

Answering the Baseless Shī'ī Allegations
Against Sayyidunā 'Uthmān

Adapted from:

Fawā'id Nāfi'ah

BY:

Shaykh Muḥammad Nāfi'

WWW.MAHAJJAH.COM

Transliteration key

أ- 'ā	ض - ḍ
آ - ā	ط - ṭ
ب - b	ظ - ḏ
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

Answering the Baseless Shī'ī Allegations Against Sayyidunā 'Uthmān	7
Introduction	7
Name, Family, Virtues, Status and Service to the Ummah	7
Objection of not participating in the Battle of Badr	15
Answer	15
Similitude between Sayyidunā 'Uthmān and Sayyidunā 'Alī	16
Objection for fleeing from the Battle of Uḥud	19
Answer	19
Objection for not Participating in the Pledge of Riḍwān	21
Answer	21
Objection of Performing Four Raka'āt in Mina	23
Answer	23
Objection of Adding the Second Adhān in Jumu'ah	25
Answer	25
Objection to Taking the Special Grazing Pasture in Madīnah	27
Answer	27
Summary	28
Objection Regarding the Burning of the Maṣāḥif	29
Answer	29
Retraction of Ibn Mas'ūd	34
Consensus of the Ṣaḥābah Upon the Muṣḥaf 'Uthmānī	35
Summary	36
Objection Regarding the Alleged Ill-Treatment and Oppression Upon the Ṣaḥābah	39
Sayyidunā 'Abd Allāh ibn Mas'ūd	39

Final Moments of Ibn Mas'ūd	45
Sayyidunā Abū Dhar al-Ghifārī	46
An incident	47
Another incident	48
Scrutiny and Criticism from the Scholars	48
The Final Moments of Sayyidunā Abū Dhar al-Ghifārī	50
Sayyidunā 'Ammār ibn Yāsir	51
Answer	52
Objection Regarding Implementation of the Ḥudūd	61
Answer	61
Objection of the Khilāfah of 'Uthmān Being an Intermission	67
Answer	68
Verses of the Qur'ān	68
Aḥādīth	72
A Few Incidents From the Era of Sayyidunā 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān	76
A letter to the governors	76
Address to the Public	76
Another Letter to the Governors	77
A letter to the Officers of the Army	78
Point to Consider	78
Explanations of the Senior Scholars	79
Explanation of Sālim Ibn 'Abd Allāh	81
Explanation of Imām al-Bukhārī	82
Statement of Ibn al-'Arabī al-Mālikī	82
Explanation of Shaykh 'Abd al-Qādir al-Jilānī	83
Final Word on This Discussion	83
Demise of Sayyidunā 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān	85
Answer	85
Date of his martyrdom	88
Dispelling a doubt	88

Answering the Baseless Shī'ī Allegations Against Sayyidunā 'Uthmān

Introduction

The Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ are the best of creation after the ambiyā' عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَام, and their virtues and merits have been expounded in numerous verses of the Noble Qur'ān. Furthermore, Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ has described their salient features in an abundance of narrations. Yet, despite their virtue being engrained in the Qur'ān and preserved in the blessed aḥādīth of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, some people still find it within themselves to criticise this excellent group; preparing against them a lengthy list of complaints, objections and criticisms against them.

In the present day as well this continues, particularly from that group who are opposed to the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ, namely the Shī'ah. Consequently, there are old and a few recent criticisms levelled against Sayyidunā 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, and we have made a small effort — according to what is destined — to answer these baseless allegations. However, it would be fitting to first mention that we have not enumerated all the virtues of Sayyidunā 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, his excellences and services to the ummah in detail, for if we were to have done so then this would have lengthened this book considerably.

However, it would most definitely not be bereft of benefit to briefly touch on a few of his virtues, which will present an illustration of his high rank and status.

Name, Family, Virtues, Status and Service to the Ummah

His name is 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, his title is Dhū al-Nūrayn and his agnomen is Abū 'Abd Allāh. His lineage meets with that of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ at the fifth generation.

‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān ibn Abī al-‘Āṣ ibn Umayyah ibn ‘Abd Shams ibn ‘Abd Manāf.

‘Abd Manāf is the common ancestor.

Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه also has a close family relation to Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم through his mother, who was the granddaughter of Hāshim ibn ‘Abd Manāf (the great-grandfather of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم). The mother of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه is Arwā bint Kurayz. The mother of Arwā is Umm Ḥakīm bint ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, who is the aunt of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم. Umm Ḥakīm was the twin sister of the father of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, ‘Abd Allāh, and was famous by the name of al-Bayḍā’.

1. Thus the link between Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم and Sayyidunā ‘Alī both, with Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه was that he was the son of their (Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم and ‘Alī رضي الله عنه) maternal cousin and their paternal cousin.¹
2. During the initial stages of the call of nubuwwah, ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه accepted Islam upon the invitation of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه; and he did not relinquish his faith despite the persecution he had to endure at the hands of his own tribesmen.
3. Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه is counted among the forerunners of the Ṣaḥābah, sharing in their virtues. Glad tidings of Jannah have been mentioned for him by Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, and he is amongst the ‘Asharah al-Mubasharah.
4. Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم married his daughter, Sayyidah Ruqayyah رضي الله عنها, to Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه. After her demise, Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم

1 For more detail with regards to this relationship, refer to our work *Ruḥamā’ Baynahum*, ‘Uthmānī section pg. 24 -30.

married his other daughter, Sayyidah Umm Kulthūm رضي الله عنها, to him. On account of this, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه attained the title of *Dhū al-Nūrayn* (the possessor of two lights).

5. When the persecution of the disbelievers intensified then the Muslims were permitted to migrate to Abyssinia. Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه migrated with his wife, Sayyidah Ruqayyah رضي الله عنها.

After this, when the migration to Madīnah Munawwarah took place, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه returned from Abyssinia and migrated to Madīnah Munawwarah. In this way, he had the honour of migrating twice.

6. During the Battle of Badr, which took place in 2 A.H, Sayyidah Ruqayyah رضي الله عنها was ill. In accordance with the instruction of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, he tended to her and thus could not participate in the battle. However, Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم counted him among the participants of Badr, and gave him a share of the spoils of Badr, after which he said that he will receive the reward of having participated in it.
7. He had the honour of being a scribe of revelation and also of writing the epistles of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم.
8. In 6 A.H, the incident at Ḥudaybiyyah took place, which we will discuss briefly:

When the Quraysh of Makkah prevented the Muslims from entering Makkah, Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم sent Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه as an emissary to Makkah to negotiate with them. Shortly thereafter, news reached Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه had been martyred, so Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم took pledges of allegiance from all the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم beneath a tree to avenge the blood of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه.

He later received news that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه is alive, and that it was only a rumour. At that time, Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, classified his hand as the hand of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه, he placed one hand on the other and said: “This is the pledge from ‘Uthmān.”

This great virtue was proven for Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه, with the hand of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, he pledged allegiance at the hands of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم.

The name of this pledge is *Bay‘at al-Riḍwān*. In the Qur’ān, Allah said with regards to those who took this pledge:

لَقَدْ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ إِذْ يُبَايِعُونَكَ تَحْتَ الشَّجَرَةِ فَعَلِمَ مَا فِي قُلُوبِهِمْ فَأَنْزَلَ
السَّكِينَةَ عَلَيْهِمْ وَأَثَابَهُمْ فَتْحًا قَرِيبًا

Certainly was Allah pleased with the believers when they pledged allegiance to you, (O Muhammad), under the tree, and He knew what was in their hearts, so He sent down tranquillity upon them and rewarded them with an imminent victory.¹

9. The Battle of Tabūk took place in 9 A.H. During that time, the Muslims were in great need and under financial strain. Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه would always provide financial help to the Muslims. On this occasion too, he showed unique generosity and financial support.

Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم had requested the Muslims a number of times for financial support to prepare this army. At that time, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه donated 960 camels, forty horses and ten thousand dinars. He brought it and placed it in the lap of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم was immensely pleased and said:

ما ضر عثمان ما عمل بعد اليوم

No harm will come to ‘Uthmān with regards to what he does after this day.

1 Sūrah al-Faṭḥ: 18

10. Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه was appointed as khalīfah in the following manner: Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه appointed six people, viz. Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān, Sayyidunā ‘Alī, Sayyidunā ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Awf, Sayyidunā Ṭalḥah ibn ‘Ubayd Allah, Sayyidunā Zubayr ibn al-‘Awwām, Sayyidunā Sa’d ibn Abī Waqqāṣ رضي الله عنه, with the instruction to choose the khalīfah from amongst themselves within three days. Subsequently, after discussions between them, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه was chosen, without any dispute or difference of opinion amongst them. The rest of them pledged allegiance upon the hands of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه, and in this way, he became the third khalīfah of Islam.

The khilāfah of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه began in Muḥarram 24 A.H and ended on 18 Dhū al-Ḥijjah 35 A.H.

11. During his khilāfah, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه rendered great services to the ummah. One important and unique achievement of this era was that in the last days of 24 A.H and the beginning of 25 A.H, the Muslims began to fight the disbelievers of Armenia and Azerbaijan. Different tribes joined this army. During this time there arose a difference with regards to the qirā’ah of the Qur’ān. The famous Ṣaḥābī, Sayyidunā Ḥudhayfah ibn al-Yamān رضي الله عنه, was very concerned about this and understanding the gravity of the situation felt, he immediately came to Madīnah and voiced his concerns to Amīr al-Mu’minīn; Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه:

ادرك هذه الامة قبل ان يختلفوا في الكتاب اختلاف اليهود والنصارى

Save this ummah with regards to the Qur’ān, before they differ with regards to the Qur’ān as the Jews and Christians differed (with regards to their Books).¹

In short, looking at these circumstances, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه consulted with the senior Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم, amongst whom was

1 *Mishkāt* pg. 193

Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. In the light of their decision, the copy of the Qur’ān that was compiled in the era of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, and in the possession of Umm al-Mu’minīn Sayyidah Ḥafṣah رضي الله عنها, was taken and a uniform copy was prepared in the dialect of the Quraysh. Ḥāfiẓ al-Dhahabī رحمته الله discusses this in the following text:

Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه gathered the ummah upon Muṣḥaf and saved the ummah from differences in the Qur’ān.¹

Note:-

More detail with regards to this issue will be mentioned in the responses to the criticism about burning the Maṣāḥif.

12. Just as there were great conquests during the khilāfah of Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه, in the same way it continued during the era of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه. After the martyrdom of Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه, some of the conquered lands had rebelled (e.g. Ḥamdān, Rayy, Azerbaijan, Armenia, etc.) and during the khilāfah of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه these lands were reconquered and the rebellion put to an end.

Moreover, in the east; Khurāsān, Tabristān, Bayhaq, Nayshapūr, Herat, Balkh etc., were conquered, and to the west; Marākish and Tarāblus (Andalus) came under Islamic rule.

In Africa, there was a great war by the name of ‘Ḥarb al-‘Ibādalah’ that took place. Through this, many areas of Africa came under the sway of Islam.

Naval battle began in the era of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه, through the efforts of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه; and by means of it a

1 *Tadhkirah al-Ḥuffāz* vol. 1 pg. 8

number of islands were conquered (Jazīrah, Qabras, etc.) and the Romans defeated. The authority of the Caesar of Rome had come to an end.

In short, during the khilāfah of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه, from Marākish in the west till Kabul in the east, Hījāz, Yemen, Egypt, Shām, Iraq, Persia; all these areas had come under Islamic rule.

The services of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه in spreading Islam are mentioned in detail in the books of ḥadīth and history. We have only presented a summary here.

After this brief biography, the objections against Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه will be dealt with. The objective is not to deride or malign any particular individual or people, but rather to establish the truthfulness of the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, their just nature and defend their status; so that when Muslims face these criticisms they will not fall prey to them and destroy their hereafter.

Objection of not participating in the Battle of Badr

The opposition raise this objection with regards to the third Khalīfah, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه, that in Islam the Battle of Badr has great virtue and importance. Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه on the other hand did not participate in it. In this way, he was deprived of the virtues of the Battle of Badr.

Answer

On the occasion of the Battle of Badr, Sayyidah Ruqayyah رضي الله عنها — the daughter of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم and the wife of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه — was ill. When Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم went out for the Battle of Badr with the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه remained behind in Madīnah on the instruction of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم, to look after his wife, Sayyidah Ruqayyah رضي الله عنها. Sayyidah Ruqayyah رضي الله عنها passed away in this time. When Sayyidunā Zayd ibn Ḥārithah رضي الله عنه brought the good news of the victory at Badr to Madīnah, the people were completing the burial of Sayyidah Ruqayyah رضي الله عنها.

Yet when Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم divided the booty among the victors of Badr, he gave an equal share to Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه and he included him in its virtue. In light of this, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه is counted among the participants of Badr. Two references from the biographical accounts and works of history are presented here:

عن عبد الله بن مكنف بن حارثة الانصاري قال لما خرج رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم الى بدر خلف عثمان على ابنته رقية وكانت مريضة فمات رضي الله عنها يوم قدم زيد بن حارثة المدينة بشيرا بما فتح الله على رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ببدر وضرب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم لعثمان بسهمه واجره في بدر فكان كمن شهدها

‘Abd Allāh ibn Miknaf ibn Hārithah al-Anṣārī narrates: “When Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم left for Badr, he left ‘Uthmān to take care of his daughter, Ruqayyah, who was ill. She passed away, may Allah be pleased with her, the day Zayd ibn Ḥārithah رضي الله عنه entered Madinah to convey the good news of the victory

at Badr. Rasūlullāh ﷺ gave ‘Uthmān a share of the spoils and said he would receive the same reward as those who participated in it. Thus he was equal to those who participated in it.¹

عثمان بن عفان رضي الله عنه تخلف على امراته رقية بنت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وكانت مريضة فتوفيت وجاءت البشرى بالفتح حين دفنت فضرب له رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بسهمه من الغنيمة وياجره من المشهد فهو يدري

‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ remained behind to tend to his wife Ruqayyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا, the daughter of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, who was ill. She passed away (on account of her illness). The good news of the victory arrived while she was being buried. Rasūlullāh ﷺ gave him a share of the spoils and the reward for one who participated (in Badr), thus he is also a Badrī.²

Therefore, although Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ did not personally participate in the Battle of Badr, but in accordance to the instruction of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, he was not deprived of the virtues of Badr and Rasūlullāh ﷺ gave him of the spoils of Badr and said that he will get the reward of those who participated in Badr as well.

Similitude between Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān and Sayyidunā ‘Alī

We would wish to inform the critics that the non-participation of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ in the Battle of Badr is the same as the non-participation of Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ in the Battle of Tabūk. Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ also stayed behind in Madīnah according to the instruction of Rasūlullāh ﷺ and did not participate in the Battle of Tabūk. Similarly, in accordance to the instruction of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ could not participate in the Battle of Badr, and was instructed to remain behind to look after the daughter of Rasūlullāh ﷺ.

1 *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa‘d* vol. 3 pg. 38

2 *Jawāmi‘ al-Sīrah* of Ibn Ḥazm al-Andalūsī pg. 115

The same ruling applies to both of these incidents and it is not correct to criticise any of them for not participating in the respective battles. Rasūlullāh ﷺ had the right to instruct his sons-in-law with regards to household affairs, whether it was the Battle of Badr or the Battle of Tabūk.

Moreover, study our books, listed hereunder, for further details on this issue, where we have discussed this issue at length:

1. *Banāt Arba‘ah* p. 194 - p. 197
2. *Ruḥamā’ Baynahum* (‘Uthmānī section) p. 34, 35

Objection for fleeing from the Battle of Uḥud

Those who criticise Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ have mentioned that in the Battle of Uḥud, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was among those Ṣaḥābah who fled from the battlefield; and it is forbidden in Islam to flee the battlefield.

Answer

The senior scholars of history have mentioned that in the Battle of Uḥud, Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ deputed a group of archers on a hill with the instruction not to leave their position under any circumstances. However, the battle quickly turned in favour of the Muslims, and having perceived this to be a victory (and end of the battle), a group of these archers left their position and participated in gathering the spoils of war. While in this condition, the disbelievers led a severe counterattack from this unguarded position. It was in this perilous time that some of the Muslims were shaken and left the battlefield. Among them was Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

Allah has mentioned this incident in the Qur’ān briefly, expressing His Forgiveness for having slipped at this juncture:

إِنَّ الَّذِينَ تَوَلَّوْا مِنْكُمْ يَوْمَ الْتَقَى الْجَمْعَانِ إِنَّمَا اسْتَزَلَّهُمُ الشَّيْطَانُ بِبَعْضِ مَا كَسَبُوا ۗ وَلَقَدْ عَفَا اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ ۗ إِنَّ اللَّهَ غَفُورٌ حَلِيمٌ

Indeed, those of you who turned back on the day the two armies met, it was Shayṭān who caused them to slip because of some (blame) they had earned. But Allah has already forgiven them. Indeed, Allah is Forgiving and Forbearing.¹

In short, from whoever this slip up occurred, including Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, Allah forgave them. Now there is no sin on them as Allah has forgiven

1 Sūrah Āl-‘Imrān: 155

them completely. No person now has the right to criticise them, nor is there any permissibility to rebuke them.

Objection for not Participating in the Pledge of Riḍwān

Those who criticise Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه level a third objection against him that he did not participate in the pledge of Riḍwān. Therefore, he was deprived of this significant virtue.

Answer

This objection was levelled against Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه early in Islam and the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم have given the answer themselves.

It is recorded in the books of ḥadīth that a person from Egypt came to Makkah Mukarramah on the occasion of ḥajj, and saw a gathering of people in one place. He asked: “Who are these people?” The answer was given that they are of the Quraysh and the famous Ṣaḥābī, ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar رضي الله عنه, had come. This person came to ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar رضي الله عنه and posed a few questions to him regarding certain issues:

1. Tell me, did ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān flee from Uḥud?

Ibn ‘Umar رضي الله عنه replied: “Yes.”

2. You know that ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān did not participate in Badr.

Ibn ‘Umar رضي الله عنه replied: “Yes.”

3. He was not present at the Pledge of Riḍwān and did not take part in this pledge.

Ibn ‘Umar رضي الله عنه once again replied: “This is correct.”

After this, Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar رضي الله عنه provided answers to all three questions that were posed. He said:

I shall reply, listen well,

- What you have said with regards to fleeing from Uḥud, I bear testimony that Allah has forgiven him for that. (as mentioned in Sūrah Āl ‘Imrān: 155)
- The reason for ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān’s absence from the Battle of Badr was that the daughter of Rasūlullāh ﷺ (Sayyidah Ruqayyah رُقَيْيَا) was married to him and she was very ill at that time. Rasūlullāh ﷺ told ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān that he should look after her, “You will get a share in the spoils and the reward of those that participated in Badr.”
- As for ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān’s remaining absent from the pledge of Riḍwān, it was because if there was anyone nobler than ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān in the valley of Makkah, then Rasūlullāh ﷺ would have sent him instead of ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān. (However, there was no one more suitable for this task at that time than Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ). So, Rasūlullāh ﷺ sent ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān and after ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān left, the incident of the Pledge of Riḍwān took place. On this occasion, Rasūlullāh ﷺ said: “This hand of mine is the hand of ‘Uthmān.” He placed it in the other hand and pledged. He said: “I pledge allegiance on behalf of ‘Uthmān.”¹

After rendering these replies, Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh Ibn ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ addressed the objector saying: “These are the replies to your questions and now you can go.”

The above narration of Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ has the replies to all three questions. The scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah and the Shī‘ah have mentioned all three narrations in their works clearly. There is no need for any further response.

1 *Mishkāt* pg. 562, *Bukhārī* vol. 1 pg. 523, *Bukhārī* vol. 2 pg. 581, 582, *al-Mustadrak Ḥākim* vol. 3 pg. 98, *al-Istī‘āb* vol. 3 pg. 71, *Tārīkh al-Ya‘qūbī al-Shī‘ī* vol. 2 pg. 169, *Rowdat al-Kāfi* pg. 151

Objection of Performing Four Raka'āt in Mina

An objection is levelled against Sayyidunā 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān رضي الله عنه that on the occasion of ḥajj, he performed four Raka'āt in Mina, whereas a traveller is commanded to perform two Raka'āt instead of four.

Answer

This is an old objection that is levelled against the action of Sayyidunā 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān رضي الله عنه. At this point, it is worthy to state that the scholars have written that Sayyidunā 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān رضي الله عنه possessed extensive knowledge of the rulings of ḥajj. He was first in rank in this matter. Subsequently, it is stated in *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa'd*:

كان اعلمهم بالمناسك ابن عفان وبعده ابن عمر

He was the most knowledgeable of the rulings of ḥajj and after him was Ibn 'Umar رضي الله عنه.¹

The scholars of ḥadīth have recorded the explanation provided by Sayyidunā 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān رضي الله عنه in reply to this, after which there remains no scope for any objection. It is reported in *Musnad al-Ḥumaydī*:

عن عثمان (بن عفان) رضي الله عنه انه قال صلى باهل منى اربعا فانكر الناس عليه ذلك فقال : اني تاهلت بها لما قدمت واني سمعت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يقول اذا تاهل الرجل في بلد فليصل به صلاة المقيم

It is narrated that 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān رضي الله عنه led the people in four raka'āt in Mina, so the people objected. 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān رضي الله عنه said in replied: "I made the intention of residing in Makkah when I entered, and I heard Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم say that when a person makes an intention to reside in a city, then he should perform the ṣalāh of a resident (i.e. four raka'āt).

1 *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa'd* vol. 3 pg. 41

Because I made the intention of residing here, that is why I performed four raka'āt."¹

In short, after the explanation of Sayyidunā 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān رضي الله عنه, there is no need for a further response and the objection falls away.

The scholars have given various interpretations in this ruling. Despite this, after the above mentioned proof, we do not see the need to mention it.

1 *Musnad al-Ḥumaydī* vol. 1 pg. 21, *Musnad Abū Ya'lā* vol. 1 pg. 157, *Muṣannaf 'Abd al-Razzāq* vol. 2 pg. 516, *Qurrat al-'Aynayn* pg. 274

Objection of Adding the Second Adhān in Jumu‘ah

The objectors mention that in the thirtieth year after hijrah, ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān added a second adhān to the Jumu‘ah Ṣalāh, whereas before this, this adhān was not given and it is something disliked to add things from one’s own side in the rulings of the sharī‘ah.

Answer

In order to explain this ruling, it is necessary to know a few aspects by way of introduction. The khalīfah in Islam has the choice to exercise ijtihād in Islamic rulings. In the era of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه, the number of Muslims grew significantly, and a means to gather the people timeously was required. Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه adopted this adhān — by way of ijtihād — so that people would arrive well in time for the Jumu‘ah Ṣalāh. This addition was made out of necessity. There were innumerable Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم present at that time, and they too agreed with Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه in this regard, without any reservation. The scholars refer to this as *al-Ijmā‘ al-Sukūti* (concessional silence), and this is an authentic proof of the permissibility of this adhān.¹

Another important aspect is that this took place in 30 A.H, and Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه was martyred in 35 A.H; after which Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā رضي الله عنه was chosen as the fourth khalīfah. He remained the khalīfah from 36 A.H to 40 A.H. In all this time, this ‘additional’ adhān continued. Similarly, during the khilāfah of Sayyidunā Ḥasan رضي الله عنه (approximately 6 months), this adhān was continuously called out.

The practice of these senior Hāshimī luminaries attest to the action of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه, declaring it correct, in terms of the sharī‘ah, and worthy of being practised upon.

1 Marginalia of *Bukhārī* vol. 1 pg. 124

If this adhān was not permissible in the Sharī'ah, then they would have immediately opposed it and they would have ended its practice in their khilāfah.

In Islam, the principle form of worship is ṣalāh and adhān is an action for calling towards ṣalāh. Those deeds that are a means have room for ijtihād, within the framework of sharī'ah. The reality is that from the time that the adhān was initiated until today, the Muslims have continued to practice it and no one has left it out. Therefore, there is tawātur through the generations in this ruling.

Moreover, Rasūlullāh ﷺ said:

لا تجتمع امتي على الضلالة

My ummah will never gather upon deviation.

Therefore, there is consensus of the ummah on this ruling and this is correct in the sharī'ah. It is not deviation. There are a number of rulings that are proven through the continued practice of the ummah and this is also of this type.

Objection to Taking the Special Grazing Pasture in Madīnah

Historians have recorded that when some anarchists arose in Egypt, Kūfah and Baṣrah in the time of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه, they came to Madīnah and laid siege to the house of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه. These anarchists then levelled a number of baseless accusations against him. Sometimes Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه would reply to these objections and sometimes Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه would personally respond. One of these objections were that in the nearby areas of Madīnah, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه had reserved a certain area only for his camels to graze, and this was not permissible.

Answer

In reply to this objection, Sayyidunā ‘Alī and Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنهما have said that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān had reserved these pastures for the animals of charity and the camels of the Bayt al-Māl (not for his personal animals). Before him, Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه had also specified a pasture for the camels of charity.

The famous historian, Khalīfah ibn Khayyāṭ recorded the answer to this objection as stated by Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه himself:

فاما الحمى فان عمر رضي الله عنه حماه قبلي لابل الصدقة فلما وليت زادت ابل الصدقة فزدت في الحمى لما زاد من ابل الصدقة

As for the pastures, ‘Umar reserved them specifically for the camels of charity before me. When I was appointed, the camels of charity increased, so I increased the pastures because of the increased number of camels.¹

Ḥāfiẓ al-Dhahabī رحمته الله has mentioned this reply in the following text, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه said:

1 *Tārīkh Khalīfah Ibn Khayyāṭ* vol. 1 pg. 146, *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* vol. 5 pg. 107

فاما الحمى فوالله ما حميته لابللي ولا لغنمي وانما حميته لابل الصدقة

As for the pastures, by Allah, I did not reserve it for my camel or my goats,
I had reserved them for the camels of charity.¹

Similarly, the reply given by Sayyidunā ‘Alī has been reported by Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Kathīr رحمه الله as follows:

واما الحمى فانما حماه لابل الصدقة لتسمن ولم يحمه لابله ولا لغنمه قد حماه عمر رضي الله عنه قبله

As for the pastures, it was reserved for the camels of charity, in order to fatten them and it was not reserved for his (personal) camels or goats; ‘Umar had reserved it before him.²

Summary

In light of the explanation reported by the historians, it is proven that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه did not reserve these pastures for his personal use, thus this accusation has no basis.

The camels of charity had increased a great deal, and in accordance with the need of the hour, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه increased the grazing pastures. However, these grazing pastures were not for his personal animals.

Moreover, the historians have clarified that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه was not the one who initiated this practice, but Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه was the one who had reserved the pastures around Madīnah for the animals of the Bayt al-Māl. Therefore, this objection on Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه is not correct at all.

1 *Tārīkh al-Islām* vol. 2 pg. 121

2 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* vol. 7 pg. 171

Objection Regarding the Burning of the Maṣāḥif

The objection has been levelled against Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه that he burnt copies of the Noble Qur’ān, which is disrespectful and belittles the Qur’ān, and ultimately forbidden in sharī‘ah.

Answer

It is imperative to understand the background to the issue first, before contemplating upon the reply to this allegation. At the time when this incident occurred a number of various tribes – from various quarters of the Arabian peninsula – had embraced Islam. In the early years of Islam, the Arabs would recite the Noble Qur’ān in their respective dialects, for which permission had been granted. This was later brought to an end and all Muslims were given the command to recite in the dialect of the Quraysh.

We have discussed this previously in our work *Sīrah Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā* رضي الله عنه under the topic, “the help of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه in gathering the Qur’ān in the era of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه”, one may refer to it for further detail.

During the khilāfah of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه, in 24 A.H and 25 A.H, different tribes of the Arabs had gathered in various areas and would recite the Qur’ān in their differing dialects, in which they differed. This incident took place in Armenia and Azerbaijan.

The famous Ṣaḥābī, Sayyidunā Ḥudhayfah ibn al-Yamān رضي الله عنه was present there at that time and disliked the differences in the variant recitations. He felt that if these differences were to remain, then just as the Jews and Christians differed in the divine scriptures, so too would the Muslims also differ with regards to the Noble Qur’ān; which would inevitably result in division and disunity.

As a result, Sayyidunā Ḥudhayfah ibn al-Yamān رضي الله عنه brought it to the attention of the khalīfah, ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه:

يا امير المؤمنين! ادرك هذه الامة قبل ان يختلفوا في الكتاب اختلاف اليهود والنصارى

O Amīr al-Mu'minīn, save this ummah with regards to the Qur'ān, before they differ with regards to the Qur'ān as the Jews and Christians differed (with regards to their Books).¹

Accordingly, Sayyidunā 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān رضي الله عنه consulted with the senior Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم, amongst whom was Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه. In the light of their decision, the copy of the Qur'ān that was compiled in the era of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, and in the possession of Umm al-Mu'minīn Sayyidah Ḥafṣah رضي الله عنها, was taken and a uniform copy was prepared in the dialect of the Quraysh. These Maṣāḥif were then sent to the people of Shām, Egypt, Baṣrah, Kūfah, Makkah and Yemen. One copy was kept in Madīnah.²

The Shī' scholars present the detail of this in the following way:

وبعث بمصحف الى الكوفة ومصحف الى البصرة ومصحف الى المدينة ومصحف الى مكة ومصحف الى مصر ومصحف الى الشام ومصحف الى البحرين ومصحف الى اليمن ومصحف الى الجزيرة وامر الناس ان يقرأوا على نسخة واحدة وكان سبب ذلك انه بلغه ان الناس يقولون قرآن آل فلان فاراد ان يكون نسخة واحدة

'Uthmān sent copies of the Muṣḥaf to Kūfah, Baṣrah, Madīnah, Makkah, Egypt, Shām, Bahrain, Yemen and al-Jazīrah. He commanded the people to recite from this one Muṣḥaf. The cause of this was that news reached 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān that people were saying the Qur'ān of so and so family. Thus he intended thereby that there be only one Muṣḥaf.³

In order to increase the knowledge of the readers, this point is written here that the senior scholars have mentioned that about five years, from 25 A.H to 30 A.H, were spent in preparing these copies of the Noble Qur'ān. These Maṣāḥif were

1 *Mishkāt* pg. 193

2 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* vol. 7 pg. 216, *Fatḥ al-Bārī* vol. 9 pg. 17

3 *Tārīkh Ya'qūbī* vol. 2 pg. 170

sent to the different cities of the Muslims (as explained above). One Muṣḥaf was kept for the people of Madīnah, and Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه kept one copy for himself. These Maṣāḥif were compiled under the supervision of the famous and expert Qurrā’ (of Ṣaḥābah); and the Muslim ummah thanked Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه for rendering this great service.

It is stated in the marginalia of *Tārīkh al-Islām*:

وقد استمر على الجماعة في نسخ المصاحف مدة خمس سنين من سنة خمس وعشرين الى سنة ثلاثين في التحقيق ثم ارسلوا المصاحف المكتوبة الى الامصار وقد اختفظ عثمان بمصحف منها لاهل المدينة بمصحف لنفسه وكانت تلك المصاحف تحت اشراف قراء مشهورين في الاقراء والمعارضة بها فشكرت الامة صنيع عثمان رضي الله تعالى عنه

A group continued with gathering the Maṣāḥif for five years, from 25 A.H to 30 A.H. They then sent the copies of these Maṣāḥif to the cities. ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān kept one of these copies for the people of Madīnah, and a Muṣḥaf for himself. These were compiled under the supervision of the famous qurrā’ and the ummah thanked ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه for his service he rendered.¹

The famous scholar Badr al-Dīn Zarkashī رحمته الله spoke about this great service of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه in the following words:

لقد وفق لامر عظيم ورفع الاختلاف وجمع الكلمة وراح الامة

He was granted the ability to do carry out this great service, to remove the differences of opinion and gather the ummah on one recitation. He gave relief to the Muslims (and the ummah was blessed with unity).²

The opposition level objections against this great service of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه, that he had copies of the Noble Qur’ān burnt, and thereby

1 Marginalia of *Tārīkh al-Islām* vol. 2 pg. 103

2 *Tafsīr al-Burhān fī ‘Ulūm al-Qur’ān* part 1 pg. 339

disrespected the Noble Qur’ān, which is forbidden in Islam. However, the reality is that the rebels had levelled this objection against Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه at first and those who came later merely repeated it with added exaggeration. The answer to this objection was given in the era of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم and it was clarified that what Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه did was burn those copies that had the interpretations written alongside the actual words of the Qur’ān (making it difficult to discern between interpretation and actual Qur’ānic text. Besides this, some would write the abrogated words (in terms of recitation), together with the words of the Noble Qur’ān in their personal copies of the Muṣḥaf.

Initially there was no fear of confusion, but if those copies of the Qur’ān were to have remained, then there would have been great confusion amongst the future generations, who would be unable to discern between the original words of the Qur’ān and the interpretations, or between what was abrogated and not abrogated? Therefore, with the consultation of the majority of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم (among whom was Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه), Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه destroyed these copies and that which was not the text of the Qur’ān.

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Kathīr رحمه الله has mentioned this issue in *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* in the following text:

واما المصاحف فانما حرق ما واقع فيه اختلاف وابقى لهم المتفق عليه كما ثبت في العروة الاخيرة (يعني التي درسها جبريل عليه السلام على رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم في آخر سني حياته

As for the Maṣāḥif, those copies were burnt regarding which there were differences and those which were agreed were kept — as established in the last recital (i.e. that which Sayyidunā Jibrīl عليه السلام revised with Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم in the last year of his life).¹

Moreover, there is support for this in the aḥādīth, as al-Bukhārī states:

1 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* vol. 7 pg. 171

وامر عثمان بما سواه من القرآن في كل صحيفة او مصحف ان يحرق... الخ

Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه ordered that whatever was not the Qur’ān that people had written, it should be burnt.¹

Furthemore, the fourth Khalīfah, Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā رضي الله عنه, during his khilāfah, clarified this issue, once and for all, to remove any doubts in the minds of the people:

يقول يا ايها الناس! لا تغلوا في عثمان رضي الله تعالى عنه ولا تقولوا له الا خيرا في المصاحف واحراق المصاحف فوالله ما فعل الذي فعل في المصاحف الا عن ملامنا جميعا

O people, do not exaggerate with regards to ‘Uthmān and do not say anything but good regarding him. With regards to the Maṣāḥif and burning the Maṣāḥif; whatever he did, he did not do it except after consulting with us.²

Therefore, no criticism should be directed against him in this regard.

In the same narration, a little ahead, Suwayd ibn Ghafalah narrates the statement of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه:

سمعت عليا يقول رحم الله عثمان لو وليته لفعلت ما فعل في المصاحف

I heard ‘Alī saying: “May Allah have mercy on ‘Uthmān, if I was the ruler, I would have done the same as ‘Uthmān with regards to the Maṣāḥif.”³

Similarly, the famous scholar Badr al-Dīn Zarkashī has written in his *Tafsīr*:

‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه was a just ruler; he had no enmity at all. In the compilation of the Qur’ān, he did not adopt any form of stubbornness or

1 *Al-Bukhārī* vol. 2 pg. 746

2 *Kitāb al-Maṣāḥif* Ḥāfiẓ Abū Bakr ‘Abd Allāh ibn Abī Dāwūd al-Sijistānī pg. 22, 23

3 *Kitāb al-Maṣāḥif* pg. 23

deviation. He did whatever was necessary. Because of this, no one refuted him, but they approved of his action and it is counted as part of his virtues, to the extent that ‘Alī رضي الله عنه said:

لو وليت ما ولي عثمان لعملت بالمصاحف ما عمل

If I was put in charge of what Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه was put in charge of, I would have done the same thing with regards to the Maṣāḥif as what ‘Uthmān did.¹

In the light of the above explanation, it has been clarified that whatever Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه destroyed, was that which was not the actual Qur’ān. In this matter, the senior Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم, including Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه assisted and supported Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه; and in accordance to their view, the plan of action was carried out with regards to the Maṣāḥif. Therefore, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه was not guilty of disrespecting or belittling the Qur’ān, and there is no permissibility to make him a target of criticism.

Retraction of Ibn Mas‘ūd

For the sake of clarity, it is worthy to mention that in the beginning, Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mas‘ūd رضي الله عنه had a different opinion with regards to the Maṣāḥif and he was firm upon his view, which differed with the rest of the Ṣaḥābah. However, later on, when Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه encouraged Sayyidunā Ibn Mas‘ūd رضي الله عنه to follow the rest of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم and invited him to remain with the main body (of Muslims), he retracted his view and agreed with the rest of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم.

Subsequently, in *al-Bidāyah*, Ibn Kathīr رحمه الله has mentioned this detail in the following text:

فكتب اليه عثمان رضي الله عنه يدعو الى اتباع الصحابة فيما اجمعوا عليه من المصلحة في ذلك وجمع

1 *Tafsīr al-Burhān fī ‘Ulūm al-Qur’ān* vol. 1 pg. 240

الكلمة وعدم الاختلاف فاتاب واجاب الى المتابعة وترك المخافلة رضي الله عنهم اجمعين

‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه wrote to him, calling him to follow the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم in the matter wherein they agreed upon, because of the expediency in it and in gathering them on one recital and not to stay on his differing view. He repented and responded by following their opinion and leaving his differing view. May Allah, be pleased with them all.¹

Consensus of the Ṣaḥābah Upon the Muṣḥaf ‘Uthmānī

Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr رحمه الله is a famous scholar among the Mālikīs. In his famous work *Kitāb al-Tamhīd lī mā fī al-Muwaṭṭa’ min al-Ma’ānī wa l-Asānīd*, he states in the fourth volume:

واجمع العلماء ان ما في مصحف عثمان بن عفان وهو الذي بأيدي المسلمين اليوم في اقطار الارض حيث كانوا هو القرآن المحفوظ الذي لا يجوز لاحد ان يتجاوزه ولا تحل الصلاة لمسلم الا بما فيه... انما حل مصحف عثمان رضي الله عنه هذا المحل لاجماع الصحابة وسائر الامة عليه ولم يجمعوا على ما سواه وبالله التوفيق... الخ

There is consensus of the scholars of the ummah upon the Muṣḥaf ‘Uthmānī, it is the very same Muṣḥaf in the hands of the Muslims in the corners of the globe today. This Noble Qur’ān is protected and it is not permissible for a person to go beyond it and the ṣalāh of any Muslim will not be valid except with it. The rank and status that this Muṣḥaf ‘Uthmānī has acquired, is on account of this joint effort of Muslim Ummah and there can be no consensus on anything else. And Allah grants divine ability.²

Note:-

وقد تولى الخلافة بعد هؤلاء الشيوخ الثلاثة امير المؤمنين علي رضي الله عنه فامضى عملهم واقر مصحف عثمان رضي الله عنه برسمه وتلاوته في جميع اصمار ولايته وبذلك انعقد اجماع المسلمين في صدر الاول... الخ

1 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* vol. 7 pg. 217

2 *Kitāb al-Tamhīd lī mā fī al-Muwaṭṭa’ min al-Ma’ānī wa l-Asānīd* vol. 4 pg. 278, 279

At this point, we must pay attention to this point that after the first three khulafā, the Khilāfah of Amīr al-Mu'minīn Sayyidunā 'Alī al-Murtaḍā رضي الله عنه was established, and he maintained the deeds and actions of the previous khulafā. One of them was that he kept the Muṣḥaf 'Uthmānī in its place and it was recited in all the countries and cities and every year during Ramaḍān al-Mubārak, this very same Muṣḥaf 'Uthmānī was recited in Tarāwīḥ and no other Qur'ān was recited in the era of Sayyidunā 'Alī al-Murtaḍā رضي الله عنه. Because of this, in the first century, there was consensus on this Muṣḥaf 'Uthmānī and it had acquired tawātur through the generations.¹

In the light of the above texts, this communal action during the era of Sayyidunā 'Alī al-Murtaḍā رضي الله عنه was a very strong reason to show that the action of Sayyidunā 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān رضي الله عنه with regards to gathering the Qur'ān was totally correct. It is as though this action during the khilāfah of Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه is a clear proof of the correct nature of this issue and it has the status of a complete testimony. There remains no need for any further testimony to prove that the Muṣḥaf 'Uthmānī is correct.

Subsequently, a famous scholar, Muḥammad ibn Yaḥyā ibn Abī Bakr, writes in his work:

فعل ذلك عثمان ولو كان منكرا لكان علي رضي الله عنه غيره لما صار الامر اليه فلما لم يغيره علم ان
عثمان كان مصيبا في ما فعل

Whatever 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān رضي الله عنه did with regards to the Muṣḥaf, if it was wrong, then when 'Alī رضي الله عنه became the khalīfah he would have changed it and when Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه did not change it, we learn that 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān رضي الله عنه was correct.²

Summary

During his era of khilāfah, Sayyidunā 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān رضي الله عنه carried out this great service and in order to save the Muslim ummah from differences in the

1 Marginalia of *al-'Awāṣim min al-Qawāṣim* by Muḥibb al-Dīn al-Khaṭīb pg. 69

2 *Kitāb al-Tamhīd* pg. 185

Qur'ān, he adopted this plan and preserved the Noble Qur'ān. This service was carried out with the agreement and consensus of the senior Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ (as we have mentioned with references above). The Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ classified this action as correct, and together with this, they did not have difference of opinion. So, this was the practice of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ and it is also referred to as tawātur through the generations (*Tawātur Ṭabaqātī*). Therefore, based on the practice of the Ṣaḥābah and tawātur through the generations, this matter has been classified as consensus and Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ said:

لا تجتمع امتي على الضلالة

My ummah will not gather upon deviation.

We have mentioned the related aspects to this objection on Sayyidunā 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and we have discussed this issue at length in *Sīrah Sayyidunā 'Alī al-Murtaḍā* (p. 191 – 204).

We request the readers to ponder over this great service of Sayyidunā 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and to decide for themselves to what extent is this objection relevant? May Allah guide the Muslims and grant us the ability to remain in agreement on those issues which were agreed upon. And Allah alone is the guide.

Objection Regarding the Alleged Ill-Treatment and Oppression Upon the Ṣaḥābah

The critics of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه have often asserted that he oppressed the senior Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم in various ways, and he dealt with them harshly; which can never be condoned in the sharī‘ah. The names of Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mas‘ūd, Sayyidunā Abū Dhar al-Ghifārī and Sayyidunā ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir رضي الله عنه are especially mentioned.

Hereunder, we will clear the name of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه from all these baseless allegations. A number of points will be mentioned in his defence, through which the reality of these incidents will become known and it will be made apparent that these objections are baseless and contrary to reality.

Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mas‘ūd

The scholars of history have reported that Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mas‘ūd رضي الله عنه differed with Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه in certain rulings, on account of which he was allegedly beaten upon the instruction of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه and dismissed from his position as governor in Kūfah. Furthermore, his stipend from the Bayt al-Māl was stopped.

In *Minhāj al-Kirāmah*, Ibn Muṭahhar al-Ḥillī al-Shīrī has written that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه ordered ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mas‘ūd to be beaten; until he finally succumbed and passed away on account of the beating.

Answer

The explanation of the senior scholars will be presented in reply to this objection, after which the reality will be cleared and the baselessness of this allegation will be made apparent.

- a. Subsequently, Abū Bakr ibn al-‘Arabī رحمته الله in his work *al-‘Awāṣim min al-Qawāṣim* writes:

واما ضربه لابن مسعود ومنعه عطاء فزور

As for his (‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه) beating of Ibn Mas‘ūd and stopping his stipend; it is a fabrication.¹

b. Al-Dhahabī رحمه الله has written in his work *Al-Muntaqā*:

واما قولك ضرب ابن مسعود حتى مات فهذا من اسمع الكذب المعلوم

As for the statement that Ibn Mas‘ūd رضي الله عنه was beaten up by ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه until he died, this is one of the most well-known lies.²

c. The historian Daryābakrī has stated in *Tārīkh al-Khamīs*:

واما ما رووه مما جرى على عبد الله بن مسعود رضي الله عنه من عثمان رضي الله عنه وامره غلامه بضربه الى اخر ما قرره فكلمه بهتان واختلاق لا يصح منه شيء هؤلاء الجهلة لا يتحامون الكذب فيما يروونه موافقا لاغراضهم اذ لا ديانة تردهم لذلك

What the historians have mentioned that ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه commanded his slave to beat Ibn Mas‘ūd, this is an accusation and a fabrication. There is no authenticity to it. The ignorant historians, who reported this narration, did not attempt to sieve the false narrations (from their works) in accordance to their objectives, as they were not bound by any ethics to prevent them from this.³

The scholars have written that even if we were to assume that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه admonished Sayyidunā Ibn Mas‘ūd or Sayyidunā ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir رضي الله عنه, then he was fully entitled to do so as he was the khalīfah of the Muslims and the leader of the time; and based on his ijtihād, he had the choice to implement punishments.

1 *Al-‘Awāsim min al-Qawāsim* pg. 63

2 *Al-Muntaqā* pg. 394, *Al-Sawā‘iq al-Muḥriqah* pg. 114

3 *Tārīkh al-Khamīs* vol. 2 pg. 270

Similarly, assuming that he dismissed someone from his position and gave the post to someone else, then too, he was correct and he holds the position in shar'ah to do this. Based on his foresight, he has the right to appoint and dismiss. Subsequently, the senior scholars have written of this ruling as a principle:

ان من طعن على عثمان رضي الله عنه انما كان لعزله اياه وتولييه غيره وقطع عطاياه وذلك سائق للامام
اذا ادى اجتهاده اليه

As for those who criticise 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān, his dismissal from posts and appointing someone else in their place and cutting off stipends, that is part of the duties of the leader, wherein he exercises his ijtiḥād.¹

Shāh Walī Allāh Muḥaddith Dehlawī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ has mentioned this ruling in the following way:

The khalīfah of the time has the choice to dismiss and appoint people to positions. Similarly, the khalīfah has the right to give and stop stipends. If the ijtiḥād of the khalīfah guides him in this direction, that the ummah will be best served by a certain person, then it is necessary upon him to appoint the person to that position.²

Therefore, if Sayyidunā 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān رَحِمَهُ اللهُ dismissed or appointed someone, or he admonished someone, then it was in accordance to his ijtiḥād and he had shar'ī permission to do so. It is not permissible for anyone to object in this matter.

Note:-

The historians have mentioned the above texts when discussing the issues that happened between them, and they resorted to laxities and extremities when discussing these issues. The scholars have replied to these objections, clarifying its relevance, the summary of which we have mentioned above.

1 Ibid vol. 2 pg. 271

2 Qurrat al-'Aynayn pg. 272

Now we shall discuss the true relationship that existed between them (Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān and Sayyidunā Ibn Mas‘ūd رضي الله عنه) which will make apparent the good will and well-wishing they bore for each other.

Assuming that previously, if there was some dispute, then too, it was temporary and after the conditions passed, it had come to an end. It was not a permanent argument that continued throughout their lives.

1. When Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه was martyred and the issue of the selection of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه came up, then Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mas‘ūd رضي الله عنه addressed those who were present and said:

انا اجتمعنا اصحاب محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم فلم نال عن خير ناذى فوق فبايعنا امير المؤمنين عثمان
فبايعونه

We, the Ṣaḥābah of Muḥammad صلى الله عليه وسلم have gathered, we have not fallen short in choosing the best and most suited from our group. We have all pledged allegiance to ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه, so you also pledge allegiance to him.¹

قال لما استخلف عثمان رضي الله عنه قال عبد الله بن مسعود رضي الله عنه امرنا خير من بقي ولم نالوا

When ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه was appointed as the khalīfah, ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mas‘ūd رضي الله عنه said: “We have appointed the best of those who remained behind, and we did not find anyone better.”²

The views of Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mas‘ūd رضي الله عنه regarding Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه are clear, that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه was the most worthy from all the of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم at that time for the position of khilāfah.

1 *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa‘d* vol. 3 pg. 43

2 *Majma‘ al-Zawā‘id* vol. 9 pg. 88

2. On the occasion of ḥajj, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه performed four raka‘āt in Mina instead of two, whereas the khulafā’ before him had performed two raka‘āt. Some people said that he went against them in this particular ruling, so Sayyidunā Ibn Mas‘ūd رضي الله عنه said:

فقال ابن مسعود رضي الله عنه اني اكره الخلاف وفي رواية الخلاف شر

I dislike opposing the Khalīfah of the time.¹

From this incident it is clear that Sayyidunā Ibn Mas‘ūd رضي الله عنه was not opposed to Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه, but would sometimes leave his own view and gave preference to following the khalīfah.

3. It is worthy of clarifying at this point that during the era of the third khalīfah, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه, the matter of gathering the Noble Qur‘ān arose. The view of Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mas‘ūd رضي الله عنه was different in this particular matter. Despite this, he finally agreed with the action of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه and the rest of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم and he abandoned his own opinion.

Therefore, in the matter of the Muṣḥaf, the difference of opinion between Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه and Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mas‘ūd رضي الله عنه came to an end.

We have clarified this issue previously under the criticism dealing with burning the Maṣāḥif.

4. At this point, the historians have also mentioned that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه had stopped the stipend of Sayyidunā Ibn Mas‘ūd رضي الله عنه for some temporary need.

¹ *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* vol. 7 pg. 217

We could not learn the correct finer details of this ruling. The historians have resorted to great exaggeration in this regard, as to what was the reason for his stipend being stopped. What were the circumstances at the time? All this requires research and investigation. Despite this, the historians have written that the remainder of the stipend of Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mas‘ūd رضي الله عنه was given to his heirs upon his demise and by means of Sayyidunā Zubayr ibn al-‘Awwām رضي الله عنه, these stipends were given to the worthy recipients.¹

5. During the khilāfah of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه, Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mas‘ūd رضي الله عنه resided in Kūfah and for a while he was engaged in spreading Islam and religious activity. According to certain narrations, he was the supervisor of the Bayt al-Māl. However, later on, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه removed him from the Bayt al-Māl of Kūfah and appointed Sayyidunā ‘Uqbah ibn ‘Āmir رضي الله عنه in his place. After this, he was not put in charge of anything, nor was he made a governor. However, he lived there without holding any position and he would impart religious knowledge to the people.

After staying in these conditions for some time, Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mas‘ūd رضي الله عنه realised the evil and transgression in the nature of the people and conditions of trials and corruption had come about, so he became disheartened with the people of Kūfah and sought permission from Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه to return to Madīnah. At first, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه did not permit him, but later on, he permitted him to return, due to temporary needs and demands. According to some historians, a few months before his demise, he returned to Madīnah and he passed away in 32 A.H and was buried in Jannat al-Baqī.²

1 *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa‘d* pg. 113, 114, *Tārīkh al-Islām* vol. 2 pg. 104

2 *Al-Tamhīd wa al-Bayān fī Maqatal al-Shahīd ‘Uthmān* pg. 65

Final Moments of Ibn Mas‘ūd

The historians state that during his final days, Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mas‘ūd رضي الله عنه returned from Kūfah and came to reside in Madīnah. In this time, he fell ill. When Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه came to know that his health was failing, he came to visit Ibn Mas‘ūd رضي الله عنه.¹

Ibn Sa‘d رحمته الله writes in his *Ṭabaqāt*:

‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān and ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mas‘ūd رضي الله عنه sought forgiveness from each other and they forgave each other (just before the demise of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mas‘ūd رضي الله عنه). ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mas‘ūd رضي الله عنه then passed away and ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه performed the Ṣalāt al-Janāzah over him.²

Ibn Sa‘d says that some people said that Sayyidunā ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir رضي الله عنه performed the Ṣalāt al-Janāzah over Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mas‘ūd رضي الله عنه, but this is not reliable, and the authentic view is that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه performed the Ṣalāt al-Janāzah over Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mas‘ūd رضي الله عنه.

The reason for this view being correct and the reason for preference is that it is an accepted law in Islam that the khalīfah of the Muslims has the greatest right of the ṣalāh. When he is present, then he is worthy of performing the ṣalāh, except if he gives another person permission to perform the ṣalāh.

In the light of the above texts, it has been clarified that during the last moments of their lives, there was no disagreement between them (as is mentioned in the above narration). Both of them held careful consideration for the rank of the other. Now, it is apparent that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه, the khalīfah of the time, performed the Ṣalāt al-Janāzah of Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mas‘ūd رضي الله عنه and he was buried in Jannah al-Baqī and the story about Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه having Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mas‘ūd رضي الله عنه beaten until he died is

1 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* vol. 7 pg. 163

2 *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa‘d* vol. 3 pg. 113

nothing but a fabrication and false propaganda. There is no truth to it at all. We have mentioned the correct circumstance at the time of his demise, which shows their mutual reconciliation and that; there was no ill feeling at all between them.

Sayyidunā Abū Dhar al-Ghifārī

His name is Jundub ibn Junādah. He is linked to the Ghaffār tribe and he is counted amongst the forerunners of Islam. He possessed abundant knowledge and great virtues, however, it is the quality of *zuhd* (abstinence) and his asceticism which are his most salient features. Asceticism was second nature to him and he was an embodiment of the trait:

They do not fear the criticism of others.

When it came to shar‘ī rulings, he was unflinching and would not accommodate any opinion contrary to his own research. An example of this is the matter of accumulating wealth (in excess of one’s needs), regarding which the scholars have written:

وكان مذهبه بذل ما فضل عن الحاجة وإن امسأكه كنز يكوى به صاحبه ويتلوا آية والذين يكنزون الذهب والفضة ولا ينفقونها في سبيل الله فبشرهم بعذاب اليم... الخ

His view was that whatever wealth was left after one’s basic necessities were taken care of has to be spent (and cannot be retained). (According to him) Keeping this (excess) wealth falls under hoarding of wealth, for which there is a punishment. He would quote the following verses (as support of his view): “As for those who store gold and silver as a treasure and they do not spend it in the path of Allah, give them glad tidings of a painful punishment.”¹

There are a number of incidents pertaining to this ruling of his, but only two will be discussed. The critics have especially used the incident of Rabadhah to level severe criticism against Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه.

1 *Al-Muntaqā* pg. 396

An incident

When he was residing in Shām, the governor of which was Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān رضي الله عنه, in the thirtieth year after hijrah, a juristic difference of opinion arose between Sayyidunā Abū Dhar al-Ghifārī رضي الله عنه and the other Ṣaḥābah who resided there. Sayyidunā Abū Dhar رضي الله عنه said that it is not permissible to gather and store silver and gold or any other form of wealth in excess of one’s basic necessities. He exhorted that it was obligatory to donate all excess wealth in charity, and it should not be stored. He was extremely vociferous in this ruling.

Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and the other Ṣaḥābah on the other hand were of the opinion that it is permissible to keep the wealth in excess of one’s necessities, after zakāh has been paid.

This created confusion and uncertainty, which resulted in Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه writing to Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه in Madīnah Munawwarah, explaining to him the situation. Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه felt it most expedient to bring Sayyidunā Abū Dhar al-Ghifārī رضي الله عنه to Madīnah Munawwarah, so as to prevent division and preserve the honour of Sayyidunā Abū Dhar رضي الله عنه.

Sayyidunā Abū Dhar al-Ghifārī رضي الله عنه then returned to Madīnah and after remaining there for a short while, with the council of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه, he felt it more suitable to adopt residence in Rabadhah.¹

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Kathīr رحمه الله has written:

وامره (عثمان لابي ذر رضي الله تعالى عنه) ان يتعاهد المدينة في بعض الاحيان حتى لا يرتد اعرايبا بعد هجرته ففعل

‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه instructed Abū Dhar al-Ghifārī رضي الله عنه that he should come to Madīnah from time to time, so that the effects of Bedouin life do not return to him after migrating. He accepted the proposal.²

1 *Al-Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah* vol. 11 pg. 110, 111, *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa’d* vol. 4 pg. 166

2 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* vol. 7 pg. 155

Another incident

Ḥāfiẓ al-Dhahabī رحمه الله has written:

ولما توفي عبد الرحمن بن عوف وخلف مالا عد ذلك ابو ذر رضي الله عنه من الكنز الذي يعاقب عليه
وعثمان يناظره في ذلك حتى دخل كعب (احبار) فواق عثمان فضر به ابو ذر رضي الله عنه

When ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn ‘Awf رضي الله عنه passed away in 32 A.H, he left behind a significant amount of wealth, which Abū Dhar al-Ghifārī رضي الله عنه regarded as hoarded wealth (according to his interpretation) for which they would be punishment (in the hereafter). ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān debated with him on this issue until Ka‘b (al-Aḥbār) رضي الله عنه interjected and sided with ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه; Abū Dhar رضي الله عنه (became angry and as a result) struck Ka‘b.¹

At this point, the historians write:

ونزل الربذة وبنى بها مسجدا واقطعه عثمان رضي الله تعالى عنه صرمه من الابل واعطاه مملوكين واجرى
عليه رزقا وكان يتعاهد المدينة وبين المدينة والربذة ثلاثة اميال

Abū Dhar رضي الله عنه then moved to Rabadhah and built a Masjid there. ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه gave him a few camels (and according to the narration of Ṭabarī, a flock of goats as well). He also gave him two servants (one male and one female), and stipulated a stipend for him from the Bayt al-Māl. He would visit Madīnah now and then, and the distance between Rabadhah and Madīnah was about three miles.²

Scrutiny and Criticism from the Scholars

The narrators of the historical reports have made considerable changes to the narration detailing Sayyidunā Abū Dhar al-Ghifārī رضي الله عنه staying in Rabadhah, and in order to tarnish the reputation of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه, a number of putrid additions were made. In addition, a number of fabrications

1 *Al-Muntaqā* pg. 396, 397, *Musnad Abū Ya‘lā al-Mūsilī* vol. 1 pg. 157, 158

2 *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* vol. 2 pg. 1029, *Al-Tamhīd wa al-Bayān* pg. 74 to pg. 76

have been attributed to Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān رضي الله عنه. As a result of this:

a. The famous historian al-Ṭabarī, writes under this story:

واما الاخرون فانهم رووا في سبب ذلك اشياء كثيرة وامورا شنيعة كرهت ذكرها

People have mentioned many evil things (with regards to the incident of Sayyidunā Abū Dhar al-Ghifārī رضي الله عنه moving to Rabadhah), which I dislike mentioning.¹

b. The author of *Kitāb al-Tamhīd wa l-Bayān* has written:

واما ما ذكر في سبب اخراجه من الامور الشنيعة وسبب معاوية اياه وتهديده بالقتل وحمله من الشام الى المدينة بغير وطا ونفيه فلا يصح النقل به هوا من اكاذيب الرافضة قبحهم الله تعالى

Whatever putrid things has been mentioned with regards to the reason for his removal (from Shām); Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه cursing him, threatening to kill him and sending him from Shām to Madīnah without a conveyance, etc.; there is no authentic narration in this regard. In fact, all this is from the lies of the Rawāfiḍ, May Allah disgrace them.²

Senior scholars like Imām al-Bukhārī رحمه الله and others have written in defence of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه:

On one occasion, Ghālib al-Qattān asked Ḥasan al-Baṣrī: “Did ‘Uthmān banish Abū Dhar from Madīnah?” He said: “No, Allah forbid.”³

In the light of the above explanation of the historians, it has been clarified that in this incident, some narrators — especially the Rawāfiḍ — made appalling

1 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* vol. 5 pg. 67

2 *Kitāb al-Tamhīd wa l-Bayān* pg. 74

3 *Tārīkh al-Kabīr* of Bukhārī vol. 4 pg. 100

‘additions’ to the narrations and spread lies about Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه and Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه, whereas the true sequence of events contradicts it.

Note:-

We have discussed this incident at length in our book, *Sīrah Ḥaḍrat Amīr Mu‘āwiyah*, (vol. 1 pg. 179 – 183).

The Final Moments of Sayyidunā Abū Dhar al-Ghifārī

As explained above Sayyidunā Abū Dhar al-Ghifārī رضي الله عنه resided in Rabadhah upon the advice of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه. Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه in turn provided for his necessities and granted him a stipend. A short while later Sayyidunā Abū Dhar al-Ghifārī رضي الله عنه left this earthly abode. The historians have recorded that he passed away in Rabadhah in 32 A.H, and aside from his wife and children, no one else present. Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mas‘ūd رضي الله عنه happened to pass by with his companions from Iraq and they performed the ghusl, shrouding and burial of Sayyidunā Abū Dhar al-Ghifārī رضي الله عنه. When Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه got news of the demise of Sayyidunā Abū Dhar al-Ghifārī رضي الله عنه, he took responsibility for his family and took charge of them.¹

In short, we have presented the biography of Sayyidunā Abū Dhar al-Ghifārī رضي الله عنه in accordance to what is mentioned in the history works, which makes it clear that there was no dispute between Sayyidunā Abū Dhar al-Ghifārī رضي الله عنه and Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه, nor were they opposed to each other. Whatever has been narrated of the alleged animosity between Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه and Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه with Sayyidunā Abū Dhar al-Ghifārī رضي الله عنه are baseless fabrications.

1 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* vol. 7 pg. 165, *al-Tamhīd wa l-Bayān* pg. 79

Sayyidunā ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir

The claim has been made that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه assaulted Sayyidunā ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir رضي الله عنه so savagely, even stepping on his private parts, such that he was no longer able to control his bladder.

Evidence is cited from for this allegation from a narration reported by Ibn Shabbah:

Qāsim ibn Fuḍayl — ‘Amr ibn Murrah — Sālim ibn Abī al-Ja’d says: “‘Uthmān called a group of the Ṣaḥābah of the Rasūl of Allah صلی الله علیه وسلم, amongst whom was ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir. ‘Uthmān said: ‘I am going to ask some questions to you, I implore you by Allah! Don’t you know that the Rasūl of Allah صلی الله علیه وسلم used to prefer the Quraysh over the rest of the people, and would prefer the Banū Hāshim over the balance of the Quraysh?’ The people remained silent. He then said: ‘If I had the keys of Jannah in my hands I would definitely give them to the Banū Umayyah to enter until the last of them, By Allah, I will definitely give and use them in defiance of those who have a problem.’ ‘Ammār said: ‘Even if I have a problem?’ ‘Uthmān said: ‘(Yes,) Even if you have a problem.’ ‘Ammār asked: “And even if Abū Bakr and ‘Umar have a problem?” This angered ‘Uthmān and he pounced upon ‘Ammār, beating him severely. Thus the people became frightened of him because of it. He then sent for the Banū Umayyah, and said, “O wicked creation of Allah, have you caused me to become angry with this man such that I was about to destroy him and myself.’ He sent for Ṭalḥah and Zubayr. He said: ‘What is wrong with my conduct, when I just said to him what he said to me, and it was not befitting of me to compel him like how I did. So both of you go to this man and give him a choice between three things; that he should seek retribution, accept monetary compensation or forgive.’ He (‘Ammār) said: ‘By Allah, I will not accept any of those conditions until I meet the Rasūl of Allah and complain to him.’ They came back to ‘Uthmān (and related what he had said), to which he replied: ‘I will relate to you something with regards to him, on one occasion I was with the Rasūl of Allah صلی الله علیه وسلم, who was holding my hand in — a place called — Baṭḥā’. He صلی الله علیه وسلم came to him, his father and mother — while they were being persecuted — and his father

said: ‘O Rasūl of Allah, is it going to be like this forever?’ The Rasūl of Allah ﷺ replied: ‘Have patience O Yāsir! O Allah, forgive the family of Yāsir.’ And I have definitely done so (that is forgiven him).”¹

Answer

The reply to this accusation is:

Firstly: The ḥadīth is not ṣaḥīḥ, there is *inqiṭā‘* (disjointedness) in its chain of narration. Muslims do not accept in their dīn except that which is ṣaḥīḥ. It is imperative that a ḥadīth conform with these five conditions:

1. *Ittiṣāl al-Sanad*, the chain must be unbroken.
2. *‘Adālat al-Ruwāt*, the faith of the narrators must be unquestionable.
3. *Ḍabṭ al-Ruwāt*, the narrators should have a sound memory.
4. *Intifā‘ al-Shudhūdh*, there should be no irregularities.
5. *Intifā‘ al-‘illah*, it should be free from any defect.

» Imām Abū ‘Amr ibn Ṣalāḥ said:

أما الحديث الصحيح: فهو الحديث المسند الذي يتصل إسناده بنقل العدل الضابط عن العدل الضابط إلى متتهاه؛ ولا يكون شاذًا ولا معللاً.²

As for this narration it fails to meet the first condition; which is *Ittiṣāl al-Sanad*. The defect being there is a break in its chain between ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān and Sālim ibn al-Ja‘d

1 *Tārīkh al-Madīnah* by Imām ‘Umar ibn Shabbah vol. 3 p. 1098. Publisher: Al-Sayyid Ḥabīb Maḥmūd Aḥmad (Jiddah), ed. Fahīm Muḥammad Shaltūt.

2 *‘Ulūm al-Ḥadīth*, by Imām Abū ‘Amr ibn al-Ṣāliḥ, p. 11, Publisher: Dār al-Fikr al-Mu‘āṣir (Lebanon), Dār al-Fikr (Syria), ed. Nūr al-Dīn ‘Antar.

» Imām Abū Zur‘āh al-‘Irāqī said:

سالم بن ابي الجعد: حديثه عن عمر و عثمان و علي مرسل

Sālim ibn al-Ja‘d: His narrations from ‘Umar, ‘Uthmān and ‘Alī are Mursal^{1,2}

» Imām al-Mizzī said:

ولا يصح لسالم سماع من علي و انما يروي عن محمد بن الحنفية

It is not correct that Sālim heard from ‘Alī but he only narrates from Muḥammad al-Ḥanafīyyah (‘Alī’s son).³

» Imām Ibn Ḥajar al-Asqalānī said:

سالم بن ابي الجعد: ثقة و كان يرسل كثيرا

Sālim ibn al-Ja‘d: Reliable but narrate copious Mursal narrations.⁴

If the reality is that Sālim ibn al-Ja‘d did not hear from ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رضي الله عنه who lived a few years after ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه, then how is it possible that he narrates or heard from ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه himself.

This ḥadīth is Mursal, and the known fact is that Mursal is considered to be amongst the weak narrations.

1 A Mursal Ḥadīth is a narration in which a Tabī‘ī omits the person he heard the narration from.

2 *Tuḥfat al-Taḥṣīl fī Ahkām al-Marāsīl*, by Imām al-Ḥāfiẓ al-‘Irāqī, p. 120 Publisher: Maktabat al-Rashad-al-Riyāḍ, ed. ‘Abd Allāh Nawārah.

3 *Tuḥfat al-Ashrāf*, by Imām Abī al-Ḥajjāj al-Mizzī, vol. 8 p. 376, Publisher: al-Maktabat al-Islāmī (Beirut), ed. ‘Abd al-Ṣamad Sharaf al-Dīn, Zuhayr al-Shāwīsh.

4 *Taqrīb al-Tahdhīb*, by Imām Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī p. 166, #2170, Publisher: Mu‘assasat al-Risālah (Beirut), ed. ‘Ādil Murshid.

» Imām Muslim writes:

والمرسل من الروايات في اصل قولنا و قول اهل العلم بالاخبار ليس بحجة

A Mursal narration according to us and according to the people of knowledge in ḥadīth is that it cannot be used as evidence.¹

» Imām Ṣāliḥ al-Dīn al-‘Alā’ī says:

قال الإمام ابن أبي حاتم: سمعت أبي وأبا زرعة يقولان: لا يحتج بالمراسيل، ولا تقوم الحجة إلا بالأسانيد
الصحيح المتصلة

Imām Ibn Abī Ḥātim said: “I heard my father and Abū Zur‘ah saying, ‘Mursal cannot be used as evidence or proof, but evidence can only be established by a sound unbroken chain.’”²

It is not permissible to cite as evidence the likes of these narrations to defame the Ṣaḥābah of the Rasūl of Allah ﷺ.

Secondly: other books which report this narration:

In addition to this narration of the ‘Uthmān assaulting ‘Ammār — which is a blatant lie — the narration of *Ansāb al-Ashrāf* of al-Balādhurī is quoted, wherein it is claimed that ‘Uthmān instructed his slaves to hold his (‘Ammār’s) hands — who was very old and frail — and then proceeded to strike him in his private parts, while wearing his leather socks, and violently assaulted him. As a result of this he was unable to control his urine, suffered with a hernia and lost consciousness. We ask: what would be the reason for such a ruthless beating (if it were true)? I found this statement in *Ansāb al-Ashrāf* of al-Balādhurī:

1 *Muqaddimah Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim*, by Imām Muslim ibn Al-Ḥajjāj, vol. 1 p. 18, Publisher: Dār al-Ṭayyibah (Riyāḍ), ed. Naẓr Muḥammad al-Ghārbābī.

2 *Jāmi‘ al-Taḥṣīl fī Aḥkām al-Marāṣil*, by Imām Ṣāliḥ al-dīn al-‘Alā’ī p. 36, Publisher: ‘Ālam al-Kutub (Beirut), ed. Ḥamdī ‘Abd al-Majīd al-Sulḥī.

» Al-Balādhurī says:

ويقال إن المقداد بن عمرو وعمار بن ياسر وطلحة والزبي في عدة من أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم كتبوا كتابا عددوا فيه أحداث عثمان وخوفوه ربه وأعلموه أنهم موائبوه إن لم يقلع، فأخذ عمار الكتاب وأتاه به، فقرأ صدرها منه فقال له عثمان أعلي تقدم من بينهم؟ فقال عمار: لأن أنصحهم لك، فقال: كذبت يا ابن سمية، فقال: أنا والله ابن سمية وابن ياسر، فأمر غلمانا له فمدوا يديه ورجليه ثم ضربه عثمان برجليه وهي في الخفين على مذاكيره فأصابه الفتق،

It is mentioned that Miqdād ibn ‘Amar, ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir, Ṭalḥah, Zubayr and several others from the Ṣaḥābah of the Rasūl of Allah ﷺ wrote a letter wherein they enumerated the innovations of ‘Uthmān. They warned him of his Rabb, and informed him that they will take him to task if he does not refrain. ‘Ammār took the letter and brought it to ‘Uthmān. He read some portion from it and ‘Uthmān said to him: “Do you come to me from amongst them?” ‘Ammār said, “So that I may counsel you on their behalf.” He said: “Do not lie, O son of Sumayyah.” He said, “I am, by Allah, the son of Sumayyah and the son of Yāsir.” ‘Uthmān then instructed some of his slaves to hold his arms and legs, and he struck him between his legs — while wearing leather socks, which caused him to suffer from a hernia. He was an old and frail, and thus fell unconscious.

And this by Allah is something extremely strange. Al-Balādhurī reports it with the words “it has been said,” yet the critics insist on basing their argument upon it, as if it is an accepted fact. Where is erudite research and sound narrations they claim to possess indicting ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ?

Is it with the likes of this incomplete narration — in terms of chain and meaning — that he maligns the Ṣaḥābah of the Rasūl of Allah ﷺ? Is it just because these narrations are found reported in some books that it became acceptable to substantiate from them, without investigation and thorough research? If a statement is mentioned in the beginning of some book that so and so person narrates such and such, will we deem it credible as if it is flawless? Which method is this? And which dīn is this?

» Imām Ibn Khaldūn says:

وكثيرا ما وقع للمؤرخين والمفسرين وأئمة النقل من المغالط في الحكايات والوقائع لاعتمادهم فيها على مجرد النقل غثا أو سمينا ولم يعرضوها على أصولها ولا قاسوها بأشباهها ولا سبروها بمعيار الحكمة والوقوف على طبائع الكائنات وتحكيم النظر والبصيرة في الأخبار فضلوا عن الحق وتاهوا في ببداء الوهم والغلط، ولا سيما في إحصاء الأعداد من الأموال والعساكر إذا عرضت في الحكايات إذ هي مظنة الكذب ومطية الهذر ولا بد من ردها إلى الأصول وعرضها على القواعد

A great amount of fallacy occurred amongst the historians, mufassirīn and traditionalists when narrating with the intention to merely transmit, whether it is correct or incorrect. They did not evaluate it in light of the principles, or compare it with other narrations, or examine it extensively, weigh its credibility in accordance to natural temperament and thoroughly scrutinise the narration. They contradicted the facts and ventured down a path of speculation and error. Especially concerning calculation of wealth and numbers of the army when relating incidents; they are false speculations and nonsense. It is imperative to scrutinise it in light of the principles and subject it to the necessary laws.

Where is this narration in comparison to what the earlier and latter scholars of this ummah have established in the form of principles and laws for correct transmitting?

Thirdly: Observing the *matn* (text) of the narration:

What was it that ‘Ammār رضي الله عنه did — in this fabricated and baseless narration — that would warrant such anger from ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه such that he would assault him in this manner?

Is it for the mere fact that he (‘Ammār) said, “I am advising you,” or was it when ‘Uthmān said, “O son of Sumayyah,” and ‘Ammār responded by saying that he is the son of Yāsir and Sumayyah (rama)? Was this what prompted ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه to assault him? What is this prattle and obscure talk that no intelligent educated person will accept? Who ever said that ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه was one whose anger would

cause him to lose his senses and behave so brutish and irresponsibly? Critics claim that one cannot read this narration except that tears come to the eyes, we reply that indeed it does bring tears to the eye but sometimes those tears are caused by excessive laughter upon this unfounded and baseless narration!

They claim after this incident, ‘Ammār could not control his urine; where is this statement in the book *Ansāb al-Ashrāf* or in *Tārīkh al-Madīnah*?

Furthermore, such anger from ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه is unfathomable. Let us see what the Nabī of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم said about ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه.

» Imām Aḥmad ibn Ḥambal narrates:

عن أنس بن مالك، عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قال: "أرحم أمتي بأمتي أبو بكر، وأشد هم في دين الله عمر وأصدق هم حياء عثمان، وأفرض هم زيد بن ثابت، وأقرؤهم لكتاب الله أبي بن كعب، وأعلمهم بالحلل والحرام معاذ بن جبل، ألا وإن لكل أمة أمينا، وإن أمين هذه الأمة أبو عبيدة بن الجراح

Anas ibn Mālik رضي الله عنه narrates from the Nabī of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم that he said: "The most merciful of my ummah upon my ummah is Abū Bakr, the most firm on the dīn of Allah is ‘Umar, the most modest of them is ‘Uthmān, the most knowledgeable with regards to the laws of inheritance is Zayd ibn Thābit, the best with regards to the recitation of the Qur’ān is Ubay ibn Ka’b, the most knowledgeable with regards to ḥalāl and ḥarām is Mu‘adh ibn Jabal, verily for every ummah there is a trustee, and the trustee of this ummah is Abū ‘Ubaydah ibn al-Jarrāh.¹

Fourthly: From where can we take authentic history?

Dr. Ibrāhīm ‘Alī says:

It is necessary to produce a chain of narration in all matters of dīn. And we will rely on it in the aḥādīth of the Rasūl of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم, and other

¹ *Musnad Imām Aḥmad ibn Ḥambal*, vol. 21 p. 406, publisher: Mu‘assasat al-Risālah (Beirut), ed. Shaykh Shu‘ayb al-Arna‘ūtī and others.

matters of dīn with regards to *manāqib* (merits of the Ṣaḥābah), *Faḍā'il* (virtues of various a'māl), *maghāzī* (records of the battles), *siyār* (history) and other such things from matters of our firm religion and clear law of Islam.¹

Some of these matters are such that it is possible to rely on a narration as long as they can be confirmed by a chain of narration, especially after the generation that was known to be the best. Our pious predecessors were very strict in stressing the importance of chains of narration; that it is necessary for dīn, and it is among the specialities of our ummah.

Dr. Ibrāhīm 'Alī provides as evidence the statement of the renowned scholars on the importance and value of chains of narration.

» Imām Muslim narrates in his *Ṣaḥīḥ*:

عن عبد الله بن المبارك يقول الاسناد من الدين و لو لا الاسناد لقال من شاء ما شاء

'Abd Allāh ibn al-Mubārak said: "Chains of narration are part of dīn, and if it were not chains of narration then anyone would say whatever they wished (to say).²

How much more is the scrutiny required when allegations are cast upon the best of people to have lived, after *ambiyā'*? Do you not submit to the counsel of Nabī ﷺ?

» Imam Ṭabarānī narrates:

عن ثوبان، عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قال إذا ذكر أصحابي فأمسكوا، وإذا ذكرت النجوم فأمسكوا،
وإذا ذكر القدر فأمسكوا

1 *Al-'Awāṣim min al-Qawāṣim*, by Imām Abū Bakr ibn al-'Arabī p. 280, publisher: Dār al-Turāth (Cairo), ed 'Ammār Ṭālibī.

2 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Sīrat al-Nabawīyyah*, Dr. Ibrāhīm 'Alī p. 12, publisher: Dār al-Naghā'is (Jordan).

Thowbān رضي الله عنه narrates that Nabī صلى الله عليه وسلم said: “When my Ṣaḥābah are mentioned then refrain (from discussing their faults), when the stars are mentioned then refrain (from pursuing the discussion further), and when Taqdīr is mentioned then refrain (from pursuing the discussion further).”¹

I counsel you with the word of Allah:

تِلْكَ أُمَّةٌ قَدْ خَلَتْ ۗ لَهَا مَا كَسَبَتْ وَلكُمْ مَا كَسَبْتُمْ ۗ وَلَا تُسْأَلُونَ عَمَّا كَانُوا يَعْمَلُونَ

That was a nation which has passed on. It will have (the consequence of) what it earned, and you will have what you have earned. And you will not be asked about what they used to do.²

1 Muqaddimat Ṣaḥīḥ Muslim, by Imām Muslim ibn Ḥajjāj p. 8, publisher: Dār al-Ṭayyibah (Riyād), ed. Naẓr Muḥammad al-Ghārbābī.

2 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 134

Objection Regarding Implementation of the Ḥudūd

The critics of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه also mention that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه was negligent in implementing the ḥudūd; ‘Ubayd Allāh ibn ‘Umar رضي الله عنه was responsible for the killing of Hurmuzān, Jafīnah, etc., who were involved in the killing of Sayyidunā ‘Umar al-Fārūq رضي الله عنه, but Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه did not implement the law of Qiṣāṣ (death penalty) upon him.

Answer

When the magian Abū Lu’lu’ Firowz martyred Sayyidunā ‘Umar al-Fārūq رضي الله عنه, the second khalīfah, then his son — Sayyidunā ‘Ubayd Allāh ibn ‘Umar رضي الله عنه, was overpowered by anger and killed the companions of Abū Lu’lu’, Hurmuzān and Jafīnah, since they too were part of the plot to assassinate Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه. After the demise of Sayyidunā ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb رضي الله عنه, three days later in Muḥarram 24 A.H, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه was elected as the third khalīfah, in accordance with the shurā that he had appointed. The first issue he had to deal with was how ‘Ubayd Allāh ibn ‘Umar رضي الله عنه be dealt with, who killed Hurmuzān and his companions.

It was the view of some that Qiṣāṣ should be taken from ‘Ubayd Allāh ibn ‘Umar رضي الله عنه, whereas others did not have this view. They said: “Yesterday his father was killed and today his son executed; this will never happen.”

There was difference of opinion amongst the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم on this issue, and it was a worrying time. Circumstances were delicate and fitnah was rearing its head amongst the tribes. Shaykh Ḥusayn Diyārbakrī has written this briefly in his work, *Tārīkh al-Khamīs*:

فلما رأى عثمان ذلك اغتنم تسكين الفتنة وقال امره الى سارضى اهل الهرمز ان

When ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān saw the circumstances, he sought to quell the

fitnah and said: “This matter has been handed over to me and I shall please the relatives of Hurmuzān in this matter.”¹

Other scholars have written that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه decided on giving blood money to the families of those killed, from his personal wealth. This is because the matter was given over to the khalīfah to act according to his best discretion. Therefore, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه paid the *diyāh* (blood money) to the families of those killed and thus quelled this fitnah. ‘Ubayd Allāh ibn ‘Umar رضي الله عنه was then released. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Kathīr رحمه الله has written at this point:

فودى عثمان رضي الله عنه اولئك القتالي من ماله لان امرهم اليه اذ لا وارث لهم الا بيت المال والامام يرى الاصلح في ذلك وخلي سبيل عبيد الله

‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه paid the *diyāh* to the families of those killed from his wealth, because they had no heirs but the Bayt al-Māl and the Imām saw that this was the best and ‘Ubayd Allāh was released.²

Shāh Walī Allāh Dehlawī رحمه الله has written this in the following words:

He pleased the families of the killed. In this case, the Qīṣāṣ fell away and fitnah was quelled, and this is part of the virtue of Dhū al-Nūrayn.³

Shāh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz Dehlawī رحمه الله has written the following in this regard:

Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه saved the nation from a great fitnah that was looming and he gave abundant wealth to the families of the killed and pleased them.⁴

1 *Tārīkh al-Khamīs* vol. 2 pg. 274

2 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* vol. 7 pg. 149

3 *Qurrat al-‘Aynayn* pg. 274

4 *Tuḥfah Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah* pg. 324, Lahore

Moreover, the sharī ruling was practised properly because the law in the sharī ah is that if the heirs of the killed given the diyah, and are pleased with it, then the Qiṣāṣ will fall away from the killer.

In summary, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه did not do anything against the sharī ah in this matter and he did not trespass any sharī limit; solving the problem in an amicable manner.

Note:-

It is reported in in some narrations Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā رضي الله عنه opposed Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه in this ruling and was in favour of executing ‘Ubayd Allāh ibn ‘Umar رضي الله عنه in retaliation for Hurmuzān and the others. Therefore, when Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā رضي الله عنه was chosen as the khalīfah, ‘Ubayd Allāh ibn ‘Umar رضي الله عنه fled to Shām upon learning of his view.

The readers should know that the narrations of history are many, and every sort of narration is recorded in history, whether authentic, weak, or even fabricated; and this narration is a historical narration. The historians have each written on it in their own way. The principle with regards to this is that together with the narration we must adopt reasoning.

Now ponder, the khilāfah of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه was twelve days less than twelve years and the matter of Qiṣāṣ of ‘Ubayd Allāh ibn ‘Umar رضي الله عنه was the first issue dealt with. The senior Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم held differing views in this regard, which Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه settled with his decision and this decision was correct in terms of the sharī ah. The senior Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم, including Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā رضي الله عنه, thus did not object to the decision and the matter was brought to an end. Now what reason would Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā رضي الله عنه have for bringing up this case twelve years later, when it had been closed and there was no need for delving into it (when Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه had more pending issues to deal with). Furthermore, the statements and practice of Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā رضي الله عنه during his khilāfah totally contradicts this.

1. Muḥammad ibn Sīrīn رحمه الله narrates:

ان عليا قال اقضوا كما كنتم تقضون حتى تكونوا جماعة فاني اخشى الاختلاف

‘Alī said (to the judges): “Pass verdict as you used to pass verdict (during the eras of the previous khulafā’) so that there will be unity, for verily I fear dissention.¹

2. The famous scholar, Ibn Ḥazm al-Andalūsī رحمه الله writes on this issue in his work *al Faṣl fī al-Milal*:

ثم ولي علي رضي الله عنه فما غير حكما من احكام ابي بكر وعمر وعثمان رضي الله تعالى عنهم ولا ابطل عهدا من عهودهم ولو كان ذلك عنده باطلا لما كان في سعة من ان يمضي الباطل وينفذه وقد ارتفعت التقية منه

When ‘Alī رضي الله عنه was appointed as khalīfah, he did not change any ruling of Abū Bakr, ‘Umar and ‘Uthmān, and he did not terminate any treaties that they signed. If he regarded it to be baseless then he would never allow something baseless and false to be implemented, as Taqīyyah was no longer required from him.²

Note:-

We have discussed this issue in our work *Sīrah Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā رضي الله عنه* (p. 425 – 428), where we learn that Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā رضي الله عنه did not change the decision passed by Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه with regards to Hurmuzān and the others and he did not take any steps against it.

The narrations which mention that he intended to take Qiṣāṣ for the killing of Hurmuzān and the others (whereas Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه had passed the decision already), are not considered. In fact,

1 Al-Muṣannaf ‘Abd al- Razzāq vol. 11 pg. 329, Bukhārī vol. 1 pg. 526

2 Al-Faṣl fī al-Milal wa al-Ahwā’ vol. 4 pg. 97

it contradicts the decisions made by Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, as we have explained from the clarifications of the senior scholars above. In light of these explanations, those narrations are matrūk (rejected) and are not worthy of any attention.

3. It is worthy of repetition here that in *Ruḥamā’ Baynahum* (vol. 3 p. 120) it was mentioned that the Shī‘ī scholars have recorded that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was responsible for implementing punishments during the reign of the first three khulafā’. Imām Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ narrates from his forefathers:

ان ابا بكر وعمر وعثمان كانوا يرفعون الحدود الى علي بن ابي طالب... الخ

Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would hand over the decisions of the ḥudūd to ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib.¹

In the light of these clarifications of the A‘immah, it is clear that implementation of the ḥudūd was left to Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. It is thus apparent that the matter of Qiṣāṣ for Hurmuzān and the others also came before him — and assuming the view of the khalīfah was different from his — he still passed verdict in favour of the opinion of the khalīfah, which he maintained during his khilāfah as well. This adds further weight to the correctness of the opinion of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Since if it was anything but correct, then Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would have classified it as impermissible and passed verdict according to his opinion.

The summary of the discussion is that in this incident, the decision of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was correct and he did not transgress any limits, nor did he fall short in implementing the legal punishments.

1 *Ja‘fariyyāt* pg. 133, Tehran

Objection of the Khilāfah of ‘Uthmān Being an Intermission

The critics of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه levelled yet another objection against Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه, claiming that the Islamic system of government was not properly established during his khilāfah and the laws and principles of Islam not practised upon. Instead during his era, Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam ruled the Islamic empire — on account of the khalīfah’s ill health — who interfered with the Islamic system of governance.

Those who level this objection against Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه do so in the following words:

وان عهد عثمان الذي تحكم فيه مروان كان فجوة بينهما

And the era of ‘Uthmān, in which Marwān ruled, there was an intermission between them.

They imply by this statement that the khilāfah of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه served as an intermission between the khilāfah of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr and Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنهما, and that of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, thus it was void of any implementation of the laws of Islam and sharī‘ah. On the contrary, in the years before it — the khilāfah of Abū Bakr and ‘Umar — and those after it — in the khilāfah of ‘Alī — the correct rule of Islam was established in accordance to the principles of the Sharī‘ah. During this ‘intermission’, Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam ruled. The objectors refer to this ‘intermission’ with the term “*fajwah*”, which refers to the space between two hills.

The one who raised this objection has in a few words slandered the entire khilāfah of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه. It classifies the entire twelve years of his khilāfah as useless, in terms of religious and sharī‘ system, whereas this was the golden age of the Muslims, accepted as the al-Khilāfat al-Rāshidāh. In the same manner that this objection is directed towards Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه, it similarly maligns all of his governors, helpers and agents who assisted in the khilāfah — a

large number of them being Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ and senior Tābi'īn. Thus, with this one objection they have maligned an entire era.

Answer

In reply to terming the era of Sayyidunā 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ as an intermission, the readers are urged to ponder over the following points and thereafter arrive at a conclusion.

1. This statement contradicts the verses of the Qur'ān.
2. It contradicts the aḥādīth of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.
3. It contradicts historical fact.
4. The senior scholars of the ummah have discussed the proper and correct nature of the Sayyidunā 'Uthmān's khilāfah, which proves the opposite of this, and there is no way that it can be harmonised.

We will now discuss each of these points in sequence, which will prove beneficial in answering this allegation.

Note:-

It needs to be clarified for those who are unaware that the leader of the Ikhwān al-Muslimīn in Egypt was Sayyid Qutb, and was is he who mentioned this sentence when analysing khilāfah of Sayyidunā 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Since this analysis is contrary to reality, these few points will be discussed in defence of the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ, clearing them of these allegations.

Verses of the Qur'ān

1. Many verses of the Qur'ān can be quoted in this regard. However, at the present moment, we should keep the following verses before us:

وَأَلْزَمَهُمْ كَلِمَةَ التَّقْوَىٰ وَكَانُوا أَحَقَّ بِهَا وَأَهْلَهَا

And (Allah) stuck the word of taqwā onto them as they are most deserving of it and worthy of it.¹

The participation of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه in the treaty of Ḥudaybiyyah is an absolute fact, and it was during this incident that Allah caused His peace and tranquillity to descend upon His Rasūl صلى الله عليه وسلم and his Ṣaḥābah; establishing the word of taqwā firmly in their hearts. Thus, it is also proven that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه possessed the quality of taqwā, which was a permanent quality (since Allah says that He established it in their hearts) and not temporary.

Now, if someone were to have the thought that the Ṣaḥābah abandoned the laws and principles of sharī‘ah at some moment in their lives, and adopted an irreligious path, then this thought runs in the face of the above quoted verses of the Qur’ān. The reason for this is that these saintly luminaries were not deprived of the quality of taqwā at any point, and their lives were only spent in serving the sharī‘ah. In fact, they always remained firm on the laws of Islam, and the bounty of Allah — the word of taqwā — demands this.

Therefore, for them to now turn away from the laws of dīn and the sharī‘ system of government is tantamount to the quality of taqwā being removed from them, whereas in the light of the divine statement, it can never be removed from them since this quality was permanently present in them.

2. Moreover, the verses which Allah revealed during the incident of Ḥudaybiyyah, explain the qualities of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم and his Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم in the following way:

1 Sūrah al-Fatḥ: 26

مُحَمَّدٌ رَسُولُ اللَّهِ وَالَّذِينَ مَعَهُ أَشِدَّاءُ عَلَى الْكُفَّارِ رُحَمَاءُ بَيْنَهُمْ تَرَاهُمْ رُكَّعًا سُجَّدًا يَبْتَغُونَ فَضْلًا
مِّنَ اللَّهِ وَرِضْوَانًا ۚ

Muhammad is the Rasūl of Allah; and those with him are forceful against the disbelievers, merciful among themselves. You see them bowing and prostrating (in ṣalāh), seeking bounty from Allah and (His) pleasure.¹

In the light of this verse, it is proven that the Ṣaḥābah of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, and especially those who were participated in the incident of Ḥudaybiyyah, were always seeking the bounty and pleasure of Allah. Allah negated ostentation and show, and gave testimony of their sincerity; Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ being also included amongst these Ṣaḥābah. Therefore, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ always had these qualities — at all stages of his life — and he would strive in seeking the pleasure of Allah. This continued in his khilāfah, and he still possessed these praiseworthy qualities.

During his khilāfah he did not go act against the decrees of Allah nor did he act contrary to the orders of Rasūlullāh ﷺ, never abandoning any aspect of sharī‘ah. In fact, maintained the system of khilāfah as per the commands of Allah and Rasūlullāh ﷺ.

Therefore, it is despicable to dub the khilāfah of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ as an intermission because it contradicts the testimony which Allah announced in his favour; that his deeds are sincere and such deeds which only a believer will perform. The critics have ignored this testimony of the Qur’ān and have shown no regard for it.

3. In accordance to the general view of the Mufasssīrīn, the following verse of the Qur’ān was revealed with regards to the companions who participated in Ḥudaybiyyah:

1 Sūrah al-Fatḥ: 29

كَزَرَاعٍ أَخْرَجَ شَطْأَهُ فَآزَرَهُ فَاسْتَغْلَظَ فَاسْتَوَىٰ عَلَىٰ سُوقِهِ يُعْجِبُ الزُّرَّاعَ لِيغِيظَ بِهِمُ الْكُفَّارَ ط

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.¹

In this verse of the Qur'ān, the progress of the religion of Islam has been likened to a farm and has been explained, i.e. it is like a crop, its shoots have come out and then have become strong and thick and it stands on its own stem.

From this verse we learn:

- a. The Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ will definitely progress spiritually and it will happen slowly just as a crop grows slowly.
- b. This progress will not stop until it reaches perfection.
- c. Moreover, this progress will be continuous; there will be no break in between. If we take the era of Sayyidunā 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to be empty of an Islamic system and that the laws of Sharī'ah were discarded, then it calls for thought that how can the similarity between the two be correct?

The critics say that during the era of Sayyidunā Abū Bakr, Sayyidunā 'Umar and Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ there was a proper Islamic system in place, but in between the sharī system was halted; whereas the similitude in the Qur'ān demands that the progress continue slowly and perpetually with no break in between.

Therefore, to have this view of 'intermission' with regards to the khilāfah of Sayyidunā 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is absolutely incorrect. This is because the example will not hold true and the Mufassirīn have explained:

1 Sūrah al-Faṭḥ: 29

وهذا مثل ضربه الله تعالى لبدا الاسلام وترقيه في الزيادة الى ان قوى واستحكم

This is an analogy, which Allah has given, for the initial years of Islam, its strengthening, until it became firm and resolute.¹

If we were to accept that there was no progress of Islam in the era of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه, then the quality of it being strong and resolute will be absent, which will contradict the analogy given by Allah. This too informs us that the claim of their being an intermission is incorrect in light of the verse of the Qur’ān. If we were to accept it as correct, then it necessitates belying the verses of Allah, from which we seek the protection of Allah.

Aḥādīth

Although there are countless aḥādīth in this regard, we will only present a few narrations; in light of which it will become clear that this objection is incorrect, and that the critics have presented their own obscure personal opinion which is in total contradiction of the authentic narrations:

1. Sayyidunā Anas ibn Mālik رضي الله عنه narrates:

عن انس قال لما امر رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ببيعة الرضوان كان عثمان رسول رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم الى مكة فبايع الناس فقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ان عثمان رضي الله عنه في حاجة الله وحاجة رسوله فضرب باحدى يديه على الاخرى فكانت يد رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم لعثمان رضي الله عنه خيرا من ايديهم لانفسهم

When Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم issued the command of the pledge of Riḍwān, then Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه was sent as an envoy by Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم to Makkah. When the people pledged allegiance, then Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم said: “‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه has gone for the work of Allah and His Rasūl صلى الله عليه وسلم,” Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم then placed one hand into his other hand and said, “This pledge is from ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه.” So, the hand of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم

1 *Tafsīr Madārik al-Tanzīl* pg. 62

that was given as pledge on behalf of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was better than the hands of the others, with which they pledged for themselves.¹

This narration has been recorded by a number of Muḥaddithīn. The incident mentioned in it is correct. It is clearly proven from this narration that Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ classified his own hand as the hand of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. This shows the great virtue of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and the good fortune he was granted. Now ponder, how is possible that one endowed with such virtue could have ever acted in contravention of the sharīah.

Moreover, Allah mentions glad tidings of His pleasure for those who participated in the pledge, which includes Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ by the testimony of Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ:

لَقَدْ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ إِذْ يُبَايِعُونَكَ تَحْتَ الشَّجَرَةِ فَعَلِمَ مَا فِي قُلُوبِهِمْ فَأَنْزَلَ السَّكِينَةَ عَلَيْهِمْ وَأَثَابَهُمْ فَتْحًا قَرِيبًا

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.²

This also refers to Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and he was worthy of it. How then can such criticism be levelled against such a person for whom these virtues and glad tidings have been announced? No intelligent person will accept such views. Whoever has such views about Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ has definitely fallen prey to jealousy, stubbornness and malice.

1 Tirmidhī, *Mishkāṭ* pg. 562

2 Sūrah al-Faṭḥ: 18

2. The famous Ṣaḥābī, Sayyidunā Jābir رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ narrates that in one sermon, besides other advices, Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ gave the following prophecy:

ان هذا الامر لا ينقضي حتى يمضي اثني عشر خليفة

This matter will not conclude until twelve khulafā' pass.

In other narrations, it is mentioned:

لا يزال هذا الدين عزيزا منيعا الى اثنا عشر خليفة... كلهم من قريش... الخ

This dīn will continue to be triumphant until twelve khulafā' pass, all of them will be from the Quraysh.¹

In light of this ḥadīth, it is clear that there will definitely be a number of khulafā' from the Quraysh and in their eras, the religion of Islam will be triumphant. Sayyidunā 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is the third of these rightly guided khulafā'. In accordance to the glad tidings given by Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, in his era of khilāfah, the religion of Islam will definitely be triumphant and Islamic system will be implemented.

This makes it clear that those who raised this objection against Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ are in delusion. This is because the demand of this ḥadīth is that Islam will be triumphant and the Islamic method of rule will be in place.

3. Rasūlullāh صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ is reported to have said in an authentic ḥadīth:

عن عرابض بن سارية (مرفوعا) وسترون من بعدي اختلافا شديدا فعليكم بسنتي وسنة الخلفاء الراشدين المهديين وعضوا عليها بالنواجذ

And you will see after me great differences, so hold onto my sunnah and the sunnah of the rightly guided khulafā, and hold firmly onto it with your molars.²

1 *Muslim* vol. 2 pg. 119

2 *Sunan al-Dāramī* pg. 25, *Al-Mustadrak li al-Ḥākim* vol. 1 pg. 96, *al-Sunan al-Kubrā* vol. 10 pg. 114

This ḥadīth makes it clear that it is necessary upon the Muslims to follow Rasūlullāh ﷺ and his khulafā', and Rasūlullāh ﷺ has advised us to hold on firmly to their way. It proves that the rule of the khulafā' of Rasūlullāh ﷺ was in accordance to the rules of Islam and sharī'ah. It is thus necessary to follow them and to adopt their way is in accordance with the dictates of sharī'ah. If we were to assume that in the era of one of these khulafā' (for example, Sayyidunā 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ), the Islamic system was not implemented, then it would have been necessary to exclude this era from being bound to follow so that people do not fall into deviation. However, this was not done, which makes it clear to us that everything was correct and worthy of being followed.

4. There are numerous narrations reported which show the veracity of the khilāfah of Sayyidunā 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. One of these narrations is narrated by Sayyidah 'Ā'ishah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا:

عن عائشة رضي الله عنها ان النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قال لعثمان يا عثمان ان الله مقمصك قميصا فان ارادك المنافقون على خلعه فلا تخلعه حتى تلفاني وهذا من الاحاديث الظاهرة في خلافته الدالة دلالة واضحة على حقيقتها لنسبه القميص في الحديث المكنى به عن الخلافة الى الله تعالى

Rasūlullāh ﷺ said to 'Uthmān: "O 'Uthmān, Allah will make you wear a shirt, if the hypocrites intend to remove it from you, then do not ever remove it until you meet me (in the hereafter)."

This ḥadīth is from those narrations that clearly show that true nature of the khilāfah of Sayyidunā 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. This is because in the above quoted ḥadīth, it is stated that he will be made to wear the shirt from Allah. This is a subtle indication to khilāfah. Together with this, he was commanded not to remove the shirt.¹

1 Aḥmad, Tirmidhī, Ibn Mājah, Ḥākim, al-Sawā'iq al-Muḥriqah pg. 109, al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah vol. 7 pg. 207, 208

This highlights the truthful nature of the khilāfah of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه. If someone assumes that it was void of Islamic principles and the sharī‘ah not implemented, then this assumption is incorrect and it contradicts the demand of these clear narrations.

A Few Incidents From the Era of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān

At this point, we wish to present a few historical incidents from the khilāfah of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه, through which the nature of his khilāfah will be clarified and reveal to us his method of dealing with the masses. It will then become clear as to what type of administration existed at that time, what consideration was given to religious rulings, what was the attitude of the majority at that time, and what link did they have with the khalīfah of Islam?

A letter to the governors

On one occasion, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه wrote to all his governors:

اما بعد فان الله خلق الخلق بالحق فلا يقبل الا الحق خذوا الحق واعطوا الحق به والامانة الامانة قوموا عليها ولا تكونوا اول من يسلبها فتكونوا شركاء من بعدكم الى ما اكتسبتم والوفاء الوفاء لا تظلموا البيتم ولا المعاهد فان الله خصم لمن ظلمهم

Allah created His creation with proper planning, thus Allah does not accept anything but the truth; acquire only the lawful and give only what is lawful. A Trust is a trust, so maintain it. And do not be the first to usurp it lest you share with (the vice of) those who come after you on account of what you have earned (unlawfully). And a pledge is a pledge (so remain true to it). Do not oppress the orphan nor the one with whom you have made an agreement; for Allah Himself will argue the case against the oppressor.¹

Address to the Public

On another occasion, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه addressed the public and said:

1 *Tārīkh Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī* vol. 5 pg. 44

اما بعد فانكم انما بلغتكم بالاقتداء والاتباع فلا تلفتكم الدنيا عن امركم

O people, the progress that you desired, you acquired through conformity and obedience, so do not let desire for the world turn you away from this.¹

It is apparent from this letter and public address that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه would exhort his governors to be considerate and fulfil the rights of others honestly, and not exploit the trust give to them, which is an explicit instruction to follow the sharī‘ah.

Another Letter to the Governors

On another occasion, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه wrote to his governors regarding consideration for the public, fulfilment of rights and remaining cognisant of their condition. He wrote:

Allah instructs the rulers that they must consider the rights of people and be a shepherd over them not that they should be the one to attack them. The initial people of the ummah were made protectors and guardians, and they were not those who maim or injure. Soon a time will come when the rulers and governors will become those who maim and injure and they will not remain protectors and guardians. When they become like this, then shame, honesty and commitment will come to an end. The most just way is that you keep an eye on the matters of the Muslims and their rights and duties. Whatever must be given to them, give it to them and whatever must be collected from them, take it from them. Bear in mind the rights of the Ahl al-Dhimmah, whatever must be given to them, give them, and take whatever must be taken from them. Then, whichever enemy comes in front of you, deal with him in an honest way as well.²

1 Op. cit. vol. 5 pg. 45

2 Op. cit. vol. 5 pg. 44

A letter to the Officers of the Army

Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه wrote a letter to the officers of his army regarding their responsibilities and duties:

اما بعد فانكم حماة المسلمين وزادتهم وقد وضع لكم عمر ما لم يغب عنا بل كان عن ملاء منا ولا يبلغني عن احد منكم تغيير ولا تبديل فيغير الله ما بكم ويستبدل بكم غيركم فانظروا كيف تكونون فاني انظر فيما الزمني الله النظر فيه والقيام عليه

You are the protectors and defenders of the Muslims. Whatever rights ‘Umar placed for the sake of the people, they are not hidden from us. In fact, it was decided with mutual consultation. You should not get any notification of change from me, otherwise Allah will change you and replace you. Keep an eye on your condition. Whatever Allah has made me responsible to consider, I shall consider.¹

‘Allāmah Ibn Kathīr رحمه الله has written under the khilāfah of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه that on one occasion, he sent a letter to the governors of the cities, leaders of the army, imāms of ṣalāh and supervisors of the Bayt al-Māl advising them to be wary of calling towards good and forbidding evil, encouraging them to follow and obey the commands of Allah and His Rasūl صلوات الله عليه وسلامه, and to adhere to the sunnah and abandon innovation.²

Point to Consider

We have mentioned a few historical facts above, which the historians have recorded in their works under the section relating to the era of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه. Our objective here is not to gather all the incidents, but after studying them perceptively, the following is evident:

- Due consideration was given to the fulfilment of rights; and more specifically towards, trusts, rights of orphans, promises and agreements made with other tribes or nations.

1 Op. cit. vol. 5 pg. 44

2 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* vol. 7 pg. 149

- Encouragement to adhere to the sharī'ah was given at all times.
- Admonishment of government employees and officials with regards to their responsibilities, to support the dīn of Islam, remain ever prepared to protect it, and they never to fall short in one's duties.
- In the era of Sayyidunā 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān رضي الله عنه, all the laws of Islam were considered, and encouragement was given to follow the sharī'ah.
- This era was never void of the Islamic system of rule.

Explanations of the Senior Scholars

In the previous pages, we presented a few historical incidents in which this objection as replied to.

Now we shall quote a number of the senior scholars in reply to this objection, so that the readers can ponder over this allegation justly. First study the explanation of a senior Ṣaḥābī رضي الله عنه, Sayyidunā 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Umar رضي الله عنه:

قال عبد الله بن عمر رضي الله عنهما جائني رجل في خلافة عثمان فكلمني بكلام طويل يريد ان اعيب على عثمان رضي الله عنه وهو امرا في لسانه ثقل لا يكاد يقضي كلامه في سريع فلما قضى كلامه قلت قد كنا نقول ورسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم حى افضل امة رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ابو بكر رضي الله عنه ثم عمر رضي الله عنه ثم عثمان رضي الله عنه وانا والله! ما نعلم عثمان قتل نفسا بغير نفس ولا جاء من الكباثر شيئا

A person came to me in the era of 'Uthmān and he spoke to me for a long time, intending to criticise 'Uthmān. There was a stutter on his tongue, and he could not speak quickly. Once he concluded what he wanted to say, I said: "We used to say, when Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم was still alive, the best of the ummah of Rasūlullāh صلى الله عليه وسلم is the Abū Bakr, then 'Umar, and then 'Uthmān, I do not know, and I take an oath by Allah, of 'Uthmān ever taking the life of someone without right or having committed a major sin."¹

1 *Kitāb al-Tamhīd wa l-Bayān* pg. 184, 185

This reply of Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar رضي الله عنه informs us that:

- a. The rank and status of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه in terms of khilāfah is third, i.e. after Abū Bakr and ‘Umar رضي الله عنه.
- b. During his khilāfah, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه never took the life of anyone without right and he did not ever commit any major sin, i.e. he did not commit any sin or oppression and his deeds were correct; never in contravention of Islam.
- c. A famous Ṣaḥābī gave this testimony, whose truthfulness is well-acknowledged.

We hope that the readers will ponder over this explanation and decide for themselves to what extent this objection upon the khilāfah of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه is relevant.

Historians such as Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī رحمته الله and Ibn Khaldūn رحمته الله and others have recorded an incident from the era of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه, which is further proof for the falsity of this allegation.

The summary of this incident is that in his era, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه sent senior Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم to different cities in the form of a delegation to investigate the complaints against his governors. He sent Sayyidunā Muḥammad ibn Maslamah al-Anṣārī رضي الله عنه to Kūfah, Sayyidunā Usāmah ibn Zayd رضي الله عنه to Baṣrah, Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar رضي الله عنه to Shām and Sayyidunā ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir رضي الله عنه to Egypt. They said to the residents of these areas:

ايها الناس! ما انكرنا شيئا ولا انكره اعلام المسلمين ولا عوامهم وقالوا جميعا الامر امر المسلمين الا ان امرائهم يقسطون بينهم ويقومون عليهم

O people, we did not see anything reprehensible, and the common masses and the elite also have not expressed their dissatisfaction with anything. All of them said that the affairs of the Muslims are in order, the governors execute justice and they implement the laws.¹

1 *Al-Fitnah wa Waqa'āt al-Jamal* pg. 49, 50, *Tārīkh Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī* vol. 5 pg. 99, *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* vol. 2 pg. 1027

The report given by these Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم indicate that there was no evil or wrong doing being perpetrated during the khilāfah of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه, nor any dissatisfaction among the masses and the elite of that era. The entire administration was being run under the guidance of Islamic law. The governors were not oppressive, but dealt with the public amicably. Therefore, the objection of the era of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه being an ‘intermission’ is unfounded.

Explanation of Sālīm Ibn ‘Abd Allāh

Lastly, the explanation of the son of Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar رضي الله عنه, Sālīm ibn ‘Abd Allāh رضي الله عنه is presented. This has been recorded by the famous historian, Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī رحمه الله:

عن سالم بن عبد الله قال لما ولي عثمان حج سنواته كلها الا آخر حجة... وامن الناس وكتب في الامصار ان يوافيه العمال في كل موسم ومن يشكوهم وكتب الى الناس الى الامصار ان اتمروا بالمعروف وتناهوا عن المنكر ولا يذل المؤمن نفسه فاني مع الضعيف على القوي ما دام مظلوما (إنشاء الله)

When ‘Uthmān was appointed as the khalīfah, then he performed every ḥajj, except for the last one. During his time, people were in safety and security and his way was, Every ḥajj season there would be an instruction sent by Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه to the governors that they should come (for ḥajj) and whoever had a complaint regarding them were told to also come; so that the correct decision could be passed after hearing the complaint from both sides. He would send written instructions to the people in all the cities that they should command the good and stay away from evil. No Muslim should think low of himself, or that he is helpless. (he would say) “I am the helper of the weak against the strong, as long as his oppression is not removed. (In shā Allāh)”¹

The same subject matter is discussed by Ibn Kathīr رحمه الله in the following text:

1 *Tārīkh Ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī* vol. 5 pg. 134

يلزم عماله بحضور الموسم كل عام ويكتب الى الرعايا من كانت له عند احد منهم مظلومة فليواف الى الموسم فاني اخذ له حقه من عامله

He would make it compulsory for his governors to attend every ḥajj and he would write to the subjects that if anyone had been oppressed, he should come for ḥajj, “for indeed I shall take his right from the governor.”¹

The explanation of Sālim ibn ‘Abd Allāh رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ clarifies that during the era of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, there was a proper system of dealing with the complaints of the oppressed, and commanding the good and forbidding the evil common practice. Furthermore, the governors were commanded to remove the difficulty experienced by the weak. In short, the khilāfah was established according to the sharī‘ah.

Explanation of Imām al-Bukhārī

The famous Muḥaddith, Imām Muḥammad ibn Ismā‘īl al-Bukhārī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, in his work *Tārīkh al-Ṣaghīr*, records with his chain of narration from Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ:

قال سمعت الحسن يقول عمل امير المؤمنين عثمان بن عفان ثنتي عشرة سنة لا ينكرون من امارته شيء حتى جاء فسقة فداهن والله في امره اهل المدينة

Amīr al-Mu‘minīn ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān ruled for twelve years; during which the people did not object to anything; until the sinful (irreligious) people came and the people of Madīnah showed them leniency (instead of punishing them for their contempt).²

Statement of Ibn al-‘Arabī al-Mālīkī

The famous scholar, Ibn al-‘Arabī al-Mālīkī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, discussed the khilāfah of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ:

1 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* vol. 7 pg. 218

2 *Tārīkh al-Ṣaghīr* pg. 32, *Tārīkh al-Islām* of al-Dhahabī vol. 2 pg. 145

فلم يات عثمان منكرا لا في اول الامر ولا في آخره ولا جاء الصحابة بمنكر وكل ما سمعت من خبر باطل اياك ان تلتفت اليه

‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān perpetrated nothing reprehensible, neither in the beginning nor in the end, nor did any of the Ṣaḥābah perpetrate anything reprehensible in this time. Whatever narrations you hear of wrong (having been perpetrated) pay no attention to it.¹

Explanation of Shaykh ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Jilānī

Shaykh ‘Abd al-Qādir Jilānī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ has written in his work *Ghunyat al-Ṭālibīn* with regards to Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رَحِمَهُ اللهُ and his khilāfah:

فكان (عثمان رضي الله عنه) اماما حقا الى ان مات ولم يوجد فيه امر يوجب الطعن فيه ولا فسقه ولا قتله
خلاف ما قالت الروافض تبا لهم

‘Uthmān was the leader upon truth until he was martyred, and nothing was found in him permitting criticism of him, nor attribution of sinfulness (fisq) to him or the reason for his assassination; except for what the Rawāfiḍ have said, may they be destroyed.²

You have studied the comments of these three pious scholars with regards to the khilāfah of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رَحِمَهُ اللهُ, which represents a true reflection of the khilāfah of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رَحِمَهُ اللهُ. They have clarified that during his era, the system of government was in accordance to Islam and there was no evil found in it..

Final Word on This Discussion

We have mentioned a number of points in reply to this objection, the scholars will understand well the seriousness of this criticism, but even the ordinary man would have understood the evil and harm of this criticism.

1 *Al-‘Awāṣim min al-Qawāṣim* pg. 60

2 *Ghunyat al-Ṭālibīn* pg. 137

A number of points were mentioned in clarifying the truthful nature of the khilāfah of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه; verses of the Qur’ān, ahādīth, historical realities and the explanations of the senior scholars of the ummah were cited as references.

The originator of this objection discarded all these historical facts and gave in to the prejudices of his tainted beliefs. We ask the readers to be fair in their assessment and request them to ponder over the issues explained; is there any validity to this objection? Is there any angle of truthfulness to this criticism that can be seen?

Distance yourself from the people of stubbornness and prejudice, use the understanding and foresight given to you by Allah and decide for yourself.

And Allah guides whoever He wants to the straight path.

Demise of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān

The Rawāfiḍ and others opposed to Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه have reported such narrations with regards to the burial of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه that would unsettle any person. In these narrations, they have attempted to assert that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān’s رضي الله عنه body was left discarded, after his martyrdom, and no one attempted to bury him for three days. He was just left in this condition, until finally some people buried hastily with his blood stained clothes.

Answer

It is imperative to state that some historians rendered a great disservice in the manner that they compiled their books, gathering all sorts of narrations – whether authentic, weak or even fabricated – without authenticating the material or clarifying the status thereof. This results in an inaccurate portrayal of history. For example:

1. Muḥammad ibn Jarīr al-Ṭabarī رحمته الله, author of *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*
2. Ibn Qutaybah, author of *Kitāb al-Imāmah wa al-Siyāsah*
3. Aḥmad ibn A‘tham al-Kūfī رحمته الله, author of *Tārīkh A‘tham al-Kūfī*
4. Mīr Khawānid, author of *Rowḍat al-Ṣafā*

These and other historians have filled their works with every type of narration, without clarifying the status of the narrations.

Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī is a conglomeration of every type of narration, authentic and unauthentic, whereas the remaining three (above) are extremist Shī‘ah; who penned these one sided biased books in support of their Rafḍ and Tashayyū‘.

They did not consider the rank and status of the senior Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم, which they were awarded in the Qur’ān and sunnah, nor the other historical narrations

which answer these objections and criticisms. Instead they turned a blind eye to these (authentic) facts and only rely upon those narrations which support their dogma. Thus they relay information in accordance to their personal views. This is a regrettable effort that was made against the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم in an effort to drum up hatred for them. After this has been understood, in contrast to this, we present those narrations from history and ḥadīth which depict the true sequence of events regarding the martyrdom of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه.

It has been mentioned in the biography of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه that when Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه passed away, then a few members of his household as well as a few others, like Sayyidunā Zubayr ibn al-‘Awwām, Sayyidunā Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī, Sayyidunā Abū Jahm ibn Ḥudhayfah رضي الله عنه, and Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam brought the bier out of the house of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه between Maghrib and ‘Ishā’ for the Janāzah. They brought it to Hash Kowkab (an extension to Jannat al-Baqī). According to some, Jubayr ibn Mut‘im رضي الله عنه or Ḥakīm ibn Ḥizām رضي الله عنه or Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam performed the Ṣalāt al-Janāzah. According to another view, Sayyidunā Zubayr ibn al-‘Awwām رضي الله عنه performed the Ṣalāt al-Janāzah (and he was buried there).¹

Imām Aḥmad رحمه الله has recorded in his *Musnad*:

ثنا عبد الرزاق ثنا معمر عن قتادة قال صلى الزبير على عثمان رضي الله عنه ودفنه وكان اوصى اليه

Qatādah reported that Zubayr performed the Ṣalāt al-Janāzah ‘Uthmān and buried him. ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه had made a bequest for him to do so.²

The Muḥaddithīn have narrated this with a reliable chain of narration. Moreover, Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Kathīr رحمه الله has reported the following narration:

1 *Kitāb al-Tamhīd wa l-Bayān* pg. 142, *Tārīkh Khalīfah ibn Khayyāṭ* vol. 1 pg. 155, 156,

2 *Musnad Imām Aḥmad*, with footnotes of *Muntakhab Kanz al-‘Ummāl* vol. 1 pg. 74

قيل بل دفن من ليلته ثم كان دفنه ما بين المغرب والعشاء خفية من الخوارج وقيل بل استودن في ذلك بعض روستائهم فخرجوا به في نفر قليل من الصحابة فيهم حكيم بن حزام وحويطب بن عبد العزى وابو جهم بن حذيفة ونبار بن مكرم الاسلمي وجبير بن مطعم وزيد بن ثابت وكعب بن مالك وطلحة والزبير وعلي بن ابي طالب وجماعة من اصحابه ونسائه منهن امراته نائلة (بنت الفرافصة) وام البنين بنت عبد الله بن حصين وصبيان... وجماعة من خدمه حملوه على باب بعد ما غسلوه وكفنوه وزعم بعضهم انه لم يغسل ولم يكفن والصحيح الاول

It has been said that he was buried the same night, between Maghrib and 'Ishā', out of fear for the Khawārij. Some said that permission was taken from some of the rebel leaders and the people brought the bier of 'Uthmān out. Some of the Ṣaḥābah like Ḥakīm ibn Ḥizām, Huwaytib ibn 'Abd al-'Uzza, Abū Jahm ibn Ḥudhayfah, Niyār ibn Mukrim al-Aslamī, Jubayr ibn Mu'tim , Zayd ibn Thābit , Ka'b ibn Mālik , Ṭalḥah , Zubayr , and 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib participated and were present. A group of his friends, and of his spouses Nā'ilah and Umm al-Banīn and some children. A group of attendants of 'Uthmān lifted him after the ghusl and shrouding and brought him to the door. Some are of the opinion that he was not given ghusl and a shroud but this is not correct, in fact, the first view is correct (that the ghusl and a shroud was given).¹

In *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, the following narration is mentioned:

خرج مروان حتى اتى دار عثمان رضي الله عنه فاتاه زيد بن ثابت وطلحة بن عبيد الله وعلي والحسن وكعب بن مالك وعمامة من ثم من اصحابه فتوافي الى موضع الجنائز صبيان ونساء فاخرجوا عثمان رضي الله عنه فضلى عليه مروان ثم خرجوا به حتى انتهوا الى البقيع فدفنوه فيه مما يلي حش كوكب

Marwān left until he reached the house of 'Uthmān, where he was joined by Zayd ibn Thābit, Ṭalḥah ibn 'Ubayd Allāh, 'Alī, Ḥasan, Ka'b ibn Mālik رضي الله عنه and whoever from among the friends of 'Uthmān, a number of women and children also participated. He was brought to the place where the Ṣalāt al-Janāzah is performed and Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam performed the Ṣalāt al-Janāzah and after this all of them brought him to Baqī' and he was buried in the area next to Hash Kawkab.²

1 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* vol. 7 pg. 191, *Tārīkh al-Madīnah al-Munawwarah* pg. 1240

2 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* vol. 5 pg. 144, *al-Fitnah wa Waq'at al-Jamal* pg. 84

Date of his martyrdom

Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه was martyred on 18 Dhū al-Ḥijjah 35 A.H, Friday, corresponding to 655 C.E.

Dispelling a doubt

One may have the following question lingering on his mind; that the narrations of *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* which the critics have cited have been disregarded but then proof from the same book is cited. In this regard the following principle, as expounded by the scholars, should be kept in mind:

وإذا اختلف كلام امام فيؤخذ ما يوافق الأدلة الظاهرة ويعرض عما خالفها

When there is difference found in the speech of an imām in a certain issue, then whatever is in accordance to the apparent proofs will be taken, and whatever contradicts it will be discarded.

In the light of this law, only those narrations of al-Ṭabarī which are in accordance with the laws of sharī‘ah, and correspond to the explanations of the senior scholars and historians, will be relied upon. As for all the other narrations which are cited by the critics they will not be considered on account of falling short in their authenticity.¹

These narrations indicate that Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رضي الله عنه was buried the same day, i.e. the day of Friday after ‘Aṣr, after the rebels had oppressively murdered him. The rebels tried to prevent his burial, however, despite the opposition the senior Ṣaḥābah made arrangements to bury him that same night. The ghusl and shroud was done and the Ṣalāt al-Janāzah was performed. Among those who participated in the burial were Sayyidunā ‘Alī, Sayyidunā Ṭalḥah, Sayyidunā Zubayr, Sayyidunā Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī and others رضي الله عنهم, as stated in the narrations. The above references testify to this as well. Those who raised the objection

1 *Al-Zawājir* pg. 28, *Radd al-Muḥtār* vol. 3 pg. 317

were dishonest, and only reported the narration which suited their needs and conveniently omitted those narrations which answer their allegations.

Note:-

We have discussed this issue at length in our work *Ruḥamā' Baynahum* (vol. 3 'Uthmānī section p. 190 – p. 194), which may be referred to.