam, undisputed *aḥādīth*, or rational proofs. So even if a thousand people like *Hishām* and *Muḥammad ibn Muslim* are hypothetically proved to be heretics or transgressors, this will not shake our beliefs.

He says:

It is very unlikely to find a religion wherein some of the narrations of which are not baseless or interpreted. So it devolves on religious honest people to formulate a ruling which they cannot escape in debate. The ruling is that proof should be used against the opponent of that which contradicts his religion and is documented in his books, and whatever the narrator and scholars have mentioned is accepted by both parties. Or that it is established through *tawātur* wherein there is no possibility of falsehood according to the sound and sensible.

Dildār ‘Alī writes in *Ḥusām* regarding *khavar al-wāḥid*:

خير واحد اگر بے معارض ہم باشد ظنی ست در اصول اعتقادات یان تمسک نباید کرد بلکه نزد محققین شیعه امامیه مثل ابن ادریس و شریف مرتضی و اکثر قدمائے ایشان قابل احتجاج نیست و متاخرین ایشان ہمیں مذہب را اختیار کرده اند و بذا اخبار احاد را در دلائل نشمرده بلکه رد اینرا واجب دانسته (خصوصاً در اعتقادات حسام)

A *khavar al-wāḥid*, even though it is non contradictory, provides *ẓann*. It is not permissible to use it as evidence in the fundamentals of belief. In fact, according to the *muḥaqqiqīn Shī‘ī* scholars like Ibn Zuhrah, Ibn Idrīs, Sharīf Murtaḍā, and majority of the early scholars, it is not worthy of proof. The latter scholars have preferred this view and have not included *khavar al-wāḥid* amongst the proofs. Rather, they deem its rejection as necessary especially when it comes to beliefs.

Dildār ‘Alī states regarding the rejection or interpretation of those *aḥādīth* which contradict *shar‘ī* proofs:

و آنچه درین باب از ائمه دین نقل می کند همه زور و بہتان ست و از موضوعات دروغ گویان و یا اینکه گو فرموده باشند لکن واجب التاویل ست نظر باین کہ کہ معارض ست یان چه از ادله شرعیہ کہ اقوی ازان ست

Whatever has been reported from the *A‘immah* in this regard is false and slanderous and the fabrications of the deceitful. Or maybe the *A‘immah* have stated it but there is definitely some interpretation since it contradicts those *shar‘ī* proofs which are stronger than it.¹

1 *Ḥusām* pg. 6.

He writes on page 14 of the same book:

بیچک فرقہ ہالکہ ضالہ نخواہد بود کہ یکے از آیات و احادیث نبویہ بحسب ظاہر موافق مسلک و ناہشاد پس اگر مجرد و جود معارض دلیل بطلان مذہب شود باید کہ مذہب اسلام ہالمرہ باطل باشد و مستحق طعن و تشنیع از قبل کفار و ملاحظہ شود اے باوجود قوت معارض اگر کسی جانب ضعیف او اختیار نہاید البتہ مورد طعن و تشنیع اورا می توان ساخت

There is no misguided and destructive sect such that no verse or ḥadīth externally does not contradict it. So if finding contradiction was sufficient as proof for the falsehood of a religion, then the religion of Islam would have been totally false and the target of criticism and censure from the disbelievers. If anyone prefers the weak side over the strong one, then he will be the target of criticism and censure.¹

He writes on page 25:

بالجملہ دانستی کہ بناء اعتقادات امامیہ بر اخبار احاد نیست پس ابن بابویہ در کتاب اعتقادات خود روس اعتقادات امامیہ را کہ بنا بر آیات و احادیث متواترہ و اجماع اہل بیت و ادلہ عقلیہ بہ ثبوت پیوستہ مذکور ساختہ در کتب احادیث موافق داب محدثین اخبار احاد را بہر قسم کہ ماثور گشتہ مندرج فرمودہ و لازم نیست کہ محدثین انچہ روایت کند مطابق این ہم اعتقاد داشته باشند

In short, you have learnt that the foundation of the beliefs of the Shī'ah does not rest on khabar al-wāḥid. Ibn Bābawayh has mentioned in his book I'tiqādāt that the basis of the fundamentals of Shī' beliefs is verses, aḥādīth mutawātirah, consensus of the Ahl al-Bayt and those rational proofs which are proven. The muḥaddithīn have included the khabar al-wāḥid in the aḥādīth books as narrated as is their habit. It is not a compulsion that the muḥaddithīn hold beliefs conforming to their narrations.

He then writes on page 62:

بدانکہ ورود احادیث مختلفہ الطواہر مخصوص بیچک یک از فرق اہل اسلام کہ ارباب کتب احادیث و اخبار باشند نیست و نظر بہ ہمیں علماء اہل اسلام طریق جمع بین الاحادیث المختلفہ و وجوہ ترجیح احد الخبرین المتعارضین را

1 *Husām* pg. 14.

بر حدیث دوم در کتب اصول و غیره مدون و بیان ساخته اند پس اگر بمجرد ایراد روایات مختلفه ابن بابویه محل طعن و تشنیع باشد کافیہ محدثین اہل اسلام باید محل طعن و تشنیع باشند

The appearance of such aḥādīth which are externally contradictory is not peculiar to any sect of Islam which have aḥādīth books. The scholars of Islam have mentioned the methods of reconciling two seemingly contradictory narrations or giving preference to one over the other in the books of uṣūl. So if Ibn Bābawayh is the target of criticism and censure due to him narrating contradictory narrations, then all the muḥaddithīn of Islam will be the targets of criticism and censure likewise.¹

He writes on page 38:

بہیچک محدثین عامہ و خاصہ التزام این نموده کہ در ہر کتاب حدیث اینچہ روایت کند بر طبق مدلول ظاہری این معتقد و عامل ہم باشد بلکہ در صورت تعارض حدیث با ادلہ شرعیہ گو این حدیث را روایت کردہ باشد بمقتضائے این چہ از ادلہ شرعیہ راجح می باشد بمقتضائے این عمل می کند²

None of the muḥaddithīn have taken the responsibly to believe and practice according to the external meaning of the narrations they report. Rather, in the case of contradiction, they practice upon that which is *rājih* (more convincing) in accordance to sharī proofs notwithstanding them narrating both.

Sayyid Muḥammad Mujtahid says in *Ḍarbat Ḥaydariyyah*:

سوال اول کہ مصدرست بقول وے از ان جملہ اینکہ حکم بموضوع بودن احادیث قدح ہشامین کہ در کافی کلینی کہ یکے از اصول اربعہ شیعہ ست موجود ست الخ جواب علی نپج الصواب اینکہ این سوال متبنی است بر عدم درک طریقہ انیقہ متکلمین و مجتہدین امامیہ چہ ایشان و اصول دینیہ متبنیہ بر دلائل قطعینہ اعتماد می کند و بس و ظن و تقلید را در ان جائز و سائغ نمی داند پس در اصول دینیہ اعتماد بر اخبار احاد نمی نمایند و صحاح و حسان و موثقات ضعاف درین مادہ یکساں ست اما در فروع دینیہ پس اعتماد شان در ضروریات دین و مذہب بر قطع ست و بس لا علی اخبار الاحاد و در غیر این بر ظن ست نہ مطلق ظن بل ما حصل من الادلۃ الاربعۃ کتابا او سنتہ او اجماعا او عقلا و لا عبرۃ عندہم بالقیاس المنہدم الاساس و لا بمعض الرای و اجتہاد الناس و در صورت تعارض ادلہ شان بر ترجیح

1 Ḥusām.

2 Ḥusām.

بعض علی بعض ست و انہاء ترجیح و مناشی ایں متکثر و منشعب بشعب کثیرہ ست کہ استقصائے ایں دریں مقام مخرج کلام از ما نحن فیہ ست و بالجملہ یکے از مرجحات نظر در سند و حال رجال ست پس بر تقدیر تعارض صحیح با ضعیف و عدم الخبر ضعف ایں بعمل اصحاب و غیرہ من القرائن بہ ترجیح صحیح علی الضعیف می پر دازند ن بر تقدیر عدم تعارض و وجدان خبرے ضعیف السند اگر ایں خبر منجر الضعف بعمل اصحاب باشد فلا ریب فی الاعتماد علیہ و ہکذا لو حلف بقرائن عاصدۃ لہا و ہم چنینی اگر ایں خبر مسوق باشد برائے بیان یکے از مستجاب چہ مسامحہ در ادلہ س شائع کما بین فی محلہ و اگر منجر بعمل نیست و نہ مسوق برائے بیان سس یا بی موافق اصول خواہد بود کاصل البرائتہ و الاستصحاب و الضحوی و غیرہ ذلک یا مخالف ایں علی الاول یعتمد علیہ و یحتج الیہ علی الاظہر و علی الثانی حکمش ائیل و راجع بتعارض خواہد بود و رجوع بہ مرجحات لازم و اگر اصلے در دست نخواہد بود و حدیث ضعیف بلا معارض دران صورت نیز عمل بران سائغ علی کلام فیہ الحاصل قطعیت صد در ہر واحد از اخبار کتب اربعہ غیر مدعی و غیر ثابت و حالش نزد ایشان مثل حال اخبار صحاح ستہ سنیہ نیست کہ اگر طلاق حلق بران خورد طلاقش واقع نشود قال فضل روزپہان اما صحاحنا فقد اتفق العلماء علی ان کل ما عدا من الصحاح سوی التعليقات فی الصحاح السنۃ لو حلف الطالق انه من قول رسول اللہ او من فعلہ و تقریرہ لم یقع الطلاق و لم یحنت انتہی و عمل فرقیہ حقہ بر اخبار کتب خود نہ بر سبیل غض بصر عن المعارضة و الترجیحات می باشد بلکہ بعد نقر و بحث اطراف و جوانب ایں را از مزینات و مرجحات و حال رواۃ ملاحظہ نمودہ در محل اعتماد اعتماد می نہایند در مقام جرح و طرح و جرح و در جائے تاویل تاویل و لا ینحصر وجوہ ترجیحہم و علمہم فی وجہ و سبیل و احاطہ ابن مقاصد علیہ بر کسیکہ در تدرب فن اجتہاد روز را بسبب نیادہ و شباب را بشئیب مبدل نساختہ حیلے عسیر و لا یاتیک مثل خبیر و چون راویان مثالب ہشامین و من یحد و حذفہما مخالف اجماع فرقیہ حقہ و معارض بروایات متواترۃ است لا محالہ محتمل الطرح یا ماثول باشد نہ ایں کہ قطعاً جزما کسے حکم بوضع و طرح ایں نمودہ باشد کما یلمح الیہ صدر کلام الفاضل المجادل و ازین معنی لازم نمی آید کہ جمیع مرویات رواۃ قدح شان مطروح گردد اگر چہ داعی الی الوضع و باعث الی الطرح دران مفقود باشد چنانچہ وجوب تاویل در بعض آیات منافی ادلہ قطعیہ ست مثل ایتہ کریمہ ید اللہ فوق ایدیہم و امثال ایں مستلزم وجوب تاویل در جمیع ظواہرات نیست

The *Shīʿī mutakallimīn* and *mujtahidīn* rely on *qaṭʿī* proofs with regards to the fundamentals of *dīn* and do not give credence to *ẓann* and *taqlīd* in this regard. They do not consider *khavar al-wāḥid* when it comes to the fundamentals of *dīn*. In this topic, all types of *aḥādīth* – authentic, *ḥasan*, strong, and weak – are equal. With regards to the *furūʿ* of *dīn* – the *ḍarūriyyāt al-dīn* – consideration is given to *yaqīn*, not *khavar al-wāḥid*. Besides these, *ẓann* is considered but not unfettered. Rather that *ẓann* which is acquired from one of the four proofs, i.e. *Qurʿān*, *Sunnah*, *ijmāʿ*, and analogy. In the case of contradiction, *ṣaḥīḥ* will get preference over *ḍaʿīf*. When there is no contradiction, then if the *khavar* conforms to the practice of the people of the religion then it will be relied upon.

Every khabar from the narrations of the four books (i.e. the four books of ḥadīth which are regarded as authentic according to them) providing yaqīn is not established nor was it claimed. The condition of the four aḥādīth compilations of ours is unlike the *al-Ṣiḥāḥ al-Sittah* of the Sunnī that if anyone swears on their authenticity then ṭalāq will not take place. Nor is the practice of the Shī'ah upon their aḥādīth without considering contradiction and predilection. Rather, it is only after deep contemplation, discussing, considering all the angles, and scrutinising the narrators. After pondering over all of these, they rely on that which is reliable, criticise what needs to be criticised, and interpret where needed. The reasons for giving preference and practicing are not one. The narrations like those in condemnation of Hishām which contradict ijma' and mutawātir narrations are discredited or interpreted.¹

Those narrations which disparage Hishām and crew are recorded in al-Kāfi. Notwithstanding their narrators being Shī'ah from whom al-Kulaynī has narrated, they are discrediting those men who the Shī'ah regard as the pioneers of their creed and the bosom friends of the Imām. Therefore, without scrutinising the narrators, they declare these narrations as *matrūk* (discarded) in fact *mawḍū'* (fabricated). Dildār 'Alī has written at the end of the answer to belief 13:

پر گاه امامیه باوجود عدم احتیاج بطرف و ثاقت بشام و مومن الطاق و باوجود این روایات مثالب مثل ابو الخطاب و مغیره و عثمان بن عیسی و نظرائے ایناں ایشاں را انکاشتند دلیل قوی ست کہ این روایات یا موضوع اند کہ حساد و اعدائے بشام و غیره بنا بر قرب و منزلت کہ ایشاں را پیش جناب ائمه بود یافته اند یا این کہ جناب ائمه بنا بر صیانت نفس خود و جانہائے ایشاں مثل حضرت خضر نسبت بسفینہ در نظر مخالفین ایشاں معیوب ساخته اند و قرینہ بریں ہر دو محمل اینکه اجل امثال چنین کساں کہ اسناد مذہب باطلہ بطرف اینہا شدہ باوجود انکہ غرض ایشاں صحیح بود و لیکن عوام معنی و مراد ایشاں نفہیدہ اند انتہی کلامہ

This is strong proof that these narrations are either fabricated or either made up by those who were jealous and harboured hatred and enmity for Hishām etc., due to the proximity they enjoyed by the A'immah. Or maybe the A'immah disparaged them for their protection like Sayyidunā Khaḍīr

1 *Durbaṭ Ḥaydariyyah* pg. 362, 363.

عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَامُ made the ship defective in the eyes of the enemy. The evidence for this is the abundance of people who have been attributed to false religions whereas their object was correct but the masses could not understand them.

Shaykh Abū Ja‘far al-Ṭūsī has stated in *al-Tahdhīb*, the chapter concerning bequeathing a third:

إذا وجدت عنهم بانهم فعلوا فعلا يخالف ما استقر في شريعة الاسلام فينبغي ان يحكم ببطلانها او حملها على وجه في الجملة يطابق الصحيح من الاخبار وان لم نعلمه على التفسير

When you find a narration which states that they practiced an action that contradicts that which is established in the Sharī‘ah of Islam, then it devolves on you to declare its falsehood or to relate it to that which conforms to what is authentic, although its commentary is not known.

Shaykh al-Ṭūsī has harped upon the negligence and delusion of the narrators notwithstanding their reliability at many places in *Tahdhīb*. He says in the chapter about retraction of a bequest:

قال محمد بن الحسن ما يتضمن هذا الخبر من قوله ان اوصى به كله فهو جائز وهم من الراوى

Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan has said, “What this narration mentions i.e. he said ‘If he bequests everything, it is permissible’ this is a narrator’s delusion.”

He writes in *Kitāb al-Waqf*:

قال محمد بن الحسن ما يتضمن هذا الخبر من قوله يعنى صاحب الدار حين ذكر ان رجلا جعل لرجل سكنى دار له فانه غلط من الراوى

Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥasan has said, “What this narration mentions – i.e. the owner of the house saying that a man gave the house to another to stay – is a mistake of the narrator.”

At many places he uses the words:

يجوز ان يكون الراوى وهم

It is possible that the narrator erred.

انما اشتبه الامر على فلان

So and so was confused about the matter.

The Shī'ah scholars accept that no scholar's mere statement is worthy as proof. Qāḍī Nūr Allah al-Shūstarī has declared Hārūn and Ma'mūn to be from the Shī'ah. Sayyid Mujtahid answers this claim in *Ḍarbat Ḥaydariyyah* by saying:

اما آنچه از كلام سيد نور الله نور الله مرقدہ مستفاد می شود کہ جناب ایشان بتشیع اینها قائل بوده اند پس اولاً اینکه تقلید شان غیر لازم و در باب امثال این گونه امور غیر مطع فان الحق احق بالاتباع خصوصاً نظر برین کہ بہمت جناب سيد ممدوح بسوی توسیع دائرہ تشیع چنان مصروف بوده و تکثیر سواد این فرقه این چنان مطمح نظر داشته کہ مثل سيد شريف جرجانی و علامہ دوانی راہم محاط محیط این دائرہ گردنیدہ ماند منصور دانقی شقی را نیز درین شان بتکلف گردانیدہ

It is established from the statements of Sayyid Nūr Allah that he declared Hārūn Rashīd and Ma'mūn Rashīd – the khulafā' of their respective eras – as Shī'ah. Firstly, it is not necessary to follow him in such matters because only the truth is followed. Sayyid Nūr Allah widening the scope of Shī'ism is contentious. Due to this ideology of his, he included Sayyid Sharīf Jurjānī and 'Allāmah Dawānī among the Shī'ah. He also included Manṣūr Dānīqī Shaqqī with much effort.

Shaykh Murtaḍā has written in his *Rasā'il* – published in Iran – concerning contradiction and fabrication of ahādīth:

ثم ان ما ذكر من تمكن اصحاب الائمة من اخذ الاصول و الفروع بطريق اليقين دعوى ممنوعة واضحة المنع و اقل ما يشهد عليها ما علم بالعين و الاثر من اختلاف اصحابهم صلوات الله عليهم في الاصول و الفروع و لذا شكى غيره واحد من اصحاب الائمة اليهم اختلاف اصحابه فاجابوهم تارة بانهم قدر القوا

الاختلاف بينهم حقنا لدمائهم كما في رواية حرير وزاره و ابي ايوب الجزار و اخرى اجابوهم بان ذلك من جهة الكذابين كما في رواية الفيض بن المختار قال قلت لابي عبد الله جعلني الله فداك ما هذا الاختلاف الذي بين شيعتكم قال و اى الاختلاف يا فيض فقلت له انى اجلس فى حلقهم بالكوفة و اكاد اشك فى اختلافهم فى حديثهم حتى ارجع الى الفضل بن عمر فيوقضنى من ذلك على ما تستريح به نفسى فقال اجل كما ذكرت يا فيض ان الناس قد اولعوا بالكذب علينا كان الله افترض عليهم و لا يريد منهم غير انى احدث احدهم بحديث فلا يخرج من عندى حتى يتاوله عن غير تاويله و ذلك لانهم لا يطلبون بحديثنا و بحسبنا ما عند الله تعالى و كل يحب ان يدعى راسا و قريبا منها رواية داود بن سرحان و استثناء القميين كثير امن رجال نوادر الحكمة معروف و قصة ابن ابي العوجاء انه قال عند قتله قد وست فى كتبكم اربعة الاف حديث مذكورة فى الرجال و كذا ما ذكره يونس بن عبد الرحمن من انه اخذ احاديث كثيرة من اصحاب الصادقين ثم عرضها على ابي الحسن الرضا فانكر منها احاديث كثيرة الى غير ذلك مما يشهد بخلاف ما ذكره

What he has mentioned that the companions of the A'imma derived uṣūl and furū' from them through yaqīn is a baseless claim. The smallest proof to debunk this is the well-known ikhtilāf of the companions in uṣūl and furū'. It is for this reason that when anyone complained to the A'imma of the ikhtilāf of their companions then sometimes they answered by saying that they themselves had created this ikhtilāf in order to save their lives as appears in the narration of Ḥarīz, Zurārah, and Abū Ayyūb al-Jazzār. At other times, they answered that this is from the liars as appears in the narration of al-Fayḍ ibn al-Mukhtār who relates that he said to Abū 'Abd Allah, "May I be sacrificed for you. What is this ikhtilāf between your companions?"

He asked which ikhtilāf.

He explained, "I sit in their gathering in Kūfah and begin to have doubts due to their ikhtilāf in aḥādīth. Then I go to al-Faḍl ibn 'Umar who informs me of that which brings satisfaction and relief to my soul."

The Imām commented, "Yes, it is as you have said, O Fayḍ! People have fabricated upon us as if Allah had made it obligatory upon them and He desires nothing from them besides this. I narrate to one of them a ḥadīth and he does not even leave the gathering and he has already given it a false interpretation. This is due to the fact that with our ḥadīth and love

they do not desire what is by Allah ﷻ. Each of them wishes to become a leader.”

Similar to this is the narration of Dāwūd ibn Sarḥān. The exclusion of the Qummiyyīn from the rijāl of *Nawādir al-Ḥikmah* is well-known. The incident of Ibn Abī al-‘Awjā’ is that he confessed before being killed, “I have added four thousand aḥādīth to your books which are recorded in *al-Rijāl*.”

Likewise, Yūnus ibn ‘Abd al-Rahman has related that he narrated many aḥādīth from the students of al-Bāqir and al-Ṣādiq and then presented them to Abū al-Ḥasan al-Riḍā’ who denied majority of the aḥādīth. There are other reports as well which testify to the opposite of what he has mentioned.

In this book, where there are rational proofs to substantiate the strength of *khbar al-wāḥid*, it is written regarding not relying on what is recorded in books without hearing the aḥādīth, as well as fabrications and false narrations being included in the books:

وهو ان لا شك للمتبع في احوال الرواة المذكورة في تراجمهم في كون اكثر الاخبار بل جلها الا شذر و ندر صادرة عن الائمة و هذا يظهر بعد التامل في كيفية اهتمام ارباب الكتب من مشائخ الثلاثة و من تقدمهم في تنقيح ما ادعوه في كتبهم و عدم الاكتفاء باخذ الرواية من كتاب و ايداعها في تصانيفهم حذرا من كون ذلك الكتاب مدسوسا فيه من بعض الكذابين فقد حكى عن احمد بن محمد بن عيسى انه جاء الى الحسن بن و شاد طلب منه ان يخرج اليه كتابا لعلاء بن ذرين و كتابا لابان عثمان الاحمر فلما اخرجهما قال احب ان سمعها قال ما عجبك اذهب فاكتبهما فقال له رحمك الله ما عليك اذهب فاكتبهما و اسمع من بعد فقلت له لا امن من الحدثان فقال لو علمت ان الحديث يكون له هذا للطلب لاستكثرت منه فاني قد ادركت في هذا المسجد مائة شيخ كل يقول حدثني جعفر بن محمد و عن محمد بن نوح انه وقع و عنده و فاتر فيه احاديث ابن سنان فقال ان تكتبوا ذلك فاني كتبت عن محمد بن سنان و لكن لا روى لكم عنه شيئا فانه قال قبل موته كلها حدثتكم فليس بسماع و لا برواية و انما وجدته فانظر كيف احاطوا في الرواية عمن لم يسمع من الثقات و انما وجد في الكتب و كفاك شاهد ان على بن الحسن بن فضال لم يروى كتب ابيه الحسن عنه مع مقابلتها عليه و انما يرويها عن اخويه احمد و محمد عن ابيه و اعتذر عن ذلك بانه يوم مقابلته الحديث مع ابيه كان صغير السن ليس له كثير معرفة بالروايات فقرأ ما على اخويه ثانيا و الحاصل ان الظاهر الحصار مدارهم على ايداع ما سمعوه من صاحب الكتاب او ممن سمعوه منه فلم يكونوا يودعون ال ما سمعوا و لو بوسائط من صاحب الكتاب و لو كان معلوم الانتساب مع اطمينانهم بالوسائط و شدة و ثوقهم بهم حتى انهم ربما كانوا يتبعونهم في تصحيح الحديث و رده كما اتفق للصدوق

بالنسبة الى شيخه ابن الوليد و ربما كانوا لا يتقون بمن يوجد فيه قدح بعيد المدخليه فى الصدق و لذا حكى عن جماعة منهم تحرز عن الرواية عمن يروى من الضعفاء و يعتمد المراسيل و ان كان ثقته فى نفسه كما اتفق بالنسبة الى البرقى هل يتحرزون عن الرواية عمن يعمل بالقياس مع ان علمه لا دخل له بروايته كما اتفق بالنسبة الى الاسكا فى حيث ذكر فى ترجمته انه كان يرى القياس فترك رواياته لاجل ذلك و كانوا يتوقفون فى روايات من كان على الحق فعدل عنده و ان كانت كتبه و رواياته حال الاستقامة حتى اذن لهم الامام او تابعه كما سئلوا العسكرى عن كتب فضال و قالوا ان بيوتنا منها ملاء فاذن لهم و سئلوا الشيخ ابا القاسم بن روح عن كتب ابن غداقر التى صنفها قبل الارتداد عن مذهب الشيعة حتى اذن بهم الشيخ فى العمل بها و الحاصل ان الامارات الكاشفة عن اهتمام اصحابنا فى تنقيح الاخبار فى ازمة المتاخرة عن زمان الرضا اكثر من ان يحصى و يظهر للمتبع و الداعى الى شدة الاهتمام مضافا الى كون تلك الروايات اساس الدين و بها قوام شريعة سيد المرسلين صلى الله عليه و سلم و لهذا قال الامام فى شان جماعة من الرواة لولا هولاء لاندردت اثار النبوة و ان الناس لا يرضون بنقل ما يوثق به فى كتبهم المؤلفة لرجوع من ياتى اليها فى امور الدين على ما اخبرهم الامام بانه ياتى على الناس زمان هرج لا يانسون الا بكتبهم و على ما ذكره الكليني فى ديباجة الكافي عن كون كتابه مرجعا لجميع من ياتى بعد ذلك ما تنبهوا له و نبههم عليه الائمة عن ان الكذابة كانوا يدرسون الاخبار الكذوبة فى كتب اصحاب الائمة كما يظهر من الروايات الكثيرة منها نه عرض يونس بن عبد الرحمن على سيدنا ابي الحسن الرضا كتب جماعة من اصحاب الباقر و الصادق فانكر منها احاديث كثيرة ان يكون من احاديث ابي عبد الله و قال ان ابا الخطاب كذب على ابي عبد الله كذلك اصحاب ابي الخطاب يدسون الاحاديث الى يومنا هذا فى كتب اصحاب ابي عبد الله

There is no doubt for the person who studies the biographies of the narrators that most of the narrations, in fact all of them besides a few, are not from the A'imma. This will only be realised after pondering over the amount of importance given to narrations reaching us by the authors of the books, i.e. the three mashāyikh and those who preceded them. The amount of analysis and scrutiny they observed to the narrations before including them in their books. They were not satisfied just by narrating from books and did not include such narrations in their books for fear that some fabricators might have added to these books. The incident of Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn Ṭsā is that he came to Ḥasan ibn Shād and requested for the books of 'Alā' ibn Dharīn and Abān ibn 'Uthmān ibn Aḥmar. When Ḥasan brought the books, Aḥmad voiced his desire to listen to them directly to which Ḥasan commented, "What is the hurry? Take them and write them."

He then said, "May Allah have mercy on you. Take them and write them and learn from the one who succeeds me."

Aḥmad said, “This is not protected from lies.”

Ḥasan said, “If I knew that there would be such a desire for ḥadīth, I would have acquired much. I saw 100 persons in this Masjid who claimed that Ja’far ibn Muḥammad narrated to them.”

It is narrated about Muḥammadūyah ibn Nūḥ who acquired plenty archives which contained the aḥādīth of Ibn Sinān that he said, “Write what you want. I have heard directly from Muḥammad ibn Sinān. However, I will not narrate to you because he said before dying that all the aḥādīth I told you, I have not heard them. Rather, I found them written down.”

Look at the caution they observed from relating from one who did not hear directly from reliable men but simply found it in books. This evidence is sufficient for you that ‘Alī ibn Ḥasan ibn Fuḍāl does not narrate his father’s books from his father although he checked them with his father. Rather, he narrates from his brothers Muḥammad and Aḥmad who in turn narrate from their father. ‘Alī presents this excuse that he was young at the time he checked the aḥādīth with his father, and did not have sufficient knowledge about narrating. Therefore, he learnt again from his brothers.

In short, this clearly shows that the basis of the muḥaddithīn is upon hearing from the author himself or from someone who heard from him. They would not narrate a ḥadīth until they did not hear it themselves even though there are many links between them and the author. Moreover, they had reliance and confidence on the person who heard directly from the author to the extent that sometimes they also followed those links in the authentication and rejection of aḥādīth as al-Ṣadūq does with his Shaykh Ibn Walīd. Sometimes they do not rely on them when any criticism is found in them or their truthfulness is blemished. It is for this reason that it is reported regarding a group of muḥaddithīn that they would not relate from one who narrates from weak narrators and relies on mursal, even though he himself is reliable as in the case of al-Barqī. In fact, they discard narrating from those who practice upon *qiyās* (analogy) notwithstanding the fact that practice has nothing to do with narrating as in the case

of al-Askāfī who was believed to deem qiyās as permissible, hence his narrations were discarded. They would not narrate from those who were on the straight path but then strayed away although their narrations and books did not change. To this extent that people sought permission from the Imām or Imām’s deputy, e.g. Imām al-‘Askarī to narrate from the books of Banū Fuḍāl saying that their houses were full of his books and were then granted permission. Shaykh Abū al-Qās ibn Rūḥ was asked about the condition of the books of Ibn Ghadāfir which he wrote prior to apostatising from the Shī‘ī faith; he gave permission to narrate from them. In brief, the evidences of the importance given by the scholars to the scrutinizing of narration in the last era, i.e. the era of Imām al-Riḍā عليه السلام, are countless and clearly visible to the one who seeks. The reason for this is that these narrations are the basis of dīn and the Sharī‘ah of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم. Owing to this, the Imām stated regarding a group of narrators: “Had these men not been, the signs of nubuwwah would have been destroyed.”

People do not agree with unreliable narrations in their history books whose falsehood is not detrimental to their religion or world. So how will such people agree with this in those books which were written concerning matters of the dīn which affect the entire creation? The Imām has prophesised that such a difficult time will come that they will only find solace in books. Al-Kulaynī has written in the preface of his book *al-Kāfī* that his book will be the source for everyone. The muḥaddithīn informed him and they were informed by the A‘immah that liars will mix false narrations in the books of the A‘immah’s students as is seen from many narrations. One narration is that Yūnus ibn ‘Abd al-Rahman presented the books of the students of al-Bāqir عليه السلام and al-Ṣādiq عليه السلام to Abū al-Ḥasan al-Riḍā who rejected majority of the aḥādīth and declared, “These are not the words of Abū ‘Abd Allah.”

He also stated, “Abū al-Khaṭṭāb fabricated upon Abū ‘Abd Allah.” And up until this day, the students of Abū al-Khaṭṭāb add narrations to the books of Abū ‘Abd Allah.

و منها ما عن هشام بن حكم انه سمع ابا عبد الله يقول كان المغيرة بن سعد لعنه الله و يعتمد الكذب على ابي و ياخذ كتب اصحابه و كان اصحابه المستترون باصحاب ابي ياخذون الكتب من اصحاب ابي فيدفعونها الى المغيرة لعنه الله فكان يدس فيها الكفر الزندقة و يسندها الى ابي عبد الله الحديث و رواية الفيض بن مختار المتقدمة فى ذيل كلام الشيخ الى غير ذلك من الروايات فظهر مما ذكرنا ان ما علم اجمالا من الاخبار الكثيرة من وجود الكذابين و وضع الاحاديث فيها فهو انما كان قبل زمان مقابلة الحديث و تدوين على الحديث و الرجال بين اصحاب الائمة مع ان العلم لوجود الاخبار المكذوبة انما ينافى دعوى القطع بصدور الكل التى ينسب الى بعض الاخباريين او دعوى الظن بصدور جميعها و لا ينافى ذلك ما نحن بصدده من دعوى العلم الاجمالي بصدور اكثرها او كثير منها بل هذه دعوى بديهية

A narration appears that it is related from Hishām ibn Ḥakam who heard Abū ‘Abd Allah saying, “Mughīrah ibn Sa’d – may Allah curse him – would intentionally fabricate upon my father. He would take the books of his students. And his students would associate with the students of my father. So they would take the books from my father’s students and give them to Mughīrah – may Allah curse him. He would add kufr and heretic narrations therein and attribute them to my father ‘Abd Allah.”

Another narration is from Fayḍān ibn Mukhtār which passed in the footnotes of Shaykh. And there are copious narrations besides these.

What we have mentioned sufficiently proves in brief that majority of the narrations are not free from liars and fabricators. This took place before the A’immah’s students began writing books on aḥādīth and rijāl. The knowledge of fabrications falsifies the claim of all aḥādīth being the words of Rasūlullāh ﷺ or the A’immah with yaqīn or ḡann. However, our claim remains intact, i.e. the claim that majority of them are true. In fact, this claim is obvious.¹

Besides contradiction and fabrication, the belief of Taqīyyah of the Shī‘ah has totally confused the aḥādīth. Intellect plays not a part therein and reliance is solely on faith. No rational principles can be formulated to assess these aḥādīth. Shaykh al-Murtaḍā writes in his *Rasā’il* under the heading, *Khātimah fī al-Ta’ādul wa al-Tarjīh*:

1 *Farā’id al-Uṣūl* pg. 95.

الثانى ما رواه ابن ابى الجمهور الاحسانى فى غوالى اللالى عن العلامة مرفوعا الى زرارة قال سئلت ابا جعفر فقلت جعلت فداك ياتى عنكم الجزان و الحديثان المتعارضان فبايهما اخذ فقال يا زرارة خذ بما يقول اعدلهما عندك و اوتقهما فى نفسك فقلت انهما معادلان مرضيان موثقان فقال انظر ما وافق منهما العامة فاتركه و خذ بما خالفهم فان الحق فيما خالفهم قلت ربما كانا موافقين لهم او مخالفين فكيف اصنع قال اذن فخذ بما فيه الحافظة و اترك الاخر قلت فانهما معا موافقان للا احتياط او مخالفان له فكيف اصنع فقال اذن فتخير احديهما و تاخذ به و دع الاخر

Secondly, Ibn Abī al-Jamhūr al-Iḥsānī has written in *Ghawālī al-La'ālī* from 'Allāmah that Zurārah said that he asked Abū Ja'far, "May I be sacrificed for you. Two contradictory narrations are reported from you; which one should I accept."

The Imām replied, "O Zurārah. Accept that which the one most just and most reliable in your eyes says."

Zurārah said, "Both are equal in reliability and justice."

The Imām then said, "Discard what conforms to the Sunnī and accept what opposes them. For indeed, the truth is in what opposes them."

Zurārah asked, "Sometimes both narrations conform to them or both disagree with them, so what should I do?"

The Imām replied, "Then take the one in which there is greater caution and discard the other."

Zurārah said, "What if both have the same level of caution, then what should I do?"

The Imām said, "Choose one of them and leave the other."¹

الثالث ما رواه الصدوق باسناده عن ابى الحسن الرضا فى حديث طويل قال فيه مما ورد عليكم من حديثين مختلفين فاعرضوهما على كتاب الله فما كان فى كتاب الله موجودا حلالا او حراما فاتبعوا ما وافق الكتاب و ما لم يكن فى الكتاب فاعرضوهما على سنن رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم فما كان فى

1 *Rasā'il Shaykh Murtaḍā* pg. 429, 430.

السنة موجودا منهيًا عنه نهى حرام او مأمورا به عن رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم امر الزام فاتبعوا ما وافق نهى النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم و امره و ما كان في السنة اعاقفة او كراهة ثم كان الخبر خلافه فذلك رخصة في ما عافه رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم و كرهه و لم يحرمه و ذلك الذى يسع الاخذ بهما جمعا او بايهما شئت و سعك الاختيار من باب التسليم و الاتباع و الرد الى رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم و ما لم تجدوه فى شىء من هذه الوجوه فردوا اليها علمه فنحن اولى بذلك و لا تقولوا فيها بارانكم و عليكم بالكف و التثبت و الوفاق و انتم طالبون باحثون حتى ياتيكم البيان من عندنا و الرابع ما ان رسالة القطب الراوندى بسنده الصحيح عن الصادق اذ اورد عليكم حديثان مختلفان فاعرضوهما على كتاب الله فما وافق كتاب الله فخذوه و ما خالف كتاب الله فذروه و ان لم تجدوهما فى كتاب الله فاعرضوا على اخبار العامة فما وافق اخبارهم فذروه و ما خالف اخبارهم فخذوه الخامس بسنده ايضا عن الحسين السيرى قال قال ابو عبد الله ان اورد عليكم حديثان مختلفان فخذوا بما خالف القوم السادس بالسند عن الحسن بن بالجهم فى حديث قلت له يعنى العبد الصالح يروى عن ابي عبد الله شىء و يروى عنه الرضا خلاف ذلك فبايهما ناخذ قال خذ بما خالف القوم و ما وافق القوم فاجتنبه السابع بسنده ايضا عن محمد بن عبد الله قال قلت الرضا كيف نصنع بالخبرين المختلفين قال اذ اورد عليكم خبران مختلفان فانظروا ما خالف منهما العامة فخذوه و انظروا ما يوافق اخبارهم فذروه

Thirdly, Al-Ṣadūq has narrated a lengthy narration from Abū al-Ḥasan al-Riḍā in which the Imām says, “When two contradictory narrations come before you, then analyse them in front of the Qur’ān; follow that which is found in the Qur’ān – ḥalāl or ḥarām. Whatever is not found in the Qur’ān, then analyse it in the light of ḥadīth. Whatever is found in the ḥadīth – whether emphatically prohibited or strictly commanded – then follow the prohibition or command of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. What is overlooked or disliked in the Sunnah and the narration mentions something contradictory, then this is leeway in what Rasūlullāh ﷺ has overlooked or disliked and he has not emphatically prohibited it. In this case, you have liberty to take anyone you like or to take both. This choice is in conformity to accepting, following, and referencing to Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Whatever is still not found should be brought to us. Do not give your own opinions. Be cautious and exercise restraint – while you are seekers and researchers – until clarification comes from us.”

Fourthly, the letter of al-Quṭb al-Rāwīndī with his authentic sanad from al-Ṣādiq, “When two conflicting reports come to you, then present them in front of the Qur’ān; accept whatever conforms to it and reject what conflicts it. If you do not find it in the Qur’ān, then present it in front of

the narrations of the Sunnī. Reject what conforms to their narrations and accept what contradicts them.”

Fifthly, with his sanad from Ḥusayn al-Siyarī who narrates that Abū ‘Abd Allah said, “When two conflicting narrations come to you, then accept that which contradicts the Sunnī.”

Sixthly, with a sanad from Ḥasan ibn Bālajahum who says, “I asked him, i.e. al-‘Abd al-Ṣālīh, ‘Something is narrated from Abū ‘Abd Allah and al-Riḍā narrates the opposite. So which one should I accept?’

He answered, ‘Accept that which contradicts the Sunnī and reject what conforms to them.’”

Seventhly, with his sanad from Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allah, “I asked al-Riḍā, ‘What should we do with two conflicting narrations?’

He answered, ‘When two contradictory narrations appear before you, then accept what contradicts the Sunnī and accept what conforms to them.’”¹

الثامن ما عن الاحتجاج بسنده عن سماعة بن مهران قال قلت لابي عبد الله يرد علينا حديثان واحد يامرنا بالآخذ به و الآخر ينهانا قال لا تعمل بواحد منهما حتى تلقى صاحبك فتستل قلت لا بد ان نعمل بواحد منهما قال خذ بما خالف العامة التاسع ما عن الكافي بسنده عن المعلى بن جنس قال قلت لابي عبد الله اذا جاء حديث عن اولكم و حديث عن اخركم بايهما ناخذ قال خذوا به حتى يبلغكم عن الحى فان بلغكم عن الحى فخذوا بقوله قال ثم قال ابو عبد الله انا و الله لا ندخلكم الا فيما يسعكم العاشر عنه بسنده الى الحسين بن المختار و عن بعض اصحابنا عن ابي عبد الله قال ارأيتك لو حدثتك بحديث العام ثم جئتنى من قابل فحدثتك بخلافه بايهما كنت تاخذ قال كنت اخذ بالآخر فقال لى رحمك الله تعالى الحادى عشر ما بسنده الصحيح ظاهرا عن ابي عمرو الكنانى عن ابي عبد الله قال يا ابا عمرو و ارأيت لو حدثتك بحديث او افتيتك بفتيا ثم جئت بعد ذلك تسألنى عنه فاخبرتك بخلاف ما كنت اخبرتك او افتيتك بخلاف ذلك بايهما كنت تاخذ قلت باحدثها و ادع الآخر قال قد اصبت يا ابا عمرو و ابي الله الا اى يعبد سرا اما و الله لئن فعلتم ذلك انه لخير لى و لكم ابي الله لنا فى دينه الا التقية

Eighth, what appears in *al-Ihtijāj* with his sanad from Samā‘ah ibn Mahrān who narrates, “I said to Abu ‘Abd Allah, ‘Two aḥādīth appear before us; one commanding us and the other prohibiting us.’

1 Rasā‘il Shaykh Murtaḍā pg. 430.

He said, ‘Do not practice on any of them until you meet the Imām and ask him.’

I retorted, ‘It is necessary to practice upon one.’

He said, ‘Then practice on that which contradicts the Sunnī.’”

Ninth, what appears in *al-Kāfi* with his sanad from al-Mu‘allā ibn Jins, “I said to Abu ‘Abd Allah, ‘When a ḥadīth comes from one of you and another from another, then which one should I practice upon?’

He replied, ‘Practice upon it until something reaches you from the living Imām. When this reaches you, then act upon it.’

He then added, ‘Indeed, we do not want to overburden you.’”

Tenth, with his sanad to Ḥusayn ibn al-Mukhtār and from some of the Shī‘ah from Abu ‘Abd Allah who says, “If I narrate to you a ḥadīth and then when you come to me again I narrate the opposite, which one will you take?”

He said, “I will practice upon the latter.”

The Imām commented, “May Allah ﷻ have mercy on you.”

Eleventh, with his authentic sanad from Abū ‘Amr al-Kinānī from Abū ‘Abd Allah who said, “O Abū ‘Amr! If I narrate a ḥadīth to you or give you a fatwā and then you return asking me the same thing and I give you the opposite answer, then which one will you practice upon.”

He said, “I will practice on the latest one and discard the former.”

The Imām commented, “You have chosen correctly O Abū ‘Amr. Allah rejects except that He be worshipped secretly. By Allah, if you do this, it will be better for me and for you. Allah rejects everything in our dīn for us except Taqiyyah.”¹

1 *Rasā’il Shaykh Murtaḍā* pg. 430.

From these statements which we have reproduced from reliable books and reputable scholars of the Shī'ah, it is apparent that their aḥādīth are contradictory. Many slandered the A'immaḥ and fabricated thousands of aḥādīth in their name and included thousands of false narrations in the books deceitfully. Their muḥaqqiq scholars and renowned muḥaddithīn did not simply rely on what was recorded in the books until they heard the same narration directly or indirectly from the author. This is also established that notwithstanding this type of contradiction, the presence of thousands of fabrications and the possibility of error and forgeries in the present aḥādīth, the Shī'ah have declared their reliable and authentic aḥādīth books as the basis of their sharī'ah and creed and relied upon them in both uṣūl and furū'. They have formulated principles to remove contradiction, the best of which are opposing the Sunnī and Taqīyyah. In this situation, I do not see how the Shī'ah have the audacity to object to Sunnī books and declare all the aḥādīth as unreliable due to the fact that some people fabricated aḥādīth. How can they declare the books of the muḥaddithīn to be incorrect and turn a blind eye to the great efforts and pains the muḥaddithīn undertook in scrutinizing the biographies of the narrators? How can they ever claim that the Sunnī declare their own books as unreliable and break the foundation of their religion with their own hands simply on the basis that the Sunnī have accepted the existence of fabrications and mistakes and made the public aware of fabrications and errors. The only thing I can say at this juncture is that a person living in a glass house should not throw stones at those living in brick homes.

One question arises here. When both the parties' condition of narrations are nearly the same, both have authentic, unauthentic, strong, and weak narrations and both have formulated principles to scrutinise and investigate aḥādīth then no group could use such aḥādīth of the other party to prove his stance which hampers on the uṣūl, 'aqā'id, and consensus of that party. If we practice upon this, then the door to presenting inculpatory proofs will be closed. When the Sunnī will present aḥādīth in favour of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم from Shī'ī books, the latter will answer that these are unauthentic and in conflict to consensus and established principles, hence they cannot be used as proof against us. Similarly,

when the Shī'ah present narrations which criticise the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم from Sunnī books, the latter will answer that these aḥādīth are unauthentic, weak, and in conflict to consensus and established principles.

We accept this objection and say that these types of inculpatory proofs are not sufficient and no one's claim can be established against the other – taking into consideration their principles – simply based on such proofs. However, our usage of Shī'ī narrations is not because we regard it as necessary to prove our stance. Rather, such proofs are merely inculpatory, i.e. just as how they use some of our weak narrations as proof, we wish to falsify them with their authentic and strong aḥādīth. This is the methodology of the latter scholars. They have adopted this on the pattern of the Shī'ah. Otherwise, our early scholars only utilised Qur'ān and rational proofs to substantiate their beliefs and claims and refrained from using citing proofs from Shī'ī works. Although we have used inculpatory proofs in this book, it is only to show the Shī'ah that their objection is answered by their own narrations. However, we have used the glorious Qur'ān and rational proofs as the primary proofs to establish the virtues of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم and to answer the allegations against them. And we have used these extensively. We can openly claim that if the methodology of inculpatory proofs is closed then the Shī'ah will not be able to stand in debate with the Sunnī. They will not be able to establish their claim regarding the criticism against the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم from the glorious Qur'ān and sound intellect.

Point 5

Many sects appeared in Islam and they differed in uṣūl and furū'. However, generally these were based upon different views, misunderstandings, philosophy, and misinterpretation of Qur'ānic verses. From among the various sects, none of them opposed the Ṣaḥābah or the Ahl al-Bayt رضي الله عنهم making them the targets of censure and condemnation besides two sects: the Shī'ah and Khawārij. Their difference led them to harbouring enmity for the Ṣaḥābah and Ahl al-Bayt رضي الله عنهم. And the cause for this is the matter of khilāfah. Due to them including this matter among the fundamentals of dīn, they have transgressed the limits of balance. One

of them caught hold to the Ahl al-Bayt and excluded the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ from Islam while the other, i.e. the Khawārij, leaned so much to the Ṣaḥābah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ that they made the Ahl al-Bayt the target of censure and deemed their condemnation the crux of Islam. Due to this matter of khilāfah, the Shī'ah have created so much of hatred for the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ that they declared them as infidels, turning a blind eye to the difficulties and hardships they bore for the spreading of the Qur'ān and Islam. It is this belief of theirs that has forced them to fabricate and accept those narrations which condemn the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ. We do not regret over the fact that this matter of Imāmah has made a sect enemies of the Ṣaḥābah but more surprising and regretful is that this belief has not even spared the Ambiyā' and the children of the A'immaḥ from condemnation. Their jealousy and hatred for those who reject Imāmah have made the Ambiyā' and the bulk of the Ahl al-Bayt targets of their criticism and censure just as the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ were made. The only difference is that they openly declare hatred for the Ṣaḥābah and publicly defame them on the one side while on the other hand they make ludicrous interpretations for the Ambiyā' and the Ahl al-Bayt and verbally acknowledge their purity and greatness. Otherwise, if one looks deeply, this matter of Imāmah has not spared the Ambiyā' and the family of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ – besides a few – from condemnation and blame. Some have been criticised for harbouring jealousy for the A'immaḥ, some have been labelled kāfir due to rejecting Imāmah, and some have been branded with kufr and fisq due to them claiming Imāmah. In short, we do not have remorse over the opposition of one Ṣaḥābī. The reality is that in whichever direction one looks, everyone has become the target of the arrows of Imāmah.

Let us study the Ambiyā' first. The Shī'ah boast that their belief in the greatness, virtue, purity, and infallibility of the Ambiyā' is not possessed by any other sect of Islam. It is the sole honour of the Shī'ah that they believe that the Ambiyā' were innocent and pure from every type of sin – major and minor – and every type of flaw and imperfection. Dildār 'Alī writes in *Ḥusām*:

تمام اہل اسلام اتفاق دارند بریں کہ در باب عصمت انبیاء آنچه امامہ مبالغہ می دارند هیچ یک از فرق اہل اسلام این قدر ندارد وزیراکہ امامیہ منفرداند باینکہ می گویند انبیاء از اول عمر تا اخر از گناہ صغیر و کبیرہ عمدا و سہوا منزہ می

باشند بخلاف دیگران و قال بعض افاضلهم که ابتهام شیعیان ال عبادر باب تنزیه انبیاء و اوصیا از اول عمر تا اخر عمر از جمیع گنا بان صغیره و کبیره بحدی است که بیچ فرقه را غیر ایشا حاصل نیست حتی اینکه اجتهاد را بم بر زمره انبیاء و اوصیا جائز نمی دارند فضلا عن وقوع الخطا فی الاجتهاد

All the Muslims unanimously agree that the level the Shī'ah have adopted regarding the purity and infallibility of the Ambiyā' has not been adopted by any other sect. It is the belief of the Shī'ah alone that all the Ambiyā', from beginning to end, were pure from every type of sin, major and minor, intentionally and unintentionally. Other sects disagree with this. Some of their scholars complain that the Shī'ah have taken so much pains to prove the purity and infallibility of the Ambiyā' and Aṣṣiyā' from every type of minor and major sin from their births until their deaths which has not been observed by any other sect. To the extent that they do not regard ijtihād permissible for the Ambiyā' and Aṣṣiyā' since there exists the possibility of error in ijtihād.

However, when we study their books and listen to the aḥādīth of their A'immah, we realise that the defects which the infidels regard as the worst and the qualities which the heretics and atheists regard as immoral and wicked; they attribute these to the Ambiyā'. Together with claiming their infallibility, they accuse them of committing major sins. May Allah protect us! Listen with an open heart to the aḥādīth attributed to the A'immah regarding Sayyidunā Ādam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, the father of mankind.

Muḥammad ibn Bābawayh in *'Uyūn Akhbār al-Riḍā* has narrated from 'Alī ibn Mūsā al-Riḍā who said:

When Allah honoured Ādam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام by ordering the angels to prostrate to him and entering him into Jannah, he thought to himself that he is the greatest of creation. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى called to him, "O Ādam! Lift your head and look at the leg of My Throne."

As Ādam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام lifted his head, he saw:

لا اله الا الله محمد رسول الله على ولى الله امير المؤمنين وزوجته فاطمة سيدة نساء العالمين و الحسن
و الحسين سيدا شباب اهل الجنة

There is no deity but Allah. Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allah. ‘Alī is the walī of Allah and Amīr al-Mu‘minīn. His wife Fāṭimah is the Queen of the women of the world. Ḥasan and Ḥusayn are the leaders of the youth of Jannah.

Sayyidunā Ādam enquired, “Who are they?”

Allah ﷻ replied, “They are your progeny and they are greater than you and superior to My entire creation. Had they not been, I would not have created you, nor Jannah, Jahannam, nor the heavens and the earth. Beware O Ādam! Do not look at them with the eyes of jealousy. If you do, I will remove you from My proximity.”

Ādam looked at them with the eyes of jealousy so Shayṭān overpowered him until he ate from the tree Allah prohibited him from.

Do not think that this is the only ḥadīth regarding the father of mankind Sayyidunā Ādam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام from Imām ‘Alī ibn Mūsā al-Riḍā. Listen to the narration which involves the grandmother in the grandfather’s sin.

It appears in *Ma‘ānī al-Akḥbār* with the sanad of Mufaḍḍal ibn ‘Umar from Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ:

When Ādam and Ḥawā’ saw the names of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, ‘Alī, Fāṭimah, and Ḥasanayn written on the ‘Arsh with celestial light, they submitted, “O Allah! What lofty status and how beloved are these to You!”

Allah ﷻ said, “Had they not been, I would not have created you. They are the treasures to My knowledge and the safe keepers of My secrets. O Ādam and Ḥawā’, be vigilant. Do not look at them with jealousy and do not aspire their status and rank or else you would disobey Me and become of the oppressors.”

Thereafter, Shayṭān whispered to them and deceived them and they looked at these five with jealousy. Hence, Ādam and Ḥawā' were removed.

Dildār 'Alī writes two answers to this in *Ḥusām* in response to Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīz رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ:

Firstly, this ḥadīth is not authentic so believing it and authenticating it is not of the fundamentals of dīn. Secondly, jealousy is of two types: 1. envy 2. Desiring the removal of a favour [of another]. The first is permissible and the second is forbidden. So why is the jealousy of Ādam not taken to be of the first type.

He did not stop here. He narrated a ḥadīth from *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* to shut the Sunnī's mouths. He says:

اما حدیث حسد حضرت ادم که در کتب امامیه مروی گشته و اسباب تشنیع ناصب عداوت طایفه بر شیعیان اهل بیت گردیده پس از جمله احادیث صحاح نیست تا اعتقاد کردن بیان و تصحیح نمودن این از جمله ضروریات نزد امامیه باشد و ایضا گویا بغوش این ناصب عداوت عرف نرسیده که حسد برد و قسم ست یکی بمعنی غبط ست و دوم حسد بمعنی استدعا زوال نعمت اول مباح ست و دوم مذموم و می دانم که اگر بمجرد ادعای این تقسیم اکتفا نمایم ناصب عترت طایفه تکذیب خواهد نمود و لہذا بذکر یک حدیث صحاح ایشان که دلالت صریح دار و بر اینچہ ادعا نموده ام پرواز و دہن اورا باین تقریب می دوزم کہ گفته اند دہن سگ بہ لقمہ دوختہ بہ و یساع بعد ذلک ان یقال فی حقہ قہیت الذی کفر کانہ التقمہ الحجر و این ست کہ بخاری روایت نموده از ابو ہریرہ رضی اللہ عنہ قال لا حسد الا فی اثین رجل اتاہ اللہ القران فہو یتلوہ اثناء اللیل والنہار فسمعہ جار لہ فقال لیتنی اوتیت مثل ما اوتی فلان فعملت مثل ما یعمل و رجل اتاہ اللہ مالا فہو ینفقہ فی حقہ فقال رجل لیتنی اوتیت مثل ما اوتی فلان فعملت مثل ما یعمل و بتفاوت یسیر قریب این مضمون حدیث دیگر ست کہ این را بخاری و مسلم و ترمذی روایت کرده اند پس چرا جائز نباشد کہ حسد حضرت ادم ازین قبیل بوده باشد و چگونه چنین نباشد و حال این کہ مفضل بن عمر کہ ناصبی این را مذکور ساخته متضمن کلمہ و حملہا علی ثمنی منزلتہم است در قوت تفسیر معنی حسد ست لیکن چون غبطہ ہر چند مباح ست اما بنظر علو منزلت و شرف مرتبت جناب عترت سید المرسلین غبط ایشان از قبیل ترک اولی ست لہذا حق سبحان تعالی علی حسب جری العادۃ الالہیۃ حضرت ادم را معاتب ساخته و ایضا حسد بہجرد این کہ بہقتضای بشریت عارض و ما دامیکہ بہقتضای این کار کند ادمی گنہگار بران نمی شود چنانچہ درین معنی احادیث از ائمہ عترت ماثور گشته و ایضا معلوم ست کہ حضرت ادم متمسک گرویدہ بکلماتیکہ تفسیر این بنا بر احادیث بسیار با سہاء ال عباشدہ پس باین قرینہ بدین حسد بمعنی غبطہ کہ از قبیل ترک اولی بوده

The jealousy of Ādam is recorded in Shī'ī books which the Sunnī use as proof for the Shī'ah's hatred for Ādam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام. This ḥadīth is not authentic, so

belief in it is not necessary and to accept it is not one of the fundamentals of dīn. The ears of the Shī'ah's enemy, the Sunnī, have not heard that jealousy is of two types: 1. envy 2. Jealousy, i.e. to hope for the removal of a favour. The first, i.e. envy, is permissible whereas the second, i.e. jealousy, is reprehensible. I know that this division is sufficient to prove the Sunnī wrong. However, I wish to reproduce a ḥadīth from their Ṣiḥāḥ which will shut their mouths as the saying goes, "It is better to shut the dog's mouth with one morsel." And it is befitting to say after this, "Silent was that kāfir, as if he swallowed a stone."

This ḥadīth appears in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* as reported by Abū Hurayrah. "Jealousy is not permitted except in respect of two persons. One whom Allah ﷻ has bestowed with the Qur'ān and he recites it in the hours of the night and the hours of the day. His neighbour hears him and says, 'I wish I could be bestowed like him and practice as he does.' And the second to whom Allah ﷻ has given wealth and he spends it in the right avenues. A man says, 'I wish I could be given like him and practice like him.'"

The subject matter of this ḥadīth can be found in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, and *Sunan al-Tirmidhī* so how is it not possible for Sayyidunā Ādam's ﷺ jealousy to be of the same type? Mufaḍḍal ibn 'Umar, Sunnī, has declared this incident equal to Ādam's desire for status. And the commentary of it [the desire for status] is jealousy. Although envying is permissible, but since Rasūlullāh's ﷺ family's position is the highest, to envy them is abandoning which is best. It is for this reason that Allah ﷻ disciplined Ādam ﷺ. Jealousy is the nature of man. And until one does not display his jealous through action, he is not sinful as explained in the A'imma's aḥādīth. It is also known that the words uttered by Sayyidunā Ādam ﷺ are found; their commentary is found copious in the aḥādīth of Asmā' Āl 'Abā. Taking this into consideration as well, this jealousy will mean envy which is abandoning the best.

This explanation of Dildār 'Alī has not removed the imperfection his elders cast on Sayyidunā Ādam ﷺ. If this ḥadīth does not appear in the *Ṣiḥāḥ*, it means that it does not appear in the four canonical works, i.e. *al-Kāfī* of al-Kulaynī, *Tahdhīb*,

Istibṣār and *Man Lā Yaḥḍuruḥu al-Faqīh*, then this does not prove unauthenticity. There are thousands of narrations which do not appear in these four books and are regarded as authentic by the Shī'ah. If the meaning is that the narrator is weak or there is some flaw in the sanad, then he should have clarified it. But what could he have said? This ḥadīth appears in reliable books like *ʿUyūn* and *Maʿānī al-Akḥbār* whose author's truthfulness and honesty is apparent from his name, i.e. *al-Ṣadūq* (extremely truthful). He is one of the authors of the four canonical works. Moreover, he has narrated this ḥadīth with a strong sanad from the infallible Imām. To reject the authenticity of such a ḥadīth which is directly linked to the Imām without proving any fault of a narrator is unacceptable. Dildār 'Alī himself has quoted extensively from *ʿUyūn* and *Maʿānī al-Akḥbār* in this book of his, i.e. *Ḥusām*, and his other books and presented them to support his claims. In such a situation, if it is permissible to claim that this ḥadīth is not from the authentic aḥādīth without any proof then it will be permissible to reject all of the narrations of the Sunnī which condemn the Ṣaḥābah by merely claiming that they are unauthentic. The author of *Istiqṣā' al-Aḥḥām* has accepted the authenticity of this ḥadīth and interpreted the words of Dildār 'Alī in the following words:

غرض اینجناب از انکار معدود بودن این حدیث در احادیث صحاح اینست که این حدیث از جمله احادیث قطعیة الصدور نیست الی قوله کی مراد این جناب یعنی صحت بمعنی قطعی الصدور ست زیرا که از آن مفهوم می شود که اگر این حدیث از جمله احادیث صحیحہ می بود اعتقاد کردن بیان از جمله ضروریات می بود پر ظاهر ست که این لازم نمی آید مگر بعد صحت قطعیة الصدور

Dildār 'Alī's rejection of this ḥadīth with the words, "This ḥadīth is not from the authentic books," shows that his objective is that this ḥadīth is not from among those aḥādīth which are *qaṭ'ī al-ṣudūr* (definitely spoken by Rasūlullāh ﷺ or the A'immaḥ). The meaning of authentic is for it to be *qaṭ'ī al-ṣudūr*. From this we learn that had this ḥadīth been authentic, it would have been necessary to believe likewise. This is only necessary when a ḥadīth is *qaṭ'ī al-ṣudūr*.

Hāmid Ḥusayn could not establish Dildār 'Alī's answer as correct by this explanation. In fact, he further supported and substantiated our stance because he says:

اگر این حدیث از جمله احادیث صحیحہ می بود اعتقاد کردن بآن از جمله ضروریات می بود پر ظاہر ست کہ این لازم نمی آید مگر بعد صحت قطعیتہ الصدور

From this we learn that had this ḥadīth been authentic, it would have been necessary to believe likewise. This is only necessary when a ḥadīth is qaṭī al-ṣudūr.

We accept this explanation on condition that they accept this principle in relation to our aḥādīth. It should not be that they utilise weak and fabricated aḥādīth as proof against us whereas they do not accept their own authentic narrations as proof against them due to them “not being qaṭī al-ṣudūr,” i.e. yaqīnī. Nevertheless, we will substantiate this ḥadīth with narrations whose authenticity and reliability are unobjectionable.

وَقُلْنَا يَا آدَمُ اسْكُنْ أَنْتَ وَزَوْجُكَ الْجَنَّةَ وَكُلَا مِنْهَا رَغَدًا حَيْثُ شِئْتُمَا وَلَا تَقْرَبَا هَذِهِ الشَّجَرَةَ فَتَكُونَا مِنَ الظَّالِمِينَ

And We said, “O Adam, dwell, you and your wife, in Paradise and eat therefrom in [ease and] abundance from wherever you will. But do not approach this tree, lest you be among the wrongdoers.”¹

In the commentary of this verse, it is written in *Tafsīr Imām Ḥasan ‘Askarī* that the meaning of tree is the knowledge of Muḥammad and the family of Muḥammad صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى declared it exclusively for them and Ādam ate it, thus being removed from Jannah.

Read this from the pen of Mullā Bāqir al-Majlisī who states in *Hayāt al-Qulūb*:

در تفسیر امام حسن عسکری مذکور ست کہ چون حق تعالی ابلیس را لعنت کرد بیایا کردن او و گرامی داشت ملائکہ را بہ سجده کردن ایشان ایدم علیہ السلام را امر کرد کہ ایدم و حواریا بہشت برند و فرمود کہ یا ایدم ساکن شو تو و جفت تو در بہشت و کلا رغدا حیث شئتما و بخورید از بہشت کشادہ و گوہر جا کہ خوابید بے تعبی و لا تقربا بذہ الشجرۃ و نزدیک مشوید این درخت را کہ درخت علم محمد صلی اللہ علیہ و سلم و ایل محمد ست کہ حق تعالی ایشان را منع کرد ازل کہ نزدیک این درخت شوند کہ مخصوص محمد و ایل محمد صلی اللہ علیہ و سلم ست و کسیہ بامر خدا نمی خورد

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 35.

از آن درخت مگر ایشان الی قوله و حق تعالی فرمود که نزدیک این درخت مروید که خواهید طلب کنید درجه محمد و ال محمد صلی الله علیه و سلم و فضیلت ایشان زیرا که خدا ایشان را مخصوص گردانیده است باین درجه از سایر خلق و این درختیست که هر که از این درخت بخورد باذن خدا تعالی الهام کرده می شود علم اولین و آخرین را بے اینکه از کسی بیاموزد و هر که بے رخصت خدا بخورد از مراد خود نا امید می شود و نافرمانی پروردگار کرده است فتکونا من الظالمین پس خواهد شویدا و ستم گاران بنافرمانی شما و طلب کردن شما درجه را که اختیار کرده است خدا باین درجه غیر شما بر گاهبه قصد کنید این درخت را بغیر حکم خدا الی قوله پس باین سب فریب خورد ادم و غلط کرد و از آن درخت خورد پیش رسید بایشان آنچه خداوند در قرآن ذکر کرده است فالزلهما الشيطان عنها فاخرجهما مما كانا فيه

It appears in the *Tafsīr* of Imām Ḥasan al-‘Askarī that Allah ﷻ cursed Shayṭān due to his rejection and honoured Ādam by commanding the angels to prostrate to him. When Allah entered Ādam and Ḥawā’ into Jannah, He proclaimed, “O Ādam. Live in Jannah with your wife and eat from wherever you like of this spacious Jannah without any hesitation. But do not approach this tree – the tree of the knowledge of Muḥammad and the family of Muḥammad ﷺ.”

Allah ﷻ forbade going close to that tree since it was exclusively from Muḥammad ﷺ and his family. No one besides Ādam and Ḥawā’ ate from that tree. Allah ﷻ commanded not to go close to the tree, i.e. do not desire the status and virtue of the family of Muḥammad ﷺ for this is exclusive to them. The specification of this tree was that whoever eats from it, he is bestowed with the knowledge of everything by the will and permission of Allah ﷻ and he learns everything without being taught. Whoever eats of it without Allah’s permission is unsuccessful and hopeless. And he is from the oppressors because he disobeyed Allah and intended to reach that status which is above his. When Ādam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام and Ḥawā’ intended to eat from the tree without Allah’s permission, and went close to it and ate from it thus committing a mistake, then Allah removed them from Jannah.

فَأَزَلَّهُمَا الشَّيْطَانُ عَنْهَا فَأَخْرَجَهُمَا مِمَّا كَانَا فِيهِ

But Satan caused them to slip out of it and removed them from that [condition] in which they had been.¹

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 36.

It is proven from this ḥadīth that the tree from which Ādam and Ḥawā' were prevented from eating was the tree of the knowledge of Muḥammad and the family of Muḥammad ﷺ which when eaten, the knowledge of all is acquired without learning. Due to eating from this tree, Ādam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام and Ḥawā' عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام were removed from Jannah. This much is proven that due to Shayṭān's misguidance, Ādam and Ḥawā' ate from the tree due to which they fell into a calamity. Another ḥadīth which is narrated with a reliable sanad from Imām 'Alī al-Naqī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ states that the tree which Allah ﷻ prohibited was jealousy which Sayyidunā Ādam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام ate from intentionally, i.e. he was jealous of the A'imma. Al-Majlisī states in *Hayāt al-Qulūb*:

بِسند معتبر از حضرت امام علی نقی منقول است که در ختیکه ادم و زوجه اش را نهی کرد از خوردن ازان درخت حسد بود و حق تعالی عهد کرد بسوئے ادم و حوا که نظر نکند بسوئی که حق تعالی اینها را بر ایشان و بر جمیع خلائق فضیلت داده ست بدیده حسد و نیاقت حق تعالی از و درین باب عزم و اہتمام

With a reliable sanad, it is related from Imām 'Alī Naqī that the tree which Ādam and Ḥawā' were prevented from eating was the tree of jealousy. Allah prohibited them from looking at the tree since the family of Muḥammad ﷺ have been given superiority over the entire creation so no one should be jealous of them. Allah did not see determination and resolution in Ādam and Ḥawā' to fulfil this command.¹

This ḥadīth does not state that Sayyidunā Ādam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام ate from the tree of jealousy, i.e. he looked at the A'imma with the eyes of jealousy and did not fulfil the divine command, due to Shayṭān's misguidance. Rather, it states that Ādam and Ḥawā' had no resolution and determination to fulfil this command, i.e. they did not bother of the command of Allah. This is clearly stated by the words:

حق تعالی از و درین باب عزم و اہتمام

Allah did not see determination and resolution in Ādam and Ḥawā' to fulfil this command.

1 Urdu translation of *Hāyāt al-Qulūb* vol. 1 pg. 92.

Most probably, it will appear to some that Sayyidunā Ādam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ forgot the divine command and thus acted contrary to it just as some Shī'ī Mufasssīrīn have written. However, with a reliable sanad from Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ, it is stated that Sayyidunā Ādam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ did not forget Allah's command and transgressed the prohibition nonetheless. Al-Majlisī states in *Hayāt al-Qulūb*:

بسنند معتبر مروی ست که از امام محمد باقر پر سید نداز تفسیر قول خدا فنسی و لم نجد له عزما که جمعه تفسیر کرده اند که حضرت ادم فراموش کرد نهی خدا حضرت فرمود که فراموش نه کرده بود و حال آنکه در وقت وسوسه کردن شیطان نهی خدا را بیاد ایشاں آورد و می گفت که خدا شمارا برائے این نهی کرده است که ملک نباشیده و در بهشت بهمیشه نباشید پس نسیان درینجا بمعنی ترک ست بمعنی ترک کرد امر خدا را

In a reliable narration from Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir, it appears that people asked clarification of the verse,

“But he forgot; and We found not in him determination.”¹

People say that the meaning is that he forgot the prohibition of Allah. In answer to this, Imām al-Bāqir said, “He did not forget. How could he have forgotten whereas when Shayṭān whispered to him, he reminded him of Allah's prohibition by saying, ‘Allah prohibited you from going close to this tree so that you do not become an angel and live in Jannah for ever.’? So the meaning of ‘forgot’ in this context is discarded, i.e. Ādam discarded the divine command.²

This proves that Sayyidunā Ādam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ intentionally broke Allah's command and although Shayṭān reminded him of the prohibition, he did not bother. And why would he bother? When he saw the lofty status of the A'imma, his jealousy erupted – May Allah forbid – and he forgot his religion and his world. Desire for their status made him so hopeless and helpless – May Allah forbid – that he did not make a resolution otherwise.

1 Sūrah Ṭāhā: 115.

2 Urdu translation of *Hāyāt al-Qulūb* vol. 1 pg. 92.

Listen to a ḥadīth of Imām Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq رَحِمَهُ اللهُ regarding the jealousy he had for the status of the A‘immah. Mulla Bāqir al-Majlisī has narrated a ḥadīth from Imām Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq رَحِمَهُ اللهُ in *Hayāt al-Qulūb* with a reliable sanad that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى granted the souls of the pure five and the rest of the A‘immah the loftiest status and presented them to all the inhabitants of the heavens and earth declaring, “These are My friends and proofs upon the creation. Whoever claims their position, I will punish him as I never punished any creation and fling him into Jahannam with the mushrikīn whereas whoever acknowledges their wilāyah and Imāmah, I will grant him place in Jannah. Their wilāyah is a trust upon the creation. Which of you will accept it?”

The heavens, earth and mountains declined from accepting it fearing the majesty of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. When Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى entered Ādam and Ḥawā’ into Jannah and they saw the status of the A‘immah, they asked, “Who enjoys this status?”

Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى replied, “Look at the ‘Arsh’s leg.”

When they looked at the ‘Arsh, they saw the names of Muḥammad صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, ‘Alī, Fāṭimah, Ḥasanayn, and the A‘immah and said surprisingly, “They are very beloved to You and honoured in Your sight.”

Allah warned, “Do not look at them with the eyes of jealousy and do not desire their position in My eyes nor hope for the lofty and honoured rank they enjoy. Otherwise you will disobey Me and become of the oppressors.”

Ādam and Ḥawā’ enquired, “Who are the oppressors?”

“Those who unjustly claim their status,” came the reply.

Thereupon, Ādam and Ḥawā’ requested Allah to show them the place He prepared for the oppressors in Jahannam. Allah commanded Jahannam and it showed them all the various forms of punishments and tortures that were prepared for the oppressors. They will be in the deepest part of Jahannam and will want to escape, but Jahannam will pull them back. Their skins will be burnt and they will be given new skins so that they do not get any comfort from the punishment.

After showing them this, Allah stated, “O Ādam and Ḥawā’! Do not look at My lights and proofs, i.e. the A’immah, with the eyes of jealousy, or else I will remove you from My proximity and humiliate you.”

Shayṭān whispered to them and misled them to desire their status. Thus, they looked with the eyes of jealousy at them due to which Allah released Shayṭān upon them and removed His help and friendship from them.¹

This is the gist of the lengthy narration we reproduce in the footnotes². Where are the eyes to see and the ears to hear this narration? Where are the hearts that

1 Urdu translation of *Hāyāt al-Qulūb* vol. 1 pg. 94, 95, 96.

۲ و بسند معتبر دیگر از آنحضرت منقول ست کہ حق تعالی خلق کرد روحها پیش از بدنها بد و ہزار سال پس گرانید بلند تر و شریف تر از ہمہ روحها روح محمد صلی اللہ علیہ و سلم و علی و فاطمہ و حسن و حسین و امامان بعد ازین شان صلوات اللہ علیہم اجمعین را پس عرض نمود ارواح ایشان را بر اسمانہا و زمینہا و کوبہا پس نور ایشان ہمہ را فر و گرفت پس حق تعالی فرمود باسمانہا و زمین و کوبہا کہ ایہاں دوستان و اولیا و حجتہا من اند بر خلق من و پیشوایان خلائق من اند فریدم مخلوقہ را کہ دوست تدرام از ایشان از برائے ایشان و ہر کہ ایشان را دوست دارد افریدہ ام بہشت خود را برائے او و ہر کہ مخالفت و دشمنی کند بایشان افریدہ ام ایش چہنم را برائے او پس ہر کہ دعوی کند منزلت را کہ ایشان نزد من دارند و محلے کہ ایشان از عظمت من دارند عذاب کنم اورا عذایے کہ عذاب نکرده باشم یان احدے از عالمیان را و اورا بایہا کہ شرک بمن اوردہ اند پائین ترین درکپای چہنم جاہم و ہر کہ اقرار بولایت و امامت ایشان بکند و ادعاکنند منزلت ایشان را نزد من و مکان ایشان را از عظمت من جادہم اورا بایشان در باغہای بہشت خود و از برائے ایشان باشد در بہشت آنچه خواہند نزد من و مباح گردانم از برائے ایشان کرامت خود را و در جوار خود ایشان را جادہم و شفیع گردانیم ایشان را در گناگنارانی از بندگان و کنیزان من پس ولایت ایشان امانتی ست نزد خلق من پس کدام یک از شما برمی دارد این امانت را سنجینے این و دعوی می کند این مرتبہ را کہ ازوست و از بر گردید بایے خلق من ست پس ابا کرند اسمانہا و زمینہا و کوبہا از اینکہ این امانت را بردارند و ترسیدند از عظمت پروردگار خود کہ چنین منزلت را بنا حق دعوی کند و چنین حیل بزرگی برای خود ایزو کند پس چون حق تعالی ادم و حوا را در بہشت ساکن گردانید گفت بخورید ازین بہشت بسیار و گو از ہر جا کہ خواہید و نزدیک این درخت مروید یعنی درخت گندم پس خواہید بود از ستم گاران پس نظر کردند بسوے منزلت محمد صلی اللہ علیہ و سلم و علی و فاطمہ و حسن و حسین و امامن بعد از ایشان پس منزلتہائے ایشان را در بہشت بہترین منزلتہا یافتند پس گفتند پروردگارا این منزلت از برائے کیست حق تعالی فرمود کہ بلند کنید سرہای خود را بسوے ساق عرش من پس سر بالا کردند و دیدند نام محمد صلی اللہ علیہ و سلم و علی و فاطمہ و حسن و حسین و امامان بعد ازین شان صلوات الہ علیہم را کہ بر ساق عرش نوشته بود بنوری از نور خداوند جبار پس گفتند پروردگار راچہ بسیار گرامی اند این منزلت بر تو چہ بسیار محبوبند نزد تو و چہ بسیار شریف و بزرگ اند در درگاہ تو پس خدا فرمود کہ اگر ایشان نمی بودند من شماپارا خلق نمی کردم ایشان خزینہ داران علم مند و امتیاز مند بر رازیہا من زنیار کہ نظر مکتبہ بسوی ایشان بدیدہ حسد و ایزو مکتبہ منزلت ایشان رانزو من و محل ایشان از کرامت من پس بایں سب داخل خواہید شد در نہی و نافرمانی من پس از ستم گاران خواہید بود گفتند پروردگار را کیستند ستم گاران و ظالمان فرمود کہ اینہا کہ ادعاے منزلت ایشان می کند بنا حق گفتند پروردگار را پس ہنما منزلتہائے ظالمان ایشان را در ایش چہنم تا بہ بنیم منزلتہائے اینہا را چنانچہ منزلتہائے این بزرگواران را در بہشت دیدیم پس حق تعالی امر کرد ایش را کہ ظاہر گردانید جمیع آنچه در این بود از انواع شد تہاد و عذابہاد فرمود کہ جای ظالمان ایشان کہ ادعاے منزلت نمایند در پائین درکات این چہنم ست ہر چند ارادہ کند کہ بریوں ایند از چہنم ہر گرداند ایشان را بسوے این و ہر چہ بختہ و سوختہ شود پوستہای ایشان بدل کند ایشان را پوستہای غیر اینہا کہ تاجشند عذاب را اے ادم و اے حوا نظر نکند بسوی نور ہنما و حجتہای من بدیدہ حسد پس شما را پائین می فرستم از جوار خود و بر شما می فرستم خوری خود را پس وسوسہ کرد ایشان را شیطان تا ظاہر گرداند برائے ایشان اینچہ پوشیدہ بود از ایشان از عورتہای ایشان و گفت نہی نکرده اشت شما را پروردگار شما از این درخت مگر برائے اینکہ نخواست کہ شما در ملک باشید یا ہمیشہ در بہشت باشید و سو کند یاد کرد کہ من از خیر خواہا ہستم پس ایشان را فریب داد و بریں داشت کہ ارموے منزلت اینہا بکنید پس نظر کردند بسوے ایشان بدیدندہ حسد پس بایں سب خدا ایشان را بخود گراشت و باری و توفیق خود را از ایشان برداشت (حیات القلوب جلد اول صفحہ ۴۹ و ۵۰)

will ponder over it? Notwithstanding the fact that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى warned Ādam and Ḥawā' of the evil consequences of desiring the status of the pure five and A'imma and displayed to them the punishments that are stored for them and advised them sincerely, Ādam and Ḥawā' did not listen and harboured jealousy. Notwithstanding such a narration which proves that Sayyidunā Ādam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ and Ḥawā' عَلَيْهَا السَّلَامُ committed a major sin the punishment of which is burning in the lowest depths of Jahannam with the mushrikīn, the Shī'ah claim that the Ambiyā' and infallible and protected from both major and minor sins. They not only make this claim but declare:

در باب عصمت انبیاء آنچه امامه مبالغه می دارند هیچ یک از فرق اهل اسلام این قدر ندارد

In the matter of the infallibility of the Ambiyā', the overemphasis the Shī'ah observe is not displayed by any other sect of Islam.

If this is infallibility and this is the type of overemphasis the Shī'ah observe, then they are truthful. May Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى protect the poor Sunnī from being upholders of the infallibility of the Ambiyā' to this extent that behind this guise, they accuse them of harbouring jealousy for the A'imma and being the inhabitants of the lowest depths of Jahannam!

Listen to another ḥadīth which supports the jealousy of Ādam and Ḥawā' عَلَيْهَا السَّلَامُ and gives the final decision from the Imām's tongue as to which tree Ādam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ ate from. Mulla Bāqir al-Majlisī writes in *Hayāt al-Qulūb*:

بسنده معتبر منقول است که ابو صلت بروی از امام رضا پر سید که یا این رسول الله مرا خبرده ازان درختی که ادم و حوا ازان درخت خوردند چه درخت بود بدرستی که مردم اختلاف کردند بعضی روایت کردند که این گندم بود و بعضی روایت کردند که این درخت حسد بود فرمود که همه حق است ابو صلت گنت چگونه همه حق است باین همه اختلاف فرمود که ای ابو صلت درخت بهشت انواع میوای برمی دارد پس این درخت گندم بود و دران انگور هم بود و اینها مثل درختان دنیا نیستند و بدرستی که چون خدا گرامی داشت و ملائکه او را سجده کردند او را داخل بهشت گردانید در خاطر خود گزرانید که ایا خلق کرده ست خدا بشریکی بهتر از من باشد چون خدا دانست که چه در خاطر او گزشت ندا کرد او را که سر بلند کن اے ادم و نظر کن بسوی ساق عرش من چون ادم سر بلند کرد دید که در ساق عرش نوشته ست که لا اله الا الله محمد رسول الله علی بن ابی طالب امیر المؤمنین و زوجته فاطمة سیده نساء العالمین و الحسن و الحسين سیدا شباب

اہل الجنة اِدم گفت پوردگار کیستند اینها حق تعالی فرمود کہ ایہاں ذریت تو اند و ایشاں بہتر انداز تو و اجمع افریدہای من و اگر ایشاں نمی بودند نہ تر خلق میکردم نہ بہشت و دوزخ و نہ ایسا و زمین پس زہار نظر حسد بسوی ایشاں مکن کہ ترا از جوار خود بیرون کنم پس نظر کرد بسوی اینها بدیدہ حسد و ایزوی منزلت ایشاں کرد پس مسلط شد شیطان بر او تا خورد از میوہ کہ او را از ایشاں نہی کردہ بودند و مسلط شد بر حوا تا نظر کرد بسوی فاطمہ بدیدہ حسد تا خورد از ایشاں چنانچہ اِدم خورد پس خدا ایشاں را از بہشت بیرون کرد و از جوار خود بز میں فرستاد ۱

Abū Ṣalt al-Harawī asked Imām al-Riḍā, “O son of Rasūlullāh ﷺ Tell me from which tree Ādam and Ḥawā’ ate. People have differences of opinion regarding it. Some say it was the wheat plant and others say it was the tree of jealousy.”

The Imām answered, “All are correct.”

Abū Ṣalt asked how all could be correct with the differences to which the Imām answered, “O Abū Ṣalt. The trees of Jannah bear different fruits. And although that tree was wheat, there were grapes on it too. The trees of Jannah are unlike the trees of this world. Allah honoured Ādam; the angels prostrated to him and he lived in Jannah. He thought to himself whether Allah ﷻ created anyone superior to him. Knowing what was in his heart, Allah commanded him, ‘O Ādam, lift your gaze and look at the leg of the ‘Arsh.’ He acted accordingly and it was written:

لا اله الا الله محمد رسول الله على ولى الله امير المؤمنين و زوجته فاطمة سيدة نساء العالمين و الحسن و الحسين سيدا شباب اهل الجنة

There is no deity but Allah. Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allah. ‘Alī is the walī of Allah and Amīr al-Mu’minīn. His wife Fāṭimah is the Queen of the women of the world. Ḥasan and Ḥusayn are the leaders of the youth of Jannah.

Seeing this he asked, ‘O Allah, who are they?’

Allah ﷻ replied, ‘They are your offspring and they are superior to you and all My other creations. Had they not been, I would not have created

1 Urdu translation of *Ḥayāt al-Qulūb* vol. 1 pg. 97.

you, Jannah, Jahannam, the earth, and skies. Remember! Do not even obliviously harbour jealousy for them otherwise I will remove you from My proximity.'

In short, Ādam looked at their status and lofty position with the eyes of jealousy and Shayṭān overpowered him and fed him the forbidden fruit. Moreover, Shayṭān overpowered Ḥawā' and made her jealous of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها and she ate from the same tree of jealousy Ādam ate from due to which Allah punished them by removing them from Jannah and His proximity and sending them to the world."

Dildār 'Alī's answered that jealousy here means envy which is not reprehensible but he himself is not convinced by this, hence he says:

چرا جائز نباشد که حسد ادم ازین قبیل بوده باشد و چگونه چنین نباشد

Why is not possible to take Ādam's jealousy in this meaning?

Even if he had conviction that this interpretation was correct, the words and context of the ḥadīth do not support it. It cannot be understood to be envy. It is definitely jealousy which is reprehensible since Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى warned him about it and threatened him that if he desires their status, he will be among the oppressors. Then too, Ādam was jealous and was punished. Did Dildār 'Alī not see the stern warning apparent from the words:

فاياك ان تنظر اليهم بعين الحسد فاخرجتك عن جوارى و القيا فتدخلا من ذلك فى نهى و عصبانى فتكونا
من الظالمين

Beware of looking at them with the eyes of jealousy, or I will remove you from My proximity and you will disobey Me thus becoming of the oppressors.

The sin for which there was such a severe warning which he perpetrated and was punished for by getting removed from Jannah as is apparent from the words:

فَنظَرَ إِلَيْهِمْ بِعَيْنِ الْحَسَدِ وَتَمَنَّى مِثْلَهُمْ فَسَلَطَ عَلَيْهِمُ الشَّيْطَانُ فَنظَرَ إِلَيْهِمْ بِعَيْنِ الْحَسَدِ فَخَذَلَا لِذَلِكَ

He looked at them with the eyes of jealousy and desired their status, thus Shayṭān was let loose upon them. He looked at them with the eyes of jealousy and was humiliated due to this.

If this ‘jealousy’ was permissible and in the meaning of envy, then why would he be of the oppressors? Why would Allah remove him from His proximity and Jannah for doing a permissible action?

This is further supported by a ḥadīth whose authenticity is undeniable which states that Allah wanted to take the pledge of the wilāyah of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and the A’immah from Sayyidunā Ādam but he did not, in fact he did not intend to. Ibn Bābawayh writes in chapter 101 of ‘*Ilal al-Sharā’i*’:

العلة التي من اجلها سمي اولوا العزم اولى العزم حدثنا ابي عن سعد بن عبد الله بن احمد بن محمد بن عيسى بن علي بن الحكم عن مفضل بن صالح عن جابر بن يزيد عن ابي جعفر في قول الله عز وجل وَلَقَدْ عٰهَدْنَا اِلٰى اٰدَمَ مِنْ قَبْلُ فَنَسِيَ وَلَمْ نَجِدْ لَهُ عَزْمًا قَالَ عٰهَد اليه في محمد و الائمة من بعده فترك و لم يكن له عزم فيهم انه هكذا و انما سمي اولوا العزم لانهم عاهد اليهم محمد و اله و اوصياء من بعده و المهدي و سيرته فاجمع عزمهم ان ذلك كل و الاقرار به

The reason why the ulū al-‘azm are called ulū al-‘azm. My father narrated to me from Sa’d ibn ‘Abd Allah ibn Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad ibn ‘Īsā ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥakam from Mufaḍḍal ibn Šālīḥ from Jābir ibn Yazīd from Abū Ja’far concerning Allah’s ﷺ statement:

وَلَقَدْ عٰهَدْنَا اِلٰى اٰدَمَ مِنْ قَبْلُ فَنَسِيَ وَلَمْ نَجِدْ لَهُ عَزْمًا

And We had already taken a promise from Adam before, but he forgot; and We found not in him determination.¹

He said, “Allah took a promise from him regarding Muḥammad and the A’immah after him, but he denied and did not intend to. They were called

1 Sūrah Ṭāhā: 115.

the ulū al-‘azm since Allah took a pledge from them of Muḥammad, his family, the Aṣṣiyā’ after him, and al-Mahdī and his sīrah, and they all made a determination and assurance.”

When such types of aḥādīth regarding the Ambiyā’ are found in reliable Shī’ī books and yet they believe in the infallibility of the Ambiyā’ and claim that these aḥādīth are “not qaṭ’ī al-ṣudūr” and interpret them, then it is not fair for them to use absolutely weak narrations from our books which tarnish the image of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم. Why should they not accept our answers and interpretations which are stronger, more convincing, and more substantiated than theirs? The truth is that the Shī’ah in order to amplify this matter of Imāmah, were forced to mention such aḥādīth which equates Imāmah to nubuwwah whether the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم were labelled as infidels or the Ambiyā’ were vilified.

I will not mention any other narrations regarding the Ambiyā’ in this discussion. I will present a sample of the allegations cast against the Ahl al-Bayt due to the matter of Imāmah.

One of the beliefs of the Shī’ah is that one who claims Imāmah or rejects it is an infidel, whether he be an ‘alawī or fāṭimī. Rejection of Imāmah is sufficient for kufr. History bears testimony to the fact that after the martyrdom of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه, no Imām passed in whose era one of his brothers or family members did not claim Imāmah or regard Imāmah to be specific to someone and there has always been some fight between the Imām and those who claim it. We will prove this from the beginning, i.e. the era of Imām Zayn al-‘Ābidīn رضي الله عنه.

After the martyrdom of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه, Imām Zayn al-‘Ābidīn رضي الله عنه is accepted as the Imām. However, Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah – the uncle of Imām Zayn al-‘Ābidīn رضي الله عنه – has declared himself worthy of Imāmah and told Imām Zayn al-‘Ābidīn رضي الله عنه, “I am more worthy of Imāmah than you. So do not argue with me in this regard and accept me as a waṣī and Imām.” This incident between Imām Zayn al-‘Ābidīn رضي الله عنه and Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah رضي الله عنه is recorded in Kitāb al-Ḥujjah of *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* in the following words:

عن ابي جعفر قال لما قتل الحسين ارسل محمد بن الحنفية الى على بن الحسين فخلا به فقال له يا ابن اخي قد علمت ان رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم دفع الوصية و الامامة من بعده الى امير المؤمنين ثم الى الحسن ثم الى الحسين و قد قتل ابوك و صلى عليه روحه و لم يوص و انى عمك و صنو ابيك و ولادتي من على فى سنى و قديمى احق بها منك فى حادثتك فلا تنازعنى فى الوصية و الامامة و لا تحاجنى

Abū Ja'far reports, "When Ḥusayn was martyred, Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah sent for 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn and met with him in privacy. He said to him, 'O my nephew! You know well that Rasūlullāh ﷺ gave al-Waṣīyyah and al-Imāmah after him to Amīr al-Mu'minīn, then to Ḥasan, and then to Ḥusayn. Your father has been killed – May Allah's ﷻ salutations be upon his soul – and has not made any bequest. I am your uncle and equal to your father. Me being the son of 'Alī, older in age, and more experienced makes me more worthy of Imāmah than you who are tender in age. So do not argue and contest with me in al-Waṣīyyah and al-Imāmah."

فقال له على بن الحسين يا عم اتق الله و لا تدع ما ليس لك بحق انى اعظك ان تكون من الجاهلين ان ابنى يا عم صلوة الله عليه اوصى الى قبل ان يتوجه الى العراق و عهد الى قبل ان يستشهد بساعة و هذا سلاح رسول الله صلى الله عليه و اله عندى فلا تتعرض لهذا فانى اخاف عليك نقص العمر و تشتت الحال ان الله جعل الوصية و الامامة فى عقب الحسين فاذا اردت ان تعلم ذلك فانطلق بنا الى الحجر الاسود حتى نتحاكموا اليه و نساله عن ذلك قال ابو جعفر و كان الكلام بينهما بمكة

'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn told him, "O uncle, fear Allah and do not claim that which you have no right over. I advise you from becoming of the ignorant. My father – May Allah's ﷻ salutations be upon him – bequeathed to me before proceeding to Iraq and took a pledge from me – minutes before being martyred. The weapons of Rasūlullāh ﷺ are by me (which is a sign). So do not advance for this. I fear that Allah will reduce your lifespan and disturb your affairs. Allah ﷻ has kept al-Waṣīyyah and al-imāmah in the progeny of Ḥusayn. If you wish to ascertain this, then let us go to *al-Ḥajar al-Aswad* (the black stone) and ask it and make it decide in this matter."

Abū Ja'far says that there dialogue took place in Makkah.

فانطلقا حتى اتيا الحجر الاسود فقال علي بن الحسين لمحمد بن الحنفية ابدا انت فابتهل الى الله عز و
 جل فساله ان ينطق لك الحجر فابتهل محمد في الدعاء و سال الله ثم دعا الحجر فلم يجبه فقال علي بن
 الحسين يا عم لو كنت وصيا و اماما لاجابك فقال له محمد فادع الله انت يا بن اخي و اساله فدعا الله
 علي بن الحسين لما اراد ثم قال اسالك بالذي جعل فيك ميثاق الانبياء و ميثاق الاوصياء و ميثاق الناس
 اجمعين لما اخبرتنا من الوصي و الامام بعد الحسين بن علي قال فتحرك الحجر حتى كاد ان يزول عن
 موضعه ثم انطقه الله بلسان عربي مبين يقال اللهم ان الوصية و الامامة بعد الحسين بن علي و فاطمة بنت
 رسول الله صلى الله عليه و اله لك قال فانصرف محمد بن علي و هو يتولى علي بن الحسين

They walked until they reached al-Ḥajar al-Aswad. ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn said to Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyah, “Begin and implore Allah and beg Him to make al-Ḥajar speak to you.”

Muḥammad began imploring and begging Allah in du‘ā’. He then called al-Ḥajar but it did not respond. ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn commented, “Uncle, had you been the waṣī and Imām, it would have responded to you. Muḥammad then told him, “Now you supplicate to Allah, O nephew and ask Him.”

Thus ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn implored Allah for what he wanted and then said to it, “I ask you by the Being Who has placed in you the pledge of the Ambiyā’, Awṣiyā’, and the entire mankind to inform us as to who is the waṣī and Imām after Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī.”

The stone began shaking violently to the extent it almost moved from its place. Then Allah made it speak in clear Arabic, “O Allah. Indeed al-Waṣīyah and al-Imāmah after Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī wa Fāṭimah bint Rasūlullāh ﷺ is for you.” Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī walked away and regarded ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn as his Imām.¹

The least that comes out from this ḥadīth is that Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyah claimed Imāmah which is sufficient to label him as kāfir. If he thereafter regarded Imām Zayn al-‘Ābidīn as the Imām, then he repented from his kufr. However, there is no doubt that he remained murtad for a few days.

1 Uṣūl al-Kāfi pg. 218; Shāfi vol. 2 pg. 314 Urdu translation of Uṣūl al-Kāfi.

Now listen to the story of Zayd al-Shahīd رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. It appears in Kitāb al-Ḥujjah of *al-Ṣāfi* the commentary of *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* – the work of Mulla Khalīl on page 22; Abū Ja'far Muḥammad ibn Nu'mān relates, “Sayyidunā Zayd ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn called for me. It was a time when Zayd was in hiding. I went to Zayd who asked me, ‘If anyone of us rebels, will you join him?’

I replied, ‘If your father, i.e. Imām Zayn al-‘Ābidīn, or your brother, Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir, rebels, then I will join them.’

Zayd thereupon said, ‘I wish to rebel against Hishām ibn ‘Abd al-Malik the khalīfah of the Banū Umayyah, so join me.’

I replied by saying, ‘I cannot do so. The reason for this is that if the Imām – whose obedience is compulsory – is present on earth and alive, then those who do not join you will be saved and those who do will be doomed.’”

Mullā Khalīl writes in the commentary of this ḥadīth:

بنا بر این شق ظاهرست فسق زید و تابعان او دران خروج که مبنیست بر مذہب ظاہر الفساد او کہ باداطمی بودن
اجتہاد و خروج بہ سیف را شرط امامت می شمرده

Zayd’s transgression and his rebellion against Hishām ibn ‘Abd al-Malik was such a grave sin according to the Shī‘ah leaders that those who join him will be doomed and those who were martyred alongside him – according to Shī‘ah principles – are sinful and doomed. The only reason for this is that Zayd rebelled and claimed Imāmah whereas he was not the infallible Imām whose obedience is compulsory. His cult was false according to the Shī‘ah. He did not believe that being a Fatimid was the only condition for Imāmah. He believed that *ijtihād* and *jihād* were necessary as well.

I do not understand how the Shī‘ah label this son of Sayyidunā Zayn al-‘Ābidīn who rebelled against the Banū Umayyah and attained martyrdom as a *fāsiq* and *kāfir* due to his claim of Imāmah. I cannot fathom how they claim to understand

the conditions of Imāmah better than him. If in reality, belief in Imāmah was necessary which Zayd did not understand and it is one of the fundamentals which Sayyidunā Zayn al-‘Ābidīn did not inform his son of, and it is for this reason that Zayd said surprisingly after hearing al-Aḥwal, “O Abū Ja‘far. My father loved me so much that when we would eat together, he would wait for the morsel to cool down before feeding it to me so that I am not harmed by the hot morsel. So would he not have saved me from the Fire of Jahannam? Would he have informed you of that which brings salvation in the Ākhirah and not informed me?” By saying this, Sayyidunā Zayd رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ wished to belie al-Aḥwal and falsify the principles of Imāmah as believed by the Shī‘ah.

Listen to the response given to Zayd by al-Aḥwal, “Your father did not inform of it for he feared that if you did not believe him, you will enter Jahannam and he informed me because if I did not believe, then what worry does he have if I go to Jahannam?”

After reading this narration of *al-Kāfi* which is the most reliable ḥadīth book of the Shī‘ah and whose authenticity is second to the Qur’ān, one will be totally flabbergasted at how could the Imām make his one son the Imām and his Waṣī and declare him as infallible and his obedience as compulsory and command others to obey him and explain to them the principles of Imāmah while he not only deprives the other son of these and inheritance, but does not inform him of Imāmah, and does not make him aware of the Imām and Waṣī after him. He left him in the darkness and made no efforts to prevent him from falling into misguidance. The result of this was that one brother did not recognise the rights of the other and did not bother about it and claimed Imāmah thus becoming a kāfir and deserving of remaining in Hell forever.

The Shī‘ah believe such narrations, accept these principles, regard the real brothers of the A‘immah to be ignorant of the principles of Imāmah, and regard the Imām to practice Taqīyah from his own son. They object against the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ due to khilāfah and non-acceptance of Imāmah whereas Imām Zayn al-

‘Ābidīn did not tell his own son – the coolness of his eyes – about the same and did not explain to him its uṣūl and did not advise him to obey the Imām after him. The result of this is that he himself claimed Imāmah, rebelled and was killed; and according to the Shī‘ah doomed and suicidal. What is farfetched if such people label the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم as infidels due to rejection of Imāmah?

No one should think that this was the belief of only Abū Ja‘far al-Aḥwal that Zayd was a fāsiq. This was the belief of Imām Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq رضي الله عنه according to them. When al-Aḥwal informed Imām Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq رضي الله عنه of his meeting and discussion with Zayd, the latter praised the former saying, “You caught Zayd properly and left no room for him to escape.” This shows that according to Imām Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq رضي الله عنه, Zayd’s rebellion was impermissible and his comrades were doomed for Jahannam. May Allah forbid!

Mulla Khalīl writes in Kitāb al-Ḥujjah of *al-Ṣāfi*, the commentary of *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* in the translation of the ḥadīth that al-Aḥwal said:

پس حج کردم پس حکایت کردم امام جعفر صادق را بسخن زید و آنچه گفته اورا پس گفت مرا گرفتی اورا از پیش او و از پس او و از جانب دست راست او و از جانب دست چپ او و از بالا نه سر او و از زیر قدمپای او و نگذاشتی برآه او و بیه یان راه رود

I then went for ḥajj and related to Imām Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq the discussion I had with Zayd ibn Imām Zayn al-‘Ābidīn. Imām Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq said to me on hearing this, “You chained him from all sides – top, bottom, right and left – and left no room for him to escape.”

This dialogue between Sayyidunā Zayd رضي الله عنه and al-Aḥwal took place after the demise of Zayd’s father Sayyidunā Zayn al-‘Ābidīn and his brother Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir. At that time, Imām Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq sat on the thrown of Imāmah. Hence, Mullā Khalīl writes in *al-Ṣāfi*:

احول ذکر امام محمد جعفر صادق نکرد و بفرض پدر و برادر اکتفا کرد برای تقیه و خوف افشا چه بر امام رفته گرفت گیرے نیست و خروج زید در صدر و بست و یک بجزی و ده و انتقال امام محمد باقر از دار دنیا در صد و چهارده بجزی بوده

Abū Ja'far al-Aḥwal only mentioned his father and brother. He did not mention Imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq out of secrecy and Taqiyyah. This is because it is impermissible to take a deceased Imām to task in any way. Zayd rebelled in 121 A.H and Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir passed away in 114 A.H.

This only proves that Zayd rejected the Imāmah of Imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Another narration however mentions that Sayyidunā Zayd رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ also rejected the Imāmah of his brother Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and he did not possess the conditions of Imāmah according to him. Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ did not hide this but got angry and said it on his face. It is recorded in *al-Kāfi* that Sayyidunā Zayd came to his brother Sayyidunā Muḥammad al-Bāqir and there were few letters from the people of Kūfah requesting him to come to Kūfah, for an army had been prepared to rebel against the Banū Umayyah. Sayyidunā Muḥammad al-Bāqir رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ said, “These letters are the introduction of our recognition from the people of Kūfah of our rights, our relationship to Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and friendship with him and the compulsion of our obedience as found in the Qur’ān.” He also mentioned, “Obeidience to only one of the relatives of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ is compulsory. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى commands him with ṣabr and Taqiyyah when the enemy are in authority. From after Imām Ḥusayn, all the Imāms till Imām Maḥdī have been commanded to adopt ṣabr. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى has stipulated a time for them. Ṣabr is compulsory until the promised Maḥdī comes.”

Sayyidunā Muḥammad al-Bāqir رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ told Sayyidunā Zayd رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ:

پس باید که سبک عقل نکند البته ترا این جمعی که یقین بر بوییت رب العالمین ندارند و بدر ستیکه ایشان اصلا فائده نمی رساند در دفع از تو عذای را از جانب الله تعالی که در قیامت باشند بر آنی که اگر امام نبودی چرا خروج کردی پس پیش از وقت کاره را مکن و پیش گیری مکن در حکم بجیزه الله تعالی را که عاجز کند ترا محنت پس بیند ازد ترا

Those people are brainwashing you who do not have conviction in the oneness of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and they will not be able to avert the punishment of Allah from you on the Day of Resurrection and they cannot benefit you in any way. When you are not the Imām, then why did you rebel? Do not do anything before its time, do not venture into avenues Allah has made you incapable of and do not humiliate/destroy yourself by exerting yourself.

This shows that Sayyidunā al-Bāqir not only regarded Zayd's intentions as bad, but the invitation of Allah's punishment. He understood his rebellion – while not being the Imām – as a source of disgrace and chastisement on the Day of Qiyāmah. He not only understood this, he emphatically mentioned it to his brother. Hearing this, Sayyidunā Zayd رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ became angry and said, “You are not the Imām but I am because revolting with the sword is one of the conditions of an Imām which I possess and you do not.”

The words of *al-Kāfi* are:

فغضب زيد عند ذلك ثم قال ليس الامام من جلس في بيته و ارخى سترة و تبطا عن الجهاد و لكن الامام من منع حوضه و جاهد في سبيل الله حق جهاده و رفع عن رعيته و ذب عن حريمه

An Imām is not one who sits at home behind veils and runs away from Jihād. Rather, an Imām is one who protects his country from harm and wages jihād in Allah's path as it ought to be waged, who protects his flock, and safeguards his sanctuary.”

Mulla Khalīl commentates on this in the following words:

پس غضب نامک شد زید نزد این اما باینکه تو امام نیستی و من امامم بعد ازاں برائے این کہ خروج بہ سیف یکے از شروط امامت است این در مت ست نہ در تو گفت نیست امام از جمله ما اہل بیت رسول کسیکہ نشستہ خانہ خود و اویخت پردہ خود را و کارہ شد از جہاد و امر بترک جہاد کرد و لیکن امام از ما کسی ست کہ نگرہداری کرد از ضرر مملکت خود را و جہاد کرد در راہ اللہ تعالیٰ و دفع کرد ضررا از رعیت خود و راند ضرر را از نگاہ داشتن خود

Zayd became enraged at Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir and said, “Listen. You are not the Imām but I am because rebelling with the sword is one of the conditions of an Imām which I possess and you do not.” He further said, “That person cannot be an Imām who sits at home behind veils and runs away from Jihād and commands others to do the same. Rather, an Imām is one who protects his country from harm and wages jihād in Allah's path as it ought to be waged, who protects his flock and safeguards his sanctuary.”

Imām al-Bāqir replied:

پس گفت امام محمد باقر ایامی شناسی بعلم یقینی اے برادر من از خودت چیزی را آنچه نسبت دادی نفس خود را بوی آنکه خواص امام باشد پس اوری برای چیز گواہی یقینی را از کتاب اللہ تعالیٰ در ایام گزشته کسے را امام کرده باشد کہ صفات او موافق صفات تو باشد مثل آنکہ جہل باحکام الہی داشتہ باشند و اجتہاد و مثل آنکہ ما دامیکہ خروج بہ سیف نکرده باشد امام نباشد و زمانہ خالی از اما باشد و چون خروج کند امام شود پس لازم آید کہ علی بن الحسین امام نباشند و ایضا رسول علیہ السلام در اوائل رسالت مامور بجہاد نبود و در غار پنهان شد اما نباشد و ایضا مملکت کل روی زمین ست و جہاد کل از رسول واقع نشد و امثال اینہاں در انبیای سابق و اصیای ایشان بسیارست چہ بدرستیکہ اللہ تعالیٰ حلال کردہ جنس حلال راو حرام کردہ جنس حرام راو در محکمات کتاب خود لازم کردہ لازمی چند را وزدہ مثلے چند را برائے ائمہ حق و ائمہ باطل و طریقت خود کردہ در ائمہ حق و باطل طریقے چند را و نگر دانبدہ امامے را کہ ایستادہ ست باہارت اللہ تعالیٰ در شبہ در اینچہ نہی از اختلاف و پیروی ظن ہست چہ دران صریح ست در اینکہ مجتہد امام نیست تا مبادا کہ سبقت گیرد بر اللہ تعالیٰ بکارے پیش ازان جائے تا این کار بجہاد کند راہ او پیش از حلول اہل این جہاد انتہی

O my brother! Do you know with conviction that you possess those qualities of Imāmah which you attribute to yourself? If you do have, then present it from the Qur’ān or Sunnah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ or present an incident of an Imām of the past whom Allah bestowed with the qualities you mention. For example, when being ignorant of the command of Allah, he makes his own ijtihād. Or that until he did not take up arms and rebel, he was not accepted to be an Imām and the seat of Imāmah remained empty. If this is the case, then ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn, i.e. Zayn al-‘Ābidīn, was not an Imām and in the first stages of nubuwwah when Rasūlullāh ﷺ was not commanded to wage jihād and when Rasūlullāh ﷺ hid in the cave then he was not a Rasūl. Remember that the sovereignty of the Imām stretches the whole world and Rasūlullāh ﷺ did not wage full jihād. These types of examples of the past Ambiyā’ and Awsiyā’ are plenty. Allah has declared ḥalāl as ḥalāl and ḥarām as ḥarām and emphatically declared this in the Qur’ān. He provided examples of the true and false A’immah and mentioned their methodologies. Allah has given the Imām His leadership under His supervision. Remember that a mujtahid cannot become an Imām until Allah does not utilise him for some great work and he strives in Allah’s way.¹

1 *Sharḥ Uṣūl al-Kāfi* pg. 449, 450.

After advising him and counselling him he said,

اتريد يا اخي ان تحيى ملة قوم قد كفروا بايات الله و عصوا رسوله و اتبعوا هوائهم بغير هدى من الله و ادعو الخلافة بلا برهان من الله و لا هدى من رسول الله اعينك بالله يا اخي ان تكون هذا المصلوب بالكناسة ثم رفضت عيناه و سالت دموعه ثم قال الله بيننا و بين من هتك سترتنا و جحدنا حقنا و افشى سترتنا و نسبنا الى غير جدنا و قال فينا ما لم نقله في انفسنا

O my brother, do you wish to revive the methods of a nation who belied the verses of Allah, disobeyed His Messenger, followed their whims and fancies without guidance from Allah and claimed khilāfah without a proof from Allah or direction from Rasūlullāh ﷺ. O my brother, I seek Allah's protection from you being crucified at the church. Saying this, tears become to flow from his eyes.

O my brother, Allah will decide between us and the one who disgraces us, deprives us of our rights, reveals our secrets, attributes us to anyone besides our grandfather and ascribes to us what we did not say.

The translation as provided by Mullā Khalīl is as follows:

ایامی خوابی کی تجدید کئی طریقت جمعے را کہ منکر شدند ایات محکومات اللہ تعالیٰ را کہ در انہا نہی از اختلاف و پیروی ظن ہست مراد ابو بکر و عمر و عثمان و ساشر ائمہ ضلالت ست کہ مخالفت رسول اورا و تابع شدند راہبای و اجتہادات خود را بے راہنمائی از جانب اللہ تعالیٰ و دعویٰ کردند خلافت رسول را بے راہنمائی از جانب اللہ تعالیٰ و نہ وصیتے از جانب رسول او پناہ می دہم ترا باللہ تعالیٰ اے برادرم ازاینکہ واقع در روزگار امام محمد باقر نمی شود چہ در روزگار امامت امام جعفر صادق شد بعد از ان اشک داد چشم امام محمد باقر و جاری شد اشکبای او بعد از ان گفت اللہ تعالیٰ قاضی ست میان او و میان جمعے کہ دریدند پردہ مارا بیان شرک ائمہ ضلالت و جمعے کہ براہ ایشان می رونده باشند و منکر دانستہ شدند حق مارا کہ اطاعت باشند خواہ در امر بہ صبر و تقیہ و خواہ در غیر ان وفاش کردند راز مارا کہ دعویٰ امامت باشد و نسبت دادند مارا بغير مرتبہ بزرگی ماہابین معی کہ باعث این شدند کہ در سال صد و چہل ہجری اظہار دولت حق نشود چنانچہ می اید در حدیث اول باب ہشتاد ویکم و گفتند در ما چیزے را کہ نگفتیم در خود اشارت باین ست کہ خیال ایشان این است کہ ما باوجود افشای سر ارادہ خروج داریم و این باعث ازار مامی شود و حال اینکہ ما ارادہ این نداریم تا وقت ظہور مہدی موعود

O my brother, do you wish to revive the methods of a nation (Abū Bakr, 'Umar and 'Uthmān and other misguided leaders) who belied the verses of Allah, disobeyed His Messenger, followed their whims and fancies without guidance from Allah, and claimed khilāfah without a proof from Allah or

direction from Rasūlullāh ﷺ. O brother, seek protection from Allah, when Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir will not be around and Imām Ja'far al-Şādiq will be the Imām.

Thereafter, Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir began weeping and said, "O my brother, Allah will decide between us and the one who disgraced us, supported the leaders of misguidance and shirk, deprived us of our rights in every situation whether we make ṣabr or observe Taqīyyah. They have revealed our secrets, claimed Imāmah, and wish to snatch greatness from us without attaining it themselves." The reason for this is that in 140 A.H there will not be true leadership as appears in the first ḥadīth of chapter 81.

"And attribute to us what we did not say." This indicates that although the secret has been disclosed we are believed to intend rebellion which is the cause of our suffering whereas we do not intend to rebel until the emergence of Imām Mahdī.

What greater proof you want that Sayyidunā Zayd رَحِمَهُ اللهُ ﷺ claimed Imāmah due to which his brother Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir considered him to be deserving of divine punishment on the Day of Qiyyāmah? He believed him to be a reviver of the ways of Abū Bakr, 'Umar, and 'Uthmān and one of the misguided leaders.

Now let us look at what the Shī'ī scholars believe regarding Sayyidunā Zayd رَحِمَهُ اللهُ ﷺ and what do they say about his claim for Imāmah and how do they save him from kufr and fisq notwithstanding his claim. The belief of the Shī'ah in general regarding Sayyidunā Zayd رَحِمَهُ اللهُ ﷺ is good. They accept him as superior after Imām al-Bāqir رَحِمَهُ اللهُ ﷺ and a man of piety and worship. They say regarding his claim for Imāmah that he did not claim for himself but rather for his brother Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir and that his rebellion was not for his Imāmah but for some other reason. Dildār 'Alī while answering *Tuḥfah Ithnā 'Ashariyyah* on the discussion of Zayd's رَحِمَهُ اللهُ ﷺ claim for Imāmah says:

شیخ مفید در ارشاد خود می فرماید که زید بن علی بعد امام باقر افضل برادران و صاحب ورع و عبادت و فقاہت بوده و بہ سخاوت و شجاعت موصوف و خروج بہ شمشیر نموده و امر بہ معروف و نہی از منکر کرد و طلب خون جناب سید

الشهداء می نمود و بسیاری از شیعیان اعتقاد بامامت او داشتند و نشا این اعتقاد اینها این بود که چون دیدند که او خرد به شمشیر نمود و دعوی می کرد بطرف الرضاء من ایل محمد گمان کردند که مراد او ازین صرف نفس خود ست و چینی نبود چه عارف بود باین که منصب امامت حق برادر بزرگوار او جناب امام محمد باقر است و او وصیت کرده بود در آخر وقت به حضرت صادق و سب خروج او این بود که روزی پیش ہشام بن عبد الملک کہ خلیفہ وقت بود رفت خلیفہ امر نمود بایل شام کی در مجلس او حاضر بودند کہ چنان در مجلس تنگی نمائید کہ زید تا پیش خلیفہ نرسد زید گفت کہ بیج یک از بندگان خدا فوق این نیست کہ وصیت بہ تقوی نماید و من ترا وصیت می کنم بہ پرہیزگاری ہشام گفت کہ تو خود را از اہل خلافت می پنداری و حالانکہ تو از ام ولدی زید گفت مادر جناب حضرت اسماعیل ام ولد بود و حال اینکہ مرتبہ نبوت نزدیک خدا فوق تر از مرتبہ خلافت ست و چون ہشام زید را از لشکر خود بیرون کرد زید در کوفہ امدہ خروج نمود و مردمان بسیار باو بیعت کردند و آخر نقض بیعت نمودند و او شہید شد چون خبر شہادت اور بہ جناب صادق رسید بسیار غمگین و ملول گردید و کسانیکہ بازید شہید شدہ بودند لک دینار بورثہ اینہا حضرت صادق از مال خود تقسیم نمود انتہی و چون عبد الکاذب الغادر میان ہشام بن الحکم و ہشام بن عبد الملک امتیاز نمودہ این مناظرہ را بر مناظرہ امامت رجما بالغیب حمل نمودہ انتہی

Shaykh al-Mufid says that after Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir, Zayd ibn ‘Alī is most righteous and a greater worshipper than his brothers. He was very generous and extremely brave. He took up arms and rebelled. He enjoined good and forbade evil and avenged the blood of Sayyid al-Shuhadā’. Majority of Shī‘ah believe in his Imāmah and the purport of this belief is that when they saw Sayyidunā Zayd رحمۃ اللہ علیہ rebelling with arms and claiming Imāmah for the family of Rasūlullāh صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم, they thought he referred to himself whereas he was not concerned about himself but rather acknowledged that his elder brother Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir was the rightful Imām who bequeathed Imāmah for his son, al-Ṣādiq, at the time of his death. The reason for Sayyidunā Zayd’s رحمۃ اللہ علیہ rebellion is that he once went to Hishām ibn ‘Abd al-Malik. The khalīfah commanded the people of Shām to crowd the gathering so that Zayd could not approach him. Zayd عليه السلام exclaimed, “There is no servant of Allah who cannot be commanded to fear Allah. O Khalīfah! I command you to fear Allah.”

The Khalīfah answered him, “O Zayd, You think yourself worthy of khilāfah whereas you are the son of a slave-girl.”

Zayd responded by saying, “Sayyidunā Ismā‘īl عليه السلام was the son of a slave girl. The reality is that nubuwwah holds a higher rank than khilāfah in the sight of Allah.”

When Hishām ordered his army to remove Zayd, the latter came to Kūfah and rebelled. Majority of the people pledged allegiance to him but broke their pledges later and Zayd was martyred. When Imām Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq رحمته الله was informed of his martyrdom, he was extremely remorseful and saddened. He distributed 100000 gold coins to the heirs of those who were martyred alongside Zayd. Since the treacherous ‘Abd al-Kādhīb did not differentiate between Hishām ibn Ḥakam and Hishām ibn ‘Abd al-Malik, he interpreted a debate to be the debate over Imāmah without any knowledge or information.

Although Dildār ‘Alī has taken great pains to save Zayd رحمته الله from kufr, he was not successful in his attempt to prove that Zayd رحمته الله did not claim Imāmah and provide evidence that he accepted Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir as Imām. In fact, if you have a look at the narrations we reproduced from *Uṣūl al-Kāfi*, it seems as Dildār ‘Alī is a drowning man clutching onto straws.

Furthermore, his claim that Zayd did not reject Imāmah is in conflict to those historical incidents which have reached authenticity. This is not confined to Sayyidunā Zayd رحمته الله. The children of which Imām have not claimed Imāmah for themselves? After Sayyidunā Zayd رحمته الله, his son Yaḥyā, after Imām Mūsā al-Kāẓim, his sons Ibrāhīm and Ja‘far, Ḥasan ibn Ḥasan Muthannā and his son ‘Abd Allah and his son Muḥammad whose title is Dhū Nafs Zakīyyah, Ibrahim ibn ‘Abd Allah, Zakariyyah ibn Muḥammad al-Bāqir, Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allah ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn al-Ḥasan, Muḥammad ibn al-Qāsim ibn al-Ḥasan and Yaḥyā ibn ‘Amr etc.; these children of the A‘immah have claimed Imāmah. Majority of them rebelled and were martyred.

Can these historical occurrences be denied? In fact, the difference in the matter of Imāmah due to which the Shī‘ah have been divided into many sub sects are evidence that the A‘immah’s children never believed Imāmah as one of the fundamentals of dīn and did not regard its rejecter equal to one who rejects nubuwwah. Had the A‘immah’s children believed that Imāmah was equal to nubuwwah and the Imām appointed only one of his children as an Imām after

him and bequeathed it to him, and had every Imām reminded his children of his bequest, and explained to them that the rejecter of Imāmah is a kāfir like the rejecter of nubuwwah, then is it possible to believe that the pure children of the A’immah did not accept their father’s bequest and did not accept the true Imām but rather claimed Imāmah for themselves? The difference in this matter of Imāmah which took place among the Shī’ah and the various sub sects that they split into would not have happened. This spintering has reached such a level that one sub sect accepts Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah as Imām after Sayyidunā ‘Alī عليه السلام; the Kaysāniyyah sect. There is then difference with regards to Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah. Some say that he did not pass away while others say he did and imāmah was transferred to his son, Abū Hāshim. What the grandfather said, “The seventh Imām is existing and he will have the name of the recipient of the Tawrah.”

In brief, the only reason why there is so much dispute in this matter of Imāmah is that the children of the Imām have not unanimously agreed on the Imāmah of one and have not forsaken the claim to Imāmah. It is only the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah sect which believes in 12 Imāms from Sayyidunā ‘Alī عليه السلام to Imām Mahdī. The obvious result of this belief is that those A’immah’s children who claimed Imāmah or did not accept the true Imām, are all infidels and doomed to Jahannam forever, may Allah forbid.

Appendix – Imāmah (Shaykh Muḥammad Firāsāt)

In the above pages, the author of *Āyāt Bayyināt* رَحِمَهُ اللهُ has sufficiently proven that the made up belief of Imāmah of the Shī'ah which is believed to be emphatic from Allah and his obedience as compulsory was not known to the individuals of the family of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ who debunked this belief by their statements and actions. To prove this, he presented a dialogue which is recorded in *Uṣūl al-Kāfi*, chapter 79, page 218 between Sayyidunā 'Alī's رَحِمَهُ اللهُ son, Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafiyyah, and Sayyidunā 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn (Zayn al-'Ābidīn) after the Karbalā incident. This dialogue adequately establishes the fact that the former was ignorant of the reality of Imāmah. He did not even know that Allah selected the children of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَحِمَهُ اللهُ for Imāmah and waṣiyyah.

Qāḍī Nūr Allah al-Shūstarī has interpreted this incident in *Majālis al-Mu'minīn* with reference to *Kitāb al-Kharā'ij* by saying:

Some people began regarding Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafiyyah as the Imām, so he thought it befitting to decide this matter in public so that no one falls into misguidance.¹

This interpretation of Qāḍī is not only in conflict with reality and pathetic, but very astonishing for a scholar of his calibre. Where is there scope to make such an interpretation? The answer to this interpretation is found in the ḥadīth itself; this conversation between uncle and nephew took place in solitude where the nephew was reforming his uncle's belief in Imāmah. They were no other people present.

During this conversation, the uncle said to his nephew:

وانى عمك و صنو ابيك و ولادتي من على فى سننى و قديمى احق بها منك فى حدائتك فلا تنازعنى فى الوصية و الامامة و لا تحتاجنى فقال له على بن الحسين يا عم اتق الله و لا تدع ما ليس لك بحق انى اعطك ان تكون من الجاهلين

1 Urdu translation of *Majālis al-Mu'minīn* pg. 470.

I am your uncle and equal to your father. Me being the son of ‘Alī, older in age and more experienced makes me more worthy of Imāmah than you who are tender in age. So do not argue and contest with me in al-Waṣiyyah and al-Imāmah.

‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn told him, “O uncle, fear Allah and do not claim that which you have no right over. I advise you from becoming of the ignorant.”¹

It also appears at the end of this dialogue that after the black stone’s testimony, Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafiyyah accepted Imāmah. But this does not change anything. The ḥadīth is clear that Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafiyyah never regarded himself as infallible, nor his obedience as compulsory and nor did he claim being the offspring of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn عليه السلام, yet claimed Imāmah. This clearly shows that he was unaware and ignorant of all the laws of Imāmah which the Shī‘ah have stipulated.

If we hypothetically agree that this dialogue was in accordance to what Qāḍī Nūr Allah al-Shūstarī has stated, it still proves that the full picture of Imāmah was not in the minds of the Shī‘ah of that era. This is the reality. That is why they split into sub sects very quickly. After the martyrdom of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn عليه السلام, those who propagated the belief of Imāmah secretly were divided into few sects. One group rejected the Imāmah of both Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn عليه السلام. They explained that if the reconciliation and agreement between Sayyidunā Ḥasan عليه السلام and Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah عليه السلام was correct, then Sayyidunā Ḥusayn’s عليه السلام revolt against Yazīd ibn Mu‘āwiyah was incorrect. And if the latter was correct, then the former was incorrect. A renowned Shī‘ scholar of the third century Abū Muḥammad Ḥasan ibn Mūsā al-Nawbakhtī writes in his treatise *Firaq al-Shī‘ah*:

پس درکاران دو در گهاں شدند و از امامت ایناں باز گشتند و در گفتار باتوده مردم داستاں گردیدند

These people lost confidence in both these luminaries due to their conflicting approaches. They turned away from their Imāmah and joined the general masses in belief.²

1 *Al-Ḥujjah* pg. 314.

2 *Firaq al-Shī‘ah* pg. 47.

A second group raised the flag of Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah’s Imāmah. A third group were those who accepted the Imāmah of Imām Zayn al-‘Ābidīn but were few in number. It is reported from Imām al-Ṣādiq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in *Rijāl al-Kashshī*:

عن ابي عبد الله قال ارتد الناس بعد قتل الحسين الا ثلاثة ابو خالد الكابلي و يحيى بن ام الطويل و جبير بن مطعم ثم ان الناس لحقوا و كثروا

Abū ‘Abd Allah said, “All people apostatised after the martyrdom of Ḥusayn except three: Abū Khālīd al-Kābilī, Yaḥyā ibn Umm al-Ṭawīl, and Jubayr ibn Muṭ‘im. Then people joined and multiplied.

A fourth group were those who believed that Imāmah had ended at Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. There were only three A’immah: Sayyidunā ‘Alī, Ḥasan, and Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. They did not believe in any Imām after Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.¹

A fifth group believed that Imāmah was not restricted to the offspring of Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ but rather the children of both Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ; whoever stands up for the post of Imāmah and invites people publicly, his obedience is compulsory like Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Those who disobey him and are proud or invite people to their own Imāmah are infidels. Similarly, whoever claims Imāmah for their offspring but then sits at home behind closed doors; all of his followers are kuffār and mushrikīn.²

‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ saw these with his own eyes. Intelligence demands that such an important fundamental of dīn be pronounced at the two ‘īd, ḥajj, or some other major gathering so that the masses are not ignorant about this belief like his uncle Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah. If there was some wisdom in not proclaiming it publicly, then at least mention it to the Banū Hāshim and children of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and narrate to them the emphatic statements of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ listing the A’immah’s names. Or at least display the slate of

1 *Firaq al-Shī‘ah* pg. 84.

2 *Firaq al-Shī‘ah* pg. 85.

emerald to the Mu'minīn which Allah ﷻ sent to Rasūlullāh ﷺ which has the A'imma's names inscribed on it. The incident of this slate as mentioned in *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* pg. 343, 344 goes as follows:

عن ابى بصير عن ابى عبد الله عليه السلام قال لجابر بن عبد الله الانصارى ان لى اليك حاجة فمتى يخف عليك ان اخلو بك فاستلك عنها فقال له جابر اى الاوقات احببته فخلا به فى بعض الايام فقال له يا جابر اخبرنى عن اللوح الذى رأيتہ فى يداى فاطمة عليها السلام بنت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم و ما اخبرتك به امى فى ذلك اللوح المكتوب فقال جابر اشهد بالله انى دخلت على امك فاطمة عليها السلام فى حياة رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فهنيتها بولادة الحسين و رايت فى يدها لوحا اخضر ظننت انه من زمرد و رأيت فيه كتابا ابيض شبه لون الشمس فقلت لها بابى و امى يا بنت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ما هذا اللوح فقالت هذا اللوح اهداه الله الى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فيه اسم ابى و اسم على و اسم ابنى و اسم الاوصياء من ولدى و اعطانيه ابى ليبشرنى بذلك فقال جابر فاعطنيہ امك فاطمة عليها السلام فقرأته و استنسخته فقال له ابى فهل لك يا جابر ان تعرضه على قال نعم فمشى معه ابى الى منزل جابر فاخرج صحيفة من رق فقال يا جابر انظر فى كتابك لاقراً انا عليك انظر جابر فى نسخته فقرأ ابى فما خالف حرف حرفا فقال يا جابر فاشهد بالله انى هكذا رأيتہ فى اللوح مكتوبا

Abū Baṣīr relates that Abū 'Abd Allah رحمته الله said to Jābir ibn 'Abd Allah al-Anṣārī رحمته الله, "I have some work with you. When can I have I private moment with you and talk to you about it?"

Jābir said, "Whatever time suits you."

He met with him one day and said, "O Jābir, inform me of the slate you saw in my mother's hands Fāṭimah bint Rasūlillāh رحمته الله and what my mother told you about what was written on it."

Jābir answered, "I bear witness that I went to your mother Fāṭimah رحمته الله in the lifetime of Rasūlullāh رحمته الله and congratulated her on the birth of Ḥusayn رحمته الله. I saw a green slate in her hand, and I thought it was of emerald. I saw some writing in white similar to the colour of the sun. I asked her, 'May my parents be sacrificed for you, O daughter of Rasūlullāh رحمته الله, what is this slate?'

She explained, 'Allah gifted this slate to Rasūlullāh رحمته الله. It has the name of my father, the name of 'Alī, the names of my two sons, and the names

of the Awṣiyā' from my offspring. My father gave it to me to grant me the glad tidings of it.”

Jābir continues, “Your mother Fāṭimah gave it to me. I read it and copied it.”

My father requested him, “May you show it to me, O Jābir?”

He replied in the affirmative. My father walked with him to Jābir's house. He then took out a book. My father then said, “O Jābir, look into your book. I will read to you.”

Jābir looked in his copy and my father read. There was not even the difference of one letter. My father then said, “O Jābir, bear witness to Allah that I saw it written on the slate in this way.”¹

This narration has the exact text written on the emerald slate with the 12 names of the Imāms coupled with their qualities. If Sayyidunā ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn's objective was to protect people from misguidance (as claimed by Qāḍī) then the above mentioned method was appropriate. It was not appropriate to speak to him in secrecy.

Had Zayn al-‘Ābidīn announced the belief of Imāmah in public to protect the Shī‘ah from misguidance and division, he would have fulfilled the duty of speaking the truth and at least those major differences between the Shī‘ah which are due to the belief of Imāmah would not have surfaced in the later years which resulted in the emergence of new sects after the demise of every Imām, and the sons of the Imāms; one labelling the other as misguided.

Nawāb Muḥsin al-Mulk رَحِمَهُ اللهُ has provided another example from Kitāb al-Ḥujjah of *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* printed in Lucknow on page 100, i.e. the dialogue between the great grandson of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَحِمَهُ اللهُ Zayd – Zayn al-‘Ābidīn's son – and Abū Ja‘far

1 *Al-Shāfi* translation of *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* vol. 3 pg. 165 – 167.

al-Aḥwal Muḥammad ibn Nu‘mān – a notable student of Imām Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq رحمه الله concerning the belief of Imāmāh. This dialogue took place before Sayyidunā Zayd رحمه الله revolted against the Umayyad Khalīfah Hishām ibn ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān. When Abū Ja‘far al-Aḥwal listed some principles of the belief of Imāmāh before him, the latter debunked the former saying:

قال فقال لي يا ابا جعفر كنت اجلس مع ابي على الخوان فيلقمني الضعة السمينة و يبرد لي اللقمة الحارة شفقة على و لم يشفق على من حر النار اذا اخبرك بالدين و لم يخبرني به

Abū Ja‘far relates, “He said to me, ‘O Abū Ja‘far. I would sit and eat with my father. He would feed me the nice pieces of meat and would cool a hot morsel before feeding it to me out of love for me yet he showed no affection to me from saving me from the fire of Jahannam? He informed you of dīn and did not inform me?’”²

Sayyidunā Zayd ibn Zayn al-‘Ābidīn رحمه الله mentions clearly in this conversation that his father did not inform him of the belief of Imāmāh. Any intelligent and sound person will deduce from this that this belief has no relation to Islam. Had it been one of the fundamentals of dīn, Sayyidunā Zayn al-‘Ābidīn رحمه الله would have definitely informed his son about it. Can any Muslim comprehend that those who are charged with guiding the masses and protecting them from misguidance will not teach their children of such an important aspect of dīn and allow them to fall into misguidance and bear that responsibility? Is it fathomable that Sayyidunā Zayn al-‘Ābidīn رحمه الله reforms the belief of his uncle and does not inform his son?

I will reproduce an important extract from this narration:

فلما فرغن من غسلها و كنفها دخل صلى الله عليه و سلم فحمل جنازتها على عاتقه فلم يزل تحت جنازتها حتى اوردها قبر وضعها و دخل القبر فاضطجع فيه ثم قام فاخذها على يديه حتى وضعها في

1 Sayyidunā Zayd رحمه الله revolted against the Umayyad khalīfah Hishām ibn ‘Abd al-Malik with an army 40000 strong notwithstanding the prevention of Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir and Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq. 30000 of the Shī‘ah abandoned him at the twelfth hour because he loved Shaykhayn عليهما السلام.

2 *Al-Shāfi* translation of *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* vol. 2, Kitāb al-Ḥujjah pg. 18, 19.

القبر ثم انكب عليها طويلا بناجيها و يقول لها ابنك ابنك ابنك ثم خرج و سوى عليها ثم انكب على قبرها فسمعه يقول لا اله الا الله اللهم انى استودعها اياك ثم انصرف فقال له المسلمون انا رأيناك فعلت اشياء لم تفعلها قبل اليوم فقال اليوم فقدت بر ابي طالب ان كانت ليكون عندها الشيء فتوترنى به على نفسها و ولدها و انى ذكر القيامة و ان الناس يحشرون عراة فقالت واسوأته فضمنت لها ان يعيئها الله كاسية و ذكرت ضغطة القبر فقالت واضعفاء فضمنت لما يكفيها الله ذلك فكفتها بقميصى و اضطجعت فى قبرها لذلك و انكببت عليها فلقتنها ما تسئل عنه فانها سئلت عن ربها فقالت و سئلت عن رسولها فاجابت و سئلت عن وليها و امامها فارتح عليها فقلت ابنك ابنك ابنك

When they were complete with her (Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه mother) ghusl and kafn, Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم entered and picked up her bier on his shoulders. He walked with it until he reached the grave. He entered the grave and laid in it. He then stood up and lifted her and placed her in the grave. He then remained beside her for a long time speaking to her softly and telling her, “Your son. Your son.” He then came out and levelled the grave (with sand). He then remained beside her grave. They heard him saying, “There is no deity but Allah. O Allah! I hand her over to You.” He then left.

The Muslims asked him, “We saw you doing things never before.”

He صلى الله عليه وسلم replied, “Today, I have lost the wife of Abū Ṭālib. When she had anything, she would give me preference over herself and children. I mentioned Qiyāmah and that people will be resurrected naked. She said, ‘O remorse!’ I took responsibility that Allah will resurrect her with clothes. I mentioned the squeeze of the grave. She said, ‘O my weakness.’ I took responsibility that Allah will suffice for her this. I thus shrouded her with my shirt and laid in her grave for this. I then sat beside her and reminded her of what she will be asked about. She was asked about her Rabb and she answered correctly. She was questioned about her Rasūl and she answered correctly. She was then asked about her Walī and Imām, she was speechless so I said, ‘Your son. Your son.’”¹

According to this narration of Imām Ja’far al-Ṣādiq رضي الله عنه, Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s رضي الله عنه mother answered the questions regarding Allah and His Rasūl, but when she was

1 Al-Shāfi’ translation of *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* vol. 3, Kitāb al-Ḥujjah pg. 31, 32.

asked about the Walī and Imām, she kept quiet upon which Rasūlullāh ﷺ had to teach her, “Your son. Your son.”

It is possible that one might argue that until then, Rasūlullāh ﷺ did not propagate the belief in Imāmah. The objection on this is that whose fault is it – May Allah forbid – Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ or the angels’. Why was she burdened with answering something she was not taught?

This is one angle of the situation according to which the Ahl al-Bayt and Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s ﷺ own mother were unaware of Imāmah. This is an open confirmation of the fact that this has nothing to do with Islam otherwise they would have known about it.

On the other hand, the Shī‘ah have included this belief among the fundamentals of dīn like tawḥīd, risālah, and qiyāmah and made acknowledgement of the pedestal of Imāmah the means of salvation in the Hereafter. A narration of Imām al-Bāqir or Imām al-Ja‘far appears on page 10 of *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* in the chapter regarding recognition of the Imām and referring to him:

الحسين عن معلى عن الحسن بن على عن احمد بن عائذ بن ابيه عن ابن اذنيه قال حدثنا غير واحد عن احدهما عليهما السلام انه قال لا يكون العبد مؤمنا حتى يعرف الله و رسوله و الائمة كلهم و امام زمانه و يرد اليه و يسلم له ثم قال كيف يعرف الاخر و هو يجهل الاول

Ḥusayn narrates — from Mu‘allā — from Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī — from Aḥmad ibn ‘Ā‘idh — from his father — from Ibn Udhunayh who said that more than one person narrated from one of them, Imām al-Bāqir or Imām Ja‘far who stated: “A servant cannot be a believer until he recognises Allah, His Rasūl, all the A‘immah, and the Imām of his era and refers to him and submits to him.”

He further stated, “How can he recognise the latter when he is ignorant of the former?”¹

1 *Al-Shāfī* translation of *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* vol. 2 pg. 30.

What is Imāmah?

The Shī'ah believe Imāmah as a divine position like nubuwwah. They believe in all those qualities for Imāmah which are specific to nubuwwah, i.e. the Imām is infallible like the Ambiyā', his appointment is by Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, his obedience is compulsory like the Nabī's, revelation descends on him, he has the capacity to make ḥalāl or ḥarām, he has the knowledge of the past and future, etc. The Imām's position is equal to Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and greater than all the other Ambiyā'. The 'aqidah of Imāmah of the Shī'ah is what separates them from the Ahl al-Sunnah.

I will present below some narrations and some statements of the Shī'ah scholars which shed light on the importance of Imāmah and the rank of the A'immah.

'Allāmah al-Majlisī relates from Imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ in *Biḥār al-Anwār* vol. 26 pg. 281:

عن ابي بصير عن ابي عبد الله عليه السلام قال ما من نبي و لا من رسول ارسل الا بولايتنا و فضيلتنا على من سوانا

Abū Baṣīr narrates from Abū 'Abd Allah who says, "There was no Nabī nor Rasūl sent except (after acknowledging) our wilāyah and virtue over everyone else."

One of the chapters of Kitāb al-Imāmah of *Biḥār al-Anwār* is:

تفضيلهم عليهم السلام علي الانبياء و على جميع الخلق و اخذ ميثاقهم عنهم و عن الملكة و عن سائر الخلق و ان اولوا العزم اتما صاروا اولى العزم بحبهم صلوات الله عليهم

Their superiority over the Ambiyā' and entire creation. Taking their pledge from them (the Ambiyā'), the angels, and the entire creation. The ulū al-'azm only became such due to love for them.

After presenting numerous narrations of this, 'Allāmah al-Majlisī writes with reference to 'Aqā'id Ṣadūq:

اعلم ان ما ذكره رحمة الله من فضل نبينا و ائمتنا صلوات الله عليهم على جميع المخلوقات و كون ائمتنا عليهم السلام افضل من سائر الانبياء و هو الذى لا يرتاب فيه من تتبع اخبارهم عليهم السلام على وجه الاذعان و اليقين و الاخبار فى ذلك اكثر من ان يحصى

Know that what al-Ṣadūq has mentioned regarding the superiority of our Nabī and A'immaḥ over the entire creation and our A'immaḥ being superior to all the Ambiyā' is something that no one will doubt who studies their narrations with obedience and conviction. Narrations of this kind are countless.

One of the chapters of *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* is:

ان الائمة عليهم السلام محدثون مفهومان

The A'immaḥ are muḥaddathūn mafhūmūn (inspired).

A narration from Imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ appears in this chapter:

عن محمد بن مسلم قال سمعت ابا عبد الله عليه السلام يقول الائمة بمنزلة رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم الا انهم ليسوا بانبياء و لا يحل لهم من النساء ما يحل للنبي صلى الله عليه و سلم فاما ما خلا ذلك فهم فيه بمنزلة رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم

Muḥammad ibn Muslim says that he heard Abū 'Abd Allah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ saying, "The A'immaḥ enjoy the rank of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ except that they are not Ambiyā'. What women are permissible for Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ are not permissible for them. Besides this, they enjoy the rank of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ."

Mullā Bāqir al-Majlisī writes while commenting on Imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq's رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ statement:

بيان يدل ظاهرا على اشتراكهم مع النبي صلى الله عليه و اله فى سائر الخصائص سوا ما ذكر

This clearly shows that they are partners to Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ in all specialities except what was mentioned, i.e. more than four wives are not permitted for them.¹

1 *Bihār al-Anwār* vol. 27 pg. 50.

Mulla Bāqir al-Majlisī reports the various narrations of the A'imma in Kitāb al-Imāmah, the chapter that they are muḥaddathūn mafhūmūn. He then writes under narration 45:

بيان استنباط الفرق بين النبي و الامام من تلك الاخبار لا يخلو من اشكال و كذا الجمع بينهما مشكل جدا و بالجملة لا بد لنا من الادعان بعدم كونهم عليهم السلام انبياء و بانهم اشرف و افضل من غير نبينا صلى الله عليه و سلم من الانبياء و الاوصياء و لا نعرف جهة اتصافهم بالنبوة الا رعاية جلالة خاتم الانبياء و لا يصل عقولنا الى فرق بين بين النبوة و الامامة و ما دلت عليه الاخبار فقد عرفته

Deducing a difference between the Nabī and the Imām from these narrations is objectionable. Similarly, combining both of them is very difficult. On the whole, it is necessary to believe that they are not Ambiyā' and that they are more noble and superior to all the Ambiyā' and Aṣṣiyā' besides our Nabī ﷺ. We do not know why they are not Ambiyā' except out of consideration for the honour of the seal of Ambiyā'. Our minds cannot fathom a distinctive difference between nubuwwah and Imāmah. And you have realised what the narrations mention.¹

It is quite surprising that al-Bāqir cannot understand a simple thing that when Allah ﷻ has given them a higher rank to nubuwwah, i.e. the rank of Imāmah and wilāyah, then why should they be given nubuwwah. Does any high ranking officer need to be called a policeman?

Due to such Shī'ī narrations, Mulla Bāqir al-Majlisī has given the following verdict:

امامت بالاتر از رتبه پیغمبر است

The station of Imāmah is higher than the station of nubuwwah.²

The greatest Shī'ī leader of the 20th century Āyat Allah Rūḥ Allah Khomeini has articulated the same message in his book *al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah* in the following words:

1 *Bihār al-Anwār* vol. 26 pg. 82.

2 *Hāyāt al-Qulūb* vol. 3 pg. 10.

وان من ضروريات مذهبنا ان لانمتنا مقاما لا يبلغه ملك مقرب ولا نبي مرسل

One of the fundamental beliefs of our religion is that the A'immah enjoy a rank which cannot be reached by a close angel or Messenger.¹

We can reproduce tens of narrations (countless narrations according to al-Majlisi) which clearly mention that the rank of Imāmah is higher than that of nubuwwah. However, taking into consideration the lack of time we will settle on a few narrations.

In light of the above, it would not be incorrect to say that the station of nubuwwah, which is a divine station lower than Imāmah, has continued in a new advanced form of Imāmah. In this way, the value of the risālah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ does not remain, neither is it *maqṣūd bi al-dhāt* (a primary objective). In fact, it is an introduction to the A'immah's Imāmah making it *maqṣūd bi al-'arḍ* (a secondary objective). This is not our viewpoint only, non-Muslim scholars have deduced the exact same purport of Imāmah. The researcher W. Ivonow has written, "The brilliant light of Imāmah shining in the world gives nubuwwah the status of a shadow."²

Phillip K. Hitti writes of Imāmah: "The founder of Islam has made revelation, i.e. the Qur'ān a medium between Allah and man. But the Shī'ah have given this medium the form of a human, i.e. the Imām. 'I believe in Allah and I believe in the Qur'ān which is not created.' The Shī'ah have made the addition, 'I believe in the Imām whom Allah has appointed who is partner in divine attributes and the saviour.'"³

Readers, you have seen what consequences the non-Muslims have written of the belief of Imāmah. These are not the only two examples. Whenever a person

1 *Al-Ḥukūmah al-Islāmiyyah* pg. 52.

2 H.A.R Gibbs and J.H.K Ramer *short or encyclopaedia of Islam* Leiden 195 pg. 248.

3 Phillip K. Hitti, *History of the Arabs* London 1973 pg. 248.

studies Islam and ponders properly over the rank and abilities of the Imām, he will arrive at the same conclusion. Although the Shī'ah outwardly believe in Khatm al-Nubuwwah (Finality of Prophethood), they have invented a new divinely appointed station, i.e. Imāmah, thus making the belief in Khatm al-Nubuwwah meaningless.

Imāmah and Qur'ān

We have mentioned previously that the Shī'ah include Imāmah among the fundamentals of dīn like tawḥīd, risālah, and Ākhirah. Hence, they believe that just belief in tawḥīd, risālah, and Ākhirah are not sufficient for salvation in the Hereafter. The principled question which arises is that just as there are copious emphatic verses of the Qur'ān which establish the belief in tawḥīd, risālah, and Ākhirah and the command to obey Allah ﷻ and His Rasūl ﷺ has appeared extensively in the Qur'ān and just as there are categorical verses like “Say He Allah is one” and “Muḥammad is the Messenger of Allah.” have been revealed which cannot have any other meaning, similarly mention of the status of the A'immah, their Imāmah, and their obedience ought to have appeared in the Qur'ān in clear unambiguous terms. It is said about them that Allah ﷻ created the world due to them, the Ambiyā's ranks were raised due to loving them and doubting their status landed the A'immah into problems¹, the supplications of the Ambiyā' are accepted due to their blessings², Allah ﷻ handed over the guidance of the ummah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ to them³. Moreover, their rank and status has been spoken about in the previous divine books. Thus, intellect demands that these A'immah whom Allah ﷻ has commanded with the guidance of the ummah, then the pure book which Allah has revealed for their guidance ought to mention belief in them in more clear terms and more emphatically and categorically.

1 *Bihār al-Anwār* vol. 27 pg. 335.

2 *Bihār al-Anwār* vol. 26 pg. 293.

3 *Bihār al-Anwār* vol. 26 pg. 319.

The word Imām appears in the Qur’ān not once or twice but 12 times, but not once in the invented meaning of the Shī’ah. The word Imām comes in the meaning of leader in the glorious Qur’ān whether good or bad. It has been used to describe the Ambiyā’ as well as the evil infidels. We will quote five categorical verses due to time constraints.

The first verse:

فَقَاتِلُوا أئِمَّةَ الْكُفْرِ إِنَّهُمْ لَا أَيْمَانَ لَهُمْ لَعَلَّهُمْ يَنتَهُونَ

Then fight the leaders of disbelief, for indeed, there are no oaths [sacred] to them; [fight them that] they might cease.¹

In this verse, Allah ﷻ has referred to the leaders of the kuffār as Imāms for they are their leaders; the kuffār follow them.

The second verse:

وَمِنْ قَبْلِهِ كِتَابُ مُوسَىٰ إِمَامًا وَرَحْمَةً

And before it was the Scripture of Mūsā to lead and as mercy.²

Allah ﷻ has referred to a book as an Imām for it leads people and people follow it.

Third verse:

وَجَعَلْنَاهُمْ أَئِمَّةً يَدْعُونَ إِلَى النَّارِ وَيَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ لَا يُنصَرُونَ

And We made them leaders inviting to the Fire.³

1 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 12.

2 Sūrah Hūd: 17.

3 Sūrah al-Qaṣaṣ: 41.

Look in what a bad light the word Imām has been used in this verse. The people of Fir‘awn are referred to as Imāms.

The fourth verse:

وَجَعَلْنَا مِنْهُمْ أَئِمَّةً يَهْدُونَ بِأَمْرِنَا لَمَّا صَبَرُوا وَكَانُوا بِآيَاتِنَا يُوقِنُونَ

And We made from among them leaders guiding by Our command when they were patient and [when] they were certain of Our signs.¹

This verse speaks about the Banū Isrā’īl. Imām here refers to the Nabī because guidance through Allah’s سُبْحَانَكَ وَتَعَالَى command is their duty and descent of revelation has also been mentioned. This shows that Imāmah means nubuwwah here.

The fifth verse:

يَوْمَ نَدْعُو كُلَّ أُنَاسٍ بِإِيمَانِهِمْ

[Mention, O Muḥammad], the Day We will call forth every people with their Imām.²

Imām here refers to the Messenger since every ummah will be summoned with their Messenger as stated in another verse:

وَلِكُلِّ أُمَّةٍ رَّسُولٌ فَإِذَا جَاءَ رَّسُولُهُمْ فُضِيَ بَيْنَهُم بِالْقِسْطِ وَهُمْ لَا يُظْلَمُونَ

And for every nation is a messenger. So when their messenger comes, it will be judged between them in justice, and they will not be wronged.³

In the above verses, there is no clear picture of the Shī‘ī invented Imāmah. In fact, there is no trace of it. With regards to the obedience of the A‘immah

1 Sūrah al-Sajdah: 24.

2 Sūrah Banī Isrā’īl: 71.

3 Sūrah Yūnus: 47.

being compulsory, there are plenty verses in the glorious Qur'ān commanding obedience to Allah ﷻ and His Rasūl ﷺ but only two verses are coupled with obedience to the *ulū al-amr* (those in authority).

The first verse:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا أَطِيعُوا اللَّهَ وَأَطِيعُوا الرَّسُولَ وَأُولِي الْأَمْرِ مِنْكُمْ فَإِنْ تَنَازَعْتُمْ فِي شَيْءٍ فَرُدُّوهُ إِلَى اللَّهِ وَالرَّسُولِ إِنْ كُنْتُمْ تُؤْمِنُونَ بِاللَّهِ وَالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ ذَلِكَ خَيْرٌ وَأَحْسَنُ تَأْوِيلًا

O you who have believed, obey Allah and obey the Messenger and those in authority among you. And if you disagree over anything, refer it to Allah and the Messenger, if you should believe in Allah and the Last Day. That is the best [way] and best in result.¹

We learn from this verse that obedience to Allah ﷻ and Rasūlullāh ﷺ is mandatory in every occasion. To argue in this regard is forbidden. In fact, obedience to Allah ﷻ and to Rasūlullāh ﷺ is the very same thing. The words are two but reference is one. Accordingly, Allah ﷻ states a little further in this very Sūrah:

مَنْ يُطِيعِ الرَّسُولَ فَقَدْ أَطَاعَ اللَّهَ

He who obeys the Messenger has obeyed Allah.²

The reason for these obediences being one is that the Rasūl is infallible. He cannot command anything contradictory to Allah's ﷻ command and wish.

The second thing learnt from this verse is that obedience to the *ulū al-amr* is not mandatory in every occasion. If any command of theirs conflicts to the Qur'ān and Sunnah, it will not be followed and obeyed.

1 Sūrah al-Nisā': 59.

2 Sūrah al-Nisā': 80.

The Shī'ah attribute *ulū al-amr* in this verse to their A'immah which is wholly incorrect. This is because when there arises any difference with the *ulū al-amr*, the Mu'minīn have been commanded to refer to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and His Rasūl صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. It is apparent that the Shī'ah believe their A'immah to be infallible and any difference with them as *ḥarām*. Hence, they cannot be referred to here. The reality is that all those who are obeyed among the Muslims are included in *ulū al-amr*. The khalīfah of the time, army generals, 'Ulamā', and Fuqahā' are all included. There is another verse wherein referral to the *ulū al-amr* has been commanded which appears after the above verse in the same Sūrah.

وَإِذَا جَاءَهُمْ أَمْرٌ مِّنَ الْأَمْنِ أَوْ الْخَوْفِ أَذَاعُوا بِهِ وَلَوْ رَدُّوهُ إِلَى الرَّسُولِ وَإِلَى أُولِي الْأَمْرِ مِنْهُمْ لَعَلِمَهُ الَّذِينَ يَسْتَنْبِطُونَهُ مِنْهُمْ وَلَوْلَا فَضْلُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْكُمْ وَرَحْمَتُهُ لَاتَّبَعْتُمُ الشَّيْطَانَ إِلَّا قَلِيلًا

And when there comes to them information about [public] security or fear, they spread it around. But if they had referred it back to the Messenger or to those of authority among them, then the ones who [can] draw correct conclusions from it would have known about it. And if not for the favour of Allah upon you and His mercy, you would have followed Satan, except for a few.¹

In this verse, there is no command to refer to the *ulū al-amr* in any shar'ī matter. Rather, the command is restricted to conditions of fear or peace. The command to refer shar'ī matters is only to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى and His Rasūl صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ especially in times of conflict. There is not the slightest inclination found in the Qur'ān in this matter as propagated by the Shī'ah. And how can there be, when according to the Shī'ī scholars, there exists *Taḥrīf* in the Qur'ān². Accordingly, it appears in *al-Ṣāfi* quoted from *Tafsīr al-'Ayyāshī* that Imām Muḥammad al-Bāqir رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ has said:

لولا انه زيد في القران و نقص ما خفى حقنا على ذى حجبى

1 Sūrah al-Nisā': 83.

2 The Shī'ah have unsuccessfully tried to establish the belief of Imāmah with support from *Taḥrīf al-Qur'ān* and the internal meanings of the Qur'ān which depicts their incompetence and hopelessness.

Had there been no additions and subtractions in the Qur'ān, our right would not have been concealed to the intelligent.

The gist of the Imām's statement is that Taḥrīf has taken place in the Qur'ān. Hence, Imāmah and Wilāyah cannot be established through it.

Imāmah in the First Era

After studying the Qur'ān, we will now study the lives of that group of people of the first era who are blessed with the companionship of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and whose purification and reformation took place at the hands of that guide which the Qur'ān speaks about in glowing terms:

لَقَدْ مَنَّ اللَّهُ عَلَى الْمُؤْمِنِينَ إِذْ بَعَثَ فِيهِمْ رَسُولًا مِّنْ أَنفُسِهِمْ يَتْلُو عَلَيْهِمْ آيَاتِهِ وَيُزَكِّيهِمْ وَيُعَلِّمُهُمُ
الْكِتَابَ وَالْحِكْمَةَ وَإِن كَانُوا مِن قَبْلُ لَفِي ضَلَالٍ مُّبِينٍ

Certainly did Allah confer [great] favour upon the believers when He sent among them a Messenger from themselves, reciting to them His verses and purifying them and teaching them the Book and wisdom, although they had been before in manifest error.¹

From this noble group of students of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, there are approximately 7500 blessed souls who contributed to the legacy and abundance of aḥādīth. However, not one of them has narrated about the supposed Imāmah of the Shī'ah. Abū al-A'immah Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه neither presented himself as an infallible Imām whose obedience is mandatory nor claimed this status which is higher than all the Ambiyā' and equal to Rasūlullāh ﷺ in any definite terms. On the contrary, he presented himself as one of the sincere students and ardent followers of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. When proposing for Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها, he submitted to Rasūlullāh ﷺ:

1 Sūrah Āl 'Imrān: 164.

وان الله هداني بك و على يدك و استتقذني مما كان عليه ابائي و اعمامي من الحيرة و الشرك

Allah has guided me through you and at your hands and extricated me from misguidance and shirk which my forefathers and uncles were involved in.¹

What about the Ahl al-Bayt رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ? You have read the incident of Sayyidunā Zayd رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. When Abū Ja‘far al-Aḥwal spoke to him about Imāmah, he belied him and rejected this belief in what a forceful tone. Similarly, Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ mother were unaware of this belief. Moreover, the offspring of Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ would establish the baselessness of this belief through their actions.

Surprising indeed is that Abū Ja‘far al-Aḥwal discusses intricate matters of Imāmah with the Imām’s child yet he himself does not know who the Imām is after Imām Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. Therefore, he, Hishām ibn Sālim, etc., intended to join the Murjiyah, Qadariyyah, Mu‘tazilah, or Khawā’rij after the death of Sayyidunā Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. This clearly illustrates that the founders of Imāmah had not yet made the rules of Imāmah, the narrations of the emerald slate was not yet fabricated nor were those narrations invented wherein Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ lists all the names of the Imāms.²

Readers, finally it would be appropriate to investigate this belief in the incidents of those Ahl al-Bayt members whom the Shī‘ah regard as Imāms and regarding whom they believe that their status is equal to Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and higher than the other Ambiyā’ and who have been given the responsibility of guiding the ummah of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

When we study the lives of these noble souls from Shī‘i books, we find that they donned the garb of Taqiyyah their entire lives and did not have the courage to

1 *Kashf al-Ghumma* vol. 1 pg. 480.

2 For more details see *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* pg. 220, 221; *al-Shāfi* translation of *Uṣūl al-Kāfi*, Kitāb al-Ḥujjah vol. 2 pg. 321.

proclaim this belief publicly. Besides disclosing this secret to a few close and chosen individuals, they hid it away from the entire ummah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Not only did they hide such an important fundamental of dīn – whose propagation is mandatory – they convinced their disciples to do the same. If anyone asked regarding their Imāmah, they would fervently reject it.

There is a narration from Saʿīd on page 142 in Kitāb al-Ḥujjah of *Uṣūl al-Kāfī*:

عن سعيد السمان قال كنت عند ابي عبد الله عليه السلام اذ دخل عليه رجلان من الزيدية فقالا له افياكم امام مفترض الطاعة قال فقال لا قال فقالا له قد اخبرنا عنك الثقات انك تفتى و تقر و تقول به و نسميهم لك فلان و فلان و هم اصحاب ورع و تشمير و هم ممن لا يكذب فغضب ابو عبد الله عليه السلام فقال ما امرتهم بهذا فلما رأيا الغضب فى وجهه خرجا فقال لى اتعرف هذين؟ قلت نعم هما من اهل سوقنا و هما من الزيدية و هما يزعمان ان سيف رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم عند عبد الله بن الحسن فقال كذبا لعنهما الله و الله ما رآه عبد الله بن الحسن بعينيه و لا يواحدة من عينيه و لا رآه ابوه

Saʿīd al-Sammān says, “I was sitting by Abū ‘Abd Allah ﷺ when two men of the Zaydiyyah entered and asked, ‘Is there any Imām whose obedience is mandatory among you?’

He answered in the negative.

They then said, ‘We have been informed by reliable men regarding you that you pass this verdict, acknowledge it, and propagate it and we will name these men for you viz. so and so men of piety and action and who do not lie.’

Abū ‘Abd Allah became angry and announced, ‘I did not command them with this.’

When they saw his anger, they left. He ﷺ asked me, ‘Do you know these two men?’

‘Yes,’ I replied, ‘They are from our market and they are from the Zaydiyyah and they believe that Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ sword is by ‘Abd Allah ibn al-Ḥasan.’

He ﷺ stated, ‘They have lied, may Allah curse them. By Allah, ‘Abd Allah ibn al-Ḥasan did not see it with even one of his two eyes, nor did his father see it.’”¹

The rest of the narration has that Imām Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq ﷺ then began announcing his Imāmah and claimed that Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ sword, armour, helmet, flag, Sayyidunā Mūsā’s ﷺ staff, and Sayyidunā Sulaymān’s ﷺ ring, etc. – these signs of Imāmah – are with him.

According to this narration, Imām Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq² ﷺ rejected him being an Imām and told the questioners that he did not command anyone to say this. What kind of Imām is this if he lies? Did Rasūlullāh ﷺ ever reject his nubuwwah or did he ever praise the idols out of fear for the mushrikīn?

1 *Al-Shāfi* Urdu translation of *Uṣūl al-Kāfi*, Kitāb al-Ḥujjah vol. 2 pg. 115.

2 Imām Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq ﷺ (d. 15 Shawwāl 148 A.H.) was very pious and righteous man of knowledge. He has an outstanding rank among the ‘Ulamā’ of the Ahl al-Bayt. They would live in Madīnah Munawwarah. The formers of Shī‘ism would fabricate narrations in their name and propagate it among the innocent folk who would fall into their trap of ‘love for the Ahl al-Bayt’. They would tell them that the Imām’s command is that these beliefs should not be mentioned in front of the enemy. Very soon, they would be in authority and would then proclaim it. When the Imām would find out of their doings, he would curse them and dissociate from them but these sly wretched souls would say to their people that this is the Imām’s Taqīyah and that their salvation lies in this. The reality is that those who honoured, loved, and believed the Ahl al-Bayt as righteous ‘Ulamā’ were always in majority and number in the millions. However, due to underground plots and schemes, those who believed this corrupt ideology have only been a handful in the first era. It appears in *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* on page 497:

عن حمران ابن اعين قال قلت لابي جعفر عليه السلام جعلت فداك ما اقلنا لو اجتمعنا على شاة ما افيناه

Ḥumrān ibn A‘yun says that he asked Abū Ja‘far ﷺ, “May I be sacrificed for you. We are so few in number that if we have to eat a sheep, we will not finish it.” (*Shāfi* translation of *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* vol. 4 pg. 177)

قال والله يا سدير لو كان لي شيعة بعدد هذه الجداء ما وسعني القعود و نزلنا و صلينا فلما فرغنا من الصلوة عطف على الجداء فعددها فاذا هي سبعة عشر

Imām Ja‘far Ṣādiq ﷺ said, “O Sadīr, by Allah had we had followers equal in number to these goats, sitting would not be permissible for me i.e. I would have rebelled.”

Sadīr says: “We alighted and performed ṣalāh. I then counted the goats and they numbered seventeen.” (ibid pg. 176)

This attitude of Imām Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ does not in any way resemble that of his grandfather who in the early stages of Islam cared not for his life and proclaimed the truth in the streets and in the market places. Can there be any disparagement worse for a guide than saying he conceals the truth and reveals falsehood?

O beloved readers! It has been proven in Shī‘ī literature that the A‘immah would reject their Imāmah. They would also command their disciples to do the same. Some narrations in this regard are mentioned hereunder:

عن سليمان بن خالد قال قال ابو عبد الله عليه السلام يا سليمان انكم على دين من كتبه اعزه الله و من اذاعه اذله الله

Sulaymān ibn Khālid narrates that Abū ‘Abd Allah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ said, “O Sulaymān! You are following such a religion; the one who conceals it will be honoured by Allah while the one who propagates it will be disgraced by Allah.”¹

عن عبد الاعلى قال سمعت ابا عبد الله عليه السلام يقول ليس من احتمال امرنا التصديق له و القبول فقط انه من احتمال امرنا ستره و صيانته من غير اهله ... فاذا عرفتم من عبد اذاعة فامشوا اليه و ردوه عنها فان قبل منكم و الا فتحملوه عليه بمن يثقل عليه و يسمع منه فان الرجل منكم يطلب الحاجة فيلطف فيها حتى تقضى له فالطفوا في حاجتي كما تطفون في حوائجكم فان هو قبل منكم و الا فادفنا كلامه تحت اقدامكم و لا تقولوا انه يقوله فان ذلك يحمل على و عليكم

‘Abd al-A‘lā says that he heard from Abū ‘Abd Allah, “The meaning of choosing our Imāmah is not only acknowledging and accepting it. It also entails keeping it secret from the unworthy (enemy) and not narrating our narrations to them. When you learn of someone who spreads this matter, then go to him and prevent him. If he accepts, it is better. Otherwise, take someone to him whose words are weighty in his eyes and who he listens to attentively. Some of you have a need and exercise leniency until it is fulfilled. So exercise leniency in my need like how you exercise leniency in your needs. If he listens to you, then well and good. Otherwise, trample his speech under your feet, i.e. do not mention what he says. This will be the cause of ease for me and you.”²

1 *Shāfi* translation of *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* vol. 4 pg. 147.

2 *Shāfi* translation of *Uṣūl al-Kāfi* vol. 4 pg. 148.

عن عبد الله بن سليمان عن ابي عبد الله عليه السلام قال قال لى ما زال سرنا مكتوما حتى صار فى يد (ى) ولد كيسان فتحدثوا به فى الطريق و قرى السواد

‘Abd Allah ibn Sulaymān relates from Abū ‘Abd Allah عليه السلام who said to him, “Our matter remained secret until it landed up in the hands of the offspring of Kaysān who publicised it in the streets and the villages.”¹ [Some people say that the offspring of Kaysān refers to the offspring of Mukhtār who publicised Shīism.]

قال ابو عبد الله عليه السلام يا معلى اكنتم امرنا و لا تدعه فانه من كنتم امرنا و لم يدعه اعزه الله به فى الدنيا و جعله نورا بين عينيه فى الاخرة يقوده الى الجنة يا معلى من اذاع امرنا و لم يكتمه اذله الله به فى الدنيا و نزع النور من بين عينيه فى الدنيا و نزع النور من بين عينيه فى الاخرة و جعله ظلمة تقوده الى النار

Abū ‘Abd Allah عليه السلام stated, “O Mu‘allā! Keep our matter secret and do not disclose it. Whoever does this, Allah will honour him in this world and make it a light for him in the Hereafter which will lead him to Jannah. O Mu‘allā! Whoever discloses our matter and does not keep it secret, Allah will disgrace him in this world and remove light from in front of him in this world and in the Hereafter turning it into darkness which will lead him to Jahannam.”²

This clearly shows that the A‘immah strictly emphasised the concealing of the belief of Imāmah and it remained secret. However, when the Kaysān people accepted it, they publicised it which was disturbing to the A‘immah.

The crucial question is: A belief which forms part of the Shīī fundamentals of dīn; upon which rests salvation in the Hereafter, whose accepter is a believer and whose rejecter is an infidel and without which belief in tawḥīd, risālah, and Ākhirah has no value; why is there the stern command to conceal it?

کوئی معشوق ہے اس پردہ نگار میں

Is there a beloved behind the veil?

1 Ibid pg. 149.

2 Ibid pg. 150.

The answer is simple. A belief which is not found in the Qur'ān and Sunnah, is unknown by the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ; regarding which the Ahl al-Bayt are ignorant and which is rejected by those very A'immaḥ from whom there are tons of narrations; such an un-Islamic belief ought to be concealed. It is a different matter altogether that the dīn brought by Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ can never be concealed. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى emphatically declares:

هُوَ الَّذِي أَرْسَلَ رَسُولَهُ بِالْهُدَىٰ وَدِينِ الْحَقِّ لِيُظْهِرَهُ عَلَى الدِّينِ كُلِّهِ وَلَوْ كَرِهَ الْمُشْرِكُونَ

It is He who has sent His Messenger with guidance and the religion of truth to manifest it over all religion, although they who associate others with Allah dislike it.¹

It is clear as daylight from this verse that a religion which should be concealed and the one who publicises it is disgraced by Allah, can never be the dīn of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

O readers! We have very briefly scrutinised the qualities of the Imām, his status and rank, his powers and capabilities from the most reliable Shīṭ books and the statements of their most renowned scholars and also from non-Muslim scholars which sufficiently prove that the founders of Shī'ism have invented a divine station above that of nubuwwah which will remain till Qiyāmah and which supersedes the risālah of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. The natural consequence of this – although not acknowledged verbally – is a rejection of the belief of Khatm al-Nubuwwah. The detriments and evils of this belief can be seen practically from Shīṭ aḥādīth, tafsīr books, their actions, methodologies, statements, poetry, literature, and daily religious festivals. In short, at every juncture. However, a neutral mind and open eye is needed.

1 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 33.

Chapter Four

Discussion concerning Fadak

We will now begin the actual discussion about Fadak. We will mention the following in this discussion:

1. The reality of Fadak, its boundaries, and income.
2. How did Fadak come into the possession of Rasūlullāh ﷺ?
3. The meaning of Fay' and its recipients.
4. Did Rasūlullāh ﷺ gift Fadak to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا or not?
5. Did Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا claim the gifting of Fadak to her in the presence of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ or not?

The Reality of Fadak, its Boundaries, and Income

- It appears in *al-Qāmūs* that Fadak is a village in Khaybar.
- It is documented in *Miṣbāḥ al-Lughāt* that it is a city, located at a distance of a two day journey from Madīnah and one manzil from Khaybar.
- *Lisān al-'Arab* contains that Fadak is a village in Ḥijāz.
- Azharī says that it is a village in Khaybar.
- Some say that it is located on one side of Ḥijāz. It contains springs and date-palms. Allah ﷻ gave it to Rasūlullāh ﷺ as Fay'.
- It appears in *Marāṣid al-Itlā' 'alā Asmā' al-Amkinah wa al-Biqā'*¹ that Fadak is a village in Ḥijāz situated at a distance of a two or three day journey from Madīnah which Allah ﷻ awarded His Messenger ﷺ as Fay' since it was conquered after *ṣulḥ* (conciliation). It has springs and date-palms.

1 Vol. 2 pg. 337.

- *Muʿjam al-Buldān*¹ says that Fadak is a village in Ḥijāz at a distance of a two day journey from Madīnah. Some narrations say a three day journey. This village fell into the hands of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, after a *ṣulḥ*, during the 7th year of hijrah. It has plenty springs of water and date-palms.
- It is written in *Fath al-Bārī* that it is a town situated at a distance of a three day journey from Madīnah.²

Al-Shūstarī states in *Iḥqāq al-Ḥaqq* that the author of *Ibṭāl al-Bāṭil* says that Fadak was one of the villages of Khaybar. However, this is a lie. This is due to the fact that the author of *Jāmiʿ al-Uṣūl* has reported from Mālik ibn Aws that among the proofs Sayyidunā ʿUmar رضي الله عنه furnished was that a third of the spoils of Banū Naẓīr, Khaybar, and Fadak belonged to Rasūlullāh ﷺ.

Dildār ʿAlī, author of *Imād al-Islām* quotes from Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd — the Muʿtazilī — the reality of Fadak just as Qāḍī has mentioned.³

The boundaries of Fadak according to the Shīʿah

The incident the Shīʿah have mentioned about the boundaries of Fadak and its designation is as follows.

Mullā Bāqir al-Majlisī narrates on the authority of ʿAbd Allāh ibn Sinān who relates from Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq رحمته الله:

Rasūlullāh ﷺ was sitting in the house of Fāṭimah when Jibrīl appeared and said, “O Muḥammad! Stand up. Allah سبحانه وتعالى has instructed me to outline the boundary of Fadak for you with my wings.”

Accordingly, Rasūlullāh ﷺ stood up and left with Jibrīl and returned after a short while. Upon Fāṭimah’s enquiry, Rasūlullāh ﷺ said, “Jibrīl عليه السلام sketched out for me the boundaries of Fadak with his wings.”⁴

1 By Yāqūt al-Ḥimawī

2 *Fath al-Bārī*, commentary of *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, vol. 6 pg. 140.

3 *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah*, Chapter 10, section one.

4 *Bihār al-Anwār*, Kitāb al-Fitan. vol. 8 pg. 101.

Regretfully, we are unaware of any narration of the Imāmiyyah attributed to any of their Imāms which describes the area Jibrīl عليه السلام designated with his wings. Was it confined to that city, town, or village situated at a distance of a two or three day journey from Madīnah? Or were those boundaries designated which appear in the narration of Imām Mūsā al-Kāzīm; viz. one boundary in ‘Adn, the second in Samarqand, the third in Africa, and the fourth at the sea of Ārmīniyah hearing which Hārūn al-Rashīd exclaimed, “This encompasses the whole world!” The narration goes as follows:

Mullā Bāqir al-Majlisī narrates from *al-Manāqib* of Ibn Shahrāshūb that Hārūn al-Rashīd told Imām Mūsā al-Kāzīm to take Fadak. However, the Imām refused. Whenever Hārūn al-Rashīd bade him to take possession of Fadak, he would refuse. At the end, when he insisted, Imām Mūsā said, “I will only take it on condition that it is handed over wholly, with all its boundaries.”

Hārūn al-Rashīd said, “Okay, then tell me the boundaries.”

Imām Mūsā said, “If I describe the boundaries to you, you will never be able to give it.”

Hārūn Rashid submitted, “I take an oath on your grandfather that I will most definitely hand it over.”

Imām Mūsā then explained, “Its first boundary is ‘Adn.”

Hearing this, Hārūn al-Rashīd’s face changed.

He continued, “Its second boundary is Samarqand,” hearing which Hārūn al-Rashīd’s face began changing colour.

The Imām continued, “Its third boundary is Africa.”

Hārūn al-Rashīd’s face became black upon hearing this.

The Imām then concluded, “Its fourth boundary is the shore of the ocean bordering Ārmīniyah.”

Hārūn Rashid exclaimed, “You have left absolutely nothing for us.”

Imām Mūsā said, “I told you beforehand that if I tell you its boundaries, you will never be able to hand it over.”

After this, Hārūn al-Rashīd, intended to assassinate him.¹

After recording this narration, Mullā Bāqir al-Majlisī writes:

The narration of Ibn Asbāṭ mentions the first boundary as ‘Arīsh Miṣr (Egypt), the second as Dawmat al-Jandal, the third as Uḥūd, and the fourth as the ocean. Upon this Hārūn al-Rashīd, exclaimed, “This encompasses the whole world.”

Imām Mūsā explained, “This fell into the possession of the Jews after the death of Abū Hālah. Thereafter, Allah ﷻ and His Messenger took possession of it by way of Fay’ without any battle or fight and Allah ﷻ commanded Rasūlullāh ﷺ to give it to Fāṭimah.”

Al-Majlisī then says that these two boundaries are contradictory to what *Lughat Nawīsū* has mentioned. He then provides the answer to this by asserting that probably the Imām’s purport was that all of these were included in the ruling of Fadak. Although, the claim was for all, the word Fadak was used to refer to it all.

We have quoted here the narration that outlines the boundaries of Fadak which the Shī’ah narrate, for it seems as if Fadak and Khilāfah are synonymous according to them. Everything the Muslims owned was included under Fadak and that was exactly what Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا claimed.

However, the reality is something else, as we have expounded by quoting our narrations. Fadak is only a small hamlet and its boundaries were known to be limited and recognised just as the boundaries of other villages and towns. Rasūlullāh ﷺ handed over the administration of it to those from whom

1 Ibid

it was taken *ṣulḥan* (after conciliation; without war). It was decided that it will be split half between Rasūlullāh ﷺ and them. Subsequently, people would go there every year on behalf of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, evaluate or estimate the produce and bring Rasūlullāh's ﷺ half. Rasūlullāh ﷺ would set aside a portion from the produce and grain that would come from there for his family and household and would distribute the rest among the Muslims.

On the other hand, the Shī'ah claim that the income every year was 24000 gold coins¹ as asserted by al-Majlisī in *Ḥayāt al-Qulūb*. He writes that Rasūlullāh ﷺ made a covenant with the residents of Fadak that they will send 24000 gold coins each year. The author of *Tashīd al-Maṭā'in* writes that Abū Dāwūd documents in his *Sunan* that when 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz became Khalīfah, the income from Fadak at that time was 40000 gold coins.

How did Fadak come into Rasūlullāh's ﷺ possession?

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar writes in *Fathī al-Bārī*² that all the historians have recorded the incident of how Fadak fell into the hands of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. The residents of Fadak were Jews. After Khaybar was conquered, they sent a message to Rasūlullāh ﷺ that he should grant them amnesty and they will leave the city. Abū Dāwūd relates from al-Zuhrī that some people of Khaybar locked themselves up in a fort. They requested Rasūlullāh ﷺ to forgive them and allow them to leave. Rasūlullāh ﷺ acceded to their request and acted accordingly. Abū Dāwūd relates from Ibn Shihāb that Rasūlullāh ﷺ sieged the remainder of the people of Khaybar. During this period, the people of Fadak and some other selected villages came to a compromise and settlement with him.

It is written in *al-Tafsīr al-Kabīr*³ in the reason behind the revelation of the verse:

1 One gold coin weighs 4.374 grams. Hence, 24000 gold coins will weigh 104 976g. The price of gold on the 29th of Muḥarram 1439 (20th October 2017) was R560.85/g. Thus 24000 gold coins calculates to R58 875 789.60.

2 Vol. 6 pg. 139.

3 Page 271.

وَمَا أَفَاءَ اللَّهُ عَلَى رَسُولِهِ مِنْهُمْ

And what Allah restored [of property] to His Messenger from them¹

This verse is regarding Fadak since its residents were exiled and all their villages and wealth fell into the possession of Rasūlullāh ﷺ without any battle. Rasūlullāh ﷺ would take out the expenditure for himself and his family from the produce of Fadak and spend the remainder on weapons, etc.

Imām Abū al-‘Abbās Aḥmad ibn Yaḥyā al-Balādhurī writes in *Futūḥ al-Buldān* that Usāmah ibn Zayd reports from Ibn Shihāb who in turn reports from Mālik ibn Aws that Sayyidunā ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ said:

Rasūlullāh ﷺ had 3 ṣafāyā. (Ṣafāyā refers to that wealth or item which the Imām sets aside for himself from the booty.)

1. The wealth of Banū Naḍīr
2. Khaybar
3. Fadak

Rasūlullāh ﷺ set aside the wealth of Banū Naḍīr for his necessities, Fadak was allocated for the travellers, and Khaybar was divided into three; two thirds were divided among the Muslims and the third portion was reserved for himself and his family. Whatever remained after spending on his family was given to the poor Muhājirīn.²

The same book contains a narration that the people said:

While Rasūlullāh ﷺ was returning from Khaybar, he despatched Muḥayyiṣah ibn Mas‘ūd al-Anṣārī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to the people of Fadak to invite them to Islam. Their leader was a Jewish man by the name Yūsha’ ibn

1 Sūrah al-Ḥaṣhr: 6.

2 *Futūḥ al-Buldān* pg. 20.

Nūn. The Jews settled on handing half the land to Rasūlullāh ﷺ. The Muslims did not attack them on steeds, hence this portion was exclusively for Rasūlullāh ﷺ which he would spend on the travellers visiting him. The people of Fadak remained there until Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ assumed the position of khalīfah. He exiled the Jews from Hījāz. He despatched Abū al-Haytham Mālik ibn Tihān al-Anṣārī, Suhayl ibn Abī Khaythamah al-Anṣārī, and Zayd ibn Thābit al-Anṣārī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ to Fadak. They honestly estimated the value of half of the land and gave them the equivalent in money. Thereafter, they exiled them to Syria.¹

Similar narrations appear in *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, and *Tārīkh Kāmil Ibn Athīr*. We will reproduce their original texts in the footnotes.²

1 Ibid pg. 29.

2 The gist of what appears in *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* is:

حاصر رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أهل خيبر في حصينهم الوطيح والسلام حتى إذا أيقنوا بالهزيمة سألوه أن يسيرهم ويحقتهم دمائهم ففعل وكان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قد حاز الأموال كلها الشف ونطاح والكتيبة وجميع حصونهم إلا ما كان من ذبك الحصين فلما سمع بهم أهل فدك قد صنعوا ما صنعوا بعثوا إلى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يسألونه أن يسيرهم ويحقت دمائهم لهم ويحلوا لهم الأموال ففعل وكان في من مشى بينهم وبين رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم في ذلك محبصة بن مسعود وأخو بني حارثة فلما نزل أهل خيبر على ذلك سألو رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أن يعاملهم بالأموال على النصف وقالوا نحن أعلم بها منكم وأعدر لها فصالحهم رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم على النصف أعني أنا إذا شئنا نخرجكم وأخر جناكم وصالحه أهل فدك على مثل ذلك فكانت خيبر فينا للمسلمين وكانت فدك خالصة لرسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم

Rasūlullāh ﷺ laid siege to the people of Khaybar in their forts al-Waṭīḥ and al-Salālim. When they were convinced of defeat they beseeched him to allow them to leave and to spare their lives. Rasūlullāh ﷺ acted accordingly. Rasūlullāh ﷺ had secured all the wealth, al-shaff, naṭṭāḥ, al-kaṭībah, and all their forts except what was in these two forts. When the residents of Fadak heard about their plight and how they acted, they sent to Rasūlullāh ﷺ asking him to allow them to leave and spare their blood and wealth. Rasūlullāh ﷺ acceded to their request. Muḥayyiṣah and the brother of Banū Ḥārithah were some of those who delivered messages between them and Rasūlullāh ﷺ. When the residents of Khaybar agreed to this, they asked Rasūlullāh ﷺ to make a contract with them on half of the wealth. They said, “We are more knowledgeable of the land than you and have stayed here longer.” Rasūlullāh ﷺ thus made an agreement with them on half, coupled with the clause that when they desire, they will exile them. The people of Fadak came to the same agreement with Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Thus, Khaybar was Fay’ for the Muslims and Fadak was exclusively for Rasūlullāh ﷺ.

¹Al-Shūstārī with reference to *Muʿjam al-Buldān*, authored by Yāqūt al-Ḥimawī, has written that in the seventh year of hijrah Allah ﷻ awarded his Rasūl Fadak as Fay' upon conciliation. The incident is as follows:

When Rasūlullāh ﷻ reached Khaybar and conquered its forts, then only a third of the people remained. The severity of the siege began to tell on them, so they sent a man to Rasūlullāh ﷻ begging him to allow them to leave. Rasūlullāh ﷻ acceded to their request. This news reached the residents of Fadak who sent an envoy to Rasūlullāh ﷻ asking him to settle on half the wealth and fruits. Rasūlullāh ﷻ accepted this request as well. In this instance, steeds of war and camels were not instrumental in the conquest. Therefore, it was solely for Rasūlullāh ﷻ.

The manner in which Fadak fell into the hands of Rasūlullāh ﷻ appears in *Bihār al-Anwār* as narrated by Imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq رحمهُ اللهُ in the following way:

1 continued from page 721

The following appears in *Tārīkh Kāmil Ibn Athīr* vol. 2 pg. 108:

لما انصرف رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم من خيبر بعث محبصة بن مسعود إلى أهل فدك يدعوهم إلى الإسلام و رئيسهم يومئذ يوشع بن نون اليهود فصالحوا رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم على نصف الأرض فقبل منهم ذلك وكان نصف فدك خالصا لرسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم لأنه لم يوجف المسلمون عليه بخيل ولا ركاب يصرف ما يأتيه منها على أبناء السبيل ولم يزل أهلها بها حتى استخلف عمر بن الخطاب رضي الله عنه وأجلى يهود من الحجاز فبعث أبا الهيثم بن تيهان وسهل بن أبي خيثمة وزيد بن ثابت فقوموا النصف تربتها بقيمة عدل فدفعها إلى اليهود وأجلاهم إلى الشام ولم يزل رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وأبو بكر وعمر وعثمان وعلي رضي الله عنهم يصنعون صنع رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بعد وفاته فلما ولي معاوية الخلافة أقطعها مروان بن الحكم فوهبها مروان ابنه عبد الملك

When Rasūlullāh ﷻ departed from Khaybar, he sent Muḥayyiṣah ibn Mas'ūd to the inhabitants of Fadak inviting them towards Islam. Their leader at that time was the Jew Yūsha' ibn Nūn. They offered Rasūlullāh ﷻ a settlement on half of the land and Rasūlullāh ﷻ agreed. Thus, half of Fadak belonged solely to Rasūlullāh ﷻ since the Muslims did not attack it with their steeds and camels. He would spend its produce on the travelers. The inhabitants remained there until 'Umar was appointed Khalīfah. He exiled the Jews from Ḥijāz. So he dispatched Abū al-Haytham ibn Tihān, Suhayl ibn Abī Khaythamah, and Zayd ibn Thābit. They worked out the price of half of the land, with justice and equity, and gave the same to the Jews. He then exiled them to Syria. Abū Bakr, 'Umar, 'Uthmān, and 'Alī continued doing as Rasūlullāh ﷻ did after his demise. However, after Mu'āwiyah, Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam divided it and gifted it to his son 'Abd al-Malik.

Rasūlullāh ﷺ went on a Jihād campaign. While Rasūlullāh ﷺ was returning therefrom and stopped at a place, others were with Rasūlullāh ﷺ at the time, Jibrīl عليه السلام descended upon Rasūlullāh ﷺ and rolled the earth just as a cloth is rolled until he reached Fadak. When the inhabitants of Fadak heard the sound of horses, they thought that an enemy of theirs is about to attack them, so they closed the doors of the city. They handed the keys over to an old woman living on the outskirts of the city and climbed the mountain. Jibrīl عليه السلام came to the old woman, took the keys from her, and opened the doors of the city. Rasūlullāh ﷺ toured every house there. Jibrīl then said, “O Muḥammad! This is what Allah has exclusively given you, to the exclusion of all others. This is the meaning of Allah’s words:

وَمَا آفَاءَ اللَّهِ عَلَىٰ رَسُولِهِ

And what Allah restored [of property] to His Messenger.¹

Jibrīl عليه السلام thereafter closed the doors and handed over the keys to Rasūlullāh ﷺ who put them in the sheathe of his sword which was attached to his luggage. Rasūlullāh ﷺ then mounted his conveyance and the earth was rolled up for him until he reached the caravan [of Muslims]. People were still sitting at their places; they had not moved yet or gone anywhere. Just then, Rasūlullāh ﷺ announced, “I went to Fadak and Allah سبحانه وتعالى gave it to me as booty.”

The hypocrites began gesturing to one another. Rasūlullāh ﷺ then said, “These are the keys to Fadak.”

He took them out of his sheathe and displayed them. The people then mounted and departed. As soon as they reached Madīnah, Rasūlullāh ﷺ went to Fāṭimah and said, “O my daughter! Allah سبحانه وتعالى gave your father Fadak as booty. It belongs exclusively to your father, to the exclusion of other Muslims. I can do as I please with it.”²

1 Sūrah al-Ḥaṣhr: 6.

2 This narration also appears in the Urdu translation of *Ḥayāt al-Qulūb* vol. 2 pg. 347, 348.

Al-Majlisī narrates an even more surprising and astonishing narration from *Tafsīr Furāt ibn Ibrāhīm*. This narration totally suits his nature. He wants to show that Fadak came into the possession of Rasūlullāh ﷺ with the help of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and after some leaders of Fadak were killed. He wishes to implicitly establish Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s رضي الله عنه right over Fadak. The narration goes as follows:

Zayn ibn Muḥammad ibn Ja’far ‘Alawī, reports from Muḥammad ibn Marwān, from ‘Ubayd ibn Yaḥyā, from Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه:

Jibrīl عليه السلام entered the presence of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Rasūlullāh ﷺ wore his armour and saddled his horse. Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه also wore his armour and saddled his horse. Then in the middle of the night both ventured out to somewhere no one knew and to where Allah wished to take them. Finally, they reached Fadak. Just then, ‘Alī submitted to Rasūlullāh ﷺ, “I will carry you and proceed?”

Rasūlullāh ﷺ replied, “No, I will carry you instead.”

Rasūlullāh ﷺ then lifted ‘Alī onto his shoulders and proceeded until they reached the outskirts of the fort of Fadak. ‘Alī entered the fort from there holding Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ sword. ‘Alī then advanced and called out the adhān and the takbīr, hearing which the people of the fort became scared and exited the doors. Rasūlullāh ﷺ then came to them followed by ‘Alī. ‘Alī killed 18 of their leaders and seniors after which the rest of them surrendered. Rasūlullāh ﷺ placed their children in front of him and placed their wealth and commodities on their necks and took them to Madīnah. Thus, no one used any effort in conquering Fadak. That is why Fadak is exclusively for him and his progeny, the Muslims have no share therein.¹

1 *Bihār al-Anwār*, Kitāb al-Fitan, pg. 90.

In short, it is accepted by both parties that Fadak is included in the wealth known as Fay'. We thought it appropriate to explain the meaning and recipients of Fay'.

The meaning of Fay' and its recipients

It appears in *Lisān al-'Arab*:

الفية الغنيمة و الخراج و هو ما حصل للمسلمين من أموال الكفار من غير حرب و لا جهاد و أصل الفية الرجوع كأنه كان في الأصل لهم فرجع إليهم و منه قيل الظل الذي يكون بعد الزوال فيء لأنه يرجع من جانب الغرب إلى جانب الشرق

Fay' is that booty and tax which the Muslims acquire from the wealth of the kuffār without war, or jihād. Fay' originally means to return. As if it was originally for the Muslims, and now it returned to them. From this perspective, the shadow which appears after zenith is called fay' since it returns from the West to the East.

The word Fay' has been extracted from the glorious Qur'ān. Who is it exclusively for and whom are its recipients has been mentioned in detail in the following verse of Sūrah al-Ḥashr. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى declares:

وَمَا آفَاءَ اللَّهُ عَلَى رَسُولِهِ مِنْهُمْ فَمَا أَوْجَفْتُمْ عَلَيْهِ مِنْ خَيْلٍ وَلَا رِكَابٍ وَلَكِنَّ اللَّهَ يُسَلِّطُ رَسُولَهُ عَلَى مَنْ يَشَاءُ ۗ وَاللَّهُ عَلَى كُلِّ شَيْءٍ قَدِيرٌ ۖ مَا آفَاءَ اللَّهُ عَلَى رَسُولِهِ مِنْ أَهْلِ الْقُرَىٰ فَلِلَّهِ وَلِلرَّسُولِ وَلِذِي الْقُرْبَىٰ وَالْيَتَامَىٰ وَالْمَسَاكِينِ وَابْنِ السَّبِيلِ

And what Allah restored [of property] to His Messenger from them - you did not spur for it [in an expedition] any horses or camels, but Allah gives His messengers power over whom He wills, and Allah is over all things competent. And what Allah restored to His Messenger from the people of the towns - it is for Allah and for the Messenger and for [his] near relatives and orphans and the [stranded] traveller.¹

1 Sūrah al-Ḥashr: 6, 7.

It is written in the commentary of this verse in *al-Tafsīr al-Kabīr*¹:

Mubarrad says that *fā'a yafr'u* is said when something returns. When Allah ﷻ returns something, He says *afā'a Allah*.

Azharī explains that *Fay'* refers to that wealth of the enemy which Allah gives the Muslims without a fight. There are many ways this could happen.

1. The enemy run away from their land, leaving it for the Muslims.
2. They come to a compromise on *Jizyah* which they will pay on behalf of every person.
3. Or they give in lieu anything else besides *Jizyah* for the protection of their lives. For instance, the Banū Naḍīr made an agreement with Rasūlullāh ﷺ that every three men will load a camel with whatever they can, excluding weapons, and will leave the rest behind. The wealth that remained is known as *Fay'*.

This is the wealth which Allah ﷻ diverted from the *kuffār* to the Muslims.

The pronoun in *minhum* (from them) refers to the Jews and the Banū Naḍīr.

Fa mā awjaftum (you did not spur). This comes from *wajafa al-faras al-ba'ir yajifu wajfan wa wajīfan* which means to move swiftly. When anyone spurs someone to move swiftly, then it is said *awjafa ṣāhibah*, (he prodded his companion/animal).

The pronoun in '*alayh* (for it) refers back to *mā afā'a Allah*.

Min khayl wa lā rikāb (any horses or camels). *Rikāb* refers to camels. The Arabs refers to a camel rider as *rākib*, and a horse rider as *fāris*.

1 Vol. 6 pg. 271.

The meaning of this verse is that the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ requested Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ to distribute the wealth of Fay' among them just as he distributes Ghanīmah (booty). Upon this, Allah سُبحانه وتعالى revealed verses explaining the difference between the two. Ghanīmah is that wealth which you laboured for and attacked on horseback and camelback, while Fay' is different in the sense that you did not work for it. Thus, this will remain in Rasūlullāh's صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ possession; he may do with it as he pleases.

Imām Rāzī writes in the commentary of this verse that if the verse refers to the wealth of the Banū Naḍīr, then the question arises that their wealth was seized after fighting, which follows that it ought to be Ghanīmah, not Fay'. He then explains that the Mufasssīrīn give two answers.

1. This verse does not pertain to the villages of Banū Naḍīr, but rather to Fadak.
2. Although it applies to the wealth of Banū Naḍīr. However, when the battle took place the Muslims did not have any horses or camels nor did they travel. Their enemy lived 2 miles away from them so the Muslims walked to their forts. Only Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was mounted on a camel. Moreover, there was not much fighting and camels were not present at all. Therefore, Allah سُبحانه وتعالى declared its acquisition similar to the acquisition without a fight and declared the wealth solely for Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

Nevertheless, it appears in a narration that Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ distributed the wealth among the Muḥājirīn and only gave three men of the Anṣār who were needy viz. Abū Dujānah, Sahl ibn Ḥanīf, and Ḥārith ibn Ṣimmaḥ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ.

With regards to the wealth that came into the possession of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and the Khulafā' and A'immah after his demise, it is necessary to explain in detail its reality, its types, and its recipients so that the difference between Fay' and other types of wealth e.g. Ghanīmah, etc., becomes evident. Moreover, to determine whether the usage of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and the Khulafā' was due to possession or administration. We will explain these points here.

It should be remembered that majority of the time, the word *ṣadaqah*, or *ṣadaqāt* when used in the glorious Qur’ān and the aḥādīth has two meanings. One is general and the other specific. Sometimes it is used in its general meaning referring to that wealth which is collected and spent for the benefit of the Muslims, mobilisation of the army, and other work. This meaning includes *ṣadaqah*, *zakāh*, wealth with no heirs, fifth of the booty, *Kharāj* (tax), and *Fay’*. At other times, it is used in its specific meaning referring to *zakāh* and *iṣṭilāḥī ṣadaqah* (i.e. *wājib* charity). The *ṣadaqah* which is prohibited for the Ahl al-Bayt of Rasūlullāh ﷺ is the specific *ṣadaqah*, i.e. *zakāh* and *wājib ṣadaqah*.

The wealth that came into Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ possession is of three types.

1. *Zakāh*
2. *Ghanīmah* (booty)
3. *Fay’*

Ṣadaqah is used to refer to *zakāh* at times. Its mention appears in Sūrah al-Tawbah where the recipients of *zakāh* have been listed.

Booty is that wealth which is acquired after war. It is also referred to as *anfāl* and has been mentioned in Sūrah al-Anfāl.

Allah ﷻ states regarding the recipients of *zakāh*:

إِنَّمَا الصَّدَقَاتُ لِلْفُقَرَاءِ وَالْمَسْكِينِ وَالْعَامِلِينَ عَلَيْهَا وَالْمُؤَلَّفَةِ قُلُوبُهُمْ وَفِي الرِّقَابِ وَالْغَارِمِينَ
وَفِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ وَأَبْنِ السَّبِيلِ فَرِيضَةً مِّنَ اللَّهِ وَاللَّهُ عَلِيمٌ حَكِيمٌ

Zakāh expenditures are only for the poor and for the needy and for those employed to collect [*zakāh*] and for bringing hearts together [for Islam] and for freeing captives [or slaves] and for those in debt and for the cause of Allah and for the [stranded] traveller - an obligation [imposed] by Allah. And Allah is Knowing and Wise.¹

1 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 60.

Only the following are deserving of zakāh:

1. *Faqīr*, i.e. those poor people who do not beg.
2. *Miskīn*, i.e. those poor people who beg.
3. Those appointed to collect zakāh.
4. Those whose assistance can be used in jihād. Softening their hearts is the objective.
5. To free slaves.
6. To pay off the debts of the debtors.
7. In the path of Allah, e.g. Jihād, etc.
8. The travellers.

Some munāfiqīn levelled objections against Rasūlullāh's ﷺ manner of distributing zakāh. They objected by saying that Rasūlullāh ﷺ takes wealth from the wealthy and gives his relatives and friends as he pleases and does not observe justice. Consequently, Allah ﷻ revealed this verse explaining the recipients of zakāh to confirm that Rasūlullāh ﷺ has no connection to it. He does not take anything for himself, nor does he give anything to his relatives or friends. Rasūlullāh ﷺ is a trustee and treasurer and divides it according to Allah's ﷻ command.

فكان عليه الصلوة والسلام يقول ما أعطيتكم شيئا ولا أمنعكم إنما أنا خازن أضع حيث أمرت

Rasūlullāh ﷺ would declare, "I do not give you anything nor withhold from you anything. I am only a trustee. I spend as I am instructed."

Allah ﷻ mentions Ghanīmah in the beginning of Sūrah al-Anfāl:

يَسْأَلُونَكَ عَنِ الْأَنْفَالِ قُلِ الْأَنْفَالُ لِلَّهِ وَالرَّسُولِ فَاتَّقُوا اللَّهَ وَأَصْلِحُوا ذَاتَ بَيْنِكُمْ وَأَطِيعُوا اللَّهَ
وَرَسُولَهُ إِن كُنْتُمْ مُؤْمِنِينَ

They ask you, [O Muḥammad], about the bounties [of war]. Say, “The [decision concerning] bounties is for Allah and the Messenger.” So fear Allah and amend that which is between you and obey Allah and His Messenger, if you should be believers.¹

This verse was revealed concerning the booty obtained during the Battle of Badr. Since Badr was the first battle and this was the first booty which the Muslims obtained, there was some argument regarding it. It is mentioned in Ma‘ālim al-Tanzīl, etc., that the reason for the argument was that in the era of ignorance, the procedure was that the leader of the army would first take what he wanted for himself. What he took was called ṣafī². A fourth was then given to the army general and the rest was distributed among the warriors. Whatever a person seized himself, he would understand it to be his possession. In this way, the strong and sturdy would oppress the weak by taking all the fine wealth for themselves. Keeping this in mind, a dispute arose regarding the booty. And since no command had been revealed yet concerning booty, the people submitted, “O Rasūlullāh ﷺ! Take a fourth and ṣafī (what you want) for yourself from the booty and allow us to distribute the rest.” Upon this, Allah ﷻ revealed the verse announcing that the booty did not belong to anyone. It belongs to Allah ﷻ and His Messenger ﷺ, so do not dispute over it.

It should be clearly understood that the meaning of

الْأَنْفَالُ لِلَّهِ وَالرَّسُولِ

Bounties are for Allah and the Messenger

does not mean that half belongs to Allah and the other half belongs to Rasūlullāh ﷺ. The purport is that the wealth belongs to Allah, and Rasūlullāh ﷺ is the trustee and distributor. Mention of Rasūlullāh ﷺ does not mean that

1 Sūrah al-Anfāl: 1.

2 Ṣafāyā is its plural which appears many a times in this discussion.

it belongs solely to Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Instead, such speech is used to show the possession of Allah alone. And the object of declaring it Allah's *سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى* wealth is so that no one has a claim over it. Rather, it will be distributed as instructed by Allah *سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى*. In the 41st verse of the same Sūrah, Allah *سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى* commanded:

وَأَعْلَمُوا أَنَّمَا غَنِمْتُمْ مِنْ شَيْءٍ فَإِنَّ لِلَّهِ خُمُسَهُ وَلِلرَّسُولِ وَلِذِي الْقُرْبَىٰ وَالْيَتَامَىٰ وَالْمَسَاكِينِ وَابْنِ
السَّبِيلِ

And know that anything you obtain of war booty - then indeed, for Allah is one fifth of it and for the Messenger and for [his] near relatives and the orphans, the needy, and the [stranded] traveller.¹

Four fifths will be distributed among those who physically fought or were active in posts related to fighting.

The words: *for the Messenger and for [his] near relatives and the orphans, the needy, and the [stranded] traveller* clearly establish that Allah did not apportion a share specifically for Rasūlullāh ﷺ as the leader of the army as in the days of ignorance. Rather, Allah *سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى* destroyed the practice of ignorance and established *khumus* (the fifth) which will be spent firstly on Rasūlullāh's ﷺ and his family's needs. That which remains will be spent on the orphans, the needy, and travellers. Allah *سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى* wished to highlight the fact that He only commanded His Messenger to fight the kuffār in order to defend Islam, protect the Muslims, and raise the banner of Allah's Word. His Messenger is pure and free from appropriating wealth, acquiring power and authority, usurping wealth and commodities, and the love for fame. It follows, that Rasūlullāh ﷺ was not allowed to take any share for himself or allot any land for himself or for his relatives as was the practice in the days of ignorance or is the practice of normal army generals of the world today. To the contrary, the orphans, needy, traveller, and his family members were all partners in the fifth of the booty. He was appointed as a trustee to spend the wealth to assist them, take care of them,

1 Sūrah al-Anfāl: 41.

and fulfil their needs. Considering this fact, no staunch enemy of Islam can ever object to Rasūlullāh ﷺ of sensuality, love for fame, appropriation, etc. In fact, he will have conviction that Islam is the true religion of Allah ﷻ and its commands are not for the benefit or luxury of certain individuals, even though he be the Messenger of Allah. He was appointed to spend on his family's basic needs, and then on the orphans, needy, and travellers; keeping nothing for himself. Accordingly, whatever would come to him as fifth of the booty, he would use a small portion of it for his needs and spend the rest in the path of Allah ﷻ. And this fact is evident from his biography and practice. He would not keep anything for the morrow. If anything remained behind, he would be restless until it was spent in the path of Allah. And Allah knows best where to place His Message.

The following is written in *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi*:

قل الأنفال لله و الرسول مختصة بهما يضعانها حيث شاء

Say: Bounties are for Allah and the Messenger. This is exclusively for them. They may spend it as they wish.

It appears in *al-Tahdhīb* from Imām al-Bāqir and Imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq رحمهما الله that Fay' and Anfāl refer to that wealth which was obtained without bloodshed, after a compromise was reached. Fay' and Anfāl is the same thing. The verses that apply to Fay' are in Sūrah al-Ḥashr. The first verse is:

وَمَا آفَاءَ اللَّهِ عَلَىٰ رَسُولِهِ مِنْهُمْ فَمَا أَوْجَفْتُمْ عَلَيْهِ مِنْ خَيْلٍ وَلَا رِكَابٍ وَلَكِنَّ اللَّهَ يُسَلِّطُ رَسُولَهُ عَلَىٰ مَنْ يَشَاءُ وَاللَّهُ عَلَىٰ كُلِّ شَيْءٍ قَدِيرٌ

And what Allah restored [of property] to His Messenger from them - you did not spur for it [in an expedition] any horses or camels, but Allah gives His messengers power over whom He wills, and Allah is over all things competent.¹

1 Sūrah al-Ḥashr: 6.

The second verse explains the recipients of Fay’:

مَا أَفَاءَ اللَّهُ عَلَى رَسُولِهِ مِنْ أَهْلِ الْقُرَىٰ فَلِلَّ رَسُولِ وَلِذِي الْقُرْبَىٰ وَالْيَتَامَىٰ وَالْمَسَاكِينِ وَابْنِ
السَّبِيلِ

And what Allah restored to His Messenger from the people of the towns - it is for Allah and for the Messenger and for [his] near relatives and orphans and the [stranded] traveller.¹

The point of discussion concerning Fay’ is whether the wealth belonged to Rasūlullāh ﷺ and was understood as his personal possession or was it in the administration of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and he would spend it as Allah ﷻ commanded, for the benefit of the Muslims and to fulfil other sharī necessities. What is apparent from Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ behaviour and conduct is that Rasūlullāh ﷺ would spend it according to the command of Allah ﷻ. He did not own it. He was not free to do as he pleased with it; spend on whomsoever he willed, and withhold from whomsoever he willed. Rather, he performed just as a slave is commanded; he spent as his Master instructed. Rasūlullāh ﷺ himself announced this as appears in the ḥadīth:

ما أعطيتكم شيئا ولا أمنعكم إنما أنا خازن أضع حيث أمرت

I do not give you anything nor prevent you from anything, I am only a trustee. I spend as I am instructed.

The same thing is evident from the manner Rasūlullāh ﷺ spent Fay’. Whatever produce came from those lands, Rasūlullāh ﷺ would set aside one year’s suitable expenditure for himself and his family and spend the rest to buy conveyances and weapons for war. In short, Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ usage of Fay’ was administrative, not possessive.

1 Sūrah al-Ḥashr: 7.

Allah's *سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى* declaration of it being for Rasūlullāh *صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ* means that no other person's share is in it, nor can it be distributed like booty. It will remain in the control of Rasūlullāh *صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ*. He may use it for the benefit of Islam, to prepare armies, or fulfil the needs of the orphans, needy, and poor.

Rasūlullāh *صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ* was faced with fighting the enemy and coming to compromises with them. Due to this, there was a great need of money for the administration of the Islamic state. The booty that would be obtained; four fifths were divided among the soldiers and only one fifth was used to fulfil all other needs, which did not prove sufficient. Hence, the wealth that was obtained without fighting the enemy was kept especially for Rasūlullāh's *صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ* usage so that he may execute the requisites of the Islamic state.

It is documented in *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi*:

وفي الجامع عن الصادق الأنفال كل ما أخذ من دار الحرب بغير قتال و كل أرض انجلى أهلها عنها بغير قتال و سماها الفقهاء فينا و الأرضون الموات و الأجام و بطون الأودية و قطائع الملوک و ميراث من لا وارث له و هي لله و للرسول و لمن قام مقامه بعده

It appears in *al-Jāmi'* from al-Ṣādiq: Anfāl is everything taken from lands of war without any battle and every land from where the residents have been evicted without a battle. The Fuqahā' have called it Fay'. Included herein are uncultivated lands, forests, valleys, feudal estates, and the inheritance of one who is not survived by any heirs. It belongs to Allah and His Messenger and to his successor after his demise.

This ḥadīth also proves that Fay' is not the personal possession but rather in the administration of Rasūlullāh *صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ* to spend for the benefit of the state. As a result, it falls into the control of Rasūlullāh's *صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ* successor after his demise. Otherwise the following words of Imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq *رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ* will be meaningless:

هي لله و للرسول و لمن قام مقامه بعده

It belongs to Allah and His Messenger and to his successor after his demise.

Another narration recorded in *al-Kāfi* from Imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq has the following:

الأفقال ما لم يوجف عليه بخيل و لا ركاب أو قوم صولحوها أو قوم أعطوا بأيديهم و كل أرض خربة و بطون الأودية فهو لرسول الله و هو للإمام من بعده يضعه حيث يشاء

Anfāl: That which was not conquered by prodding horses or camels, or a nation with whom a compromise was reached, or a nation who surrendered, every uncultivated land, and valleys. They belong to Allah and the Messenger of Allah and the Imām after him; they may spend it as they wish.

This proves that Anfāl and Fay' are only under the administration of the Messenger and the Imām thereafter. Otherwise, Imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ – had he believed in dividing Rasūlullāh's صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ inheritance as supposed by the Shī'ah – he would not have said that after Rasūlullāh's صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ demise it will be the Imām's. The word Imām itself indicates that the wealth reaches him because of his succession to Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, not due to inheritance. This occurs worldwide. From every king to every small mayor, whoever is in a position of leadership, has two angles to his job position. One is personal and the other is governmental, managerial, or administrative. Taking into consideration the first angle, all land which he is in charge of belongs solely to him. And looking at the second angle, all land, treasures, taxes, and other forms of income are understood to be part of the state and are kept in the *bayt al-māl*, which is referred to as state property and the public treasury nowadays. The first type of wealth falls into his inheritance while the second type goes into the possession of his successor who will spend it according to certain established principles and laws.

In the commentary of the verse:

وَأَعْلَمُوا أَنَّمَا غَنِمْتُمْ مِنْ شَيْءٍ

And know that anything you obtain of war booty¹

1 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 41.

The author of *Tafsīr al-ṣāfi* writes the following regarding the recipients of the one fifth:

و في الكافي عن الرضا أنه سئل عن هذه الآية فقيل له فما كان لله فللمن هو فقال لرسول الله و ما كان
لرسول الله فهو للإمام

It is narrated in *al-Kāfi* from al-Riḍā that he was asked concerning this verse, “That which is for Allah, for whom is it?”

He replied, “It is for the Messenger of Allah, and whatever is for the Messenger of Allah is for the Imām.”

This clearly shows that it is not the personal and individual wealth of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and cannot be distributed as inheritance. Instead, it goes to the Imām because he is the successor of the Messenger.

Tafsīr al-Qummī reports from the same source:

سهم الله و الرسول يرثه الإمام

Allah and the Messenger’s share will be taken by the Imām.

The reason for it being transferred to the Imām is that he is tasked with the same responsibilities as the Messenger, i.e. assisting the Muslims, settling debts, preparing weaponry and steeds for war, arranging and coordinating Ḥajj and Jihād, etc.

Al-Qummī says:

و الخمس يقسم على ستة أسهم سهم لله و سهم لرسول الله و سهم للإمام فسهم الله و سهم الرسول يرثه
الإمام فيكون للإمام ثلاثة أسهم من ستة و ثلاثة أسهم لأيتام آل الرسول و مساكينهم و أبناء سبيلهم و إنما
صارت للإمام وحده من الخمس ثلاثة أسهم لأن الله تعالى قد ألزمه بما ألزم النبي من مؤونة المسلمين و
قضاء ديونهم و حلهم في الحج و الجهاد

Khumus will be divided into six parts. One share for Allah, one for Rasūlullāh ﷺ, and one for the Imām. Allah's share and Rasūlullāh's ﷺ share will be taken by the Imām. Thus, the Imām will have three shares of the six. Three shares will be for the orphans of Rasūlullāh's ﷺ family, their needy, and their travellers. Three shares of the Khumus have been reserved solely for the Imām because Allah Ta'ālā charged him with what he charged the Nabī ﷺ viz. assisting the Muslims, settling their debts, and assisting them financially for Ḥajj and Jihād.

It is written in the tafsīr book *Manhaj al-ṣādiqīn* under the commentary of the verse, what Allah restored to his Messenger:

سوم فی است یعنی منجمله اموالیکه ائمه و ولایه دران تصرف دارند و این مالے ست که که از کفار به مسلمانان منتقل شود بدون قتل و ایجاب خیل و رکاب و این رسول رابا شد در حیات وی و بعد از وی کسی را که قائم مقام وی باشد از ائمه دینو ایشان بپیر کس که خوابند دهند و بپیر چه صلاح باشد صرف نمایند و این قول امیر المومنین است صلوة الله و سلامه علیه

Fay' is that wealth which the Muslims acquire from the kuffār without a fight and without an attack by the cavalry. This wealth is for the Messenger during his lifetime and in the administration of that person after his demise who is his successor from the A'immah of Dīn. He has the option to give whom he wills and spends where he feels appropriate. This is the declaration of Amīr al-Mu'minīn رضی اللہ عنہ.

This declaration which has been quoted clearly shows that Rasūlullāh's ﷺ usage of the wealth was administrative, nor possessive. After his demise, it cannot be divided as inheritance. Instead, it falls into the management of his successor and Imām of the time.

The same author has written thereafter:

ابن عباس و عمر و فقہای ما براند کہ مستحقان فی و خمس بنو باشم انداز فرزندان ابو طالب و عباس

It is unanimously agreed upon by our Fuqahā' as well as Ibn 'Abbās and Ibn 'Umar that the Banū Hāshim, i.e. the sons of Abū Ṭālib and 'Abbās are deserving of Fay' and Khumus.

This proves that the Imāmiyyah Fuqahā' do not regard Fay' as the personal wealth of Rasūlullāh ﷺ or the Imām. They regard the entire Banū Hāshim – referring to the sons of Abū Ṭālib and 'Abbās – deserving of it, not only the sons of Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا.

Without considering any narrations, aḥādīth, or statements, the glorious Qur'ān itself affirms that Fay' cannot be the personal belonging or individual lands of anyone specific. The verse that stipulates Fay' for Allah, His Messenger, the orphans, the needy, and the travellers;

مَا أَفَاءَ اللَّهُ عَلَى رَسُولِهِ مِنْ أَهْلِ الْقُرَىٰ فَلِلَّهِ وَلِلرَّسُولِ وَلِذِي الْقُرْبَىٰ وَالْيَتَامَىٰ وَالْمَسْكِينِ وَابْنِ السَّبِيلِ

And what Allah restored to His Messenger from the people of the towns - it is for Allah and for the Messenger and for [his] near relatives and orphans and the [stranded] traveller.¹

Inclusion of the last three categories reveal that this wealth is not someone's personal wealth. Instead, it is given to look after these categories of people.

The example of this is like a king appointing a governor of a province over the produce/income and telling him its recipients. Undoubtedly, the governor can allot a share for his personal needs. However, he is charged with discharging the remainder among the recipients listed by the king in a manner he feels suitable. Appointing him over the funds does not mean that he becomes the individual owner of that wealth and he may spend it as he pleases without following the commands of the king, and thereafter leave it behind for his heirs to distribute it among themselves as inheritance. Similarly, Allah ﷻ gave Fay' into the management of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and listed the recipients for him. This means that after fulfilling his basic needs, he should spend the rest on the relatives, orphans, needy, and travellers. Had this not been intended, but rather his sole

1 Sūrah al-Ḥashr: 7.

ownership was intended then only the word *li al-rasūl* (for the Messenger) would have appeared without orphans, needy, and travellers attached to it. Allah ﷻ has highlighted this very point just a few words further in the same verse stating:

كَيْ لَا يَكُونَ دُولَةً بَيْنَ الْأَغْنِيَاءِ مِنْكُمْ

So that it will not be a perpetual distribution among the rich from among you.¹

We have given this directive so that Fay' does not remain among the affluent, staying in their perpetual distribution. This will be the case when Fay' becomes someone's personal possession and it remains in his progeny. Accordingly, it is written in the commentary of this verse in *Manhaj al-Ṣādiqīn*:

حق سبحان ایں را یعنی فی را خاصہ پیغمبر گدانید و قسمت انزابر وجہیکہ مذکور شد مقرر ساخت و فرمود کہ بریں طریق کہ حکم فی نمودیم کیلا یکون تانبا شد ایں فی دولتہ ایں چیزے کہ متداول باشدست بدست گرداں بین الاغنیاء منکم میان توانگراں از شما کہ بیان مکاترت کنید و بقوت و غلبہ زیادہ از حق خود بردارید و فقراء را اندک دہید یا محروم سازید چنانکہ در زمانہ جاہلیت بود

Allah exclusively assigned Fay' for Rasūlullāh ﷺ and determined its distribution. He commanded that this wealth of Fay' should not be passed in the hands of people in this manner that the wealthy get a greater portion than they deserve due to their larger numbers and greater influence, leaving only a little for the poor or totally depriving them. This will then lead to the exact practice of the era of ignorance.

The same Mufassir writes thereafter:

خطاب بابل ایمان است غیراز پیغمبر و اہل بیت و ے صلوة اللہ علیہم اجمعین

Besides the Messenger and the Ahl al-Bayt, the address is to all Muslims.

1 Sūrah al-Ḥashr: 7.

However, this statement has no sanad.

At the same time, it does not mean that this wealth is the personal belonging of Rasūlullāh ﷺ or anyone from the Ahl al-Bayt for inheritance to apply to it. Our viewpoint is further strengthened by what has been reported from ‘Alam al-Hudā in *Tafsīr Manhaj al-Ṣādiqīn* that *dhawī al-qurbā* refers to the Imām, and not the general relatives. This is due to the fact that the Imām is the replacement of the Messenger, hence Fay’ ought to be under his control and management. He writes:

از علم الهدی نقل است که ذوی القربی که بصورت مفرد واقع شده دلالت می کند برآنکه مراد از آن امام است که قائم مقام پیغمبر است چه اگر مراد جمع می بود ذوی القربی واقع می شد

It is reported from ‘Alam al-Hudā that since the word *dhawī al-qurbā* appeared in its singular form, it refers to the Imām who is Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ substitute. Had it not referred specifically to the Imām but included all others as well, the word *dhawī al-qurbā* would have appeared in its plural form.

The author of *Majma’ al-Bayān* writes in his *Tafsīr* in the commentary of the above verse:

الدولة اسم للشيء الذي يتداوله القوم بينهم يكون لهذا مرة إي لثلا يكون الشيء متداولاً بين الرؤساء منكم يعمل فيه كما كان يعمل في الجاهلية وهذا خطاب للمؤمنين دون أهل بيته عليهم السلام وفي هذه الآية إشارة إلى إن تدبير الإمة مفوض إلى النبي وإلى الإئمة القائمين مقامه ولهذا قسم رسول الله إموال خيبر و من عليهم في رقابهم و إجلى بني النضير و بني قينقاع و إعطاهم شيئاً من المال و قتل رجال بني قريظة و سبي ذراريهم و نسائهم و قسم إموالهم على المهاجرين و من على أهل مكة

Al-dūlah is the name of something which people pass around. It belongs to this one for a while and that one for a while. The meaning is, so that it does not remain a perpetual distribution between your leaders, and enjoyed as it was enjoyed in the era of ignorance. This address is for the Mu’minīn, not the Ahl al-Bayt رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ. In this verse, there is indication towards the fact that caring for the ummah has been assigned to the Nabī ﷺ and

the A'immah who are his replacements. Owing to this, Rasūlullāh ﷺ divided the wealth of Khaybar but spared their lives. He exiled the Banū al-Naḍīr and the Banū Qaynuqā' but gave them a little wealth. He killed the men of the Banū Qurayzah and took their children and women as captive and distributed their wealth among the Muhājirīn and those from Makkah but spared the people of Makkah.

It is apparent from the above statements that the only difference between Ghanīmah and Fay' is that the latter does not have a share of anyone else unlike the former. It has been assigned to Rasūlullāh ﷺ so that he may keep administrative possession over it and spend it according to the pleasure and command of Allah. After his demise, it was handed over to the Imām and Khalīfah of the time so that he may distribute it among those recipients Rasūlullāh ﷺ would give. The obvious conclusion is that the laws of inheritance do not apply to Fay' since it is not the personal belonging of anyone. Fadak is part of Fay'. So if hypothetically, the laws of inheritance applied to Rasūlullāh's ﷺ estate, and Rasūlullāh's ﷺ blessed being was not excluded from the general rule of inheritance, then too Fadak would be discounted from application of the laws of inheritance and distribution since it was not his personal wealth.

Some far sighted Shī'ah realised the flaw of confining Sayyidah Fāṭimah's claim of Fadak to inheritance, so they proffered that it was gifted to her and this is what she claimed. Whereas Rasūlullāh ﷺ having only administrative control over Fadak, not possessive, falsifies the gift claim because gifting something out of one's personal possession is not possible. Nevertheless, we will turn a blind eye to this.

We feel it appropriate to mention all the proofs the Shī'ah scholars have provided from Sunnī sources in historical sequence, from their early scholars to their present day scholars.

A list of Shī'ī books written on the Fadak issue in chronological order

What the senior Shī'ah – who lived close to the era of the noble A'imma – have written in this regard has not passed our gaze. However, probably it would not be very detailed. As far as we know, the first book that documented this discussion in detail is *al-Shāfi* which al-Sayyid al-Murtaḍā – titled as '*Alam al-Hudā*' – wrote in refutation of Qāḍī 'Abd al-Jabbār's book *Mughnī*. This book was written towards the end of the fourth century or in the beginning of the fifth since the author was born in 355 and died in 433, or 436 A.H. This book was published in Iran in 1301 and the following was written about it:

و هو كتاب لم يأت بمثله أحد من الأنام في سالف الشهور و الأعوام و لا يأتون أبدا و لو كان بعضهم
لبعض ظهيرا لأن أجداده الطاهرين كانوا له في نصرته لهم هاديا و مؤيدا و نصيرا

No one from the creation has authored a book similar to it in the past nor will they be ever able to in the future, although they help one another. This is due to the fact that his pure forefathers were guiding him, assisting him, and supporting him.

Shaykh al-Ṭā'ifah Abū Ja'far al-Ṭūsī gave a new layout to the discussions of the book *al-Shāfi* and named it *Talkhīṣ al-Shāfi*. This book was written in 432 A.H. as stated by the author himself. The following has been written in praise of it:

و هو كأصله لم يأت مصنف و لا مؤلف بمثله على رد العلماء العامة العياء

1 His full name is 'Alī ibn Ḥusayn ibn Mūsā al-Mūsawī. However, he is commonly known with the titles '*Alam al-Hudā* and al-Sayyid al-Murtaḍā. He was born in 355 A.H. He is the elder brother of Sharīf Raḍī, compiler of *Nahj al-Balāghah*. Both brothers were students of Shaykh al-Mufīd.

Al-Khuwānsārī writes about him that al-Sayyid al-Murtaḍā was unique and exceptional in knowledge, understanding, oratory, and poetry and extremely honoured in his time. With regards to his books, they all assume the level of *uṣūl* (principles) and *ta'sīs* (foundation), which is unprecedented. For instance, the book *al-Shāfi* is such a book on Imāmah which is unparalleled. I say that this book is just like its name, *kāfi* (sufficient) and *shāfi* (satisfactory). (*Rawḍāt al-Jannāt* vol. 4 pg. 1295)

He is one of the pillars of Shī'ism and one of its founders. He died in 436 A.H. (Shaykh Muḥammad Firāsāt)

It is just like its original. No author or writer has written something like it in refutation of the incapable Sunnī ‘Ulamā’.

Thereafter the book *Kashf al-Ḥaqq wa Nahj al-Ṣidq* was written by ‘Allāmah Jalāl al-Dīn Abū al-Manṣūr Ḥasan ibn Yūsuf ibn ‘Alī Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī regarding whom al-Shūstarī writes in his book *Iḥqāq al-Ḥaqq*:

The author of this book debated with the ‘Ulamā’ of the Ahl al-Sunnah who gathered from various cities in the presence of Sulṭān Ghiyāth al-Dīn Awljātiyū Khudābandah. He established the falsehood of their religion and the truth of the Imāmiyyah with rational proofs and textual verifications so marvellously that the ‘Ulamā’ of the Ahl al-Sunnah began to hope that they be turned into rocks or trees. The same author then authored the book *Kashf al-Ḥaqq wa Nahj al-Ṣidq bi al-Ṣawāb*. The Sulṭān together with his governors and a large group of ‘Ulamā’ and seniors became Shī‘ah. Although distinguished personalities of the ‘Ulamā’ of the Ahl al-Sunnah were present in that era, the likes of Quṭb al-Dīn Shīrāzī, ‘Umar Kātib Qazwīnī, and Mawlā Niẓām al-Dīn, yet none had the courage to write a refutation of this book.

This book was written most probably towards the end of the seventh century since the author was born in 648 and died in 724 A.H.

Another book was authored in the seventh century, *al-Ṭarā’if fī Ma‘rifat Madhāhib al-Ṭawā’if*. The author of this book is ‘Alī ibn Ṭā’ūs al-Ḥillī. He was born in 580 A.H. and died in 660 A.H. The author, observing Taqīyyah, deceitfully wrote the book in the name of a dhimmī devising his name as ‘Abd al-Maḥmūd. He wrote an introduction at the beginning of his book attributed to the dhimmī.

When I became of age, I heard about the diversity of religions so I decided to study the reality of the belief systems of different religions. I began with researching the Dīn of Islam. I found majority of them as Mālikī, Ḥanafī, Shāfi‘ī, and Ḥambalī and was totally amazed since these men did not live in the lifetime of Rasūlullāh ﷺ or his Companions and did not have

the same belief system as they did, so how can they regard their belief system as the best. I then studied the Shī'ah religion which is attributed to the Imāms and the progeny of the Ambiyā'. I thereafter investigated the belief systems from the 'Ulamā' of the four schools and debated them, and concluded that they were not on the truth. I proved their religion's falsehood from their books.

In this manner, the author manifested the truthfulness of his belief system. He has discussed the Fadak issue in this book in great detail, and in a very eloquent and persuasive manner. Its worth and value can be realised by the fact that Dildār 'Alī quoted a great portion from the above book in the Fadak discussion in his famous book *'Imād al-Islām*.

Thereafter, Qāḍī Nūr Allāh al-Shūstarī wrote many renowned books in this field. One of his works is *Iḥqāq al-Ḥaqq*, which is a detailed and famous book, written in refutation of *Ibṭāl al-Bāṭil* which 'Allāmah Rawzbahān wrote in answer to *Kashf al-Ḥaqq*.

In the eleventh century, Mullā Bāqir al-Majlisī wrote many books. He is addressed as:

محي طبقة سيد البشر في رأس مائة الحادي عشر

Reviver of the station of the leader of mankind in the eleventh century.

One of his celebrated books is *Bihār al-Anwār* which is an ocean of narrations and incidents. In the eighth volume in *Kitāb al-Fitan*, he dedicated a section to the discussion of Fadak titled:

باب نزول الآيات في أمر فذك و قصة جوامع الإحتجاج فيه

Chapter regarding the revelation of verses concerning Fadak and the incident wherein proofs are collected.

He then wrote two abridged versions of the book in the Persian language, viz. *Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn* and *Ḥayāt al-Qulūb*.

A new era began in the thirteenth century. A huge craze of dialogues and debates between Shī'ah and Sunnī arose. After the publication and distribution of *Tuḥfah Ithnā 'Ashariyyah*, the Shī'ī scholars showed the worth of their knowledge and capability and the great Shī'ī mujtahidīn and scholars of Delhi and Lucknow wrote voluminous books.

One of these books is *Imād al-Islām* authored by Dildār 'Alī in the Arabic language which is extensive and wherein the author refutes Imām Rāzī's *Nihāyat al-'Uqūl*. He has written about Fadak in great detail.

Tashīd al-Maṭā'in by Muḥammad al-Qillī and *Ṭa'n al-Rimāh* by Mujtahid Sayyid Muḥammad are books written in refutation of *Tuḥfah Ithnā 'Ashariyyah* which the Shī'ah boast over. They have conviction that what is written in them can never be answered, as Munshī Subḥān 'Alī Khān writes in one of his articles:

از اینجا که مجتهد العصر و الزمان سمي رسول الله الى كافة الانس و الجان اعني مولانا و مقتدانا السيد محمد مد ظله الصمد در کتاب معدوم النظر موسوم بطعن الرماح این معضله دل روز مخالفین را بجناس بیان کافی و وافی ایضاح فرموده اند که بالاترازاں بلکه مماثل این از حد قدرت بشری بیرون ست این فاقد الادراک استیعاب دلائل اثبات غضب حق بضعه رسول الله برهمان کتاب مستطاب حواله نموده بر تقریری آخر که خالی از تجذی نیست از ماجری فیها ابطال خلافت اول و ثانی می سازد

From amongst them, the Mujtahid of the era i.e. Mawlānā Sayyid Muḥammad – may his shadow be lengthened – has written such a refutation against the opposition, whose hearts are covered in deviation, in his unparalleled book *Ṭa'n al-Rimāh* in such a marvellous and remarkable manner that writing something better than it or equal to it is out of man's capacity. He has written outstanding proofs and evidences to prove the usurpation of Rasūlullāh's ﷺ beloveds that are innovative and unprecedented and totally falsify the khilāfah of one and two (Abū Bakr and 'Umar).

Besides the above, there are some books published in Iran which give much detail on the Fadak issue. One such book is *Baḥr al-Jawāhir* by Sayyid Muḥammad Bāqir

ibn Sayyid Muḥammad al-Mūsawī who lived in the era of Fatḥ ‘Alī Shāh Qāchār. The second book is *Kifāyat al-Muwahḥidīn fī ‘Aqā’id al-Dīn* by Ismā’īl ibn Aḥmad ‘Alawī al-Ṭabarsī, one volume of which is dedicated to the discussion on Imāmah. The third book is *Lam‘at al-Bayḍā’ fī Sharḥ Khuṭbat al-Zahrā’* comprising of 470 pages which records Sayyidah Fāṭimah’s ﷺ lecture regarding Fadak coupled with all the narrations and discussions related to the topic. The fourth book is chapter four of *Nāsikh al-Tawārīkh* by Muqarrab al-Khāqān Mirzā Muḥammad Taqī Lisān al-Mulk wherein the author has written a biography of Sayyidah Fāṭimah ﷺ in which the Fadak issue is discussed in detail. Moreover, many Persian and Urdu articles have been written. However, they have all quoted from *Ṭa’n al-Rimāḥ*. They have simply presented the very same material just in a different way.

Book	Author	Century
<i>Al-Shāfi</i>	Al-Sayyid al-Murtaḍā	5th
<i>Talkhīṣ al-Shāfi</i>	Shaykh al-Ṭā’ifāh Abū Ja’far al-Ṭūsī	5th
<i>Kashf al-Ḥaqq wa Nahj al-Ṣidq</i>	‘Allāmah Jalāl al-Dīn Abū al-Manṣūr Ḥasan ibn Yūsuf ibn ‘Alī Muṭahhar Ḥillī	7th
<i>al-Ṭarā’if fī Ma’rifat Madhāhib al-Ṭawā’if</i>	‘Alī ibn Ṭā’ūs Ḥillī	7th
<i>Iḥqāq al-Ḥaqq</i>	Qāḍī Nūr Allah Shūstarī	
<i>Bihār al-Anwār</i>	Mullā Bāqir al-Majlisī	11th
<i>‘Imād al-Islām</i>	Dildār ‘Alī	13th
<i>Tashīd al-Maṭā’in</i>	Muḥammad Qillī	13th
<i>Ṭa’n al-Rimāḥ</i>	Mujtahid Sayyid Muḥammad	13th
<i>Baḥr al-Jawāhir</i>	Sayyid Muḥammad Bāqir ibn Sayyid Muḥammad Mūsawī	
<i>Kifāyat al-Muwahḥidīn fī ‘Aqā’id al-Dīn</i>	Ismā’īl ibn Aḥmad ‘Alawī Ṭabarsī	
<i>Lam‘at al-Bayḍā’ fī Sharḥ Khuṭbat al-Zahrā’</i>		
<i>Nāsikh al-Tawārīkh</i>	Muqarrab al-Khāqān Mirzā Muḥammad Taqī Lisān al-Mulk	

Discussion regarding the Gifting of Fadak

Which claim was first, inheritance or gift?

Among the books mentioned above, *Kashf al-Ḥaqq* has mentioned the inheritance claim prior to the gift claim. It can be deduced from here that the author regards the inheritance claim greater than the other. In the Fadak discussion, clarity needs to be ascertained whether Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا made the inheritance claim first or the gift claim.

Generally, Shīʿī scholars mention that she made two claims. They explain that Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ gifted her Fadak and she remained its controller and possessor. When Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ became khalīfah, he dismissed her trustee and took possession over it. Hearing this, she approached him claiming that it was gifted to her, and demanding an explanation as to why he snatched it away from her. Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ demanded witnesses from her and she presented Sayyidunā 'Alī, Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, and Umm Ayman رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُنَّ who all gave testimony in her favour. Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ dismissed their testimony explaining that it did not reach the desired amount. Hence, he did not return Fadak to her. At this, she became upset and then claimed her inheritance.

Accordingly, Dildār 'Alī writes:

المسئلة الرابعة أن فاطمة هل ادعت ميراثا أولا ثم ادعت النحلة أو بالعكس و يستفاد من كلام أكثر العامة أن دعوى النحلة ظهرت منها بعد دعوى الميراث و قالت الإمامية بالعكس

The fourth mas'alah: Did Fāṭimah claim inheritance first then a gift or vice versa. It is grasped from the writings of the majority Sunnī that the gift claim took place after the inheritance one whereas the Imāmiyyah state the opposite.¹

1 'Imād al-Islām, chapter 10, benefit 4, mas'alah 4.

Clarification Regarding the Gift Claim

It becomes apparent from here that Dildār ‘Alī wishes to impress on the minds of the readers that the gift claim is also correct according to the Ahl al-Sunnah, but it just took place after the inheritance claim. Whereas the reality is that the gift claim is not proven from any reliable or authentic narration. The Ahl al-Sunnah do not accept that Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا made this claim. Thus, the entire building built on this narration is razed to the ground.

The false narration says that Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا was asked to present witnesses and she presented the testimony of Sayyidunā ‘Alī, Ḥasan, Ḥusayn and Umm Ayman رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا. However, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ did not accept their testimony explaining that the testimony does not meet the desired amount according to the laws of Sharī‘ah and he subsequently rejected her claim. They then condemn Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in different ways by accusing him of oppression and tyranny and assert that the Sunnī believe that Sayyidah Fāṭimah, ‘Alī, Ḥasan, and Ḥusayn were liars and concocted false testimony for worldly motives, etc.

Whereas the reality is that there is no authentic narration regarding this in the first place. The following saying aptly applies to it:

ثبت الجدار ثم انقش

Erect the wall and then decorate it.

So all the extensive theses the Shī‘ī scholars have written, all the vociferous lectures they have delivered, and all the proficient books they have authored in this regard are totally useless, futile, and ineffective. Following this, Shāh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz writes the following after answering the inheritance claim in his renowned work *Tuḥfah Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah* – May Allah reward him abundantly:

در اینجا فائده عظیمه باید دانست که شیعه در اول در باب مطاعن ابو بکر منع میراث می نوشتند و چون از عمل ائمه معصومین و از روی روایات این حضرات عدم توریث پیغمبر ثابت شد از دعوی انتقال نموده دعوی دیگر تراشیدند و

طعن دیگر بر آوردند که این طعن سیزدهم است که ابو بکر رضی الله عنه فدک را بفاطمه نداد حالانکه پیغمبر برائے او بمیه نموده بود و دعوی فاطمه را مسموع نمود و ازوی گواه و شاید طلب ید الی قوله جواب ازین طعن آنکه دعوی بمیه از حضرت زبیرا رضی الله عنہا و شہادت دادن حضرت علی رضی الله عنه و ام ایمن یا حسنین رضی الله عنہما علی اختلاف الروایات در کتب اہل سنت اصلاً موجود نیست محض از افتریات شیعه است و در مقام الزام اہل سنت آوردن و جواب این طلب یدان کمال سفاهت است

We should consider a very significant point here. To accuse Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضی اللہ عنہ, firstly the Shī'ah fabricated that he prevented Rasūlullāh's inheritance from her. When it was proven from the practice of the infallible A'imma and their narrations that Rasūlullāh's صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم inheritance is not distributed, the Shī'ah then concocted yet another fabrication using it to indict him which he calls the 13th criticism. It goes as follows: Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضی اللہ عنہ did not give Fadak to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضی اللہ عنہا whereas according to them Rasūlullāh صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم gifted her the same. He did not accept her claim for Fadak and instead asked her to provide witnesses. The answer to this criticism of the Shī'ah is that this claim of hers and Sayyidunā 'Alī, Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, and Umm Ayman رضی اللہ عنہن giving testimony which is found in various narrations of the Shī'ah do not feature anywhere in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah. They are nothing but Shī'ī fabrications. To use them against the Ahl al-Sunnah and on top of that to demand an answer is utter foolishness.

We do not wish to say a lot in this discussion. However, what we will point out is that the Shī'ī scholars themselves have accepted that some narrations mention the inheritance claim before the gift claim. It is written in *Lam'at al-Bayḍā' fī Sharḥ Khuṭbat al-Zahrā'*:

و ما في بعض الروايات إنما ادعت الإرث أولاً ثم ادعت النحلة فذلك على تقدير الصحة إنما هو بلحظ أنها في محل إرثها لا محالة فلما ألقوا الشبهة بنقل الرواية ادعت ما هو الواقع من حقيقة النحلة

What appears in some narrations that she claimed inheritance prior to claiming the gift, if accepted to be authentic it was only considering the fact that it falls into her share of inheritance at the end of the day. However,

when they cast doubts by quoting the narration, she claimed that which was the reality, i.e. the gift.

Since the Shī'ī scholars have mentioned the gift claim prior to the inheritance claim, we will follow this sequence. Advancing or regressing does not affect the actual contentious issue at hand, especially when according to us the gift claim never transpired.

Did Rasūlullāh ﷺ gift Fadak to Fāṭimah or not?

The Imāmiyyah claim that Fadak was gifted to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها. When it was usurped from her, she went to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه to claim her right. Now it devolves upon them to establish both these claims from reliable narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah. If they are able to, then it devolves upon us to answer the objections levelled against Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه. However, if they fail to establish their claim, then it is not necessary for us to answer their baseless accusations and waste precious time in answering hypothetical happenings. For this, we will conduct a detailed analysis of the books mentioned above to show our readers what substantiations they have presented and what types of narrations from which types of books they have furnished for their claims.

Comprehensive study of the narrations attributed to the Ahl al-Sunnah by Shī'ī scholars

Al-Shāfi contains no ḥadīth or narration from Sunnī books regarding the gifting of Fadak. He sufficed on saying that Qāḍī 'Abd al-Jabbār wrote in his book *al-Mughnī* that the Shī'ah claim that it is reported on the authority of Sayyidunā Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī رضي الله عنه that when the verse:

وَأْتِ ذَا الْقُرْبَىٰ حَقَّهُ

And give the relative his right.¹

1 Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl: 26

was revealed, Rasūlullāh ﷺ gifted Fadak to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا. ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz then returned it to Fāṭimah’s progeny. He sufficed on this narration. After quoting this claim of the Shī‘ah, Qāḍī ‘Abd al-Jabbār wrote that the narration the Shī‘ah present in this regard is not authentic. ‘Alam al-Hudā brought no other narration to prove the gifting of Fadak. From here we learn that ‘Alam al-Hudā did not locate any other authentic narration in the reliable books of the Ahl al-Sunnah. Otherwise, he would have presented it. Similarly, no other narration has been presented in *Talkhīṣ al-Shāfi* in this regard.

We have not found any authentic sanad concerning the gifting of Fadak in Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī’s book *Kashf al-Ḥaqq wa Nahj al-Ṣidq*.

The following narration appears in *al-Ṭarā’if* from Bishr ibn al-Walīd, al-Wāqīdī, and Bishr ibn Ghiyāth:

روى غير واحد منهم بشر بن الوليد و الواقدي و بشر بن غياث في أحاديث يرفعونها إلى محمد نبيهم أنه لما فتح خيبر اصطفى لنفسه قرى من قرى اليهود فنزل جبريل بهذه الآية و أت ذا القربى حقه فقال محمد صلى الله عليه و سلم من ذا القربى و ما حقه قال فاطمة فدفعها إليها فدك ثم أعطاه العوالي بعد ذلك فاستغلتها حتى توفي أبوها محمد صلى الله عليه و سلم

Many of them have narrated – inter alia Bishr ibn al-Walīd, al-Wāqīdī, and Bishr ibn Ghiyāth – which they attribute to their Nabī Muḥammad ﷺ that when he conquered Khaybar, he selected for himself some villages of the Jews. Jibrīl then descended with this verse: And give the relative his right.

Muḥammad ﷺ enquired, “Who is the relative and what is his right?”

Jibrīl explained, “Fāṭimah.”

Hence, he gave her Fadak and then gave her al-‘Awālī thereafter. Subsequently, she received the proceeds of it until her father Muḥammad ﷺ passed away.¹

1 *Al-Ṭarā’if* pg. 68.

Besides the above, he quotes the narration of Sayyid al-Ḥuffāz Ibn Mardawayh:

و من طريق مناقضاتهم ما رووهم في كتبهم الصحيحة عندهم رجالهم عن مشايخهم حتى استنده عن سيد الحفاظ ابن مردويه قال أخبرنا محي السنة أبو الفتح عبدوس بن عبد الله الهمداني إجازة قال حدثنا القاضي أبو نصر شعيب بن علي قال حدثنا موسى بن سعيد قال حدثنا الوليد بن علي قال حدثنا عباد بن يعقوب قال حدثنا علي بن عباس عن فضيل عن عطية عن أبي سعيد قال لما نزلت آية و آت ذا القربى حقه دعا رسول الله فاطمة فأعطها فداك

One of the astonishing contradictions of the Ahl al-Sunnah is what they have narrated in their reliable and authentic books from their Mashāyikh on the authority of Sayyid al-Ḥuffāz Ibn Mardawayh who says: Muḥyī al-Sunnah Abū al-Faṭḥ ‘Abdūs ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Hamdānī informed me with *ijāzah* (permission) saying: Qāḍī Abū Naṣr Shu‘ayb ibn ‘Alī reported to us saying: Mūsā ibn Sa‘īd narrated to us saying: Walīd ibn ‘Alī narrated to us saying: ‘Abbād ibn Ya‘qūb narrated to us saying: ‘Alī ibn ‘Abbās narrated to us from Fuḍayl from ‘Aṭīyyah from Abū Sa‘īd who reports:

When the verse: *And give the relative his right* was revealed, Rasūlullāh ﷺ summoned Fāṭimah and gave her Fadak.

In the chapter concerning the revelation of verses regarding Fadak in *Biḥār al-Anwār*, al-Majlisī writes in the *shān nuzūl* of the verse *and give the relative his right*:

رواه كثير من المفسرين و وردت به الأخبار من طرق الخاصة و العامة

Scores of Mufasssīrīn have narrated it. Many traditions regarding it have been reported from the chains of the Shī‘ah and Sunnī.

He writes thereafter:

قال الشيخ الطبرسي قيل إن المراد قرابة الرسول

Shaykh al-Ṭabarsī has said: “It has been said that the purport is Rasūlullāh’s *relative*.”

He then quotes the following narration from him:

أخبرنا السيد مهدي بن نزار الحسيني بإسناد ذكره عن أبي سعيد الخدري قال لما نزلت قوله و آت ذا القربى حقه أعطى رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم فاطمة فدك قال عبد الرحمن بن صالح كتب المأمون إلى عبيد الله بن موسى يسئله عن قصة فدك فكتب إليه عبيد الله بهذا الحديث رواه عن الفضيل بن مرزوق عن عطية فرد المأمون فدك على ولد فاطمة

Sayyid Mahdī ibn Nazār al-Ḥasanī informed us with an isnād he mentioned till Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī who reports:

“When the verse: *And give the relative his right* was revealed, Rasūlullāh ﷺ gave Fadak to Fāṭimah.”

ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Ṣāliḥ says, “Maʿmūn wrote to ʿUbayd Allah ibn Mūsā asking him concerning the incident of Fadak. ʿUbayd Allah wrote to him this ḥadīth which Fuḍayl ibn Marzūq narrated to him from ʿAṭīyyah. Subsequently, Maʿmūn returned Fadak to the children of Fāṭimah.”

Al-Majlisī omits the isnād here. Nevertheless, al-Ṭabarsī has mentioned its isnād in the following way in the commentary of the verse *and give the relative his right*:

أخبرنا السيد أبو حميد مهدي بن نزار الحسيني قراءة قال حدثنا الحاكم أبو القاسم بن عبد الله الحسكاني قال حدثنا الحاكم الوالد أبو محمد قال حدثنا عمر بن أحمد بن عثمان ببغداد شفاها قال أخبرني عمر بن الحسين بن علي بن مالك قال حدثنا جعفر بن محمد الأحمصي قال حدثنا حسن بن حسين قال حدثنا أبو معمر بن سعيد جيشم و أبو علي القاسم الكندي و يحيى بن يعلى و علي بن مسهر عن فضيل بن مرزوق عن عطية الكوفي عن أبي سعيد الخدري قال لما نزلت قوله و آت ذا القربى حقه إلخ

Sayyid Abū Ḥumayd Mahdī ibn Nazār al-Ḥasanī informed us *qirāʿatan* (someone was reading to him and we were listening) saying: Ḥākim Abū al-Qāsim ibn ʿAbd Allāh al-Ḥaskānī narrated to us saying: Ḥākim al-Wālid Abū Muḥammad reported to us saying: ʿUmar ibn Aḥmad ibn ʿUthmān narrated to us in Baghdād face to face saying: ʿUmar ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn ʿAlī ibn Mālik informed us saying: Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad al-Aḥmaṣī narrated to us saying: Ḥasan ibn Ḥusayn narrated to us saying: Abū Maʿmar ibn Saʿīd Jaysham, Abū ʿAlī al-Qāsim al-Kindī, Yaḥyā ibn Yaʿlā, and ʿAlī ibn Mus-hir narrated

to us from Fuḍayl ibn Marzūq from ‘Aṭīyah from Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī who reports:

“When the verse *And give the relative his right* was revealed ...”

The same narration in the Persian language:

و نیز سعید ابو حمید مهدی بن نزار الحسنی از حاکم ابو القاسم بن عبد الله الحسکانی نقل می کند که در بغداد حاکم ابو محمد از عمر بن احمّد بن عثمان بنین حدیث کرد که عمر بن حسین بن علی بن مالک گفت که جعفر بن محمد الاحمسی بنین گفت که حسن بن حسین مرا حدیث کرد از ابو معمر بن سعید و علی بن سعید الخدری که گفتند چون آیت و ات ذا القربی حقه نازل شد حضرت رسالت باغ فدک را بفاطمه عطا فرموده الخ

Sa‘īd Abū Ḥumayd Mahdī ibn Nazār al-Ḥasanī heard from the lips of Ḥākim Abū al-Qāsim ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥaskānī that in Baghdād Ḥākim Abū Muḥammad reported to me via ‘Umar ibn Aḥmad ibn ‘Uthmān which Abū Ma‘mar ibn Sa‘īd and ‘Alī ibn Sa‘īd al-Khudrī conveyed:

“When the verse: *And give the relative his right* was revealed, Rasūlullāh ﷺ summoned Fāṭimah and gifted her Fadak.”

The second narration written by al-Majlisī:

محمد بن العباس عن علي بن العباس المقانعي عن أبي كريب عن معاوية عن فضيل بن مرزوق عن عطية عن أبي سعيد الخدري قال لما نزلت قوله و آت ذا القربی حقه دعا رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم فاطمة و أعطاهها فدك

Muḥammad ibn al-‘Abbās from ‘Alī ibn al-‘Abbās al-Muqānīṭ from Abū Kurayb from Mu‘āwiyah from Fuḍayl ibn Marzūq from ‘Aṭīyah from Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī who reports:

“When the verse: *And give the relative his right* was revealed, Rasūlullāh ﷺ summoned Fāṭimah and gifted her Fadak.”

The third narration is quoted from Sayyid ibn Ṭā’ūs’s book *Sa‘d al-Sa‘ūd*:

روى سيد ابن طاؤس في كتاب سعد السعود من تفسير محمد بن العباس بن علي بن مروان قال روى حديث فذلك في تفسير قوله تعالى وآت ذا القربى حقه عن عشرين طريقا فمنها ما رواه عن محمد بن محمد بن سليمان الأعبدي وهيثم بن خلف الدوري و عبد الله بن سليمان بن الأشعث و محمد بن القاسم بن زكريا قالوا حدثنا عباد بن يعقوب قال أخبرنا علي بن عباس و حدثنا جعفر بن محمد الحسيني عن علي بن منذر الطريقي عن علي بن عباس عن فضيل بن مرزوق عن عطية العوفي عن أبي سعيد الخدري قال لما نزلت قوله وآت ذا القربى حقه دعا رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فاطمة وأعطاهما فذلك

Sayyid ibn Ṭā'ūs narrates in the book *Sa'd al-Sa'ūd* from the commentary of Muḥammad ibn al-'Abbās ibn 'Alī ibn Marwān saying: he narrated the Fadak ḥadīth in the tafsīr of His statement: *And give the relative his right* from 20 chains. One of them he narrates from Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn Sulaymān al-A'badī, Haytham ibn Khalaf al-Dūrī, 'Abd Allāh ibn Sulaymān ibn al-Ash'ath, and Muḥammad ibn al-Qāsim ibn Zakariyyā who said: 'Abbād ibn Ya'qūb narrated to us saying: 'Alī ibn 'Ābis informed me; and Ja'far ibn Muḥammad al-Ḥusaynī narrated to me from 'Alī ibn Mundhir al-Ṭarīqī from 'Alī ibn 'Ābis from Fuḍayl ibn Marzūq from 'Aṭīyyah from Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī who reports:

“When the verse: *And give the relative his right* was revealed, Rasūlullāh ﷺ summoned Fāṭimah and gifted her Fadak.”

Al-Shūstarī has quoted the same narration in his book *Iḥqāq al-Ḥaqq*. He then comments:

روى الواقدي وغيره من نقلة الأخبار عندهم وذكروه في الأخبار الصحيحة عندهم أن النبي لما فتح خيبر اصطفى قرى من قرى اليهود إلخ

Al-Wāqidī and others – from the aḥādīth narrators of the Ahl al-Sunnah – have narrated it and mentioned it in authentic narrations in their opinion that when the Nabī ﷺ conquered Khaybar, he selected few villages of the Jews ...

He reports the very same narration of *al-Ṭarā'if* in *'Imād al-Islām* i.e. from Sayyid al-Ḥuffāz Ibn Mardawayh:

فأقول يدل على ثبوت ذلك أعطى النبي فداك فاطمة ما رواه سيد الحفاظ ابن مردويه قال أخبرنا محي السنة أبو الفتح عبدوس بن عبد الله الهمداني إجازة قال حدثنا القاضي أبو نصر شعيب بن علي قال حدثنا موسى بن سعيد قال حدثنا الوليد بن علي قال حدثنا عباد بن يعقوب قال حدثنا علي بن عباس عن فضيل عن عطية عن أبي سعيد قال لما نزلت آية و آت ذا القربى حقه دعا رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم فاطمة فأعطاهما فداك

I say: what indicates to the authenticity of this – the Nabī gave Fāṭimah Fadak – is what Sayyid al-Ḥuffāz ibn Mardawayh has narrated saying: Muḥyī al-Sunnah Abū al-Faṭḥ ‘Abdūs ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Hamdānī informed me with *ijāzah* (permission) saying: Qāḍī Abū Naṣr Shu‘ayb ibn ‘Alī reported to us saying: Mūsā ibn Sa‘īd narrated to us saying: Walīd ibn ‘Alī narrated to us saying: ‘Abbād ibn Ya‘qūb narrated to us saying: ‘Alī ibn ‘Abbās narrated to us from Fuḍayl from ‘Aṭīyyah from Abū Sa‘īd who reports:

“When the verse: *And give the relative his right* was revealed, Rasūlullāh ﷺ summoned Fāṭimah and gifted her Fadak.”

He relates another narration from *Kanz al-‘Ummāl* of Shaykh ‘Alī Muttaqī:

و ما في كنز العمال للشيخ على المتقي في صلة الرحم من كتاب الأخلاق عن أبي سعيد قال لما نزلت و آت ذا القربى حقه قال النبي يا فاطمة لك فداك رواه الحاكم في تاريخه و قال تفرد به إبراهيم بن محمد بن ميمون عن علي بن عباس بن النجار

It appears in *Kanz al-‘Ummāl* of Shaykh ‘Alī Muttaqī regarding maintaining family ties in *Kitāb al-Akhlāq* (chapter concerning character) from Abū Sa‘īd who relates:

“When they verse: *And give the relative his right* was revealed, the Nabī ﷺ said, ‘O Fāṭimah! Fadak is for you.’”

Al-Ḥākim documented it in his *Tārīkh* and remarked, “Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad ibn Maymūn is the sole reporter from ‘Alī ibn ‘Ābis ibn al-Najjār.”

He narrates a third narration from *Tafsīr Durr Manthūr* of al-Suyūṭī:

و في الدر المنثور للسيوطي في تفسير قوله تعالى و آت ذا القربى حقه دعا رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم فاطمة فأعطاه فداك

It appears in Durr Manthūr of al-Suyūṭī in the commentary of Allah’s ﷺ statement: *And give the relative his right:*

“Rasūlullāh ﷺ called Fāṭimah and gave her Fadak.”

He narrates a fourth narration from *Ma‘ārij al-Nubuwwah*:

و ما في معارج النبوة الشهير بسير مولانا الهروي في وقائع السنة السابعة بعد واضع خير بهذه العبارة

در مقصد اقصی مذکور ست کہ بعضے گویند کہ حضرت رسول اللہ صلی اللہ علیہ و سلم بسوی خیر امیر المؤمنین علی را فرستاد و مصالحہ بردست امیر واقع شد بران نہیج کہ حضرت امیر قصد خون ایشاں نکند و حوائط خواص ازان رسول باشد پس جبریل فرود آمد و گفت کہ حق تعالی می فرماید کہ حق خویشاں بدہ رسول گفت کہ خویش من کیستند و حق ایشاں چیست جبریل گفت فاطمہ است حوائط فداک را با و دہ و اینجہ از خدا و رسول اوست در فداک ہم باویدہ پغمبر فاطمہ را بخواند و برای وی حجتی نوشت و ایں وثیقہ بودہ کہ بعد از وفات رسول پیش ابو بکر اورد و گفت این کتاب رسول خداست برای من و حسن و حسین

The following text appears in *Ma‘ārij al-Nubuwwah* commonly known as *Siyar Moulānā al-Harawī* among the incidents of the seventh year after the Conquest of Khaybar:

It is written in *Maqṣad Aqṣā* that some people say that Rasūlullāh ﷺ despatched Sayyidunā ‘Alī ؑ towards Khaybar, and a compromise was reached with him to spare the blood of the people of Khaybar in lieu of some specified orchards which will be handed over to Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Just then, Jibrīl ؑ descended and said, “Allah ﷻ commands you to fulfil the rights of your relatives.”

Rasūlullāh ﷺ asked, “Who are my relatives and what are their rights?”

Jibrīl answered, “Give Fadak – the share of Allah and His Messenger – to Fāṭimah.”

Accordingly, Rasūlullāh ﷺ summoned Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا and gave her Fadak and the document. After Rasūlullāh's ﷺ demise, Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا showed this document to the khalīfah of the time, Abū Bakr, saying, “This is Rasūlullāh's ﷺ document for me, Ḥasan, and Ḥusayn.”

After quoting the above four narrations, he declares:

و قال السيد المرتضى في الشافي و قد روى من طريقة مختلفة غير طريق أبي سعيد الذي ذكره صاحب الكتاب أنه لما نزل قوله تعالى و أت ذا القربى حقه دعا النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم فاطمة فأعطاه فذلك و إذا كان ذلك مرويا فلا معنى لدفعه بغير حجة

Al-Sayyid al-Murtaḍā states in al-Shāfi that besides the narration of Abū Saīd which the author has quoted, this narration appears from various chains wherein it is mentioned that when the verse: And give the relative his right was revealed, Rasūlullāh ﷺ called Fāṭimah and gave her Fadak. When this has been narrated, there is no reason to reject it.

However, neither did Dildār ‘Alī in *‘Imād al-Islām* nor did al-Sayyid al-Murtaḍā in *al-Shāfi* report the narration from those various chains, besides the chain of Abū Saīd. Just to claim that it has been narrated from other people is not sufficient and satisfying. Especially when Qāḍī ‘Abd al-Jabbār attributed this narration to the Shīah in his book *al-Mughnī* with the words:

و قالوا قد روي عن أبي سعيد الخدري

The Shīah say that it has been reported from Abū Saīd al-Khudrī.

He then writes in response:

و الجواب عن ذلك أن أكثر ما يردون في هذا الباب غير صحيح

The answer to this is that majority of what they narrate in this regard is unauthentic.

A little further, Qāḍī ‘Abd al-Jabbār writes clearly:

وإن صح عقد الهبة ...

If the gift contract was correct, then Fadak ought to be in Fāṭimah’s possession.¹

From here we realise that Qāḍī ‘Abd al-Jabbār does not have conviction on this narration. ‘Alam al-Hudā’s affirmation that it is undisputed that this narration has been reported from other chains, would not have been accepted and sufficient to

1 The full text is as follows:

قال صاحب الكتاب شبهة لهم أخرى واحد إمام طعنوا به و عظموا القول في أمر فذك قالوا قد روي عن أبي سعيد الخدري أنه قال لما نزلت و آت ذا القربى حقه أعطى رسول الله فاطمة فذك ثم فعل عمر بن عبد العزيز ذلك و رده على ولدها قالوا و لاشك أن أبا بكر غضبها إن لم يصح كل الذي روى في هذا الباب و قد كان الأجل أن يمنعهم التكرم مما ارتكبوا فضلا عن الدين ثم ذكر إنها استشهدت أمير المؤمنين و أم أيمن فلم تقبل شهادتهما هذا مع تركه أزواج النبي في حجرهن و لم يجعلها صدقة و صدقهن في أن ذلك لهن و لم يصدقها ثم قال الجواب عن ذلك أن أكثر ما يروون في هذا الباب غير صحيح و لسنا ننكر صحة ما روي من ادعائها فذك فأما أنه كان في يدها فغير مسلم بل لو كان في يدها لكان الظاهر أنه لها فإذا كان في جملة التركة فالظاهر أنه ميراث و إن صح عقد الهبة و هذا هو الظاهر لأن التسليم لو كان وقع يظهر ان كان في يدها فكان ذلك كافيا في الاستحقاق

The author of the book said: Another misconception of theirs is that the Imāmiyyah criticise him and exaggerate over the Fadak issue. They say that it has been reported from Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī who said that when they verse And give the relative his right was revealed, Rasūlullāh ﷺ gave Fadak to Fāṭimah. ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz did the same and returned it to her children. They said that there is no doubt that Abū Bakr usurped it from her even if everything reported in this discussion is not authentic. It was better for honour to prevent them from what they perpetrated, if not religion. He then mentioned that Amīr al-Mu‘minīn and Umm Ayman bore testimony but their testimony was not accepted. This, together with leaving the wives of Nabī ﷺ in their rooms and not making it ṣadaqah. He believed them that it belonged to them, but did not believe her.

He then said, “The answer to this is that majority of what they narrate in this chapter is unauthentic. We do not reject the authenticity of the narration of her claim over Fadak. However, claiming that it was in her possession is not accepted. In fact, had it been in her possession, it would be apparent that it belonged to her. However, when it was with the rest of the estate, then it is apparent that it was inheritance. Had the gift contract been correct, and this is evident because had handing it over taken place, it would be manifest from her possession of it. And this would be sufficient proof for her right over it.” (*al-Shāfi* pg. 234, 235)

prove his claim. It devolved upon him to quote those various chains which he claimed consensus of, strengthening his claim thereby.

In *Ṭaʿn al-Rimāh*, Mujtahid Sayyid Muḥammad quotes from al-Suyūṭī's *al-Durr al-Manthūr*, Shaykh 'Alī Muttaqī's *Kanz al-'Ummāl*, and Ibn Mardawayh as well as Āl 'Abbās regarding the gifting of Fadak:

روى السيوطي في تفسير الدر المنثور في ذيل تفسير قوله تعالى و آت ذا القربى حقه أخرج البزار و أبو يعلى و ابن أبي حاتم و ابن مردويه عن أبي سعيد الخدري قال لما نزلت هذه الآية و آت ذا القربى حقه دعا رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم فاطمة فأعطاهما فدك

و ابن روایت صریح ست در اینکه هر گاه آیه و آت ذا القربى حقه یعنی عطا نما صاحب قرابت را حق او نازل گردید این جناب فاطمه را طلب فرموده فدک را بن حضرت عطا فرمود شیخ علی متقی در کتاب کنز العمال در باب صلہ رحم از ابو سعید روایت کرده قال لما نزلت هذه الآية و آت ذا القربى حقه قال النبي يا فاطمة لك فدك و سيد الحفاظ ابن مردويه در کتاب خود مسند ابو سعید روایت سابقه را نقل کرده و نیز صاحب روضة الصفا و معارج النبوة از مقصد اقصی روایت اعطاء فدک و نوشتن وثیقه را نقل کرده چنانچه اینفا عبارت این بهعرض بیان در امد و عقل بهیچ عاقل باور نمی کند که با وصف اعطاء فدک و ببه این و نوشتن وثیقه برائے این از زمان فتح خیبر تا هنگام وفات سرور کائنات اقباض این بوقوع نه پوسته باشد بلکه لفظ اعطاء نیز بران دلالت دارد کما لا یخفی و صاحب تاریخ ال عباس که از معتدین اهل سنت ست در تاریخ مذکور علی ما نقل عنه نوشته که بعد از اینکه جماعتی از اولاد حسنین نزد مامون دعوی فدک کردند مامون جمع نمود و صدکس از علماء حجاز و عراق و غیر ایشان را و تأکید کرد که کتمان صواب نموده از متابعت حق و راستی سرنه پیچند پس ایشان روایت واقدی و بشر بن الولید و غیره نقل کردند که بعد از فتح خیبر جبریل علیه السلام با آیه و آت ذا القربى حقه نازل شد پس رسول خدا گفت کیست ذا القربى و چیست حق او جبریل گفت فاطمه است و فدک حق اوست پس رسول خدا فدک را بآنحضرت داد

Al-Suyūṭī reports in *Tafsīr al-Durr al-Manthūr* under the commentary of Allah the Sublime's words: *And give the relative his right*:

Al-Bazzār, Abū Ya'lā, Ibn Abī Ḥātim, and Ibn Mardawayh narrated from Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī:

"When the verse: *And give the relative his right* was revealed, Rasūlullāh ﷺ summoned Fāṭimah and gave her Fadak."

This narration is clear. When the verse *and give the relative his right* was revealed, Rasūlullāh ﷺ summoned Fāṭimah and gave her Fadak. Shaykh 'Alī Muttaqī in *Kanz al-'Ummāl* reports from Abū Sa'īd that upon

the revelation of this verse, Rasūlullāh ﷺ said, “O Fāṭimah, Fadak is yours.”

The authors of *Rawḍat al-Ṣafād* and *Ma‘ārij al-Nubuwwah* have also documented the gifting of Fadak and the writing of the document. No intelligent person’s mind can deny that from the conquest of Khaybar until his demise, although he gifted Fadak to her and wrote a document, Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا had no possession over it. So the meaning of giving it to her will be exactly as everyone understands, i.e. her expenses will be taken care of from that wealth. The author of *Tārīkh Āl ‘Abbās*, a renowned Sunnī, writes in his book that when the sons of Fāṭimah claimed Fadak from Ma‘mūn, the Khalīfah of the time, Ma‘mūn gathered over 200 scholars from Ḥijāz, Iraq, etc. and stressed upon them not to conceal the truth and not to divert away from honesty and following the aḥkām of the Sharīah. Subsequently, all the scholars quoted a narration from al-Wāqidi, Bishr ibn al-Walīd, etc. that after the Conquest of Khaybar, Jibrīl ﷺ brought the verse *And give the relative his right* to Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Rasūlullāh ﷺ asked, “Who is the relative and what is his right?”

Jibrīl explained, “Fāṭimah is the relative and Fadak is her right.”

Accordingly, Rasūlullāh ﷺ gifted her Fadak.

Muḥammad Qillī, author of *Tashīd al-Maṭā‘in*, did not present any new narration than the ones mentioned previously.

A detailed discussion on Fadak appears in *Kifāyat Mawsūm al-Wilāyah*¹. The following is written on page 360 concerning the verse, *And give the relative his right*:

از برائے احدے از امت شبه نبود درآنکه فدک خالص بود از برائے رسول خدا صلی الله علیه و سلم واحدے رادراں حقے نبود از امت و اخبار طرفین از خاصه و عامه ناطق باین امر ست و نیز ظاہر ایة و ات ذا القربی حقہ بہ تصدیق کثیرے از علماء و مفسرین و روایت عامہ اینکہ رسول خدا صلی الله علیه و سلم اینرا نحلہ و عطیہ داد بحضرت فاطمہ چون ثعلبی و

1 Vol. 2 pg. 378 – 380.

جوہری و یاقوت حموی صاحب کتاب معجم البلدان و شہرستانانی و صاحب تاریخ ال عباس و واقدی و بشر بن الولید و عبد الرحمن بن صالح و عمر بن شہہ و ابن حجر در صواعق و ابن ابی الحدید و ابو بلال عسکری در کتاب اخبار الاوائل و حاکم ابو القاسم الحسکانی و حاکم ابو محمد و احمد بن عثمان بغدادی و قاضی عبد اللہ بن موسیٰ انہ لما نزلت آیتہ و
 ایت ذال قریبی حقہ اعطی رسول اللہ فاطمہ فدک فقط

No ummatī has any doubt or misgiving that Fadak was exclusively for Rasūlullāh ﷺ and no ummatī had any right over it. The Shī'ah and Sunnī attest to this fact. Majority of the mufassirīn have stated the evident commentary of this verse that Rasūlullāh ﷺ gave Fadak to Fāṭimah رضی اللہ عنہا as a gift, e.g. Tha'labī, Jawharī, Yāqūt Ḥimawī – author of *Mu'jam al-Buldān* – Shahrastānī, author of *Tārīkh Āl 'Abbās*, al-Wāqīdī, Bishr ibn al-Walīd, 'Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Šālīḥ, 'Umar ibn Shabbah, Ibn Ḥajar in *al-Šawā'iq*, Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd, Abū Hilāl 'Askarī in *Akhbār al-Awā'il*, Ḥākim Abū al-Qāsim al-Ḥaskānī, Ḥākim Abū Muḥammad, Aḥmad ibn 'Uthmān Baghdādī, and Qāḍī ibn 'Abd Allāh Mūsā.

Here the author has confused the narration of gifting Fadak, and claiming Fadak. He has not quoted the narrations and statements in favour of the latter. The only new name he brought is that of Tha'labī. The narration of his appears in page 358 of this book in the following words:

و ثعلبی کہ از اعظم مفسرین ایشان ست بسند خود از سدی و دیلمی روایت کرده ست کہ حضرت علی ابن الحسین بہ یکی از اہل شام فرمود ایا قرآن خواندہ گفت بیلے فرمود در سورہ بنی اسرائیل این آیتہ خواندہ کہ و ایت ذال قریبی حقہ ایں شخص عرض کرد مگر شما آیتہ ذی قریبی کہ حق سبحان اللہ تعالیٰ امر فرمودہ کہ حق ایںہارا برساند فرمود بیلے

Tha'labī – the celebrated Mufassir of the Sunnī – has reported from al-Suddī and al-Daylamī that 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn (Zayn al-'Ābidīn) asked a resident of Shām, "Have you read the Qur'ān?"

He replied in the affirmative. He then asked, "Have you read this verse in Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl: *And give the relative his right?*"

The man asked, "Are you the relative whose rights Allah has commanded to fulfil."

'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn replied, "Yes."

Besides the above books, another book has recently been published in Iran by the name: *Ghāyat al-Marām wa Ḥujjat al-Khiṣām fī Ta'yīn al-Imām min Ṭarīq al-Khāṣ wa al-'Ām*. The author of this book is Sayyid Hāshim commonly referred to as 'Allāmah. Yūsuf Baḥrānī has written in his book *Lu'lu'at al-Baḥrayn* concerning him:

السيد المذكور فاضلا محدثا جامعا متتبعا للأخبار بما لم يسبق إليه سابق سوى الشيخ المجلسي وكانت وفاته للسنة السابعة بعد المائة والألف و صنف كتباً عديدة تشهد بشدة تتبعه و الطلاقة

The above mentioned Sayyid is a scholar, muḥaddith, compiler, and master of narrations. No one has surpassed him besides Shaykh al-Majlisī. He died in the year 1107 A.H. He has authored many books which testify to the intensity and depth of his research and knowledge.

The above author has written *Ghāyat al-Marām* to establish the concept of Imāmah. He has gathered therein all verses of the Qur'ān and all the aḥādīth and narrations related to that verse whether related by the Ahl al-Sunnah or Shī'ah. He has listed in the bibliography of this book the names of all the books he quotes from. Undoubtedly, this book is very comprehensive and attests to his vast knowledge and perfect acquaintance. He has quoted all the narrations of both Sunnī and Shī'ah which deal with the verse *And give the relative his right* in maqṣad 2, chapter 17, and 18. But despite its comprehensiveness, he has mentioned no other narration from the Ahl al-Sunnah besides Tha'labī's. However, he has quoted 11 aḥādīth from the Shī'ah. He writes on page 323:

الباب السابع عشر قوله تعالى و آت ذا القربى حقه و المسكين الآية من طريق العامة و فيه حديث واحد الثعلبي في تفسيره في هذه الآية قال عنى بذلك قرابة رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم ثم قال الثعلبي روى عن السدي عن أبي الدلمي قال قال علي بن الحسين لرجل من أهل الشام أقرأت القرآن قال نعم قال فما قرأت في بني إسرائيل و آت ذا القربى حقه و أنكم القرابة التي أمر الله تعالى أن يوتى حقه قال نعم فقط

Chapter 17: Allah the Sublime's statement: *And give the relative his right and the needy.*

From the chain of the Sunnī. Herein is the ḥadīth of al-Tha'labī in the commentary of this verse. He says: "He meant by this Rasūlullāh's ﷺ relative."

Al-Tha‘labī then said: It has been reported from al-Suddī and Abū al-Daylamī who said that ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn (Zayn al-‘Ābidīn) asked a resident of Shām, “Have you read the Qur’ān?”

He replied in the affirmative.

He then asked, “Have you read this verse in Sūrah Banī Isrā’īl *And give the relative his right?*”

The man asked, “Are you the relative whose right Allah has commanded to fulfil.”

‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn replied, “Yes.”

The Persian translation of this which appears in *Kifāyah* has been quoted above.

He then writes:

الباب الثامن عشر في قوله تعالى و آت ذا القربى حقه و المسكين الآية من طريق الخامسة و فيه أحد عشر
حديثا

Chapter 18: Allah the Sublime’s statement: And give the relative his right and the needy.

From the chain of the Shī‘ah, there are 11 aḥādīth herein.

Those narrations from ‘Aṭīyyah al-‘Awfī have been reported which the Shī‘ī scholars have quoted from some Sunnī books, as we have mentioned previously.

He says:

الثامن العياشي بإسناده من عطية العوفي قال لما فتح رسول الله خيبر و أفاء الله عليه فدكا و أنزل الله عليه و آت ذا القربى حقه قال يا فاطمة لك فدك التاسع العياشي بإسناده عن عبد الرحمن بن صالح كتب المأمون إلى عبد الله بن موسى العباسي يسئله عن قصة فدك فكتب إليه عبد الله بن موسى بهذا الحديث و العاشر العياشي بإسناده عن فضيل بن مرزوق عن عطية أن المأمون رد فدكا على ولد فاطمة

Number 8: Al-‘Ayyāshī with his isnād from ‘Aṭīyyah al-‘Awfī who reports: “When Rasūlullāh ﷺ conquered Khaybar and Allah restored to him Fadak and Allah revealed, *And give the relative his right*, he said, ‘O Fāṭimah, Fadak is for you.’”

Number 9: Al-‘Ayyāshī with his isnād from ‘Abd al-Rahmān ibn Šāliḥ who reports: “Ma’mūn wrote to ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mūsā al-‘Abasī asking him concerning the incident of Fadak. ‘Abd Allāh wrote to him this ḥadīth.”

Number 10: Al-‘Ayyāshī with his isnād from Fuḍayl ibn Marzūq from ‘Aṭīyyah that Ma’mūn returned Fadak to the children of Fāṭimah.”

Munshī Subḥān ‘Alī Khān, who is renowned in the science of literature, has written a book on Imāmah. The Fadak discussion appears on page 74 of volume two. However, the author only copied from *Ṭa’ al-Rimāḥ* but gave it new wording. He writes:

این فاقد الادراک استیعاب دلائل اثبات حق بضعه رسول پریمان کتاب مستطاب طعن الرماح حواله نموده به تقریبے
اخر کہ خالے از تجددهے نیست از ماجری فیہا ابطال خلافت خلیفہ اول و ثانی کہ بانی مبانی این اعتدا مشار الیہ است
عے سازد فقط

There is no new narration therein worth quoting here.

The readers will realise from the above that we have quoted verbatim all the narrations which have been extracted from our Sunnī books and recorded in the famous books of the Shī‘ah which discuss Fadak from the fourth century till the thirteenth century. Although it is apparent that there could be many other books which we did not find, however we have listed the books of prominent personalities and recognized luminaries of the Shī‘ah the likes of ‘Alam al-Hudā, ‘Allāmah al-Ḥillī, Sayyid Ibn Ṭā’ūs, Mullā Bāqir al-Majlisī, Qāḍī Nūr Allah al-Shūstarī, Dildār ‘Alī, Muṭahid Sayyid Muḥammad, and Muḥammad al-Qillī. Most probably, there investigation has not located any other narration, especially the muṭahidīn of Lucknow. So we have a reason to believe, with certainty, that they do not possess any more narrations than those they have presented.

We will now examine these narrations and prove to the readers that such ‘proofs’ are worthless, both rationally and textually. In fact, they are not proofs in the first place.

All of the narrations revolve around a narrator who is not only unreliable and untrustworthy, but is a liar and a Shīī. One man is hiding behind all the decorated veils. Everyone has taken a different colour from this multi coloured man. It is a dirty source from which all these springs run. It is the root of one lie from which all these branches bloom.

Let us remove the veil from these narrations upon which they have erected a huge building, and due to which they criticise Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and ‘Umar رضي الله عنهما, which they quote in their heartfelt sermons to prove their oppression and tyranny, and around which they have erected many deceitful walls on the rejection of Sayyidah Fāṭimah’s رضي الله عنها claim. We believe that when the Shīī scholars will realise the reality of those narrations which they boast over, and the veil will be lifted from their eyes, they will be flabbergasted and flummoxed. The same words al-Shūstarī wrote concerning the Sunnī after the publication of *Kashf al-Ḥaqq* will apply to them:

أن يتمنون أن يكونوا جمادا أو شجرا و يبتهون كأنهم اتقوا حجرا

They will wish they were boulders or trees and will be left speechless as though they transformed into stone.

Detailed analyses of the narrations attributed to the Ahl al-Sunnah

If we analyse all the above narrations the Shī‘ah have presented and attributed to the Ahl al-Sunnah, we will find them to be of two types. One is where the entire chain of narrators has been mentioned, and the second is when only the book’s name has been mentioned, or only some narrators have been mentioned, not all. There are four narrations of the first type and five of the second.

Narrations with complete isnād:

1. Narrated from Ibn Mardawayh in *al-Ṭarā'if*¹ and quoted in 'Imād al-Islām and other books. The chain of narrators are as follows:

- a. Muḥyī al-Sunnah Abū al-Faṭḥ 'Abdūs ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Hamdānī
- b. Qāḍī Abū Naṣr Shu'ayb ibn 'Alī
- c. Mūsā ibn Sa'īd
- d. Walīd ibn 'Alī
- e. 'Abbād ibn Ya'qūb
- f. 'Alī ibn 'Abbās
- g. Fuḍayl
- h. 'Aṭīyyah
- i. Abū Sa'īd – the core of the isnād

2. Appears in *Biḥār al-Anwār*² without any isnād and in *Majma' al-Bayān al-Ṭabarsī* with a detailed isnād. The narrators are as follows:

- a. Sayyid Abū Ḥumayd Mahdī ibn Nazār al-Ḥasanī
- b. Ḥākīm Abū al-Qāsim ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥaskānī
- c. Ḥākīm al-Wālid Abū Muḥammad
- d. 'Umar ibn Aḥmad ibn 'Uthmān
- e. 'Umar ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī ibn Mālik
- f. Ja'far ibn Muḥammad al-Aḥmaṣī
- g. Ḥasan ibn Ḥusayn
- h. Abū Ma'mar ibn Sa'īd Jaysham
- i. Abū 'Alī al-Qāsim al-Kindī

1 Page 17.

2 Page 15, 16.

- j. Yaḥyā ibn Yaʿlā
- k. ʿAlī ibn Mus-hir
- l. Fuḍayl ibn Marzūq
- m. ʿAṭīyyah al-ʿAwfī
- n. Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī

3. Appears in *Biḥār al-Anwār*¹ quoted from Sayyid Ibn Ṭāʿūs's book *Saʿd al-Saʿūd* who reported from the *Tafsīr* of Muḥammad ibn ʿAbbās ibn ʿAlī ibn Marwān. The narrators are:

- a. Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn Sulaymān al-Aʿbadī
- b. Haytham ibn Khalaf al-Dūrī
- c. ʿAbd Allāh ibn Sulaymān ibn al-Ashʿath
- d. Muḥammad ibn al-Qāsim ibn Zakariyyā
- e. ʿAbbād ibn Yaʿqūb
- f. ʿAlī ibn ʿĀbis (which in reality is ʿAlī ibn ʿAbbās)
- g. Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad al-Ḥusaynī
- h. ʿAlī ibn Mundhir al-Ṭarīqī
- i. Fuḍayl ibn Marzūq
- j. ʿAṭīyyah al-ʿAwfī
- k. Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī

4. Recorded by Majlisī in *Biḥār al-Anwār*². The narrators are:

- a. Muḥammad ibn ʿAbbās
- b. ʿAlī ibn ʿAbbās Muqālīṭ
- c. Abū Kurayb
- d. Muʿāwiyah

1 Page 9.

2 Page 9.

- e. Fuḍayl ibn Marzūq
- f. ‘Aṭīyyah al-‘Awfī
- g. Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī

Narrations without complete isnād:

1. Quoted in ‘Imād al-Islām¹ from *Kanz al-‘Ummāl*. It was taken from Ḥākim’s *Tārīkh*. Some narrators names have appeared therein including:

- Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad ibn Maymūn
- ‘Alī ibn ‘Ābis ibn al-Najjār

They have attributed their narration to Abū Sa‘īd.

2. Quoted in ‘*Imād al-Islām*² etc. from al-Durr al-Manthūr without any isnād. *Ṭa‘n al-Rimāh* added that al-Bazzār, Abū Ya‘lā, Ibn Ḥātim, and Ibn Mardawayh have reported it from Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī.

3. Written in *Biḥār al-Anwār*³ etc. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Ṣāliḥ reports that Ma‘mūn wrote to ‘Ubayd Allah ibn Mūsā asking him concerning the incident of Fadak. ‘Ubayd Allah wrote to him this ḥadīth which Fuḍayl ibn Marzūq narrated to him from ‘Aṭīyyah. Two names appear here:

- Fuḍayl ibn Marzūq
- ‘Aṭīyyah

4. Reported in *al-Ṭarā‘if*⁴ from Bishr ibn al-Walīd, al-Wāqidī, and Bishr ibn Ghiyāth. The isnād is omitted. Al-Shūstarī quoted it in *Iḥqāq al-Ḥaqq* citing al-Wāqidī.

1 Ibid.

2 Ibid.

3 Page 13.

4 Page 15.

5. Quoted in 'Imād al-Islām' etc. from *Ma'ārij al-Nubuwwah* and *Maqṣad al-Aqṣā*.

That is it. This is all the Shī'ī scholars boast over. This is all they have which they passionately present against the Ahl al-Sunnah to prove the gifting of Fadak. Since the narrations are reported with different wordings and at different places in the Fadak discussion, some naïve Sunnī may see them and get worried thinking that these narrations appear in our books at the end of the day so they must be authentic. They thus become perplexed and doubts began to sprout in their hearts about their beliefs. However, now that we have gathered them at one place, the reader will realise that the core of all these narrations is Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī. 'Aṭīyyah narrated from him and Fuḍayl ibn Marzūq narrated from 'Aṭīyyah. Then the chain continues. In short, Abū Sa'īd is the core of all the narrations they have presented. However, an amazing deception has been played with the name Abū Sa'īd which leaves the readers into thinking that it is the Ṣaḥābī Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī رضي الله عنه, whereas it is not him. Instead it is Abū Sa'īd who is titled al-Kalbī and is the exegete. He has many different names and agnomens, so many are misled by his name. Sometimes his name appears as Muḥammad ibn Sā'ib al-Kalbī, and sometimes Ḥammād ibn Sā'ib al-Kalbī. He has three agnomens viz. Abū Naṣr, Abū Hishām, and Abū Sa'īd. 'Aṭīyyah al-'Awfī reported from him. Since 'Aṭīyyah is a cunning Shī'ī, he narrated these types of aḥādīth from his teacher Abū Sa'īd al-Kalbī in such a manner which misleads the reader into thinking that he is narrating from Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī رضي الله عنه. He says *haddathanā* or *qāla Abū Sa'īd* (Abū Sa'īd narrated to us or said) and then remains silent. He does not say al-Kalbī or any other famous name of his so that people are deceived into thinking that he is narrating from Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī رضي الله عنه, not Abū Sa'īd al-Kalbī.

We will now present the condition of 'Aṭīyyah al-'Awfī and Abū Sa'īd al-Kalbī from the books of Asmā' al-Rijāl and lift the veils which have concealed these narrations for a long time. We will consult the reliable books of Asmā' al-Rijāl for this study.

‘Aṭīyyah al-‘Awfī

- He makes plenty mistakes; he was Shīṭī and a mudallis.¹
- A famous Tābīṭī who is ḍa‘īf.
- Sālim al-Murādī said, “Aṭīyyah had Shīṭī tendencies.”
- Aḥmad said, “Ḍa‘īf al-ḥadīth.”
- Haytham would criticise ‘Aṭīyyah
- Ibn al-Madā’inī reports from Yaḥyā who said, “Aṭīyyah, Abū Hārūn, and Bashīr ibn Ḥarb are all equal according to me [i.e. all are ḍa‘īf].”
- Aḥmad said, “It reached me that ‘Aṭīyyah would go to al-Kalbī and learn tafsīr from him. He would record it as Abū Sa‘īd and would say, ‘Abū Sa‘īd said,’ giving the impression that it is al-Khudrī.”
- Al-Nasa‘ī and a group labelled him ḍa‘īf.²

Firstly, due to his abundance of mistakes, his narrations cannot be relied upon. Secondly, due to him practicing tadrīs, they are not considered. Thirdly, he is Shīṭī, so this narration is a Shīṭī narration, not a Sunnī one.

What is tadrīs and what level of defect is it deemed in a narrator needs some elucidation so that the readers might evaluate the worth of this narration on the basis of tadrīs.

Ibn al-Jawzī regards tadrīs as such a heinous and terrible crime that he writes in *Talbīs Iblīs*:

و من تلبس أبلّيس على علماء المحدثين رواية الحديث الموضوع من غير أن يبينوا أنه موضوع و هذا خيانة منهم على الشرع و مقصودهم تنفيق أحاديثهم و كثرة رواياتهم و قد قال النبي من روى عني حديثا يرى أنه كذب فهو أحد الكاذبين و من هذا الفن تدليسهم في الرواية فتارة يقول أحدهم فلان عن فلان أو قال فلان عن فلان يوهم أنه سمع منه و لم يسمع و هذا قبيح لأنه يجعل المنقطع في مرتبة المتصل

1 *Al-Taqrīb*.

2 *Mizān al-‘itidāl*.

One of the deceptions of Iblīs upon the Muḥaddithīn ‘Ulamā’ is narrating a fabrication without stating that it is a fabrication. This is treachery on their part upon the Sharī‘ah. Their intention is to market their aḥādīth and to increase their narrations whereas Rasūlullāh ﷺ has stated, “Whoever narrates a ḥadīth from me knowing that it is false is one of the liars.”

Tadlīs in the science of ḥadīth is a narrator saying, “So-and-so from so-and-so” or “so-and-so said from so-and-so,” giving the impression that the former heard it from the latter, whereas he did not. This is scandalous since it equates *munqaṭī’* (broken chain – where one or more narrators are missing) with *muttaṣil* (unbroken chain – where no narrator is missing).

Al-Sakhāwī has discussed al-Kalbī in *Risālah Manzūmah Jazarī*, which deals with the principles of ḥadīth, under the chapter dealing with people who have various names and different descriptions. He says:

و هو أبو سعيد الذي روى عنه عطية العوفي موهما أنه الخدري

He is Abū Sa‘īd from whom ‘Aṭīyyah al-‘Awfī reports giving the impression that it is al-Khudrī.

After we have disclosed the reality of ‘Aṭīyyah’s tricks, it becomes clear as daylight that this narration is not from Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, the Ṣaḥābī, but rather from Abū Sa‘īd al-Kalbī, the commentator.

Abū Sa‘īd al-Kalbī

It is appropriate to disclose the condition of Abū Sa‘īd al-Kalbī so that it becomes manifest in front of all that the core of all these narrations is a liar, fabricator of aḥādīth, and a Shī‘ī.

Al-Sakhāwī has written in *Sharḥ Risālah Manzūmah Jazarī*:

أن من أمثلة اي من له أسماء مختلفة و نعت متعددة محمد بن السائب الكلبي المفسر هو أبو النصر الذي روى عنه ابن إسحاق و هو حماد بن السائب روى عنه أبو أسامة و هو أبو سعيد الذي روى عنه عطية الكوفي موهما أنه الخدري و هو أبو هشام روى عنه القاسم بن الوليد

One example of those who have different names and various descriptions is Muḥammad ibn Sā'ib al-Kalbī, the exegete. His agnomen is Abū Naḍr. Ibn Ishāq uses this agnomen when reporting from him. His name is Ḥammād ibn Sā'ib; Abū Usāmah uses this name of his when narrating from him. His agnomen is also Abū Sa'īd; 'Aṭṭiyah al-Kūfī reports from him using this agnomen to throw the unwary into thinking that it is al-Khudrī. His agnomen is also Abū Hishām which Qāsim ibn al-Walīd uses when quoting him.

- Muḥammad ibn al-Sā'ib ibn Bashīr al-Kalbī, Abū al-Naḍr al-Kūfī, the genealogist and exegete. He has been accused of lying and criticised of rafḍ. He is from the sixth category. He died in 146 A.H.¹
- Muḥammad ibn al-Sā'ib al-Kalbī, Abū al-Naḍr al-Kūfī, the Exegete, Genealogist, and Akhbārī.
- Al-Thawrī says, “Be careful of al-Kalbī.” He was asked, “But you narrate from him?” He explained, “I know his truths from his lies.”
- Al-Bukhārī said, “‘Alī said, Yahyā reported to us from Sufyān, al-Kalbī said to me, ‘All that I narrated to you from Abū Ṣālīḥ is a lie.’”
- Yazīd ibn Zuray‘ said, “Al-Kalbī narrated to us and he was a Saba'ī.”
- Abū Mu'āwiyah says, “Al-A'mash says, ‘Fear this Saba'ī. I found that people had been poisoned by the liars.’”
- Ibn Ḥibbān said, “Al-Kalbī was a Saba'ī from that group who believe that ‘Alī did not die and will return to the world and fill it with justice just as it was filled with oppression. He saw a cloud and they said, Amīr al-Mu'minīn is in it.”
- Abū 'Awnah reports, “I heard al-Kalbī saying, ‘Jibrīl would dictate the revelation to the Nabī ﷺ. When the Nabī ﷺ would enter the toilet, he would dictate the revelation to ‘Alī.’”

1 *Al-Taqrīb*.

- Aḥmad ibn Zuhayr said, “I asked Aḥmad ibn Ḥambal if it was permissible to look to al-Kalbī’s tafsīr. He replied in the negative.”
- Al-Jūzajānī and others said, “*Kadhāb* (great liar)”
- Al-Dāraquṭnī and a group said, “*Matrūk* (suspected of ḥadīth forgery).”
- Ibn Ḥibbān said, “His fabricating and lying are so evident that its needs no substantiation.”
- One of his qualities is that he reports tafsīr from Abū Ṣāliḥ from Ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه whereas neither did Abū Ṣāliḥ ever see Ibn ‘Abbās, nor did al-Kalbī hear Abū Ṣāliḥ. Nonetheless, whenever the need arises, he unearths his hidden treasures. It is not permissible to mention him in books. So what about using him as proof?¹

In *Tadhkirat al-Ḥuffāz*, al-Dhahabī has revealed that Muḥammad ibn al-Sā’ib al-Kalbī is a Rāfiḍī. This appears in the discussion of his son Hishām ibn al-Kalbī² whom he declared as matrūk and did not list among the Ḥuffāz of ḥadīth. He says:

1 *Mizān al-I’tidāl*.

2 The following is written in *Ansāb Sam’ānī* by Abū Sa’īd ‘Abd al-Karīm ibn Muḥammad al-Marwazī al-Shāfi’ī regarding father and son:

و ابو النصر محمد بن السائب ابن بشر بن عمر و ابن الحارث بن عبد العزى بن امرئ القيس بن عامر بن النعمان ابن عامر بن عبدود بن كنانة بن عوف بن عذرة بن زيد اللات بن افيدة ابن ثورين كلب صاحب التفسير من أهل الكوفة يروي عنه الثوري و محمد بن إسحاق و يقولان ثنا أبو النصر حتى لا يعرف و هو الذي عطية العوفي كنى أبا سعيد فكان يقول حدثني أبو سعيد يريد به الكلبي فيتوهمون أنه أراد به أبا سعيد الخدري و كان الكلبي يقول أسبابا من أصحاب عبد الله بن سبأ من اولئك الذين يقولون أن عليا لم يموت و أنه راجع إلى الدنيا قبل قيام الساعة فيملأها عدلا كما ملئت جورا و أن رأوا سحابة قالوا أمير المؤمنين فيها فاحذ منهم و قال من قوم إذا ذكروا عليا يصلون الصلوة على السحاب و مات الكلب ١٠٤٦ و ابنه أبو المنذر هشام بن محمد بن السائب بن بشير الكلبي من أهل الكوفة صاحب النسب يروي عن أبيه و معروف مولى سليمان الغرائب و العجائب و الأخبار التي لا أصول لها روى عنه شباب العصفري و ابنه العباس بن هشام و محمد بن سعيد كاتب الواقدي و علي بن حرب الموصلي و عبد الله بن الضحاک الهداوي و أبو الأشعث أحد بن المقدم العجلي و كان غالبا في التشيع أخباره في الأغلوطن أشهر من أن يحتاج إلى الإعراف في وصفها و كان هشام بن الكلبي يقول حفظت ما لم يحفظ أحد و نسيت ما لم ينس أحد كان لي عم يعاتبني على حفظ القرآن فدخلت بيتا و حلفت أن لا أخرج منه حتى أحفظ القرآن محفظة في ثلاثة أيام و نظرت في المرأة و قبضت على لحيتي لأخذ ما دون القبضة فأخذت ما فوق القبضة قال عبد الله بن أحمد بن حنبل سمعت أبي يقول هشام بن محمد بن السائب الكلبي من يحدث عنه إنها هو صاحب سمر و نسب و ظننت أن أحدا يحدث عنه مات سنة أربع و ست و ماتتین

continued ...

‘هشام بن كلبى الحافظ أحد المترولين ليس بثقة فلهذا لم أدخله بين حفاظ الحديث و هو أبو المنذر هشام بن محمد بن السائب الكوفي الرافضى النسابة

Hishām ibn Kalbī, the Ḥāfiẓ. He is one of the matrūk narrators and is unreliable. Due to this, I did not include him among the Ḥuffāz of ḥadīth. He is Abū al-Mundhir Hishām ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Sā’ib al-Kūfī – the rāfiḍī genealogist.

Yāqūt al-Ḥimawī has recorded in *Mu’jam al-Buldān* while listing the books of Muḥammad ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī:

1 continued from page 774

Abū al-Naḍr Muḥammad ibn al-Sā’ib ibn Bishr ibn ‘Amr ibn al-Ḥārith ibn ‘Abd al-‘Uzzā ibn Imra’ al-Qays ibn ‘Āmir ibn al-Nu’mān ibn ‘Āmir ibn ‘Abdūd ibn Kinānah ibn ‘Awf ibn ‘Adharah ibn Zayd al-Lāt ibn Afidah ibn Thawrīn Kalb, author of the tafsīr from the residents of Kūfah. Al-Thawrī and Muḥammad ibn Isḥāq narrated from him. They say: Abū al-Naḍr narrated to us so that he may not be recognised. He is the same person ‘Atīyyah al-‘Awfī titled as Abū Sa’īd. Accordingly, he would say, “Abū Sa’īd narrated to me,” referring to al-Kalbī but people would think that he means Abū Sa’īd al-Khudrī رضي الله عنه. Al-Kalbī is among the followers of ‘Abd Allah ibn Saba’ who say that ‘Alī did not die, and will return to the world before the Day of Judgement and he will fill it with justice just as it was filled with tyranny and he saw a cloud and said, “Amīr al-Mu’minīn is inside.” So be careful of him. He said: Some people when they take ‘Alī’s name, they send salutations upon the clouds. Al-Kalbī died in 1046.

His son is Abū al-Mundhir Hishām ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Sā’ib ibn Bashīr al-Kalbī from the resident of Kūfah, the genealogist. He narrates from his father and Ma’rūf the freed-slave of Sulaymān such amazing and astonishing narrations which are baseless. Shabāb al-‘Aṣfurī, his son ‘Abbās ibn Hishām, Muḥammad ibn Sa’īd – al-Wāqidi’s scribe – ‘Alī ibn Ḥarb al-Mawṣilī, ‘Abd Allah ibn al-Ḍaḥḥāk al-Ḥadāwī, and Abū al-Ash’ath Aḥmad ibn al-Miqdām al-‘Ijlī narrate from him. He was an extremist Shī’ī. His mistakes are very common and needs to introduction. Hishām ibn al-Kalbī would say, “I remembered what no one remembered and forgot what no one forgot. I had an uncle who would censure me for not memorising the Qur’ān. So I entered a house and took an oath that I will not exit from it until I do not memorise the entire Qur’ān in three days. I looked in the mirror one day and caught hold of my beard to trip it below my first, but instead cut above my fist.” ‘Abd Allah ibn Aḥmad ibn Ḥambal says, “I heard my father saying: ‘Hishām ibn Muḥammad ibn al-Sā’ib al-Kalbī whom they narrate from is just a story teller and a genealogist. I never thought anyone will narrate from him.’” He died 216 A.H.

و لم يتعرض أي الطبري تفسير غير موثوق به فإنه لم يدخل في كتابه شيئاً عن كتاب محمد بن السائب الكلبي و لا مقاتل بن سليمان و لا محمد بن عمر الواقدي لأنهم عنده أظناه

Al-Ṭabarī did not entertain the tafsīr of unreliable narrators. Accordingly, he did not include in his book anything from the books of Muḥammad ibn al-Sā'ib al-Kalbī, Muqātil ibn Sulaymān, or Muḥammad ibn 'Umar al-Wāqidī since they were dubious according to him.

Muḥammad Ṭāhir Gujrātī writes regarding al-Kalbī in *Tadhkirat al-Mawḍū'āt*:

قد قال أحمد في تفسير الكلبي من أوله إلى آخره كذب لا يجعل النظر فيه

Indeed, Aḥmad has stated, “In al-Kalbī’s tafsīr, there is lies from the beginning to the end. It should not be looked at!”

This is the condition of Abū Sa'īd al-Kalbī which we have quoted from the Muḥaqqiqīn. He is from 'Abd Allāh ibn Saba's group in his beliefs. He believes in Raj'ah and that Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is hiding in the clouds. He is on such a lofty pedestal of truthfulness that he narrates from those he never saw and never heard from. He concocted whatever he felt and fabricated tales in their name. His integrity is on such a level that al-Ṭabarī considers it impermissible to quote him in his book. He is the fabricator or transmitter of the ḥadīth of the gifting of Fadak. Moreover, 'Aṭīyyah is a Shī'ī mudallis. He reports from the former to give credence to his crooked creed. He abstains from taking his name and says instead, “Abū Sa'īd narrated to me,” to deceive people into believing that this is Sayyidunā Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

What has been established here that the Abū Sa'īd who is the core of this narration is not Sayyidunā Abū Sa'īd al-Khudrī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, is not some philosophy. Rather it is confirmed by the former scholars from their writings and traditions. For example, the narration of *Kanz al-'Ummāl*, Ḥākīm's *Tārīkh*, Ibn Mardawayh, *al-Durr al-Manthūr*, al-Bazzār, Abū Ya'lā, and Ibn Abī Ḥātim only mention Abū Sa'īd without al-Khudrī. This has only been added due to the deception.

The false nature of the narration has now been verified after revealing the condition of ‘Aṭīyyah and al-Kalbī and its fictitiousness has been established beyond doubt. Although, there remains no reason to discuss the other narrators, however we will discuss them coupled with the text so that people realise that the isnād is filled with matrūk, majhūl, and kadhāb Rawāfiq. Every person in the isnād reeks from the stench of Shī‘ism, tadrīs, or majhūliyyah.

Fuḍayl ibn Marzūq al-Kūfī narrates from ‘Aṭīyyah.

Fuḍayl ibn Marzūq al-Kūfī

- Accused of having Shī‘ tendencies. (Hence, he has been discarded.)¹
- Ibn Ma‘īn said, “Extreme in Shī‘ism.”
- Abū Ḥātim declared, “Truthful but makes plenty mistakes.”²
- His aḥādīth can be written but he cannot be used as proof.
- Al-Nasa‘ī said, “Ḍa‘īf.”³
- Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim says, “Fuḍayl ibn Marzūq does not meet the standards of *ṣaḥīḥ* (authenticity). Muslim has been criticised for recording his aḥādīth in *Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*.”
- Ibn Ḥibbān commented, “Extremely *munkar al-ḥadīth* (reports weak narrations which contradict *ṣaḥīḥ* narrations). He would err when reporting from reliable narrators. He reports fabrications from ‘Aṭīyyah. I say, ‘Aṭīyyah is more Ḍa‘īf than him.”
- Ibn ‘Adī says, “When he concurs with reliable narrators, then his narrations will be used as evidence.”
- Aḥmad ibn Abī Khaythamah narrates from Ibn Ma‘īn, “Ḍa‘īf.”⁴

1 *Al-Taqrīb*.

2 *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*.

3 *Al-Tahdhīb*.

4 *Mīzān al-I‘tidāl*.

‘Alī ibn ‘Abbās narrates from Fuḍayl ibn Marzūq al-Kūfi

‘Alī ibn ‘Abbās al-Arzaq al-Asadī al-Kūfi

- He narrates from al-‘Alā’ ibn al-Musayyab and Ibn Abī Sulaym and others. Ibn ‘Abbās reports from Abī Ma‘īn, “He is worthless.”
- Al-Jūzajānī, al-Nasa‘ī, and al-Azdī say, “Ḍa‘īf.”
- Ibn Ḥibbān declares, “His blunders are numerous so he deserves to be abandoned.”
- Al-Qāsim ibn Zakariyyā says, “‘Abbād ibn Ya‘qūb narrated to us from ‘Alī ibn ‘Abbās from Fuḍayl ibn Marzūq from ‘Aṭīyyah from Abū Sa‘īd who reports, ‘When the verse And give the relative his right was revealed, Rasūlullāh ﷺ summoned Fāṭimah and gave her Fadak.’ I declare, This is utterly false. Had he given her this, Fāṭimah would not have come seeking something in her possession and control. There are other ḍa‘īf narrators besides ‘Alī in the isnād.¹

‘Abbād ibn Ya‘qūb narrates from ‘Alī ibn ‘Abbās

‘Abbād ibn Ya‘qūb al-Rawājini²

- Truthful. Rāfiḍī. His ḥadīth appears in al-Bukhārī *maqrūnan* (in a supporting nature).
- Ibn Ḥibbān emphasised, “He deserves to be abandoned.”³
- One of the leaders of the Shī‘ah.
- Ibn ‘Adī said about him, “He narrates many *munkar aḥādīth* (weak narrations contradicting ṣaḥīḥ narrations) about the virtues of the Ahl al-Bayt.”

1 *Mīzān al-I’tidāl*.

2 The wāw has no tashdīd, the jīm has a kasrah, and the nūn has no tashdīd.

3 *Al-Taqrīb; al-Mughnī*.

- Šālih ibn Muḥammad says, “He would curse ‘Uthmān.”¹
- From among the extremist Shī‘ah and leaders of bid‘ah (innovation). However, he is truthful in ḥadīth from Sharīk, Walīd ibn Abī Thawr, and others. Al-Bukhārī narrated from him a ḥadīth in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* in a supporting capacity.
- Ibn Khuzaymah says, A reliable narrator reported to us, “Abbād is *muttahaḥ* (accused) in his dīn.”
- ‘Abdān al-Ahwāzī reports from someone reliable, “Abbād ibn Ya‘qūb would swear the *Salaf* (pious predecessors).”
- Ibn ‘Adī says, “He reports many aḥādīth regarding virtues for which he has been criticised.”
- Šālih Jazarah says, “Abbād ibn Ya‘qūb would vilify ‘Uthmān. I heard him saying, ‘Allah is more just than to enter Ṭalḥah and Zubayr into Jannah who fought against ‘Alī after giving him bay‘ah.’”
- He invited to rafḍ. Coupled with this, he narrates weak narrations from well-known narrators, hence he is deserving of being abandoned.
- Al-Dāraquṭnī says, “Abbād ibn Ya‘qūb is a truthful Shī‘ī.”²

These are the 5 names of this isnād we managed to locate in the books of Asmā’ al-Rijāl. By Allah’s سُبْحَانَكَ وَتَعَالَى grace, they are all Shī‘ah, viz. ‘Abbād ibn Ya‘qūb, ‘Alī ibn ‘Abbās, Fuḍayl, ‘Aṭīyyah, and Abū Sa‘īd.

Their tutor who is the core of this narration is Abū Sa‘īd al-Kalbī who is an extremist in Shī‘ism. As mentioned earlier, he does not believe in Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ demise and believes in Raj‘ah.

The second narration which appears in *Biḥār al-Anwār* and *Majma‘ al-Bayān*, begins with Sayyid Abū Ḥumayd Mahdī ibn Nazār Ḥusaynī and ends with Abū Sa‘īd al-

1 *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*.

2 *Mīzān al-Itidāl*.

Khudrī. The last three narrators are Fuḍayl, ‘Aṭīyyah, and Abū Sa‘īd; and either unintentionally or a deliberate attempt to deceive, the last was thought to be Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī. One narrator who appears in the isnād is Yaḥyā ibn Ya‘lā.

Yaḥyā ibn Ya‘lā al-Aslamī Abū Zakariyyā al-Kūfī al-Qaṭrāfi

- Shī‘ī. Ḍa‘īf. From the ninth category.¹
- He reports from Yūnus ibn Khabbāb and al-A‘mash. Jandal ibn Wāliq and Qutaybah report from him.
- Ibn Ma‘īn said, “He is worthless.”
- Abū Ḥātim remarked, “Ḍa‘īf al-ḥadīth.”²

The rest of the narrators have not been located in the books of Asmā’ al-Rijāl by me. Nevertheless, there is no real need to verify their worth since even if hypothetically we agree that they are reliable, truthful, Sunnī narrators, then too the isnād ends with 3 cunning Shī‘ī men. Moreover, the core of the isnād is Abū Sa‘īd; the liar, fabricator, and extremist Shī‘ī.

Besides this, this narration that appears in *Biḥār al-Anwār* has not been referenced to any book. It is nothing implausible, actually I can declare with almost certainty, that this narration is fabricated by the Shī‘ah and taken from their books.

With regards to the third narration quoted from *Sa‘d al-Sa‘ūd*, this has been quoted from the tafsīr of Muḥammad ibn ‘Abbās ibn ‘Alī ibn Marwān. Let us find out who this person is. After studying *Muntahā al-Maqāl fī Asmā’ al-Rijāl*³, we realised that he is one of the Shī‘ī scholars and exegetes. It appears in this book about him:

1 *Al-Taqrīb*.

2 *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*.

3 A very reliable book concerning Asmā’ al-Rijāl among the Shī‘ah. It holds the same position in the eyes of the Shī‘ah as does *Mīzān al-Itidāl* in the eyes of the Sunnī.

محمد بن عباس بن علي بن مروان بن الماهيار أبو عبد الله البزاز المعروف بابن الحجاج ثقة في أصحابنا عين سديد كثير الحديث له كتاب المقنع في الفقه كتاب الدواجن كتاب ما نزل من القرآن في أهل بيت و قال جماعة من أصحابنا أنه كتاب لم يصنف في معناه مثله و قيل أنه ألف ورقة جش ، صه إلا ذكر الكتائبين الأولين و في ست أخبرنا بكتبه و رواياته جماعة من أصحابنا عن أبي محمد بن هارون بن موسى التلعكبري عنه أقول في مشكا ، ابن عباس بن علي بن مروان ثقة عنه التلعكبري

Muḥammad ibn ‘Abbās ibn ‘Alī ibn Marwān ibn al-Māhyār, Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Bazzāz commonly known as Ibn al-Ḥajjām. He is reliable and from our scholars. A straight spring and narrator of plenty aḥādīth. He has prepared *Kitāb al-Muqni’* in Fiqh, *Kitāb al-Dawājīn*, and *Kitāb Mā Nazala min al-Qur’ān fī Ahl al-Bayt*. A group of our scholars said, “It is such a book which is unparalleled in its field.” It comprises of 1000 odd pages. (*Rijāl al-Najjāshī*)

The same is mentioned in *al-Khulāṣah* except for the first two books.

A group of our scholars reported to us his books and narrations from Abū Muḥammad ibn Hārūn ibn Mūsā al-Tala‘kabrī from him.

I say, it is mentioned in *al-Mushtarikāt*: Ibn ‘Abbās ibn ‘Alī ibn Marwān the reliable, al-Tal‘ukbarī narrated from him.

So the narration appearing in his book is accepted by the Shī‘ah, not the Sunnī. Moreover, they did not write whether it was taken from a Shī‘ī book or a Sunnī one. But it is the very same narration which we have been discussing. This narration appears from two chains. One is Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad, Haytham ibn Khalaf, ‘Abd Allāh ibn Sulaymān, and Muḥammad ibn Qāsim. They all say ‘Abbād ibn Ya‘qūb reported to us who reported from ‘Alī ibn ‘Abbās (which was mistakenly written as ‘Ābis). The second isnād is Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad Ḥusaynī, from ‘Alī ibn Mundhir al-Ṭarīqī, from ‘Alī ibn ‘Abbās. Both these isnāds run through ‘Alī ibn ‘Abbās, from Fuḍayl, from ‘Aṭīyyah from Abū Sa‘īd. And the last three are well known.

One isnād runs via ‘Alī ibn Mundhir al-Ṭarīqī:

‘Alī ibn Mundhir al-Ṭarīqī al-Kūfī

- He is truthful and has Shīʿī ideologies.²
- Al-Nasaʿī said, “A proper Shīʿī. Reliable.”³

Now that he is proven to be Shīʿī, his narration which supports his corrupt beliefs is unacceptable.

Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad al-Ḥusaynī reports from him who is not an ordinary Shīʿī but rather a very truthful and reliable individual and one of the Mashāyikh of ijāzah of the Shīʿah. It appears in *Muntahā al-Maqāl*:

جعفر بن محمد بن إبراهيم الحسيني الموسوي المصري يروي عنه التلعكبري و كان سماعه عنه سنة أربعين و ثلاث مائة بمصر و له منه إجازة و زاد في بعض النسخ أبو القاسم في الأول فانظر أنه يكتب به و كناه به الشيخ أيضا في محمد بن أبي عمير و عبر عنه ابن شريف الصالح و في عبد الله أحمد بن نهيك أيضا كونه من مشايخ الإجازة و ذلك مارة الوثيقة

Jaʿfar ibn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm al-Ḥusaynī al-Mūsawī al-Miṣrī. Al-Talaʿabrī narrates from him and heard him in the year 340 A.H. in Egypt and also secured ijāzah from him. An addition of Abū al-Qāsim appears in some copies in the beginning. So most probably he was given this title. And Shaykh also gave him the title of Muḥammad ibn Abī ʿUmayr. Ibn Sharīf al-Ṣāliḥ makes mention of this. It appears in ʿAbd Allāh ibn Nahīk’s book that he is from the Mashāyikh of ijāzah. And this is a sign of credibility.

It is written about ʿAbd Allāh ibn Nahīk:

الشيخ الصدوق ثقة

He is a Shaykh, truthful, and reliable.

1 With a fatḥah on the ṭā’, a kasrah on the rā’, followed by a yā sākin and then a qāf.

2 *Al-Taqrīb*.

3 *Mizān al-ʿitidāl*.

It also appears:

أخبرنا القاضي أبو الحسن محمد بن عثمان بن الحسن قال اشتملت إجازة أبي القاسم جعفر بن محمد
بن إبراهيم الموسوي

Qāḍī Abū al-Ḥasan Muḥammad ibn ‘Uthmān ibn al-Ḥasan says, “I secured ijāzah from Abū al-Qāsim Ja‘far ibn Muḥammad ibn Ibrāhīm al-Mūsawī.

Another narrator is Muḥammad ibn Qāsim Zakariyyā

Muḥammad ibn Qāsim ibn Zakariyyā al-Asadī al-Majāzī al-Kūfī – originally from Syria

- His title was *kādhīb* (liar)¹
- A group criticised him
- It is said he believed in raj‘ah.
- He sat and narrated *Kitāb al-Nahy* from Ḥusayn ibn Naṣr ibn Muzāḥim whereas he did not hear it from him. He passed away in 326 A.H.²

Another narrator is Muḥammad ibn Sulaymān

Muḥammad ibn Muḥammad ibn Sulaymān

- Al-Ṭabarānī declares, “A narrator accused of fabricating aḥādīth.”³

‘Abd Allāh ibn Sulaymān al-Ash‘ath al-Sijistānī, Abū Bakr al-Ḥāfiẓ

- Reliable and author of many books.
- Al-Dāraquṭnī called him reliable but said that he blunders in speech.

1 *Al-Taqrīb*.

2 *Mizān al-I‘tidāl*.

3 *Ibid*

- Ibn ‘Adī mentioned him and then said, “Had it not been for the condition I stipulated, I would not have mentioned him.” He said further on, “I heard Abū Dāwūd saying, ‘My son ‘Abd Allāh is a *kadhāb* (great liar).’”
- Ibn Sa’d comments, “Sufficient for us is what his father said about him.”
- Ibn ‘Adī then said, “I heard Mūsā ibn al-Qāsim saying, ‘Abū Bakr told me that he heard Ibrāhīm al-Iṣfahānī saying that Abū Bakr ibn Abī Dāwūd is a *kadhāb* (great liar).’”
- Ibn ‘Adī said, “Initially, he was attributed to naṣb so Ibn al-Furāṭ exiled him from Baghdād. Subsequently, ‘Alī ibn ‘Īsā sent him back. He began narrating aḥādīth on the virtues of the Ahl al-Bayt from his imagination and became a Shaykh among them.”

This is the condition of the two isnāds Sayyid ibn Ṭā’ūs quoted from Muḥammad ibn ‘Abbās. He writes that this narration has 20 other isnāds. So most probably, they are none the better on condition that they actually exist. What does not convince us that other isnāds actually exist is that al-Majlisī’s habit is to gather all narrations. He does not shy away from this. In fact, his book *Biḥār al-Anwār* is a shoreless ocean of narrations. So he would have definitely quoted these narrations to impress upon the reader the worth of the narration. But since he did not, we are sceptical about the claim.

The narrators of the fourth narration al-Majlisī records in *Biḥār al-Anwār* are as follows:

- Muḥammad ibn al-‘Abbās
- ‘Alī ibn al-‘Abbās al-Muqānī’ī
- Abū Kurayb
- Mu‘āwiyah
- Fuḍayl ibn Marzūq
- ‘Aṭīyyah
- Abū Sa’īd al-Khudrī

Since the last three narrators are the same, it does not appear to be another narration, despite the first few narrators being different. One narrator is Abū Kurayb who is *majhūl* (unknown).

Abū Kurayb al-Asadī

- Abū Ḥātim said, “Majhūl.”¹

In conclusion, the four narrations of the first type have been explained in detail. We have showed very clearly that the narration is actually only one, with various isnāds leading up to the same source, and the last narrator is a Shīʿī.

The narration of *Kanz al-ʿUmmāl* only mentions, “from Abū Saʿīd”. The word al-Khudrī does not appear, nor does the rest of the isnād. The author has taken it from Ḥākim’s *Tārīkh*. Ḥākim only says that Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad ibn Maymūn narrated it from ‘Alī ibn ‘Ābis. This narration is astonishing and disgusting. Firstly, Ḥākim had Shīʿī leanings. Secondly, he records many fabrications in his book. Al-Dhahabī records in *Tadhkirat al-Ḥuffāz*:

قال الخطيب أبو بكر أبو عبد الله الحاكم كان ثقة يميل إلى التشيع فحدثني إبراهيم بن محمد المودي و كان صالحا عالما قال جمع الحاكم أحاديث و زعم أنها صحاح على شرط البخاري و مسلم منها حديث الطير و من كنت مولاة فعلي مولاة فأنكرها عليه أصحاب الحديث و لم يلتفتوا إلى قوله و لا ريب أن في المستدرک أحاديث كثيرة ليست على شرط الصحة بل فيه أحاديث موضوعة شان المستدرک بإخراجها فيه قال ابن طاهر سألت أبا إسماعيل الأنصاري عن الحاكم فقال ثقة في الحديث رافضي خبيث ثم قال ابن طاهر كان شديد التعصب للشيعة في الباطن

Al-Khaṭīb Abū Bakr stated: “Abū Abd Allah al-Ḥākim was reliable and had Shīʿī tendencies. Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad al-Mūdī who is a righteous ‘Ālim narrated to me saying, ‘al-Ḥākim gathered aḥādīth and thought they were ṣaḥīḥ, meeting the standards of al-Bukhārī and Muslim [whereas the reality was the different]. One of them is *ḥadīth al-ṭayr* (the bird narration) and whoever’s mawlā I am, ‘Alī is his mawlā. The muḥaddithīn criticised

1 *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*.

him for such narrations and did not consider his statement. Undoubtedly, there are many aḥādīth in *al-Mustadrak* which do not meet the standards of authenticity. In fact, there are plenty fabrications therein which have tainted *al-Mustadrak*.”

Ibn Ṭāhir says, “I asked Abū Ismāʿīl al-Anṣārī about al-Ḥākim. He replied, ‘Reliable in ḥadīth. A disgusting Rāfiḍī.’” Ibn Ṭāhir then said, “He had extreme *taʿaṣṣub* (favouritism, prejudice, bias) for the Shīʿah.”

He narrates from Ibrāhīm ibn Maymūn. This establishes his shīʿī inclinations because it appears in *Muntahā al-Maqāl fī Asmāʾ al-Rijāl*:

و من كتاب ميزان الاعتدال أنه من أجلاء الشيعة روى عن علي بن عابس انتهى و لعله بن ميمون

It appears in *Mīzān al-ʿItidāl* that he is reckoned among the high ranking Shīʿah. He reports from ʿAlī ibn ʿĀbis. Probably he is Ibn Maymūn.

He writes at another juncture:

إبراهيم بن ميمون الكوفي صدوق و يأتي في ترجمة عبد الله بن مسكان أن إبراهيم هذا حمل جواب مسائل عبد الله عن أبي عبد الله فيظهر أن الإمام كان يعتمد فهو معتمد عليه وفاقا للجمع

Ibrāhīm ibn Maymūn al-Kūfī is truthful. It appears in the biography of ʿAbd Allāh ibn Miskān that Ibrāhīm would convey the answer from Abū ʿAbd Allāh to the question of ʿAbd Allāh. This shows that the Imām had reliance upon him. Therefore, he is reliable by consensus.

This makes it clear that he was no ordinary Shīʿī. Imām Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq عليه السلام relied upon him. He reports from ʿAlī ibn ʿĀbis, which ought to be ʿAlī ibn ʿAbbās, whom we learnt about earlier:

أنه كان من الضعفاء المتروكين

He was among the *ḍaʿīf* and *matrūk* narrators.

This isnād goes up until Abū Saʿīd, but *al-Khudrī* has not been added so it shows that it was not the Ṣaḥābī but al-Kalbī.

The second narration is quoted in *ʿImād al-Islām* etc., from al-Durr al-Manthūr without any isnād. Ṭaʿn al-Rimāḥ added that al-Bazzār, Abū Yaʿlā, Ibn Ḥātīm, and Ibn Mardawayh have reported it from Abū Saʿīd al-Khudrī. Although the isnād is not mentioned, it seems to be the very same narration from Sayyid ibn Mardawayh. Ḥaydar ʿAlī has mentioned the isnād of this narration in one of his books as follows:

حدثنا عباد بن يعقوب حدثنا أبو يحيى التيمي حدثنا فضيل بن مرزوق عن عطية عن أبي سعيد

ʿAbbād ibn Yaʿqūb narrated to us from Abū Yaḥyā al-Taymī from Fuḍayl ibn Marzūq from ʿAṭīyyah from Abū Saʿīd.

The word al-Khudrī does not appear here. This confirms that it is al-Kalbī from whom ʿAṭīyyah narrates. All the narrators here are Shīʿah besides Abū Yaḥyā al-Taymī.

Abū Yaḥyā al-Taymī

- Abū Ḥātīm declared him ḍaʿīf.¹

In short, this narration is not a new one. It is the very same narration of al-Kalbī.

The third narration as recorded in *Biḥār al-Anwār*² etc., is that ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Ṣāliḥ reports that Maʾmūn wrote to ʿUbayd Allah ibn Mūsā asking him concerning the incident of Fadak. ʿUbayd Allah wrote to him this ḥadīth which Fuḍayl ibn Marzūq narrated to him from ʿAṭīyyah.

This narration is wholly Shīʿī. The first narrator till the last narrator are all Shīʿah. It is reported from ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Ṣāliḥ.

1 *Al-Tahdhīb*.

2 Page 13.

‘Abd al-Rahmān ibn Ṣālīḥ al-Azdī Abū Muḥammad al-Kūfī

- He was a Shī‘ī
- Abū Dāwūd says, “He wrote a book disparaging the Ṣaḥābah. An evil man.”
- Ibn ‘Adī stated, “He was drowned in Shī‘ism. He passed away in 235 A.H.”¹
- He alighted in Baghdād. Truthful, with Shī‘ī ideologies.
- Abū Dāwūd stated, “He fabricated criticisms against the Ṣaḥābah.”²

So it is nothing amazing for him to narrate this. In fact, even if we hypothetically agree to him being Sunnī, then too the incident mentions that the answer given to Ma’ mūn was the very same narration Fuḍayl ibn Marzūq reports from ‘Aṭīyyah, and both are unreliable. Hence, the narration is unreliable.

The fourth narration is reported in *al-Tarā’if* and *Iḥqāq al-Ḥaqq* from Bishr ibn al-Walīd, al-Wāqidī, and Bishr ibn Ghiyāth without any isnād. Most probably, this is the narration of Fuḍayl, ‘Aṭīyyah, and Abū Sa‘īd. Furthermore, since it is narrated from al-Wāqidī and Bishr ibn Ghiyāth in these two books, no attention needs to be paid towards it since al-Wāqidī books are filled with ḍa‘īf and mawḍū‘ narrations. Majority of the Muḥaqqiqīn and ‘Ulamā’ agree on his unreliability. Bishr ibn Ghiyāth is even worse than al-Wāqidī to the extent that the Muḥaqqiqīn have labelled him a *zindīq* (heretic).

Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar al-Wāqidī al-Madanī al-Qāḍī

- He settled in Baghdād. He is matrūk despite his vast knowledge.³
- Al-Dhahabī states, “I did not mention his biography here since they are unanimous on discarding his aḥādīth. He is one of the containers of

1 *Mīzān al-I’tidāl*.

2 *Al-Taqrīb*.

3 *Al-Taqrīb*.

knowledge. However, he was not cautious when dealing with aḥādīth. Nonetheless, he is a leader in Maghāzī and Siyar, but he narrates everything, ṣaḥīḥ and ḍaʿīf.”¹

- Al-Bukhārī said, “Matrūk.”²
- Aḥmad stated, “He is a *kadhāb* (great liar).”
- Ibn Maʿīn said, “He is ḍaʿīf.”³
- Author of many books and one of the containers of knowledge. There is consensus upon his *ḍuʿf* (weakness). Sufficient proof for you is that Ibn Mājah does not take the courage to take his name.
- Aḥmad ibn Ḥambal states, “He is a *kadhāb*. He changes aḥādīth. He mixes the ḥadīth of his nephew al-Zuhrī with Maʿmar, and vice versa.”
- Ibn Maʿīn stated, “He is unreliable,” and at another place, “His aḥādīth could be written.”
- Al-Bukhārī and Abū Ḥātim commented, “Matrūk.”
- Abū Ḥātim also remarked as well as al-Nasaʿī, “He fabricates aḥādīth.”
- Ibn ʿAdī states, “His aḥādīth are not *mahfūz* (corroborated) and the problem lies with him.”
- Abū Ghālib ibn Bint Muʿāwiyah ibn ʿAmr said, “I heard ibn al-Madīnī say, ‘Al-Wāqidī fabricates aḥādīth.’”
- Abū Dāwūd says that it has reached him that ʿAlī ibn al-Madīnī stated, “Al-Wāqidī would narrate 30 000 weak aḥādīth.”
- Al-Mughīrah ibn Muḥammad al-Muhallabī states that he heard Ibn al-Madīnī saying, “Haytham ibn ʿAdī is more reliable than al-Wāqidī to me. I do not sanction him in ḥadīth, nor in genealogy, nor in anything else.”

1 *Tadhkirat al-Ḥuffāz; Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb.*

2 *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb.*

3 *Al-Tahdhīb.*

- I say, “Many of al-Wāqidī’s narrations have passed. Some of them and others are found in my *Tārīkh al-Kabīr*. He passed away while executing the post of judge in 207 A.H in Dhū al-Ḥijjah. There is consensus on al-Wāqidī’s ḍu‘f.”¹

These reports prove that he was a renowned ‘Ālim and celebrated author. However, he was unreliable, ḍa‘īf, and matrūk. What worse defect can a person have than fabricating aḥādīth? 30 000 weak aḥādīth are reported from him. the worth of his narrations can be gaged from the fact that reliable Mufasssīrīn avoid quoting him, like al-Ṭabarī who did not quote from al-Kalbī and al-Wāqidī in his tafsīr since they are ḍa‘īf and unreliable.

Some have gone to the extent of saying that the books that are published in his name are actually those of Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad ibn Abī Yaḥyā, a Shī‘ī author. Al-Wāqidī copied his books and published them in his name. Therefore, his books should be considered as Shī‘ī books. It appears in *Muntahā al-Maqāl fī Asmā’ al-Rijāl* in the biography of Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad:

إبراهيم بن محمد بن أبي يحيى أبو إسحاق مولى أسلم مدني روى عن أبي جعفر و أبي عبد الله و كان خصيصا و العامة لهذه العلة تضعفه و حكى بعض أصحابنا عن بعض المخالفين أن كتب الواقدي سائرهما إنما هي كتب إبراهيم بن محمد بن أبي يحيى نقلها الواقدي و ادعاها و في فهرست الشيخ و ابن محمد بن يحيى أبو إسحاق مولى أسلم مدني روى عن أبي جعفر و أبي عبد الله و كان خاصا بحدِيثنا و العامة تضعفه لذلك ذكر يعقوب بن سفيان في تاريخه في أسباب تضعيفه عن بعض الناس أنه سمعه ينال من الأولين ذكر بعض ثقال العامة أن كتب الواقدي سائرهما إنما هي كتب إبراهيم بن محمد بن أبي يحيى نقلها الواقدي و ادعاها و ذكر بعض أصحابنا أن له كتابا مبويا في الحلال و الحرام عن أبي عبد الله الحسين بن محمد الأزدي إلى قوله و ما مر من أن العامة تضعفه لذلك و يشهد له ما من صاحب ميزان الاعتدال و هو كذاب رافضي

Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad ibn Abī Yaḥyā Abū Ishāq, Mawlā of Aslam, Madanī. He narrated from Abū Ja‘far and Abū ‘Abd Allāh. He was a pure Shī‘ī. The Sunnī declare him ḍa‘īf due to this. Some of our scholars quote from some opposition that the books of al-Wāqidī are in fact the books of Ibrāhīm ibn

1 *Mizān al-Itidāl*.

Muḥammad ibn Abī Yaḥyā which al-Wāqidī copied and ascribed to himself. It appears in the contents of Shaykh: Ibn Muḥammad ibn Abī Yaḥyā Mawlā of Aslam, Madanī. He narrated from Abū Ja‘far and Abū ‘Abd Allāh. He exclusively reported our aḥādīth. Due to this, the Ahl al-Sunnah categorise him as ḍā‘if. Ya‘qūb ibn Sufyān reports in his *Tārīkh* that among the reasons of him being labelled ḍā‘if is that he heard him condemning the former people [Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم]. Some reliable Sunnī have mentioned that all of al-Wāqidī’s books are in reality the books of Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad ibn Abī Yaḥyā which al-Wāqidī copied and attributed to himself. Some of our scholars mentioned that he has a book with chapters regarding ḥalāl and ḥarām from Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥusayn ibn Muḥammad al-Azdī.

What has appeared earlier that the Sunnī declare him ḍā‘if due to this; evidence of this is the statement of the author of *Mizān al-I’tidāl*, “He is a *kadhāb* (great liar); Rāfiḍī.”¹

By presenting such fabricators as proof in contentious discussions shows that the Imāmiyyah could not locate any authentic narration in this regard. How is it possible for them to locate it when it is non-existent? When it is understood that al-Wāqidī actually copied the books of Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad ibn Abī Yaḥyā and published them in his name, then undoubtedly these are actually Shī‘ī books.

Bishr ibn Ghiyāth al-Muraysī

- A deviant *mubtadi‘* (innovator). It is not proper to narrate from him.
- Abū Naḍr Hāshim ibn al-Qāsim said, “Bishr al-Muraysī’s father was a Jew butcher and tanner who lived in the market of Naṣr ibn Mālīk.”
- Al-Marmūzī said, “I heard Abū ‘Abd Allāh speaking of Bishr saying, ‘His father was a Jew.’”
- Bishr would appeal for help in the gathering of Abū Yūsuf. Abū Yūsuf told him, “You better desist or you will be crucified.”

¹ *Muntahā al-Maqāl* pg. 25.

- Qutaybah ibn Sa'īd said, "Bishr al-Muraysī is a kāfir."
- Al-Khaṭīb stated, "Many horrible statements have been reported from him. The scholars have made nasty comments about him, and majority of them have labelled him kāfir for his statements."
- Abū Zur'ah al-Rāzī said, "Bishr al-Muraysī is a *zindīq* (heretic)."¹

The fifth narration which is mentioned in *Imād al-Islām* is taken from *Ma'ārij al-Nubuwwah*. We are totally astonished that a mujtahid like Dildār 'Alī presented this narration as proof. Elementary students will know that *Ma'ārij al-Nubuwwah* has absolutely no value to the 'Ulamā'. It is a beautiful example of poetry. However, it has absolutely no worth when it comes to authenticity. The author is among those historians who brought all types of logs to keep his fire burning. He presents these narrations with beautiful words to amaze, please, and surprise his audience. However, no one ever considered them worth presenting as proof and no one used them as evidence in any discussion. So to use any narration therein as proof is very far-fetched from the status of the 'Ulamā'. Nonetheless, even if we hypothetically regard its author as reliable, then too using it as proof is astonishing because there are many indications pointing towards its unauthenticity.

Indications

- Despite the author taking the prerogative of quoting incidents, he did not label this narration as an incident. Instead, he labelled the narration before this one an incident which conflicts this one.
- The author placed this narration last and placed the narration that conflicts it first.
- He does not reference this narration whereas he referenced the conflicting narration to *Maqṣad Aqṣā*.
- He does not attach any heading or reference to it. He just says that "some people have said..." and quotes this narration. These words indicate to

¹ *Mīzān al-Itidāl*.

a *majrūh* (criticised) or *majhūl* narration. On the other hand, he put the conflicting narration under a heading and referenced it which indicates to its authenticity and credibility.

This proves that the author indicated in many ways to the unauthenticity and unreliability of this narration. So even if we accept the reliability of the author and his book, then too we do not have to provide any answer to such a narration. All we have to say is that it is in polarity with the status of the ‘Ulamā’.

Finally, we have disclosed the reality of all the narrations from the era of *al-Shāfi* until now which stretches over a period of 900 years. The following aptly fits these narrations:

Whenever he lifted his tail, he turned out to be female.

The core of all these narrations is Abū Sa‘īd al-Kalbī. And due to their discrepancies, they are totally unreliable. Notwithstanding that all these narrations only have one source, we are totally shocked that ‘Alam al-Hudā and Dildār ‘Alī, who are ‘muḥaqqiqīn’ and ‘masters’ in Shī‘ism had the audacity to claim:

قد روي من طريق مختلفة غير طريق أبي سعيد الذي ذكره صاحب الكتاب أنه لما نزل قوله تعالى وآت ذا القربى حقه دعا النبي فاطمة فأعطاهما فدك وإذا كان ذلك مرويا فلا معنى لدفعه بغير حجة

It has been reported from various chains besides the chain of Abū Sa‘īd which the author of the book has documented. When the Sublime’s words *And give the relative his right* were revealed, the Nabī ﷺ summoned Fāṭimah and gave her Fadak.

When this has been narrated, then there is no reason to reject it without any proof.

Is this not deplorable? It is astonishing that al-Sayyid al-Murtaḍā did not narrate this from any chain and only quoted the very same narration which the Shī‘ah have passed on from generation to generation – the very same narration Qāḍī

‘Abd al-Jabbār mentioned in *al-Mughnī* and attributed to the Shī‘ah. Yet, he thinks it is sufficient just to claim that this narration appears from many other chains.

Is it not surprising that the Shī‘ah could not furnish one authentic narration despite the thousands of scholars who passed in this time, the hundreds of thousands of books that were written concerning this discussion, the grand claims they made with much vigour and force, and the heart touching lectures delivered?! They have analysed the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah under microscope leaving no text, no footnote, no ḥadīth book, and no history book; yet they could not locate one ṣaḥīḥ ḥadīth in a Sunnī book. Had these great scholars and famous polemicists, whose fame has reached the skies and who boast over their victory over the Ahl al-Sunnah, only furnished one ṣaḥīḥ ḥadīth instead of displaying their prowess in oratory and literacy, it would have been more appropriate and suitable. Their failure to do so has showed the world that such a ṣaḥīḥ ḥadīth is non-existent.

The authors of *al-Shāfi*, *Kashf al-Ḥaqq*, *al-Ṭarā’if*, *Bihār al-Anwār*, *‘Imād al-Islām*, *Ta’n al-Rimāh*, and *Tashīd al-Maṭā’in* could only present the fabrication of Fuḍayl ibn Marzūq, ‘Aṭīyyah, and Abū Sa’īd al-Kalbī as evidence. We do not only challenge those who have passed on, we declare our challenge to all the Shī‘ah of Lucknow, Tehran, India, and Iran, and all the Shī‘ah of the entire world to establish their claim by presenting only one ṣaḥīḥ ḥadīth from any Sunnī book, the narrators of which are Ahl al-Sunnah, not Shī‘ah.

فَإِنْ لَمْ تَفْعَلُوا وَلَنْ تَفْعَلُوا فَانقُتُوا النَّارَ الَّتِي وُقُودُهَا النَّاسُ وَالْحِجَارَةُ أُعِدَّتْ لِلْكَافِرِينَ

But if you do not - and you will never be able to - then fear the Fire, whose fuel is men and stones, prepared for the disbelievers.

Now we have totally destroyed and refuted all those narrations which the Shī‘ah presented from our books. We will now display the inconsistencies and contradictions between the narrations of the Shī‘ah, confirming that their claim cannot even be proven from their own narrations.

The inconsistencies and contradictions of Shī'ī narrations regarding Rasūlullāh ﷺ gifting Fadak to Fāṭimah

Firstly, we will quote those Shī'ī narrations which discuss the gifting of Fadak. Thereafter, we will point out the contradictions and inconsistencies.

It appears in *Bihār al-Anwār*:

فيما احتج الرضاء في فضل العترة الطاهرة قال و الآية الخامسة قال الله عز و جل و آت ذا القربى حقه خصوصية خصهم العزيز الجبار بها و اصطفاهم على الأمة فلما نزلت هذه الآية على رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم قال ادعو لي فاطمة رضي الله عنها فدعيت له فقال يا فاطمة قالت لبيك يا رسول الله فقال فدك هي مما لم يوجف عليه بخيل و لا ركاب و هي لي خاصة دون المسلمين و قد جعلتها لك لما أمرني الله به فخذ بها و لو لدك

One of the proofs al-Riḍā' uses to prove the superiority of the pure family is that he says: The fifth verse. Allah ﷻ declares: *And give the relative his right.*

This is a speciality which the Mighty and Over-Powering has reserved for them and favoured them with over the ummah. When this verse was revealed, Rasūlullāh ﷺ said, "Call Fāṭimah for me."

Accordingly, she was called.

He said, "O Fāṭimah!"

"I am present in your service, O Messenger of Allah," she said.

He continued, "Fadak is that which was not conquered by the spurring on of horses or camels. It is specially for me, to the exclusion of the Muslims. I have given it to you after Allah commanded me to do so. So take it for yourself and your progeny."¹

It appears in the *Tafsīr al-Qummī* from Imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ:

1 *Bihār al-Anwār*, Kitāb al-Fitan, bāb nuzūl al-āyāt fī amr Fadak pg. 89. Extracted from 'Uyūn al-Akhbār.

روي عن أبي عبد الله أن رسول الله خرج في بعض الطريق فبينما رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يطعم و الناس معه إذ أتاه جبريل عليه السلام فقال يا محمد قم فاركب فقام النبي فركب جبريل معه فطويت له الأرض كطي الثوب حتى انتهى إلى فداك فلما سمع أهل فداك ... وقع الخيل فظنوا أن عدوهم قد جاء وهم تغلقوا أبواب المدينة و دفعوا المفاتيح إلى عجزوز لهم خارج من المدينة و لحقوا برؤس الجبال فأتى جبريل العجزوز حتى أخذ المفاتيح ثم فتح أبواب المدينة و دار النبي في بيوتها و قراتها فقال جبريل عليه السلام يا محمد هذا ما خصك الله به و أعطاكه دون الناس و هو قوله تعالى ما آفأ الله على رسوله من أهل القرى فله و للرسول و لذي القربى و ذلك قوله فما أوجفتم عليه من خيل و لا ركاب و لكن الله يسلمه رسله على من يشاء و لم يعرف المسلمون و لم يظؤوها و لكن الله آفأها على رسوله و طاف به جبريل عليه السلام في دورها و حيطانها و فلق الباب و دفع المفاتيح إليه فجعلها رسول الله في غلاف سيفه و هو معلق بالرحل ثم ركب و طويت به الأرض كطي الثوب فأتاهم رسول الله و هو على مجالسهم و لم يتفرقوا و لم يبرحوا فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قد انتهيت إلى فداك و إني قد آفأها الله علي فغمز المنافقون بعضهم بعضا فقال رسول الله هذه مفاتيح فداك ثم أخرج من غلاف سيفه ثم ركب رسول الله و ركب معه الناس فلما دخل المدينة دخل على فاطمة رضي الله عنها فقال يا بنته إن الله قد آفأها على أبيك بفداك و اختصه بها فهي لي خاصة دون المؤمنين أفعل بها ما شاء و إنه قد كان لأمك خديجة على أبيك مهر و إن أباك قد جعلها بذلك و انحلكتها لك و لولدك بعدك فدعا بأديم و دعا علي بن أبي طالب فقال اكتب لفاطمة فداك نحلة من رسول الله فشهد على ذلك علي بن أبي طالب و مولى لرسول الله و أم أيمن فقال رسول الله إن أم أيمن امرأة من أهل الجنة و جاء أهل فداك إلى النبي فقاطعهم على أربعة و عشرين ألف دينار في كل سنة

It is reported from Abū ‘Abd Allāh that Rasūlullāh ﷺ went on a Jihād campaign. While Rasūlullāh ﷺ was eating, and others were with him, Jibrīl عليه السلام came to him and said, “O Muḥammad. Stand up and mount.”

Accordingly Rasūlullāh ﷺ stoop and mounted, and Jibrīl عليه السلام mounted with him. The earth was folded up for him just as a cloth is folded until he reached Fadak. When the inhabitants of Fadak heard the sound of horses, they thought that an enemy of theirs is about to attack them, so they locked the gates of the city and handed the keys over to an old woman living on the outskirts of the city and they climbed the mountain. Jibrīl عليه السلام came to the old woman, took the keys from her, and opened the gates of the city. Rasūlullāh ﷺ toured the houses there and the villages. Jibrīl then said, “O Muḥammad! This is what Allah has exclusively given you, to the exclusion of all others. This is the meaning of Allah’s words:

مَا آفَأَ اللَّهُ عَلَى رَسُولِهِ مِنْ أَهْلِ الْقُرَىٰ فَلِلَّهِ وَاللَّسُّوْلِ وَلِلَّذِي الْقُرْبَىٰ

And what Allah restored to His Messenger from the people of the towns - it is for Allah and for the Messenger and for [his] near relatives.

And His statement:

فَمَا أَوْجَفْتُمْ عَلَيْهِ مِنْ خَيْلٍ وَلَا رِكَابٍ وَلَكِنَّ اللَّهَ يُسَلِّطُ رُسُلَهُ عَلَىٰ مَنْ يَشَاءُ

You did not spur for it [in an expedition] any horses or camels, but Allah gives His messengers power over whom He wills.

The Muslims were unaware and did not set foot on that ground. But Allah restored it to His Messenger. Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام then circuited the houses and farms and locked the gates. He then handed the keys over to Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ who put them in the sheathe of his sword attached to his luggage. Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ then mounted his conveyance and the earth was folded up for him like how a cloth is folded until he reached the Muslims. People were still sitting at their places; they had not yet moved or gone anywhere. Just then, Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ announced, “I went to Fadak and Allah ﷻ gave it to me as booty.”

The hypocrites began nudging one another. Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ then said, “These are the keys to Fadak.”

He took them out of his sheathe and displayed them. Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ mounted and the people mounted with him and departed. As soon as they reached Madīnah, Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ went to Fāṭimah and said, “O my daughter! Allah ﷻ gave your father Fadak exclusively as booty. It belongs exclusively to me, to the exclusion of other Muslims. I can do as I please with it. Your father still owes your mother, Khadījah, dowry. Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ has given this to her in lieu of that and gifted it to you and your progeny after your demise.”

He then called for leather and summoned ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib. He instructed, “Write: Fadak is a gift from Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ to Fāṭimah.”

‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib was witness to this, as well as Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ freed slave and Umm Ayman. Rasūlullāh ﷺ then affirmed, “Umm Ayman is a woman from Jannah.”

The inhabitants of Fadak came to the Nabī ﷺ. He came to a compromise with them upon 24000 gold coins every year.”¹

This narration explains how Fadak came into Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ possession.

فتزل و آت ذا القربى حقه قال و ما هو قال اعط فاطمة فدكا و هي من ميراثها من أمها خديجة فحمل إليها النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم ما أخذ منه و أخبرها بالآية فقالت لست أحدث فيها حدثا و أنت حي و أنت أولى بي من نفسي و مالي لك فقال أكره أن يجعلوها عليك سبة فيمنعوك إياها من بعدي فقالت انفذ فيها أمرك فجمع الناس إلى منزلها و أخبرهم أن هذا المال لفاطمة كذلك و ياخذ منه قوتها فلما دنا و فاته دفعه إليها

The verse *And give the relative his right* was revealed. He enquired, “What is it?”

He replied, “Give Fadak to Fāṭimah. It is her inheritance from her mother Khadījah.”

Thus, Rasūlullāh ﷺ carried to her all the wealth he took from it and informed her of the verse. She said, “I will not innovate something new in it while you are alive. You have more right over me than my own self and my wealth belongs to you.”

Rasūlullāh ﷺ said, “I dislike that they will discredit you for it and prevent you from it after my demise.”

She said, “Implement your instruction therein.”

Subsequently, he gathered the people at her house and informed that this wealth belongs to Fāṭimah and he will take her substance from here. When his demise drew close, he handed it over to her.”²

1 *Bihār al-Anwār* pg. 90.

2 *Ibid* from *Manāqib Ibn Shahrāshūb; Tarjamah Urdū Ḥayāt al-Qulūb* pg. 666, 668.

لما نزل الله تعالى و آت ذا القربى حقه و المسكين قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم يا جبريل عليه السلام قد عرفت المسكين فمن ذوي القربى قال هم أقاربك فدعا حسنا و حسينا و فاطمة عليهم السلام فقال صلى الله عليه و سلم إن ربي أمرني أن أعطيكم ما أفاء الله علي قال أعطيتكم فذك

After Allah ﷻ revealed, “And give the relative his right and the needy,” Rasūlullāh ﷺ enquired, “O Jibrīl عليه السلام, I understand the needy, but who does the relative refer to?”

He answered, “They are your relatives.”

Consequently, Rasūlullāh ﷺ summoned Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, and Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها. He then said, “My Sustainer has commanded me to give you what Allah ﷻ has restored to me.” He continued, “Accordingly, I give you Fadak.”¹

‘Abd Allāh ibn Sinān has narrated an extremely lengthy narration from Imām Ja’far al-ṣādiq which will we reproduce verbatim in the discussion of the claim over Fadak which mentions the testimony of Sayyidah Umm Ayman رضي الله عنها. It says that when Jibrīl عليه السلام took Rasūlullāh ﷺ to show him the boundaries of Fadak and then returned, Sayyidah Fāṭimah asked him where he went. Rasūlullāh ﷺ answered, “Jibrīl took me to show me the boundaries of Fadak.” Upon this Sayyidah Fāṭimah submitted:

يا أبي إني أخاف العيلة و الحاجة من بعدك فصدق بها علي فقال هي صدقة عليك فقرضتها

O my father, I fear need and want after your demise, so donate it to me. Rasūlullāh ﷺ said, “It is charity for you.” She then took possession of it.

Rasūlullāh ﷺ then told Sayyidunā ‘Alī and Sayyidah Umm Ayman رضي الله عنها to be witness.²

1 Bihār al-Anwār from Tafṣīr ‘Ayyāshī pg. 19.

2 Ibid, Kitāb al-Ikhtisāṣ pg. 101.

The narrations we have quoted above are not contradictory in minor and unnecessary aspects but are conflicting each other in significant matters and affect the incident itself. After studying them, it appears as if the fabricators concocted aḥādīth to suit every occasion and to answer every objection, but their abundant fabrications has led to inconsistencies which cannot be resolved.

- a. The first narration which we referenced to *‘Uyūn al-Akhbār* and *Biḥār al-Anwār* says that after the revelation of the verse, Rasūlullāh ﷺ instructed that Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا be called. The second narration referenced to *Tafsīr al-Qummī* mentions that when Rasūlullāh ﷺ brought the keys of Fadak to Madīnah, he went himself to Fāṭimah and told her that he gives her and her children Fadak in lieu of the dowry he owes her mother.
- b. It appears in the first narration that Rasūlullāh ﷺ said that Allah commanded him to give Fadak to her. Whereas in the second narration he says that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى عَنِ الْجِنَّةِ وَالنَّاسِ gave him Fadak exclusively and he may give it to whomsoever he wishes. And he then chose to give it to her in lieu of her mother’s dowry.
- c. The third narration referenced to *Manāqib Ibn Shahaṛāshūb* from *Biḥār al-Anwār* mentions that upon the revelation of the verse, Rasūlullāh ﷺ asked Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ who the relative refers to. Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ told him to give Fadak to Fāṭimah since it was the inheritance of her mother Khadījah and her sister Hind bint Abī Hālah. This narration states that Fadak was given to Fāṭimah as her mother’s inheritance. The second narration mentions that it was given as her mother’s dowry. Besides this, consider the fact that the income of Fadak was 24000 gold coins annually, but the amount of Sayyidah Khadījah’s رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا dowry has not been clarified. Maybe 24000 gold coins annually was stipulated as her dowry.
- d. The third narration mentions that when Rasūlullāh ﷺ intended to give it to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, she submitted, “I do not wish to innovate anything new in it. You are free to do with my life and wealth

as you please.” Rasūlullāh ﷺ said, “Probably people will snatch it away from you after my demise.” So Fāṭimah agreed that Rasūlullāh ﷺ should do as he pleases. Rasūlullāh ﷺ called all the people to his house and told them that this is Fāṭimah’s wealth. This shows that Rasūlullāh ﷺ gathered many people and announced that Fadak was hers in their presence. It is astonishing that the Shī’ah write in those narrations which mention that when witnesses were demanded from Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, she presented Sayyidunā ‘Alī, Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, and Umm Ayman رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا and did not present any other man. If this incident did take place in front of a large gathering, then many witnesses would have been alive at the time. So when she was asked for more witnesses, she should have brought few more. Either she would have secured Fadak for herself thereby, or had sufficient evidence against Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. It is reported by them that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ demanded that the quota be fulfilled. So why did she not fulfil it?

- e. The third narration proves another significant point. After gifting Fadak, it remained in the possession of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. He was in full control of its administration and spent the income on whomever he wished, giving Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا only what was sufficient for her. This narration falsifies the narration which mentions that after gifting Fadak, Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا had possession over it and appointed her agent, who was evicted by Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ etc.
- f. This narration mentions that Rasūlullāh ﷺ called the people to her house and announced to them that Fadak is her wealth, while another narration mentions that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ wrote the gift document in her name; and only he and Umm Ayman رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا witnessed it. It is amazing that Rasūlullāh ﷺ apprehending that in the future, people should not find any reason to deprive her, he called all the people and announced in their presence that the wealth belongs to her, but at the same time orders ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to write the document on which only his name and Umm Ayman’s name appear. Why did he not write the names of the others

who were called whereas making them witness was more sensible and necessary to remove any future objections and so that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه would be forced to accept their testimony?

- g. Although, this third narration mentions that Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم returned Fadak to Fāṭimah prior to his demise, but there is no detail of the method of returning it and how did she take possession of the same. It devolves upon the Shī'ah to prove how, when, and in whose presence did Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها take possession of Fadak.
- h. The fourth narration contradicts all the others. Other narrations mention that when Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم asked Jibrīl عليه السلام as to who the relative refers to, he specifically mentioned Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها from Allah's side. This ḥadīth however states that he did not take the name of anyone specifically but only restricted it to the relatives of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, not the relatives of the rest of the ummah. As to who those relatives are and to whom should he give their right, this was left to the choice of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم. Rasūlullāh's justice demanded that he give only Fāṭimah, Ḥasan, and Ḥusayn رضي الله عنهم, to the exclusion of all others.

The evil consequences of this inconsistency

Other narrations which mention the specification can be answered by affirming that it was the command of Allah which Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم simply carried out. However, this ḥadīth shows that the specification was applied by Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, so no answer can be given to it.

It is unbelievable from the status, behaviour, and conduct of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم not to show fairness; that he only favours his one daughter and her sons and deprives everyone else, May Allah forbid. We do not know how the Shī'ah will remove this imperfection their belief and ideology has tarnished the noble image of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم with.

If anyone objects: Was this the fairness, justice, and unbiased nature of

Rasūlullāh ﷺ that he discards everyone else and only favours 3 of his relatives whom he selected with all of that he received at the time. What answer will the Shī'ah present? Our hairs stand on end thinking of such a thing. We regard it as disrespectful and blasphemous to the personality of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and a type of accusation against him. May Allah forbid!

- i. Besides this, many narrations mention that when Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه demanded witnesses, Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها presented Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Ḥusayn رضي الله عنهما who gave testimony. The above narration debunks this one. The fact is that when taking into consideration the fourth narration, the claimant can not only be Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها. Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Ḥusayn رضي الله عنهما are also claimants. So how can they be claimants and witnesses at the same time?
- j. The fifth narration totally razes their building to the ground. It mentions that when Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها complained of poverty and want after Rasūlullāh's demise, he told her, "It is charity for you." He then told Sayyidunā 'Alī and Umm Ayman رضي الله عنهما to bear witness to it. This clearly shows that she begged for Fadak complaining of poverty and as a result, Rasūlullāh ﷺ favoured her with it. This narration is in conflict to the narrations mentioning the revelation of the verse and Jibrīl's explanation that relative refers to Fāṭimah etc., as well as the narrations which say that it was given to her from her mother's inheritance or dowry.

We cannot fathom how the Shī'ah wish to prove the gifting of Fadak with such inconsistent narrations. What face can they show in front of such glaring discrepancies and irregularities?

- k. Besides the above contradictory reports, there is yet another narration in *al-Shāfi* from Ja'far al-Ṣādiq رحمته الله which says that *dhawī al-qurbā* (relatives) refers to Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه and his right is the waṣiyyah made in his name, coupled with the grand name, inheritance of knowledge, and the

effects of the knowledge of Nubuwwah he was given. This ḥadīth appears in chapter 47, of Kitāb al-Ḥujjah in *al-Shāfi*. This is a grand ḥadīth which affirms that Rasūlullāh ﷺ would always mention the virtues of the Ahl al-Bayt and express the verses revealed in their favour.

Rasūlullāh ﷺ recited 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.¹

And then said that Allah ﷻ declares:

وَاعْلَمُوا أَنَّمَا غَنِمْتُمْ مِنْ شَيْءٍ فَإِنَّ لِلَّهِ خُمُسَهُ وَلِلرَّسُولِ وَلِذِي الْقُرْبَىٰ

And know that anything you obtain of war booty - then indeed, for Allah is one fifth of it and for the Messenger and for [his] near relatives.²

Rasūlullāh ﷺ then declared, as appears in *al-Kāfi*:

ثم قال جل ذكره وآت ذا القربى حقه فكان عليا و كان حقه الوصية التي جعلت له و الاسم الأكبر و ميراث العلم و آثار علم النبوة

The Persian translation of the above appears in the following words in *al-Ṣāfi*, *Sharḥ Uṣūl al-Kāfi*:

بعد ازان گفت جل ذكره سوره بنی اسرائیل بده صاحب نزدیک ترا حق او پس حاضر شد علی رضی الله عنه برائے اخذ حق خود و بود حق او وصیتی از رسول صلی الله علیه و سلم کو گردانیده شد برائے او بمعنی آنکه این حق باور سانیده شد و اسم اکبر و میراث علم و آثار علم نبوت

1 Sūrah al-Aḥzāb: 33.

2 Sūrah al-Anfāl: 41.

He Whose remembrance is Magnificent then declared in Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl: *And give the relative his right*. It referred to 'Alī and his right was the waṣīyyah made in his name, coupled with the grand name, inheritance of knowledge, and the effects of the knowledge of Nubuwwah.

If this ḥadīth is ṣaḥīḥ, then it is clear that the verse was revealed commanding the fulfilment of Sayyidunā 'Alī's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ right; thus relative refers to him. In this case, those narrations which mention the verse's revelation concerning the gifting of Fadak are falsified.

Probably the Shī'ah will assert that both the narrations are ṣaḥīḥ. Dhawī al-qurbā and ḥaqq refers to Sayyidah Fāṭimah and her right of Fadak as well as Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and his right of waṣīyyah, etc. However, this assertion is incorrect. It is evident from other narrations that Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was unaware of the reality of dhawī al-qurbā and the right so he asked Sayyidunā Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام who informed him, by Allah's command, that it refers to Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا and her right of Fadak. So both these narrations cannot be reconciled.

This ḥadīth has been quoted under the verse of Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl in *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi*. Most probably the author realised that the two narrations are contradictory, so he said the following to remove the possible objection:

أقول لا تنافي بين هذا الحديث و بين الأحاديث السابقة و لا بينهما و بين تفسير العامة كما يظهر للمتدبر العارف بمخاطبات القرآن و معنى الحقوق و من الذي له الحق و من الذي لا حق له و الحمد لله

I say: There is no contradiction between this ḥadīth and the previous aḥādīth, nor any contradiction between them and the tafsīr of the Ahl al-Sunnah as is apparent for one with deep meditation who is cognisant of the forms of address of the Qur'ān, the meaning of rights, who is deserving of them, and who is not. And all praise belongs to Allah.

However, he did not explain the reason. He just praised Allah and kept silent and left the reconciliation upon the contemplator and expert in the Qur'ān. The only

thing apparent to the contemplator and expert of the meanings of the Qur'ān is that all these narrations are fabricated and in polarity to the context of the Qur'ān.

We have now shown and proven the inconsistencies and irregularities between the Shī'ī narrations which makes it impossible to believe them. We will now demonstrate to you that one who is cognisant of the Qur'ān's mode of address and realises that this verse is Makkī, not Madanī, will understand all the explanations of the Imāmiyyah regarding this verse as a form of *tahrīf ma'nawī* (adulteration of meaning). Considering the place of revelation of the verse and its mode of address does not establish the gifting of Fadak.

We have presented all the narrations of the Shī'ah dealing with the gifting of Fadak and confirmed that due to their inconsistencies, they do not meet the requirements of the principles of evidence. Now we will prove that the verse does not support the Shī'ah's claim for the following reasons.

A Detailed Examination of the verse *And give the relative his right*

This verse appears twice in the Qur'ān, in Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl and in Sūrah al-Rūm. Both these Sūrahs are Makkī. Where was Fadak at the time? It only fell into the hands of Rasūlullāh ﷺ in the seventh year after hijrah.

Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīz writes:

جمع كثير از علماء ايشان سعی بلیغ نموده اند و در کتب احادیث که شهرت ندارند و نسخ این کتب متعذّر بدست نهد
اید اکاذیب موضوعه که مؤید مذہب شیعه مبطل مذہب سنیاں باشد الحاق نہایند چنانچه قصه فدک در بعض تقاسیر
داخل نموده اند و سیاق حدیث چنین روایت کرده اند کہ و لها نزلت و ایت ذا القربی حقہ دعی رسول اللہ فاطمہ و إعطابا
فدک امام بحکم اینکہ دروغ گورا حافظہ نہی باشد بیاد شاں نہاند کہ این ایتہ مکی است و در مکہ فدک کجا بود

Majority of the scholars have exhausted their efforts to include fabricated and concocted narrations in non-famous books and non-existent books which falsify the Sunnī religion and establish the Shī'ī creed. For example,

the incident of Fadak which has been included in some tafsīr books and reported as follows:

When the verse *And give the relative his right* was revealed, Rasūlullāh ﷺ called Fāṭimah and gave her Fadak.

Since a liar does not realise, the Shī'ah did not realise that this verse was revealed in Makkah and Fadak was not in Makkah. They have written that as soon as this verse was revealed, Fadak was gifted.¹

In the footnote, the following has been quoted from *Tafsīr Majma' al-Bayān*:

السورة الروم مكية إلا قوله تعالى فسيحن الله حين تمسون و حين تصبحون

Sūrah al-Rūm is Makkī except the Sublime's statement, Glory be to Allah in the evening and in the mornings.

Muḥammad Qillī answers this in *Taqlīb al-Makā'id* by saying:

There are many opinions of the Ahl al-Sunnah mentioned in Majma' al-Bayān just for information sake. Moreover, labelling a Sūrah Makkī is taking into consideration the majority of its verses and examples of this are plenty in the Qur'ān. Furthermore, it is possible that the verse was revealed twice, first in Makkah then in Madīnah just as Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī wrote about Sūrah Fāṭīḥah. Makkī refers to those verses that were revealed in Makkah, whether pre hijrah or post hijrah. It could have been revealed during the Conquest of Makkah or Ḥajjat al-Wadā'.

He then says:

و اگر ازین بمه مراتب تنزل کنیم پس ممکن است که جواب داده شود که اگر چه فدک در مکه نبود لیکن چون حق تعالی شانه بعلم ازلی می دانست که رسول خدا را بعد از هجرت به مدینه و فتح جنگ خیبر از دست حق پرست امیر المؤمنین علی بن ابی طالب فدک بدست خواهد آمد حکم این از پیشتر نازل کرده و در نزول حکم امرے که در استقبال

1 *Tuḥfah Ithnā 'Ashariyyah*, chapter two, kayd 32.

خوابد امد از وقوع ان مها نعتی نیست و امثال ان بسیار ست و فخر الدین رازی در تفسیر کبیر در تفسیر قوله تعالی و ما جعلنا الرؤیا التي اریناک إلا فتنة للناس گفته القول الثالث فی الرؤیا قال سعید بن المسیب رای رسول الله بنی امیة ینزلون علی منبره تعداد القردة فسائه ذلك و بدأ قول ابن عباس رضی الله عنہما فی روایة و الاشکال فیہ ان بذه الایة مکیة و ما کان لرسول الله بمکة منبر قال و یمکن ان یجاب عنه بانہ لا یبعد ان یرى بمکة ان له بالمدينة منبر يتداولونه بنی امیة

If we ignore the above, then too it is possible for the Shīah to answer by saying that although Fadak was not in Makkah, but Allah ﷻ knew in His infinite knowledge that Rasūlullāh ﷺ after making hijrah to Madīnah will conquer Khaybar with the help of Sayyidunā ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and take over Fadak. Allah revealed the command before the actual occurrence of the event. And it is not impermissible to issue a command regarding the occurrence of something in the future. There are many examples of this. Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī writes in *al-Tafsīr al-Kabīr* in the commentary of the verse:

وَمَا جَعَلْنَا الرُّؤْيَا الَّتِي أَرَيْنَاكَ إِلَّا فِتْنَةً لِلنَّاسِ

And We did not make the sight which We showed you except as a trial for the people.¹

Sa‘īd ibn al-Musayyab relates that Rasūlullāh ﷺ saw the Banū Umayyah in his dream as monkeys jumping on his pulpit. And this upset him.

This is Ibn ‘Abbās’s رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ opinion. However, what is problematic is that this verse is Makkī and Rasūlullāh ﷺ had no pulpit in Makkah. It is possible to answer by saying that it is not unlikely for him to be foretold that a pulpit will be constructed in Madīnah.

Answer:

To claim that many opinions of the Ahl al-Sunnah have been quoted in *Majma‘ al-Bayān* is not a satisfying answer. He should have at least established that this Sūrah is Madanī, not Makkī, through Shīī narrations.

1 Sūrah Banī Isrā‘īl: 60.

Moreover, it is not sufficient just to claim that a Sūrah is labelled Makkī considering the majority of its verses without ascertaining which verses are Makkī and which are Madanī.

To claim that it is possible for this verse to be revealed twice, once in Makkah and then in Madīnah is shocking since the verse was revealed twice, once in Sūrah al-Rūm and once in Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl but both are Makkī. It would be better if he said that maybe the verse was revealed thrice.

To claim that Makkī refers to those verses revealed in Makkah, whether pre hijrah or post hijrah during the conquest of Makkah or Ḥajjat al-Wadā' is meaningless. Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا was not given Fadak in Makkah, but rather in Madīnah immediately after it was conquered.

The author found the last answer better than all the above so he said that although Fadak was not conquered then, yet Allah knew the future and issued a command accordingly. Meaning that when Fadak will be conquered then give it to Fāṭimah. However, this answer is not satisfying because the narrations clearly mention that upon the revelation of this verse, Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ immediately summoned Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا and gave her Fadak. In fact, Shī'ī narrations openly declare that this verse was revealed after the conquest of Khaybar and after Fadak came into Rasūlullāh's صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ possession, not before that. Accordingly, it appears in *Tafsīr al-Ṣāfi* in the commentary of this verse:

و في الكافي عن الكاظم في حديث له مع المهدي أن الله تعالى لما فتح علي نبيه فدك و ما والاها لم يرجف عليه بخيل و ركاب فأنزل الله علي نبيه و آت ذا القربى حقه و لم يدر رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم من هم فراجع في ذلك جبريل عليه السلام و راجع جبريل ربه فأوحى الله إليه أن ادفع فدك إلى فاطمة رضي الله عنها

It appears in *al-Kāfi* from al-Kāzīm, regarding his dialogue with al-Mahdī, that when Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى opened Fadak for his Messenger and its surroundings, horses and camels were not spurred onto the land. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى thus revealed upon His Messenger, *And give the relative his right.*

However, Rasūlullāh ﷺ was unaware as to who they were. So he referred the matter to Jibrīl عليه السلام who in turn raised the matter with His Rabb. Allah سبحانه وتعالى then inspired him to hand over Fadak to Fāṭimah.

This ḥadīth and other aḥādīth documented in ‘*Uyūn al-Akhbār*, etc., establish the fact that this verse was revealed after Fadak fell into Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ possession. So to claim that this verse was revealed in Makkah as a prophecy to Fadak being conquered falsifies the A’immah’s aḥādīth.

In short, the pieces of the puzzle are not fitting and from no angle is this fabricated narration making any sense. Shāh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz’s statement aptly applies:

A liar does not realise what he is saying.

Context of the verse

Although the address in the verse *And give the relative his right* is directed towards Rasūlullāh ﷺ. However, the context of the Qur’ān indicates that the address is general. It is for the entire ummah, and not restricted to Rasūlullāh ﷺ. The verse that appears in Sūrah Banī Isrā’īl discusses *tawḥīd*, *iḥsān* (kindness), maintaining family ties, and good character. The verses preceding it and after it indicate towards generalisation, not specification.

The verses read:

وَقَضَىٰ رَبُّكَ أَلَّا تَعْبُدُوا إِلَّا إِيَّاهُ وَبِالْوَالِدَيْنِ إِحْسَانًا إِمَّا يَبُلُغَنَّ عِنْدَكَ الْكِبَرَ أَحَدُهُمَا أَوْ كِلَاهُمَا فَلَا تَقُلْ لَهُمَا آفٌ وَلَا تُنْهَرُهُمَا وَقُلْ لَهُمَا قَوْلًا كَرِيمًا وَأَخْفِضْ لَهُمَا جَنَاحَ الذَّلْمِ مِنَ الرَّحْمَةِ وَقُلْ رَبِّ ارْحَمْهُمَا كَمَا رَبَّيْتَنِي صَغِيرًا رَبُّكُمْ أَعْلَمُ بِمَا فِي نُفُوسِكُمْ إِنْ تَكُونُوا صَالِحِينَ فَإِنَّهُ كَانَ لِلأَوَّابِينَ غَفُورًا وَأَتِ ذَا الْقُرْبَىٰ حَقَّهُ وَالْمَسْكِينِ وَابْنَ السَّبِيلِ وَلَا تَبْذُرْ تَبْدِيرًا إِنَّ الْمُبْدِرِينَ كَانُوا إِخْوَانَ الشَّيَاطِينِ وَكَانَ الشَّيْطَانُ لِرَبِّهِ كَفُورًا وَإِمَّا تُعْرِضَنَّ عَنْهُمُ ابْتِغَاءَ رَحْمَةٍ مِّنْ رَبِّكَ تَرْجُوهَا فَقُلْ لَهُمْ قَوْلًا مَّيْسُورًا وَلَا تَجْعَلْ يَدَكَ مَغْلُولَةً إِلَىٰ عُنُقِكَ وَلَا تَبْسُطْهَا كُلَّ الْبَسْطِ فَتَقْعُدَ مَلُومًا مَّحْسُورًا إِنْ رَبُّكَ يَبْسُطُ الرِّزْقَ لِمَنْ يَشَاءُ وَيَقْدِرُ إِنَّهُ كَانَ بِعِبَادِهِ بَصِيرًا

And your Lord has decreed that you not worship except Him, and to parents, good treatment. Whether one or both of them reach old age [while] with you, say not to them [so much as], “uff,” and do not repel them but speak to them a noble word. And lower to them the wing of humility out of mercy and say, “My Lord, have mercy upon them as they brought me up [when I was] small.” Your Lord is most knowing of what is within yourselves. If you should be righteous [in intention] - then indeed He is ever, to the often returning [to Him], Forgiving. And give the relative his right, and [also] the poor and the traveller, and do not spend wastefully. Indeed, the wasteful are brothers of the devils, and ever has Shayṭān been to his Lord ungrateful. And if you [must] turn away from the needy awaiting mercy from your Lord which you expect, then speak to them a gentle word. And do not make your hand [as] chained to your neck or extend it completely and [thereby] become blamed and insolvent. Indeed, your Lord extends provision for whom He wills and restricts [it]. Indeed He is ever, concerning His servants, Acquainted and Seeing.

Prior to these verses were verses which prohibited shirk and sins. Allah ﷻ declares:

لَا تَجْعَلْ مَعَ اللَّهِ إِلَهًا آخَرَ فَتَقْعُدَ مَذْمُومًا مَّخْذُومًا

Do not make [as equal] with Allah another deity and [thereby] become censured and forsaken.

Allah first announced a severe warning against shirk and disobedience followed by the command of tawḥīd and worship. Thereafter, *iḥsān* (kindness), maintaining family ties, and good character were commanded. Hence, these verse deal with tawḥīd, worship, maintaining family ties, imbibing good character, kindness, pleasant approaches, and fulfilment of rights. These have been listed for the guidance and regulation of the ummah. It is a set of noble morals and an encouragement to observe them. There is no evidence to prove that all the verses are general and are addressed to the entire ummah, but one small portion is solely and exclusively for Rasūlullāh ﷺ. There is no sign for this exclusiveness.

Al-Ṭabarsī writes under these verses in *Majma' al-Bayān*:

كما تقدم النهي عن الشرك و المعاصي عقبه سبحانه بالأمر بالتوحيد و الطاعات فقال سبحانه و قضى
ربك ألا تعبدوا إلا إياه

Allah follows the prohibition of shirk and sins with the command to observe tawhīd and acts of worship. Accordingly, He ﷻ announces: *And your Lord has decreed that you not worship except Him.*

He commentates on verse 23 to verse 27 by saying:

ثم حث سبحانه نبيه على إيتاء الحقوق لمن يستحقها و على كيفية الإنفاق فقال و أت ذا القربى حقه معناه
و أتو القربات حقوقهم التي أوجبها الله لهم في أموالكم

Allah ﷻ then encourages His Messenger to fulfil the rights of the deserving and the manner of spending. He declares: *And give the relative his right.* The meaning is *and give (plural) relatives their rights which Allah ﷻ has stipulated for them in your wealth.*

After studying the context of this verse, it becomes evident that there is no specialisation for Rasūlullāh ﷺ in any specific matter. If the portion *And give the relative his right* is specified for Rasūlullāh ﷺ, the entire paragraph will remain meaningless. The Shī'ah have only found one reason to regard the verse as specific, i.e. the singular form of address was used. However, leave alone the masters of *Ma'ānī* and *Bayān*, an ordinary person who just reads over a translation of the Qur'ān will understand that the methodology of the Qur'ān is such. Majority of places, the address is directed at Rasūlullāh ﷺ but the entire ummah is intended. There is no need to go very far and search other places of the Qur'ān to verify this. Just have a look at the rukū' in which this verse appears.

Allah ﷻ states:

لَا تَجْعَلْ مَعَ اللَّهِ إِلَهًا آخَرَ فَتَقْعَدَ مَذْمُومًا مَّخْذُومًا

Do not make [as equal] with Allah another deity and [thereby] become censured and forsaken.

Will any Muslim think for a moment that this address is specific to Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ? The Shīṭī Mufasssīrīn themselves have understood the address to be general. Accordingly, al-Ṭabarsī says:

إن الخطاب للنبي و المراد أمته

The address is directed at the Nabī صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ but his ummah is intended.

Another verse that appears in this rukū‘ reads:

إِمَّا يَبْلُغَنَّ عِنْدَكَ الْكِبَرَ أَحَدُهُمَا أَوْ كِلَاهُمَا فَلَا تَقُلْ لَهُمَا أُفٍّ وَلَا تَنْهَرْهُمَا وَقُلْ لَهُمَا قَوْلًا كَرِيمًا

Whether one or both of them reach old age [while] with you, say not to them [so much as], “uff;” and do not repel them but speak to them a noble word.¹

Will any ignorant person regard this address specific to Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ? Rasūlullāh’s صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ lofty character is far beyond him needing to be reproached for bad behaviour. Moreover, his parents passed away when he was young and Allah’s speech was revealed 40 years later. It is manifest that this address is to the ummah.

Besides the above, the other commands are also general:

وَاخْفِضْ لَهُمَا جَنَاحَ الذَّلِّ مِنَ الرَّحْمَةِ وَقُلْ رَبِّ ارْحَمْهُمَا كَمَا رَبَّيْتَانِي صَغِيرًا

And lower to them the wing of humility out of mercy and say, “My Lord, have mercy upon them as they brought me up [when I was] small.”²

1 Sūrah Banī Isrā’īl: 23.

2 Sūrah Banī Isrā’īl: 24.

وَلَا تُبَدِّرْ بِنَدِيرٍۙ

And do not spend wastefully.¹

وَلَا تَجْعَلْ يَدَكَ مَغْلُولَةً إِلَىٰ عُنُقِكَ وَلَا تَبْسُطْهَا كُلَّ الْبَسْطِ

And do not make your hand [as] chained to your neck or extend it completely.²

No command in these verses is specific to Rasūlullāh ﷺ despite the address being used in the singular form for Rasūlullāh ﷺ. The Shī'ah cannot deny this glaring fact.

To specify a portion of a verse from this chain of verses for Rasūlullāh ﷺ without any reason of preference or specification is ludicrous. Especially when the first verse of this chain which deals with kindness of parents clearly shows that this is a string of commands which focus on morals, kindness, maintaining family ties, fulfilling rights, etc. Allah ﷻ begins by declaring that that no one should be worshipped besides Him, then commands kindness to parents, followed by enjoining the fulfilment of the rights of relatives, the needy, and travellers. Allah ﷻ then instructs moderation; do not be extravagant nor miserly when spending in charity. Allah ﷻ also advises that if one does not have the capability to fulfil everyone's rights, then at least display politeness and softness.

فَقُلْ لَهُمْ قَوْلًا مَّيْسُورًا

Then speak to them a gentle word.³

1 Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl: 26.

2 Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl: 29.

3 Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl: 28.

If giving the relative his right refers to gifting Fadak to Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, then what is the meaning of?

وَلَا تُبْذِرْ تَبْذِيرًا

And do not spend wastefully.¹

This prohibition is then followed by stern words:

إِنَّ الْمُبْذِرِينَ كَانُوا إِخْوَانَ الشَّيَاطِينِ وَكَانَ الشَّيْطَانُ لِرَبِّهِ كَفُورًا

Indeed, the wasteful are brothers of the devils, and ever has Shayṭān been to his Lord ungrateful.²

Furthermore, if it really refers to the gifting of Fadak, then what does the following verse mean:

وَأِمَّا تَعْرِضْنَ عَنْهُمْ فَحَسِّنْ لَهُمْ قَوْلًا مِّسُورًا

And if you [must] turn away from the needy awaiting mercy from your Lord which you expect, then speak to them a gentle word.³

It will remain insignificant then, may Allah forbid!

The Shīṭī Mufasssīrīn have stated that which supports our view. Al-Ṭabarsī writes:

وإما تعرضن عنهم أي وأن تعرض عن هؤلاء الذين أمرتكم بأداء حقوقهم عن مسألتهم إياك لأنك لا تجد ذلك حياء منهم ابتغاء رحمة من ربك ترجوها أي لتبتغي الفضل من الله والسعة التي يمكنك معها البذل بأجل تلك السعة وذلك الفضل فقل لهم قولا ميسورا أي عدهم عدة حسنة وقل لهم قولا سهلا لبنا يتيسر عليك وروي أن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم كان لما نزلت هذه الآية إذا سئل ولم يكن عنده ما يعطي قال يرزقنا الله وإياكم من فضله

1 Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl: 26.

2 Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl: 27.

3 Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl: 28.

And if you [must] turn away from the needy i.e. if you turn away from these people [out of embarrassment] whose rights you have been commanded to fulfil after they ask you because you cannot find anything to give them; awaiting mercy from your Lord which you expect i.e. in anticipation of grace from Allah and wealth which will allow you to spend; then speak to them a gentle word i.e. make a good promise to them and speak to them polite and gentle words which you are able to.

It has been reported that after this verse was revealed, whenever Rasūlullāh ﷺ was asked and did not have anything to give, he would say, “May Allah provide for us and you from His grace.”

A thorough examination of the verses of Sūrah Banī Isrā’īl has been made.

Now let us ponder over the verses of Sūrah al-Rūm and the context there. The verses before and after it read:

وَإِذَا أَدْقْنَا النَّاسَ رَحْمَةً فَرَحُوا بِهَا وَإِن تَصِبْهُمْ سَيِّئَةً بِمَا قَدَّمْتَ أَيْدِيهِمْ إِذَا هُمْ يَفْتَنُونَ أَوْلَمْ يَرَوْا أَنَّ اللَّهَ يَبْسُطُ الرِّزْقَ لِمَن يَشَاءُ وَيَقْدِرُ إِنَّ فِي ذَلِكَ لَآيَاتٍ لِّقَوْمٍ يُؤْمِنُونَ فَاتُ ذَا الْقُرْبَىٰ حَقَّهُ وَالْمَسْكِينِ وَابْنِ السَّبِيلِ ذَلِكَ خَيْرٌ لِلَّذِينَ يُرِيدُونَ وَجْهَ اللَّهِ وَأَوْلَتْكَ هُمُ الْمُفْلِحُونَ

And when We let the people taste mercy, they rejoice therein, but if evil afflicts them for what their hands have put forth, immediately they despair. Do they not see that Allah extends provision for whom He wills and restricts [it]? Indeed, in that are signs for a people who believe. So give the relative his right, as well as the needy and the traveller. That is best for those who desire the countenance of Allah, and it is they who will be the successful.¹

Here also, specification is refuted. Allah mentions that He extends provision for whom He wills and restricts it for whom He wills. This is general. Immediately thereafter, Allah sounds the command: *So give the relative his right, as well as the needy and the traveller.*

1 Sūrah al-Rūm: 36 - 38.

It is glaring from the context, that the verse is general. In fact, the last portion of this verse certifies this:

ذَلِكَ خَيْرٌ لِلَّذِينَ يُرِيدُونَ وَجْهَ اللَّهِ وَأُولَئِكَ هُمُ الْمُفْلِحُونَ

That is best for those who desire the countenance of Allah, and it is they who will be the successful.¹

This sentence will only fit correctly when the command is general and the address is directed at all Muslims. Otherwise, the Qur’ān – the epitome of eloquence and articulacy – will be regarded as meaningless. No one can ever imagine that Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ would hesitate in fulfilling the rights of the deserving and is in need of encouragement to practice. What is the object of the last portion then, *That is best for those who desire the countenance of Allah, and it is they who will be the successful?*

The meaning will only fit when the address is for the Muslims in general. The individuals of this ummah need encouragement and inspiration to fulfil the rights of others. They are advised in this beautiful way so that they do not give preference to self-motives and specific love.

In conclusion, the person who studies the Qur’ān with a little contemplation and observes the context of this verse will not doubt that dhawī al-qurbā refers to general relatives.

كما قيل إنه خطاب له ولغيره والمراد بالقربى قرابة الرجل وهو أمر بصلة الرحم بالمال

As said: it is an address to him and others. The meaning of al-qurbā is a person’s relatives. This verse commands maintaining family ties with wealth.

1 Sūrah al-Rūm: 38.

If we accept that the verse is as the Shī'ah claim, i.e. dhawī al-qurbā refers to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا and her right is Fadak, then may Allah forbid, Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ did not fulfil the entire command or Allah did not allow him to. The fact is that this verse commands the fulfilment of the right of 3 categories; viz. 1. the relative, 2. the needy, 3. the traveller. With regards to the relative, the Shī'ah have claimed that Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was unaware of who it refers to and what their right is, so Jibrīl clarified that it means Fāṭimah and her right is Fadak. However, the other two categories remain deprived. Moreover, the compound dhawī al-qurbā is general and includes all relatives so why was only one individual selected?

The compound dhawī al-qurbā at other places in the Qur'ān

Furthermore, the compound dhawī al-qurbā does not only feature in this verse. In fact, it features 13 times in the Qur'ān at different places in various Sūrahs. It features where the context is about fulfilment of rights and encouragement of the same. And at most places, it is coupled with others, e.g. the needy, the traveller, etc. This shows that wherever this word appears, it entails charity, assisting, and caring for these categories of people. For example,

Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى states in Sūrah al-Baqarah:

وَإِذْ أَخَذْنَا مِيثَاقَ بَنِي إِسْرَائِيلَ لَا تَعْبُدُونَ إِلَّا اللَّهَ وَبِالْوَالِدَيْنِ إِحْسَانًا وَذِي الْقُرْبَىٰ وَالْيَتَامَىٰ
وَالْمَسَاكِينِ وَقُولُوا لِلنَّاسِ حُسْنًا وَأَقِيمُوا الصَّلَاةَ وَآتُوا الزَّكَاةَ ثُمَّ تَوَلَّيْتُمْ إِلَّا قَلِيلًا مِّنْكُمْ وَأَنْتُمْ
مُّعْرِضُونَ

And [recall] when We took the covenant from the Children of Israel, [enjoining upon them], “Do not worship except Allah; and to parents do good and to relatives, orphans, and the needy. And speak to people good [words] and establish prayer and give zakāh.” Then you turned away, except a few of you, and you were refusing.¹

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 83.

The addressees here are the Banī Isrāʾīl who broke the covenant. This verse serves as a warning to the ummah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ not to perpetrate the same crime. Sūrah Banī Isrāʾīl clarifies that this command is not specific to the Banī Isrāʾīl. Instead, displaying good character, and upright social etiquette is necessary for every human. Although Rasūlullāh ﷺ has been addressed, his entire ummah is intended. As if these verses are an elucidation of the verse of Sūrah al-Baqarah.

1. Sūrah al-Baqarah:

وَإِذْ أَخَذْنَا مِيثَاقَ بَنِي إِسْرَائِيلَ

And [recall] when We took the covenant from the Children of Israel,
[enjoining upon them]

Sūrah Banī Isrāʾīl:

وَقَضَىٰ رَبُّكَ

And your Lord has decreed

The meaning of the two is almost the same i.e. we have made it obligatory upon them.

2. Sūrah al-Baqarah:

لَا تَعْبُدُونَ إِلَّا اللَّهَ

Do not worship except Allah

Sūrah Banī Isrāʾīl:

أَلَّا تَعْبُدُوا إِلَّا إِيَّاهُ

That you not worship except Him

3. Sūrah al-Baqarah:

وَبِالْوَالِدَيْنِ إِحْسَانًا

And to parents do good

Sūrah Banī Isrāʾīl:

وَبِالْوَالِدَيْنِ إِحْسَانًا

And to parents, good treatment.

Further clarification appears here; do not even tell them ‘uff’.

4. Sūrah al-Baqarah:

وَذِي الْقُرْبَىٰ وَالْيَتَامَىٰ وَالْمَسْكِينِ

Do good and to relatives, orphans, and the needy.

Sūrah Banī Isrāʾīl:

وَأْتِ ذَا الْقُرْبَىٰ حَقَّهُ وَالْمِسْكِينَ وَابْنَ السَّبِيلِ

And give the relative his right, and [also] the poor and the traveller,

Here, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَىٰ also enjoins moderation:

وَلَا تُبْذِرْ تَبْدِيرًا

And do not spend wastefully.¹

1 Sūrah Banī Isrāʾīl: 26.

5. Sūrah al-Baqarah:

وَقُولُوا لِلنَّاسِ حُسْنًا

And speak to people good [words]

Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl:

فَقُلْ لَهُمْ قَوْلًا مَّيْسُورًا

Then speak to them a gentle word.

See the similarity and coherence of these two verses. The verses of Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl elucidate on these verses.

Another place in Sūrah al-Baqarah reads:

لَيْسَ الْبِرَّ أَنْ تُوَلُّوا وُجُوهَكُمْ قِبَلَ الْمَشْرِقِ وَالْمَغْرِبِ وَلَكِنَّ الْبِرَّ مَنْ آمَنَ بِاللَّهِ وَالْيَوْمِ الْآخِرِ
وَالْمَلَائِكَةِ وَالْكِتَابِ وَالنَّبِيِّينَ وَآتَى الْمَالَ عَلَى حُبِّهِ ذَوِي الْقُرْبَىٰ وَالْيَتَامَىٰ وَالْمَسَاكِينَ وَابْنَ السَّبِيلِ
وَالسَّائِلِينَ وَفِي الرِّقَابِ

Righteousness is not that you turn your faces toward the east or the west, but [true] righteousness is [in] one who believes in Allah, the Last Day, the angels, the Book, and the prophets and gives wealth, in spite of love for it, to relatives, orphans, the needy, the traveller, those who ask [for help], and for freeing slaves.¹

Here again, Allah ﷻ commands kindness and charity.

A verse in Sūrah al-Anfāl reads:

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 177.

وَأَعْلَمُوا أَنَّمَا غَنِمْتُمْ مِنْ شَيْءٍ فَإِنَّ لِلَّهِ خُمُسَهُ وَلِلرَّسُولِ وَلِذِي الْقُرْبَىٰ وَالْيَتَامَىٰ وَالْمَسَاكِينِ وَابْنِ
السَّبِيلِ

And know that anything you obtain of war booty - then indeed, for Allah is one fifth of it and for the Messenger and for [his] near relatives and the orphans, the needy, and the [stranded] traveller.¹

If the Shī'ah have to reflect deeply on this verse, then their claim that verse 26 of Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl was revealed after the conquest of Khaybar will be awkward. In fact, there entire web will be torn apart.

No one doubts that verse 41 of Sūrah al-Anfāl was revealed prior to the conquest of Khaybar. Booty was acquired way before this and was divided among the Muslims in accordance to this verse. So from Badr to Khaybar, Rasūlullāh ﷺ gave shares from the booty to the relatives, needy, and travellers. It follows that he already knew who they referred to. So why the need to clarify from Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام after conquering Khaybar and acquiring Fadak as to who the relative is? Had he required clarification, he should have asked after verse 41 of Sūrah al-Anfāl was revealed so that he does not make any error.

Nonetheless, if for argument's sake we agree that the word relative in verse 26 of Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl refers to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, then the same word in verse 41 of Sūrah al-Anfāl ought to refer to her as well. Khumus supposed to be her exclusive share then and the entire Banū Hāshim tribe would then be deprived of the Khumus, whereas no one ever made such a ridiculous claim. The Shī'ah themselves do not agree to this and state that half belongs to the Imām of the time and the other half should be distributed among the orphans, needy, and travellers.

Al-Ṭabarsī writes:

1 Sūrah al-Anfāl: 41.

اختلف العلماء في كيفية قسمة الخمس و من يستحقه على أقوال أحدها ما ذهب إليه أصحابنا و هو أن الخمس يقسم على ستة أسهم سهم لله و سهم للرسول و هذان السهمان مع سهم ذي القربى للإمام القائم مقام الرسول و سهم لتمامى آل محمد و سهم لمسكينهم و سهم لأبناء سبيلهم لا يشركهم في ذلك غيرهم لأن الله سبحانه حرم عليهم الصدقات لكونها أوساخ الناس و عوضهم من ذلك الخمس روي ذلك الطبري عن علي بن الحسين زين العابدين و محمد بن علي الباقر و اختلف في ذوي القربى فقولهم هم بنو هاشم خاصة من ولد عبد المطلب لأن هاشم لم يعقب إلا منه عن ابن عباس و مجاهد و إليه ذهب أصحابنا

The scholars have differed with regards to the manner of distributing the Khumus and who is deserving of the same. One view is what our scholars have opted for, i.e. the Khumus will be divided into six shares; viz. one share for Allah, one share for the Messenger; and these two shares coupled with the share of the relative will be for the Imām who is the successor to the Messenger; a share for the orphans of Rasūlullāh's ﷺ family, a share for their needy, and lastly a share for their travellers. None shall share with them because Allah ﷻ has prohibited charity for them as it is the filth of people and substituted them with the Khumus. Al-Ṭabarī reported this from ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn Zayn al-‘Ābidīn and Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī al-Bāqir. There exists difference of opinion regarding the relative. It is said that they are the Banū Hāshim solely from the progeny of ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib since Hāshim has no issue except from this son of his. This is the view of Ibn ‘Abbās and Mujāhid and our scholars have favoured it.¹

فمن الغنيمة يخرج الخمس و يقسم على ستة أسهم سهم لله و سهم لرسول الله و سهم للإمام فسهم الله و سهم الرسول يرثه الإمام فيكون للإمام ثلاثة أسهم من ستة و ثلاثة أسهم لأيتام آل الرسول و مسكينهم و أبناء سبيلهم

The Khumus will be taken out from the booty and will be divided into six parts. One share for Allah, one for Rasūlullāh ﷺ, and one for the Imām. Allah's share and Rasūlullāh's ﷺ share will be taken by the Imām. Thus, the Imām will have three shares of the six. [The remaining] three shares will be for the orphans of Rasūlullāh's ﷺ family, their needy, and their travellers.²

1 *Majma' al-Bayān*.

2 *Tafsīr al-Qummī*.

In short, by no stretch of imagination can it be perceived that Rasūlullāh ﷺ was unaware of the meaning of dhawī al-qurbā and their rights. Despite many verses mentioning the word dhawī al-qurbā, Rasūlullāh ﷺ was forced to enquire from Sayyidunā Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام its meaning; this is preposterous. More shocking is the claim that Allah ﷻ commanded Rasūlullāh ﷺ to give Fadak exclusively to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, the income of which was 24000 gold coins annually, thereby being absolved of his duty, and deprive the rest of his relatives, the needy and the travellers.

و كيف يجوز لأحد من المسلمين أن يتكلم بمثل هذا و يبدل كلام الله من تلقاء نفسه و يحرفه عن موضعه
سبحانك هذا بهتان عظيم

How is it possible for any Muslim to utter such drivel, change the speech of Allah from his own side, and take words out of their context? Glory be to You, O Allah. Indeed, this is a grand slander!

Is it fathomable for Rasūlullāh ﷺ to give Fadak exclusively to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا whereas its annual income is estimated at 24000 gold coins?

For a moment, let us set aside all the narrations and incidents as well as the inconsistencies and contradictions and let us analyse this issue rationally. With a balanced and impartial attitude, let us ponder for a minute.

Evaluate all the booty, Fay', and tax which the Muslim treasury was receiving at the time of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Now consider all the expenses in the propagation of Islam, protection of the Muslims, preparations for offensive and defensive Jihād, hospitality to the delegations and guests, and giving them gifts and donations. Now ask yourself: Was the Muslim treasury overflowing with money to the extent that Rasūlullāh ﷺ gives his daughter a land estimated at 24000 gold coins annually? Does it gel with the personality, behaviour, and lofty status of Rasūlullāh ﷺ to ignore the Muhājirīn, Anṣār, and general Muslims, allowing them to live in poverty and give one selected family member such an enormous amount of wealth?

If anyone just has to ponder over the above, he will realise the fallaciousness of the gift incident and will never imagine it to be in conformity with Rasūlullāh's ﷺ position, habit, and general behaviour.

Fadak fell into the hands of Rasūlullāh ﷺ in the 7th year of hijrah. That was an era of want and need. Rasūlullāh's ﷺ personal condition was that he spent days on hunger without any food, tying stones to his blessed belly to soothe the pangs of hunger. His household members did not have sufficient barely to bake bread and had no money to fulfil their basic needs and necessities. The Muhājirīn were still living in the houses of their Anṣārī brethren who would help them, ignoring their own plight. Islam was being attacked from all four sides. Every day was an opportunity for Jihād and at every moment did the Muslims fear an attack from the enemy. Rasūlullāh ﷺ was perpetually concerned how to acquire weapons and arms to equip the Muslim army. Delegations were pouring in who needed to be entertained. They would come with gifts, and Rasūlullāh ﷺ needed to reciprocate the favour. He would beseech the Muslims to donate generously for these noble causes and Allah ﷻ revealed verses encouraging spending in His path. The Muslims contributed above their means and preferred to survive off a meagre amount and donated whatever they possessed happily in the path of Allah.

In such trying times, will any leader who truly cares for his subordinates and makes an effort to protect them ignore all the above essentials, and give all that he receives to his relatives? In fact, will he deprive all his relatives and give everything to one selected daughter of his? From a worldly perspective, will anyone consider such a person worthy of leadership? Will people accept him as their army general? Will he deserve respect in any of their hearts?

Everyone will regard him as selfish and self-seeking. This is unfathomable in respect of a pure soul who is the leader of the world in Islam, the special and selected servant of Allah ﷻ who was sent to perfect noble character and who plucked self-centeredness from its roots. At every juncture, he favoured others over himself and directed his relatives and friends to do the same. Their level

of preference of others was of such a high degree that Allah ﷻ announced His happiness of it. They became examples for the entire world and their acts of kindness became proverbial, to the extent that the angles praised their selflessness. Can anyone ever imagine regarding such a noble personality that he will deprive all and favour one of his own? Can anyone believe that his daughter will watch everyone suffer adversity and keep her father's gift for herself and her children? This is unimaginable and impossible.

In reality, if the Fadak narration is agreed to be ṣaḥīḥ and its income was 24000 to 70000 gold coins, those who reject Nubuwwah will have a perfect opportunity to cast nasty allegations against Rasūlullāh ﷺ. It is like handing over to the enemy a weapon of mass destruction. The Shī'ah are so blind in the love for the Ahl al-Bayt that they do not see the detrimental consequences of such absurdity. Their only concern is to indict the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ so they concoct narrations as they please to reach their objective. We get goosebumps just imagining such blasphemy and we distance ourselves from everything that will tarnish the noble Messenger's image.

We will now establish the fact that it was an era of adversity and Rasūlullāh ﷺ did not have sufficient funds to make adequate preparations for Jihād, which proved to be a cumbersome task. The Shī'ī books are witness to this.

Adversity in the Era of Nubuwwah

This subject has been discussed in most books. We have taken this from *Nāsikh al-Tawārīkh* which has recently been published in Iran and is written by a renowned Shī'ī scholar. The original text is as follows:

و این لشکر را جیش العسرة و گفتند چه در تخطی و سختی زحمت فراواں دیدند بالجمله این غزوه و ابسین غزوات رسول خدا صلی الله علیه و سلم ست مع القصة رسول خدا صلی الله علیه و سلم فرمود باں اے مردم دنیا یاخرت این مقدار ندارد کہ سر انگشت خویش را با ب زنه و الا نئش این ربا تمامت اور یا بمیزان بری لا جرم دولته بزرگ را بہر چیزے اندک از دست مگزارید و درکار جہاد سبک خیز و استوار باشید چنانچہ خدا فرماید انقروا خفافا و ثقالا الخ مع القصة چون پیغمبر لختے بتحریر جہاد سخن کرد ور مردم مدینہ جنبش پدید گشت لا جرم عثمان بن عفان کہ این وقت دو صد شتر و در صد اوقیہ سہم از بہر تجارت شام ساز کردہ بود بتہامت بحضرت رسول آورد و برائے تجہیز لشکر پیش داشت پیغمبر

فرمود لا یضر عثمان ما عمل بعد ہذا و بروایتی سی صد شتر با ساز و برگ و ہزار مثقال زر سرخ حاضر کرد پیغمبر فرمود الہم ارض عن عثمان فانی منہ راض و نیز گفته اند کہ از سی ہزار تن لشکر کہ سفر تبوک کردہ دو ہجرہ را عثمان تجہیز داد عمر بن خطاب گویند کہ من باخود اندیشدم کہ امر و زاز ابو بکر سبق گیرم و یک نیمہ مال خود را بحضرت رسول صلی اللہ علیہ و سلم بردم تا کار لشکر بسازد فرمود یا ابن الخطاب از بہر اہل خود چہ ذخیرہ نہادہ عرض کردم ہم بدین مقدار برائے اہل خویش گزارشتہ ام این ہنگامہ ابو بکر برسید و اندوختہ خویش را بہتامت پیش داشت پیغمبر فرمود برائے اہل خود چہ نہادہ عرض کرد اذخرت اللہ و رسولہ یعنی خدا و رسول را از بہر ایشان ذخیرہ نہادم عمر گفت اے ابو بکر ہیچ گاہ بر تو بیشی نتوانم گرفت ... عبد الرحمن بن عوف چہل اوقیہ زر و بروایتی چہار ہزار درہم آورد و گفت مرا ہشت ہزار درہم بود یک نیمہ را بقرض بروردگار خویش دادم و نیم دیگر را از بہر عیال خود گزارشتہم ... بالجملہ عباس بن عبد المطلب و طلحہ بن عبید اللہ و سعد بن عبادہ و محمد بن سلہم ہر یک مہلبے حاضر کردند و عاصم بن عدی انصاری صد و سق خرما از بہر تجہیز لشکر بذل کرد ابو عقیل انصاری نیم صاع خرما یا ساعے آورد و گفت دوش تا بامد ادبار یسمان ای کشیدم و دو روز مزدور مردم بودہ ام دو صاع خرما مرا اجرت دادہ اند یکے را برائے عیال نہادم و این کشیدم و این دیگر را از بہر ساز ابطال آوردم پیغمبر فرمود تا این صاع را بر فراز دیگر صدقات نثر کردہ اند منافقان بر قلت صدقہ او عیب گرفتند و اذ این رانا ستودہ شہر دند و گفتند این صدقہ از بہر این آورد کہ از اموال صدقات چیزے بستاند خدا این ایت فرستاد الذین المظوعین الخ - این ہنگام سالم بن عمیر و عتبہ بن زید الحارثی و ابو لیلی و عبد الرحمن بن کعب مازنی و عمر بن عنہ اسلمی و سلہم بن صخر از بنی زریق و عرباض بن ساریہ اسلمی و عبد اللہ و بروایتی مغفل بن یسار یا مہدی بن عبد الرحمن و نیز گفته اند عمرو بن الحمام بن الجموع و بروایتی صخر بن خنسا گفتند یا رسول اللہ صلی اللہ علیہ و سلم لیس بنا قوۃ ان نخرج معک مار الضاعۃ و عدتے نیست کہ باتو توانیم کوچ داد از ہر قوتے و ثروتے دست ما تہی است کنوں ما را مر کیے بذل فرما کہ پیادہ گانیم فرمود اینچہ شما طلب می کنید بدست نیست ایشان از نزد پیغمبر بیرون و گریای بود ندازیں رہ بہ جماعت بکائین ملقب گشتند و این ایت مبارکہ در صفت ایشان آمد و لا علی الذین اذا ما اتوک لتحملہم الخ

The final expedition Rasūlullāh ﷺ participated in was Ghazwat al-Tabūk which took place in the 9th year after hijrah. There was so much hardship and poverty at the time, that the army was named *Jaysh al-'Usrah* (the army of difficulty). Allah ﷻ sent down many verses encouraging spending in His path and warning against miserliness. Accordingly, those true in their faith assisted whole heartedly. When the verse:

انْفِرُوا خِفَافًا وَثِقَالًا وَجَاهِدُوا بِأَمْوَالِكُمْ وَأَنْفُسِكُمْ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ ذَلِكُمْ خَيْرٌ لَّكُمْ إِن كُنْتُمْ تَعْلَمُونَ

Go forth, whether light or heavy, and strive with your wealth and your lives in the cause of Allah. That is better for you, if you only knew.¹

1 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 41.

was revealed, and Rasūlullāh ﷺ exhorted them to assist with their lives and wealth, there was uproar in Madīnah. ‘Uthmān presented to Rasūlullāh ﷺ 200 camels and 200 ūqiyah of silver – which he had gathered to do business in Shām – in front of Rasūlullāh ﷺ to prepare the army, upon which Rasūlullāh ﷺ declared:

ما ضر عثمان ما عمل بعد اليوم

No matter what ‘Uthmān does after today, it will not harm him. [i.e. his entry into Jannah is confirmed.]

In one narration, it is mentioned that he donated 300 camels with luggage as well as 1000 mithqāl gold. Rasūlullāh ﷺ supplicated:

اللهم ارض عن عثمان فإنني عنه راض

O Allah, be pleased with ‘Uthmān as I am certainly pleased with him.

‘Umar thought to himself that on that day he will outdo Abū Bakr so he donated half of his wealth to Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Rasūlullāh ﷺ questioned him, “What have you left behind for your family?”

‘Umar answered, “The equivalent of what I have donated.”

He was followed by Abū Bakr who came along with all of his wealth and belongings. Rasūlullāh ﷺ asked him what he had left for his family. He answered:

اذخرت الله ورسوله

I have left behind Allah and His Messenger.

‘Umar succumbed, “I can never surpass you!”

‘Abd al-Rahman ibn ‘Awf presented 40 ūqiyah and according to a narration 4000 dirhams (silver coins) and submitted, “I only possessed 8000 dirhams. I have given half for Allah and left half for my family.”

Similarly, ‘Abbās ibn ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, Ṭalḥah ibn ‘Ubayd Allah, Sa’d ibn ‘Ubādah, and Muḥammad ibn Salamah رضي الله عنه donated according to their means. Since there was a pressing need and Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم had great concern to make necessary preparations for the campaign, those Muslims who possessed wealth presented whatever food items they could get hold of. Sayyidunā ‘Āṣim ibn ‘Adī al-Anṣārī رضي الله عنه gave 100 wasaq dates for the army and Sayyidunā Abū ‘Aqīl al-Anṣārī رضي الله عنه gave half or a full ṣā¹ of dry dates. He submitted, “I worked the entire morning filling water and laboured for 2 days and got 2 ṣā’ of dates. I have left one for my family and one I presented to you.”

Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم ordered that his dates be placed on top of all the wealth. The hypocrites looked condescending at his humble donation and criticised its small quantity. Upon this Allah سبحانه وتعالى revealed:

الَّذِينَ يَلْمُزُونَ الْمُطَّوِّعِينَ مِنَ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ فِي الصَّدَقَاتِ وَالَّذِينَ لَا يَجِدُونَ إِلَّا جُهْدَهُمْ
فَيَسْخَرُونَ مِنْهُمْ سَخِرَ اللَّهُ مِنْهُمْ وَلَهُمْ عَذَابٌ أَلِيمٌ

Those who criticize the contributors among the believers concerning [their] charities and [criticize] the ones who find nothing [to spend] except their effort, so they ridicule them - Allah will ridicule them, and they will have a painful punishment.²

It reached such a level, that the women began taking out their jewellery and sending it to Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم. Despite this level of contribution, some had no wealth nor any furniture, and no conveyance. Among them were Sālim ibn ‘Umayr, ‘Utbah ibn Zayd al-Ḥārithī, Abū Laylā, ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Ka’b al-Māzinī, ‘Umar ibn ‘Anmah al-Aslamī, Salamah ibn Ṣakhr from the Banū Zurayq, ‘Irbāḍ ibn Sāriyah al-Aslamī, and ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mughaffal. Some narrations include Mughaffal ibn Yasār, Mahdī ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān, ‘Amr ibn al-Ḥammām ibn al-Jamū’, and Ṣakhr ibn Khansā.

1 Ṣā’ is equal to four mudd. And mudd with a ḍammah is a measure which is equivalent to a riṭl and a third. Ṣā’ is 3184.272 grams.

2 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 79.

They came into Rasūlullāh's ﷺ presence and submitted: "O Messenger of Allah, we do not have the means to accompany you on your journey. We are penniless. Give us a conveyance so that we may join you."

Rasūlullāh ﷺ replied, "I do not have anything to give you."

As there were no extra conveyances. Hearing this, they left his presence with tears flowing from their eyes. The following verse was revealed about them:

وَلَا عَلَى الَّذِينَ إِذَا مَا اتَّوَكَّ لِحِمْلِهِمْ قُلْتَ لَا أَجِدُ مَا أَحْمِلُكُمْ عَلَيْهِ تَوَلَّوْا وَأَعْيُنُهُمْ
تَفِيضُ مِنَ الدَّمْعِ حَزَنًا أَلَّا يَجِدُوا مَا يُنْفِقُونَ إِنَّمَا السَّبِيلُ عَلَى الَّذِينَ يَسْتَأْذِنُونَكَ وَهُمْ
أَغْنِيَاءُ رُضُومًا بِأَنْ يَكُونُوا مَعَ الْخَوَالِفِ وَطَبَعَ اللَّهُ عَلَى قُلُوبِهِمْ فَهُمْ لَا يَعْلَمُونَ

Nor [is there blame] upon those who, when they came to you that you might give them mounts, you said, "I can find nothing for you to ride upon." They turned back while their eyes overflowed with tears out of grief that they could not find something to spend [for the cause of Allah]. The cause [for blame] is only upon those who ask permission of you while they are rich. They are satisfied to be with those who stay behind, and Allah has sealed over their hearts, so they do not know.^{1,2}

In short, this is how people assisted. Despite this, out of 30000 soldiers, only 10000 had conveyances and the rest were on foot.

The point we wish to prove from here is that there was so much of difficulty in the final expedition of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Preparing this army was a cumbersome task. Poverty and want had reached this ebb that a person would come with few kilos of dates and it would be accepted. Despite everything, sufficient means of transport and food could not be made. Many could not accompany the army

1 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 92, 93.

2 *Nāsikh al-Tawārīkh* vol. 1 pg. 421.

because they had no transport and Rasūlullāh ﷺ could not provide them with any.

A narration¹ speaks about the condition of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Once, Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ came into the house where Rasūlullāh ﷺ was staying and where he kept his belongings and only found one ṣā’ of barley and some tanned skins. Rasūlullāh ﷺ told him, “O Ibn al-Khaṭṭāb! What are you looking at?”

He submitted, “O Messenger of Allah, you are Allah’s Messenger while this is your total belongings. And look at how Qayṣar, Kisrā, and their people are enjoying the luxuries of this life.”

Rasūlullāh ﷺ recited:

وَمَا هَذِهِ الْحَيَاةُ الدُّنْيَا إِلَّا لَهُمْ وَلَعِبٌ وَإِنَّ الدَّارَ الْآخِرَةَ لَهِيَ الْحَيَوَانُ لَوْ كَانُوا يَعْلَمُونَ

And this worldly life is not but diversion and amusement. And indeed, the home of the Hereafter - that is the [eternal] life, if only they knew.²

No one should think that poverty was his lot only in the beginning, which was subsequently followed by booty, Fay’, etc., which brought him a life of luxury. Instead, the same condition of adversity was existent till the very end of his life. Although, the spoils of war and Fay’ were pouring into Madīnah, the expenses was so high that they could not be met. Therefore, Rasūlullāh ﷺ remained in adversity and difficulty. We will quote a narration from *al-Kāfī* which substantiates this. It will demonstrate the financial state of Rasūlullāh ﷺ post *Hajjat al-Wadā’* which was his final year in this worldly abode.

This ḥadīth appears under the heading:

1 *Nāsikh al-Tawārīkh* vol. 1 pg. 420.

2 *Sūrah al-‘Ankabūt*: 64.

What Allah and His Messenger decreed upon each of the A'immah.

It is a lengthy ḥadīth from Imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, the following appears:

فلما رجع رسول الله من حجة الوداع ألى قوله فلما قدم المدينة أته الأنصار فقالوا يا رسول الله إن الله شرفنا بك و بنزولك فقد فرح الله صديقنا و كتب عدونا و قد تأتيتك وفود فلا تجد ما تعطيمهم فيشمت بك العدو فتجب أن تأخذ ثلث أموالنا حتى إذا أقدم إليك وفد فوجدت ما تعطيمهم فلم يرد رسول الله شيئا و كان ينتظر ما يأتيه من ربه فنزل عليه جبريل و قال قل لا أسئلكم عليه أجرا إلا المودة في القربى الخ

After Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ returned from Ḥajjat al-Wadā' and entered Madīnah, the Anṣār approached him and submitted, "O Messenger of Allah. Certainly, Allah has honoured us with you and your stay (in our midst). Allah has made our friends happy and has disgraced our enemies. The delegations come to you but you do not have sufficient means to entertain them. This results in the enemy laughing at you maliciously. It is binding upon you that you take a third of our wealth so that when any delegation comes to you, you have adequate means to entertain them. However, Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ did not want this. He waited in anticipation for something from his Rabb. Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام came down and recited:

قُلْ لَا أَسْأَلُكُمْ عَلَيْهِ أَجْرًا إِلَّا الْمَوَدَّةَ فِي الْقُرْبَىٰ

Say, [O Muḥammad], "I do not ask you for this message any payment [but] only good will through kinship."^{1,2}

This proves that at the end of his life, he did not have sufficient means to meet minor expenses. Taking this into consideration, it is unimaginable that he will favour one of his daughters with such a large land of Fay' the income of which is 24000 gold coins annually, and turn a blind eye to all the other expenses and needs that needed to be fulfilled.

1 Sūrah al-Shūrā: 23

2 *Al-Kāfi*, Kitāb al-Ḥujjah, vol. 3 chapter 64.

The Shī'ah might explain that Rasūlullāh ﷺ gave her the land for future use and would spend the present income in the path of Allah after giving her sufficient funds. However, this explanation is not pleasing because if Rasūlullāh ﷺ was not happy with her enjoying that amount of wealth then why put it on her name for future use? Why establish such an example by his action which is outwardly against the position of Nubuwwah? Why would Rasūlullāh ﷺ consider the future well-being after Allah ﷻ informed him, as the Shī'ah narrate:

يا أحمد إن أحببت أن تكون أروع الناس فاهد في الدنيا وارغب في الآخرة وخذ من الدنيا خفا من الطعام و الشراب و اللباس و لا تدخر لغد و اجعل نومك صلوة و طعامك الجوع و قال الله يا أحمد إن المحبة للفقراء و التقرب إليهم قال يا رب و من الفقراء قال رضوا بالقليل و صبروا على الجوع و شكروا على الرخاء و لم يشكروا جوعهم و لا ظمائمهم

“O Aḥmad! If you wish to be the most righteous person, then observe abstinence from the world and desire for the Hereafter. Take just a little food, water, and clothes from the world and do not store for the morrow. Turn your sleep into prayer and your food into hunger.”

And Allah stated, “O Aḥmad! Love is indeed for the poor and drawing close to them.”

He submitted, “O my Rabb, who are the poor?”

Allah ﷻ responded, “They are happy with a little, observe patience on hunger, appreciate prosperity, and do not complain of their hunger or thirst.”¹

Among the final advices Rasūlullāh ﷺ gave to Sayyidunā ‘Alī, as documented in *Mā Lā Yaḥḍuruhū al-Faḥīh*, is:

يا علي ثلاث من حقائق الإيمان الانفاق من الاقتتار و إصافك الناس من نفسك و بذل العلم من المتعلم

O ‘Alī, there are three realities of īmān, viz. spending despite being destitute, dealing justly with people, and disseminating knowledge.

1 *Nāsikh al-Tawārīkh*, kitāb 1 from kitāb 2, pg. 744.

Rasūlullāh ﷺ is reported to have stated:

تكون أمتي في الدنيا على ثلاثة أطباق أما الطبق الأول فلا يحبون جمع المال وادخاره ولا يسعون في
افتتاه و احتكاره و إنما رضوا من الدنيا سد جرمة و ستر عورة و غناهم فيها ما بلغ بهم الآخرة فأولئك
الآمنون الذين لا خوف عليهم ولا هو يحزنون

My Ummah will be divided into three units. As regards to the first unit, they will not love to gather wealth, nor dedicate themselves to hoarding it. They will be pleased with that much of the world which satiates their hunger and covers their private parts. Their independence from the world will secure their Ākhirah for them. They are the safe ones, upon whom they will be no fear, nor will they grieve.

If hypothetically, we ignore all the above and agree that Rasūlullāh ﷺ realised the oppression and tyranny of the Khulafā' – as supposed by the Shī'ah – and gave her Fadak to secure her future, knowing fully well that she will not spend on herself but will spend in the path of Allah ﷻ. He felt it best to gift her Fadak to maintain her honour and respect. Then too, this makes no sense to us because Rasūlullāh's ﷺ behaviour towards his close ones was very much different. He did not worry about their worldly future. The only treasure he hoarded for them was abstinence, reliance on Allah, and preferring others above themselves. Therefore, it makes absolutely no sense for him to give such an expensive land to his daughter.

If we study the life of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, we will observe the lofty example of self-denial, tawakkul, and preference of others he set for himself and encouraged his relatives and dear friends to carry out. If he received Khumus, he kept only a meagre amount for himself and his relatives which was just sufficient to fulfil their needs and gave the rest in the path of Allah ﷻ, for necessities of the state and preparations for jihād.

It is unfathomable for him to give a huge land to his dear ones when the state was suffering adversity. On one side, Muslims are moving on expeditions on foot. On

the other side, the aṣḥāb al-ṣuffah are starving, without clothes to cover them and without weapons. At the very same time, the Messenger of Allah – who has set the highest standard of abstinence from the world, and preference of others – has so much of concern for the future of his beloved one that he gives her a land worth millions. We cannot possibly fathom how this gels with his noble sīrah. How is the status of his Nubuwwah apparent from this? And what noble example has this set for the world?

Is the picture we have sketched of the noble life of Rasūlullāh ﷺ accurate? The books of the Shī'ah and Sunnī are filled with incidents to support this. And nothing but this can be established from his biography. We will for the moment ignore all other incidents and concentrate on two situations that faced Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا personally. We will quote a few narrations as well.

1. It is reported from Imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq:

Amīr al-Mu'minīn and Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا came to Rasūlullāh ﷺ in order for him to divide the household chores between them. Rasūlullāh ﷺ determined that Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ take care of outdoor chores while Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا handles indoor chores.¹

This shows that they would execute household chores themselves. They had no servant to assist them for a lengthy period of time.

2. The narrator says: 'Alī ibn Muḥammad ibn Ḥasan al-Qazwīnī commonly known as Ibn Maqbarah narrates from Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allāh al-Ḥaḍramī from Jandal ibn Qāliq, from 'Umar ibn 'Umar al-Māzinī, from 'Ubādah al-Kulaynī, from Ja'far ibn Muḥammad, from his father from 'Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn, from Fāṭimah Ṣughrā from Ḥusayn ibn 'Alī from his brother Ḥasan ibn 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib who relates:

1 *Qurb al-Isnād*.

I saw my mother Sayyidah Fāṭimah al-Zahrā' standing in the miḥrāb in prayer every Thursday night, observing rukū' and sujūd until dawn. I heard her taking everyone's name and supplicating earnestly for the Muslim men and women. She would pray for everyone, besides herself. I once enquired from her the reason for this, to which she replied, "First your neighbour, then your household."¹

From here we learn the level of her preference of others over herself.

3. The narrators says: Aḥmad ibn al-Ḥasan al-Qaṭṭān, narrates from Abū Sa'īd Ḥasan ibn 'Alī al-Sukrī, from Ḥakam ibn Aslam, from Ibn 'Albah, from Ḥarīrī, from Abū Ward ibn Timāmah, from Sayyidunā 'Alī عليه السلام that he told a man from the Banū Sa'd:

Should I not relate to you the story of myself and Sayyidah Fāṭimah al-Zahrā' عليها السلام. When she lived with me, she would do all the household chores herself. She carried the water leather skins until it left marks on her chest; she grinded the mill which left calluses on her hands; she swept the house causing her clothes to remain dirty and soiled; and she would light the fire, causing her clothes to turn black with the smoke. This adversely affected her health so I told her to go to her father and request for a female servant to relieve her of these duties. Accordingly, she went to Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم and found some people around him. She felt shy to say anything in their presence and thus left. Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم understood that she had come for some necessary work so the next day he came to our house and said, "O Fāṭimah! You came yesterday to me for some work."

I said, "I will inform you of the reason. She fills the leather skins with water which has left marks on her chest, she grinds the mill causing calluses on her hands, she sweeps the house which cause her clothes to remain dirty, and she kindles the fire which has blackened her clothes. I advised her to

1 *Urdū Tarjamah 'Ilal al-Sharā'i'* pg. 137. Translator: Ḥusayn Imdād. Publisher: Niẓāmī press Lucknow 2003.

go to her father and request for a female servant to assist her with her chores.”

Rasūlullāh ﷺ said, “Should I not teach you something which is better for you than a servant. When you retire to bed, recite *Subhān Allah* 33 times, *Al-ḥamdu li Allah* 33 times, and *Allāhu Akbar* 34 times.”

Hearing this, Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضيها الله عنها submitted, “I am pleased with Allah and His Messenger’s words. I am pleased with Allah and His Messenger’s words. I am pleased with Allah and His Messenger’s words.”¹

It is manifest from this narration that despite Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ love for her and despite seeing the difficulty she was experiencing in fulfilling household chores, he wished not to deprive the poor and destitute and give his family members items of luxury especially at a time when there were other more pressing needs. This was Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ behaviour when it came to giving his daughter one servant. This establishes his Prophethood, the honour of the Ahl al-Bayt, and their noble traits.

4. Imām Zayn al-‘Ābidīn reports that Sayyidah Asmā’ bint ‘Umays رضيها الله عنها reports:

Once Rasūlullāh ﷺ went to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضيها الله عنها and saw her wearing a golden necklace which Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضيها الله عنه purchased for her from the wealth of Fay’.

Rasūlullāh ﷺ advised her, “O Fāṭimah! Will the people not say that Muḥammad’s daughter is adoring herself with the jewellery of the haughty affluent?”

As soon as she heard this, she took it off and sold it. She then bought a slave with the money attained and set him free. Rasūlullāh ﷺ was extremely pleased with this.²

1 *Urdū Tarjamah ‘Ilal al-Sharā’i’* pg. 288, 289. From Ṣadūq. Publisher: Niẓāmī press Lucknow.

2 *‘Uyūn al-Akḥbār*.

5. Zurārah reports from Imām al-Bāqir:

It was the noble habit of Rasūlullāh ﷺ to visit his dear ones before departing on a journey. He would visit Sayyidah Fāṭimah ؓ last and depart from her house. And when he returned, he would first visit her. Once it occurred that Sayyidunā ‘Alī ؓ acquired some wealth from Fay’. He gave it to Sayyidah Fāṭimah ؓ and then joined up with Rasūlullāh ﷺ. In his absence, Sayyidah Fāṭimah ؓ made two silver bracelets and hung a curtain over her door. After Rasūlullāh ﷺ returned from his journey and went to the Maṣjid, he, as was his custom, went straight to Sayyidah Fāṭimah’s ؓ house. Sayyidah Fāṭimah ؓ was elated and ran towards him. But as soon as he noticed the two silver bracelets and the curtain, he returned. Sayyidah Fāṭimah ؓ began to cry and realised that his noble habit was not the same before these items had come. So she immediately removed the curtain and bracelets and called Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Ḥusayn ؓ. She then handed the curtain to one and the bracelets to the other and instructed, “Take them to Rasūlullāh ﷺ and after giving him my salām, tell him that we have not innovated anything else besides this in his absence. Give it to him and he may do as he pleases with them.”

After they delivered the items and her message, he kissed them on their cheeks and sat them on his lap. He then instructed that the bracelets be broken and the pieces be divided among the Aṣḥāb al-Ṣuffah, those poor Muhājirīn who lived at that back room of Maṣjid al-Nabawī. He then called one of the Aṣḥāb al-Ṣuffah who did not have sufficient clothes to clad himself and tore a piece of the curtain and gave it to him. In a similarly manner, he tore pieces of cloth and gave it to those who needed in order to cover their private section and back. He then supplicated, “May Allah shower His mercy on Fāṭimah and give her the garments of Jannah in lieu of the curtain she donated which covered some Muslims and may He grant her jewellery in lieu of the bracelets which were distributed among the poor.¹

1 *Al-kāfi*.

6. Just as how Rasūlullāh ﷺ taught Sayyidah Fāṭimah the tasbīh when she asked for a servant, thus giving her a beautiful substitute for worldly luxuries, he did the same to his dear cousin Sayyidunā Ja'far al-Ṭayyār's ﷺ. The indecent goes as follows:

The very same day Khaybar was conquered, Sayyidunā Ja'far ibn Abī Ṭālib ﷺ returned from Abyssinia. This was an amazing coincidence. When Rasūlullāh ﷺ was informed of Sayyidunā Ja'far's arrival and the Conquest of Khaybar, he exclaimed: "I am unaware with which I am happier, the arrival of Ja'far or the Conquest of Khaybar."

When Sayyidunā Ja'far ﷺ entered his presence, Rasūlullāh ﷺ stood up, embraced him, and kissed him on his forehead. He then said, "O Ja'far! Should I not gift you something?"

Ja'far ﷺ replied in the affirmative. People thought that Rasūlullāh ﷺ would give him gold and silver and lifted their gazes to see what he gives him. Rasūlullāh ﷺ said, "O Ja'far! Should I not teach you such a ṣalāh, that even if you flee from the battlefield and have sins equivalent to the foam of the ocean, they will all be forgiven."

He said, "Most definitely."

Thereupon, Rasūlullāh ﷺ taught him that ṣalāh which is commonly known as Ja'far al-Ṭayyār's ﷺ ṣalāh. It consists of four rak'āt in units of two. Sūrah al-Zilzāl will be read in the first rak'āt, Sūrah al-'Ādiyāt in the second rak'āt, Sūrah al-Naṣr in the third rak'āt, and Sūrah Ikhlāṣ in the fourth rak'āt; these Sūrahs will be recited after Sūrah al-Fātiḥah in each rak'āt. After the qirā'ah in every rak'āt, the following should be recited 15 times:

سبحان الله الحمد لله لا إله إلا الله الله أكبر

Glory be to Allah. All praise belongs to Allah. There is none worthy of worship but Allah. Allah is the Greatest.

This should be recited in every rukū' and every jalsah posture 10 times.

Conclusion

A father who cannot stand to see bracelets of silver on his daughter's hands. A Nabī who cannot bear seeing a curtain over his daughter's door. A father who is prepared to stomach his daughter developing calluses and scars and her clothes remaining dirty but is not prepared to give her a servant and rather teaches her tawakkul and abstinence and a tasbīḥ which will be of assistance to her in her chores. A cousin who is elated by the arrival of his cousin Sayyidunā Ja'far رضي الله عنه but instead of giving him wealth, teaches him a special form of ṣalāh. A man who sees the honour, superiority, and excellence of his dear ones in spiritual feats, rather than worldly ones. A man who teaches his family members ṣalāh and tasbīḥ for them to attain spiritual calmness instead of worldly comfort, understanding it to be the superior substitute. A man who spent everything he received on the poor and in the path of Allah, to raise the standard of Islam, and fulfil the demands of Jihād, etc.

Can anyone fathom or have the slightest of hope that he will gift a land worth 24000 gold coins to one of his daughters, and deprive everyone else? This can never happen! Indeed, this is a despicable vilification.

By Allah's سُبْحَانَكَ وَبِحَمْدِكَ grace and mercy, we have discussed the verse *And give the relative his right* in great detail. We will now discuss the following:

- Was Fadak in Sayyidah Fāṭimah's رضي الله عنها possession?
- Was it usurped from her?
- Did she make such a claim in front of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه?
- Was she requested to present witnesses who were later dismissed?
- What substantiation or evidence do the Shī'ah produce from our books for the above and what narrations do they report in this regard.

Was Fadak in Fāṭimah's possession?

The Shī'ī scholars claim that after Rasūlullāh ﷺ gifted Fadak to Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا, he wrote a document to this effect and handed the land to her. However, they have failed to produce a single ṣaḥīḥ narration to support their claim. They have just claimed it; and that is it.

'Alam al-Hudā states in *al-Shāfi* that Qāḍī 'Abd al-Jabbār's denial of the fact that Fadak was in her possession is not supported by any proof. And it is correct to say that if Fadak was in her possession, it would be understood to be her property. It is established through many chains that after the verse of Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl was revealed, Rasūlullāh ﷺ gave her Fadak. However, we did not come across any proof substantiating that it was taken out of her possession. Therefore, it cannot be denied without proof.

However, he failed to present any text from our books that proves that Fadak was in fact in her possession, she had appointed an administrator over it, and she would receive the income of Fadak.

Dildār 'Alī presented only a rational argument instead of a textual one in *Imād al-Islām*. He says:

المسئلة الثانية أن فداك كانت في يد فاطمة يدل عليه إطباق الإمامية و رواياتهم كما مرت و أيضا يدل عليه أنك قد عرفت أن روايات العامة و الإمامية تدل أن النبي كان مأمورا بإعطاء فاطمة فداك و كان واجبا عليه أن يرفع يده عنها و يجعلها تحت يد فاطمة و عقد الهبة بدون تسليم فداك لها لا يصح و لا يخرج رسول الله عما في ذمته من أداء أمر الله تعالى و أيضا يدل عليه ما مر من عبارة علمائهم المسطور في الطرائف و أيضا يدل على كون فداك في يد فاطمة أنه استشهد أبو بكر فاطمة على ما ادعته من النحلة فلو لم يكن في يدها لكان الاستشهاد عبثا لأنه معلوم أن الهبة بدون القبض كالهبة فح كان كافيا لأبي بكر أن يقول إنك و إن كنت صادقة في ذلك لكنك تعلمين أن الهبة بدون القبض لا تنفيذ بل كان هذا أولى لأن في الاستشهاد من بنت رسول الله و رد شهادة امرأتين من أهل الجنة قباحة لا تقدر أحد على إخفائها

Second Mas'alah: Fadak was in Fāṭimah's possession. The declaration of the Imāmiyyah and their narrations which have passed are proof to this. What also attests to this is that you are well aware that the narrations

of the Sunnī and Shī'ah indicate to the fact that the Nabī ﷺ was instructed to gift Fadak to Fāṭimah. Following this, it was compulsory for him to remove his possession from it and give it into Fāṭimah's possession. The gift transaction without handing Fadak over to her is not correct and Rasūlullāh ﷺ would not have then fulfilled the directive of Allah ﷻ.

Moreover, the texts of their 'Ulamā' written in *al-Ṭarā'if* is proof to this. Another evidence to prove that Fadak was in Fāṭimah's possession is that Abū Bakr asked Fāṭimah to present witnesses for the gift claim she made. Had it not been in her possession, asking her to present witnesses would have been futile because it is common knowledge that a gift without taking possession of it is like no gift. In such a case, it would have been sufficient for Abū Bakr to say, "Although, you are truthful in your claim, however you are aware that a gift without taking physical possession of the item is not complete." In fact, this would have been more appropriate since asking Rasūlullāh's ﷺ daughter for witnesses and rejecting the testimony of two women from Jannah is so detestable that no one is able to conceal it.

The author indicated towards *al-Ṭarā'if*. However, we have the book in front of us at the moment but find no narration of ours proving that Sayyidah Fāṭimah ﷺ had possession of Fadak. Had there been any such narration, the author would have reported it. If anyone is in doubt, let him study *al-Ṭarā'if* and present a narration therefrom.

Dildār 'Alī's failure to report a narration shows that he could not locate one. Had he found any narration – whether ṣaḥīḥ or ḍa'īf, original or fabricated – he would not have spared it.

Regarding his analogy that if she did not take possession, the gift transaction would not be complete since taking possession is necessary, this is based on the narration that states that Rasūlullāh ﷺ gifted her Fadak after the revelation of the verse in Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl. We have destroyed this foundation, so the analogical building he constructed upon it also falls to the ground.

She being asked to present witnesses supports our stance because had Rasūlullāh ﷺ really gifted her Fadak, she would have been in possession of the same. Moreover, the land would have had income worth 24000 gold coins and would have remained in her possession for 3 to 4 years. She would have had her administrators looking after it and would have received the income. This is such an affair which cannot be hidden. Therefore, there would be no reason to ask for witnesses in the first place. Had Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ sought this, then an adequate answer would be:

القروض دليل الملك

Possession is proof of ownership.

It would have been very easy for her to then show the Muhājirīn and Anṣār the oppression of the khalīfah of the time. She would have said, “Until yesterday, I had full possession of this land and received the income. He snatched it away from me and asks me to present witnesses. Is there any greater witness than physical possession? And was this matter a secret?”

Had she said this, the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُمْ would have been affected and would have understood the oppression and tyranny of the khalīfah of the time. If hypothetically we agree that they were hell bent on harming her and participating in the oppression, then she would have a strong case against them. Not presenting this despite having such a huge testimony, not highlighting her possession over the land, and not displaying her administration is sufficient proof that she did not have possession over the land in the first place. When there is no possession, then the gift was not complete. Now claiming it was gifted is of no value.

Did Fāṭimah claim that Fadak was gifted to her in the court of Abū Bakr or not?

Let us study all the Shīʿī books that have been mentioned previously and see what proof they have furnished for this claim.

The gist of what *al-Shāfi* contains in answer to *al-Mughnī* is that Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا was right, and the one who prevented her and asked her to present witnesses was wrong. This is due to the fact that she is infallible, hence independent from presenting witnesses. Her claim is sufficient. He then presented the verse of the Qur’ān which states:

إِنَّمَا يُرِيدُ اللَّهُ لِيُذْهِبَ عَنْكُمُ الرِّجْسَ أَهْلَ الْبَيْتِ

Allah intends only to remove from you the impurity [of sin], O people of the [Prophet’s] household.¹

He then goes on a rant about Sayyidunā Khuzaymah dhū al-shahādātayn (the Ṣaḥābī whose individual testimony is considered as two) and gets emotional asking if Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا was more insignificant than him, and was there any doubt of her speaking anything but the truth. However, he failed miserably at bringing any ṣaḥīḥ narration to prove that she made such a claim and witnesses were sought from her. Nonetheless, he brought two baseless narrations without referencing them. We can declare with almost certainly, that they are Shīrī narrations.

The first narration states:

و قد روي أن أبا بكر لما شهد لها أمير المؤمنين كتب بتسليم فدك أليها فاعترض عمر قضيته فخرق ما كتبه روى إبراهيم بن محمد الثقفي عن إبراهيم بن ميمون قال حدثنا عيسى بن عبد الله بن محمد بن عمر بن علي بن ابي طالب عن أبيه عن جده علي قال جاءت فاطمة إلى أبي بكر وقالت إن أبي أعطاني فدك و علي يشهد و أم أيمن قال ما كنت لتقولي إلا الحق نعم قد أعطاك أبوك و دعا بصحيفة من أديم فكتب لها فيها فخرجت فلقيت عمر قال من أين جئت يا فاطمة قالت من عند أبي بكر أخبرته أن رسول الله أعطاني فدكا و علي يشهد و أم أيمن فأعطانيها و كتبها لي فأخذ عمر منها الكتاب ثم رجع إلى أبي بكر فقال أعطيت فاطمة فدكا و كتبت بها لها قال نعم قال عمر علي يجر إلى نفعه و أم أيمن امرأة و بصق في الصحيفة و معاها و قد روي هذا المعنى من وجوه مختلفة من أراد الوقوف عليها و استقصائها أخذها من مواضعها و ليس لهم أن يقولوا أنها أخبار آحاد إن كانت كذلك فأقل أحوالها أن يوجب الظن و يمنع من القطع على خلاف معناها

1 *Al-Mufradāt fī Gharīb al-Qur’ān* pg. 28.

It is reported that when Amīr al-Mu'minīn gave testimony in the presence of Abū Bakr, he wrote that Fadak be handed over to her. 'Umar objected to his decision and tore up what he wrote.

Accordingly, Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad al-Thaqafī narrates from Ibrāhīm ibn Maymūn who says that 'Isā ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Umar ibn 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib narrated to them from his father from his grandfather 'Alī:

Fāṭimah came to Abū Bakr and said, “Indeed, my father gifted me Fadak. 'Alī and Umm Ayman will bear witness to this.”

He said, “It is only appropriate for you to speak nothing but the truth. Yes, indeed your father gave it to you.”

He then called for a leather document and recorded it in her name.

She left and met 'Umar en route who asked, “Where have you come from O Fāṭimah?”

She replied, “From Abū Bakr. I informed him that Rasūlullāh ﷺ gave me Fadak and 'Alī and Umm Ayman gave testimony. Thus, he gave it to me and recorded it in my name.”

'Umar took the document from her and went to Abū Bakr and asked, “You gave Fāṭimah Fadak and documented for her?”

He replied in the affirmative.

'Umar objected, “'Alī is drawing benefit for himself and Umm Ayman is a woman.” He then spat into the document and erased it.

This subject has been reported from many different angles. Whoever desires to study them and encompass them should check them up at their places.

They cannot say that they are simply akhbār āḥād. Even if this be the case, the least it does is that it necessitates *al-ẓann* (strong thought) and prevents *al-qaṭʿ* (conviction) of its opposing meaning.¹

The second narration is regarding Sayyidunā ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz returning Fadak. It goes as follows:

وقد روى محمد بن زكريا الغلابي عن شيوئخه عن أبي المقدم هشام بن زياد مولى آل عثمان قال لما ولى عمر بن عبد العزيز فرد ذلك على ولد فاطمة و كتب إلى واليه على المدينة أبي بكر عمر بن حزم بأمره بذلك فكتب إليه أن فاطمة قد ولدت في آل عثمان و آل فلان و آل فلان فكتب إليه أما بعد فإني لو كنت كتبت إليك أمرك ان تذبح شاة لسألتني جماء أو قرناء أو كتبت إليه أن تذبح بقرة لسألتني ما لوئها فإذا ورد عليك كتابي هذا فاقسمها بين ولد فاطمة من علي قال أبو المقدم فنقمت بنو أمية ذلك على عمر بن عبد العزيز و عاتبوه فيه و قالوا له هجنت فعل الشيخين و خرج إليه عمر بن عبس في جماعة من أهل الكوفة فلما عاتبوه على فعله قال إنكم جهلتم و علمت و نسيتم و ذكرت أن أبا بكر محمد بن عمرو بن حزم حدثني عن أبيه عن جده أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم قال فاطمة بضعة مني ليسخطني ما يسخطها و يرضني ما يرضيها و إن فدك كانت صافية على عهد أبي بكر و عمر ثم صار أمرها إلى مروان فوهبها لأبي عبد العزيز فورثتها أنا و إخوتي فسألتهم أن يبيعوني حصتهم منها فمنهم من باعني و منهم من وهب لي حتى استحقها فرأيت أن أردّها على ولد فاطمة فقالوا إن أبيت إلا هذا فامسك الأصل و اقسام الغلة ففعل

Muḥammad ibn Zakariyyā al-Ghulābī reports from his shuyūkh from Abū al-Miqdām Hishām ibn Ziyād the freed slave of the family of ʿUthmān who narrates, “When ʿUmar ibn ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz assumed the position of khalīfah, he returned Fadak to the children of Fāṭimah and wrote to his governor over Madīnah Abū Bakr ʿUmar ibn Ḥazm instructing him accordingly.”

The governor wrote to him that Fāṭimah has children in the family of ʿUthmān, the family of so and so and so and so.

So ʿUmar wrote to him:

After praising Allah, had I written to you commanding you to slaughter a sheep, you would have certainly asked me whether it should be horned or not. Or had I written to you asking you to

1 *Al-Shāfi* pg. 235.

slaughter a cow, you would have asked me regarding its colour. When this letter of mine reaches you, distribute it [Fadak] among the children of Fāṭimah from ‘Alī.

Abū al-Miqdām reports further, “The Banū Umayyah were resentful towards ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz because of this and condemned him for it. They said, ‘You have run down the action of Abū Bakr and ‘Umar.’”

‘Umar ibn ‘Abs came to him with a group from Kūfah. When they rebuked him for his action, he said, “You are ignorant while I have knowledge. You have forgotten while I remember. Indeed, Abū Bakr Muḥammad ibn ‘Amr ibn Ḥazm reported to me from his father from his grandfather that Rasūlullāh ﷺ said, ‘Fāṭimah is a part of me. What displeases her displeases me and what pleases her pleases me.’ Certainly, Fadak was undisturbed in the era of Abū Bakr and ‘Umar. Then it fell into the hands of Marwān who gifted it to my father ‘Abd al-‘Azīz. Subsequently, I and my brothers inherited it. I asked them to sell to me their respective shares. Some sold it to me while others gave it to me until I became the sole owner of it. And I feel that I should return it to the children of Fāṭimah.”

They said, “If you wish to do nothing but this, then keep the land and distribute the produce.” He acceded to their request.¹

The author of *Talkhīṣ al-Shāfi* has recorded these very narrations. However, he failed to reference them which suggests that he did not find it in any Sunnī book. After quoting these two narrations, he writes the incident of Ma‘mūn returning Fadak to the progeny of Fāṭimah, again without any reference:

و مما يدل على صحة دعويها النحل وإن ذلك كان معروفا شاعرا ما كان من عمر بن عبد العزيز من رد فلك على ولدها لما تبين أن الحق كان معها وكذلك فعل المأمون فإنه نصب لها وكيلا لأبي بكر وجس للقضاء وحكم لها بذلك ولو لم يكن الأمر معروفا معلوما لما فعلوا ذلك مع موضعهم من الخلافة و سلطانهم الذي أرادوا حفظ قلوب الرعية وان لا يفعلوها يوي إلى تنفيرهم و ليس لأحد أن ينكر ذلك يدفعه لأن الأمر في ذلك أظهر من أن يخفى

1 *Al-Shāfi* pg. 236.

One of the indications of the correctness of her gift claim and that this was well known among the people is that ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz returned Fadak to her children after it became apparent that she was upon the truth. Similarly, the action of Ma’mūn who appointed for her a lawyer and a lawyer for Abū Bakr and then sat to pass judgement and passed judgement in her favour. Had the matter not been common knowledge among them, they would not have done this. Due to their position as khalīfah and their kingdom, they intended to win the hearts of their subordinates and had they not done so, it would have led to people despising them. No one can deny this fact for it is akin to concealing the sun in broad daylight.¹

‘Allāmah Ḥillī quoted the following narration of al-Wāqidi in *Kashf al-Ḥaqq*:

وروى الواقدي وغيره من نقلة الأخبار عندهم وذكروه في الأخبار الصحيحة أن النبي لما افتتح خيبر اصطفى قري من قري اليهود فنزل جبريل بهذه الآية وآت ذا القربى حقه فقال محمد ومن ذوي القربى وما حقه قال فاطمة فدفع إليها فذك والعوالي فاستغلتها حتى توفي أبوها عليه الصلوة والسلام فلما بويع أبو بكر منعها وكلمته في ردها إليها وقالت إنهما لي فأبي دفعها إلي فقال أبو بكر فلا أمنعك ما دفع إليك أبوك فأراد أن يكتب لها كتابا فاستوقفه عمر بن الخطاب وقال إنها امرأة فطالبها بالبينة على ما ادعته فأمرها أبو بكر فجاءت بأُم أيمن وأسماء بنت عميس مع علي فشهدوا بذلك فكتب لها أبو بكر فبلغ ذلك عمر فأخذ الصحيفة فمحاها فحلفت أن لا تكلمهما وماتت وهي ساخطة عليهما

Al-Wāqidi and other narrators of aḥādīth among the Sunnī have reported in ṣaḥīḥ narrations that when the Nabī ﷺ conquered Khaybar, he selected few villages of the Jews from himself. Just then Jibrīl descended with the verse: *And give the relative his right*. Rasūlullāh ﷺ asked, “Who is the relative and what is his right?”

He explained, “Fāṭimah.”

Thus, he gave her Fadak and the ‘awālī (top villages) of the area. She continued receiving the produce from these lands until her father ﷺ passed away. When allegiance was taken at the hands of Abū Bakr, he prevented her from it. She spoke to him regarding him returning it to her and said, “It belongs to me. My father gave it to me.”

1 *Talkhīṣ al-Shāfi* pg. 409.

Hearing this Abū Bakr said, “I will not prevent you from something your father gave you.”

He thus intended writing for her a document, but ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb prevented him saying, “She is only a woman so ask her to furnish proof over what she claimed.”

Abū Bakr instructed her accordingly. She thus brought Umm Ayman and Asmā’ bint ‘Umays with ‘Alī who gave testimony in her favour. Abū Bakr then wrote for her a document. News of this reached ‘Umar who took the document and erased it. She then swore that she will not speak to them and passed away angry with them.¹

The second narration he records is of Ma’mūn, without any isnād or source:

جمع المأمون ألف نفس من الفقهاء و تناظروا و أدى بحثهم إلى رد فذلك على العلويين من ولدها فرد عليهم

Al-Ma’mūn gathered 1000 Fuqahā’ who debated the issue. They came to the conclusion that Fadak be returned to Fāṭimah’s children from ‘Alī. Al-Ma’mūn practiced accordingly.

The third narration is as follows:

Abū Hilāl al-‘Askarī reports in *Akhbār al-Awā’il*² that the first to return Fadak to Fāṭimah’s heirs was ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz.

1 *Iḥqāq al-Ḥaqq* pg. 148.

2

و ذكر أبو هلال العسكري في كتاب أخبار الأوائل أن أول من رد فذلك على ورثة فاطمة عمر بن عبد العزيز و كان معاوية قطعها مروان بن الحكم و عمر بن عثمان و يزيد ابنه ثلاثا ثم غضبت فردها عليهم المهدي ثم غضبت فردها عليهم المأمون ثم قال عن أبي هلال ثم غضبت فردها عليهم الوراق ثم غضبت فردها عليهم المستنصر المعتمد ثم غضبت فردها المعتضد ثم غضبت فردها الراضي مع أن أبا بكر أعطى جابر بن عبد الله عطية ادعاها على رسول الله من غير بيعة و حضر جابر بن عبد الله و ذكر أن النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم وعده أن يجثوا له ثلاث حثيات من مال البحرين فأعطاهما ذلك و لم يطالبه البيعة مع أن العدة لا يجب الوفاء بها و الهبة للولد مع التصرف
توجب التمليك فأقل المراتب أنه كان تجري فاطمة مجراهما

Continued ...

¹⁴Allāmah Faḍl ibn Rawzbahān writes in his book *Ibtāl al-Bāṭil*, a refutation of *Kashf al-Ḥaqq*, that the following answer be given to these baseless fairy tales:

وَأما دعوى فاطمة رضي الله عنها فلم يصح في الصحاح و يذكرونها نقلة الأخبار من أرباب التواريخ
ومجرد نقلهم لا يصير سببا للقدح في الخلفاء

With regards to Fāṭimah's رضي الله عنها claim, it does not feature in the al-Ṣiḥāḥ al-Sittah. On the contrary, the historians have mentioned it. Their mere citing the narration cannot be used to indict the khulafā'.

In answer to this, al-Shūstarī presents no ṣaḥīḥ narration with a chain of narration, but suffices on quoting two baseless statements. One statement appears in *Mu'jam al-Buldān* in relation to Fadak:

وهي التي قالت فاطمة رضي الله عنها إن رسول الله نحلتهما فقال أبو بكر أريد بذلك شهودا لها قصة

Fadak is the same land regarding which Sayyidah Fāṭimah claimed that Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم gifted it to her and Abū Bakr replied, "I need witnesses for this." There is a lengthy incident attached to it.

The second is the incident of 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz and al-Ma'mūn returning Fadak. Nonetheless, there is no reference for the incident nor any isnād. Briefly, it is written therein:

1 continued from page 849

Abū Hilāl al-'Askarī mentioned in *Akhbār al-Awā'il* that the first to return Fadak to Fāṭimah's heirs was 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz. Mu'āwiyah had divided it into thirds between Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam, 'Umar ibn 'Uthmān, and Yazīd his son. It was then usurped and then returned to them by al-Mahdī. It was then usurped and returned to them by al-Ma'mūn. Then it was usurped and returned to them by al-Wāthiq, and then by al-Mustaṣfir al-Mu'tamid, then by al-Mu'taḍid and then by al-Rāḍī.

Despite the fact that Abū Bakr gave Jābir ibn 'Abd Allah after he claimed without any proof that Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم promised him three handfuls from the wealth of Bahrain. He gave him the same without asking him to provide any proof despite the fact that it is not mandatory to fulfil a promise. On the other hand, a gift to the child and administration demands ownership. The least is that Fāṭimah should have been treated the same as them.

لما ولي عمر بن عبد العزيز الخلافة كتب إلى عامله بالمدينة يأمه برد فذك إلى ولد فاطمة رضي الله عنها فكانت في أيديهم أيام عمر بن عبد العزيز فلما ولي يزيد بن عبد الملك قبضها فلم يزل في أيدي بني أمية حتى ولي أبو العباس السفاح الخلافة فدفعها إلى الحسن بن الحسن بن علي بن أبي طالب فكان هو القيم عليها يفرقها في بني علي بن أبي طالب فلما ولي منصور وخرج عليه بنو الحسن قبضها عنهم فلما ولي المهدي بن المنصور الخلافة أعاده عليهم ثم قبضها موسى الهادي و من بعده إلى أيام المأمون فجاء بنو علي فطالبها فأمر أن يسجل لهم بها فكتب السجل و قرأ على المأمون فقام و عبل و أشد شعرا صبح وجه الزمان قد ضحكا برد مأمون هاشما فدكا و في فذك اختلاف كثير في أمرها بعد النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم من رواية أخبروها بحسب الأهواء و شدة

When ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz assumed the position of khilāfah, he wrote to his governor over Madīnah commanding him to return Fadak to the children of Fāṭimah عليها السلام. Consequently, it remained in their possession for the era of ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz. When Yazīd ibn ‘Abd al-Malik became khilāfah, he took control over it and it thereafter remained in the hands of the Banū Umayyah until Abū al-‘Abbās al-Saffāḥ undertook the khilāfah. He gave it to Ḥasan ibn al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib. He remained the administrator and would distribute its produce among the children of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib. When Maṣṣūr became khilāfah and the sons of Ḥasan rebelled against him, he snatched it from them. Thereafter, when Mahdī ibn al- Maṣṣūr became khilāfah, he returned it to them. Then Mūsā al-Hādī took possession of it and those after him thereafter, until the era of al-Ma’mūn. The sons of ‘Alī came to him claiming it. He ordered that a document be written in their name and this was carried out. It was read out to al-Ma’mūn, who stood up after hearing it and sang this couplet:

The face of time has smiled

At Ma’mūn’s return of Fadak to Hāshim

There is much ikhtilāf with regards to Fadak after the Nabī’s صلى الله عليه وسلم demise due to narrators reporting according to their inclinations, prejudice, and extremism.¹

1 Mu’jam al-Buldān pg. 112; Iḥqāq al-Ḥaq pg. 112.

He quotes another narration from *Tārīkh al-Khulafā'* of Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī which briefly explains 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz's incident. He writes:

و أيضا يناقض ذلك ما رواه الشيخ جلال الدين السيوطي الشافعي في تاريخ الخلفاء من أن فدكا كان بعد ذلك حيوة أبي بكر و عمر ثم اقتطعها مروان ... عمر بن عبد العزيز قد رد فدكا إلى بني هاشم و روي أيضا أنه ردها إلى أولاد فاطمة

What Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī al-Shāfi'ī records in *Tārīkh al-Khulafā'* is opposed to this, i.e. that Fadak remained intact in the life of Abū Bakr and 'Umar. Then Marwān divided it ... 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz thereafter returned Fadak to the Banū Hāshim. It is reported in a narration that he returned it to the progeny of Fāṭimah.^{1,2}

Although, al-Shūstarī brings no narration besides the above one, yet he writes at one place:

و أما دعوى النحلة فقد مر نقلا عن كتاب المعجم و قد روي من عدة طرق من طريق غيرها أيضا

Concerning the gift claim, it has been cited from the book *al-Mu'jam*. It has been narrated through many chains besides the above as well.³

He asserts at yet another place:

و إما دعوى فاطمة فدكا إشهر من إن يطلب صحتها في كتب الصحاح إذ قد عم خبرها العلماء و الجهال و السادة الإبتاع الرؤوس الإذئاب و قد مثل به مثل ذلك بخمس مائة سنة بعض حكماء الشعراء بقوله ملك بخشا ينده در حمان ميهون خدمتت جون خلافت بی علی بوده ست و بی زبیرا فدک و اما م ذکره من إن مجرد نقل ابل التواريخ لا يصير حجة و سبأ

1 *Iḥqāq al-Ḥaqq* pg. 112.

2 Al-Shūstarī has erred when quoting the above narration. The actual text of *Tārīkh al-Khulafā'* is that 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz said:

After the demise of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, the orchard of Fadak remained under the supervision of Shaykhayn (Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and 'Umar). O people, bear witness that just as the ownership of this orchard was in the blessed era of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, it will now remain the ownership of all the Muslims. (*Mutarjam Tārīkh al-Khulafā'* – Iqbāl Aḥmad.)

3 *Iḥqāq al-Ḥaqq* pg. 112.

للقدح في الخلفاء فيه ما اشتمل عليه كتب التواريخ من جملة العلوم النقلية فيثبت بما ثبت به غيره من الأمور النقلية و قد تقرر في الإصول إن خبر العدل الواحد في النقلات فيثبت به و إذا بلغ إلى حد الشهرة و التواتر المعنوى استغنى عن التعديل و المنصف لم يتمسك بنا بمجرد رواية الواقدي بل صرح بغيره إشاراً إلى كثرة الإخبار المحكوم عليها بالصحة عند الخصم و أيده بما روى من مناظرة ألف نفس من الفقهاء أيام المأمون في ذلك و إكماله بالحدِيثين المروين عن سيد الحفاظ إبل السنة و صدر إثمتهم و ليس عليه إلا تصحيح النقلان إنكر الناصب وجوده و الإفلتيرك شغبه و وجوده

Fāṭimah's claim over Fadak is more famous than seeking its authenticity in the Ṣiḥāḥ. The incident has reached the 'Ulamā', ignorant, leaders, followers, heads, and subordinates. Some wise poets have composed a couplet about it 500 years ago.

ملك بخشا ينده در حمان ميمون خدمتت جون خلافت يى على بوده ست و بى زبرا فدك

With regards to his claim that the historians simply narrating it cannot be used as proof to indict the *Khulafā'*. The response to this is that if the books of history contain traditional facts which are established in other books then they will be authentic. It has been determined in the principles that the *khbar* (information) of one just person in traditional matters is established and when it has reached the level of *shuhrah* and *al-tawātur al-ma'nawī* (the meaning of which is *mutawātir*) it is independent of any authentication. Al-Ḥillī has not only relied on al-Wāqidī's narration as proof. In fact, he has clearly mentioned others as well. He has also indicated to an abundance of narrations which have been categorised as authentic by the opposition. What supports this is the narration of the debate of 1000 Fuqahā' in the era of al-Ma'mūn. And to top it all are the two narrations of Sayyid al-Ḥuffāz of the Ahl al-Sunnah and their Ṣadr al-A'immah¹. It

1 The report of Sayyid al-Ḥuffāz recorded in *Iḥqāq al-Ḥaqiq* is not concerning the claim of Fadak but rather the gifting of Fadak as we have mentioned previously. Similarly, Ṣadr al-A'immah's narration is concerning the gifting of Fadak. Accordingly, the two narrations are as follows:

و قد روى سيد الحفاظ ابن مردويه بإسناده إلى أبي سعيد قال لما نزلت و آت ذا القربى حقه دعا رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم فاطمة فأعطاهما فدك

Sayyid al-Ḥuffāz Ibn Mardawayh has reported via his isnād to Abū Sa'īd who says: "When the verse And give the relative his right was revealed, Rasūlullāh ﷺ summoned Fāṭimah and gave her Fadak." *continued* ..

¹only devolves upon al-Ḥillī to authenticate the narration if the opposition denies. Otherwise, the opposition should abandon his rejection.

Although, al-Shūstarī claims that al-Ḥillī has provided the reference to other narrations, we have not found any narration is *Kashf al-Ḥaqq* except the ones we narrated. Nor has al-Shūstarī presented any narration or isnād. He sufficed on claiming that it is *mash-hūr*. Both the books printed in Iran are existent. Whoever wishes may study them.

Similarly, despite al-Ḥillī showing off his proficient writing skills and his mastery in literature, he failed miserably at presenting a single *ṣaḥīḥ* narration or a reliable isnād to prove the claim to Fadak's gift in *al-Ṭarā'if*. He speaks about Fadak from page 67 to page 80 in the Mumbai print of the book, but there is no narration besides the incident of al-Ma'mūn and 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz. He sufficed on few expletives and displayed his proficiency with the pen which manages to cause misgivings in the hearts of the unwary. He claims that although Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا was infallible and Sayyidunā 'Alī and Sayyidah Umm Ayman رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا gave testimony in her favour, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ labelled them as liars and thought that they wished to usurp the rights of the Muslims for their own personal gain. People who hear this would become perturbed and reservations towards Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would develop in their hearts.

The truth is that the claim was not made, nor were witnesses demanded, nor was anything rejected. These are all lies and fairy tales. Those 'Ulamā' of the Ahl al-Sunnah who answered these claims, answered them in a hypothetical sense.

1 continued from page 853

وقد روى صدر الأئمة أخطب خوارزم الموفق بن أحمد المكي قال و مما سمعت في معاوية بإسنادي عن ابن عباس قال قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يا علي إن الله زوجك فاطمة وجعل صداقها الأرض فمن مشى عليها مبغضا لها مشى حراما

Ṣadr al-'Immah Akhṭab Khawārizm al-Muwaffaq ibn Aḥmad al-Makkī reports, "From among the narrations I heard concerning Mu'āwiyah is via my isnād from Ibn 'Abbās who narrates that Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ said, 'O 'Alī! Indeed Allah has married Fāṭimah to you and has made her dowry the earth. Hence, whoever walks on it harbouring hatred for her, his walking is ḥarām.

The Shī'ah's clamour and uproar is all a hoax. It was mandatory for them to present a ṣaḥīḥ narration as their basis from our books. Then they could have uttered and written whatever drivel they wished to. All this commotion over a baseless fairy-tale is ludicrous to say the least.

While quoting the incident of al-Ma'mūn in *al-Ṭarā'if*, he writes:

It is amazing and astonishing that although they appreciated the piety, honour, and grandeur of Fāṭimah bint Rasūlillāh ﷺ, yet they oppressed her in many different ways and trampled upon her and her father's honour. Despite them believing her to be the Queen of Jannah, they harmed and hurt her in various ways. Accordingly, the historians have narrated a lengthy address which was written and read out in the season of Ḥajj at the command of the 'Abbāsī khalīfah al-Ma'mūn. The author of *Tārīkh 'Abbāsī* has recorded it and the Roman Faqīh and author of history has indicated towards it while discussing the happenings of the year 212 A.H.

The incident goes as follows:

The children of Sayyidunā Ḥasan and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ﷺ claimed the cessation of their possession in front of the Khalīfah al-Ma'mūn by asserting that Fadak and the 'awālī belonged to their mother Fāṭimah bint Muḥammad ﷺ. But Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ﷺ snatched it away from her and they now demand justice and an end to the oppression. Al-Ma'mūn gathered 200 'Ulamā' from al-Ḥijāz and Iraq and emphasised upon them to observe honesty and to follow the truth. He explained to them the case of the heirs of Sayyidah Fāṭimah ﷺ and asked them if they knew any ṣaḥīḥ ḥadīth in that regard. Many 'Ulamā' quoted the narration of Bishr ibn al-Walīd, al-Wāqīdī, and Bishr ibn Ghiyāth with an isnād to Muḥammad ﷺ that when Khaybar was conquered, Rasūlullāh ﷺ selected few villages of the Jews for himself. Just then, Sayyidunā Jibrīl عليه السلام descended with the verse *And give the relative his right*. Rasūlullāh ﷺ enquired as to who the relative was and what his right was. Jibrīl explained that it was Fāṭimah,

so Rasūlullāh ﷺ gave her Fadak and thereafter ‘awālī which remained in her sole possession until the demise of her father. When Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ؓ was elected as khalīfah, he told her that he cannot prevent her from something her father gifted her and wanted to write a documents for her. However, ‘Umar told Abū Bakr that she is a woman and he should demand witnesses from her. Accordingly, Abū Bakr asked her to present witnesses. Fāṭimah presented Sayyidah Umm Ayman, Asmā’ bint ‘Umays, and ‘Alī ؓ. ‘Umar heard of this so he came to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ؓ who explained that they all gave witness in her favour so he wrote a document for her. ‘Umar snatched the document away clarifying that she is a woman and Sayyidunā ‘Alī ؓ is her husband who wishes to procure benefit for himself. And the testimony of two female witnesses without a man is not valid. Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ؓ sent this information to Sayyidah Fāṭimah ؓ. She swore on oath, “By Allah besides whom they is no deity. They have presented a worthy testimony.”

Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ؓ said, “Probably, you are truthful, but present more witnesses who do not desire personal gain.”

She retorted, “Did you not hear my father declaring Asmā’ bint ‘Umays and Umm Ayman women of Jannah?”

They agreed. She said, “Then will women of Jannah give false testimony?”

She became upset and went home. She would scream to her father, “My father informed me that I will be the first to meet him. I swear by Allah that I will complain to him of this.”

She then fell ill and bequeathed to Sayyidunā ‘Alī not to allow Abū Bakr and ‘Umar to join in her Ṣalāt al-Janāzah. She ignored them and did not speak to them until she passed away. ‘Alī and ‘Abbās buried her at night.

In that very gathering and on that very day, al-Ma'mūn returned Fadak to the heirs of Fāṭimah.

On the second day, he summoned a thousand Fuqahā' and explained to them the situation and cautioned them to fear Allah. They debated the issue and were divided into two groups. One group said that the husband desires personal benefit so his testimony is not accepted. Nonetheless, Sayyidah Fāṭimah's oath established her claim with the witness of two women. The second group said that they do not regard a ruling to be compulsory upon an oath coupled with a testimony. Nevertheless, the testimony of a husband is permissible. They do not regard him to be procuring benefit for himself, hence his testimony together with the two women's testimony established her claim. In short, although they differed in their approach they reached the same conclusion, i.e. Fāṭimah is entitled to Fadak and 'awālī.

Al-Ma'mūn then asked them to mention the virtues of Sayyidunā 'Alī عليه السلام. They quoted an abundance of virtues which are mentioned in Ma'mūn's letter. He then asked them about Fāṭimah عليها السلام and they mentioned many statements of her father in her favour. He then enquired from them about Sayyidah Umm Ayman and Sayyidah Asmā' bint 'Umays عليها السلام and they presented a narration of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم confirming that they are among the dwellers of Jannah. Al-Ma'mūn then said, "Is it fathomable or believable that Sayyidunā 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib عليه السلام despite his abstinence and righteousness would give false testimony in favour of Sayyidunā Fāṭimah عليها السلام whereas Allah and His Messenger attest to their superiority? Is it possible for them, keeping in mind their knowledge and excellence, to be prepared to give testimony for something that had no knowledge of? It is conceivable for Sayyidah Fāṭimah عليها السلام considering her infallibility, worship, and being the Queen of the women of the universe, or the Queen of the women of Jannah which you have just narrated to claim something not hers swearing on oath: 'there is no deity but Allah,' thereby harming the Muslims? It is perceivable for Umm Ayman and Asmā' bint 'Umays to give false testimony despite them being women of Jannah? Undoubtedly, criticising Fāṭimah is criticising the Book of Allah and heretism in Dīn. This can never be correct."

He then mentioned to them a ḥadīth stating that after the demise of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ announced that whoever Rasūlullāh ﷺ owes anything or whomsoever Rasūlullāh ﷺ promised anything should approach him. Many people came to him and claimed and he fulfilled all their demands without seeking any witness. Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ﷺ also made a similar announcement and Jarīr ibn ‘Abd Allāh came and claimed a promise which was fulfilled without demanding any witnesses. Then Sayyidunā Jābir ibn ‘Abd Allāh ﷺ claimed that Rasūlullāh ﷺ promised him a third of the wealth from Bahrain and Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ﷺ fulfilled this when the wealth from Bahrain came. Whereas both of them presented no witnesses.

‘Abd al-Maḥmūd says that Ḥumaydī has mentioned this ḥadīth in *al-Jam‘ Bayn al-Ṣaḥīḥayn*, the ninth ḥadīth of Muslim, in the Musnad of Jābir. Sayyidunā Jābir ﷺ reports, “I counted them and they were 500.” Abū Bakr ﷺ told him to take an equal amount more.

‘Abd al-Maḥmūd says that it is written in al-Ma’mūn’s letter that he was extremely astonished at this ḥadīth and exclaimed, “Was Fāṭimah and her witnesses not even equal to Jarīr and Jābir ibn ‘Abd Allāh?”

Al-Ma’mūn then emphasised that this letter be written and read out in the season of Ḥajj in front of all the people. He then gave Fadak and ‘awālī into the possession of Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib so he may administer it and divide its produce among the heirs of Fāṭimah ﷺ.

The incident of ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz returning Fadak is recorded in *Akhbār al-Awā’il* of Abū Hilāl al-‘Askarī just as it appears in *Kashf al-Ḥaqq*.

In *Biḥār al-Anwār*, there is no reliable narration quoted from our books.

Similarly, Dildār ‘Alī presented no narration with an authentic isnād. The only thing mentioned in *Imād al-Islām* is the incident of al-Ma’mūn and his returning of Fadak which he quoted verbatim from *al-Ṭarā’if*. He writes in the first mas’alah of the fourth fā’idah:

و قال السيد علي بن طاؤس في الطرائف و من الطرائف العجيبة

Al-Sayyid ibn Ṭā'ūs says in *al-Ṭarā'if*, “And one of the amazing incidents ...”

A little further, he quotes the narration of Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Shabbah from *al-Ṣawā'iq al-Muhriqah* and *Jawāhir al-'Aqdayn*:

المسئلة الثالثة هل فاطمة ادعت النحلة أم لا يدل على صحة وقوع تلك الدعوى ما في الباب الثاني من الصواعق المحرقة و في الأدب السابع من الذكر الخامس عشر من القسم الثاني من جواهر العقدين للسيد سهمودي أخرج الحافظ ابن شبه عن النمير بن الحسان قال قلت لزيد بن علي هو أخو الباقر و أنا أريد أن أهجن أمر أبي بكر إن أبا بكر انتزع من فاطمة رضي الله عنها فذك فقال إن أبا بكر كان رجلا رحيمًا و كان يكره أن يغير شيئًا تركه رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم فأنته فاطمة فقالت إن رسول الله أعطاني فذك فقال هل لك على هذا بينة فجاءت بعلي فشهد لها ثم جاءت بأم أيمن فقالت أليس تشهد أنني من أهل الجنة قال بلى قالت فأشهد أن النبي أعطها فذك فقال أبو بكر لرجل و امرأة تستحقينها إلى آخر القصة

Mas'alah 3: Did Fāṭimah claim a gift or not. What appears in the second chapter of *al-Ṣawā'iq al-Muhriqah* and the seventh adab of dhikr fifteen of the second section of *Jawāhir al-'Aqdayn* of Sayyid Sahnūdī which Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Shabbah has recorded from Numayr ibn al-Ḥassān who narrates:

I said to Zayd ibn 'Alī, the brother of al-Bāqir and I was intending to disparage Abū Bakr, “Indeed Abū Bakr snatched Fadak from Fāṭimah.”

He said, “Certainly, Abū Bakr was a merciful man. He disliked changing anything Rasūlullāh ﷺ had left. Fāṭimah came to him and said, ‘Rasūlullāh ﷺ gave me Fadak.’

He said, ‘Do you have any proof for this?’

She brought 'Alī who testified for her. She then brought Umm Ayman who said, ‘Do you not testify that I am from the dwellers of Jannah?’

He replied in the affirmative. ‘So I testify that the Nabī ﷺ gave her Fadak.’

Upon this Abū Bakr exclaimed, ‘Can a claim be established with the testimony of one man and one woman?’” until the end of the incident.

The author did not mention the rest of the incident. It goes as follows:

Zayd ibn 'Alī declared, "By Allah, had this matter been presented to me, I would have passed the same judgement as Abū Bakr:"

وفي الفصل الخامس من الباب الأول من كتاب الصواعق المحرقة ودعواها أنه نحلها فدكا لم تأت عليها إلا بعلي و أم أيمن فلم يكمل نصاب البينة على أن في قبول الشهادة الزوج لزوجته خلافا بين العلماء و عدم حكمه بشاهد و يمين إما لعله لكونه ممن لا يراه كالكثيرين من العلماء أو إنها لم تطلب الحلف مع من شهد لهما و زعمهم أن الحسن و الحسين و أم كلثوم شهدوا لها باطل على أن شهادة الفرع و الصغيرة غير مقبولة

It appears in section five of chapter two of *al-Şawā'iq al-Muḥriqah*:

Fāṭimah's claim that Rasūlullāh ﷺ gave her Fadak; since she only presented 'Alī and Umm Ayman as witnesses, the quota was not fulfilled. Another aspect is that there is a difference of opinion between the 'Ulamā' regarding acceptance of a husband's testimony in favour of his wife. And his inability to pass judgement on one witness coupled with an oath either because he does not agree to it like majority of 'Ulamā' or she did not take an oath with their testimonies. Their belief that Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, and Umm Kulthūm testified on her behalf is erroneous since the testimony of a descendant and an immature person is unacceptable.

و في المقصد الرابع من المرصد الرابع من المواقف السادس من شرح المواقف فإن قيل ادعت فاطمة أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم نحلها فدكا و شهد علي و الحسن و الحسين و أم كلثوم و الصحيح أم أيمن فرد أبو بكر شهادتهم قلنا أما الحسن و الحسين و أم كلثوم فلقصورهما نصاب البينة

In maqṣad 4 of marṣad 4 of mawqaf 6 of *Sharḥ al-Wāqif* it appears:

If the objection is raised that Fāṭimah claimed that Rasūlullāh ﷺ gifted Fadak to her and 'Alī, Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, and Umm Kulthūm gave testimony as well as Umm Ayman in the authentic version which was rejected by Abū Bakr. We will answer by saying that Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, and Umm Kulthūm's testimony did not meet the desired quota.¹

1 'Imād al-Islām.

This is all that Dildār ‘Alī could write. The Shī‘ah also claim that Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها told Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه that sufficient evidence of her ownership is that Fadak was in her possession. We hoped that ‘*Imād al-Islām*, a voluminous and comprehensive book of this nature would have at least contained one narration from our books to prove these claims. But unfortunately, this was not the case. This shows that he could not locate even a ḍa‘īf ḥadīth or an unreliable narration from our books just to save face.

Thereafter, the only hope left was that *Ṭa‘n al-Rimāḥ* would contain such a narration. However, it is remorseful indeed that our hope turned into despair after studying the book. The author sufficed on quoting the very same incidents that his predecessors and father had written, or providing reference to some of those statements. Besides this, he could not furnish a single ṣaḥīḥ narration with a reliable isnād to prove his claim. It is owing to this, that this book is considered by those who share his ideologies as “an unanswerable book.” Nevertheless, among the narrations and statements the author quoted from the books of his predecessors and the fresh statements that he made, one is the narration of Numayr ibn Ḥassān which relates the incident of Zayd being asked about Fadak. He writes:

ابن حجر در باب ثانی صواعق محرقة و سید سہمودی در جوابہر العقیدین از حافظ ابن شبہ روایت کرده و اللفظ للإخیر
عن النمیر بن حسان قال قلت لزید بن علی و إنا إرید ان إیجن إبا بکر الخ

Ibn Hajar in chapter 2 of *al-Ṣawā‘iq al-Muḥriqah* and Sayyid Sahnūdī in *Jawāhir al-‘Aqdayn* report from Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Shabbah and the wording is of Sahnūdī’s from Numayr ibn al-Ḥassān who narrates: “I said to Zayd ibn ‘Alī, the brother of al-Bāqir and I was intending to disparage the action of Abū Bakr ...”

After quoting the exact words of ‘*Imād al-Islām*, the author says:

ابن روایت صریح ست درین کہ جناب سیدہ نزد ابی بکر ائدہ دعوی بہیہ فرمودہ و او گواہ و شاہد طلب نمود و جناب
باب مدینة العلم و نفس رسول و ام ایمن کہ بنا بر حدیث متفق علیہ نبوی مبشر بہشت و بد و ابو بکر نیز بیان اقرار نمود
ادانے شہادت کردند پس او قبول نہ کرد و گفت از گواہی یک مرد و یک زن حق نمی شود انتہی

This narration clearly states that Fāṭimah claimed the gifting of Fadak in the presence of Abū Bakr who demanded witnesses. ‘Alī and Umm Ayman – who are according to the aḥādīth dwellers of Jannah – gave testimony, yet Abū Bakr did not accept it saying that a claim is not established by the testimony of one man and one woman.

The author quotes another narration from *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah* of Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd from Abū Bakr al-Jawharī:

و ايضا ابو بكر جوهری كه كنيته شريفش شايد عدل نصب و تسس اوست روايت کرده

قالت فاطمة رضي الله عنها إن أم أيمن تشهد أن رسول الله أعطاني فذك فقال لها يا بنت رسول الله و الله ما خلق الله خلقا أحب إلي من رسول الله أبيك و لوددت أن السماء تقع على الأرض يوم مات أبوك إلى أن قال إن هذا لما لم يكن للنبي إنما كان مال من أموال المسلمين يحمل به الرجال و ينفقه في سبيل الله فلما توفي رسول الله وليته كما كان يوليه قالت و الله لا كلمتك أبدا قال لا هجرتك أبدا قالت و الله لأدعون الله عليك قال و الله لا دعوت الله لك فلما حضرتها الوفاة أوصت أن لا يصلي عليها فدفنت ليلا انتهى على مما نقله ابن أبي الحديد

Abū Bakr al-Jawharī whose agnomen is proof of him being Sunnī and Nāṣibī reports:

Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها said, “Umm Ayman testifies that Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم gave me Fadak.”

He said, “O daughter of the Messenger of Allah! By Allah, Allah did not create a creation more beloved to me that the Messenger of Allah your father. I desired that the sky fall upon the earth the day your father passed on ...

This land did not belong to the Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم but was instead part of the wealth of the Muslims used to buy conveyances for the warriors and spent in the path of Allah. When Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم passed away, I was made administrator over it just as he was.”

She said, “By Allah, I will never speak to you ever.”

He retorted, “I will never stop speaking to you.”

She said, “By Allah, I will invoke the curse of Allah upon you.”

He retorted, “By Allah, I will never supplicate for you.”

When death approached her, she bequeathed that he should not perform Ṣalāt al-Janāzah upon her. Hence, she was buried at night.

This has been reported from Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd.

The third narration Mujtahid brings is the incident of ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz which he quotes from *Akhbār al-Awā’il*, *Mu’jam al-Buldān*, and *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah*. He quotes the very same thing his father Dildār ‘Alī and al-Shūstarī mentioned.

The fourth narration is of al-Ma’mūn as appears in *al-Ṭarā’if*. The only difference is that it is the Persian translation.

The fifth narration is taken from *Ma’ārij al-Nubuwwah* which appears in *‘Imād al-Islām* wherein mention is made that Rasūlullāh ﷺ wrote a document for Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا and this was furnished in front of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. He writes:

و ایضا در روضه الصفا و بهم در کتاب معارج النبوت که مشهور بسیر ملا معین بروی است از مقصد اقصی نقل کرده
که بعضی می گوید الخ

Furthermore, it has been reported in *Rawḍat al-Ṣafā* and the book *Ma’ārij al-Nubuwwah* which is famously known as *Siyar Mullā Mu’īn Harawī* quoting from *Maqṣad Aqṣā* that some have said ...

He then quotes the very same words that appear in *‘Imād al-Islām*.

The sixth narration is from *al-Milal wa al-Niḥal* of *Shaharastānī*:

الخلاف الثالث في أمر فذك و التوارث عن النبي و دعوى فاطمة رضي الله عنها على نبينا و عليها السلام ورائه تارة و تمليكا أخرى حتى دفعت عن ذلك بالرواية المشهورة عن النبي نحن سائر الأنبياء لا نورث ما تركناه صدقة

The third difference is regarding Fadak, inheriting from the Nabī ﷺ, and Fāṭimah's claim – may peace be upon our Nabī and her – over inheritance once and possession at another juncture until it was rejected with the mash-hūr narration from the Nabī ﷺ, “We all the Ambiyā’ are not inherited from, whatever we leave behind is ṣadaqah.”

Seventh narration, he provides reference to *Mawāqif* and *Sharḥ Mawāqif* and quotes the very same words from *‘Imād al-Islām*.

At number eight, he brought the sanad of *Nihāyat al-‘Uqūl* and quoted verbatim what *‘Imād al-Islām* contains in answer to this book.

الفائدة الرابعة فيما يتعلق بنحلة النبي قال الرازي مجيبا عما ذكر من قبل الإمامية ثانيا منعها فذكا بأنه لو وجب عليه تصديقها في هذه الدعوى لكان ذلك المال ما يذكرونه من وجوب عصمتها و قد سبق الكلام عليه أو للبيئة لكن البيئة الرعية ما كانت حاصلة لا يقال فيلزم أن تكون طالبة عن ذلك من غير بيئة و ذلك لا يليق بها لأننا نقول لعلها كانت تذهب إلى أن الحكم بالشاهد الواحد و اليمين جائز كما ذهب إليه بعضهم و أن أبا بكر ما كان يذهب إلى ذلك

Fourth *fā'idah* which concerns the Nabī's gift. Al-Rāzī says answering what the Imāmiyyah say: “Secondly, he denied her Fadak. Had it been mandatory upon him to believe her in this claim, then it would have been either due to her infallibility (which they believe in) and the discussion over this has passed, or due to her proof. However, the full quota was not reached.

It would not be said that she claimed something without proof since this is not befitting for her personality. Rather we would say that perhaps her opinion was that passing judgement upon one witness coupled with an oath is permissible as some have opted for. On the other hand, Abū Bakr held a different view.

Al-Kantūrī has claimed in *Tash'īd al-Maṭā'in* that he presented proofs from 25 books in response to *Tuḥfah Ithnā 'Ashariyyah*. He says:

اما آنچه گفته جواب ازین طعن آنکه دعوی همه از حضرت زهرا و شهادت دادن حضرت علی و ام ایمن یا حسنین علی اختلاف الروایات در کتب اهل سنت اصلا موجود نیست از مقتریات شیعه است در مقام الزام اهل سنت آوردن و جواب این طلب بدن کمال سفابست ست پس مردود ست بانکه انکار وجود این دعوی و شهادت در کتب اهل سنت ناشی از کمال عناد و عصبیت ست زیراکه این دعوی در کتب کثیره از کتب معتمده و اسفار معتبر ایشان مذکور ست مثل تصانیف عمر بن شبه و مجد مؤرخ و ابو بکر جوهری و معنی قاضی القضاة و ملل و نحل شهرستانی و کتاب الموافقة ابن سمان و معجم البلدان یاقوت حموی و محلی ابن حزم و نهایة العقول و التفسیر کبیر مسمی بمفاتیح الغیب و ریاض النضرة و کتاب الاکتفا و فصل الخطاب و موافق و شرح موافق و جوابر العقیدین و وفاء الوفا و خلاصة الوفا پیرسه از سید سهبودی و حاشیة صلاح الدین رومی بر شرح عقائد نسفی از تفتازانی و صواعق محرقة و برابین قاطعة و مقصد اقصی و معارج النبوة و حبیب السیر و روضة الصفا و در بسیاریه ازین کتب وقوع این شهادت بهم برین دعوی مذکور ست

The claim of the author of *Tuḥfah Ithnā 'Ashariyyah* that Sayyidah Fāṭimah's claim over Fadak and the subsequent testimony of 'Alī, Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, and Umm Ayman رضی اللہ عنہم that Rasūlullāh صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم gifted her Fadak is non-existent in Sunnī books and these are all fabrications of the Shī'ah and to cite these as proof against the Ahl al-Sunnah and to demand a response from them is utter foolishness and ignorance on the part of the Shī'ah. However, this declaration of Dehlawī's is unacceptable. To reject the presence of this claim and testimony in Sunnī books is nothing but the result of antagonism and prejudice. The reality is that this claim is found in majority of the reliable books and history books of the Ahl al-Sunnah. Take for example the following books, majority of which contain the claim as well as the testimony. The books of 'Umar ibn Shabbah, Majd the historian, Abū Bakr al-Jawharī, *al-Mughnī* of Qāḍī al-Quḍāh, *al-Milal wa al-Niḥal* of Shaharastānī, *Kitāb al-Muwāfaqah* of Ibn Sammān, *Mu'jam al-Buldān* of Yāqūt Ḥimawī, *Muḥallā* of Ibn Ḥazm, *Nihāyat al-'Uqūl*, *al-Tafsīr al-Kabīr* known as *Mafātīḥ al-Ghayb*, *Riyāḍ al-Naḍirah*, *Kitāb al-Iktifā*, *Faṣl al-Khiṭāb*, *Mawāqif*, *Sharḥ Mawāqif*, *Jawāhir al-'Aqdayn*, *Wafā' al-Wafā*, *Khulāṣat al-Wafā* – all three belong to Sayyid Sahnūdī, *Ḥāshiyat Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Rūmī* on *Sharḥ 'Aqā'id Nasaḥī* of al-Taftāzānī, *al-Ṣawā'iq al-Muḥriqah*, *Barāhīn Qāṭi'ah*, *Maqṣad Aqṣā*, *Ma'ārij al-Nubuwwah*, *Ḥabīb al-Siyar*, and *Rawḍat al-Ṣafā*.

He then presents the text of each of these books. Although he has written the names of 25 books, not one book contains a ṣaḥīḥ narration with a proper isnād. Majority of the books are the very same ones quoted from in *‘Imād al-Islam* and *Ṭa’n al-Rimāḥ* and the very same texts have been produced. The other books do not contain any narration. They have no worth. He has just listed names. He does not mention any book of ‘Umar ibn Shabbah, nor quotes any text therefrom. He quotes the very same narration *Jawāhir al-‘Aqdayn* has reported from ‘Umar ibn Shabbah. He quotes this from Sahmūdī’s book *Wafā’ al-Wafā bi Akhbār Dār al-Muṣṭafā* which is evident from studying pages 130 and 231 of *Tash’īd al-Maṭā’in*. This is the narration of Zayd being questioned about Fadak. The same narration appears in *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah* of Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd from Abū Bakr al-Jawharī. Moreover, he does not mention any specific book of Majd the historian nor quotes any of his texts. He does quote from *Wafā’ al-Wafā* the following however:

ذكر المجد في ترجمة فذك ما تقتضى أن الذي دفعه عمر إلى علي و عباس و وقعت الخصومة فيه هو فذك فإنه قال فيها و هي التي كانت فاطمة رضي الله عنها ادعت أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم أعطاها فقال أبو بكر أريد بذلك شهودا شهد لها علي فطلب لها شاهد آخر فشهدت لها أم أيمن فقال علمت يا بضعة رسول الله إنه لا يجوز إلا بشهادة رجل و امرأتين فانصرفت ثم أدى اجتهاد عمر إلى ردها لما ولي و فتحت الفتوح و كان علي يقول إن النبي جعلها في حياته لفاطمة رضي الله عنها و كان العباس يأبى ذلك فكانا يختصمان إلى عمر فيأبى أن يحكم بينهما يقول أنتما أعرف بشانكما

Majd has written in the history of Fadak that the land ‘Umar gave to ‘Alī and ‘Abbās and regarding which a dispute arose was Fadak. He said regarding it that it is the same land Fāṭimah claimed that Rasūlullāh ﷺ had gifted her. Abū Bakr said, “I want witnesses for this.”

Consequently, ‘Alī testified for her. Another witness was demanded so Umm Ayman testified for her.

He then said, “O daughter of the Messenger of Allah, it is not permissible except with the testimony of one man and two women.” So she left.

Thereafter, ‘Umar’s ijtihād led him to returning it after the conquests were made. ‘Alī would say that the Nabī ﷺ gave it to Fāṭimah during his

lifetime while ‘Abbās would deny this. Thus, they both brought their case to ‘Umar who denied passing judgement between them saying, “You are more cognisant of your affair.”

Although he takes the name of *al-Muwāfaqah* of Ibn Sammān, he quotes the text of Muḥammad Pārsā from *Faṣḥ al-Khiṭāb*:

و قال أي ابن سمان في كتاب الموافقة في ذكر فاطمة و أبي بكر جاءت فاطمة رضي الله عنها إلى أبي بكر فقال أعطني فذلك فإن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وهبها لي فقال صدقت يا بنت رسول الله ولكني رأيت رسول الله يقسمها فيعطي الفقراء و المساكين و ابن السبيل بعد أن يعطيكم منها فوكم فما تصنعين بها قالت أفعل فيها كما كان يفعل أبي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم

Ibn Sammān has said in *Kitāb al-Muwāfaqah* while discussing Fāṭimah and Abū Bakr رضي الله عنهما. “Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها came to Abū Bakr and said, ‘Give me Fadak for indeed Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم gave it to me as a gift.’

He said, ‘You have spoken the truth, O daughter of the Messenger of Allah. However, I saw Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم distributing it and giving it to the poor, needy, and travellers after giving you your sustenance. So what will you do with it?’

‘I will do the exact thing my father Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم did,’ she replied.

He quotes the following text from the footnotes of Ṣalāḥ al-Dīn Rūmī on *Sharḥ al-‘Aqā’id*:

و من منع الإرث و فذلك بالحنلة وقع بين فاطمة رضي الله عنها و أبي بكر بغض و تشاجر و لم تتكلم مع مدة حياتها

And due to preventing inheritance and Fadak as a gift, hatred and argumentation developed between Fāṭimah and Abū Bakr رضي الله عنهما. And she did not speak to him for as long as she lived.

He says that Imām Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī states in *al-Tafsīr al-Kabīr*:

فلما مات صلى الله عليه و سلم ادعت فاطمة رضي الله عنها أنه صلى الله عليه و سلم كان نحلها فذك فقال أبو بكر أنت أعز الناس علي فقراء و أحبهم إلي غنى لكني لا أعرف صحة قولك و لا يجوز أن أحكم بذلك فشهد لها أم أيمن و مولى رسول الله فطلب منها أبو بكر الشاهد الذي يجوز قبول شهادته في الشرع فلم يكن فأجرى أبو بكر ذلك على ما كان يجريه رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم و ينفق منه على ما كان ينفق عليه رسول الله و يجعل ما يبقى في السلاح و الكراع

When Rasūlullāh ﷺ passed away, Fāṭimah claimed that he had gifted Fadak to her. Abū Bakr said, “I dislike most your poverty and desire most your affluence. However, I do not know the authenticity of your claim and it is not permissible for me to pass judgement upon it.”

So Umm Ayman and Rasūlullāh's ﷺ freed slave gave testimony. Abū Bakr then demanded from her a witness whose testimony is acceptable in the Sharīah but there was none. So Abū Bakr managed it as Rasūlullāh ﷺ managed it and spent from it just as Rasūlullāh ﷺ spent from it and spent the rest on weapons and arsenals.

He quotes the same narration of Zayd ibn ‘Alī from *Kitāb al-Iktifā’* of Ibrāhīm ibn ‘Abd Allāh Yemenī Shāfi‘ī which is reported from Ibn Shabbah in other books.

He quotes the following narration from Muḥallā of Ibn Ḥazm Andalusī:

روي أن علي بن أبي طالب شهد لفاطمة عند أبي بكر الصديق رضي الله عنه و معه أم أيمن فقال أبو بكر لو شهد معك رجل أو امرأة أخرى لفضيت بها ذلك

It is reported that ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib testified for Fāṭimah in the presence of Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq ﷺ together with Umm Ayman. Abū Bakr commented, “If only another man or woman testified with you, I would have decreed it in your favour.”

The narration of Muḥibb al-Ṭabarī from *Riyāḍ al-Naḍīrah*:

و عن عبد الله بن ابي بكر بن عمر بن حزم عن أبيه قال جاءت فاطمة رضي الله عنها إلى أبي بكر فقالت أعطني فذك فإن رسول الله وهبها لي قال صدقت يا بنت رسول الله و لكني رأيت رسول الله يقسمها فيعطي الفقراء و المساكين و ابن السبيل بعد أن يعطيكم منها قوتكم فما تصنعين بها إلخ

It is reported from ‘Abd Allāh ibn Abī Bakr ibn ‘Umar ibn Ḥazm from his father who says: “Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها came to Abū Bakr and said, ‘Give me Fadak for indeed Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم gave it to me as a gift.’

He said, ‘You have spoken the truth, O daughter of the Messenger of Allah. However, I saw Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم distributing it and giving it to the poor, needy, and travellers after giving you your sustenance. So what will you do with it?’”

He then quoted the statement of Zayd ibn ‘Alī from the same book.

He quotes a narration from *Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā*:

أخبرنا محمد بن عمر ثنا هشام بن سعد عن زيد بن أسلم عن أبيه قالت (فاطمة) جاتني أم أيمن فأخبرتني أنه أعطاني فدكا

Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar informed us saying that Hishām ibn Sa‘d narrated to them from Zayd ibn Aslam from his father who said, “Fāṭimah said, ‘Umm Ayman came to me and informed me that he gave me Fadak.’”

There is no new narration in the books *Lam‘at al-Bayḍā’*, *Baḥr al-Jawāhir*, *Nāsikh al-Tawārīkh*, and *Kifāyat al-Muwaḥḥidīn* worthy of mentioning despite these books discussing the Fadak issue in great detail.

Summary

Despite our exhaustive efforts, we could not locate any other narration. All the narrations and statements which we have gathered above boil down to three.

Category 1: The narrators’ names are recorded in accordance to ḥadīth principles

Category 2: Historical incidents without any isnād, as is the practice of the historians

Category 3: This claim was mentioned by the way in answer to an objection or in relation to some aspect

Nonetheless, we have mentioned in the fourth point of this book that only those narrations may be presented in such discussions which meet the required principles of aḥādīth and whose authenticity is established after examination and applying the principles founded by both parties. However, those statements or incidents which are recorded in history books or any other books for which no reference is mentioned nor is any isnād attached are not worthy of being considered in such contentious discussions notwithstanding the authors being men of great status and popularity.

Incidents that took place 1300 years ago cannot be authenticated merely by analogy nor can conviction be placed on someone's mere statement. They are merely *akhbār* (information) and can be true or false. To prove them true, it is necessary for the complete isnād to be attached, from the first narrator right until the source. Thereafter, the narrators need to be reliable and trustworthy. If the isnād is attached, but a narrator is unknown, or had wayward ideologies and is suspected of fabricating something to support his ideology, or doubts too much, or has a weak memory; then his narration will not reach the level of authenticity. And if any narrator is a liar or fabricates aḥādīth, then the narration will be labelled a fabrication. And if the isnād is broken – a link or more is missing – then this narration is discarded as well.

We declare: Not one narration or incident from all the narrations, incidents, and statements the distinguished Shī'ah authors have quoted to prove the point under discussion meets the requirements of authenticity (i.e. the isnād is attached and the narrators are reliable). All of them without exception are unworthy of being considered.

Analysing the above narrations

Those narrations which we have included in the first category are 6.

1. Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad al-Thaqafī from Ibrāhīm ibn Maymūn from 'Īsā ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Umar ibn 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib from his father from his grandfather 'Alī. (*al-Shāfi*)⁸

2. Muḥammad ibn Zakariyyā al-Ghulābī from his shuyūkh from Abū al-Miqdām Hishām ibn Ziyād the freed slave of the family of ‘Uthmān. The incident of ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz. (*al-Shāfi*)
3. Bishr ibn al-Walīd, al-Wāqidī, and Bishr ibn Ghiyāth. The incident of al-Ma’mūn. (*al-Ṭarā’if*)
4. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Shabbah from Numayr ibn al-Ḥassān from Zayd ibn ‘Alī. (*Jawāhir al-‘Aqdayn, al-Ṣawā’iq al-Muḥriqah, Wafā’ al-Wafā, Khulāṣat al-Wafā, Riyāḍ al-Naḍīrah, Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah*)
5. ‘Abd Allāh ibn Abī Bakr ibn ‘Umar ibn Ḥazm from his father. (*Riyāḍ al-Naḍīrah, Tash’id al-Maṭā’in*)
6. Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar from Hishām ibn Sa’d from Zayd ibn Aslam from his father. (*Tash’id al-Maṭā’in, Ṭabaqāt al-Kubrā*)

Only these six narrations have an isnād – whether broken or unbroken.

We will now analyse the worth of each narration. We will prove that none of them are worthy of consideration. Their fictitious nature is a certainty.

Isnād 1

Firstly, we cannot ascertain from which book of al-Shāfi this was taken and the reality is that it is a Shī’ī narration. Nonetheless, if we hypothetically agree that it is taken from a Sunnī source then too it is not worthy of considering.

Ibrāhīm ibn Muḥammad al-Thaqafī

- Ibn Abī Ḥātim says, “He is unknown.”
- Al-Bukhārī states, “His aḥādīth are not ṣaḥīḥ.”¹

¹ *Mizān al-Itidāl*.

Ibrāhīm ibn Maymūn al-Kūfī is the next narrator. We have discussed him previously. He was among the renowned Shī'ah. It appears in *Muntahā al-Maqāl fī Asmā' al-Rijāl* of the Shī'ah that he was relied upon by Imām Ja'far al-Ṣādiq رَحِمَهُ اللهُ and all Shī'ah agree that he was reliable.

و من كتاب ميزان الاعتدال أنه من أجلاء الشيعة روى عن علي بن عابس انتهى و لعله بن ميمون

It appears in *Mizān al-I'tidāl* that he is reckoned among the high ranking Shī'ah. He reports from 'Alī ibn 'Ābis. Probably he is Ibn Maymūn.

إبراهيم بن ميمون الكوفي صدوق و يأتي في ترجمة عبد الله بن مسكان أن إبراهيم هذا حمل جواب مسائل عبد الله عن أبي عبد الله فيظهر أن الإمام كان يعتمد فهو معتمد عليه وفاقا للجمع

Ibrāhīm ibn Maymūn al-Kūfī is truthful. It appears in the biography of 'Abd Allāh ibn Miskān that Ibrāhīm would convey the answer from Abū 'Abd Allāh to the question of 'Abd Allāh. This shows that the Imām had reliance upon him. Therefore, he is reliable by consensus.

'Īsā ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn Muḥammad ibn 'Umar ibn 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib

- Al-Dāraquṭnī says, “Matrūk al-ḥadīth.”
- Ibn Ḥibbān states, “He narrates fabrications from his forefathers.”

Can anyone doubt that this is a Shī'ī narration? Can anyone claim it to be a Sunnī narration notwithstanding the fact that one narrator is one of the great Shī'ī luminaries regarding whom it is mentioned?

وهو معتمد عليه وفاقا للجمع

He is reliable by consensus of all Shī'ah.

Isnād 2

Muḥammad ibn Zakariyyā Ghulābī

- He is ḍaʿīf.
- Al-Dāraquṭnī says, “He would fabricate ḥadīth.”¹

Abū al-Miqdām Hishām ibn Ziyād al-Ṣirrī

- Aḥmad and others declared him ḍaʿīf.
- Al-Nasaʿī comments, “Matrūk.”
- Ibn Ḥibbān says, “He narrates fabrications attributing them to reliable narrators.”
- Abū Dāwūd says, “He was unreliable.”
- Al-Bukhārī states, “They (the masters of ḥadīth) criticise him.”²

When this is the condition of the narrators then although no one has declared such aḥādīth ḍaʿīf or unauthentic, then too how can they be accepted as authentic and how can they be used as proof?

If we hypothetically agree that this ḥadīth is ṣaḥīḥ, then too it does not prove that Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا claimed Fadak as a gift. Yes, it can be inferred that what Shaykhayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا did was incorrect. Following this, al-Sayyid al-Murtaḍā did not mention this incident as one of the strong evidences to prove the gifting of Fadak.

Qāḍī ‘Abd al-Jabbār says in *al-Mughnī*:

فأما فعل عمر بن عبد العزيز فلم يثبت أنه رده على سبيل التحل بل عمل في ذلك ما فعله عمر بن الخطاب بأن أقره في يد أمير المؤمنين ليصرف غلاتها في الموضوع الذي كان يجعلها رسول الله صلى الله عليه و

1 *Mizān al-I’tidāl*.

2 *Mizān al-I’tidāl*.

سلم فيه فقام بذلك مدة ثم ردها إلى عمر في آخر سنه و كذلك فعل عمر بن عبد العزيز و لو ثبت أنه فعل بخلاف ما فعله السلف لكان هو المحجوج بقولهم و فعلهم و أحد ما يقوي ما ذكرناه أن الأمر لما انتهى إلى أمير المؤمنين ترك فذك على ما كانت و لم يجعلها ميراثا لفاطمة

Regarding ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz’s action; it does uphold that he returned it due to it being a gift. Rather, he administered it the way ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb did, who kept it in the possession of Amīr al-Mu‘minīn (‘Alī) so that he may distribute its produce the same way Rasūlullāh ﷺ would do. It remained like this for a period until he returned it to ‘Umar towards the ending of his term. Similar was the practice of ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz. If it is established that he acted contrary to the predecessors, his action would not be proof against their statements and actions. One aspect that supports what we have mentioned is that when Fadak fell into the control of Amīr al-Mu‘minīn ‘Alī, he left it the way it was and did not give it as inheritance to Fāṭimah.¹

‘Alam al-Hudā responds to this by saying:

فأما إنكاره أن يكون عمر بن عبد العزيز رد فدكا على وجه النحل ثم ادعاه أنه فعل في ذلك بمثل ما فعله عمر بن الخطاب من إقرارها في يد أمير المؤمنين ليصرف غلاتها في جهاتها فأول ما فيه إنا لا نحتج عليه بفعل عمر بن عبد العزيز على وجه وقع لأن فعله ليس بحجة و لو أردنا الاحتجاج بهذا الجنس من الحجج لذكرنا فعل المأمون فإنه رد فدك بعد أن جلس مجلسا مشهورا حكم فيه بين خصمين نصبيهما أحدهما لفاطمة و الآخر لأبي بكر و ردها بعد قيام الحجة و وضوح الأمر و مع ذلك أنه أنكر من فعل عمر بن عبد العزيز ما هو معروف مشهور بلا خلاف بين أهل النقل فيه و قد روي محمد بن زكريا الغلابي عن شيوخه عن أبي المقدم هشام بن زيد

His denial of the fact that ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz returned Fadak since it was gifted then his claim that he enforced the practice of ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb by giving it to Amīr al-Mu‘minīn to distribute its produce to the rightful recipients; firstly, we do not use ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz’s action as proof against him in any way since his action is not proof. Had we intended to use such proofs, we would have mentioned the action of al-Ma‘mūn for he returned Fadak after a famous gathering was held in which judgement

1 Al-Shāfi pg. 234.

was passed between two adversaries, one in favour of Fāṭimah and the other in favour of Abū Bakr. He returned it after sufficient evidence was found and the matter was clarified. Together with this, he rejected the action of ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz which is famous and well-known among the narrators. Muḥammad ibn Zakariyyā al-Ghulābī has narrated from his Shuyūkh from Abū al-Miqdām Hishām ibn Ziyād...¹

The incident of ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz has been quoted in *Akhbār al-Awā’il*, *Mu’jam al-Buldān*, *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah*, *Ṭa’n al-Rimāḥ*, and *Tashīd al-Maṭā’in*. The gist of all these narrations is that he gave Fadak of the family of Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها. It does not say anywhere that she claimed that Fadak was gifted to her in the presence of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه. Therefore, all these narrations are worthless, and do not reach the object.

In fact, the opposite is established as Shāh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz has reported from *Mishkāṭ*, the narration of Abū Dāwūd:

‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz gathered the family of Marwān and said, “How can I be deserving of the land from which Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم prevented Fāṭimah? I make you witnesses that I will return it to the very same condition it was in during the era of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, Abū Bakr, and ‘Umar.”

The original narration is quoted in *Tuḥfah*. Whoever wishes should refer to it.

Isnād 3

This narration asserts that al-Ma’mūn gathered a thousand ‘Ulamā’ and instructed them to debate the Fadak issue. At the end, he wrote a letter which was read out during the Ḥajj season. This entire narration is a fabrication of the Shī’ah. The condition of al-Wāqidi and Bishr ibn Ghiyāth has passed. The former was among the fabricators, while the latter was among the heretics.

1 *Al-Shāfi* pg. 236.

Dildār ‘Alī and Muḥtahid Sayyid Muḥammad quoted this narration from *al-Ṭarā’if* in their respective books. It is disgusting for such Muḥtahids to relate the aḥādīth of fabricators and heretics to prove their ideologies and claim that they are ṣaḥīḥ narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah. The only reason for this is that they could not trace a single ṣaḥīḥ narration, so they presented these fabrications which the liars and heretics have concocted to undermine Islam. Sometimes they present a reference, sometimes a book’s name or sometimes a history book. But, their lies can never be concealed. No matter how they camouflage it, its true colours shine out.

Isnād 4

Only two narrators are mentioned, viz. ‘Umar ibn Shabbah and Numayr ibn Ḥassān. The rest of the isnād is discarded. Either Sahnūdī discarded the names or the Muḥtahidīn displayed laxity in narrating them. Nevertheless, after investigation it became apparent that the original source of this narration is *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah* of Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd who took it from *Saqīfah wa Fadak* of Abū Bakr Aḥmad ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Jawharī. The original text is as follows:

قال أبو بكر أخبرنا أبو زيد قال ثنا محمد بن عبد الله بن الزبير قال ثنا فضيل بن مرزوق قال ثنا البخاري بن حسان قال قلت لزيد بن علي و أنا أريد أن أهجن أمر أبي بكر إن أبا بكر انتزع فذك من فاطمة رضي الله عنها فقال إن أبا بكر إلخ

Abū Bakr says, Abū Zayd informed us saying, Muḥammad ibn ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr narrated to us saying, Fuḍayl ibn Marzūq narrated to us saying, al-Bukhtarī (most probably Numayr) ibn al-Ḥassān narrated to us saying, “I said to Zayd ibn ‘Alī, and I intended to disparage the action of Abū Bakr, ‘Indeed, Abū Bakr snatched Fadak from Fāṭimah.’ He said, ‘Certainly, Abū Bakr ...”

The rest of the narration is just as quoted from *‘Imād al-Islām* above, not forgetting the portion that he conveniently discarded which we reproduced.

The following points should be considered:

Firstly, Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd is the narrator who is Mu‘tazilī and Shī‘ī, although the Shī‘ah consider him one of the ‘ulamā’ of the Ahl al-Sunnah. Their plot is to deceive the unwary into thinking this so that misgivings develop in their hearts after reading his narrations. Nonetheless, he being Mu‘tazilī is so apparent that it cannot be denied. His book *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah* is sufficient proof of him being Shī‘ī, or at least having Shī‘ī ideologies.

Secondly, Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd quoted it from *Saqīfah wa Fadak* of Abū Bakr Aḥmad ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Jawharī. Whether this book is actually al-Jawharī’s or not is questionable. Is there any book with this name in existence first of all is uncertain. No reputable scholar besides Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd has taken this book’s name nor has this name been referenced to in any famous book. So how can the narration of such an unknown book be considered? We are totally perplexed by the presentation of this narration since Dildār ‘Alī vented his anger at Shāh for quoting from *Mihjāj al-Sālikīn*:

تا حال نام این کتاب بگوش کسی از شیعیان نرسیده و بکتاب مجهول که مصنف این نیز مجهول است احتجاج و استدلال نتوان نمود چه مستبعد است که نام کتاب را خودش بدروغ ساخته باشد پس در مقابل این اگر کسی بگوید که در اعوجاج الپالکین شخصی از مردم بخارا نوشته که ابو بکر اعتراف بکفر خود کرد می توان گفت و بالفرض اگر کتابی مسمی باین اسم از کتب شیعه بوده باشد و این روایت در آن مندرج پس از کجا معلوم شد که نقل از کتب اهل سنت نکرده باشد و این ناصب خواجه او نادیده یا دیده و دانسته عذر و فریب تاسیا بامامیه الغادرین نموده باشند

Until now, the name of this book has not reached the ear of any Shī‘ī. It is improper to furnish an unheard of book – whose author is unknown – as proof. And it is very possible that he concocted some name. If someone says in response to this vile deception that al-Bukhārī wrote a book *‘Iwāj al-Hālikīn* wherein Abū Bakr acknowledged his kufr, it will be correct. And if hypothetically *Mihjāj al-Sālikīn* is a Shī‘ī book which contains this narration then too how can it be believed with full conviction that he has not taken it from Sunnī sources? Yet their master, knowingly or unknowingly, convicts the Shī‘ah of deception.¹

1 *Al-Ṣawārim* pg. 52.

Sayyid Muḥammad has quoted the declaration of *‘Alam al-Hudā* in *Ṭa‘n al-Rimāḥ* regarding the proposal to Abū Jahl’s daughter:

هذه الخبر باطل موضوع غير معروف و لا ثابت عند أهل النقل و إنما ذكره الكريسي طاعنا به على أمير المؤمنين و معارضا بذكره لبعض شيعة من الأخبار في أعدائه و هيئات أن يشبه الحق بالباطل و بعد ازاى كلابه كه فرموده است محصل این این است كه امری دیگر درین روایت نبوده باشد پس بمجس راوی این كرابیسی است و او مععلن بعد اوت اهل بیت و ناصبی شیعی بوده كافی ست در توبیین و تكذیب این

This narration is false and fabricated. It is not known nor established by the narrators. Only al-Kuraysī has mentioned it using it to criticise Amīr al-Mu‘minīn and to oppose some Shī‘ah Akhbārīs among his enemies. It is impossible for the truth to resemble falsehood.¹

The gist of what has been mentioned thereafter is that there is nothing else in those narrations. It is the same narrator Karābīsī who is criticised due to hatred and enmity for the Ahl al-Bayt. He being Shī‘ī Nāṣibī is sufficient for his falsification and humiliation.

We hope that the Shī‘ah will understand what these two Mujtahids have declared. They have only voiced our sentiments. Hopefully, the Shī‘ah will listen to it from the deep recesses of their hearts and accept it. No one should doubt the fallaciousness of such narrations.

Thirdly, al-Jawharī says that he heard it from Abū Zayd which is the agnomen of ‘Umar ibn Shabbah as stated in *al-Taqrīb*:

عمر بن شبة بن عبدة بن زيد النميري أبو زيد

‘Umar ibn Shabbah ibn ‘Ubaydah ibn Zayd al-Numayrī Abū Zayd.

Although ‘Umar ibn Shabbah is one of the reliable narrators, however what proof is there that in reality what Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd has attributed to ‘Umar ibn Shabbah via al-Jawharī is free from concoction?

1 *Ṭa‘n al-Rimāḥ* pg. 39.

In *Tadhkirat al-Ḥuffāz* of al-Dhahabī, where there is mention of the names of those who heard narrations from ‘Umar ibn Shabbah, we do not find al-Jawharī’s name among his famous students. The following appears:

عمر بن شبة بن عبيدة الحافظ العلامة الأخباري أبو زيد النميري البصري صاحب التصانيف عن يوسف بن عطية إلى قوله و عند ابن ماجة و ابن صاعد المحاملي و محمد بن أحمد الأثرم و محمد بن مخلد و خلق

‘Umar ibn Shabbah ibn ‘Ubaydah, the Ḥāfiẓ, ‘Allāmah, and Akhbārī, Abū Zayd al-Numayrī al-Baṣrī. Author of many books. He narrated from Yūsuf ibn ‘Aṭīyyah... and Ibn Mājah, Ibn Ṣā‘id, al-Muḥāmilī, Muḥammad ibn Aḥmad al-Athram, Muḥammad ibn Mukhallad, and others have reported from him.

So probably al-Jawharī was his student, however he is not among his famous students. Due to this, we have not seen any exclusive biography of al-Jawharī’s in any book. Nevertheless, Abū al-Farj al-Iṣfahānī, author of *al-Aghānī*, has reported from him. In fact, he is the only narrator to narrate from al-Jawharī from ‘Umar ibn Shabbah. But to regard him among the famous muḥaddithīn and A‘immah is totally erroneous. Abū al-Farj al-Iṣfahānī was a Shī‘ī, and although he was from the Zaydiyyah the Shī‘ī scholars have included him among their fraternity. Accordingly, Mirzā Muḥammad Bāqir, contemporary of Ḥājī Zayn al-‘Ābidīn al-Mūsawī who is titled *Zubdat al-Mujtahidīn* (cream of the Mujtahidīn) and *Ḥujjat al-Islam wa al-Muslimīn* (Proof of Islam and the Muslims) has written the following:

علي بن الحسين أبو الفرج إصفهاني صاحب كتاب الأغاني ذكره مولانا العلامة الحلبي في الخلاصة في القسم الثاني فقال إنه شيعي زيدي و أورده صاحب الأمائل أيضا في أعد علماء الشيعة و كان عالما روى عن كثير من العلماء و كان شيعيا خبيرا بالأغاني و الآثار و الأحاديث المشهورة و المغازي انتهى و كان اشتهار تشيعه بين جماعة من أصحابنا من جهته مدناة مذهب الشيعة مع الزيدية و مشاركتها في القول بأن الإمامة غير خارجة عن الفاطمية

‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn Abū al-Farj Iṣfahānī, author of the book *al-Aghānī*. ‘Allāmah al-Ḥillī has mentioned him in *al-Khulāṣah* in the second category saying, “He is a Shī‘ī Zaydī.”

The author of *al-Amā'il* has also reckoned him among the Shī'ī scholars, "He was a scholar who reported from many 'ulamā'. He was a Shī'ī who was cognisant of *aghānī* (tunes), traditions, famous aḥādīth, and *maghāzī* (wars)."

He being Shī'ī was well known by a large group of our scholars due to him being very close to the Shī'ī creed despite him being Zaydiyyah. They both shared the belief that Imāmah is not omitted from al-Fāṭimiyah.¹

Fourthly, Abū Zayd narrated it from Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn Zubayr who is a Shī'ī.

Muḥammad ibn 'Abd Allāh ibn Zubayr

- 'Ijlī says, "Kūfī. Reliable. Has Shī'ī ideologies."²
- Abū Ḥātīm states, "Has too much doubts."

He narrates from Fuḍayl ibn Marzūq who is a staunch Shī'ī as clarified earlier.

He narrates from Numayr ibn Ḥassān.

There seems to be a mistake here, whether by publisher or narrator. He is written as Numayr ibn Ḥassān in *Imād al-Islam* and *Ṭa'n al-Rimāḥ*, and al-Bukhtarī ibn Ḥassān in *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah*. However, we could not locate any of the two in *al-Taqrīb*, *al-Tahdhīb*, *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*, or *Mizān al-I'tidāl*.

Nevertheless, even if all the narrators are reliable and truthful, the presence of Fuḍayl ibn Marzūq alone is sufficient to label it a Shī'ī narration. Even if one narrator is a liar, or accused of the same, or has warped ideologies then his entire narration is regarded as false.

1 *Rawḍāt al-Jannāt fī Aḥwāl al-'Ulamā' wa al-Sādāt* pg. 47.

2 *Mizān al-I'tidāl*.

Besides the above, the last narrator – whether Numayr or al-Bukhtarī ibn Ḥassān – seems to be a staunch Shīʿī and enemy of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم. This is clear from his statement, “I intended to disparage Abū Bakr’s action.” He used the word *ahjanu* which comes from *tahjīn*, the meaning of which as provided in *Muntahā al-‘Arab* as:

زشت و عیب ناک گردانیدن

To insult, or condemn.

And in *Qāmūs*:

التهجين من الكلام ما يعيبه و الهجين اللئيم و التهجين التوبيخ

Al-hajnah in reference to speech is to disparage. *Al-hajīn* is a wicked and evil person. And *al-tahjīn* is to insult, offend.

Isnād 5

The narrators are ‘Abd Allāh ibn Abū Bakr ibn ‘Amr ibn Ḥazm from his father.

This narration has neither any head nor tail as there is no mention from whom ‘Abd Allāh’s father heard it. Such narrations are not taken into consideration. Until the entire isnād with all narrators are not attached, a narration is unreliable.

Isnād 6

Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar from Hishām ibn Sa’d from Zayd ibn Aslam from his father.

Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar is al-Wāqidī. And we are well aware of his condition in the sight of the muḥaddithīn. He was a fabricator and his narrations are unreliable.

Al-Dhahabī writes:

I did not mention his biography here since they are unanimous on discarding his aḥādīth.

Hishām ibn Sa’d

- Yahyā ibn al-Qaṭṭān would not narrate from him.
- Al-Nasa’ī commented, “Ḍa’īf.”¹
- He has many doubts and has been criticised for having Shī’ī ideologies.²
- Abū Ḥātim says, “His aḥādīth will be written but he cannot be used as proof.”³

We are now complete with a thorough analysis of the first category of narrations. We have proven that the narrators are unreliable and some are liars. The following declaration of Shāh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz fits them aptly:

خبر غیر صحیح چون گوزشتر است

The ḥadīth is not ṣaḥīḥ and worthless.

Regarding the other categories, we do not have to write much since we explained in great detail in the fourth point that someone’s opinion, or analogy, or mention of the incident is not sufficient to prove its authenticity notwithstanding him to be a proficient in any science, a renowned ‘ālim, a distinguished personality, or a master of any field. The incident needs to have an unbroken ṣaḥīḥ sanad to be regarded as true. Even if a thousand scholars mention an incident, either by mistake or unawareness, which implies that they agree with it, then too this will not be sufficient to prove its authenticity. We will just say that the scholar did

1 *Mizān al-I’tidāl*.

2 *Al-Taqrīb*.

3 *Al-Tahdhīb*.

not investigate the narration and wrote it down. Especially when it comes to the polemicists who take pleasure in responding to objections and using analogic and rational proofs in abundance together with hypothetical situations deceiving the reader into believing that the narration is *ṣaḥīḥ*. The unwary then use such narrations to indict others. This is the condition of the statement of the Shīʿī scholars in this regard.

For an isnād to be broken, is sufficient to show its unauthenticity.

Nevertheless, we will discuss these statements for our respected readers so that the narrators' unawareness, ignorance, inconsideration, or they not being experts in the science of ḥadīth is determined. It is for the above reasons that such narrations get included in books which presents an opportunity for the Imāmiyyah to throw the masses into deception.

We have quoted all the narrations above, from *al-Shāfi* to *Ṭa'n al-Rimāḥ*. A gist of all the narrations will follow:

1. Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ wanted to write a document for Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا but was prevented by Sayyidunā 'Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. (by al-Wāqidī, *Kashf al-Ḥaqq*)
2. The incident of 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz and al-Ma'mūn. (*Mu'jam al-Buldān; Iḥqāq al-Ḥaqq*)
3. The incident of 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz. (*Tārīkh al-Khulafā'; Iḥqāq al-Ḥaqq*)
4. Umm Ayman testifies to Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ giving Fāṭimah Fadak. (Abū Bakr al-Jawharī in *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah*)
5. The gift claim. (*al-Ṣawā'iq al-Muḥriqah; 'Imād al-Islām; Ṭa'n al-Rimāḥ; Tash'īd al-Maṭā'in*)
6. The gift claim (*al-Milal wa al-Niḥal, Mawāqif, Sharḥ Mawāqif; Nihāyat al-'Uqūl; al-Tafsīr al-Kabīr*)

7. The gift claim (*Ma'ārij al-Nubuwwah; Maqṣad al-Aqṣā; Ḥabīb al-Siyar; Rawḍat al-Ṣafā*)

Let us scrutinise these narrations. Firstly al-Wāqīdī does not need further introduction. Everyone understands by now that his narration is false. One will be stunned by someone narrating from him.

The incident of *Mu'jam al-Buldān* we have discussed in great detail while discussing the narration in *al-Ṭarā'if*. We disclosed the reality of al-Ma'mūn's return of Fadak to the extent that no one remains in doubt.

The narration of *Tārīkh al-Khulafā'* is as follows:

و عن مغيرة قال جمع عمر حين استخلف بني مروان فقال إن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم كانت له فذلك ينفق منها ويعول منها على صغيرة بني هاشم و يزوح منها أيمهم و أن فاطمة سألته أن يجعلها لها فأبى فكانت كذلك حيوة أبي بكر ثم عمر ثم قطعها مروان ثم صارت لعمر بن عبد العزيز فرأيت أمرا منعه رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فاطمة فليس لي بحق و إني أشهدكم أنني قد ردتها على ما كانت على عهد رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم

Mughīrah narrates, “Umar gathered the sons of Marwān after he assumed the post of khalīfah and addressed them saying, ‘Fadak was in the control of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. He would spend from there, use the money to take care of the young of the Banū Hāshim, and get their unmarried married. Fāṭimah asked him to give it to her but he refused. Thus it remained like this in the era of Abū Bakr, and then ‘Umar. Thereafter Marwān divided it. Finally, it fell into the hands of ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz. I considered just how can I have ownership over something Rasūlullāh ﷺ prevented Fāṭimah from. I make you witness that I have returned it to the same state it was in the period of Rasūlullāh ﷺ.’”¹

This is the only narration regarding Fadak in the above book, and this narration makes it crystal clear that Sayyidah Fāṭimah (رضي الله عنها) asked for Fadak but Rasūlullāh

1 *Tārīkh al-Khulafā'* pg. 57; Maṭba‘ Muḥammadī Lahore 1304 A.H.

صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ did not give it. And Shaykhayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا spent its produce in the same manner Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ spent it. This totally debunks the gifting of Fadak and the subsequent claim. Therefore, the only thing that can be said is that to use such a narration as proof is against the status of the scholars. In fact, it does not behove the shameful to perpetrate such indecencies. Besides, al-Suyūṭī has not taken up responsibility to mention only authentic narrations and to categorise narrations. So only a cognisant expert from the men of truth is able to discern which narrations are authentic and which narrations may be used as proof.

Dildār ‘Alī has conveniently omitted the narrator above al-Jawharī so that the inspector cannot find out the reality of the narration. However, by going back to the source *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāghah* it became apparent that the narrator is Hishām ibn Muḥammad al-Kalbī who relates from his father. The text goes as follows:

قال أبو بكر و روى هشام بن محمد عن أبيه قال قالت فاطمة لأبي بكر إن أم أيمن تشهد إلخ

Abū Bakr says, “Hishām ibn Muḥammad narrates from his father who reports, ‘Fāṭimah said to Abū Bakr: Umm Ayman testifies ...’”

Hishām ibn Muḥammad is well known by the title al-Kalbī and his father is also called by the same title. Both father and son were stanch Shīṭīs, liars, and unreliable. We have dealt with his father’s condition Abū Hishām al-Kalbī earlier. Just as Zurārah, and Aḥwal’s narrations are not considered by the Ahl al-Sunnah, similarly, Hishām ibn Muḥammad and Abū Hishām al-Kalbī’s narrations are not accepted.

We have quoted the complete narration of Zayd ibn ‘Alī which is alluded to in *al-Ṣawā’iq al-Muḥriqah* above. At another place, he is reported to have stated that the quota for witnesses has not been fulfilled. Here, the author did not discuss the technicalities of the narration itself but answered it hypothetically, which is the practice of the mutakallimīn. He neither authenticated it, nor rejected it. In other words, he did not scrutinise the narration but just answered the narration which implies that such a claim was made. However, this does not prove the narration

to be *ṣaḥīḥ*. The authentication of a *ḥadīth* rests upon the *muḥaddithīn*. And we have already satisfactorily proven the fallacy of this narration.

Quoting from *al-Mīlāl wa al-Niḥāl* and *Mawāqif* does nothing but increases the volume of the book. Firstly, al-Shaharastānī did not quote any narration. He just wrote that the third *ikhtilāf* is with regards to Fadak, Rasūlullāh's ﷺ inheritance, and Fāṭimah's claim sometimes of inheritance and sometime of ownership. In Arabic:

تارة وراثه و تمليكا اخرى

Sometimes of inheritance and at other times of ownership

That's all he said. This does not prove the authenticity of any narration. In fact, the words *tamlīkan ukhrā* has various implications since the *ikhtilāf* is with regards to inheritance, i.e. whether Rasūlullāh ﷺ is inherited from. Whether a person has ownership over his possessions or not was not an issue of discussion. Therefore, these words *tamlīkan ukhrā* are superfluous here. Moreover, the proof furnished:

حتى دفعت عن ذلك بالرواية المشهورة

This has been refuted by the famous narration.

alludes to the *ḥadīth*:

نحن معاشر الأنبياء ...

We the fraternity of *Ambiyā'* ...

And this *ḥadīth* deals with inheritance, not gifting or ownership.

Furthermore, it should have been also included that this claim was not accepted since the quota was not met.

Nonetheless, every intelligent person will understand that these words are superfluous. Besides the above, al-Shaharastānī is a chameleon when it comes to ‘aqīdah. Ibn Taymiyyah writes:

بل يميل الشهرستاني كثيرا إلى أشياء من أمورهم بل يذكر أحيانا أشياء من كلام الإسماعيلية منهم بوجه و لهذا التهمة قال بعض الناس بأنه من الإسماعيلية و قد يقال هو مع الشيعة بوجه و مع أصحاب الأشعري بوجه و بالجملة فالشهرستاني يظهر الميل إلى الشيعة و لا يحتج به إلا من هو جاهل و إن هذا الرجل الشهرستاني كان له بالشيعة المام و اتصال و إنه دخل في أهوائهم بما ذكره في هذا الكتاب بعني الملل و النحل

Al-Shaharastānī leans much to their ideologies. In fact, he quotes extensively from the Ismā‘īliyyah sect. Due to this, some have regarded him as one of them. It is said that he is with the Shī‘ah in some aspects and with the Ash‘arīs in other aspects. In short, al-Shaharastānī shows Shī‘ī tendencies. Thus, no one will use him as proof besides an ignorant person. Moreover, he had a connection and relationship with the Shī‘ah. What he has mentioned in this book *al-Milal wa al-Niḥal* shows that he was affected by their ideologies.¹

The wording of *Mawāqif* and *Sharḥ Mawāqif* depict the weakness of this stance. He begins with the words *qīla* (it is said) and every elementary student knows that this word is used either to show a weak view or in a hypothetical sense.

In addition, undoubtedly the authors of these books are Ahl al-Sunnah mutakallimīn. However, their statements are not relied upon in the field of ḥadīth. Their rank among the Sunnī is like Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī’s rank among the Shī‘ah. No Shī‘ī will believe the statements of Naṣīr al-Dīn al-Ṭūsī unless it is supported by a ḥadīth, despite him being such a celebrated Philosopher, Logician, and master of ‘aqīdah.

It appears in *Sharḥ Mawāqif*:

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah*.

The correct version is Umm Ayman.

No one should be misled into thinking that he has authenticated the narration by asserting this. All he is trying to say is that the narration is supposed to have the name Umm Ayman instead of Umm Kulthūm. He thus clarifies this point immediately after quoting Umm Kulthūm's name.

This strengthens our standpoint since it is learnt from here, that the author of *Mawāqif* was unaware as to whether the Shī'ah wrote Umm Ayman or Umm Kulthūm. Since the author of *Sharḥ Mawāqif* was a Shī'ī who turned Sunnī, he was fully aware of the narrations so he picked up this mistake immediately and rectified it. This does not mean that he authenticated the narration. Nonetheless, if for argument's sake we agree that he did authenticate it, then too we will say that he has erred. These aspects are not rational or logical. They deal with aḥādīth, hence the principles and protocol of ḥadīth authentication have to be followed. And if they are not, then they are worthless.

The same can be said about Imām al-Rāzī's quoting it in *Nihāyat al-'Uqūl* and *al-Tafsīr al-Kabīr*. He simply gave an answer to the objection without investigating the claim itself and without ascertaining whether this narration is a Shī'ī or Sunnī one. By providing such an answer, it does not follow that he believes in the authenticity of the narration. Following this, he did not discuss the narration itself in his *Tafsīr*. He was a Logician and Philosopher. Their general practice is to answer the objection as it comes. He is not among those muḥaqqiqīn and muḥaddithīn whose statements hold weight in the field of ḥadīth. Consider this fact, by him answering the narration, the most that can be said is that he did not reject it. And we have already clarified that the declaration of some 'ālim is not relied upon no matter how celebrated or excellent he may be. It is necessary to investigate the worth of the narrators of the ḥadīth to ascertain its value. Only if all the narrators are reliable and not criticised, then the narration will be considered. It will then be determined whether it is a khabar wāḥid, or mash-hūr

and does not contradict other ṣaḥīḥ reliable aḥādīth. And this is the work of the muḥaqqiqīn and experts in this field. Quoting some texts from some ‘ulamā’ does not establish any claim.

If any Shī‘ī has to object by saying that when the declarations and statements of such celebrated and eminent scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah are not considered, then the door to debate is shut. The answer to every objection will be that he is not a master or expert in ḥadīth. Or if he is, he has erred by accepting a weak narration. Whoever has this objection should read the fourth point of this book and will find a satisfactory answer.

We have now dealt with all the narrations the Shī‘ah quote from Sunnī sources to prove their claim and we have revealed their unauthenticity. We will now quote the various Shī‘ī narrations in this regard which contain an abundance of contradictions and inconsistencies, enough to discredit them.

Shī‘ī narrations concerning the claim over Fadak being gifted

We will first quote the narrations and then show the contradictions. The Shī‘ah have quoted the following detailed narrations:

1. *Iḥtijāj* of al-Ṭabarsī under the chapter:

احتجاج أمير المؤمنين على أبي بكر وعمر لما منع فاطمة الزهراء فداك بالكتاب والسنة

Amīr al-Mu‘minīn’s proof with Qur’ān and Sunnah against Abū Bakr and ‘Umar when he prevented Fāṭimah al-Zahrā’ from Fadak.

عن حماد بن عثمان عن أبي عبد الله قال لما بويع أبو بكر واستقام له الأمر على جميع المهاجرين والأنصار بعث إلى فداك من أخرج وكيل فاطمة بنت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم منها فجاءت فاطمة إلى أبي بكر ثم قالت لم تمنعني ميراثي من أبي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وأخرجت وكيلي من فداك وقد جعلها لي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بأمر الله تعالى فقال هاتي على ذلك به شهود فجاءت بأمر أيمن فقالت لا أشهد يا أبا بكر حتى أحتج عليك بما قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم أنتشدك بالله ألتست تعلم أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال أم أيمن امرأة من أهل الجنة فقال بلى قالت فأشهد أن

الله عز و جل أوحى إلى رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم فأت ذا القربى حقه فجعلك فداك لفاطمة بأمر الله فجاء علي فشهد بمثل ذلك فكتب لها كتابا فدفعه إليها فأخذ عمر الكتاب من فاطمة رضي الله عنها فتغل فيه ففرقه فخرجت فاطمة رضي الله عنها تبكي فلما كان بعد ذلك جاء علي إلى أبي بكر و هو في المسجد و حوله المهاجرون و الأنصار فقال يا أبا بكر لما منعت فاطمة رضي الله عنها ميراثها من رسول الله و قد ملكته في حياة رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم فقال أبو بكر هذا فيء للمسلمين فإن أقامت شهودا أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم جعله لها و إلا فلا حق لها فيه فقال أمير المؤمنين يا أبا بكر تحكم فينا بخلاف حكم الله في المسلمين فقال لا قال فإن كان في يد المسلمين شيء يملكونه ثم ادعيت أنا فيه من تسئل البيعة قال إياك أسئل البيعة قال فما بال فاطمة سألتها البيعة على ما في يدها و قد ملكته في حياة رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم و بعد و لم تسئل المسلمين البيعة على ما ادعواها شهودا كما سألتني على ما دعيت عليهم فسكت أبو بكر فقال عمر يا علي و عنا من كلامك فإننا لا نقوي على حجبتك فإن أتيت بشهود عدول و إلا فيء للمسلمين لا حق لك و لا لفاطمة رضي الله عنها فيه قال فدمدم الناس و أنكروا بعضهم بعضا و قالوا صدق والله علي و رجع علي إلى منزله قال دخلت فاطمة رضي الله عنها المسجد و طافت بقبر أبيها و هي تقول قد كان بعد أبناء هنبشة الخ

Ḥammād ibn ‘Uthmān narrates from Abū ‘Abd Allāh:

When bay‘ah was given to Abū Bakr and he had full authority over all the Muhājirīn and Anṣār, he sent someone to Fadak to remove the trustee of Fāṭimah bint Rasūlillāh ﷺ. Fāṭimah then came to Abū Bakr and said, “Why are you depriving me of my inheritance from my father Rasūlullāh ﷺ and why did you remove my representative from Fadak whereas Rasūlullāh ﷺ gave it to me by Allah’s ﷻ command?”

He said, “Bring witnesses for this?”

Accordingly, she brought Umm Ayman who said, “I will not testify O Abū Bakr, until I remonstrate against you by Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ declaration. I ask you in the name of Allah, are you not aware that Rasūlullāh ﷺ said, ‘Umm Ayman is a woman from Jannah?’”

“Most certainly,” he responded.

She then said, “I testify that Allah the Mighty and Majestic sent revelation to Rasūlullāh ﷺ And give the relative his right. Consequent to this, he gave Fadak to Fāṭimah by the instruction of Allah.”

‘Alī then came and gave a similar testimony.

He then wrote a document in her name and handed it over to her. ‘Umar took the document from Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها and spat on it and then tore it up. Fāṭimah then left weeping.

After some time, ‘Alī approached Abū Bakr while the latter was in the Masjid surrounded by the Muhājirīn and Anṣār and said, “O Abū Bakr, why did you deprive Fāṭimah of her inheritance from Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم whereas she had ownership over it during the lifetime of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم?”

Abū Bakr answered, “This is Fay’ for the Muslims. If you can present witnesses that Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم gave it to her, [I will hand it over to her] otherwise she has no right in it.”

Amīr al-Mu’minīn enquired, “O Abū Bakr, will you pass a judgement over us contrary to Allah’s command with regards to the Muslims?”

He replied in the negative.

Amīr al-Mu’minīn asked, “If the Muslims are in possession of something that they own, and then I make a claim over it, who will you ask to provide witnesses?”

“I will ask you for proof,” he replied.

He then questioned, “Then why are you asking Fāṭimah for proof for something in her possession which she had ownership over in the life of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم and after his demise, while you do not ask the Muslims for proof for what they own, but rather you would have asked me had I made such a claim over them?”

Abū Bakr was silenced.

‘Umar then spoke, “O ‘Alī, save us from your speech as we do not have the capacity to debate you. If you bring righteous witnesses [we will give it to you], otherwise it will be Fay’ for the Muslims and neither will you nor Fāṭimah have any right over it.”

Hearing this, the people made a huge hue and cry, and they began to reject and debate each other. They said, “By Allah, ‘Alī has spoken the truth.”

Subsequently, ‘Alī returned to his house. Fāṭimah then entered the Masjid and circumbulated her father’s grave and recited the couplet:

After you, we found momentous chaotic events...¹

Thereafter it is mentioned that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنهما saw the situation and apprehending future strife decided to kill Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and appointed Sayyidunā Khālid رضي الله عنه for the job. We will mention this at its appropriate place.

2. ‘*Ilal al-Sharā’i’ wa al-Aḥkām* of Shaykh Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥasanī ibn Mūsā ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī:

قال حدثنا علي بن إبراهيم عن أبيه عن ابن أبي عمير عن ذكره عن أبي عبد الله قال لما منع أبو بكر فاطمة فدكا وأخرج وكيلها جاء أمير المؤمنين إلى المسجد وأبو بكر جالس وحوله المهاجرون والأنصار فقال يا أبا بكر لم منعت فاطمة ما جعله رسول الله لها و وكيلها فيه منذ سنتين فقال أبو بكر هذا فيء للمسلمين فإن أنت بشهود عدول وإلا فلا حق لها فيه قال يا أبا بكر أنتحکم فینا بخلاف ما تحکم فی المسلمین قال لا قال أخبرني لو كان في يد المسلمين شيء فادعيت أنا فيه فممن كنت تسئل البيعة قال إياك كنت أسئل قال فإذا كان في يدي شيء فادعى فيه المسلمون تسئلني فيه البيعة قال فسكت أبو بكر وقال عمر هذا فيء للمسلمين ولسنا في خصوصتك في شيء قال فبكى الناس وتفرقوا ودمدموا

‘Alī ibn Ibrāhīm reports from his father from Ibn Abī ‘Umayr from the narrator who quotes from Abū ‘Abd Allāh who said:

After Abū Bakr prevented Fadak from Fāṭimah and removed her representative, Amīr al-Mu‘minīn came to the Masjid. Abū Bakr was sitting with the Muhājirīn and Anṣār. ‘Alī said, “O Abū Bakr, why did you prevent Fāṭimah from what Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم gave her and her representative has been looking after it for many years?”

1 Iḥtijāj vol. 1 pg. 234, 235.

Abū Bakr said, “This is Fay’ for the Muslims. If you bring truthful witnesses, otherwise you have no right over it.”

‘Alī asked, “O Abū Bakr, will you pass a judgement on us contrary to the judgement you pass on the Muslims?”

“No,” he replied.

‘Alī asked, “Tell me, if there was something in the possession of the Muslims and then I claimed a right over it, who would you ask to furnish proof?”

“I will ask you,” he replied.

‘Alī then said, “Now when I have something in my possession and the Muslims are claiming over it, you are asking me to furnish proof?!”

Abū Bakr was speechless.

‘Umar said, “This is Fay’ for the Muslims. And we are not prepared to debate you.”

People began to cry and made an uproar and dispersed grumbling.¹

3.

عن أبي جعفر قال دخلت فاطمة بنت محمد صلى الله عليه و سلم على أبي بكر فسألته فدكا فقال قال النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم لا نورث فقالت قال الله تعالى و ورث سليمان داود فلما حاجته أمر أن يكتب لها و شهد علي بن أبي طالب و أم أيمن فخرجت فاطمة رضي الله عنها فاستقبلها عمر فقال من أين جئت يا بنت رسول الله قالت من عند أبي بكر من شأن فذك قد كتب لي بها فقال عمر هاتي الكتاب فأعطته فبصق فيه و محاه عجل الله جزاء فاستقبلها علي فقال ما لك يا بنت رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم فذكرت لما صنع عمر فقال ما ركبوا مني و من أبيك أعظم من هذا

Abū Ja‘far reports:

Fāṭimah bint Muḥammad ﷺ came to Abū Bakr and asked him for Fadak. He said, “The Nabī ﷺ declared, ‘We are not inherited from.’”

1 *Bihār al-Anwār; Tarjamah Urdū ‘Ilal al-Sharā‘i* pg. 145, 146.

She said, “Allah ﷻ declared, ‘Sulaymān inherited from Dāwūd.’”

She was successful in defeating him in the debate. Subsequently, he commanded that a document be written for her. ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib and Umm Ayman also gave testimony.

Fāṭimah ؓ then left and bumped into ‘Umar en route who asked, “Where have you come from, O daughter of the Messenger of Allah?”

She replied, “From Abū Bakr concerning Fadak. He has written a document of it in my name.”

‘Umar said, “Show me the document.”

She gave it to him. He spat in it and erased it.

‘Alī then met her and asked, “What is wrong, O daughter of the Messenger of Allah?”

She told him what ‘Umar had done. He commented, “They have not perpetrated a greater crime upon me and your father than this!”¹

4. *Bihār al-Anwār*, Kitāb al-Fitan:

عن عبد الله بن سنان عن أبي عبد الله قال لما قبض رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وجلس أبو بكر مجلسه بعث إلى وكيل فاطمة فأخرجه من فذك فأتته فاطمة فقالت يا أبا بكر ادعيت أنك خليفة أبي و جلست مجلسه و أنت بعثت إلى وكيلي فأخرجته من فذك و قد تعلم أن رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم صدق بها علي و أن لي بذلك شهودا فقال إن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم لا يورث فرجعت إلى علي فأخبرته فقال ارجعي إليه قل لي زعمت أن النبي لا يورث و ورث سليمان داود و ورث يحيى زكريا و كيف لا أرت أنا أبي فقال عمر أنت معلمة قالت و إن كنت معلمة فإنما علمني ابن عمي فقال أبو بكر فإن عاتشة تشهد و عمر أنهما سمعا رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم و هو يقول إن النبي لا يورث فقالت هذا أول شهادة زور شهد به في الإسلام ثم قالت فإن فذك إنما هي صدق بها علي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم و لي بذلك بيعة فقال لها هلمي بينتك قال فجاءت بأم أيمن و علي فقال أبو بكر يا أم أيمن إنك سمعت من رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يقول في فاطمة فقالت سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يقول

1 *Bihār al-Anwār* pg. 96 from *Miṣbāḥ al-Anwār*.

إن فاطمة سيدة نساء أهل الجنة ثم قالت أم أيمن فمن كانت سيدة نساء أهل الجنة تدعي ما ليس لها و أنا امرأة من أهل الجنة ما كنت لأشهد بما لم أكن سمعت من رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم فقال عمر دعينا يا أم أيمن من هذه القصص بأي شيء تشهدين فقالت كنت جالسة في بيت فاطمة و رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم جالس حتى نزل عليه جبريل فقال يا محمد قم فإن الله تبارك و تعالى أمرني أن أخط لك فدكا بجناحي فقام رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم مع جبريل فما لبث أن رجع فقالت فاطمة يا أي أبن ذهبت فقال خط جبريل لي فدكا بجناحيه و حد لي حدودها فقالت يا أبت إنني أخاف العيلة و الحاجة من بعدك فصدق بها علي فقال هي صدقة عليك فقبضتها قالت نعم فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم يا أم أيمن اشهدي و يا علي اشهد ثم خرجت و حملها على إتان عليه كساء حمل فدار بها أربعين صباحا في بيوت المهاجرين و الأنصار و الحسن و الحسين معها و هي تقول يا معشر المهاجرين و الأنصار انصروا الله ابنة نبيكم و قد بايعتم رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم يوم بايعتموه أن تمنعوه و ذريته مما تمنعون منه أنفسكم و ذرايكم ففوا الرسول صلى الله عليه و سلم ببيعتمكم قال فما أعاننا أحد و لا أجابها و لا نصرها قالت فانتهيت إلى معاذ بن جبل فقالت يا معاذ بن جبل إني قد جئتكم مستنصرة و قد بايعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم على أن تنصروه و ذريته و تمنعه مما تمنع ذريتك و إن أبا بكر قد غضبني على فذك و أخرج و كيلي منها قال فمعي غيري قالت لا ما أجابني أحد قال فأين أبلغ من نصرك قال فخرجت من عندنا و دخل ابنه فقال ما جاء ابنه محمد إليك قال جاءت تطلب نصرتي على أبي بكر فإنه أخذ منها فدكا قال فما أجبتها به قال قلت و ما يبلغ من نصرتي أنا و حدي قال فأبيت أن تنصرونا قال نعم قال فأني شيء قالت لك قال قالت لي والله لأثاز عنك الفضيح من رأسي حتى أرد على رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم إذا لم تجب ابنة محمد صلى الله عليه و سلم قال و خرجت فاطمة و هي تقول والله لا أكلمك كلمة حتى اجتمع أنا و أنت عند رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم ثم انصرفت فقال علي رضي الله عنه لها أيتي أبا بكر و حده فإنه أرق من الآخر و قولي ادعيت مجلس أبي و إنك خليفة و جلست مجلسه و لو كانت فذك ثم استوهبتها منك لوجب ردها علي فلما أتته و قالت له ذلك قال صدقت قال فدعا بكتاب فكتبه لها برد فذك فخرجت و الكتاب معها فلقيها عمر فقال يا بنت محمد صلى الله عليه و سلم ما هذا الكتاب الذي معك فقالت كتب لي أبو بكر فذك فقال هلميه إلي فأبت أن تدفعه إليه فرسها برجله و كانت حاملة بابن اسمه المحسن فأسقطت المحسن من بطنها ثم لطمها فكأنني أنظر إلى قرط كان في أذنها حين نقضها ثم أخذ الكتاب فخرقه فمضت و مكثت خمسة و سبعين يوما مريضة مما ضربها عمر ثم قبضت

‘Abd Allāh ibn Sinān narrates from Abū ‘Abd Allāh who relates:

When Rasūlullāh ﷺ passed away and Abū Bakr assumed his position, he sent someone to remove Fāṭimah’s trustee from Fadak. Consequently, Fāṭimah approached him and said, “O Abū Bakr. You claim that you are my father’s *khalifah* (successor), and you have sat on his place. However, you sent someone to remove my trustee over Fadak whereas you are aware that Rasūlullāh ﷺ gave it to me as charity and I also have witnesses to this.”

He answered, “Certainly the Nabī ﷺ is not inherited.”

She returned to ‘Alī and told him what happened. He instructed her, “Return to him and say, ‘You assert that the Nabī is not inherited whereas Sulaymān inherited Dāwūd and Yaḥyā inherited Zakariyyā, so why should I not inherit from my father?’”

When she said this, ‘Umar exclaimed, “You have been coached.”

She said, “So what if I have been coached? My cousin taught me.”

Abū Bakr said, “‘Ā’ishah and ‘Umar testify that they heard Rasūlullāh ﷺ announcing, ‘A Nabī is not inherited from.’”

She said, “This is the first false testimony in Islam.”

She continued, “Indeed, Rasūlullāh ﷺ gifted me Fadak and I have witnesses to this.”

He told her, “Furnish your proof.”

So she brought Umm Ayman and ‘Alī. Abū Bakr said, “O Umm Ayman, did you hear Rasūlullāh ﷺ saying anything regarding Fāṭimah?”

She replied, “I heard Rasūlullāh ﷺ saying, ‘Indeed, Fāṭimah is the Queen of the women of Jannah.’”

Umm Ayman continued, “Would the Queen of the women of Jannah claim something which does not belong to her? Moreover, I am a woman from Jannah and I will not bear witness to something I never heard from Rasūlullāh ﷺ.”

‘Umar said, “Spare us these stories O Umm Ayman. What do you testify to?”

She said, “I was sitting in Fāṭimah’s house and Rasūlullāh ﷺ was also seated there. Just then, Jibrīl descended and said, ‘O Muḥammad, stand

up. Allah ﷻ has commanded me to sketch out for you Fadak with my wings.’

Rasūlullāh ﷺ thus stood up and left with Jibrīl. Not after long, he returned. Fāṭimah said, ‘O my father, where did you go?’

He explained, ‘Jibrīl sketched for me Fadak with his wings and set its boundaries.’

She said, ‘O my father, I fear poverty and want after you so give it to me in charity.’

He said, ‘It is ṣadaqah for you.’

She thus took possession over it. She said, ‘Yes.’

Rasūlullāh ﷺ then said, ‘O Umm Ayman, be witness and O Alī be witness.’”

[Notwithstanding this testimony, Abū Bakr did not hand it over to her.]

She then left [Abū Bakr’s presence]. ‘Alī mounted her on a mule upon which there was a cloth. He then went around with her for forty days to the houses of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār with Ḥasan and Ḥusayn. She would plea, “O gathering of Muhājirīn and Anṣār! For Allah’s sake help the daughter of your Nabī. The day you pledged allegiance to Rasūlullāh ﷺ, you pledged that you will protect him and his progeny the way you protect yourselves and your children. Fulfil the pledge of Rasūlullāh ﷺ.”

No one helped us, no one supported us, and no one answered our plea.

She then went to Mu‘ādh ibn Jabal and said, “O Mu‘ādh ibn Jabal, I have come to you seeking help. You have giving bay‘ah to Rasūlullāh ﷺ to help him and his children and protect him the way you protect your children. Abū Bakr has usurped Fadak from me and removed my trustee from it.”

He asked, “Is there anyone with me?”

She said, “No. No one answered my call.”

He submitted, “Then what will be the fruits of my sole endeavour?”

She left and his son entered his presence. He asked, “What brought the daughter of Muḥammad to you.”

Mu‘ādh said, “She came seeking my assistance against Abū Bakr because he took Fadak away from her.”

He asked, “What answer did you give her?”

“I said, ‘What results will my individual assistance produce?’” he explained.

“So you declined from helping her,” he asked.

“Yes,” Mu‘ādh replied.

He asked, “What did she tell you then?”

He replied, “She told me, ‘By Allah, I will most certainly not talk to you until I meet Rasūlullāh ﷺ since you did not answer the plea of Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ daughter.’”

He continues, “Fāṭimah left saying, ‘By Allah, I will not speak a word to you until we both stand before Rasūlullāh ﷺ.’ She then went away.”

‘Alī advised her, “Go to Abū Bakr when he is alone since he is more compassionate than the other and tell him, ‘You have claimed the place of my father and that you are khalīfah and assumed his position. Had I asked you to gift Fadak to me, it would be binding on you to comply.’”

She came to him and told him this. He said, “You have spoken the truth.”

He then called for a document and wrote that Fadak be returned to her.

She left with the document and bumped into `Umar. He asked, “O daughter of Muḥammad, what is that document in your hand?”

She replied, “Abū Bakr wrote that Fadak belongs to me.”

He said, “Give it to me.”

She refused to give it to him so he kicked her. At the time, she was pregnant with a son whose name was Muḥsin and miscarried him. He then smacked her. As if I can see the mark on her ear from this smack.

He then snatched the document from her and tore it up. She left and remained ill for 75 days from `Umar’s beating until she finally passed away.¹

5.

روى العلامة في كشكولها لمنسوب إليه عن المفضل بن عمر قال قال مولاي جعفر صادق لما ولي أبو بكر ابن أبي قحافة قال له عمر إن الناس عبيد هذه الدنيا لا يريدون غيرها فامنع عن علي وأهل بيته الخمس والفيء وقد كان شيعته إذا علموا ذلك تركوا عليا عليه السلام وأقبلوا إليك رغبة في الدنيا وإيثارا ومحابة عليها ففعل أبو بكر ذلك و صرف عنهم جميع ذلك فلما قال أبو بكر بن أبي قحافة مناديا من كان له عند رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم دين او عدة فليأتني حتى أقضيه وأنجز لجابر بن عبد الله والجريز بن عبد الله الجلي قال علي لفاطمة صيري إلى أبي بكر و اذكر به فدكا فصارت فاطمة إليه و ذكرت له فدكا مع الخمس و الفيء فقال هاتي بيته يا بنت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فقالت أما فدك فإن الله عز و جل أنزل على نبيه قرآنا يأمر فيه بأن يؤتيني و ولدي حقي قال الله تعالى و آت ذا القربى حقه فكنت أنا و ولدي أقرب الخلائق إلى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فنحلني و ولدي فدكا فلما تلا عليه جبريل المسكين و ابن السبيل قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ما حق المسكين و ابن السبيل فأنزل الله تعالى و اعلموا إنما غنمتم من شيء إنيخ فقسم الخمس على خمسة أقسام فقال ما أفاء الله على رسوله من أهل القرى فله و للرسول و لذي القربى و البتامة و المساكين ابن السبيل كيلا يكون دولة بين الأغنياء منك فما لله فهو لرسوله و ما لرسول الله فهو لذي القربى و نحن ذوي القربى قال الله تعالى قل لا أسئلكم عليه أجرا إلا المودة في القربى فنظر أبو بكر بن أبي قحافة إلى عمر بن الخطاب و قال ما تقول فقال عمر و من البتامة و المساكين و أبناء السبيل فقالت فاطمة البتامة الذين يأتمون بالله و رسوله و بذى القربى و المساكين الذين أسكنوا معهم في الدنيا و الآخرة و ابن السبيل الذي يسلك مسلكتهم قال عمر فإذا الخمس و الفيء كله لكم و لمواليكم و لأشباعكم فقالت فاطمة أما فدك فأوجبها الله لي و لولدي دون موالينا و شيعتنا

1 *Bihār al-Anwār*, Kitāb al-Fitan, pg. 101.

و أما الخمس فقسمه الله لنا و لموا لينا و أشباعنا كما فقرأ في كتاب الله قال عمر فما لسائر المهاجرين و الأنصار التابعين بإحسان قالت فاطمة إن كانوا موالينا و من أشباعنا فلهم الصدقات التي قسمها الله و أوجبها في كتابه فقال عز و جل إنما الصدقات للفقراء و المساكين و العاملين عليها و المؤلفة قلوبهم و في الرقاب إلى آخر القصة قال عمر فدك خاصة و الفيء لكم و لأوليائكم ما أحسب أصحاب محمد يرضون بهذا قالت فاطمة فإن الله عز و جل رضي بذلك و رسوله رضي به قسم على الموالاة و المتبعة لا على المعادة و المخالفة و من عادانا فقد عادا الله و من خالفنا فقد خالف الله و من خالف الله فقد استوجب من الله العذاب الأليم و العقاب الشديد في الدنيا و الآخرة فقال عمر هاتي ببينة يا بنت محمد صلى الله عليه و سلم على ما تدعين فقالت فاطمة قد صدقتم جابر بن عبد الله و جرير بن عبد الله و لم تسألوهما البينة و بيتي في كتاب الله فقال عمر إن جابرا و جريرا ذكرا أمرا هينا و أنت تدعين أمرا عظيما يقع به الردة من المهاجرين و الأنصار فقالت إن المهاجرين برسول الله و أهل بيت رسول الله هاجروا إلى دينه و الأنصار بالإيمان بالله و رسوله و بذى القربى إحسانا فلا هجرة إلا إلينا و لا نصرة إلا معنا و لا اتباع بإحسان إلا بنا و من ارتد عنا فإلى الجاهلية فقال لها عمر و عينا من أباطيلك و احضرينا من يشهد لك بما تقولين فبعث إلى علي و الحسن و الحسين و أم أيمن و أسماء بنت عميس و كانت تحت أبي بكر بن أبي قحافة فأقبلوا إلى أبي بكر و شهدوا لها بجميع ما قالت و ادعته فقال أما علي فزوجها و أما الحسن و الحسين ابناها و أما أم أيمن فمولاتها و أما أسماء بنت عميس فقد كانت تحت جعفر بن أبي طالب فهي تشهد لبني هاشم و قد كانت تخدم فاطمة و كل هؤلاء يجرون إلى أنفسهم فقال علي أما فاطمة فبضعة من رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم و من آذاها فقد آذى رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم و من كذبها فقد كذب رسول الله و أما الحسن و الحسين فابنا رسول الله و سيذا شباب أهل الجنة من كذبهما فقد كذب رسول الله إذ كان أهل الجنة صادقين و أما أنا فقد قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم أنت مني و أنا منك و أنت أخي في الدنيا و الآخرة الراد عليك هو الراد علي من أطاعك فقد أطاعني و من عصاك فقد عصاني و أما أم أيمن فقد شهد لها رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم بالجنة و دعا لأسماء بنت عميس و ذريتها فقال عمر أتمم ما وصفتم به لأنفسكم و لكن شهادة الجار إلى نفسه لا تقبل فقال علي إذا كنا نحن كما نعرفون و لا تنكرون و شهادتنا لأنفسنا لا تقبل و شهادة رسول الله لا تقبل فإنا لله و إنا إليه راجعون إذا و عينا لأنفسنا تسألنا البينة فما من معين يعين و قد وثبتم على سلطان الله و سلطان رسوله فأخرجتموه من بيته إلى بيت غيره من غير بيته و لا حجة و سيعلم الذين ظلموا أي منقلب ينقلبون ثم قال لفاطمة انصر في حتى يحكم الله بيننا و هو خير الحاكمين

‘Allāmah reports in his *Kashkol* from Mufaḍḍal ibn ‘Umar who says that his master Ja‘far al-Šādiq said:

When Abū Bakr ibn Abī Quḥāfah became khalīfah, ‘Umar told him, “People are undoubtedly the servants of this world. They desire nothing else. So prevent ‘Alī and the Ahl al-Bayt from the Khumus and fay’. When his followers will come to learn of this, they will abandon him and turn to you out of greed for the world, and giving it preference.”

Abū Bakr followed his advice. Abū Bakr ibn Abī Quḥāfah made an announcement, “Whoever has any outstanding credit from Rasūlullāh ﷺ or promise should approach me and I will fulfil it.” Jābir ibn ‘Abd Allāh and Jarīr ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Bajalī were given their shares.

‘Alī said to Fāṭimah, “Go to Abū Bakr and mention Fadak to him.” She complied and approached him telling him about Fadak together with the Khumus and Fay’. He said, “Bring me proof, O daughter of Rasūlullāh ﷺ.”

She said, “With regards to Fadak, Allah ﷻ revealed verses of the Qur’ān to His Messenger commanding him to give me and my children my right. Allah ﷻ declared: *And give the relative his right.* I and my children are the closest of all creation to Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Thus he gifted Fadak to me and my children. When Jibrīl recited to him *and the needy and traveller*, Rasūlullāh ﷺ asked, ‘What is the right of the needy and traveller?’ Upon this, Allah revealed:

And know that anything you obtain of war booty...¹

Accordingly, he distributed the Khumus into few parts.

Allah then revealed:

And what Allah restored to His Messenger from the people of the towns - it is for Allah and for the Messenger and for [his] near relatives and orphans and the [stranded] traveller - so that it will not be a perpetual distribution among the rich from among you.²

So whatever is for Allah belongs to the Messenger and whatever is for the Messenger belongs to the near relatives and we are the near relatives.

Allah ﷻ declared:

1 Sūrah al-Anfāl: 41.

2 Sūrah al-Ḥaṣhr: 7.

Say, [O Muḥammad], “I do not ask you for this message any payment [but] only good will through kinship.”¹

Abū Bakr ibn Abī Quḥāfah looked at ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb and said, “What is she saying?”

‘Umar enquired, “Who are the orphans, needy, and travellers?”

Fāṭimah explained, “The orphans are those who seek sanctuary by Allah, His Messenger, and the near relatives. The needy are those who live with them in this world and the Hereafter. And the travellers are those who tread their path.”

‘Umar said, “Then Khumus and Fay’ are exclusively for you, your freed slaves, and your supporters?”

Fāṭimah said, “Allah has made Fadak obligatory for me and my children to the exclusion of our freed slaves and supporters. On the other hand, Allah divided Khumus between us, our freed slaves, and our supporters just as he stated in His Book.”

‘Umar asked, “So what is for all the Muhājirīn, Anṣār, and those who follow them with goodness?”

Fāṭimah explained, “If they are part of our freed slaves or followers, then they will receive zakāh which Allah ﷻ has distributed and made mandatory in His book. Allah ﷻ declares:

Zakāh expenditures are only for the poor and for the needy and for those employed to collect [zakāh] and for bringing hearts together [for Islam]...²

‘Umar said, “So Fadak and Fay’ belong exclusively to you and your supporters? I do not feel that the Companions of Rasūlullāh ﷺ will be pleased with this.”

1 Sūrah al-Shūrā: 23.

2 Sūrah al-Tawbah: 60.

Fāṭimah retorted, “Allah, the Mighty and Majestic, and His Messenger are pleased with this. He distributed according to friendship and following, nor upon enmity and opposition. Whoever hates us, hates Allah. Whoever opposes us opposes Allah. And whoever opposes Allah has earned himself Allah’s painful chastisement and severe punishment in the world and the Hereafter.”

‘Umar said, “Bring proof, O daughter of Muḥammad, for your claim.”

Fāṭimah said, “You believed Jābir ibn ‘Abd Allāh and Jarīr ibn ‘Abd Allāh and did not ask them for proof whereas my proof is in the Book of Allah.”

‘Umar said, “Jābir and Jarīr mentioned something trivial whereas your claim is grand which will result in the Muhājirīn and Anṣār turning renegade.”

She responded, “Indeed, the Muhājirīn with Rasūlullāh ﷺ and his Ahl al-Bayt emigrated towards his Dīn. And the Anṣār brought īmān in Allah and His Messenger and displayed kindness to the near relatives. Hence, there is no hijrah except towards us, no assistance except with us, and no following with goodness except with us. Whoever turns away from us, goes towards ignorance.”

‘Umar said, “Spare us from your nonsensical talk and present for us someone who can verify your claim.”

Thus, ‘Alī, Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, Umm Ayman, and Asmā’ bint ‘Umays – who was in the nikāḥ of Abū Bakr ibn Abī Quḥāfah – were summoned. They approached Abū Bakr and testified to everything she said and claimed.

He remarked, “‘Alī is her husband, Ḥasan and Ḥusayn are her sons, Umm Ayman is her freed slave, and Asmā’ bint ‘Umays was married to Ja‘far ibn Abī Ṭālib, hence she is testifying for the Banū Hāshim, and also she would serve Fāṭimah. All of these are pulling benefit towards themselves.”

‘Alī commented, “Fāṭimah is the part of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Whoever harms her harms Rasūlullāh ﷺ. And whoever belies her, belies Rasūlullāh ﷺ.”

ﷺ. Ḥasan and Ḥusayn are the sons of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and the leaders of the youth of Jannah. Whoever belies them belies Rasūlullāh ﷺ as the dwellers of Jannah are truthful. With regards to me, Rasūlullāh ﷺ said, ‘You are from me and I am from you. You are my brother in this world and the Hereafter. Whoever turns to you has turned to me. Whoever obeys you has obeyed me. And whoever disobeys you has disobeyed me. Rasūlullāh ﷺ has promised Umm Ayman Jannah and made du‘ā’ for Asmā’ bint ‘Umays and her progeny.’”

‘Umar shouted, “You are as you have described yourselves. However, the testimony of one who draws benefit for himself is not accepted.”

‘Alī explained, “If this is our condition and you acknowledge it and deny nothing, yet our testimony for ourselves is not accepted and Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ testimony is not accepted, then to Allah do we belong and to Him is our return. When we claim for ourselves, you ask us for proof and there is no helper to assist. You have ventured to assume the kingdom of Allah and His Messenger and removed it from its house to another house without any proof or evidence. Soon, the oppressors will come to know by what a great reverse they will be overturned.”

He then said to Fāṭimah, “Depart. Allah will decided between us and He is the best of judges.”¹

6. Khuṭbah Fāṭimah al-Zahrā’

This is a famous address recorded in *Ihtijāj* and other Shī‘ī books. It is mentioned therein that when Fāṭimah learnt that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه intended to deprive her of Fadak, she came to him in Masjid al-Nabawī and gave an eloquent and bombastic speech. She complained of his injustices and presented Qur’ānic verses and other evidences to indict him and left no stone unturned in proving her right. Since this khuṭbah is very lengthy, we will not quote it entirely. Nonetheless, there is no mention

1 *Bihār al-Anwār* pg. 101, 102.

therein of Fadak being gifted or her having possession of it. Whatever she said was concerning inheritance. She said in her address:

أنتم الآن تزعمون أن الإرث لنا أفحكم الجاهلية تبغون يا ابن أبي قحافة في كتاب الله ترث أباك و لا أرث
أبي لقد جئت شيئا فريا أفعلى عمد تركتم كتاب الله و نبذتموه وراء ظهركم إذ يقول و ورث سليمان داود
إلخ

You now think that inheritance is not for us. Do you desire the judgement of ignorance? O son of Abū Quḥāfah is it mentioned in the Book of Allah that you will inherit from your father while I will not inherit from mines? You have indeed introduced a great slander. Have you discarded the Book of Allah intentionally and thrown it behind your backs. Allah declares, “*And Sulaymān inherited from Dāwūd*”¹. And He mentions the supplication of Zakariyyā, “*So give me from Yourself an heir who will inherit me*”². Despite this, you think that I do not have any right and I will not inherit from my father. No problem, Allah will sort you out. On the Day of Qiyāmah, you will come to know.”

7.

و روي أن فاطمة جاءت إلى أبي بكر بعد وفاة رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم فقالت يا أبا بكر من يرثك
إذا مت قال أهلي و ولدي قالت فما لي لا أرث رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم فقال إن النبي لا يورث
و لكن أنفق على من كان ينفق عليه رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم و أعطي ما كان يعطيه قالت والله لا
أكملك بكلمة ما حبيت فما كلمته حتى ماتت

It is reported that Fāṭimah came to Abū Bakr after Rasūlullāh’s ﷺ demise and said, “O Abū Bakr, who will inherit from you when you die?”

He said, “My family and children.”

She said, “So why do I not inherit from Rasūlullāh ﷺ?”

He explained, “A nabī is not inherited from. However, I will spend on those Rasūlullāh ﷺ would spend on and give what Rasūlullāh ﷺ would give.”

1 Sūrah al-Naml: 16.

2 Sūrah Maryam: 5, 6.

She said, “By Allah, I will never speak a word to you for as long as I live.”

Thus she did not speak to him until she passed away.¹

8.

وقيل جاءت فاطمة إلى أبي بكر فقالت أعطني ميراثي من رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال إن الأنبياء لا تورث ما تركوه فهو صدقة فرجعت إلى علي رضي الله عنه فقال ارجعي فقولي ما شأن سليمان ورث داود وقال زكريا فهب لي من لدنك وليا يرثني ويرث من آل يعقوب فأبوا وأبى

It is said that Fāṭimah came to Abū Bakr and said, “Give me my inheritance from Rasūlullāh ﷺ.”

He responded, “The Ambiyā’ are not inherited from. Whatever they leave behind is ṣadaqah.”

She returned to ‘Alī رضي الله عنه who said to her, “Go back and tell him, ‘What is with Sulaymān who inherited from Dāwūd? And Zakariyyā said: *So give me from Yourself an heir who will inherit me and from the family of Ya‘qūb?*’”

They denied and he rejected.²

9.

عن جابر بن عبد الله الأنصاري عن أبي جعفر أن أبا بكر قال لفاطمة النبي لا يورث قالت قد ورث سليمان داود قال زكريا فهب لي من لدنك وليا يرثني ويرث من آل يعقوب فنحن أقرب إلى النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم من زكريا إلى يعقوب وعن جعفر قال قال علي لفاطمة انطلقني فاطلبي ميراثك من أبيك رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فجاءت إلى أبي بكر فقالت أعطني ميراثي من أبي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم قال النبي لا يورث فقالت ألم يرث سليمان داود فغضب وقال النبي لا يورث قالت ألم يقل زكريا فهب لي من لدنك وليا يرثني ويرث من آل يعقوب فقال النبي لا يورث فقال ألم يقل يوصيكم الله في أولادكم للذكر مثل حظ الأنثيين فقال النبي لا يورث

Jābir ibn ‘Abd Allāh al-Anṣārī reports from Abū Ja‘far that Abū Bakr said to Fāṭimah, “A nabī is not inherited from.”

1 *Bihār al-Anwār* pg. 104.

2 *Ibid*

She said, “*Sulaymān inherited Dāwūd*. Zakariyyā prayed, “So give me from Yourself an heir who will inherit me and from the family of Ya‘qūb.” We are closer to the Nabī than Zakariyyā was to Ya‘qūb.

It is reported from Ja‘far that ‘Alī said to Fāṭimah, “Go and seek your inheritance from your father Rasūlullāh ﷺ.”

Accordingly, she approached Abū Bakr and said, “Give me my inheritance from my father Rasūlullāh ﷺ.”

He said, “A nabī is not inherited.”

She responded, “Did Sulaymān not inherit Dāwūd?”

He became upset and shouted, “A nabī is not inherited.”

She said, “Did Zakariyyā not supplicated, ‘So give me from Yourself an heir who will inherit me and from the family of Ya‘qūb?’”

He said, “A nabī is not inherited.”

She said, “Did He not state, ‘Allah instructs you concerning your children: for the male, what is equal to the share of two females.’”

He said, “A nabī is not inherited from.”²

10.

عن أبي سعيد الخدري قال لما قبض رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم جاءت فاطمة عليها السلام تطلب فدكا فقال أبو بكر إني لأعلم إن شاء الله أنك لن تقولي إلا حقا ولكن هاتي ببينتك فجاءت بعلي فشهد ثم جاءت بأم أيمن فشهدت فقال امرأة أخرى أو رجلا فكتبت لك بها

Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī reports that after Rasūlullāh ﷺ passed away, Fāṭimah came seeking Fadak. Abū Bakr said, “Certainly, I know that by Allah’s you will only speak the truth. Nonetheless, provide your proof.”

1 Sūrah al-Nisā: 11.

2 *Bihār al-Anwār* pg. 104.

She brought ‘Alī who testified followed by Umm Ayman who testified.

He said, “[Bring] another woman or man and I will decree it in your favour.”¹

11. When Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ heard that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ deprived Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا of Fadak, he wrote this letter to him:

شكوا متلاطمات أمواج الفتن بحيازيم سفن النجاة و حطوا تيجان أهل الفخر بجمع أهل الغدر و استضاؤا بنور الأنوار اقتسموا موارث الطاهرات الأبرار و احتقبوا ثقل الأوزار بغصبهم نحلة النبي المختار فكأنى بكم تردد و نفي العمي كما يتردد البعير في الطاحونة أما و الله لو أذن لي بما ليس لكم به علم لحصدت رؤوسكم عن أجسادكم كحب الحصيد بقواضب من حديد و ولقعت من جماجم شجعانكم ما أقرح به أماقكم و أوهش به محالككم فإني منذ عرفت مردي العساكر و مفني الجحافل و مبيد خضراتكم و مخمد ضوضائكم و جزاز الدواين إذ أنتم في بيوتكم معتكفون و إني لصاحبكم بالأمس لعمر أبي و أمي لن تحبوا أن تكون فينا الخلافة و النبوة و أنتم تذكرون أحقاد بدر و ثارات أحد أما و الله لو قلت ما سبق من الله فيكم لتداخلت أضلاعكم في أجوافكم كتداخل أسنان دوارة الرحي فإن نطقت تقولون حسد و إن سكت فيقال إن ابن أبي طالب جزع من الموت هيهات هيهات الساقية يقال لي هذا و أنا لعميت المائت و خواض المنايا في جوف ليل حالك حامل سيفين الثقيلين و الرمحين الطويلين و منكس الروايات في غط مط الغمرات مفرج الكربات عن وجه خير البريات يهتوا فوالله لابن أبي طالب آتس بالموت من الطفل إلى محالب أمه هبلكم الهوابل لو بحت بما أنزل الله سبحانه في كتابه فيكم لا اضطربتم اضطراب الأرشية في الطوي العبيدة و لخرجتم من بيوتكم هاربين و علي و جوهكم مائمين و لكني أهون و جدي حتى ألقى ربي بيد جذاء صفراء من لذاتكم خلوا من طحناتكم فما مثل دنياكم عندي إلا كمثل غيم علا فاستعلى ثم استغلظ فاستوى ثم تمزق فانجلى رويدا فغن قليل ينجلي لكم القسطل و تجنون ثم فعلكم مرا و تحصدون غرس أيديكم ذعافا ممقرا و سما قاتلا و كفى بالله حكيما و برسول الله خصيما و بالقيامة موقفقا فلا بعد الله فيها سواكم و لا اتعس فيها غيركم و السلام على من اتبع الهدى

First you were saved from trials and abandoned pride and arrogance and came into the light of Nubuwwah. However, at the end you looted the inheritance of the pure Ahl al-Bayt and snatched the gift of Rasūlullāh رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ thus becoming a criminal. I see you stumbling in misguidance like a camel being turned in a mill.

By Allah! Had I had permission, I would have beheaded you like how a plantation is harvested and piled up. I would have killed your brave men in

1 Ibid pg. 14.

such a way that your eyes would have popped out and your houses would have become desolate. You know me from the beginning. I have destroyed armies and ruined armed forces. I have demolished your green lands and put an end to your protests, and broken your brethren into pieces. At that time, you would sit in your homes afraid. You accepted me as your leader yesterday, however by Allah you never wanted with your hearts that both khilāfah and nubuwwah remain in our home because you have not forgotten the malice of Badr and the bloodshed of Uḥud.

By Allah! If I had to manifest Allah's decision which He passed concerning you, your bones and ribs would have struck each other like the two parts of a mill. Whenever I say something, you say that I speak out of jealousy. And when I remain silent you say that Abū Ṭālib's sons are afraid of death. How regretful! I am death and this is said about me. I am lost death. I am the one to infiltrate the battlefields on dark nights. I am the carrier of sword and spear. I slam into spears in the melees and break them into pieces. I have removed difficulties from the path of Rasūlullāh ﷺ. Wait a little! By Allah! Abū Ṭālib's son is familiar with death like a child is comforted with his mother's breast.

May death befall you! If I had to disclose what Allah ﷻ had declared about you, you will be like ropes and abandon your homes in flight. You will stumble here and there. However, I will control my fervour until the time I meet my Lord in a state that my hands are free from worldly luxuries which you love. Your world in my sight is like a cloud which rose high, looked lovely and spread around. It then burst and was emptied.

Wait for a moment. The dust will settle in a little while and you will eat the fruits of your actions which will be bitter or you will harvest the plantation you sowed which will be deadly poison. Allah is sufficient as judge and Rasūlullāh ﷺ is sufficient as a caller and the plains of Qiyāmah are sufficient for justice. On that Day, may Allah deprive none of His mercy besides you and may He destroy none besides you. And peace on those who follow guidance.

از جابر جعفی مروی است که ابو بکر صدقات دہات مدینہ و فدک را غصب نموده بود و سائر اطراف نواحی مدینہ را در عہدہ اشجع بن مراحم تقفی منودہ و او مردے بود دلیر و با علی رضی اللہ عنہ دشمن بعلت اینکہ برادر او در جنگ ہوازن بدست انحضرت کشتہ شدہ بود و چون بیرون آمد اول محلے را کہ دست تعدی برا و کشود مزرعہ بود از اہل بیت مسمی بانقیبا اہل مزرعہ رسولے نزد انحضرت فرستادند کیفیت را علام نمودند انحضرت رضی اللہ عنہ عمامہ سیاہ بے برسریست و دو شمشیر بر میان بست و بر اسب صحاب سوار شد و اسب دیگر را بیدک کشید و حسنین رضی اللہ عنہما و عمار و فضل بن عباس و عبد اللہ بن جعفر و عبد اللہ بن عباس رضی اللہ عنہم را بہرہ برد و چون ماں مزرعہ رسید در مسجد فضا فرود آمد و امام حسین را بطلب اشجع فرستاد و چون نزد او رفت فرمودا جب امیر المومنین ابن ملعون گفت کیست امیر المومنین فرمود علی گفت بلکہ ابو بکر است کہ در مدینہ و آگرارادہ اورا باز حضرت فرمودا جب علیا گفت من سلطانم و او رعیت و احتیاج بہن دار دائوبیاید حضرت امام حسین بر گشت و کیفیت را عرض کرد فرمود بعمار تو برو و اورا برفق و مدارا بیار پس عمار رفت و گفت مرحبا یا ابا ثقیف چہ چیز ترا بران داشتہ کہ با امیر المومنین بد سلوکی کنی و چیزیکہ در تصرف اوست بگیری حال بیا وغدر خود بگوفحش بسیار بعمار داد و عمار ہم شدید الغضب بود دست بہ شمشیر برد کیے آمد بنزد انحضرت کہ در باب عمار را کہ الحال اورا پارہ پارہ می کند پس انحضرت اہل بیتی کہ بہرہ اوردہ بودند فرستاد و فرمود متر سید و اورا کشان کشان بنزد من برید پس ایشان آمدند و اورا کشان کشان آوردند انحضرت فرمود واگرارید اورا و تعجیل مکنید کہ بتیز مغزی حجت خدا تمام نشود بعد ازان فرمود و ای بر تو بچہ متمسک اموال اہل بیت را حلال دانستہ و چہ حجت ترا بجاتر انداختہ بر این کہ گردہ این ملعون گفت تو نیز بچہ حجت قتل مردم را بر خود حلال کردہ و من رضاء صاحب خود را دوست تر دارم از موافقت بانو حضرت فرمود بلے تفسیرے بر خود سراغ ندارم مگر کشتن برادرت و این بگفتہ رسول خدا بود چیزے نبود کہ تلافی خواہد خدا ترا بلاک کند و صورت را قبیح گرداند اشجع گفت بلکہ خدا ترا بلاک کند و عمرت را قطع نماید کہ پیوستہ با خلفاء حسد می ورزی و این ترا بہلاکت می کشاند و بہراد خود اخر نحوابی رسید پس فضل بغضب در آمد و شمشیر خود را بر اورا حوالہ نمود و در اورا بادست راست او انداخت پس اصحاب او کہ سی نفر بودند و ہمہ از شجاعان بر فضل بہجوم آوردند و امیر المومنین دست ہذو الفقار بردہ چون برق ذو الفقار برق چشم انحضرت دیدند زہرہ ایشان اب شدہ و براق خود را ریختند و گفتند الطاعة الطاعة فرمود و ای بر شما سیر این صاحب کو چک خود را پرید نزد این صاحب بزرگ خود کہ مثل شما کسی نیستند کہ کشتن شما نحوابی نحوابی داشتہ باشد پس رفتند بہدینہ و سر رفیق خود را پیش ابو بکر انداختند پس او مردم را طلبید و ترغیب نمود کہ بروند بسر انحضرت و خون اشجع را بخوابند مردم سکوت کردند گفت شما چرا گنگ شدہ ایایا پیر و خذف گردیدہ اید حجاج بن صخر گفت بسم اللہ تو پیشوائے مائی پیش برو تا ما از عقب تو بیائیم و اگر بیائی مجموع قشون را ذبح کند و نحر نماید مثل نحر کردن شتران دیگرے گفت می خوایم کہ باستراحت در خانہ بنشینیم و مارا بفرستی نزد جزار اعظم کہ مردم را شمشیر خود می ریاید بخدا ملاقات عزرائیل بر ما انسان تراست از ملاقات او پس ابو بکر نفرین کرد برایشان را و بعمر شوری نمود او گفت خالد را بفرست پس خالد را گفت بو سیف اللہ ہستی جمعیت خویرے بردار و برو علی کہ شیر درندہ ما را کشتہ و می خواہد کہ تفرقہ در میان امت بیندازد اولا اورا بطریق خوش مستمال نمودہ تابیاہد و بخانہ خود بنشیند کہ ما از تقصیر او گذاشتیم والا اوبرا با سیری بیار پس خالد بپا نصد سوار از شجاعان مکمل و مسلح روانہ شد فضل بن عباس چون گرد لشکر را دید عرض کرد یا امیر المومنین لشکر آمد حضرت فرمود تشویش مکن و اisan بگیرانہارا کہ اگر ہمہ بزرگان قریش قبائل ہوازن جمع شوند و حشتے از براے من حاصل نشودا نگاه برخاست و جلو اسب را گرفتہ خوابید برپشت خود بر برے زمین بقصد اہانت و بے التفاتی و بر نخاست تا

پواز سم اسپان بلند شد و ایشان رسیدند آنگاه برخاست چون خالد را وید فرمود یا ابا سلیمان چه چیز ترا بپورده است باین سمت گفت کسی مرا فرستاده که تو بهتر از من میدانی فرمود حال بگوگفت عالی و محتاج بتعلیم نیستی گفت این چه عمل است که از تو صادر شده و این چه عدواتی است که از تو ظاهر گردید اگر توای مرد یعنی ابو بکر را خوش نداری ابا تو چنین نیست و ترا دوست می دارد و ولایت اورنگین نباشد بر خواطر تو که بعد از اسلام و هجرت دیگر نژایه باقی نمانده بگذار مردم را بحال خود می خوابند گمراه نشوند یارستگار نو عبث باعث تقرفه میان امت مشو ایش خاموش شده را میفروز که اگر چنین کردی عاقبت خوشی نخواهد داشت اینحضرت فرمود تهدیدی کنی مرا بخود و پسر ابو قحافه مگر نمی دانی که از سخنان تو داد بامثال من تهدیدی واقع نمی شود و اگراراین لاف و گزاف را مطلقه که داری بگوگفت بمن گفته اند که اگر بر گشتی ازین اطویق در پیش ما عزیز و مکرم خوابی بود و اگربرنه گشتی ترابا سیری پرم نذا و حضرت فرمود ای کنیز زاده تومی توانی حق و باطل را ازیک دیگر فرق کنی و می توانی مثل منی را اسیر و از پری ای پسر مرتد از اسلام وائے بر تو مرا بهمگام مالک بن نویره کرده که رفتی و اورا کشتی و زن اورا متصرف شدی اے خالد باین عقل سبک ورای خالی از شهرم ائمه بامن معارضه کنی بخدا قسم اگر شمشیر خود را بکشم بر تو و اینان که بهمهرا تو اند سیر می کنم از گوشت بدن شما هر چه در صحرا از کفتا رو گرگ باشد و اے بنومن این عیستم که تو درحقیقت مرا توانید کشید و من قاتل خود رامی شناسم و از خدا ایزومی کنم صبح و شام که مرگ مرا ازین رحمت روزگار نجات و بدو اگر بخوابم حالا درزیردیوار بهمیں مسجد ترا خوابم کشت خالد بغضب در ائد و گفت تهدید و عید تو مثل غریدن شیرمی ماند و در سوارخ خود حزیدن و گریختن مثل رو باه چه بسیار بزبان تعدی می کنی و فعلت مطابق قولت نیست حضرت گفت هرگاه عقیده تو این ست پس بایست تا بفعل بهم برسی و شمشیر ذو الفقار از غلاف کشیده بر او حواله نمود خالد بهمیں که برق چشم اینحضرت و برق ذو الفقار را مشاهده نمود مرگ معائنہ دید گفت یا ابا الحسن برائے این نیامده بودم پس اینحضرت پشت ذو الفقار ابرو فرود آورد و از اسپ در غلطید و قاعده اینحضرت نبود که شمشیر را فرو آوردی دو باره دو باره بر گرداند مبادا که اورا بترسی و جبن حمل نمایند اصحاب خالد ازین کار اینحضرت بول غریبی و ترس عجیبه بهم رسانیدند پس اینحضرت بایشان خطاب نمود که چرا حمایت سید و بزرگ خود نمی کنید و الله اگر من سردار شما بودم حال بر بایه شما می کندم و برمن ایسان تریوداز ائکه دانه گندم را از خوشه بچیند و باین رشادت مال خدا و رسول و مسلمانان رامی بلید پس مثنی بن الصباح که عاقل کامله بود از اصحاب خالد گفت والله ما بعداوت و دشمنی نیامده ایم یا این نبود که ترانشناسیم بلکه کوچک و بزرگ مامی دانیم که توئی شیر خدا در زمین و شمشیر انتقام او بر معاندین لیکن ماما موریم و بجبر مارا فرستاده اند و مامور معذور است خدا تلف کند اورا که مارا فرستاد پس اینحضرت شرم کرد از سخن این مردورورا از ایشان گردانید و با خالد شوخی و مزاح می نمود بعلت صدمه وائے که باور سیده از ضرب پشت شمشیر و او بیج جواب نمی داد آنگاه فرمود و ای برتو اے خالد چه بسیار مطیع و فرمانبردار گناهیگاران و عهد شکنان گردیده مگر نقل روز غدیر کبایت نکرد ترا بحق این کسی که دانه را شکافته اگر ائچه بخیاں تو پسر ابو قحافه و پسر خطاب رسیده چیزے را اظهار می گردید و از شماشمه ازان بظهور می رسید اول کسیکه باین شمشیر کشته می شد تو و ایشان می بودید و ائچه مقدر الهی بود بععل می اید و مشیت این بدبخت ترا فاسد ملی کند و تو بهم دانسته چشم از حق می پوشی و حال ائمه که با این کثافت مرا اسیر و از پری بعد از ائچه بچشم خود دیدی و تجربها کردی چنان می دانی که ائچه رفیقیت در وقتیکه ترامی فرستاد بتو گفت و بابهم شوری و صلاح گردید بر من مخفی و پوشیده است چنان و چنان گفتند و تو می گفتی که این بمان ابو الحسن است که عمر بن عبد ود را کشت و مرحب ریاد و نیم کرد و در خیبر را او جواب بتو گفت تو بهمیں نقلهائے گزشته اورا می کنی ائنها از برکت دعائے پغمبر بود و حال پیغمبر از دنیا رفته و ائنها را نمی تو اند کرد پس بترسی اے خالد از خدا و رفیق خیانت کاران مباحش خالد گفت یا ابا الحسن والله می دانم که چی می

گوئی و طائفه عرب و عامه مردم از تورو گردان نشده اند مگر بهجت دین ایاء و اجداد خود از قدیم و از عداوت اینکه سرپاے ایشان را انداخته بودی و میل با ابو بکر بهم نرسانیدند مگر بعلت اطینان پاس و سطوت او و نرمی طبیعت او و زیاده بر حق ایشان ایشان دادن

It is reported on the authority of Jābir al-Ju'fī that Abū Bakr appointed Ashja' ibn Muzāḥim – a brave warrior whose brother was killed at the hands of 'Alī رضی اللہ عنہ – over Fadak and other lands surrounding Madīnah. He seized the lands of the Ahl al-Bayt and began oppressing his subordinates. Subsequently, they complained to 'Alī of the oppression and sought his assistance. Hearing this, immediately Sayyidunā 'Alī رضی اللہ عنہ mounted his camel putting a black turban over his head and tied two swords. He took along with him Imām Ḥusayn, 'Ammār, 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abbās, and 'Abd Allāh ibn Ja'far. He settled in the Masjid in the village and despatched Imām Ḥusayn رضی اللہ عنہ to summon Abū Bakr's trustee. Accordingly, Ḥusayn went and told him, "Amīr al-Mu'minīn is calling you."

The man asked, "Who is Amīr al-Mu'minīn?"

"Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib," he replied.

He responded, "Amīr al-Mu'minīn is Abū Bakr the khalīfah."

Imām Ḥusayn رضی اللہ عنہ said, "Okay. 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib is calling you so come."

Ashja' said, "I am king and 'Alī is from the common folk. If he has any work with me, he ought to come to me."

Imām Ḥusayn رضی اللہ عنہ said, "Shame on you. Is someone like my father a common man while you are a king?"

He said, "Yes indeed. Your father did not give bay'ah to Abū Bakr except out of coercion and force while we pledged allegiance willingly."

Hearing this, Imām Ḥusayn رضی اللہ عنہ returned and told his father what happened. 'Alī رضی اللہ عنہ turned to 'Ammār رضی اللہ عنہ and instructed him, "Go to him and tell him that we are like the Ka'bah; people come to us, we do not go to them."

‘Ammār went to Ashja‘ and spoke to him with harshness. Things got so heated up, that ‘Ammār almost unsheathed his sword. ‘Alī received news of this so he told his associates to go and bring Ashja‘. His family members who were with him at the time went and told Ashja‘, “Today you will be killed at ‘Alī’s hands.”

Then they seized him and brought him.

‘Alī asked him, “Why did you snatch the wealth of the Ahl al-Bayt and take control over it?”

He retorted, “What was the reason for you spilling the blood of people? Moreover, I regard obedience to Abū Bakr and his pleasure superior to conforming and following you.”

‘Alī said, “I do not know of any sin of mine besides killing your brother. And he cannot be avenged. May Allah disgrace you.”

He answered ‘Alī in a harsh manner and told him, “You are destroyed due to your jealousy for the Khulafā’.”

Faḍl became upset at this and beheaded him. Ashja‘’s associates attacked Faḍl. Seeing this, ‘Alī عليه السلام unsheathed Dhū al-Fiḡār. When they saw his shining eyes and the glow of Dhū al-Fiḡār, they threw down their weapons and submitted.

‘Alī commanded them, “Take the head of your small leader to your big leader.”

They complied and threw his head in front of Abū Bakr.

At this, the Muhājirīn and Anṣār gathered. Abū Bakr addressed the people saying, “Your Thaqafī brother has obeyed the khalīfah of Allah and His Messenger. I appointed him over the ṣadaqāt of Madīnah. But ‘Alī has murdered him and mutilated him in this atrocious manner. Those among you who are brave should go and avenge his death.”

Everyone heard him but became speechless and motionless.

Abū Bakr shouted, “Do you possess no tongues to speak with?”

A bedouin said, “If you go then we will follow you.”

Another said, “It is better to see the angel of death than seeing ‘Alī.”

Abū Bakr sighed, “You are afraid of ‘Alī. That is why you give me such answers.”

‘Umar then spoke up, “No one can accomplish this besides Khālid.”

Abū Bakr told Khālid, “O Abū Sulaymān, you are Allah’s sword! Take an army with you and proceed. Bring ‘Alī to me because he has killed our associate who was unmatched in bravery. Say to him that if he comes, his mistake will be forgiven. However, if he is adamant, then bring him alive to me.”

Khālid selected 500 warriors and left.

Faḍl saw them approaching so he informed ‘Alī. ‘Alī remarked, “If all the leaders of Quraysh and horsemen of Hawāzin had to gather, I would not fear them!”

Khālid reached there and asked ‘Alī, “Why did you commit such an atrocity and why did you rekindle the extinguished fire?”

‘Alī said, “Are you boasting over your bravery in my presence and warning me of Abū Bakr? Do you consider me to be Mālik Nuwayrah who you murdered and whose wife you married? I know my killer and desire martyrdom. Had I willed, I would have left you dead here in the courtyard of this Masjid.”

Khālid became enraged hearing this and ‘Alī drew his Dhū al-Fiḡār. As soon as Khālid looked into his eyes and saw the glow of Dhū al-Fiḡār, he began to plead for forgiveness. ‘Alī hit the rear of his sword on Khālid’s back which caused him to fall to the ground.

Ibn Ṣabāḥ, an intelligent man, commented, “By Allah O ‘Alī. We have not come out of hatred. You are Allah’s lion and His sword. We are all at your service.”

Amīr al-Mu’minīn calmed down after hearing this and began to make jokes with Khālīd. Khālīd was suffering tremendously with back pain. ‘Alī said to him, “O Khālīd! Surprisingly, you have forgotten about Ghadīr Khum and have very quickly given allegiance to the breachers and treacherous. And now you wish to put me in chains and escort me. Have you forgotten about ‘Amr ibn ‘Abd Wūd, Marḥab, and the battle of Khaybar?”

Khālīd said, “I know exactly what you are speaking about. However, the Arabs have abandoned you out of fear for your sword while we have pledged allegiance to Abū Bakr because of his softness and the hope of receiving more wealth than we deserve.”¹

The Contradictions and Inconsistencies between Shī‘ī narrations regarding the claim over Fadak being gifted

The contradictions and inconsistencies of the above narrations are clearer than the sun in broad daylight. And there is no scope for interpretation. Moreover, it is impossible to accept the authenticity of all the contradictory narrations and then to speak about the claim of a gift. We will now point out some significant discrepancies.

- a. The first narration from *Ihtijāj* states that after her trustee was removed, Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها approached Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه in person and asked him why he is depriving her of her father’s inheritance.

The second narration from *‘Ilal al-Sharā’i’* mentions that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه was the one who approached Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه in the Masjid.

1 *Baḥr al-Jawāhir* of Sayyid Muḥammad Bāqir ibn Sayyid Muḥammad pg. 323.

So one narration mentions that Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا came and the second mentions Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

The Shī‘ah could probably answer by saying that first ‘Alī came, then Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا.

- b. However, the sixth narration from *Ihtijāj* which documents her famous *khutbah* suggest that when she returned from Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, Sayyidunā ‘Alī was sitting in the house waiting for her. As soon as she entered, she began to scold him and reprimand him with stern words:

يا ابن أبي طالب اشتملت شملة الجنين و قعدت حجرة الضنين نقضت قادمة الأجدل فكانت ريش الأعزل
هذا ابن أبي قحافة يتزني نحلة أبي و بلغة ابني افترست الذئاب و افترشت التراب إلخ

O son of Abū Ṭālib! You are concealed like a foetus, and have sat at home like a scared slandered man. Notwithstanding that you have floored the brave men of the world and demolished their might, unfearful of their great numbers, you are now afraid of the impotent. Abū Quḥāfah’s son has snatched the gift of my father and the sustenance of my children. You are sitting like a wolf and have made the sand your bed.¹

This narration shows that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ did not leave the house. Forget approaching Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, and reproaching him, etc., he did not help Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا at all. Had Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ actually gone to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and spoken to him rationally about *Fadak* in the presence of the *Muhājirīn* and *Anṣār*, then would the noble and sublime Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا scold her husband – who is the leader of the pious, killer of the *kuffār* – using such harsh words for sitting at home and doing absolutely nothing?

- c. The fourth narration from *Biḥār al-Anwār* falsifies the above narrations. It mentions that when Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ told Sayyidah Fāṭimah

1 *Ihtijāj* vol. 1 pg. 280 no. 51424; *Ihtijāj* pg. 65.

ﷺ that a nabī is not inherited, she went back to Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ who advised her to tell him about Sayyidunā Sulaymān inheriting Dāwūd and Yaḥyā inheriting Zakariyyā. It also mentions Sayyidunā ‘Umar’s statement that she has been coached and her response etc. This narration makes it clear that Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ did not go personally to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ﷺ, nor did Sayyidah Fāṭimah ﷺ herself think of this proof and present it. Only after Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ coached her, she went back and made a second claim. Had Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ went personally or had she presented this proof herself as appears in the khuṭbah narration, then what was the need to go back to her husband and get lessons from him? After reading this narration, will anyone believe that actually Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ went himself to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ﷺ and debated him?

- d. The eleventh narration from *Iḥtijāj* states that when Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ learnt of the Fadak issue, he became upset and wrote a harsh letter to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr ﷺ wherein he manifested his bravery and clearly stated the deviation of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār. He also was not reluctant to mention the painful punishment that awaits them. Had he went personally, then what was the need for the letter. It is possible to say that first he spoke directly to him and then wrote him a letter to keep a documented file of disparagement of the Ṣaḥābah ﷺ, or he first wrote the letter and then went to him. However, everything does not seem consistent.
- e. He could not have spoken first since the narration is clear that as soon as he received information of Fadak being usurped, he wrote the letter. Had he written the letter and then went personally, then why was he scolded for sitting at home and not helping? Had the letter actually been written which contained such a vehement address, then why was he reprimanded for concealing himself at home “like a foetus in the womb”?
- f. Yet another inconsistency becomes apparent after analysing the fourth narration. It states that Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ coached Sayyidah Fāṭimah

رضي الله عنه to present the verse *And Sulaymān inherited Dāwūd* in front of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه. When he asked for witnesses, she presented Sayyidah Umm Ayman and Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. There is no mention of the latter’s testimony but the former’s testimony was not accepted since she is one woman and the testimony of one woman is not accepted. Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها became upset at this and left. If this narration is true, then why did Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه not speak his heart to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه when that was the appropriate time? Why did he not show some Hāshimī fervour seeing his wife’s anger? Why go home and write a letter or come at another time? Nonetheless, it appears from this narration that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه did not say anything prior to the testimony and observed silence and patience in front of the circumstances. However, the same narration states the he took Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها around for forty days to the houses of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār, pleading for help and assistance, but to no avail. After this forty day period, Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه told her to go to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه alone since he has a soft heart and tell him that although Fadak belongs to him, it is binding upon him to give it to her when she asks for it. She complied, and the Khalīfah acceded to her request and wrote a document for her which Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه tore.

These narrations suggest that she approached Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه twice at the institution of her husband. Once to present the inheritance argument of Sulaymān and the other to ask Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه alone due to his softness. And she was successful in her second attempt. This narration suggests that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه never approached Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه nor had any intention to debate or condemn him. He simply tutored Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها and instructed her to go. And if he did go with her to give testimony, he remained silent and did not speak a word.

- g. This fourth narration states that Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها went around to the houses of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār and even to Sayyidunā Mu‘adh ibn

Jabal رضي الله عنه but received no help. In this time, Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه took no other steps. After this, he sent her to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه. Thereafter, Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه tore the document and kicked her on her stomach – May Allah forbid – which led to the miscarrying of her foetus Muḥsin. She then remained ill for 75 days and then passed away.

This shows that after this Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه had no chance to return to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه to debate about Fadak since a fresh calamity befell which eclipses the Fadak issue, i.e. the oppression and abuse of Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه which no one can tolerate and stomach. It was the opportune time for Allah’s lion to unsheathe his sword Dhū al-Fiqār and take revenge from Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه for his oppression against the daughter of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم. It is shameful for him to observe patience and silence in the face of such tyranny. When this is his level of tolerance and patience according to the Shī‘ah then it is unfathomable that he would get angry at Fadak being usurped, debate Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه in the presence of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār over this trivial issue, and write a harsh letter wherein he labelled him an oppressor and usurper.

- h. Once you compare this narration to the twelfth one, you will be totally flabbergasted and will have to admit that no one can possibly understand the subtleties of the A‘immah or give any explanation. He is not afraid to behead someone over a trivial matter but observes total silence in the face of the worst of calamities where revenge is permissible, nay mandatory both rationally and religiously. Maybe supernatural feats are manifested in this way, which are unfathomable and impossible for humans to accomplish.

The fourth narration asserts that Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه snatched the document from Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها, smacked her and kicked her so badly that she miscarried; yet Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه remained silent. On the other hand, the twelfth narration mentions that as soon as he heard of the oppression of Ashja‘ ibn Muzāḥim, he could not tolerate it and immediately

set out with his servants, friends, and relatives and ordered that Ashja‘ be brought to him. He used expletives upon him and allowed his execution. He was experiencing such vehemence that his eyes were glowing and his Dhū al-Fiqār was shining, sending shivers down the spines of all. Then when Sayyidunā Khālīd رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ came, he threatened him and gave him a blow on his back felling him instantly. This establishes the Ḥaydarī rank and is a manifestation of the Lion of Allah. The earth and skies resound with admiration and complementation and the call, “There is no youngster but ‘Alī and no sword but Dhū al-Fiqār,” can be heard from every stone and tree. However, all this might and magnificence changes into utter shock when we see that when Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ – who according to the Shī‘ah was impotent and ignoble – abuses and oppresses Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا to the extent that she miscarries her foetus; Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ did not unsheathe his sword? Why did perseverance overpower his lion nature? Both rationally and religiously, this was not a time of tolerance, but a time to take revenge from Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and make him taste a disgraceful chastisement. A tooth for a tooth!

Sadly the object of the Shī‘ah of disparaging and condemning the Ṣaḥābah in general and Shaykhaḥayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا in particular – in accordance to their warped belief – was not achieved. At the same time, their fabrications have only tainted the noble image of the household of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and attributed to them such things which they are exempt and innocent of. They have prepared such filthy material that baffle the enemies of Islam. In fact, this is sufficient artillery for the enemy to cast doubts against Islam, Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, and his noble family. Shame upon such love!

تَكَادُ السَّمَاوَاتُ يَنْفَطِرُنَ مِنْهُ وَتَنْشَقُّ الْأَرْضُ وَتَخِرُّ الْجِبَالُ هَدًّا

The heavens almost rupture therefrom and the earth splits open and the mountains collapse in devastation.¹

1 Sūrah Maryam: 90.

i. The fourth narration states that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه advised Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها to go directly to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه when he is alone and ask him for Fadak. She complied and Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه gave it to her and also wrote a document for her. This shows that no debate took place here. He gave her Fadak willingly. On the other hand, the third narration says that only after she debated him and presented him with Qur’ānic proofs was he forced to write the document for her. In fact, Sayyidah Umm Ayman and Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه testified in her favour as well. This shows that he succumbed to her proofs and was defeated by her. It also says that she was not alone, but was accompanied by Sayyidah Umm Ayman and Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. That is why their testimony was written on the document he gave her.

j. Thereafter it is mentioned that en route, she met Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه who asked her for the documents and tore it up. When she reached home, Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه enquired as to why she was angry and she narrated her encounter with Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه. Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه was upset and declared, “No calamity has befallen me and your father greater than this.”

The inconsistency here is that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه was with Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها just few moments back. Why did they not go home together? Did he go somewhere else and send her alone? Secondly, it does not mention anything of Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه abusing her and the miscarriage. Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه saw her anger and made his statement. This debunks the claim that Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه persecuted her.

k. The Khuṭbah of Zahrā’

The sixth narration from *Ihtijāj* is very significant and needs to be analysed with scrutiny. It totally demolishes the argument that she claimed that Fadak was gifted to her. They have no other response but to label this narration as false and this khuṭbah a fabrication. Following this, the Shīṭ

scholars are extremely troubled and distressed by this narration and have presented such interpretations that are ludicrous to say the least.

Unfortunately, the Shī'ī scholars cannot reject this narration since it is very authentic and a huge building of the tyranny of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم rests on it. Hence, they are all afraid to categorise it as unreliable.

The authenticity and value of this narration can be realised from the fact that the Shī'ī scholars have made high claims of its authenticity. Moreover, they have not only narrated it from their sources but made an effort to establish it from Sunnī sources. Al-Majlisī comments on it:

اعلم أن هذه الخطبة من الخطب المشهورة التي روتها الخاصة و العامة بأسانيد متظافرة

Understand that this is one of the famous khuṭbahs which both Shī'ah and Sunnī have narrated via numerous reliable isnāds.

It appears in *Lam'at al-Bayḍā' fī Sharḥ Khuṭbat al-Zahrā'*, a book dedicated to the commentary of this khuṭbah:

و الاحتجاج المشهور كالنور على السطور المسطور في كتاب مسطور في رق منشور المعروف بخطبة
تظلم الزهراء التي مقصودنا من هذا الكتاب شرحها و كل ما ذكر إلى هنا كان مقدمة بالنسبة إليها و نحن
نشرع الآن في إيراد تلك الخطبة الشريفة المشتملة على الآيات البينات و البراهين الساطعات و الحجج
الواضحات و الدلائل القاطعات إلى قوله و بالجملة لا إشكال و لا شبهة في كون الخطبة من فاطمة
الزهراء و أن مشايخ آل أبي طالب كانوا يروونه عن آبائهم و يعلمونها أبائهم و مشايخ الشيعة كانوا
يتداولونها بينهم و يتداولونها بأيديهم و ألسنتهم

And the famous proof like a light from mount Ṭūr written in the *Lawḥ Maḥfūz*, i.e. the khuṭbah of the oppression against al-Zahrā', the commentary of which is the object of this book. Whatever has been mentioned up until now is just an introduction to it. We now reproduce that noble khuṭbah which comprises of clear verses, manifest evidences, bold proofs, and categorical verifications...

There is no objection nor any misgivings of this khuṭbah being attributed to Fāṭimah al-Zahrā'. The mashāyikh of the family of Abū Ṭālib had been narrating it from their forefathers and teaching it to their sons. Moreover, the Shī'ī mashāyikh have been learning and teaching it and passing it on to one another by means of their hands and tongues.¹

When this is the level of the authenticity of this khuṭbah, then whatever is mentioned therein ought to be in harmony with their belief system and whatever is not, ought to be incorrect. So we hope that the readers especially the Shī'ī scholars will ponder and reflect over the fact that nowhere in the khuṭbah did Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا mention anything of Fadak being snatched away from her or Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ gifting it to her, or it being in her possession. The gift story does not feature therein neither explicitly nor implicitly. Everything mentioned therein is connected to inheritance. The complaint of the oppression and tyranny is in relation to deprivation of Rasūlullāh's صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ inheritance. And the proofs she furnished are all connected to inheritance. Had the reality been that Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ gifted it to her, she had full possession and ownership of it, and Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ snatched it from her, then undoubtedly there would be some mention of this in the khuṭbah. Is it possible for her not to publicise to the Muhājirīn and Anṣār something in total conflict of the Sharīah, intelligence, and morality, i.e. to usurp something from someone's possession, perpetrated by the khalīfah of the time?

This khuṭbah is no less than 2 juz' in length and its eloquence and articulation is likened to the Qur'ān. It draws a detailed image of all the oppression and tyranny of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ and it was recited in the gathering of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār in Sayyidunā Abū Bakr's رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ presence. Such heart-felt words are used that bring the listener to tears. So it does not make any sense for her not to mention this aspect which was necessary and the greatest evidence to prove the tyranny of the khalīfah of the time.

1 *Lam'at al-Baydā' fī Sharḥ Khuṭbat al-Zahrā'* pg. 148.

Since the non-mention of the gift was something of much significance, the Shī'ī scholars turned their attention to it and pondered deeply as to how they might answer it. But as the proverb goes, *A drowning man clutches unto straws*. All the answers they provided are nonsensical and unacceptable.

Al-Majlisī writes in the commentary of this khuṭbah:

اعلم أنه قد وردت الروايات المتظافرة كما ستعرف في أنها ادعت فدكا كانت نحلة لها من رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فلعل عدم تعرضها في هذه الخطبة لتسلك الدعوى ليأسها من قبولها إياها إذا كانت الخطبة بعد ما رد أبو بكر شهادة أمير المؤمنين و من شهد معه و قد كانت المنافقون الحاضرون معتقدين بصدقه فتمسك بحديث الميراث لكونه من ضروريات الدين

Understand well that innumerable narrations have been reported as you will soon learn of that she claimed that Fadak was a gift which Rasūlullāh ﷺ gave her. So probably her non mention of it in this khuṭbah was due to her despondency of it being accepted as the khuṭbah occurred after Abū Bakr rejected the testimony of Amīr al-Mu'minīn and those who testified with him. Moreover, the hypocrites that were present believed in its correctness. Thus, she used the ḥadīth of inheritance since it is part of the *ḍarūriyyāt* (essentials) of dīn.¹

The very words of this explanation make it quite apparent that the writer himself and his ilk do not accept it with their heart. Furthermore, majority of the narrations which we have quoted above disclose its fallaciousness. His claim that this khuṭbah was delivered after Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه and other's testimony was rejected is incorrect. There is no mention of such a thing in the narration that contains the khuṭbah. In fact, the narration of *Ihtijāj* which we quoted has the following words in the beginning:

روي عبد الله الحسن بإسناده عن آبائه أنه لما اجتمع أبو بكر رضي الله عنه على منع فاطمة فدك و بلغها ذلك لانت خمارها إلخ

1 *Bihār al-Anwār*.

‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥasan reports via his isnād from his forefathers, “When Abū Bakr intended to deprive Fāṭimah of Fadak and this news reached her, she wore her veil and her shawl, and came with her servants and women of her tribe to Abū Bakr...

This shows that this was the first time Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا approached Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and this was as soon as she learnt that he was not willing to give Fadak to her or was depriving her of it. However, there is no mention as to how the news reached her. Nonetheless, the answer that she went to him after the testimony was rejected is nothing but a supposition. But this supposition does not seem correct since the words, “When news reached her...” show that she had no former knowledge of it. And it is apparent that Sayyidunā ‘Alī and Sayyidah Umm Ayman رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا could not give testimony without her knowing about it or demanding it from them.

The second narration we quoted from *Iḥtijāj* mentions that after the demise of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا came to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. He told her, “I know that you will speak nothing but the truth. However, present witnesses.” She then brought Sayyidunā ‘Alī followed by Sayyidah Umm Ayman رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا. The fourth narration from *Kitāb al-Ikhtiṣāṣ* of *Biḥār al-Anwār* asserts that the first claim Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا made to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was of inheritance. When this was rejected, she returned to Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ who told her to return and ask why Sulaymān inherited Dāwūd. The same narration mentions that when Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا learnt that her trustee had been removed, she approached Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and asked him the reason for this. So these narrations make it clear that Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا went once, in fact twice prior to that instance. And it is beyond doubt that she presented her witnesses which Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ rejected in front of her which led to her unhappiness. This was the ideal time for her to speak her heart and disparage Shaykhayn and the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ. Who can say that her witnesses were rejected and the news of this reached her,

and then only she went and delivered her sermon? This could only have been the case if the testimony took place without her knowledge and she was informed of it later. Hearing this, she went into a rage and set off towards Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه and delivered her address.

Furthermore, the third narration from *Miṣbāḥ al-Anwār* mentions that Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها approached Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه and furnished many evidences including the testimony of Sayyidunā ‘Alī and Umm Ayman which forced him to believe her. In fact, he wrote a document for her. But this was torn up by Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه after she left. This narration makes it clear that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه was not at fault. It was actually Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه who perpetrated the crime. So intelligence demands that she ought to have approached Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه and complained of Sayyidunā ‘Umar’s رضي الله عنه action. Only if he did not listen to her complaint and sided with Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه, then it would be correct for her to go to the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم and complain about the khalīfah for him writing the document for her but then stabbing her in the back and siding with Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه. Had she remonstrated in this manner then definitely the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم would have been upset and would have objected to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and criticised Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه. If all of them did not do this, then at least the supporters of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه would have sided with the Ahl al-Bayt. They had a perfect chance to support Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها and condemn Shaykhayn رضي الله عنهما.

However, these aspects that make total sense were discarded and what happened is that Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها goes to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه and only speaks of inheritance. She did not mention anything else. This makes it quite clear that she did not go after the testimony was rejected, or after the document was written, etc. In fact, as soon as she heard about Fadak, she went into a rage and approached Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه accompanied by her servants and the women of the Banū Hāshim and said what she wanted to say about not receiving her inheritance.

The fifth narration from *Biḥār al-Anwār* totally falsifies al-Majlisī's answer. It mentions that Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا did not go out of her own will but was advised by Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to go. The narration mentions that after Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ made an announcement that whoever has any outstanding credit from Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ or any promise, he should go to him and it will be fulfilled. And Sayyidunā Jābir and Jarīr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمَا went and their promises were fulfilled. After hearing of this, Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ told her to go and mention Fadak. She went and mentioned Fadak, Khumus, and Fay' and presented a number of Qur'ānic verses to substantiate her stance. Anyways, Sayyidunā 'Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ told her to bring witnesses and she brought Sayyidunā 'Alī, Ḥasan, Ḥusayn, Umm Ayman, and Asmā' who bore witness in her favour. However, their testimonies were rejected and Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ then mentioned aḥādīth in praise of Sayyidah Fāṭimah that whoever hurts her hurts Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ etc., and towards the end he also scolded them for usurping the khilāfah and warned them of the consequences. He then told Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا to go home and Allah will pass judgement as He is the best of judges.

This narration shows that everything that transpired, happened in the presence of Sayyidunā 'Alī and Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا. Both of them presented their cases, furnished proofs, presented Qur'ānic verses, and poured their hearts out. But when everything was rejected, they rested their affair with Allah سُبْحَانَكَ وَتَعَالَى. So what chance remains for her to go a second or third time and claim her inheritance, present proofs for it, and condemn the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ? How can it be true that as soon as she heard of Fadak being snatched away from her, she approached Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and gave her bombastic sermon? Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ had already done this on her behalf. He established that Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and Sayyidunā 'Umar were oppressors, usurpers, etc., in the presence of all. What was omitted for her to take the trouble of going to the Masjid and delivering her eloquent and bombastic speech?

The fourth narration proves that Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا approached Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ thrice. First when she learnt that her trustee over Fadak was removed. Second when ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ told her to present the verse Sulaymān inherited Dāwūd. And third when he told her to go to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ when he is alone since he has a softer heart. She had three chances to speak her heart. Instead, she did not. The first time, after Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ told her that a nabī is not inherited, she could not think of any response and went straight home to Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ who taught her what to say. So this proof could not have been presented in the first instance since it did not cross her mind. Rather, she was taught by Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and went for a second time.

It is far-fetched for her to deliver her sermon the second time since in that gathering after she presented her Qur’ānic proof, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ asked her for proof and she presented Sayyidunā ‘Alī and Sayyidah Umm Ayman رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا and whatever transpired thereafter was against Sayyidunā ‘Alī and Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا. At the end, she became upset when Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ said that the testimony of one woman is not accepted and Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ wants to secure his personal benefit. She remarked:

اللّٰه إنّهما ظلّما ابنة نبيك صلى الله عليه وآله حقها فاشدد وطأتك عليهما ثم خرجت

“O Allah, they have oppressed Your Prophet’s صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ daughter by depriving her of her right so chastise them severely.” She then left.

Now if we suggest that she went thereafter to deliver her sermon, it will not be accepted since the narration states that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ took her for forty days to the houses of the Muhājirīn and Anṣār رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ but received no help. He then told her to go to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ when he is alone. This is the third time she approaches him – based on this narration. There was no chance of her delivering her bombastic sermon since Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ handed Fadak over to her and wrote a

document for her. Now there cannot be a fourth instance of her going to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه and giving her sermon since she fell ill and had a miscarriage due to the severe blow of Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه — as the Shī‘ah claim — which proved fatal days later.

In short, whoever scrutinises these narrations just a little and compares them to each other will have no doubt that since the khuṭbah has absolutely no mention of the gift claim, such a claim did not happen. The Shī‘ah will not be prepared to regard the khuṭbah as false. It will follow that the gift claim is then false, without a doubt.

Al-Majlisī writes that the hypocrites who were present believed in the honesty and truthfulness of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, hence Sayyidah Fāṭimah used the ḥadīth of inheritance as proof since it is part of the essentials of dīn. This answer is very astonishing. If the reason of presenting the ḥadīth of inheritance was due to it being part of the essentials of dīn and due to its impact on the listeners, then the gift claim is more significant since ‘possession is proof of ownership’ is also part of the essentials of dīn. In fact, against the inheritance claim, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه had an opportunity to cite the statement of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم excluding the ‘Ambiyā’ from the general rule of inheritance. Those hypocrites who were present believed him and endorsed his action. On the other hand, had she claimed that Fadak was gifted and proved that she had possession over it and presented the principle *possession is proof of ownership*, Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه would have had no answer and the listeners would realise his major blunder. They would have believed Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها and supported her, understanding that the removal of her trustee was pure oppression. Had they not done so, due to hypocrisy and supporting Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, then too she would have proven him to be tyrannical.

The incident that took place after delivering the sermon and returning home is so startling and amazing, that not only does it impact the claim

over Fadak, it destroys the fundamental principle of the Shī'ah, i.e. the infallibility of Sayyidah Fāṭimah and Sayyidunā 'Alī عليه السلام. The Shī'ah are totally helpless in providing any answer or explanation or interpretation for this. Nothing seems to pass their minds in upholding their principles.

The incident is that after Sayyidah Fāṭimah عليها السلام delivered her sermon she was overtaken by grief, sadness, and sorrow to the extent that she went to the grave of her beloved father and mentioned many things, recited heartfelt couplets, and cried profusely. She then returned home. Sayyidunā 'Alī عليه السلام was at home waiting for her return. As soon as she returned she scolded him very sternly and harshly:

O son of Abū Ṭālib! You are concealed like a foetus, and have sat at home like a scared slandered man. Notwithstanding that you have floored the brave men of the world and demolished their might, unafraid of their great numbers, you are now afraid of the impotent. Abū Quḥāfah's son has snatched the gift of my father and the sustenance of my children. He raises his voice and debates me. The Anṣār have deserted me and the Muhājirīn have detached themselves. Everyone has turned a blind eye; no one is prepared to protect me nor assist me. I exited with shame and returned with sorrow. You have humiliated yourself. You sit at home like a wolf and do not move from your place. If only I had died before such humiliation. My state is pitiable. The one I relied on has left the world and my supporters have become lazy. I only complain of it to myself.

This address proves that Sayyidunā 'Alī عليه السلام did absolutely nothing and remained at home in this most crucial and difficult time. Sayyidunā Fāṭimah عليها السلام had to do everything all by herself. She made the claim, questioned, and demanded answers, and poured her heart out. She exited with shame and returned with sorrow. Sayyidunā 'Alī عليه السلام remained at home and did nothing. She was so hurt by this that she sighed, "If only I had died prior to such humiliation." She regretted the loss of her father and could not control herself and declared, "My supporters have become lazy."

This sermon makes it crystal clear that all the narrations which mention that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه went to Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, complained, debated with him, etc., are all false. Especially the narration that mentions that both were present in front of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنهما and he debated them and condemned them and warned them of the evil consequences of their actions, is totally debunked. Had this actually happened then why did Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها use such cruel and bitter words, despite her infallibility, which are devoid of any respect, patience, and dignity? After Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه exhausted all his efforts to support and assist her – if they are agreed to be true – was it fair for him to be scolded with such harsh words:

مانند جنیب در رحم پرده نشین شده مثل خائبان در خانه گریخته و بعد از آن که شجاعان دهر را بر خاک بلاک افگندی مغلوب این نامردان گردیده اینک پسر ابو قحافه بظلم و جبر بخشیده پدر مراد معیشت فرزند انم را از من می گیرد و انصار مرا یاری نمی کند و مهاجران خود را به پناه کشیده اند نه دافعه دارم و نه یآوری و نه شافیے خشم ناک بیرون رقتم و غم ناک گر گشتم خود را دلیل کردی گرگان می درند و می برند و تواز جانے خود حرکت نه کی کاش پیش ازین مذلت و خواری مرده بودم

You are concealed like a foetus, and have sat at home like a scared slandered man. Notwithstanding that you have floored the brave men of the world and demolished their might, unfeared of their great numbers, you are now afraid of the impotent. Abū Qihāfah’s son has snatched the gift of my father and the sustenance of my children. He raises his voice and debates me. The Anṣār have deserted me and the Muhājirīn have detached themselves. Everyone has turned a blind eye; no one is prepared to protect me nor assist me. I exited with shame and returned with sorrow. You have humiliated yourself. You sit at home like a wolf and do not move from your place. If only I had died before such humiliation.

Had Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه really strived to acquire Fadak for her, then her address to him is very startling. Either she was extremely hurt and angry that is why she blurted out incorrect statements, or either she felt that his efforts were insufficient. However, Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s رضي الله عنه response is more

startling since had he made the effort, he should have consoled her by saying, “I left no stone unturned in assisting you. You are overlooking my efforts due to anger and emotional hurt and not realising the worth of my efforts. I have debated them, proven them wrong, and cautioned them of the painful punishment that awaits them in the Hereafter. What more can I possibly do?” However, he said, “Be patient. Allah is responsible for you and your sustenance. What Allah has prepared for you in the Hereafter is far better than what these wicked people have snatched from you.”

Now let us have a look at the response the Shī'ah give. Let us have a glimpse at their absurd explanations. Al-Majlisī writes:

ولندفع الإشكال الذي قلما يحضر بالبال عند سماع هذا الجواب والسؤال وهو أن اعتراض فاطمة رضي الله عنها على أمير المؤمنين في ترك التعرض للخلافة وعدم نصرتها وتخطئتها فيهما مع علمها بإمامته وجوب اتباعه وعصمته وأنه لم يقل شيئاً إلا بأمره تعالى ووصية الرسول صلى الله عليه وآله وسلم مما ينافي عصمتها وجلالتها فأقول يمكن الجواب عنه بأن هذه الكلمات صدرت منه لبعض المصالح و لم تكن واقعا منكرة لما فعله بل كانت راضية وإنما كانت غرضها أن يتبين للناس قبح أعمالهم وشناعة أفعالهم وسكوته ليس لرضاء بما أتوا به و مثل هذا كثيرا ما يقع في العادات والمحاورات كما أن ملكا يعاتب بعض خواصه في أمر بعض الرعايا مع علمه ببرأته من جنائيتهم ليظهر لهم علم جرمهم وأنه مما استوجب به أخص الناس بالملك عنه المعاتبة ونظير ذلك ما فعله موسى عليه السلام لما رجع إلى قومه غضبان أسفا من إلقاءه الألواح وأخذ برأس أخيه يجره إليه و لم يكن غرضها إنكار على هارون بل أراد بذلك أن يعرف القوم عظم جنائيتهم و شدة جرمهم كما مر الكلام فيه و أما حمله على أن شدة الغضب و الأنف و الاسف حملتها على ذلك مع علمها بحقيقة ما ارتكبه فلا ينفع في دفع الفساد و ينافي عصمتها وجلالتها التي عجزت عن إدراكها أحلام العباد

We will now remove the objection that creeps into the minds of people after hearing this question and answer. It is that Fāṭimah's عليها السلام objection against Amīr al-Mu'minīn for not claiming khilāfah and abandoning assisting her and labelling him wrong in these two aspects despite her knowledge of his Imāmah, the mandatory nature of following him, and his infallibility, and that he did not speak anything accept with Allah's صلى الله عليه وسلم سبحانه وتعالى command, and Rasūlullāh's صلى الله عليه وسلم waṣiyyah is something that is in polarity to her infallibility and dignity.

I say, it is possible to answer [this already shows that al-Majlisī himself does not regard this answer as impressive or promising] by saying that these words were said due to some benefit. In reality, she did not object to what he did. Instead she was happy. Her object was to make apparent to the people their evil and horrible actions and to affirm that his silence was not to sanction what they perpetrated. This happens quite often in common speech. Like a king condemns one of his special attendants regarding an aspect of his populace, knowing fully well that the attendant is innocent of their crime so that the knowledge of their crime may be manifested and they realise that even the closest to the king is condemned for it.

An example of this is what Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام did when he returned to his nation full of anger and remorse. He cast down the tablets and caught hold of his brother's head pulling it towards himself. His intention was not to condemn Hārūn but to impress upon the people the gravity and seriousness of their crime as the discussion of this has passed.

With regards to attributing this to extreme anger, wrath, and fury which coerced her to do this knowing the reality of what she committed does not remove the objection and sin and is in polarity to her infallibly and dignity which the minds of servants are incapable of comprehending.¹

This answer has been elucidated in *Ḥaqq al-Yaqīn* in the following words:

مؤلف گوید کہ دریں مقام تحقیق بعضی از امور ضرور است اول دفع شبه چند کہ ممکن است در خاطر خطور کند اگر کسی گوید کہ اعتراض فاطمه رضی اللہ عنہا بر حضرت امیر رضی اللہ عنہ باوجود عصمت بر دو چہ صورت دارد جواب گوئیم کہ این معارضه مجبور بر مصلحت ست از برائے اینکہ مردم داند کہ حضرت امیر رضی اللہ عنہ ترک خلافت برضائے خود نہ کردہ بغصب فدک راضی نبوده و در قرآن بسیاری از معاملات با حضرت رسول شدہ و غرض تہدید و تادیب دیگران ست و ازین قبیل است اینچہ از حضرت موسی علیہ السلام صادر شد در وقتیکہ بسوئے قوم برگشت و ایشان عبادت گوشالہ کردہ بودند از انداختن الواح و سروریش بارون را گرفته بہ پیش کشیدند اینکہ می اینکہ می دانست کہ بارون تقصیر اند ارد تا اینکہ بر قوم ظاہر شود شناعت عمل ایشان و ماند عنایہ کہ حق تعالی بہ حضرت عیسی علیہ السلام خواہد کرد کہ ایا تو گفتی بہر دم کہ مرا و مادر مرا خدا بدانند اینکہ میدانند کہ اونگفتہ است و مثل این بسیاریست

1 *Bihār al-Anwār* pg. 123.

The author says that few aspects need to be clarified here. Firstly, those misgivings and doubts need to be removed which could possibly enter the heart. If someone objects that Sayyidah Fāṭimah عليها السلام had vilified Sayyidunā ‘Alī’s عليه السلام infallibility, the answer to this will be that her statement was in fact for people to know that Sayyidunā ‘Alī عليه السلام did not abandon the position of khilāfah willingly and was not happy with Fadak being usurped. Like many times Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم is addressed in the Qur’ān but other people are referred to who are being reprimanded and scolded. Similarly is the incident of Sayyidunā Mūsā عليه السلام when he returned to his people and saw them worshipping a calf. He cast the tablets with him and caught hold of Hārūn’s عليه السلام head and began pulling it towards himself. Whereas Sayyidunā Hārūn عليه السلام was a Messenger and Mūsā عليه السلام knew fully well that it was not his mistake. Nonetheless, Mūsā عليه السلام did this so that the people realise the wickedness of their misdeed. And Allah’s سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى address to Ṭā عليه السلام, “*Did you command the people to take you and your mother as deities.*” Whereas Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى has complete knowledge that he did not say this. And there are many examples of this nature.

The author of *Lam‘at al-Bayḍā’* interprets it in a very similar manner:

و ما فعلت بالنسبة إلى علي تلك الجرأة و الجسارة مع علمها بأنه إمام مفترض الطاعة و لا يليق بمثله هذه المخاطبة من مثلها إلا لإبداء شناعة ما فعله أبو بكر من تلك الفعلة الفظيعة على الأمة إثبات كفر العمرين كما فعل موسى عليه السلام بأخيه من الأخذ بلحيته و ضرب على رأسه حتى يعلم القوم شناعة عبادة العجل

What she committed towards ‘Alī with such audacity and nerve knowing that he is an Imām whose obedience is mandatory and that such an address towards his like from her like is inappropriate, was only to manifest the cruelty of Abū Bakr’s action on the ummah which established the kufr of Abū Bakr and ‘Umar. Just as Mūsā عليه السلام did to his brother by holding his beard and hitting him on the head so that the people realise the evilness of worshipping the calf.¹

1 *Lam‘at al-Bayḍā’* pg. 393.

The author of *Nāsikh al-Tawārīkh* comments:

مکشوف باد که اسرار اہل بیت مستورست از مدرکات امثال مامردم بلکه مقداد رضی اللہ عنہ و ابو ذر رضی اللہ عنہ و سلمان رضی اللہ عنہ بامنزلت بیرون ادب گام نزنند ودر سعید اے خاطر تمنائے ابن طلب نہ کند وقتی نمی دانم کجادیده ام کہ سلماندر خدمت امیر المؤمنین از غضب خلافت و تقاعد اینحضرت ضحیرتے کرد علی رضی اللہ عنہ فرمود ہاں اسے سلمان رضی اللہ عنہ می خوابی از اسرار اہل بیت اِگاہی بدست کنی بدیہی است کہ بیرون اہل بیت کنی بدیہی است کہ بیرون اہل بیت افریدہ را توانائے حمل این بارگراں نیست پھاناں فاطمہ رضی اللہ عنہا کو محدثہ بود و بحکم احادیث صحیحہ بعلم ما کان و ما یکون عالم بود لا جرم ازاں پیش کہ رسول خدا وداع جہاں گوید و حوادث بائلہ نازل گرداز مخالف امت در امر خلافت و ضبط فدک و دعوائے اِگاہی دشت و بحکم عصمت کی تشریف مویبویہ یزدانی است جزبحکم خدا و رضائے علی رضی اللہ عنہ مرتضی سخن نمی فرمود سخن او سخن عمل عمران بود و کلمہ او ودیعہ خداوند رحمن و مناعت محل اواز ملکوت و ملک رفیع تر بود تا بعوالی و فدک چہ رسد و چہ بسیار وقت حسنین را گرسنہ می خوابانید و بلغہ یک شبہ ایشان را بسائلے می رسانید مملکت دنیا در چشم او باپرد بایی بمیزان نمی رفت فدک و عوالی چیست و حاصل کدام است اگر کوئی این خطاب و خطبہ چہ بود و این ہمہ فرع و شکوہ چہ واجب می نمود پس در حضرت امیر المؤمنین رضی اللہ عنہ اظهار جسارت کرد و معذرت جس تن باجلباب عصمت بینونت داشت پاسخ این سخن را بدین گونہ ساختگی کنیم کہ اسرار اہل بیت مستورست بہ سرحی کہ مسطور افتاد والا اینکہ گوئیم بحکم مدرکات عقول ناقصہ خود اینحضرت ہمی خواست مہ ظالم را از عادل و حق را از باطل باز نماید تا اینکہ خمیر مایہ فطرت ایشان از ترشحات زلال ولایت بہرہ یافتہ از طریق ضلالت و غوایت باز شوند و بہ شاہرہ شریعت و ہدایت روند

It should be clearly understood that the mysteries of the Ahl al-Bayt are beyond our comprehension. Miqdād, Abū Dhar, and Salmān رضی اللہ عنہم did not step beyond the limits of respect whereas Rasūlullāh صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم addressed Salmān رضی اللہ عنہ as one of the Ahl al-Bayt. Moreover, none of them desired to be equated to the Ahl al-Bayt. I have seen at one place that once Salmān Fārsī entered the presence of ‘Alī رضی اللہ عنہ and expressed his unhappiness at the usurpation of the khilāfah and ‘Alī’s holding back upon which ‘Alī said, “O Salmān! Do you wish to discover the secrets of the Ahl al-Bayt? The truth is that no one has the capacity to carry this burden except the Ahl al-Bayt.”

And according to the aḥādīth, Fāṭimah رضی اللہ عنہا possessed knowledge of everything of the past and future. She through the vision of Rasūlullāh صلی اللہ علیہ وسلم could foretell the appearance of calamities. No one would speak to ‘Alī anything else besides the difference between the people with regards to khilāfah and Fadak. Their talk was equal to action; what will happen with the Fadak issue. Most of the time, he put Ḥasan and Ḥusayn off to sleep on empty stomachs and fulfilled the demands of the needy. Wordily kingdom

had no value in his eyes, not even the worth of the wing of a mosquito. Fadak, its surrounds, 'awālī, etc., had no value in his eyes. If anyone objects as to why this type of speech and complaint happened and why was such audacity displayed in front of 'Alī and why was he scolded I will complete this discussion by asserting that the Ahl al-Bayt's secrets are concealed. Yes some of them have been written. Otherwise, we declare and this is the only thing that comes into our incomplete minds that Rasūlullāh's ﷺ object was to separate the oppressor from the just and the truth from falsehood in such a way that people's nature exits from error, blindness, deviation, and crookedness and gets fixed on the highway of Sharīah and guidance.¹

Although we do not see any need to comment on the above responses for every sensible person will realise their worth. The only thing that can be said is that it is beyond human comprehension and from the mysteries of the Ahl al-Bayt. However, it is appropriate to mention a few words.

Anyone who looks at al-Majlisī's answer will be disgusted and surprised. It seems like the drowning man clutched unto straws and blurted whatever came in his mind. He says that her objective was to address others. But he does not realise that the only ones in the house at the time were Sayyidah Fāṭimah and Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه. So who did she want to tell? Moreover, what more could she have said when Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه had already thoroughly defeated them in debate and proven them wrong and warned them of Allah's punishment and Sayyidah Fāṭimah رضي الله عنها had already delivered a pompous sermon labelling them as kuffār, apostates, and inmates of Jahannam publicly. So what remained for her to say? Maybe she wanted the angels to hear who came to comfort and console her.

The example of Sayyidunā Mūsā and Sayyidunā Hārūn عليهما السلام has no connection with the issue at hand. Firstly, we do not accept the assertion that reprimanding Sayyidunā Hārūn عليهما السلام was to show the people. Besides, what Mūsā عليهما السلام done was not done publicly but in the privacy of his house. Furthermore, Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه understood her words to be addressed to him and not as al-Majlisī claims.

1 *Nāsikh al-Tawārīkh* pg. 91.

He says in answer to her:

فقال لها أمير المؤمنين لا ويل لك بل الويل لشأنك ثم نهني عن جدك يا بنت الصفة وبقية النبوة
فما غنيت عن ديني و إلا أخطأت مقدوري فإن كنت تريدن البلغة فزقك مضمون و كفيك مأمون و ما
أعدلك أفضل مما قطع عنك فاحتسبي الله فقالت حسبي الله و أمسكت

Al-Majlisī translates this into Persian in the following words:

جناب امير در جواب ارشاد فرمودند که صبر کن و ایتش و در افروزش اے دختر برگزیده عالمیاں و اے باقی مانده
ذريت پیغمبر من سستی در امر دین خود نہ کردم و آنچه جانب خدا مامور بودم بعمل اوردم و آنچه مقدور بود از طلب
حق خود راں تقصیر نہ کردم و روزی تراو اولاد ترا خدا ضامن است

Sayyidunā ‘Alī answered, “No woe to you but woe to your position. Observe patience and extinguish the fire of revenge O daughter of the selected and O remainder of Nubuwwah. I did not observe laxity in religious matters [but I acted according to the command of Allah] and spared no effort to search for my right. If you want sufficient means, then your sustenance is taken care of [by Allah] and your responsibility is safe. What awaits you is far superior to what you missed. So anticipate reward from Allah.”

She said, “Allah is sufficient for me,” and she stopped.

From this answer, we can clearly see that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ understood the address to be for him and the anger vented towards him. Otherwise, why would he say that he tried his best and spared no effort? In fact, his response implicitly directs Sayyidah Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا to realise her mistake. “Why are you venting your anger at me and labelling me lazy and a foetus etc.? I exhausted all my efforts to assist you. I testified in your favour and debated with the Ṣaḥābah etc. Notwithstanding the fact that I did this in front of you, you call me a coward and afraid and are angry at me. This is far-fetched from your position.”

These aspects are documented in Shīrī narrations. They spoil the image of Sayyidah Fāṭimah’s رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا infallibility and establish her venting of anger without right, owing to human tendencies.

The truth is that the Shī'ah are trapped. They have imprisoned themselves in the fabrications they concocted. They have forged a narration for every aspect and have presented a response to every objection. But all their lies have jammed them up.

If only they had stuck to one narration, they would not be in as many problems and they would not have been disgraced. Their abundance of narrations and contradictory statements have spared us the trouble to respond. Their inconsistencies and discrepancies have totally razed their entire building to the ground. Now their case will not be heard in any court and their false testimonies cannot extricate them from the quagmire they are in.

It has reached completion with goodness by the mercy, grace and help of Allah.