

Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah

Dispelling distortions of History

Mawlānā Muḥammad Ṣafar Iqbāl

WWW.MAHAJJAH.COM

© Maḥajjah Research Institute

All Rights Reserved.

No part of this book may be reproduced, photocopied, or printed without written permission from the Maḥajjah Research Institute.

Title: Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah ﷺ - Dispelling distortions
of History

Author: Mawlānā Muḥammad Ṣafar Iqbāl

First published:

Website: www.mahajjah.com

Contact: info@mahajjah.com

Contents

Preface	11
Foreword by Shaykh al-Ḥadīth Mawlānā Salīm Allāh Khān Ṣāḥib	15
Foreword by Mawlānā Aslam Shaykhpūrī	17
Foreword by Haḍrat Mawlānā Zāhid al-Rāshidī	19
Introduction	23
Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah <small>رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ</small> - Dispelling distortions of History	31
The Status of the Ṣaḥābah in the Noble Qur’ān	37
The Status of the Ṣaḥābah in ḥadīth	40
Prohibition against maligning the Ṣaḥābah	42
The Ṣaḥābah in their own words	46
Prohibition against maligning the Ṣaḥābah in light of ‘aqīdah	46
The Ṣaḥābah and Imām Abū Ḥanīfah	49
The Ṣaḥābah do not need accreditation	49
The probability of sin falls under divine wisdom	50
The accusation of Banū Umayyah being the most hated tribe	69
Clarification	70
Who is responsible for adding Banū Umayyah to this narration?	73
<i>Dirāyah</i> (explanation)	74
Non-marital associations and virtues	77
Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā and the Banū Umayyah	82
Summary of the Discussion	83
Allegations of not holding any virtue	85
Clearing the misconception	85
Does the lack of authenticity give credibility to such claims?	86
A few aḥādīth on the virtues of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah	93
Commentary from Ibn Kathīr regarding the above narrations	94
Additional Corroboration	95
Further Corroboration	96
The comment of Ḥāfiẓ Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī	97

Another angle	98
The reference of Ibn Taymiyyah	100
The allegation of Bid‘ah	105
Argument one	105
Definition of bid‘ah	108
Argument two	112
Scrutiny of the reference- <i>Futūḥāt al-Makkiyyah</i>	119
Accusation of Committing a Sin	121
1. Mu‘āwiyah’s رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ behavior with ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ	129
The conduct of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ	133
2. Errors in political affairs cannot be termed as an error in ijtihād	134
One Question	140
3. Failing to understand ijtihād	140
1. Imām Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī	142
2. Imām Abū Ishāq al-Isfarā’inī	142
3. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥazm al-Andalusī	143
4. Imām al-Ghazālī	143
5. ‘Allāmah Ibn al-Athīr al-Jazarī	144
6. ‘Allāmah Qurṭubī al-Mālikī	144
7. Imām Muḥyū al-Dīn al-Nawawī	145
8. Ḥāfiẓ Imād al-Dīn ibn al-Kathīr	145
9. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Taymiyyah	145
10. ‘Allāmah al-Taftāzānī	146
11. ‘Allāmah Ibn al-Khaldūn al-Maghribī	146
12. Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī	147
13. ‘Allāmah Ibn al-Humām	147
14. Ibn Ḥajar al-Makkī	147
15. Mujaddid Alf-e Thānī	148
16. ‘Allāmah al-Khafājī	148
17. Mullā ‘Alī Qārī	148
18. ‘Allāmah ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Farhārawī	149
19. Mawlānā Rashīd Aḥmad Ghanghohī	149
20. Mawlānā Sayyid Ḥusayn Aḥmad Madanī	149

21. Muftī Muḥammad Shaḥfī	150
22. Khawājah Shams al-Dīn Siyālwī	150
Closing statement	151
The ijtihād of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ	152
The reference of Mawlānā ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Jāmī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ	154
Shī‘ah insertions in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah	156
The harms caused to the monumental works of the Ahl al-Sunnah	157
Are the books of the esteemed Sūfīyyah free from discrepancies?	159
The causes of un-Islamic ideas being mixed into Islamic Taṣawwuf	161
The reason for the interpolation in the books of the sūfīyyah	163
The condition of Mawlānā Jāmī’s رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ books	165
A few examples of interpolation in <i>Shawāhid al-Nubuwwah</i>	166
The status of Mawlānā Jāmī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ	169
Our stance	172
Basic principles to protect oneself from Shī‘ah conspiracies by Mawlānā Qāsim Nānawtawī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ	172
Principle 1	173
Principle 2	173
Principle 3	174
Principle 4	174
Principle 5	174
Principle 6	175
Conclusion	176
Reference to Mawdūdī	178
The contentious Orientalist ‘masterpiece’ of Mawdūdī	180
Several references of Mawdūdī’s ‘liberal’ approach	181
Was Mawdūdī a Deobandī?	187
The accusation of poisoning Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ	191
1. <i>Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah</i>	191
2. <i>Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī</i>	192
3. <i>Tārīkh Ibn al-‘Asākir</i>	192
4. <i>Sirr al-Shāhādātayn</i>	193
5. <i>Tārīkh Ibn al-Athīr al-Jazarī</i>	193
6. <i>Tārīkh al-Khamīs</i>	194

7. <i>Shawāhid al-Nubuwwah</i>	194
8. <i>Al-Iṣābah fi Tamīz al-Ṣaḥābah</i>	195
9. <i>Ḥayāt al-Ḥayawān</i>	195
10. <i>Murūj al-Dhahab</i>	196
11. <i>Tuḥaf al-Uqūl</i>	198
12. <i>Al-Istī'āb</i>	198
1. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Taymiyyah al-Ḥarrānī	199
2. Ḥāfiẓ Shams al-Dīn al-Dhahabī	199
3. 'Allāmah 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Farḥarawī	199

The accusation of an illusory truce **203**

1. The truce was fulfilment of the glad tidings of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ	203
2. Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah's kindness towards the Ahl al-Bayt	204
3. The stipends Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah designated for the Ahl al-Bayt	204
4. The Banū Hāshim participate in the campaigns of jihād during the khilāfah of Mu'āwiyah	208
5. The Ahl al-Bayt adhered stringently to the conditions of the treaty	209
6. Addressing Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah with the title of Amīr al-Mu'minīn	210
Summary	210

The claim that the khilāfah of Mu'āwiyah was not worthy of being followed **213**

Is a Kingship condemned in Islam?	222
The khilāfah of Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ	224
1. Sayyidunā 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abbās	224
2. Sayyidunā 'Alī	225
3. Sayyidunā Ḥasan	225
4. Sayyidunā 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Umar	225
5. Sayyidunā Sa'd ibn Abī Waqqāṣ	226
6. Ka'b al-Aḥbār	226
7. Imām Abū Ishāq	226
8. Imām Mujāhid	227
9. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Taymiyyah	227
10. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Kathīr	227

11. Ḥāfiẓ al-Dhahabī	228
Argument 1	228
Argument 2	230
Argument 3	232
The al-Khulafā' al-Rāshidīn are four	235
1. Imām al-Ṭahāwī	235
2. Imām Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī	235
3. Imām Abū Bakr al-Bāqillānī	235
4. Shaykh 'Abd al-Qādir al-Jilānī	236
5. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-'Asākir	236
6. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-Kathīr	237
7. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Taymiyyah	238
8. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-Humām	238
9. Shāh Walī Allāh Muḥaddith Dehlawī	238
10. Mawlānā Qāsim Nānawtawī	239
11. Muftī Kifāyat Allāh	239
12. Mawlānā 'Abd al-Shakūr Lakhnawī	239
Aḥādīth pertaining to following the Rightly Guided Khulafā'	240
1. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn 'Abd al-Barr	240
2. Ḥāfiẓ Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī	241
3. Abū Bakr ibn al-'Arabī	241
4. Imām Sharf al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Ṭībī	241
5. Mullā 'Alī Qārī	241
6. 'Abd al-Raḥmān Mubārakpūrī	242
7. 'Allāmah Shams al-Ḥaqq Aẓīmābādī	242
8. Mawlānā Idrīs Khāndhlawī	242
Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah as a scribe of waḥī	247
1. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥazm al-Andalusī (d. 456 A.H):	248
2. Ḥāfiẓ Abū Bakr ibn al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī (d. 463 A.H):	248
3. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī (d. 852 A.H):	248
4. Ḥāfiẓ Shams al-Dīn al-Dhahabī (d. 748 A.H):	248
5. 'Allāmah 'Alī ibn Burhān al-Dīn al-Ḥalbī:	249
6. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-Kathīr (d. 774 A.H):	249

7. Ḥāfiẓ Aḥmad Ibn Ḥajar al-Haythamī al-Makkī (d. 974 A.H):	249
8. Imām Shihāb al-Dīn al-Qaṣṭalānī (d. 923 A.H):	250
9. ‘Allāmah Shihāb al-Dīn al-Khafājī (d. 1099 A.H):	250
10. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-‘Asākir (d. 1383 A.H):	250
11. Mawlānā ‘Abd al-Shakūr Lakhnawī (d. 1383 A.H):	250
12. ‘Allāmah ‘Abd al-Ḥayy al-Kattānī (d. 1382 A.H):	250
13. ‘Allāmah Muḥammad al-Khiḍrī:	251
14. Muftī Taqī ‘Uthmānī :	251
15. ‘Allāmah Sayyid Maḥmūd Aḥmad Raḍwī Barelwī :	251
16. Dr. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Īsā (Teacher at Jāmi‘ah Imām Muḥammad ibn Sa‘ūd):	252
17. Khaṭīb Tabrīzī (d. 743 A.H):	252
18. Imām Abū Ishāq al-Shāṭbī:	252
19. Shāh Mu‘īn al-Dīn Nadwī:	253
20. Aḥmad Yār Khā Gujarati Barelwī:	253
21. Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Ṭabā Ṭabā‘ī ibn Ṭiqṭaqā:	253

Closing remarks	255
A good dream about the people of Ṣiffīn	260
The dream of Abū Maysarah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ	261
The dream of ‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ	262
A final word	265

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	

Preface

The heart of this unworthy author is ever-grateful to the Ultimate Awarder of all bounty and my tongue ceaseless with His praise and glorification, as Allah through His grace and Mercy, has awarded me the opportunity to defend the honour and enumerate the virtues of an esteemed Ṣaḥābī, recorder of *waḥī* (revelation), blood-relative of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, uncle of the Ummah; Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. In an effort to malign and discredit the noble status of this Ṣaḥābī, not only were the lines of fairness crossed—which is normally expected from people of reason and intellect—but even the limits of integrity and humanity trampled upon.

Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ are amongst those personalities who have been treated extremely harshly in light of historical narration; their honour and status becoming blurred through the clouds of exaggeration and derision. Each party scrutinises these personalities through eyes of prejudice which their ideologies, beliefs and viewpoints bind them to. As a result, these two personalities have been depicted to be standing on two divergent paths, with opposing beliefs and motives. Each party, relying upon his own (limited) research and personal standards, raising one and discrediting another, asserting that this is the true reflection, despite how distant the true picture might be from it.

It is in these conditions that I have lifted my pen to enumerate the virtues of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and dispel the accusations against him. I have endeavoured to save myself from becoming ensnared by the thorns of exaggeration and derision, and to traverse this path unscathed to the shore was no easy task at all. Nevertheless, this unworthy author, with firm reliance on Allah and seeking His favour, embarked on this journey. In order to ensure safe passage, I undertook that I would not leave the hands of the pious predecessors but still, if any viewpoint might seem to divert from their own then I retract that beforehand.

The discourse at times took a lengthy course and the reason for it, I cannot help but mention. In reply to the efforts of the Rawāfiḍ in criticising and refuting the Ṣaḥābah, the industrious youth and young scholars of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā‘ah (in fact even a few of those known to be scholars of repute) began pointing out (unfounded) faults of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, considering this to be a

great scholarly service to the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā‘ah. In reply to this *faux pas*, another group, also ascribing themselves to the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā‘ah, (instead of replying to the unfounded accusations against these two saints and revealing the holes in the research of the latter) resorted to attacking Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and Abū Sufyān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ on account of the misdeeds of Yazīd, assuming this to be the most appropriate reply to the latter’s attack on Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. Over time, this difference of opinion became opposition, inclination became prejudice, and slowly members of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā‘ah were described as being partial either to the Rawāfiḍ¹ or the Nawāṣib², whereas the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā‘ah have always been opposed to both groups; since they belittle the beloveds of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, bringing pain to him, which could lead to one losing his īmān. What difference will remain between us and the Rawāfiḍ and Nawāṣib, if so called members of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā‘ah today were to begin acting in the same manner?

The Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā‘ah have always differed with both the Rawāfiḍ and Nawāṣib, and the senior scholars of the Ummah always took care not to become ensnared by the thorns of either sect, maintaining respect for both the Ṣaḥābah and the Ahl al-Bayt. The pious scholars replied to the accusations of both parties in such a substantiated manner that the entire Ummah expressed their gratitude to their invaluable services. How audacious is it that when replying to the Rawāfiḍ a tone is taken seeming to oppose the Ahl al-Bayt or when replying to the Nawāṣib a tone is taken seeming to criticise the Ṣaḥābah? Such leanings to Rāfiḍiyyah and Nāṣibiyyah, which some of the scholars have adopted in their writings today, is extremely lamentable.

In essence, despite their affiliation to the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā‘ah, both these groups are a far cry from the collective substantiated standpoint of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā‘ah. Fairness and equality is the distinguishing feature of the Ahl al-Sunnah: we do not exaggerate with the Rawāfiḍ nor deride like the Nawāṣib. We do not differentiate between the Ṣaḥābah and the Ahl al-Bayt; regarding respect for both as compulsory and belittling any one of them worthy of lament and distances one from the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā‘ah.

1 Rawāfiḍ is a term that pejoratively denotes the Shī‘ah.

2 Nawāṣib refers to those who harbour hatred for Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.

It is with a grieved heart and utmost concern that I extend my hand to both parties, pleading that for Allah’s sake, re-examine your stance. Ponder for a moment over your criticism of the Ahl al-Bayt or Şaḥābah (even if not a Şī‘ah): whose resolve do you strengthen and whose foundation do you uproot and most of all whose blessed heart are you causing pain to. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ loved both his Ahl al-Bayt and his Şaḥābah, who were first hand witnesses to his nubuwwah and risālah, the first to testify to his mission and propagate it with him, who fought alongside him and defended him, and who were proofs of his firm resolve and reformatory success. It is the unique honour of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā‘ah that we serve the Şaḥābah and the Ahl al-Bayt. If the Şaḥābah are “Stars of Guidance” then the Ahl al-Bayt are the “Ark of Success and Salvation”. They are all the fragrant flowers of the same garden of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, whose status might differ but between whom we do not discriminate, be they big or small, or late or early bloomers with īmān. The entire Ummah of the past regarded following in their footsteps as a means of eternal fortune and success and the entire Ummah in the future is dependent upon the path they laid. If any unfortunate individual were to adopt a path other than theirs then he will not attain the objective.

May Allah ﷻ grant us a place at their feet, fill our hearts with true love for them, grant us the ability to follow them, as loving them and obeying them is the true success in this world and hereafter.

Whatever I wished to say regarding the extremities and overzealous approach of these two groups has been said and I have high hopes in both parties that they will read this book with a level-head and ponder over its contents. If they fail to do so then we appeal to Allah:

O Rabb! They have failed to understand, they have not understood my words

You grant them a heart capable of understanding what my tongue could not make them understand

As for the hastiness in which this book was compiled, I present my humble and sincere apology before the fair-minded and just scholars of this Ummah. I acknowledge that the use of language is a delicate issue and requires utmost care, therefore if this humble author might make sense then accept it and understand it to be a feat from

the pious predecessors of this Ummah, but if some error is noted then please bring it to my attention.

I wish to express my gratitude to the honourable Muḥaddith Mawlānā Salīm Allāh Khān, Shaykh al-Ḥadīth Mawlānā Zāhid al-Rāshidī, Respected brother Amīr ‘Uthmānī, Mawlānā Aslam Shaykhpūrī (may we continue to benefit from them), who took out precious time to read through the work of this unworthy author and encouraged me with my effort. In addition, they took the time to increase the value of this book with words of praise and approval. May Allah ﷻ accept their good opinion of me and allow it to be true. I would also wish to thank my friend, Sulaymān ‘Āmir and brother Ghul Muḥammad who assisted me in editing this book, may Allah ﷻ reward them with the best of rewards.

In conclusion, and not for the last time, we ask Allah ﷻ to accept this small effort in His court, make it a means of attaining the pleasure of Allah for the author, his parents and asātidhah, and allow it to serve the purpose for which it was written. If this book removes those doubts that have arisen on account of lack of knowledge, lingering in the heart of one with true īmān and increases his love and admiration for the Ṣaḥābah, then the effort will have been fruitful. If, however, this effort (which is no achievement of the author but rather a reproduction of what is contained in the books of our seniors) successfully defends the honour of the Ṣaḥābah, especially the doubts and allegations made against Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, then there can be no greater exhilaration. And if on account of this effort, the author is granted a place at the feet of the Ṣaḥābah and Ahl al-Bayt then it would have achieved its ultimate goal. Lastly, to those who attack and criticise the Ṣaḥābah and Ahl al-Bayt, I say:

O enemies of the Ṣaḥābah and Ahl al-Bayt! Your efforts to remove the honour of those, who are the lanterns of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, from the hearts of the Ummah is a fruitless task...

These are lanterns which cannot be extinguished with a breath of air.

Servant of the Ṣaḥābah and Ahl al-Bayt

Muḥammad Zafar Iqbāl (May Allah forgive him)

Foreword

by Shaykh al-Ḥadīth Mawlānā Salīm Allāh Khān Ṣāhib

بِسْمِ اللّٰهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِیْمِ

الحمد لله الذى رضى لنا بالاسلام ديناً و بخير الانام و صفوة خلقه نبياً و بصحابه نبياً
اعواناً و انصاراً و الصلاة و السلام على سيد الرسل و خاتم النبىء محمد المصطفى و
المجتبى و على اله و صحبه الذين اختارهم الله تعالى لصحبة نبىه و اقامة دينه من جميع
امته و بعد

Respected Muḥammad Ṣafar Iqbāl, may Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى increase his efforts and virtue, has compiled this book entitled- Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah- Dispelling distortions of history. The author has not only fulfilled the right of research but has explained the necessity of honouring the Ṣaḥābah and loving them in such a manner that it will leave the fair-minded reader with no option but to acknowledge its veracity.

It is impossible to enumerate the excellence of this book in a few words, but one can say that this book is irrefutable and no comprehensive discourse of this nature existed before it. May Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى grant it acceptance, make it a means of salvation for the author and allow multitudes of people to derive benefit from this book.

Salīm Allāh Khān

Principal of Jāmi‘ah Fārūqiyyah Karachi

Head of Wifāq al-Madāris al-‘Arabiyyah Pakistan

12 Dhū l-Ḥijjah 1425

23 January 2005

Foreword

by Mawlānā Aslam Shaykhpūrī

What great foresight was the Messenger of Allah ﷺ blessed with that he was able to discern that such malicious people will arise who will make his pure and noble Ṣaḥābah targets of criticism. Instead of pondering over their own mistakes and weaknesses, they will search for faults amongst the first group of the pious predecessors. This is why the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said with great emphasis:

Fear Allah! Fear Allah regarding my Ṣaḥābah! Do not make them a target for your criticism after me.

All of the qualities and character described by the Noble Qur’ān, all of the glad tidings mentioned, apply first to the Ṣaḥābah and then to others. If the Qur’ān addresses such people as true believers, pious, Allah-fearing, praying through the night, humble, and generous, promising them a grand reward, forgiveness, guidance, mercy, and Jannah then all of this before applying to the esteemed and illustrious Fuqahā, Muḥaddithīn and Mufasssīrīn; it first applies to the Ṣaḥābah. If, Allah forbid, they were void of īmān and guidance then no person on this earth attained īmān and guidance.

The oppressed Ṣaḥābī, who is most often the target of such criticisms, was the recorder of *waḥī* (revelation), Amīr al-Mu’minīn Sayyidunā Mu’āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān رضي الله عنه. It should have been more fitting to present his twenty years of khilāfah and rule of the Ummah, the glorious conquests he achieved and progression which he led, that should be remembered with honour. It would have been more fitting to discuss his prowess and genius, īmān and character but sadly the opposite has occurred. Instead such filth has been flung at his person that one shudders to think of the sheer audacity. If it were to have been an outsider then it would have been expected but such allegations have come from within our camp that one even feels ashamed to take their names. This attack was not limited to this one Ṣaḥābī only, who was a blood-relative of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, but it spilled over to the entire tribe of Banū Umayyah, such that all of them are depicted to be tyrannical oppressors and wicked usurpers. Those who have distorted the pages and narrations of history did not bother to even consider that they were biting the very hand who had sustained them, since the lands in which they live were brought under the

banner of Islam either directly or indirectly by the Banū Umayyah. It was under their rule that the Islamic borders were expanded to Africa, Europe, and Asia, with distant lands glimmering with the light of Islam. Whatever expansions continued in these lands later also took place under the rule of the Banū Umayyah.

The respected Mawlānā Zafar Iqbāl (May Allah ﷻ increase his status) in this book has refuted all those allegations posed by those who might claim to be of the Ahl al-Sunnah and lovers of the Ṣaḥābah, but whose words and writings fail to support their claim. Many people have faltered when lifting their pen against Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah ﷺ such that many a time, they even cause people to doubt and turn against Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ. This is why Mawlānā was extremely cautious in his refutation of such allegations, never straying from the path of fairness nor his use of language becoming degrading in any way. The respected author not only has control of his pen and tongue but also of the topic at hand, which is why his book succeeds in pacifying and convincing the reader. Whoever will read this book without prejudice will find himself agreeing with me entirely.

The lowly servant of the Ṣaḥābah
Muḥammad Aslam Shaykhpūrī

Foreword

by Haḍrat Mawlānā Zāhid al-Rāshidi

نحمده تبارك و تعالی و نصلی و نسلم علی رسوله الکریم و علی اله و اصحابه و اتباعه
اجمعین

Amīr al-Mu'minīn Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is amongst those noble personalities of Islam who expanded the borders and rule of Islam, rendering great services and sacrifices. His twenty years of khilāfah, which was unique in its own right, was the principle reason for the great conquests and spread of Islam that occurred later. He was a Ṣaḥābī of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, a recorder of waḥī, blood-relative of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, renowned as one of the great political leaders of the Arab world. His tolerance, forbearance, and political insight were always acknowledged. The manner in which he steered the entire Ummah for twenty years is a glorious chapter in the history of Islam. In addition to being a leader and a politician, he was also a Mujtahid, whose status was acknowledged by the senior Ṣaḥābah as well. It is a well-known fact that when a Mujtahid applies his mind to a ruling then it has the possibility of being correct or incorrect. A few of his rulings might not have been accepted by his contemporaries and in such instances he has the same right as all those who hold a contrary view. However, some people have made these differences of opinion an object of criticism and in fact a reason for rejection and abuse. This continues to this very day, which opposes both knowledge and fair-handedness, resulting in Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ becoming one of the most oppressed personalities of Islamic history.

The allegations then move from Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ to the entire tribe of Banū Umayyah, whereas the rule of the Banū Umayyah has the honour of having raised the banner of Islam until the borders of Africa, Europe, and Asia, spreading far and wide. It was under their leadership that the empires of Rome and Persia were brought to their knees, making the Arabs a force to be reckoned with. The manner in which Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ enforced the laws and teachings of Islam in accordance with the Sunnah of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ can be easily gauged from the following narration in *Tirmidhī*:

On one occasion the Romans signed a temporary cease fire with Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. As the time period drew to a close, Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ left Damascus with his

army for the Roman borders thinking that his troops will be ready to advance from the border as soon as the agreement terminates. As they were on route, the Ṣaḥābī of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, ‘Amr ibn ‘Abasah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, came speeding after them. He informed Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ about the ḥadīth of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ that if you have any agreement (of cease fire) with another nation then as long as the agreement is in place, you should not even advance your soldiers. As soon as Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ heard this, he not only stopped advancing but ordered his troops to return to Damascus as well.

Similarly, Ṭabarānī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and Abū Ya’lā رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ have reported another incident, with their chain of narration, regarding which Al-Haythamī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ (in *Majma‘ al-Zawā’id* vol. 5 page 236) has said: “The narrators are all reliable”. The incident is as follows:

Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ contrary to his normal routine said one Friday in his *khuṭbah* (sermon): “The distribution of the spoils of war and public treasury is subject to my discretion; I will give to whomsoever I please and will hold back from whoever I please.” After saying this no one gave any reply. The next week he said the same and again no one replied. However, on the third week when he repeated this, a person stood from the crowd said: “Never! The spoils of war and public treasury belong to all of the Muslims, whoever will become an obstacle between us and it, his fate will be decided with the sword.” After the ṣalāh, Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ summoned the man before him. Assuming that Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ might treat him harshly, others arrived in the court to intercede on his behalf. When they reached the court, they found that Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ had seated the man alongside him, thanking him for what he had said. Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ then said to them: “I heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ say that such leaders will come who will say whatever they please and none will object to them. Such leaders will be disfigured into apes and thrown into Jahannam. It was with this in mind that I said this in the *khuṭbah*, intending to see whether anyone will object or not. When no one objected, I became exceedingly worried and so I repeated it again the second week but again no one objected and my worry increased. But today when I repeated it for the third time, this man objected to me giving me solace that I am not amongst those rulers. He has given me life and may Allah also grant him life.”

Such a person, with such a personality, who commands his troops to return after hearing one ḥadīth, who is so concerned of the warning of the Messenger of Allah

صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ that he acts in the manner mentioned above, is it not but defamation to accuse him of altering the Qur'ān and Sunnah? Allah forbid! They have indeed left the realms of fairness.

It is with this that my good friend, Mawlānā Muḥammad Ḥafar Iqbāl, lifted his pen in defence of Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. He has studied in detail the allegations made against Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and proved many of them to be baseless accusations, a result of deep hatred and prejudice against him. Some of the allegations pertain only to issues of jurisprudence but the accusers overlook the status of Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ as a Mujtahid and malign him for his opinions.

May Allah سُبحانه وتعالى reward Ḥafar Iqbāl; abundantly and grant him the ability to continue rendering services in this field.

Abū 'Ammār Zāhid al-Rāshidī

Secretary General of Pakistan religious council

10 March 2005

Introduction

بِسْمِ اللّٰهِ الرَّحْمٰنِ الرَّحِیْمِ

وَصَلَّى اللّٰهُ عَلَی النَّبِیِّ الْکَرِیْمِ

There is a general principle without which no individual will be able to comprehend our system of accreditation, in other words the procedure by which recognition and status is granted. This principle is quite simple to understand, whenever an individual or entity is linked to *Ḥaqq* (divine truthfulness), then this individual will not merely be praised on account of his personal attributes but rather because of the connection he shares with that divine link of truthfulness.

To put it differently, it is incumbent upon every individual to link himself to the Messenger of Allah ﷺ in order to attain complete salvation. This link is the defining basis of recognition. Undoubtedly, the Ahl al-Bayt and the noble Ṣaḥābah were unending fountains of righteousness but the defining characteristic, which raised them to the highest platform of excellence, was the link they shared with the beloved of Allah ﷺ, Sayyidunā Muḥammad ﷺ, an honour enjoyed by them alone.

Most certainly, their personal attributes will contribute to their lofty prestige but it is not the fundamental criteria of recognition. Likewise, individual shortcomings will not degrade their lofty status. The principle one is required to understand is that there is no achievement that will surpass the status of being a Ṣaḥābī, and there is no shortcoming except disbelief which will degrade the status of a Ṣaḥābī.

Sadly, there are multiple factions who have shunned this fundamental principle and are treading farther away from the teachings of the Prophet ﷺ. Leave aside the misguided sects, from amongst the Ahl al-Sunnah itself one will find such people who have disregarded the unquestionable status of the noble Ṣaḥābah.

Amongst these people are those who have veiled their intentions beneath the shroud of *taṣawwuf* (Sūfism), wherein the eminent Ṣaḥābī, Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, holds a pivotal position.

These individuals possess such extreme love for Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ that in their ecstasy to prove their devotion to him, they fail to differentiate between extremism and apathy; more so when it pertains to Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. In their minds hatred for Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is a prerequisite for loving Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, and these dogmatic dialogues are an integral part of their so-called spiritual gatherings, which in most instances contradict the teachings of the Qur’ān and Sunnah. Spiritual gatherings of this nature provide no benefit to the mentor or the disciple and stray far from the principles of Islam.

The dervishes who conduct these gatherings have no interest in the spiritual elevation of their disciples. Their only interest is to create a circle of devotees, who will ‘worship’ and revere them. In order to achieve this, they misuse the name of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, around whom a trail of legendary tales have been fabricated. The truth, however, is that these tales are baseless and mere concoctions of their wandering imaginations. These tales have no relation to the venerable personality of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Just as the tales regarding Prophet ‘Īsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ, which the overzealous Christians fabricated, are fictitious, so too are the fanciful tales regarding Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, which are mere deceptions fed to the uninformed.

In accordance with their limited logic and understanding they declare that if anyone from amongst the Ṣaḥābah had a disagreement with Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ then it will be sufficient to cast that Ṣaḥābī out of the fold of Islam. On the other hand, disagreements with Sayyidunā Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ bear no consequence. The reason for this delusion is that they have attached certain attributes to Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ that can only be attributed to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى or are specific to our Prophet Muḥammad صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

The noble Ṣaḥābah are all equal as far as their status as a faction is concerned and it is justified for a Ṣaḥābī to disagree with another. These disagreements can be correct or incorrect as well. When a Ṣaḥābī can question the erudite Ṣaḥābī, Sayyidunā ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, on a particular ruling of *mehr* (dowry) then why is it wrong for Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to question the decision of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ regarding the murderers of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ?

It is incumbent to first establish whether Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ had the right to raise questions regarding the murder of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ? Was this

not a religious matter as well? Was it irreligious to probe this matter further? The most that one may prove is that they both disagreed on the basis of their *ijtihād* (analytical reasoning) as to how this issue - the murder of the khalīfah - should be handled? Yes, they may have erred in the process and for that they will still be rewarded, which is the established stance of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah. Alas! Only if Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was given the responsibility of rounding up and punishing all those who were involved in the murder of Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, then today many of the current matters of distrust and division would not exist and the conquests of Islam which ensued during the khilāfah of Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would not have ceased. Undoubtedly, the martyrdom of Sayyidunā 'Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ had broken the spirit of the Ummah, which neither Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ nor Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ could mend.

When I came across the book- *Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah- Dispelling distortions of History*, I was overcome with a deep sense of gratitude that by the grace of Allah, Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ Iqbāl had fulfilled a necessary requisite of love for the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and Islam.

May Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى reward him abundantly for undertaking this initiative and ensuring its completion. May Allah raise him amongst the ranks of His most righteous servants.

I have not had the honour of meeting brother Muḥammad Ṣāliḥ Iqbāl personally, but I do know that he was a devoted acquaintance of the esteemed Mawlānā Yūsuf Ludhiyānwī Shahīd رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ. He also benefited greatly from the august personality of Mawlānā Salīm Allāh Khān and is amongst those who benefitted from the company and teachings of 'Allāmah Khālid Maḥmūd. He frequents the gatherings of many notable scholars and Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى has also blessed him with astute knowledge and those qualities necessary for the understanding of dīn.

The great Mufassir of the Qur'ān, Mawlānā Aḥmad 'Alī Lāhorī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ once said:

There are two features which are of utmost necessity for the protection of īmān and steadfastness on dīn. These two features are: (1) Concern for the Hereafter (2) reliance on the pious predecessors.

The reliance of brother Zafar Iqbāl is evident from his book. Allah willing, his concern for the hereafter is commendable as well. I say this because the one who treads in the footsteps of the pious predecessors will not be void of concern for the hereafter. I have personally heard from my elders that the one who disregards the teachings of the pious predecessors will indeed become a slave of his carnal desires and will only focus on earning the pleasures of this mundane world. Such an individual always gives preference to worldly achievements over the hereafter. May Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى forgive all our shortcomings and may Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى keep us steadfast on the path of the pious.

The purpose of the book before you is to answer a number of blasphemous and baseless allegations levelled against Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. The allegations are of such a contentious nature that no Muslim will ever tolerate it. A few of the baseless accusations levelled against Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ that will be clarified in this book are as follows:

The Banū Umayyah harboured extreme hatred for the Banū Hāshim.

The narrations regarding the status and virtues of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ are unauthentic.

Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ initiated many innovations during his khilāfah.

Waging war against Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was an unforgivable mistake perpetrated by Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ murdered Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ by poisoning him.

The peace treaty which took place between Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was illusory.

The khilāfah of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is not worthy of being followed.

Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was the scribe of a few letters of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and not a scribe of waḥī.

The general criticism levelled against the Banū Umayyah and those specifically directed towards Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ arise on account of the misconception

that praising or acknowledging Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and the Banū Umayyah is tantamount to slurring the Ahl al-Bayt. In other words, love and respect for the Ahl al-Bayt can only be true if one condemns and vilifies the Banū Umayyah and Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه along with them.

Mawlānā Ṣafar Iqbāl has remarkably highlighted the errors of such bias and has meticulously proven the achievements and status of many individuals from the Banū Umayyah. Often the dogmatist, in his mistaken hereditary prejudice, embarks on a relentless mission of vilifying Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه, such that it becomes necessary to remind him that whether the vilification is directed towards Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه or Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه, it demands refutation; a principle applicable to each and every Ṣaḥābī.

The three aḥādīth regarding the Banū Umayyah and Yazīd often cited by the opponents of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه in actuality proves that they are bereft of the necessary knowledge and aptitude required in the science of aḥādīth. If they possessed any knowledge, then they would never have depended on the reports of Al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī. On the other hand, Mawlānā Ṣafar Iqbāl scrutinised all of the material and has methodically proven their unreliability.

The majority of the aḥādīth which make mention of *manāqib* (virtues and merit) are not on the level of *ṣaḥīḥ* (authentic). Likewise, the extent of work that the Muḥaddithīn have carried out in scrutinising the authenticity of the narrations pertaining to Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه has not been carried out for any other Ṣaḥābī. In simple words, the amount of inaccuracies which the scholars of Islam have discovered in the chapters pertaining to the virtues of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه is of such an extent that deniability is no more a choice in this matter. In spite of this, the scholars of Islam have never said that the status of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه is not proven. Why is the same sentiment and principle not applied with Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه?

Furthermore, Mawlānā Ṣafar Iqbāl has accurately discredited the narration used to substantiate the claim that Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه was an innovator. In this light, the elucidation of Mawlānā Muḥammad Nāfi‘ is of such a calibre, that hopefully it will be a means of success and guidance for all the opponents of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه.

A common argument raised against Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was that he initiated or incited the poisoning of Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. Mawlānā Ḥafṣ ibn Iqbāl has refuted any and all misunderstandings in this regard.

Regarding the era of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, the scholars are of the opinion that it does not form part of that khilāfah classified as the Khilāfah al-Rāshidah, but it does not mean that it was an era void of benefit to Islam and unworthy of being followed. Mawlānā Ḥafṣ ibn Iqbāl also clarified the various doubts and allegations regarding the khilāfah of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.

Amongst the common errors, the opponents of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ make in building their case against him, is the allegation that Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was not a scribe of waḥī, but rather only a scribe for a few epistles of the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Mawlānā Ḥafṣ ibn Iqbāl once again refutes this allegation and presents an array of authentic and reliable narrations as well as commentaries which resolve this matter once and for all. Through the grace of Allah, I firmly believe that allegations such as these hold no value against the pioneers of knowledge such as Ibn Ḥazm رَحِمَهُ اللهُ, Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ, Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ and Al-Dhahabī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ and their likes.

In short, the author, Mawlānā Ḥafṣ ibn Iqbāl has shunned and dismantled all the baseless criticisms that the sceptics dare to present against Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. The presentation of indexes and academic style is a reminder of the works of the earlier scholars and this is what truly makes this book a masterpiece.

In conclusion, I would like to commend the disapproval that these sceptics might voice at times against Shī‘ism, especially, when one considers the conditions surrounding them, whereby it is extremely difficult if not impossible to voice such sentiments, but at the same time one will realise that they too are guilty of the same crime as the Shī‘ah. Sadly, in this day and age giving precedence to Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ has become a fundamental belief within certain sects, at times their fanaticism leading to deviation. It is because of this belief that much blood has been spilled over the course of history and closing this door has become a *shar‘ī* (religious) requirement. This matter is of such a grave nature that some individuals have elevated Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ above the rest of the Ambiyā’.

Indeed, it is a pre-requisite of īmān to love and respect the noble family of the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, but at the same time one must be careful, not to use this love for personal gain, as to do so will be an act of treachery and enmity against Islam.

Nonetheless, I am extremely pleased with Mawlānā Zafar Iqbāl for preparing this manuscript in defence of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, which will (Allah-willing) be of great benefit to one and all. May Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى reward him abundantly for his efforts and bless him with success in all his endeavours.

Jāwid Amīr ‘Uthmānī
Iqbāl Academy
Lahore

Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ - Dispelling distortions of History

All praise is due to Allah, who is sufficient and may peace be upon His selected servants.

Allah سُبْحَانَ تَعَالَى attributed that religion to the Ṣaḥābah, which He completed upon the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and He was pleased with as a religion for prosperity:

الْيَوْمَ أَكْمَلْتُ لَكُمْ دِينَكُمْ وَأَتَمَمْتُ عَلَيْكُمْ نِعْمَتِي وَرَضِيتُ لَكُمُ الْإِسْلَامَ دِينًا

*Today I have perfected your religion for you, and I have completed My favour upon you, and I am pleased with Islam for you as a religion.*¹

The history of Islam begins with the Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Their virtues and excellence were acknowledged by the previous Prophets, and the earlier nations would enhance their faith by recounting the praises heaped upon them:

ذَلِكَ مَثَلُهُمْ فِي التَّوْرَةِ وَمَثَلُهُمْ فِي الْإِنْجِيلِ

*This is their description in the Torah and their description in the Injil...*²

The dīn of Islam cannot advance a single step if the Ṣaḥābah are removed from the history of Islam.

عن عويم بن ساعدة رضي الله عنه ان رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم قال : أن الله تبارك و تعالی اختارني و اختار لي اصحابا ، فجعل لي منهم وزراء و أنصارا و أصحابا ، فمن سبهم فعليه لعنة الله و الملائكة و الناس اجمعين ، لا يقبل منه يوم القيامة صرف و لا عدل . (هذا حديث صحيح الإسناد و لم يخرجاه و قال الذهبي رحمة الله عليه صحيح)

Uwaym ibn Sā'idah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ narrates that the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ said: “Verily Allah selected me and chose Ṣaḥābah for me. He made for me among them some as ministers, some as assistants and some as relatives through

1 Sūrah al-Mā'idah: 3.

2 Sūrah al-Faḥ: 29.

marriage. So whosoever swears at them, may the curse of Allah, the angels and all the people be upon him. On the Day of Resurrection, no good deed will be accepted from him, be it compulsory or optional.”¹

Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mas‘ūd رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ narrates:

إن الله نظر في قلوب العباد فاختر محمدا صلى الله عليه وسلم فبعثه برسالة و انتخبه بعلمه ، ثم نظر في قلوب الناس بعده ، فاختر له أصحابا ، فجعلهم أنصار دينه و وزراء نبيه ، و ما رآه المؤمنون حسنا فهو عند الله حسن ، و ما رآه المؤمنون قبيحا فهو عند الله قبيح

Allah glanced at the hearts of His servants and chose Muḥammad صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, He then sent him with His message and selected him with His knowledge. Thereafter, Allah glanced at the hearts of mankind and He selected companions for him. Allah made them the supporters of His religion and the ministers of His Messenger صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Whatever the believers collectively consider as good, is also good in the sight of Allah, and whatever the believers collectively consider as inappropriate, is also inappropriate in the sight of Allah.²

It is understood from the aforementioned narrations that just as Allah selected the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ from among the entire creation, likewise the most blessed people and the most fortunate souls from all of mankind were chosen for the companionship of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Apart from the Ambiyā’ these people are the most superior from the entire creation in their nobility, excellence, honour, qualities, status and rank. If there existed any other people in the creation more superior than the Ṣaḥābah, Allah would have chosen them for the companionship and friendship of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

Reviling them, disrespecting and hurling scorn at the Ṣaḥābah not only derides their companionship with the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ but scoffs at the selection made by Allah.

Similar is the case of the Ahl al-Bayt; together with enjoying kinship with the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, they are included among the Ṣaḥābah, as they too had

1 Ṣaḥīḥ according to Al-Dhahabī, *Mustadarak al-Ḥākim*, vol. 5 pg. 632.

2 *Musnad Abū Dāwūd al-Ṭayālīsī*, pg. 33.

the honour of remaining in the company of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, if they were amongst those who lived during his lifetime. It is obligatory to respect the Ṣaḥābah, and likewise it is essential to hold the Ahl al-Bayt in high regard.

‘Allāmah Khālid Maḥmūd writes:

Just as it is an essential component of the beliefs of a true Muslim to revere the Ṣaḥābah and the al-Khulafā’ al-Rāshidīn, likewise whosoever reviles the Ahl al-Bayt does not deserve to be considered part of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā‘ah.¹

Mujaddid Alf-e Thānī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ (d. 1034 A.H) writes:

How is it possible to assume that the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā‘ah do not adore the Ahl al-Bayt, whereas love for the Ahl al-Bayt is considered to be a component of īmān, and attaining an easy death is dependent upon deep admiration for them. Love for the Ahl al-Bayt is a hallmark of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā‘ah, yet our adversaries are unaware of this reality and they are ignorant of the concept of moderate love for the Ahl al-Bayt. They have adopted one extreme in this matter of love, while others have adopted another extreme by considering everybody else to be out of the fold of Islam.

They do not realise that between the two extremes is the moderate path that the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā‘ah have adopted. This is the essence of truth and the correct stance. May Allah appreciate their endeavours.²

According to the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā‘ah there is no separation between the Ṣaḥābah and the Ahl al-Bayt. Wherever the word Ṣaḥābah appears in our discussion, the Ahl al-Bayt are included in it.

The teachings and guidance imparted by the Messenger of Allah ﷺ prepared the Ṣaḥābah to become the role models and guides for the entire world. They were the link between the message of nubuwwah and the Ummah. The Ṣaḥābah imbibed within themselves the magnificence and effulgence of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ to such an extent that their lives became a component of the life of the

1 *Ahl al-Bayt al-Kirām*, pg. 4.

2 *Maktūbāt Imām-e Rabbānī*, journal 2, letter 36.

Messenger of Allah ﷺ. It is impossible to entirely mention the blessed life of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ without mentioning the lives of the Ṣaḥābah, for the reason that the Ṣaḥābah are the testimony to the Messenger's of Allah ﷺ mentorship.

After understanding their excellence, it would be appropriate to recognize the status of the Ṣaḥābah in light of the standards set by the Noble Qur'ān and Sunnah. Our misfortune has been such that we have begun to look at the Ṣaḥābah and their differences in the mirror of the disputes and circumstances of worldly political leaders. Whereas very often worldly leaders are willing to destroy the wellbeing of people in this world and ākhirah as well, merely for the sake of power.

According to the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah, the Ṣaḥābah are the foundation of īmān and Islam. It is a matter of belief for the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah that the differences which arose between the Ṣaḥābah, even if it led to war between them, were not based upon the aspiration for power. Each faction fought against the other on the premise of protecting and elevating Islam. All these personalities held the view that the stance of the opposing group was also based upon sound religious judgement. Thus, although each faction would consider the opinion or assumption of the other to be incorrect, they would not consider them to be imposters or disbelievers.¹

Additional details of this will be discussed in its appropriate place. This is the unanimous view of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah. In all the books of 'aqā'id (beliefs), this topic has been discussed in a dedicated chapter: "The noble status and recognition of the Ṣaḥābah". Hence their status cannot be ascertained and determined by a cursory glance at historical narration.

Whilst discussing the importance and the position of the subject of History, Muftī Muḥammad Shafī رحمه الله (d. 1396 A.H) mentions:

It is inappropriate to determine the character and status of the Ṣaḥābah solely on the basis of historical narration. In their role as the link between the message of nubuwwah and the Ummah, these individuals enjoy a special position in

1 *Maktūbāt Imām-e Rabbānī*, letter: 96.

light of the Noble Qur'ān and Sunnah. Historical narrations do not have the same position as the Noble Qur'ān and Sunnah and thus the status of the Ṣaḥābah cannot be raised or lowered simply based upon historical narration. By no means is it implied that history cannot be relied upon completely and is useless. The reality is that there are variant degrees of credibility. The status of credibility which Islam has afforded to the Noble Qur'ān and to mutawātir aḥādīth¹, when compared to general aḥādīth and historical narration is not of the same standing. Likewise, the sayings of the Ṣaḥābah do not hold the same weight as the words of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. By the same token, the degree of reliability of historical narrations is not the same as that of the Noble Qur'ān, Sunnah or authentically established sayings of the Ṣaḥābah. If any connotation implied from a ḥadīth, which is not mutawātir, conflicts with the text of the Noble Qur'ān, then it will be imperative to find an interpretation for that connotation. If a suitable interpretation cannot be found then it will be necessary to discard the connotation which contradicts the text of the Noble Qur'ān. In a like manner, should any issue, derived from a historical narration, be inconsistent with the understanding established from the Noble Qur'ān and Sunnah then the former will be discarded or a suitable interpretation sought, no matter the strength of authenticity of the historical narration.²

After a few pages, Muftī Muḥammad Shafī' رحمه الله writes:

It is the consensus of the entire Ummah that the significance of the Ṣaḥābah, their status and the differences which arose between them cannot be concluded as any general topic of history is concluded. The importance of the Ṣaḥābah is a fundamental component of the science of ḥadīth, as has been clarified in the introduction of *Al-Iṣābah* by Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar رحمه الله and in the introduction of *al-Istī'āb* by Ḥāfiẓ Ibn 'Abd al-Barr رحمه الله. The scholars of this Ummah have treated the subject of the status of the Ṣaḥābah, the varying ranks amongst them and the differences that arose between them as a separate theme in the science of 'aqīdah and have dedicated chapters discussing it in all the books of Islamic creed. In a matter related to Islamic creed, and upon the basis of which many Muslim factions came into existence, it is obvious sources such as the Qur'ān, Sunnah, and *ijmā'* (consensus of the Ummah) have to be utilised.

1 Mutawātir: A ḥadīth reported by such a large number of people that it is inconceivable for them to have all agreed upon a lie.

2 *Maqām-e Ṣaḥābah*, pg. 14-15.

If a deduction is to be made from any narration, it is fundamental that it be analysed according to the principles of ḥadīth. Simply searching for a source among historical narrations and relying upon it, is a fundamental error. Even though history may have been compiled by reliable and authentic scholars of ḥadīth, in essence it still remains history, and in history it is common practice to accumulate both the authentic and unauthentic.¹

Ibn Ḥajar al-Makkī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 974 A.H) states:

و الواجب أيضا على كل من سمع شيئا من ذلك أن يتثبت فيه و لا ينسبه الى أحد منهم بمجرد رؤية في كتاب أو سماعه من شخص، بل لا بد أن يبحث عنه حتى يصح عنده نسبه الى أحدهم، فحيثئذ الواجب أن يلتمس لهم أحسن التأويلات

Whosoever hears anything regarding the differences and misunderstandings among the Ṣaḥābah, it is incumbent upon him to enquire regarding that matter. One should not merely apportion fault to any of them based solely on something read in a book or heard from another. It is vital to research the matter until it can be correctly attributed. It will be prudent at this point to seek the most befitting interpretation.²

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Taymiyyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 728 A.H) while discussing the beliefs of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah writes:

و يبرؤون من طريقة الروافض الذين يبغضون الصحابة و يسبونهم و طريقة النواصب الذين يؤذون أهل البيت بقول أو عمل، و يمسكون عما شجر بين الصحابة و يقولون: أن هذه الآثار المروية في مساويهم منها ما هو كذب و منها ما قد زيد فيه و نقص غير عن وجهه، و الصحيح منه هم فيه معذرون، إما مجتهدون مصيبون و إما مجتهدون مخطئون. وهم مع ذلك لا يعتقدون أن كل واحد من الصحابة معصوم عن كبائر الاثم و صغائره، بل يجوز عليهم الذنوب في الجملة، و لهم من الفضائل و السوابق ما يوجب مغفرته ما يصدر منهم ان يصدر، حتى انهم يغفر لهم من السيئات ما لا يغفر لمن بعدهم

The Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah stand exonerated from the methodology adopted by the Shī'ah, who harbour hatred for the Ṣaḥābah and consider them

¹ *Maqām-e Ṣaḥābah*, pg. 35-36.

² *Al-Ṣawā'iq al-Muḥriqah*, pg. 216.

as evil. Similarly, we are exonerated from the methodology of the Nawāṣib, who cause harm to the Ahl al-Bayt verbally or physically. The Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah choose to adopt silence regarding the differences which arose between the Ṣaḥābah. They state that the narrations reported against the Ṣaḥābah vary; a number of those narrations are fabrications, while some narrations are such that certain alterations have taken place to the extent that their correct meaning has been adulterated. Yet there are also some narrations which are authentic. In these instances, the Ṣaḥābah are considered excused as they were either accurate in their *ijtihād* (analytical reasoning) or they erred even after following the correct analytical methodology. Similarly, the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah do not hold this belief that the Ṣaḥābah were infallible from committing any minor or major sin. Essentially there was a probability of them committing sin. Their virtues and merits are, however, so immense that it warrants their forgiveness even if a misdemeanour had to occur from them. In fact, forgiveness would be extended to them to a degree unachievable by those after them.¹

Mujaddid Alf-e Thānī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ (d. 1024 A.H) states:

The disputes and quarrels which arose between the Ṣaḥābah should be interpreted in a positive light, and it should be understood to be as distant as possible from individualistic or sectarian motives. These differences were essentially premised on analytical deductions and interpretations, and not upon desires. This is the standpoint of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah... It is important for us to maintain our beliefs in accordance with the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah and not to lend an ear to the statements of any simpleton. Founding one's beliefs and ideologies upon the views of false people is tantamount to destroying one's īmān. It is vital to follow the path of those who will attain salvation, i.e. the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah, so that one can be hopeful of earning salvation.²

The Status of the Ṣaḥābah in the Noble Qur'ān

Take note of the following verses in the Noble Qur'ān:

1 *Al-'Aqīdah al-Wāsiṭiyah*, pg. 173.

2 *Maktūbāt Imām-e Rabbānī*, letter: 251.

1.

كُنتُمْ خَيْرَ أُمَّةٍ أُخْرِجَتْ لِلنَّاسِ

*You are the best of all nations who have been raised for mankind.*¹

2.

وَكَذَلِكَ جَعَلْنَاكُمْ أُمَّةً وَسَطًا لِتَكُونُوا شُهَدَاءَ عَلَى النَّاسِ

*Thus, We have made you such a group that is moderate in nature so that you may be witnesses over people.*²

The direct addressees of these two verses are the Ṣaḥābah themselves. In the first verse, they are crowned with the title of the “best of all nations”, classified as the role models and guides of the entire Ummah. In the second verse, along with being praised with the words, “moderate in nature”, a unique honour is mentioned for them: just as the Messenger of Allah ﷺ will be a witness for the Ṣaḥābah, so too will the Ṣaḥābah serve as witnesses and exemplars for those after them.

3.

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

Muḥammad ﷺ is Allah’s Messenger and those with him are severe against the kuffār and compassionate among themselves. You will see them sometimes bowing, sometimes prostrating, seeking Allah’s bounty and His pleasure. Their hallmark is on their faces because of the effect of prostration. This is their description in the Torah. Their description in the Injil is like that of a plant that sprouts its shoots and strengthens it, after which it becomes thick and stands on its own stem, pleasing the farmer. So that the kuffār may be enraged by them. Allah has promised forgiveness and a grand reward for those of them who have īmān and who do good deeds.³

1 Sūrah Āl ‘Imrān: 110.

2 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 143.

3 Sūrah al-Fatḥ: 29.

In this verse, the phrase “Muḥammad ﷺ is Allah’s Messenger” is a claim and the phrase “And those with him...” is the proof of that claim. The later phrase includes the entire assembly of the Ṣaḥābah. Allah presents them as evidence of the Messenger of Allah’s ﷺ nubuwwah whilst also attesting to their piety, credibility and integrity. Whosoever criticizes the Ṣaḥābah not only finds fault in the nubuwwah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, but rather denies the claim of the Noble Qur’ān. It is evident from this verse that anybody who harbours anger and fury against the Ṣaḥābah could only be a disbeliever. It is as if though the very existence of the Ṣaḥābah was a cause of rage for the disbelievers. Lastly, Allah has promised forgiveness and an immense reward for the Ṣaḥābah on the basis of their faith and virtuous deeds.

4. وَالسُّبْقُونَ الْأَوَّلُونَ مِنَ الْمُهَاجِرِينَ وَالْأَنْصَارِ وَالَّذِينَ اتَّبَعُوهُمْ بِإِحْسَانٍ رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ وَرَضُوا عَنْهُ وَأَعَدَّ لَهُمْ جَنَّاتٍ تَجْرِي تَحْتِهَا الْأَنْهَارُ خَالِدِينَ فِيهَا أَبَدًا ذَلِكَ الْفَوْزُ الْعَظِيمُ

And the foremost pioneers of the Muhājirīn (those who migrated from Makkah to Madīnah) and the Anṣār (the citizens of Madīnah who helped the Muhājirīn) and also those who followed them exactly in virtue; Allah is well-pleased with them and they are well-pleased with Him. He has prepared for them Gardens under which rivers flow, to dwell therein forever. That is the supreme success.¹

In this verse, Allah has described two categories of the Ṣaḥābah. The first are the “Muhājirīn” and the second are “Anṣār”. They have unconditionally been assured four bounties together with the glad tidings of a “great success”. These four promises are:

Allah is forever pleased with them.

They are always pleased with Allah.

Jannah (Paradise) has been prepared for them.

They will abide in Jannah forever.

¹ Sūrah al-Towbah: 100.

5. *وَ إِذَاقِيلَ لَهُمُ امْنُوا كَمَا امْنَتَ النَّاسُ قَالُوا اَنْوَمِنُ كَمَا امْنَتَ السُّفَهَاءُ اَلَا اِنَّهُمْ هُمُ السُّفَهَاءُ وَلَكِنْ لَا يَعْلَمُونَ*

And when it is said to them (the hypocrites): “Believe as the people (Ṣaḥābah) have believed,” they say: “Shall we believe as the fools have believed?” Verily, they (the hypocrites) are the fools, but they know not.¹

This verse declares the īmān of the Ṣaḥābah as being complete as well as being of the required standard in the sight of Allah. People’s īmān will not be complete until it is measured on the scale of the īmān of the Ṣaḥābah. The acceptable standard of īmān is that of the Ṣaḥābah, therefore a person who criticises the īmān of the Ṣaḥābah is treading the path of the hypocrites. Whosoever considers the Ṣaḥābah to be foolish and dumb, then in the sight of Allah such a person is in fact foolish and dumb. Whichever people find fault in the Ṣaḥābah do so out of their sheer ignorance, shallowness, oblivion, and lack of knowledge.

My purpose is not to encompass all the verses concerning the status of the Ṣaḥābah and it will be sufficient to conclude from what has been mentioned that they are accepted in the sight of Allah and have been promised Jannah. For those who are willing to accept, five verses are more than sufficient. As for those not willing to accept, the entire Qur’ān may be quoted and yet it will still be insufficient.

The Status of the Ṣaḥābah in ḥadīth

Take note of the following aḥādīth:

1. *عن عبد الله رضي الله عنه أن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم قال : خير الناس قرني ثم الذين يلونهم ثم الذين يلونهم*

‘Abd Allāh رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ narrates that the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ said: “The best people are those of my era, then those who are after them and then those who are after them.”²

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 13.

2 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, vol. 1, pg. 515; *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Muslim*, vol. 2, pg. 309.

2. عن عمر رضي الله عنه قال قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم أكرموا أصحابي فإنهم خياركم

‘Umar رضي الله عنه reported that the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم said: “Honour my Ṣaḥābah for certainly they are the best of you.”¹

3. و عن جابر رضي الله عنه عن النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم قال لا تمس النار من رأيي أو رأي من رأيي

Jābir رضي الله عنه narrated that the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم said: “The fire of Jahannam will not touch that Muslim who has seen me nor the one who has seen someone who has seen me.”²

4. عن أنس رضي الله عنه قال قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم مثل أصحابي في أمتي كالملح في الطعام لا يصلح الطعام الا بالملح

Anas رضي الله عنه reported that the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم said: “The likeness of my Ṣaḥābah in my Ummah is as the likeness of salt in food. Food is not delicious unless salt is added to it.”³

5. ... فمن أحبهم فبحبي أحبهم و من أبغضهم فببغضي أبغضهم

Whosoever loves my Ṣaḥābah, it is on account of his love for me, and whosoever has enmity for my Ṣaḥābah, it is on account of his enmity for me.⁴

1 *Mishkāt*, pg. 554.

2 *Tirmidhī*, vol. 2 pg. 231; *Mishkāt*, pg. 554.

3 *Mishkāt*, pg. 554.

4 *Tirmidhī*, vol. 2 pg. 225; *Mishkāt*, pg. 554.

Prohibition against maligning the Ṣaḥābah

Just as the aḥādīth expound the innumerable virtues of the Ṣaḥābah, so too has a prohibition been directed against maligning them. Consider the following narrations:

1.

اللّٰه الله في أصحابي، الله الله في أصحابي، لا تتخذوهم غرضا من بعدي

Fear Allah! Fear Allah, regarding my Ṣaḥābah! Fear Allah! Fear Allah, regarding my Ṣaḥābah! Do not make them a target of criticism after me.¹

2.

لا تسبوا أصحابي فلو أن أحدكم أنفق مثل أحد ذهباً ما بلغ مد أحدهم ولا نصيفه

Do not curse my Ṣaḥābah! If any of you were to spend the amount of gold equivalent to the mountain of Uḥud in charity, you would still not reach their reward of spending in charity of even a mudd², nor even half of it.³

3.

إذا رأيتم الذين يسبون أصحابي فقولوا لعنة الله على شركم

When you see those people who curse my Ṣaḥābah then say to them: “May the curse of Allah be upon the one who is the more evil between you.”⁴

Whilst explaining this narration my mentor, Mawlānā Yūsuf Ludhiyānwī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ، shared the following gems of knowledge, which are inspired only upon the hearts of the pious:

- a. The word “curse” in this narration does not merely mean using vulgar language but includes any word of scorn which may belittle the Ṣaḥābah in any way. From this it is understood that it is not permissible to malign or disrespect the Ṣaḥābah. A person who does so will be accursed and expelled from the mercy of Allah.

1 Ibid. vol. 2 pg. 225.

2 A measurement of volume equivalent to approximately 750ml.

3 Ṣaḥīḥ al-Muslim, vol. 2 pg. 310.

4 Tirmidhī, vol. 2 pg. 227; Mishkāṭ, pg. 554.

- b. Showing contempt towards the Ṣaḥābah causes pain to the blessed heart of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. This is clear from his statement: “Whosoever has caused harm to them has harmed me”. By causing grief to the blessed heart of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ there is a danger of the reward of good deeds being wiped away.

Allah says in the Noble Qur’ān:

أَنْ تَحْبَطَ أَعْمَالِكُمْ وَأَنْتُمْ لَا تَشْعُرُونَ

Lest your deeds will be wiped off while you do not know.

Thus, vilifying the Ṣaḥābah can very likely be a cause of losing one’s īmān.

- c. Defending the honour of the Ṣaḥābah and responding to the accusations levelled against them is a religious obligation.
- d. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ did not say that a detailed response should be given to each and every criticism against the Ṣaḥābah, as this will result in an endless process of answers and counter answers. However, the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said that an all-comprehensive and principled response should be given which is: “May the curse of Allah be upon the one who is the more evil between you.”
- e. There are two possible meanings of the phrase, “the more evil between you”. In this phrase, the word “evil” is connected to a personal pronoun (i.e. you) which would imply: “May the curse of Allah be upon your evil which is spread all over!” The second possible meaning would be that the word “evil” denotes a degree of intensity and comparison. This would imply that between yourselves and the Ṣaḥābah whosoever is more evil, may the curse of Allah be upon them. In this phrase, the Messenger of Allah ﷺ has made a subtle inference to those who vilify the Ṣaḥābah. Whosoever ponders over this will realise that the root of those who disregard the Ṣaḥābah has been severed. This much is clear that whatever the Ṣaḥābah may be, in essence they will always be better than you. You may be able to fly in the air, reach the sky, or live a hundred lives but you will never reach the status of the Ṣaḥābah. Where will you get such eyes that had seen the beautiful countenance of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ? Where will you get such ears that were honoured to hear the words of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ? Where will you get such hearts that were enlightened with

the effulgence of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ? Where will you get such minds that were inspired by the Messenger of Allah ﷺ? Where will you get such hands that touched the blessed skin of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ and it remained scented for the rest of their lives? Where will you get such feet that were blistered in going towards his blessed company? Where will you get such a place where the leader of the world was in authority? Where will you get such a gathering where the goblets of success of both worlds were being served? Where will you get such an environment where the sensation of ‘it is as if I am seeing Allah before me’ is always present? Where will you get such a gathering in which the ambiance was ‘as if though birds are perching on our heads’? Where will you get that fragrance of ambergris whose breeze scented the streets and alleys of Madīnah Munawwarah? Where will you get such love that prevented the lover from sleep just to glance at the beloved? Where will you get such īmān that lit up the entire world? Where will you get such actions that were carried out precisely according to the standard approved by the Messenger of Allah ﷺ? Where will you get such character that was beautified by emulating the example of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ? Where will you get such a colour that was toned in ‘the colour of Allah’? Where will you get such demeanour that inspired onlookers to emulate them? Where will you get such a salāh wherein the imām was the Imām of all the Ambiyā’ عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَامُ? How will you form such a congregation whose leader was the leader of all the Ambiyā’ عَلَيْهِمُ السَّلَامُ? You may revile the Ṣaḥābah a hundred thousand times, but look closely into your hearts and admit: Are you not worse than them? If they are deserving of scorn and rebuke, then are you not deserving of anger and curses? If you are just and have any trace of modesty, then search your soul and keep silent regarding the Ṣaḥābah.

‘Allāmah Ṭībī رحمه الله quotes a unique poem of Sayyidunā Ḥassān ibn Thābit رضي الله عنه and in the commentary of this narration mentions:

Do you revile the Messenger of Allah ﷺ when you are not equal to the Messenger of Allah ﷺ? May the worst among you two be sacrificed for the one who is better than you.

- f. It is also understood from this narration that one who reviles the Ṣaḥābah is proud, conceited, and vane. If anybody criticises the actions of another, he implies that the latter is inferior to him in relation to a particular trait. So if for instance, a person comments that a certain Ṣaḥābī did not fulfil the demands of

justice and equity, it would mean that if this person was in the same position as that Ṣaḥābī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, he would have fulfilled the requirements of justice in a better manner, as if though he had a higher calibre of fairness than that Ṣaḥābī. This is the evil of pride and the lewdness of the ego which drives one to revile the Ṣaḥābah. This evil requires reformation, which the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ hints at in this narration.

- g. The etiquette of engagement and debate is also explained in this narration. An opponent should not be directly addressed with the words “May you be cursed!” Instead it should be said to him: “May the one who is the worst between you be cursed!” This is such a neutral approach which all will concur with and there is no possibility for anyone disputing it. It still remains, who is referred to by the phrase “the one who is the more evil between you”? The critic? Or the one whom he is criticising? The answer to this is not difficult and keeping in mind the collective circumstances of each of the two, any simple minded person will be able to easily conclude whether the Ṣaḥābah are evil or the foolish critic?
- h. In this narration, the instruction is given to the Ummah to, “say to him”, which implies that the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ did not consider the critic of the Ṣaḥābah to be part of this Ummah. On the contrary, the critic is from an opposing faction to this Ummah. This is a severe warning to those who vilify the Ṣaḥābah, similar to other transgressions for which the admonition: “He is not from us” has been directed.
- i. It is also understood from this narration that in the same manner as the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was concerned with the honour of the injunctions of Islam, similarly he was concerned of protecting the honour of the Ṣaḥābah. The very foundation of Islam rests upon them. The narration also informs us that those who speak ill of the Ṣaḥābah are like those who have detracted from Islam. The Ummah has been given the instruction to rebuke such people. This subject matter is clearly mentioned in several other narrations as well:¹

May the curse of Allah, His Angels and all the people be upon whoever curses them (the Ṣaḥābah). Allah will not accept any good deed from him on the Day of Resurrection, be it compulsory or optional.²

1 *Bayyināt*, monthly periodical, Muḥarram 1390 A.H.

2 *Tafsīr al-Qurṭubī*, vol. 16 pg. 297-298.

The Ṣaḥābah in their own words

Sayyidunā Saʿīd ibn Zayd رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, one of the ten Ṣaḥābah who were given the glad tidings of Jannah, states:

والله لمشهد رجل منهم مع رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يغبر فيه وجهه فيه خير من
عمل أحدكم عمره ولو عمر عمر نوح

“By Allah! The short period of time any companion of the Messenger of Allah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ may have spent in his company on a battlefield through which his face may have been covered in dust, is more valuable than the life’s worship of any of you (a non-Ṣaḥābī), even if you be granted the lifespan of Nūḥ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ.”¹

Prohibition against maligning the Ṣaḥābah in light of ‘aqīdah

In addition to the discussion regarding this matter in the Noble Qur’ān and aḥādīth, the books of ‘aqīdah of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā’ah emphatically state that the Ṣaḥābah were upright and trustworthy, together with them being above any form of condemnation. Whoever maligns them, his īmān and Islam is questionable and such a person is deserving of punishment. All praise be to Allah, the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā’ah (whether they be from the Ḥanafī, Shāfi’ī, Mālikī or Ḥanbalī schools of thought) are all unanimous in their belief and there are no divergences among them.

We should take note of references from the books of ‘aqīdah of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā’ah, wherein prohibition against maligning the Ṣaḥābah is mentioned. Make these the principles of your life and at the same time be aware of the religious verdict regarding those who malign the Ṣaḥābah.

The treatise titled *Al-‘Aqīdah al-Ṭaḥāwīyyah* is a reliable work of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā’ah. In it Imām Abū Ja’far al-Ṭaḥāwī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ (d. 321 A.H) has concisely compiled the beliefs of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā’ah, in accordance with the methodology of the scholars of ḥadīth, as well as the statements of the three A’immah, Imām Abū Ḥanīfah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ (d. 150 A.H), Imām Abū Yūsuf رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ (d. 182 A.H) and Imām Muḥammad رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ (d. 189 A.H). All the followers of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā’ah have accepted

1 Abū Dāwūd, pg. 639; *Musnad Aḥmad*, vol. 1 pg. 187.

this exemplary compilation throughout the generations and it continues to be studied and taught throughout. Even in the present era, this treatise is taught in Saudi Arabia.

It is stated in this book:

و نحب أصحاب النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم و لا نفرط في حب أحد منهم ، و لا نتبرأ من أحد منهم ، و نبغض من يبغضهم و بغير الحق لا نذكرهم، نذكرهم الا بخير ، و حبهم دين و ايمان و احسان ، و بغضهم كفر و نفاق و طغيان ... الى قوله ... و من أحسن القول في أصحاب النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم و أزواجه و ذريارته فقد برئ من النفاق

“...and we love all the Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. We do not go to the extreme in our love for any one of them nor do we discard any of them. We abhor anyone who harbours hatred or speaks ill about them. We only refer to them with goodness. Love for them is part of religion, Islam, and piety. Hatred for them is tantamount to disbelief, hypocrisy, and evil... Whosoever speaks well of the Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, his wives and his family is free from hypocrisy.”¹

It is narrated from Imām Mālik رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 179 A.H):

و من شتم أصحابه ادب و قال أيضا من شتم واحدا من أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم ابا بكر او عمر او عثمان او معاوية او عمرو بن العاص فان كانوا في ضلال قتل و ان شتم بغير هذا من مشامة الناس نکالا شديدا

Whosoever reviles the Ṣaḥābah should be disciplined. Whosoever says that any of the Ṣaḥābah, whether it be Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ or ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, were misguided should be executed. Whosoever is vulgar against any of the Ṣaḥābah should be severely punished.²

Maymūnī reports that he heard Imām Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal رَحِمَهُ اللهُ say:

1 Al-‘Aqīdah al-Ṭaḥāwīyyah, pg. 11-12.

2 Rasā’il Ibn ‘Ābidīn al-Shāmī, vol. 1 pg. 358.

وقال الميموني سمعت احمد يقول : ما لهم و لمعاوية رضي الله عنه نسئل الله العافية
وقال يا ابا الحسن إذا رايت أحدا يذكر أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم بسوء
فاتهمه على الاسلام

What is wrong with people that they speak ill about Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه? We beseech Allah for ease!” Then he said: “O Abū al-Ḥasan! Whenever you see someone mentioning the Ṣaḥābah inappropriately, you should doubt his Islam.”¹

Imām Abū Zur‘ah al-Rāzī رحمه الله (d. 261 A.H) states:

إذا رايت الرجل يتقصص أحدا من أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم فأعلم أنه
زنديق

If you see a man condemning any of the Ṣaḥābah, you should know with certainty that he is a *zindīq* (renegade).²

Imām Abū Bakr al-Sarakhsī رحمه الله (d. 483 A.H) writes:

إن الله تعالى أثنى عليهم في غير موضع من كتاب كما قال تعالى ”محمد رسول الله و
الذين معه“ (الاية) و رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم وصفهم بأنهم خير الناس فقال
”خير الناس قرني الذين أنا فيهم“ و الشريعة انما بلغتنا بنقلهم ، فمن طعن فيهم فهو
ملحد منابذ للإسلام دواؤه السيف إن لم يتب

Certainly Allah has praised the Ṣaḥābah in several instances in the Noble Qur‘ān, for example: “Muḥammad صلى الله عليه وسلم is the Messenger of Allah...” The Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم has described them as the “best of people” in his statement: “The best people are those of the era in which I am.” The laws of Islam have reached us through their transmission, so whoever reviles them as being transgressors has turned against Islam. If he does not relent, the only cure for him is the sword.³

1 *Al-Sārim al-Maslūl*, pg. 573.

2 *Al-Iṣābah*, vol. 1 pg. 22.

3 *Uṣūl al-Sarakhsī*, vol. 2 pg. 134.

The Ṣaḥābah and Imām Abū Ḥanīfah

Imām Abū Ḥanīfah رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ (d. 150 A.H) states:

ولا نذكر الصحابة الا بخير

We only mention the Ṣaḥābah with goodness.¹

The Ṣaḥābah do not need accreditation

It is unanimous and undisputed that the Ṣaḥābah are upright and the most excellent of this Ummah. Their credibility does not need to be attested to by any person of this Ummah since Allah, who was All-Aware of their inner-selves, had confirmed their trustworthiness. Senior scholars have with great clarity discussed this matter in their books.

Ḥāfiẓ Abū Bakr Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ (d. 463 A.H) explains:

فلا يحتاج أحد منهم مع تعديل الله تعالى لهم ، المطلع على بواطنهم الى تعديل أحد
من الخلق

The Ṣaḥābah are not in need of anyone of the creation to declare their righteousness, when Allah who is aware of their inner-selves has already done so.²

Ibn al-Athīr al-Jazarī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ (d. 630 A.H) writes:

والصحابه يشاركون سائر الرواة في جميع ذلك الا في الجرح والتعديل فانهم كلهم
عدول لا يتطرق اليهم الجرح لأن الله عز وجل ورسوله زكاهم وعدلاهم وذلك
مشهور لا نحتاج لذكره

The Ṣaḥābah are similar to other narrators in all aspects except in their credibility, since all of them were reliable and credible. They cannot be criticised since Allah and the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ have declared their integrity. Their authenticity is well-known and needs no elaboration.³

1 *Sharḥ al-Fiqh al-Akbar*, pg. 85.

2 *Al-Kifāyah*, pg. 47; *Al-'Awāsīm min al-Qawāsīm*, pg. 34; *Al-Ṣawā'iq al-Muḥriqah*, pg. 210.

3 *Uṣd al-Ghābah*, vol. 1 pg. 14.

The famous historian, Ibn Khaldūn al-Maghribī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ (d. 808 A.H) states:

هذا هو الذي ينبغي أن تحمل عليه أفعال السلف من الصحابة و التابعين فهم خيار الأمة
و إذا جعلناهم عرضة القرح فمن الذي يختص بالعدالة و النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم
يقول خير الناس قرني ثم الذين يلونهم مرتين أو ثلاثا ثم يفسحوا الكذب فجعل الخيرة و
هي العدالة مختصة بالقرن الأول و الذي يليه فإياك أن تعود نفسك أو لسانك التعرض
لأحد منهم

It is only appropriate that the actions of our predecessors, the Ṣaḥābah and Tābīʿīn, are interpreted with goodness since they were the best of this Ummah. If we make them the target of criticism, then who will be distinguished with integrity? The Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ has stated: “The best people are those of my era, and then those who followed them. (He repeated it twice or thrice.) Then falsehood will become widespread.” The Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ attributed goodness to the first and second (or third) era, by this he implied their credibility. Beware of harbouring ill-feelings against any of them or uttering a word of scorn against them.¹

The probability of sin falls under divine wisdom

It is clear from the Noble Qurʾān, the aḥādīth and the sayings of the pious predecessors that the Ṣaḥābah earned the praise of Allah and the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. The revelation of Allah is abundant in describing their accomplishments and qualities and thus they are not in need of endorsement of their credibility from anyone. When they entered into the fold of Islam, their hearts were illuminated with the effulgence of revelation from Allah. By token of this, they had elevated to such a position of purity and integrity that they became a source of envy for the angels. If any rare misdeed was committed by them, which was almost non-existent, then too the Divine Wisdom of Allah played a role in this.

Imām Abū Ḥanīfah رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ (d. 150 A.H) says:

ما قاتل أحد عليًّا إلا و علي أولى بالحق منه ، و لولا ما سار علي فيهم ما علم أحد كيف
السيرة في المسلمين

¹ Muqadamah Ibn Khaldūn, pg. 218.

Nobody engaged in battle against ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ except that ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was closer to the truth in that regard. If ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ did not interact with them in such a manner then nobody would have known how to react in an instance when there is a clash between Muslims.¹

Mawlānā ‘Ashiq Ilāhī Mīrthī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ while discussing the life of Shāh ‘Abd al-Raḥīm Raipūrī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ in *Tadhkirat al-Khalīl* writes:

As per his usual habit, one day after ‘Asr salāh, he was sitting on a bedstead in the patio of the garden, surrounded on all sides by attendants and a large group of people, some of whom were seated on reed stools. At this instance, Rao Murād ‘Alī Khān brought up the subject of conflict between the Ṣaḥābah. People began expressing their opinions, someone said that so-and-so was wrong and so-and-so should not have acted in such a manner. When it reached this point, Haḍrat (referring to Shāh ‘Abd al-Raḥīm Raipūrī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ) became enraged and broke his silence in a trembling tone, saying: “O Rao! Listen to my few words. The Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ came to this world to inform the creation of all their necessities relating to their religion as well as to their worldly life that will arise until the Day of Resurrection. It is evident that he was granted a very short life span to pass on such a great message and to accomplish his role of informing the creation of every type of circumstance and eventuality that would arise. Through the outcome of these circumstances the world would learn how to conduct themselves in a particular situation.

In principle, no irrelevant incident occurred during the era of The Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. These occurrences were of two types. Firstly, there were those incidents which did not contradict the position of nubuwwah. Secondly, there were those that were in conflict with the prominent position of The Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. The Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ himself experienced the incidents which were from the first category, for example, marriage, having offspring, demise, burial, etc. Through all the incidents of happiness and sadness which The Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ experienced, the world learnt the lessons of how to behave in these situations. When a relative passes away, for example, which actions are appropriate and which are not. At the time of birth or marriage of someone or at any other joyous occasion, what is permissible and what contradicts the Sunnah.

1 *Manāqib Imām-e A‘zam*, vol. 2 pg. 83-84.

There were also those incidents which would be in conflict with the prominent position of The Messenger of Allah ﷺ. If they were to occur with The Messenger of Allah ﷺ himself (which they did not) then the position of The Messenger of Allah ﷺ would be undermined. For example, if adultery, stealing, etc., takes place, how should a penalty be executed, or if a conflict breaks out or an argument based on self-interests was to occur, how should reconciliation take place. It would be inappropriate if these occurrences were to happen to The Messenger of Allah ﷺ himself, while at the same time there was a need for them to occur.

The Ṣaḥābah presented themselves as servants of this dīn for this very reason. It was as if they agreed for such occurrences to happen to them, which were in conflict with the prominent position of The Messenger of Allah ﷺ. This was in order for the outcomes of these incidents to be defined so that Islam could reach its completion. Therefore all such things happened to the Ṣaḥābah which would serve as a means of guidance to all those to come after them until the Day of Resurrection. Through these events, every ordinary person would come to know how to act in such a scenario.

Are there any such courageous and devoted souls willing to endure every disgrace as honour, and defects as strength, together with bearing the brunt of criticism, solely for the completion of the religion of Muḥammad ﷺ? It is as if though their actions spoke out:

“Everybody desires fame, honour, and prominence, but ask a lover what is the sweetness of devotion and what is the enjoyment experienced in enduring disgrace along the path of the beloved.”

Such true lovers sacrificed their honour and self-respect for the sake of our guidance and reformation. Yet, after thirteen hundred years, we sit like commissioners over their tribunals to pass a judgement on them. We find fault with them and spoil our own destiny. What will we get out of this? If we cannot appreciate these gems of the Sunnah, then at the least we should keep our mouths silent from criticising them.

The Messenger of Allah ﷺ said: “Fear Allah! Fear Allah, regarding my Ṣaḥābah! Do not make them the target of criticism after me!”

For a long while he continued his speech in this vain, as if though petals were being sprinkled from his mouth and the listeners were being captivated by its scent.¹

At this point I would like to refer to another related matter, a few years ago while compiling my treatise on a comparative study between Islam and Shī'ism, in the course of perusing through various resources for and against Shī'ah doctrines, I came across references being made to a book by Naṣīr al-dīn Naṣīr Golrawī, entitled *Nām wa Nasab*. This occurred concurrently with my reading of another book entitled *Sunnī Mawqaf*, which is a compilation of the discourses of Mawlānā 'Alī Sher Haydarī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ. I was curious to find out who was this person who has written a book against Shī'ism entitled *Nām wa Nasab*.

After purchasing the book I realised that the contents of the book was not specifically against Shī'ism, but rather a response to the Shī'ah scholar, Najm al-Ḥasan Karārī, who made certain allegations against the lineage of Shaykh 'Abd al-Qādir al-Jilānī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ (d. 561 A.H). Only 119 pages in the eleventh chapter of the book was related to the subject, whilst the remainder (despite its volume) was unrelated to the discussion. The book comprises of a total of 946 pages excluding the pages with illustrations. While reading the book, I realised that the eighth chapter is specifically written against Shī'ism and in it I read the following passage:

Regrettably the beliefs of the Ahl al-Sunnah are being influenced by that of the Shī'ah and Khawārij. Some people of Ahl al-Sunnah have gone to such an extreme in opposing Shī'ah beliefs that they have become vulgar and impolite just as the Khawārij. While some Ahl al-Sunnah have become so obsessive in opposing the Khawārij that they have become impolite like the Shī'ah. This is because the Khawārij malign the Ahl al-Bayt while the Shī'ah malign the Ṣaḥābah. It is for this reason that in this book the corrupt beliefs and false perceptions of both have been strongly refuted. The Ahl al-Sunnah should desist from the beliefs of both the Khawārij and that of the Shī'ah, and adopt moderation in their love for the Ahl al-Bayt as well as for the Ṣaḥābah. Admiration for the one should not result in disregard for the other.²

1 *Tadhkirat al-Khalīl*, pg. 246-248.

2 *Nām wa Nasab*, pg. 427.

He mentioned further:

We calmly listen to an array of abusive statements by people. By Allah! We have not accorded our predecessors a more lower status than this, whose nobility is enshrined in the Noble Qur'ān and the Sunnah within the limits and boundaries prescribed by the principles of Islam. The Ambiyā' of Allah are after all the Ambiyā', but still we should perceive ourselves to be the slaves of the Ṣaḥābah, which most of the pious awliyā' openly did in their discourses. We have never taken any Ṣaḥābī or pious saint to be infallible. It is a unanimous fact that only the Ambiyā' are infallible; however, the Ahl al-Bayt, the Ṣaḥābah, and other pious persons of this Ummah are at times guarded against sin. The difference between infallibility and being guarded against sin is well-known to people of knowledge. I appeal to those Muslim brethren who have not adopted the beliefs of the Ahl al-Sunnah to choose the methodology of the Ahl al-Sunnah. A Sunnī is not someone who merely adopts certain beliefs of the Ahl al-Sunnah but rather adheres to all its beliefs, and inclusive in the beliefs of the Ahl al-Sunnah is respecting the Ahl al-Bayt and honouring the Ṣaḥābah. Detesting the Ahl al-Bayt is tantamount to the beliefs of the Khawārij and hatred for the Ṣaḥābah is Shī'ism. Admiration for the Ahl al-Bayt, respect for the Ṣaḥābah and reverence for the pious is part of Ahl al-Sunnah. Pondering over these statements, one will realise that the Khawārij have taken to the Ṣaḥābah but abandoned the Ahl al-Bayt. The Shī'ah have accepted the Ahl al-Bayt and have rejected the Ṣaḥābah. The refuters of taqlīd and the Wahhābī have mostly taken to the Ṣaḥābah and significantly left out the Ahl al-Bayt. Together with this, they have consciously disregarded and denigrated the pious servants of Allah. Those who espouse the beliefs of the Ahl al-Sunnah, whether Chishtī, Nizāmī, Qādrī, Suharwardī or Naqshbandī, all have kissed the feet of these devout souls and have afforded them their due respect.

In the approach of the Ahl al-Sunnah one will find respect for the pious and for the Imāms, reverence for the Ṣaḥābah as well as admiration for the family of 'Alī عليه السلام and Fāṭimah عليها السلام. Fellow brothers in faith! Adopt the approach of the Ahl al-Sunnah. This approach has been transmitted to us, it is rational and is acceptable in the court of truth (Allah).¹

He continues:

1 Ibid. pg. 445.

In the world of Islam, the Ṣaḥābah are granted the highest esteem and this extraordinary reverence for them is on account of the honour of being the close companions of The Messenger of Allah ﷺ. Honouring them is in reality honouring the leader of the worlds, The Messenger of Allah ﷺ.¹

Honourable readers! Reading the words of Naṣīr al-Dīn brings us great joy since it seems that he has stood clear from any extremities and has composed his thoughts regarding the Ahl al-Bayt and Ṣaḥābah in his book. This positive perception of him did not remain for long as his claims of refuting Shī'ism and the beliefs of the Khawārij proved to be nothing more than empty. While at one instance he makes the following supplication:

O Allah! Grant us abundant love and admiration for both, the Ahl al-Bayt and the Ṣaḥābah. Whatever was the rank of any particular Ṣaḥābī in the eyes of The Messenger of Allah ﷺ, grant us that level of admiration for that Ṣaḥābī. This is Islam. This is obedience. This is īmān.²

What he went on to write clearly contradicted this supplication.

The Messenger of Allah ﷺ himself prevented the Ṣaḥābah from relating to him any complaint or grievance concerning another Ṣaḥābī. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ said:

لا يبلغني أحد من أصحابي عن أحد شيئاً فإني أحب أن أخرج إليكم سليم الصدر

None of you should complain to me regarding any companion of mine. I would like to come out to meet you with a clear heart (conscience).³

This was the instruction given to the Ṣaḥābah. Furthermore, The Messenger of Allah ﷺ advised the ummah:

الله الله في أصحابي الله الله في أصحابي لا تتخذوهم غرضاً من بعدي

Fear Allah! Fear Allah, regarding my Ṣaḥābah! Fear Allah! Fear Allah, regarding my Ṣaḥābah! Do not make them the target of criticism after me.⁴

1 Ibid. pg. 470.

2 *Nām wa Nasab*, pg. 519.

3 *Tirmidhī*, vol. 2 pg. 252; *Abū Dāwūd*, vol. 2 pg. 311.

4 *Tirmidhī*, vol. 2 pg. 225.

As for the pious predecessors, Imām Abū Ḥanīfah رحمته الله (d. 150 A.H), whom Allah had blessed with such traits which were an embodiment of the grandeur and dignity of Islam, had witnessed the final years of the era of the Ṣaḥābah. Not only did he have a deep insight into the lives of these esteemed souls, but he was also blessed with their company. It was through his efforts that Islamic Jurisprudence was first consolidated. He was the appropriate purport of the ḥadīth which signified glad tidings for the person who would even go to the stars in search of knowledge.¹

Concerning the differences which arose among the Ṣaḥābah, Imām Abū Ḥanīfah رحمته الله made a very profound, concise, sensible and wise statement.

Imām Shams al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn Yūsuf al-Ṣāliḥi al-Dimashqī al-Shāfi‘ī (d. 947 A.H) writes:

سئل أبو حنيفة عن علي و معاوية و قتلى صفين ، فقال أخاف أن أقدم على الله تعالى بشيء يسألني عنه ، و إذا أقامني يوم القيامة بين يديه لا يسألني عن شيء من أمورهم ، يسألني عما كلفني ، فالإشتغال بذلك أولى

Somebody asked Imām Abū Ḥanīfah رحمته الله concerning ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and those who were slain in the Battle of Ṣiffīn. Imām Abū Ḥanīfah رحمته الله answered: “I fear to make such an utterance before Allah regarding which I will be questioned about. When Allah makes me stand before Him on the Day of Resurrection, He will not question me concerning these people (i.e. ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه) and those who were slain in the Battle of Ṣiffīn. However, Allah will question me regarding those aspects which I am responsible for. It is more appropriate for me to be preoccupied in preparation for those things.²

Muḥammad ibn Naḍra said regarding ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz رحمته الله:

قال (محمد بن النضر) ذكروا اختلاف أصحاب محمد صلى الله عليه و سلم عند عمر بن عبد العزيز فقال : أمر أخرج الله أيديكم منه ما تعلمون ألسنتكم فيه؟

In the presence of ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz رحمته الله, the differences which arose among the Ṣaḥābah were mentioned. He said: “It is a matter which Allah has shielded your hands from, so what do your tongues know about it?”³

1 Ḥāfiẓ al-Suyūṭī: *Tabyīd al-Ṣaḥīfah*, pg. 20.

2 ‘Uqūd al-Jamān, pg. 305.

3 *Ṭabqāt Ibn Sa’d*, vol. 5 pg. 297.

He is also reported to have said:

تلك دماء كف الله يدي عنها و انا أكره أن أغمس لساني فيها

This is such blood which Allah has protected my hands from, so I dislike that I should soil my tongue with it.¹

Imām Shāfi'ī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ states:

تلك دماء طهر الله عنها أيدينا فلنظهر عنها ألسنتنا

Allah has kept our hands pure from such blood (which was spilt in the Battles of Şiffīn and Jamal), so we should also keep our tongues clean from it as well.²

Ibrāhīm al-Nakha'ī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 95 A.H) states:

تلك دماء طهر الله أيدينا منها افنلطنخ ألسنتنا

That is such blood with Allah has kept our hands clean from, are we going to now pollute our tongues with it?³

Ḥasan al-Baṣrī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 110 A.H) says:

قتال شهده أصحاب محمد صلى الله عليه وسلم و غبنا ، و علموا و جهلنا ، و اجتمعوا فاتبعنا ، و اختلفوا فوقفنا

These were battles that the Şaḥābah engaged in and we were not present. They were fully aware of all the circumstances relating to them and we are ignorant of that. We follow the Şaḥābah in whichever matter they were unanimous. We adopt silence concerning any matters about which they disputed.⁴

It is for these reasons that our predecessors did not allow any unnecessary discussion regarding the disputes of the Şaḥābah. However, certain 'enlightened' minds have chosen to ignore the instruction of The Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and

1 Ibid. vol. 5 pg. 307.

2 *Sharḥ al-Mawāqif*, vol. 8 pg. 374; *Maktūbāt Imām-e Rabbānī*, letter: 251.

3 *Al-Nāhiyah*, pg. 6.

4 Imām al-Qurṭubī: *Jāmi' al-Aḥkām al-Qur'ān*, vol. 16 pg. 1322.

the teachings of the pious predecessors, by bare footedly stepping into the complex and intricate realm of the differences which arose among the Ṣaḥābah.

The author of *Nām wa Nasab*, through his own conjecture, in the process of admiration and defending the Ahl al-Bayt has grossly denigrated and attacked the honour of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. Whereas Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, whom the author passionately admires, has instructed:

لا تقولوا إلا خيرا

Do not utter anything but good (regarding Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and his companions).¹

It seems that the author has to a large extent forgotten the principle that love demands obedience. It is therefore obligatory upon one who claims to love Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ to also obey him. A poet says:

لو كان حبك صادقا لاطعته إن المحب لمن يحب مطيع

If your love was true, then you would obey your beloved; since a lover is always obedient to the beloved.

The author of *Nām wa Nasab* has in no way fallen short with his tongue or pen in emphasising to follow the pious predecessors, honour the Ṣaḥābah and love the family of The Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. With regards to his practice, it does not make any sense why he did not heed his own advice. Why are the standards of give and take different?

The manner in which Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is denigrated, under the guise of refuting the Nawāṣib, reveals the level of which one has become tainted in the hue of the Shī‘ah and their clamour. The only difference is that when the Shī‘ah object to Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ they only refer to him as “Mu‘āwiyah”, while the critics, who conceal themselves under the label of the Ahl al-Sunnah, refer to him as “Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ”.

The greatest sorrow is that while the author of *Nām wa Nasab* has considered the accusations made upon the lineage of Shaykh ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Jilānī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ to go

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah*, vol. 3 pg. 61.

against his religious allegiance and loyalty to his spiritual affiliation, he does not show the same regard for Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. After five years of continuous effort he prepared a refutation to those allegations in a dissertation of 946 pages. We have no objection to this in the least nor does it harm us — if he had not reviled a Ṣaḥābī of The Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. In fact every Muslim, including us, would have appreciated his effort and commended him. Conversely, in this book the author has dedicated an entire chapter in which he has criticised and maligned Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.

In reality, Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was a Ṣaḥābī while Shaykh ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Jilānī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was a saint, and no matter how lofty the status of sainthood may be, it cannot equate to a fraction of the status of being a Ṣaḥābī.

Shaykh Mujaddid Alf-e Thānī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ (d. 1024 A.H) states:

و فضيلة الصحبة فوق جميع الفضائل و الكمالات و لهذا لم يبلغ اويس القرني الذي هو
خير التابعين مرتبة ادنى من صحبه عليه الصلاة و السلام فلا تعدل بفضيلة الصحبة شيئا
كائنا ما كان فان ايمانهم ببركة الصحبة و نزول الوحي يصير شهوديا

The excellence of the companionship of The Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ supersedes all other virtues and accomplishments. It is for this reason that Uways al-Qarnī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, who was the highest ranking Tābi‘ī, cannot reach the status of the lowest ranking Ṣaḥābī. Do not equate anything whatsoever to the status of the companionship of The Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Their īmān was on account of the blessings of their companionship with The Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. As a result of them witnessing the revelation descending they became eye-witnesses.¹

Ibn Ḥajar al-Makkī (d. 944 A.H) mentions:

ان فضيلة صحبته صلى الله عليه وسلم و رؤيته لا يعدلها شيء

The companionship and sight of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ cannot be equated to anything.²

1 *Maktūbāt Imām-e Rabbānī*, letter: 59.

2 *Al-Ṣawā‘iq al-Muḥriqah*, pg. 213.

Shāh ‘Abd al-Quddūs Ghanghohī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ (d. 944 A.H) says:

It is part of our belief that a person who is not a Ṣaḥābī, even though he may achieve a lofty rank in sainthood and is endowed with great powers and bounties, will still not reach the status of the Ṣaḥābah. The excellence of the companionship of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ is an all-inclusive virtue, whilst sainthood is a partial virtue. A partial virtue can never be equal to an all-inclusive virtue.¹

‘Allāmah Khālīd Maḥmūd states:

It is the belief of the Ahl al-Sunnah that being a Ṣaḥābī is an honour in its own right that is not based upon any academic excellence or achievement. Be it the knowledge, piety or achievement of the likes of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah, Imām Mālīk, Junayd al-Baghdādī or Bāyazīd al-Bustāmī, it cannot equate to the status of the companionship of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.²

Yet some will consider extolling the innocence of a saint as a means of salvation while deriding a Ṣaḥābī of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ is deemed acceptable. Is this called honouring the Ṣaḥābah?

Shaykh ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Jilānī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ (d. 561 A.H) states regarding Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ:

If I were to sit in the pathway of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and the dust from the hoof of the horse of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ were to fall upon me, I would consider this as a means of my salvation.³

Similarly, Shaykh ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Jilānī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ states the following regarding the differences which arose between the Ṣaḥābah:

و اما قتاله رضي الله عنه لطلحة و الزبير و عائشة و معاوية رضي الله عنهم فقد نص الإمام أحمد رحمه الله على الإمساك عن ذلك و جميع ما شجر بينهم من منازعة و

1 *Maktūbāt-e Qudsiyyah*, pg. 50.

2 *Mi‘yār-e Ṣaḥābiyyāt*, pg. 27.

3 *Imdād al-Fatāwā*, vol. 4 pg. 133.

منافرة و خصومة ، كما قال عز و جل : وَنَزَعْنَا مَا فِي صُدُورِهِمْ مِّنْ غَلٍ إِخْوَانًا عَلَى سُرُرٍ مُّتَقَابِلِينَ

With reference to ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ engaging in battle against Ṭalḥah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, Zubayr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, ‘Ā’ishah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا and Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ; Imām Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ has stated: “It is better to remain silent regarding all the conflicts, arguments and altercations which occurred between the Ṣaḥābah. On the Day of Resurrection, Allah will free them from all these differences which occurred between them, as Allah states: “*And We shall remove from their breasts any deep feeling of bitterness (that they may have). (They will be like) brothers facing each other on thrones.*”¹

Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is that Ṣaḥābī concerning whom Shaykh ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Jilānī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ expressed such sentiments that he considered the dust from the horse of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to suffice for his good fortune and salvation. Shaykh ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Jilānī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ even prevented the discussion regarding the differences among the Ṣaḥābah.

Presently, some foolish people malign Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ even after noting the advice of Shaykh ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Jilānī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ concerning him. This is despite them claiming to have intense love for Shaykh ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Jilānī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. They are not perturbed at branding Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ an innovator. How then can they hope that their writings would please Shaykh ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Jilānī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ?

Shaykh ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Jilānī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would recite the following couplet at the end of his supplication:

و من يترك الآثار قد ضل سعيه و هل يترك الآثار من كان مسلما

Whosoever detracts from the footsteps of the pious predecessors, his efforts are wasted. Is it possible for a Muslim to stray from the footsteps of the pious predecessors?²

The author of *Nām wa Nasab* has not presented any newfound research in this chapter, rather he has pilfered the earlier criticisms from the books of other likeminded role

1 *Ghunyat al-Ṭālibīn*, pg. 77.

2 *Qalā'id al-Jawāhir fī Manāqib ‘Abd al-Qādir*, pg. 41.

models of his such as Mawdūdī and the Shī'ah. The senior scholars of Islam have long ago concluded the responses to these criticisms.

The Ṣaḥābah are described in ḥadīth as the “stars of guidance and righteousness” and the Ahl al-Bayt as the “ark of salvation and success”. In light of what the Messenger of Allah ﷺ has said, the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah consider admiration for the Ṣaḥābah and for the Ahl al-Bayt to be indispensable of each other.

The Ahl al-Sunnah are convinced that whoever distances himself from the ark of the Ahl al-Bayt will be drowned in the sea of misguidance. Similarly, whoever embarks on the ark of the Ahl al-Bayt but is deprived of the light of guidance from the stars of the Ṣaḥābah, he too will drown in the ocean of misguidance. There is darkness in the ocean and the glow of the stars serve as a means of guidance for the traveller.

In his commentary of *Mishkāt* entitled, *Mirqāt*, Mullā 'Alī Qārī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ (d. 1040 A.H) has quoted this statement of Imām Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ (d. 606 A.H), which is the mark of distinction of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah:

نحن معاشر اهل السنة بحمد الله تعالى ركبنا سفينة محبة اهل البيت و اهتدينا بنجم
هدى اصحاب النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم فخرجوا النجاة من احوال القيامة و دركات
الجحيم و الهداية الى ما يوجب درجات الجنان و النعيم المقيم

All praise is due to Allah, we the Ahl al-Sunnah have boarded the ark of love for the Ahl al-Bayt and we are guided by the stars of guidance which are the Ṣaḥābah. Thus, we are hopeful of attaining salvation from the terrors of the Day of Resurrection and from the trenches of the fire. We are hopeful of attaining that guidance which will make us deserving of the stages of Jannah and everlasting favours.¹

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Taymiyyah رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ (d. 728 A.H) writes:

و أما اهل السنة فيتولون جميع المؤمنين ، و يتكلمون بعلم و عدل ، ليسوا من اهل
الجهل و لا من اهل الالهواء و يتبرؤن من طريقة الروافض و النواصب جميعا و يتولون

¹ *Mirqāt al-Mafātih*, vol. 10 pg. 553.

السابقين و الأولين كلهم و يعرفون قدر الصحابة و فضلهم و مناقبهم و يراعون حقوق
اهل البيت شرعها الله لهم

The Ahl al-Sunnah befriend all the believers and they speak on the strength of knowledge and justice. They are not from among the ignorant, nor are they from among those who follow their whims. They are exonerated from the paths of both, the Rawāfiḍ and the Nawāṣib. They have a high regard for all the predecessors and acknowledge the lofty position, honour and virtue of the Ṣaḥābah. Together with all of this, they consider it necessary to fulfil the rights of the Ahl al-Bayt, as has been established from the Sharī'ah.¹

The spiritual mentor of this humble servant, Mawlānā Yūsuf Ludhiyānwī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ (d. 1421 A.H) said:

I consider it an important component of īmān to have admiration and respect for all the Ahl al-Bayt and Ṣaḥābah. I regard the slightest disrespect shown to any of them as a sign of depravation of īmān, even if it be it in the semblance of inferring. This is my conviction and I would like to be presented in the court of Allah with this conviction.²

It is worth writing the statements of Imām al-Rāzī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ, Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Taymiyyah رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ and Mawlānā Yūsuf Ludhiyānwī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ in gold. In this day and age when maligning the pious predecessors has become common place, these statements will serve as a guide for forthcoming generations. May Allah grant us death in such a state while we still hold fast to these beliefs and actions.

I would like to mention another aspect which requires thought. Namely, whenever such allegations are refuted with various references, the following assertion is made:

These are all fictitious fables and poisonous spurts that have been plagiarized from the books of the Khawārij that no rational person will accept.³

Why was the same principle not kept in mind when objections against a companion of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ were raised? Why do such critics never say:

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah*, vol. 1 pg. 165.

2 *Ikhtilāf-e Ummah awr Ṣirāt-e Mustaqīm*, pg. 24.

3 *Nām wa Nasab*, pg. 537.

These are all fabricated tales and poisonous spurts that have been plagiarized from the books of the Shī'ah that no rational person will accept.

Why are double-standards adopted between the Ṣaḥābah and the Ahl al-Bayt? A poet says:

He sits in stringent seclusion behinds screens; but he is not properly concealed nor does he make an appearance.

It is extremely crucial to rely upon reputable sources, specifically with regards to Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. There are two reasons for this:

1. A great deal of propaganda against Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ had taken root in his era already. Once someone asked Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ: “Why is it that you have aged so quickly?”, and he responded:

كيف لا ولا ازال ارى رجلا من العرب قائما على رأسي يلحق لي كلاما ما يلزمني جوابه
، فإن اصبت لم احمد و إن أخطأت سارت بها البرود

Why should it not be so when there is still an Arab man constantly standing upon my head who fabricates such things for which I am compelled to answer? If I do anything correctly nobody acknowledges it, and if I err then the news travels everywhere?¹

2. The Abbasid khilāfah began after the Umayyad khilāfah in the year 132 A.H (749 CE). Its founder was Abū al-'Abbās al-Ṣaffāḥ. He and his successors overthrew the Umayyad khilāfah, and made the Banū Umayyah a particular target for their enmity. They even went to the extent of excavating the graves of several leaders of the Banū Umayyah and selectively assassinated many children of the Umayyad rulers and their supporters. The well-known Abbasid khalīfah, Ma'mūn al-Rashīd made a declaration:

برئت الذمة ممن ذكر معاوية بخير

We cannot be held responsible for anyone who speaks favourably of Mu'āwiyah.²

1 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 140.

2 *Duwal al-Islām*, vol. 1 pg. 129.

The Shī'ah historian, Mas'ūdī, has written about this aspect in his book, *Murūj al-Dhahab*:

و في سنته اثنتى عشرة و مائتين نادى منادى المأمون : برئت الذمة من احد من الناس
ذكر معاوية بخير او قدمه (على احد) من اصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم

In the year 212 A.H, the spokesperson of Ma'mūn announced: "The government is not responsible for any person who mentions Mu'āwiyah with praise or considers him superior in rank to any other Ṣaḥābī.¹

This was a period in Islamic history wherein the classical sciences of Islamic learning were being consolidated and documented. One can imagine how challenging the task must have been for the historians to accurately document the attributes and characteristics of Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ for Islam and the Muslims in this atmosphere. However, there were a few exceptions. The famous Mawlānā Shāh Mu'īn al-Dīn Nadwī writes:

The Abbasid khilāfah was formed while they were still arch enemies of the Banū Umayyah. The objections raised against the Banū Umayyah in the era of Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ continued to gain momentum throughout the reign of the Abbasids. Rather, the uproar became even louder and by then the Abbasid khilāfah had expanded from the East to the West. The accusations against Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ had thus spread from one end to the other end of the Muslim Empire. This era was marked by the onset of the compilation of Islamic History and many fabricated narrations, which were in circulation on the tongues of people for a long time, made their way into historical records. Since it was the onset of the documenting of history, it was challenging to put in place processes of verification whereby authentic narrations could be distinguished from fabricated. Through the process of verification many narrations were later excluded which had absolutely no basis and were evidently absurd. Nevertheless, numerous other incorrect incidents still became part of history.²

The author of *Al-'Awāsim min al-Qawāsim*, Muḥibb al-Dīn Al-Khaṭīb رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ (d. 1390 A.H), who is a well-known researcher states:

1 *Murūj al-Dhahab*, vol. 4 pg. 40.

2 *Siyar al-Ṣaḥābah*, vol. 6 pg. 93-94.

ان التاريخ الاسلامي لم يبدأ تدوينه الا بعد زوال بني أمية و قيام دول لا يسر رجالها التحدث بمفاخر ذلك الماضي و محاسن اهله . فتولى تدوين تاريخ الاسلام ثلاث طوائف : طائفة كانت تشد العيش و الجدة من التقرب الى مبغض بني امية بما تكتبه و تؤلفه

The documentation of Islamic history began in the period after the fall of the Umayyad khilāfah and upon the onset of that dynasty whose leaders were not satisfied with the accomplishments of the past and the integrity of their custodians. The compilation of Islamic history was done by three categories of people. Firstly, there were those whose obsession was animosity and hostility towards the Banū Umayyah, together with finding fault at their achievements in order to win favour with their enemies; namely the Abbasid rulers.¹

It is worth noting the observation of Mawlānā ‘Abd al-Shakūr Lakhnawī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 1383 A.H), whereby he concisely and aptly categorised the critics of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ into three groups:

The people who harbour ill-feelings against Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ are of three kinds: The first are the Rawāfiḍ whose rancour is not surprising. They harbour malice for such noble personages who cannot be compared to anyone in the Ummah. The second group are the ignorant mystics who consider it the epitome of admiration for ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ to speak ill about Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. These people consider themselves as Sunnī but in reality they contradict the Ahl al-Sunnah in this as well as many other matters, be it principled or specific. This often renders them to be part of the Shī‘ah sect. The third group are some of the Zāhirī supporters of today. At times they do peruse through narrations which may criticise Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. However, due to their literal approach to text, their minds do not delve into the appropriate interpretations of it. The most harmful are the second group who are the ignorant mystics.²

After this preliminary discussion, we now focus on providing refutations to the self-conjectured accusations raised against Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.

و الأمر بيد الله تعالى و هو الموفق

1 Al-‘Awāsīm min al-Qawāsīm, Footnote no. 177.

2 Izālat al-Khafā, vol. 1 pg. 571.

The matter is in the hands of Allah and He grants the ability (to do good).

Lastly, before we begin our discussion, I would like to say:

Do not hasten in proving your integrity; look into your lap, look into your fastened coat.

Khumār Barā Bankwī has said:

If you criticise others; first place a mirror in front of yourself.

The accusation of Banū Umayyah being the most hated tribe

In an effort to belittle and malign Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, some Orientalists quote certain ‘aḥādīth’ which disparage the entire tribe of Banū Umayyah and Yazīd ibn Mu‘āwiyah. For example:

اهل بيتي سيلقون بعدي من امتي قتلا وتشديدا وان أشد قومنا لنا بغضا بنو أمية وبنو
مخزوم . رواه الحاكم

My household will face killing and severe conditions and the Banū Umayyah and Banū Makhzūm will hate us the most.¹

Since the following narration has been reported in *Mustadrak al-Ḥākim*, they accentuate upon the point that the following narration has been reported by a ‘Sunnī’ and not a Shī‘ah, the reality of which we will clarify shortly.

It is appropriate that we give the reply to this objection in terms of *riwāyah* (narration) and *dirāyah* (explanation), through which the reality of this narration— which asserts that the Banū Umayyah were the most abhorred tribe— will be clarified. Thereafter it will beg the question, can such a narration be accepted? It should not be that those who quote such a narration are the epitome of the authentic ḥadīth:

He who wilfully attributes a lie to me, should prepare for his abode in the Hell-fire.²

Furthermore, does it not contradict historical fact and simple logic? After understanding both these spheres, no objection will remain, Allah willing.

The point has been emphasized that the person who has transmitted it is not a Shī‘ah but rather a pure Sunnī. However, as much as it may be emphasised, the reality is, regrettably so, that the author of the book (Abū ‘Abd Allāh al-Ḥākim al-Naysābūrī) from which this narration was taken (namely *Mustadrak al-Ḥākim*), was a Shī‘ah. If you are not convinced by this then study *Lisān al-Mizān* which states:

1 *Nām wa Nasab*, pg. 512.

2 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, vol. 1 pg. 21.

هو شيعي مشهور

He is a famous Shī'ah.¹

Ḥāfiẓ al-Dhahabī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ (d. 748 A.H) comments on al-Ḥākīm under one narration:

قلت قبح الله رافضيا افتراه

I say: may Allah destroy the Rāfiḍī who fabricated it.²

In addition, the renowned Shī'ī works scrutinising (Shī'ī) narrators; *A'yān al-Shī'ah*³ and *Al-Kunā wa l-Alqāb*⁴ includes a biography of al-Ḥākīm.

Clarification

At this point, we feel it necessary to clarify that it is not sufficient to refute a narration only on the basis of its narrator being termed a Shī'ah. Since according to the terminology of the early and latter day scholars, the definition of being Shī'ah differs.⁵ Therefore, a narrator labelled as a Shī'ah by the earlier scholars should not be considered in light of the definitions of the latter day scholars.

Al-Ḥākīm was undoubtedly a Shī'ah. However, from his era until today, the scholars of ḥadīth have accepted his narrations. It should also be noted that all the narrations of *Mustadrak al-Ḥākīm* are not of the same level but various types of narrations can be found in it. Therefore, according to the scholars of ḥadīth, only those narrations of Al-Ḥākīm will be accepted that have been verified by Ḥāfiẓ al-Dhahabī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ in his *Talkhīs al-Mustadrak*. This has been stated by Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīz Muḥaddith Dehlawī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ (d. 1239 A.H):

It is for this reason that the scholars of ḥadīth have explained that we should not rely on the *Mustadrak* of Al-Ḥākīm without the *Talkhīs* of Al-Dhahabī.⁶

1 *Lisān al-Mīzān*, vol. 5 pg. 233.

2 *Mustadrak al-Ḥākīm*, vol. 3 pg. 32, the person responsible for fabricating it is Faḍl ibn Muḥammad.

3 *A'yān al-Shī'ah*, vol. 9 pg. 391.

4 *Al-Kunā wa l-Alqāb*, vol. 2 pg. 170.

5 *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*, vol. 1 pg. 118, 119.

6 *Bustān al-Muḥaddithīn*, pg. 113.

We have clarified this in order to expose the inaccuracy of such claims that the person who has transmitted it is not a Shī'ah but a pure Sunnī.

Now, study the chain of narration as reported in *Mustadrak al-Hākim*. The chain of narration is as follows:

اخبرني محمد بن المؤمل بن الحسن حدثنا الفضل حدثنا نعيم بن حماد ثنا الوليد بن مسلم عن ابي رافع اسماعيل بن رافع عن ابي نضرة قال قال ابو سعيد الخدري قال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ان اهل بيتي سيلقون... الخ هذا حديث صحيح الاسناد ولم يخرجاه . مستدرک حاکم ، کتاب الفتن والملاحم

Ḥāfiẓ al-Dhahabī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ writes regarding this ḥadīth:

لا والله ليس بصحيح كيف واسماعيل متروك ثم لم يصح السند اليه . أيضا

By Allah, this narration is not *ṣaḥīḥ* (authentic), how can it be *ṣaḥīḥ* when Ismā'īl is *matrūk* (discarded). Moreover, the chain of narration until Ismā'īl is also not *ṣaḥīḥ*.¹

We have mentioned above, with reference from Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīz رَحِمَهُ اللهُ that only those narrations of *Mustadrak* will be accepted that have been verified by Ḥāfiẓ al-Dhahabī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ. In this case, Ḥāfiẓ al-Dhahabī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ takes an oath in the name of Allah and announces that this narration is not *ṣaḥīḥ*.

Now, let us examine the other narrators:

The chain of narrators has al-Faḍl ibn Muḥammad al-Sha'rānī. The ḥadīth scholar Al-Qiṭbānī says that he is a *Kadhāb* (a great liar). *Mīzān al-I'tidāl* states that he is an extremist Shī'ah.²

How then can the narration of an extremist Shī'ah be accepted? How incorrect is the claim that this has been reported by a pure Sunnī.

Nu'aym ibn Ḥammād is in the chain of narration. There is a difference of opinion regarding his reliability and weakness. Ibn Ma'īn رَحِمَهُ اللهُ says that he is nothing in

1 Ibid.

2 *Mīzān al-I'tidāl*, vol. 3 pg. 358.

ḥadīth. Abū Dāwūd رحمه الله says that he narrated twenty aḥādīth from the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم that have no basis. (It is possible that this is one of them, author). Imām Nasā'ī رحمه الله says that he is weak. Nu'aym ibn Ḥammād would fabricate narrations in order to give strength to the Sunnah and he used to fabricate incidents about Imām Abū Ḥanīfah رحمه الله in order to belittle him. All these were false.¹

The false narrations that this enemy of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah رحمه الله fabricated to slander the illustrious Imām should serve as sufficient proof against him. How can any decent follower of the Ahl al-Sunnah accept it?²

Walīd ibn Muslim is also a narrator in this chain of narration. He is a Mudallis³.

Abū Mushīr رحمه الله says that he even omits narrators who lie. Ḥāfiẓ al-Dhahabī رحمه الله says that when he narrates using the words “عن” then his ḥadīth cannot be relied upon.⁴

Despite all these flaws, if this narration is still deemed ṣaḥīḥ, then no narration in the world can be regarded as weak or even fabricated?

Similarly, Al-Ḥākim reports another narration in his *Mustadrak* from Sayyidunā Abū Barzah al-Aslamī رضي الله عنه:

كان ابغض الاحياء الى رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم بنو امية و بنو حنيفة و ثقيف

1 *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*, vol. 8 pg. 526, 530.

2 The famous Ahl al-Ḥadīth scholar, Ibrāhīm Mīr Siyālkotī, states after mentioning the criticism of Nu'aym ibn Ḥammād with reference to *Mīzān al-I'tidāl*, *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb* and *Nihāyat al-Su'ul*:

The summary is that Nu'aym is such a personality that a great luminary like Imam Abū Ḥanīfah cannot be censured based on his narrations. A critic of narrators like Ḥāfiẓ Shams al-Dīn al-Dhahabī mentions him (Imam Abū Ḥanīfah) with honourable titles. (*Tārīkh Ahl al-Ḥadīth*, pg. 45)

It should be noted that a scholar of the Ahl al-Ḥadīth does not accept the narrations of Nu'aym ibn Ḥammād in criticism of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah رحمه الله, yet some are willing to declare the entire tribe of Banū Umayyah (which includes personalities such as 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān رضي الله عنه and 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz رحمه الله) as abhorred and detested.

3 One who conceals or omits the person he has narrated from.

4 *Mīzān al-I'tidāl*, vol. 4 pg. 347.

The most hated of tribes to the Messenger of Allah ﷺ were the Banū Umayyah, Banū Ḥanīfah and Banū Thaḳīf.

Whereas Imām Aḥmad ibn Ḥanbal رَحِمَهُ اللهُ has transmitted all the narrations of Sayyidunā Abū Barzah al-Aslamī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ in his *Musnad*, but when reporting the above quoted narration, there was no mention of Banū Umayyah. Only the Banū Ḥanīfah and Banū Thaḳīf were mentioned.¹

Who is responsible for adding Banū Umayyah to this narration?

Even if we were to accept these narrations as ṣaḥīḥ, then too it can never mean that every person and every individual of these tribes are disliked and wretched. Similarly, having an affinity to a certain tribe or city can never mean that every person of that city or tribe is deemed beloved. The Quraysh tribe was the most beloved tribe to the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, and Makkah Mukarramah and Madīnah Munawwarah were the most beloved cities to him. However, the Messenger of Allah ﷺ did not love Abū Lahab, Abū Jahal, and others like them, even though they were from the Quraysh and lived in Makkah Mukarramah. In a similar manner, the Jews and hypocrites lived in Madīnah Munawwarah but the Messenger of Allah ﷺ disliked them.

Ibn Ḥajar al-Makkī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 974 A.H) has written:

أن هذا الاستنتاج أعنى قول المعترض فهو الخ دليل على جهل مستنجه وأنه لا دراية له بمبادئ العلوم، فضلا عن غوامضها، لأنه يلزم على هذه النتيجة لو سلمت أن عثمان وعمر بن عبد العزيز كليهما لا أهلية فيهما للخلافة وأنهما من الأشرار، وذلك خرق لإجماع المسلمين، والحاد في الدين... فبطلت تلك النتيجة وبأن أن قائلها جاهل أو معاند فلا يرفع إليه رأس ولا يقال له وزن ولا يعاب بما يلقيه ولا يعتد بما يديه لقصور فهمه وتحقق كذبه ووهمه

The answer is that drawing a conclusion from this ḥadīth regarding Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ in reality reveals the ignorance of those who draw such a conclusion. It also indicates that he does not have understanding of the primary sciences, let alone the intricate aspects of knowledge. This is because this conclusion

¹ *Musnad Aḥmad*, vol. 4 pg. 428.

necessitates that ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ were not worthy of khilāfah. Also, may Allah save us, that they were from the evil ones. This is contrary to the consensus of the Muslims and is clear heresy. Therefore, this conclusion is baseless and the person who utters it is either ignorant or stubborn. His words need no attention because his understanding is deficient and his falsehood established.¹

Dirāyah (explanation)

After having scrutinised the chain of narration, we wish to add that if the Banū Umayyah were such an abhorred tribe, then why did the Banū Hāshim have so many associations with them; in terms of marriage and other ways as well? Why were they given such a high and grand position? Hereunder, a few marital relations as well as non-marital associations between the Banū Umayyah and the Banū Hāshim will be mentioned.

Marital relations

1. The Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ married his daughter Sayyidah Ruqayyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا to Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān al-Umawī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.²
2. After the demise of Sayyidah Ruqayyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ married his other daughter, Sayyidah Ummī Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا, to Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.³
3. The sister of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, Sayyidah Ummī Ḥabībah bint Abī Sufyān al-Umawī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهَا was married to the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.⁴
4. The maternal grandmother of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was the paternal aunt of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Her name was Ummī Ḥakīm al-Bayḍā’ bint ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib ibn Hāshim ibn ‘Abd al-Manāf.⁵

1 *Taṭhīr al-Jinān*, pg. 30, 31.

2 *Usd al-Ghābah*, vol. 3 pg. 607.

3 *Ṭabqāt Ibn Sa‘d*, vol. 8 pg. 30, 31.

4 *Ibid.* vol. 8 pg. 77.

5 *Mustadrak al-Ḥākīm*, vol. 3 pg. 96.

5. The lineage of the mother and father of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, in sequence, meets with that of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ at the sixth and fifth generation.¹
6. Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ were married to sisters: Umm al-Mu‘minīn Ummī Salamah’s رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا sister, Qarībah al-Sughrā was married to Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.²
7. Sayyidunā Ja‘far al-Ṭayyār ibn Abī Ṭālib’s رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ granddaughter, Ummī Kulthūm رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا, was married to the son of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.³
8. The daughter of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Sayyidah Sakīnah bint Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا, was married to the grandson of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Zayd ibn ‘Amr ibn ‘Uthmān.⁴
9. The daughter of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Sayyidah Fāṭimah bint Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا, was married to the grandson of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Amr ibn ‘Uthmān.⁵
10. The granddaughter of Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Sayyidah Ummī Qāsim bint Ḥasan ibn Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا, was married to the grandson of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Marwān ibn Abān ibn ‘Uthmān.⁶
11. Hind bint Abī Sufyān al-Umawī was married to Ḥārith ibn Naufal ibn ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib, from the children of Sayyidunā ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.⁷
12. The son of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, ‘Alī ibn Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib’s maternal grandmother is Maymūnah bint Abī Sufyān ibn Ḥarb al-Umawī.

1 *Murūj al-Dhahab*, vol. 2 pg. 341.

2 *Al-Muḥbir*, pg. 102.

3 Ibn Qutaybah: *Al-Ma‘ārif*, pg. 90.

4 *Ṭabqāt Ibn Sa‘d*, vol. 8 pg. 347.

5 *Ibid.* pg. 346.

6 *Jamharat al-Ansāb al-‘Arab*, vol. 1 pg. 85.

7 *Al-Iṣābah*, vol. 8 pg. 345.

In other words, the mother-in-law of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is Maymūnah bint Abī Sufyān al-Umawī. This is the maternal grandmother of ‘Alī al-Akbar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, the martyr of Karbalā’.¹

13. The granddaughter of Sayyidunā ‘Abbās ibn ‘Abd al-Muṭṭalib رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, the beloved uncle of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, Lubābah bint ‘Ubayd Allāh ibn ‘Abbās was married to the grandson of Abū Sufyān al-Umawī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, Walīd ibn Utbah ibn Abī Sufyān.²
14. The nephew of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah al-Umawī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, Abū al-Qāsim ibn Walīd ibn Utbah ibn Abī Sufyān was married to the granddaughter of Sayyidunā Ja‘far al-Ṭayyār رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, Ramlah bint Muḥammad ibn Ja‘far ibn Abī Ṭālib.³
15. The granddaughter of Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, Sayyidah Nafisah bint Zayd ibn Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib was married to the nephew of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah al-Umawī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, Walīd ibn ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān ibn Ḥakam ibn Abī l-‘Āṣ ibn Umayyah.⁴
16. The daughter of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, Sayyidah Ramlah bint ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib was married to the son of Marwān, Mu‘āwiyah ibn Marwān ibn Ḥakam ibn Abī l-‘Āṣ ibn Umayyah.⁵
17. The granddaughter of Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, Sayyidah Zaynab bint Ḥasan ibn Ḥasan ibn Abī Ṭālib was married to the grandson of Marwān, Walīd ibn ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Marwān.⁶
18. The brother of Marwān al-Umawī, Ismā‘īl ibn ‘Abd al-Malik ibn Ḥārith ibn Ḥakam ibn Abī l-‘Āṣ ibn Umayyah, was married to the granddaughter of Sayyidunā Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, Khadījah bint Ḥusayn ibn Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib.⁷

1 *Nasab Quraysh*, pg. 57.

2 *Al-Muḥbir*, pg. 441.

3 *Al-Muḥbir*, pg. 441.

4 *Ṭabqāt Ibn Sa‘d*, vol. 5 pg. 234.

5 *Nasab Quraysh*, pg. 45.

6 *Nasab Quraysh*, pg. 52.

7 *Ibid.* pg. 171.

19. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ said: “Even if I had forty daughters , I would have married them off to ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, turn by turn.”¹

Can such strong bonds of lineage and family relation exist with a tribe one considers to be the most detestable?

Non-marital associations and virtues

1. Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān al-Umawī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was a scribe of revelation.
2. Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was the third rightful khalīfah.
3. On account of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ 1400 Ṣaḥābah earned the pleasure of Allah.
4. Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ could not participate in the Battle of Badr because of attending to his wife, Sayyidah Ruqayyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا, yet the Messenger of Allah ﷺ counted him amongst the participants and gave him a share of the booty.²
5. On the occasion of the Battle of Tabūk, Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ gave abundant wealth for the preparation of the army and the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said:

ما ضر عثمان ما عمل بعد هذا اليوم

No deed will harm ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ (al-Umawī) after this day.³

6. On the occasion of the treaty of Ḥudaybiyyah, the Messenger of Allah ﷺ sent ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ as his ambassador to Makkah Mukarramah.⁴
7. On this occasion, the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said that his hand is the hand of ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.⁵

1 *Usd al-Ghābah*, vol. 3 pg. 376.

2 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, vol. 1 pg. 522.

3 *Mustadrak al-Ḥākim*, vol. 3 pg. 102.

4 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, vol. 1 pg. 523.

5 *Ibid.*

8. On the occasion of the conquest of Makkah Mukarramah, the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said that the house of Abū Sufyān al-Umawī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is a place of safety.¹
9. During the Battle of Ḥunayn, when the non-Muslim prisoners needed to be guarded, the Messenger of Allah ﷺ appointed Abū Sufyān al-Umawī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ to guard over them.²
10. When Najrān was conquered, the Messenger of Allah ﷺ appointed Abū Sufyān al-Umawī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ the officer in charge of charities, the governor and leader.³
11. When the Banū Thaqīf accepted Islam, the Messenger of Allah ﷺ sent Mughīrah ibn Shu‘bah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and Abū Sufyān al-Umawī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ to destroy their idols.⁴
12. Yazīd ibn Abī Sufyān al-Umawī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was a scribe of revelation.⁵
13. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ appointed Sayyidunā Yazīd ibn Abī Sufyān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ as the governor of Tīmā’.⁶
14. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ appointed Sayyidunā Yazīd ibn Abī Sufyān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ as the officer in charge of charities over the tribe of Banū Firās.⁷
15. The delegations that came to meet the Messenger of Allah ﷺ and his guests would stay at the home of Sayyidunā Yazīd ibn Abī Sufyān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.⁸
16. Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was a scribe of revelation.⁹

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Muslim*, vol. 2 pg. 104.

2 *Muṣannaḥ ‘Abd al-Razzāq*, vol. 5 pg. 381.

3 *Sunan al-Dār Quṭnī*, vol. 4 pg. 16.

4 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. 5 pg. 30-33.

5 *Jawāmi‘ al-Sīrah*, pg. 26.

6 *Al-Muḥbir*, pg. 126.

7 *Al-Iṣābah*, vol. 6 pg. 516.

8 *Ṭabqāt Ibn Sa‘d*, vol. 7 pg. 149.

9 *Jawāmi‘ al-Sīrah*, pg. 47.

17. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ sent Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ to stipulate the land portions.¹
18. Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ had the honour of cutting the hair of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ.
19. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ appointed Sayyidunā ‘Attāb ibn Usayd al-Umawī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ as the governor of Makkah Mukarramah.
20. Sayyidunā Khālīd ibn Sa‘īd al-Umawī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was appointed over the charities of Banū Madh-ḥaj in the era of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ and the governor of San‘ā and Yemen.
21. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ first appointed Sayyidunā Abān ibn Sa‘īd ibn al-‘Āṣ al-Umawī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ as governor of Surāyā and then later over Bahrain.²
22. ‘Uthmān ibn Abī l-‘Āṣ was appointed governor over Ṭā’if and surrounding areas.³

I shall suffice on these twenty-two references and ask: why was the most detested and abhorred tribe to the Messenger of Allah ﷺ awarded such positions of authority by him? For the sake of brevity, we have deliberately omitted their services and positions during the khilāfah of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. Ibn Taymiyyah says:

وكان بنو امية اكثر القبائل عمالا للنبي صلى الله عليه وسلم

The majority of the governors appointed by the Messenger of Allah ﷺ were from the Banū Umayyah.⁴

Qāḍī Abū Bakr ibn al-‘Arabī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ writes:

1 Imām Bukhārī: *al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr*, vol. 4 pg. 175.

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah*, vol. 3 pg. 175, 176.

3 *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*, vol. 5 pg. 491.

4 *Minhāj al-Sunnah*, vol. 2 pg. 145.

وعجبا لاستكبار الناس ولاية بني امية ، واول من عقدهم الولاية رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم

It is astonishing to note that people raise their noses regarding the rule of the Banū Umayyah, whereas the first person that appointed them to leadership was the Messenger of Allah ﷺ.¹

Ibn Taymiyyah رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ writes:

أن بني امية كان رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم يستعملهم في حياته واستعملهم من بعده من لا يتهم بقرباة فيهم أبو بكر الصديق رضي الله عنه وعمر رضي الله عنه

During his life, the Messenger of Allah ﷺ appointed the Banū Umayyah as governors, and after him, Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ appointed them to high positions and they were not accused of having any family links to the Banū Umayyah.²

The famous historian, Mawlānā Shāh Mu‘īn al-Dīn Nadwī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ، writes in tribute to the Banū Umayyah:

The Banū Umayyah were men in the battlefield, the conquests of the era of ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ testify to this. The first to traverse the Roman seas were the Banū Umayyah, the Banū Umayyah were those who conquered Africa, and it was the Banū Umayyah who knocked at the door of Europe. The Banū Umayyah did not go forward because Amīr Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was their family, but they went forward because they were masters of the sword and men of the battlefield. This is the reason why those conquests that took place in the era of the Banū Umayyah could not be seen thereafter in history.³

Respected reader, together with the proofs, you have studied the links between the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, and the Banū Umayyah. How did the Messenger of Allah ﷺ deal with the Banū Hāshim? Read what Ḥakīm Maḥmūd Aḥmad Ṣafar has to say:

1 Al-‘Awāsīm min al-Qawāsīm, pg. 234.

2 Minhāj al-Sunnah, vol. 3 pg. 175.

3 Siyar al-Ṣahābah, vol. 6 pg. 127.

On the contrary, during his life, the Messenger of Allah ﷺ did not appoint any Hāshimī to rule over any province, he did not appoint any of them to commanding positions in the army. During the last days of his life, the Messenger of Allah ﷺ appointed ‘Alī رضي الله عنه as a collector in Yemen for a short while. However, the highest leadership position was given to Abū Mūsā al-Ash‘arī رضي الله عنه and Mu‘ādh ibn Jabal رضي الله عنه.¹

Furthermore, study the entire history of the era of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ and you will not find even one governor that was linked to the Banū Hāshim by blood. In fact, some of the Banū Hāshim had made apparent their desire to be appointed to positions of leadership but the Messenger of Allah ﷺ did not accept. This is the very reason why during the last few days of the Messenger of Allah’s ﷺ life in this world, Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه said to Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه:

O ‘Alī! By Allah, after three days, there will be another ruler over you and you will be his subject. By Allah, I feel that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ will pass away in this illness. Therefore, it is best that we find out from the Messenger of Allah ﷺ who will be the khalīfah after him. If it is from us, then we will know, otherwise he will make a bequest in our favour.

Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه replied:

It is possible that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ will refuse us and we will then be deprived forever. By Allah, I shall not say a single word regarding this to him.²

In essence, during the era of risālah, it was mostly the Banū Umayyah who held positions as governors and not a single individual among the Banū Hāshim was made a governor, whereas the uncle of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, Sayyidunā ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه and his cousin, Sayyidunā ‘Aqīl ibn Abī Ṭālib رضي الله عنه, as well as Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and many more were present. The governmental positions are but one matter; the Messenger of Allah ﷺ left Madīnah Munawwarah on twenty-eight occasions for battle but not on a single occasion did he appoint a deputy from the

1 *Ḥilyat al-Awliyā’*, vol. 1 pg. 354; *Madārij al-nubuwwah* pg. 502; *Zurqānī* vol. 3 pg. 99; *Musnad Aḥmad* vol. 5 pg. 235.

2 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, *Musnad Aḥmad*, *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*.

Banū Hāshim. In fact, he sometimes appointed a deputy from the Banū Umayyah and sometimes an Anṣārī of Madīnah. He sometimes appointed a Makhzūmī as well, sometimes even a Kalbī or Ghifārī. On the occasion of the battle of Tabūk, the Messenger of Allah ﷺ appointed Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه as his deputy but he was not the deputy and governor of Madīnah Munawwarah, instead he was left behind to look after the families. The deputy in Madīnah Munawwarah on that occasion was Muḥammad ibn Maslamah al-Anṣārī رضي الله عنه.¹

Now that the position of the Banū Umayyah has been clarified through narration and explanation, and the historical inaccuracy revealed; we mention a few statements of the Muḥaddithīn that discusses the status of these types of narrations. Ibn Qayyim رحمه الله (d. 751 A.H) writes:

ومن ذلك الاحاديث في ذم معاوية رضي الله عنه وكل حديث في ذمه فهو كذب وكل
حديث في ذم بني امية فهو كذب

From among the fabricated narrations are the aḥādīth that belittle Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and every ḥadīth that denounces him is a lie and every ḥadīth that belittles the Banū Umayyah is also a lie.²

Mullā ‘Alī Qārī al-Ḥanafī رحمه الله (d. 1014 A.H) says:

ومن ذلك الاحاديث في ذم معاوية... و ذم بني امية

From among these fabricated narrations are the ones that vilify Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and the Banū Umayyah.³

Sayyidunā ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā and the Banū Umayyah

Study the following statements of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه in praise of the Banū Umayyah:

عن ابن سيرين قال قال رجل لعلي أخبرني عن قريش قال ارزننا احلاما اخوتنا بني امية

1 *Ṭabqāt Ibn Sa‘d*, vol. 1 pg. 119.

2 *Al-Manār al-Munīf*, pg. 110.

3 *Al-Mawdhū‘āt*, pg. 106.

It is narrated from Ibn Sīrīn that a person said to ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ: “Tell me about the Quraysh.” ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ replied: “In terms of forbearance, our brothers, the Banū Umayyah, are ahead.”

He is also reported to have said:

فقال وأما بنو امية فقادة ، أدبة ذادة

And the Banū Umayyah are leaders, they are generous and they support and defend.¹

Summary of the Discussion

In brief, the statements and deeds of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ clarify that the Banū Umayyah are an accepted, supportive, virtuous and loved tribe. The narrations that state that the Banū Umayyah are detested and disliked are not *ṣaḥīḥ* according to the Muḥaddithīn. Now, to those who persist in saying that the Banū Umayyah are a hated and rejected tribe, relying upon these fabricated narrations, we say:

From a detailed study, a person that has a balanced nature and intelligence will be able to gauge the status of the Banū Umayyah. If some doubt still arises, whilst we have not said anything of our own opinion, then for those who look at the Banū Umayyah with the eyes of hatred, we supplicate earnestly for their guidance.²

1 *Ibid.* vol. 11 pg. 57.

2 *Nām wa Nasab*, pg. 555.

Allegations of not holding any virtue

The critics of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ make much ado about the statement of Ishāq ibn Rāhawayh رَحِمَهُ اللهُ regarding the virtues narrated about Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. In light of this, they conclude that nothing ‘ṣaḥīḥ’ has been narrated from the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ regarding the virtue of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.

Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ, commentator of *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, writes:

The following has been narrated from Ishāq ibn Rāhawayh:

لم يصح في فضائل معاوية شيء

There are no ṣaḥīḥ narrations proving the virtues of Mu‘āwiyah.

It has been reported that Imām Nasā’ī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ also concurred with this and Ḥāfiẓ al-Suyūṭī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ as well.¹

Clearing the misconception

With reference to the virtues of the Ahl al-Bayt, and showing love and affection towards them; the Ahl al-Sunnah have never held divergent opinions regarding them and always considered loving and honouring them to be a central tenet of our belief. Love for the Ahl al-Bayt has always been a sense of pride and considered a means of salvation by the followers of the Ahl al-Sunnah. The books of the Ahl al-Sunnah are replete with chapters solely dedicated to the virtues of the Ahl al-Bayt; ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا, Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. All praise beings to Allah, this view is the aggregate of what is to be contained in both the Qur’ān and Sunnah, as well as what is to be found in the teachings of the Ṣaḥābah.

The Grand Muftī of Pakistan, Muftī Muḥammad Shafi‘ رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 1979 CE) said:

Loving and respecting the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ more than anyone is part and parcel of īmān; rather it is the very foundation thereof. This implies that those who hold any familial ties to him are also deserving of the same respect and love. Therefore, the stronger the relationship one had with him, the stronger our relationship with them shall be. Undoubtedly, biological relations

¹ *Nām wa Nasab*, pg. 514-515.

hold the closest social bonds between human beings, thus love and respect for them too will be part of *īmān*. However, this should not negate the fact that the blessed wives of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ and other select *Ṣaḥābah* held a multiple-level relationship with him.

In short, the issue of loving the Ahl al-Bayt has never been subject to differences of opinion amongst the Ummah. In fact, there remains *Ijmā'* (consensus of opinion) that love and reverence for them is a necessity of *īmān*. Opinions have been at variance when attempts were made to malign other notable people, but the Ahl al-Bayt, irrespective of how far their genealogy may be from the Messenger of Allah ﷺ; love and veneration towards them is a way of earning eternal salvation and bliss.¹

As for the attempts at proving that Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ holds no virtue by way of the above-mentioned quotes, despite the fact that it may represent the sentiments of a small minority of scholars, in no way is it supported by the majority of scholars, or any authentic traditions of a *Ṣaḥābī*, *Tābi'ī* or the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. It is highly possible that the authentic narrations did not reach that minority. A Muḥaddith not knowing a certain *aḥādīth* does not necessitate its non-existence. Aḥmad Yār Khān Gujarātī remarked:

A Muḥaddith not having knowledge of a certain *ḥadīth* does not necessitate the non-existence of that *ḥadīth*.²

The provenance of such claims is not something unprecedented, many people from the early days held dissentious opinions with regards to Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. The 'Anti-Mu'āwiyah' camp would lay preposterous claims, all in the name of defending and loving Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. The claims of these pseudo-followers of Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ can never be used to justify their so-called 'love' for him; the 'ulamā have answered any such doubts which may have arisen.

Does the lack of authenticity give credibility to such claims?

Another factor worthy of mentioning: If a narration is not authentic, does that automatically imply that it is a fabrication? The simple answer is no. Whoever

1 *Ma'ārif al-Qur'ān*, vol. 7 pg. 683-686.

2 *Amīr Mu'āwiyah par I'tirāzāt wa Jawābāt* No. 12, vol. 2 pg. 89.

disagrees is simply unacquainted with the classification of the Muḥaddithīn. The following is a list of quotations from various ‘ulamā, reiterating the aforementioned fact.

Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 852 A.H) says:

لا يلزم من كون الحديث لم يصح أن يكون موضوعا

If it is said about a ḥadīth: “It is not ṣaḥīḥ”, it does not necessarily imply that it is a fabrication.¹

‘Allāmah ‘Abd al-Bāqī al-Zurqānī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 1122 A.H) says:

نفية الصحة لا ينافي انه حسن كما علم

A ḥadīth which is not ṣaḥīḥ does not negate the possibility of it being ḥasan (reliable), as is known (by the scholars).²

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-Humām رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 861 A.H) is reported to have said:

و قول من يقول في حديث انه لم يصح ان سلم لم يقدح لان الحجة لا تتوقف على
الصحة بل الحسن كاف

If the statement of someone who says: “It is not ṣaḥīḥ” is accepted, it does not detract from the normative nature of the ḥadīth. Ḥasan aḥādīth are admissible in Sharī‘ah and do not necessarily have to be ṣaḥīḥ.³

‘Allāmah Nūr al-Dīn al-Samhūdī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 911 A.H) states in *Jawāhir al-‘Aqdayn fi Faḍl al-Sharafayn*:

قد يكون غير صحيحو هو صالح للاحتجاج به اذ الحسن رتبته بين الصحيح و الضعيف

Sometimes a narration which is not ṣaḥīḥ may be admissible for formulating law because it has the potential to be ḥasan, which is a level of authenticity between ṣaḥīḥ and *ḍa‘īf* (weak).⁴

1 *Al-Qawl al-Musaddad*, pg. 89.

2 *Sharḥ al-Zurqānī ‘alā al-Mawāhib*, vol. 5 pg. 55.

3 *Mirqāt al-Mafātīḥ*, vol. 3 pg. 88.

4 *Al-Raf wa al-Takmīl*, pg. 196.

Ibn Ḥajar al-Makkī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ (d. 964 A.H), while commenting on Imām Aḥmad’s statement, said:

قول أحمد إنه لا يصح أى لذاته فلا ينفي كونه حسنا لغيره و الحسن لغيره يحتاج به كما
بين في علم الحديث

The statement of Imām Aḥmad: “This is not ṣaḥīḥ”, does not negate the possibility of the ḥadīth being *ḥasan li ghayrihī* (reliable due to other reasons). As it is known amongst the ḥadīth scholars, such aḥādīth are admissible in Sharīah.¹

‘Allāmah ‘Abd al-Ḥayy al-Lakhnawī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ (d. 1304 A.H) writes:

كثيرا ما يقولون : لا يصح و لا يثبت هذا الحديث و يظن منه من لا علم له أنه موضوع أو
ضعيف و هو مبني على جهله بمصطلحاتهم و عدم و قوفه على مصطلحاتهم

Many a time you will find them (ḥadīth scholars) saying: “This ḥadīth is not ṣaḥīḥ” or “This ḥadīth has not been established”, and a person who has no knowledge of the classification and sciences of ḥadīth will assume the ḥadīth to be ḍa‘īf or even *mawḍū‘* (fabricated).²

Aḥmad Raḍā Khān (d. 1341 A.H) writes:

If a scholar of ḥadīth says: “This ḥadīth is not ṣaḥīḥ”, it does not mean that it is completely invalid and baseless. Rather the term ṣaḥīḥ, according to the Muḥaddithīn, refers to a high-level of authenticity, the conditions of which are many and rigorous at the same time. To find all of those conditions together is somewhat rare, and even if they are to be found then to establish such conditions requires stringent testing. Explaining such a process will require quite a bit of detail, suffice it to say that whenever the Muḥaddithīn find a ḥadīth lacking a certain condition, they will not classify it as ṣaḥīḥ. In other words, the narration has not reached such a high level of authenticity whereby we can classify it as ṣaḥīḥ. However, it will fall under another category— slightly below— called ḥasan, which by its very name indicates towards something

1 *Al-Ṣawā‘iq al-Muḥriqah*, pg. 185.

2 *Al-Raf‘ wa al-Takmīl*, pg. 191.

positive and not negative. A ḥasan narration simply possesses the same qualities of a ṣaḥīḥ narration but at a slightly lesser degree. There are hundreds of these narrations to be found in the six authentic books of ḥadīth, including *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Muslim* and *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*. Such narrations are deemed admissible for formulating law (Iḥtijāj) and as such, ‘ulamā who may not necessarily classify them as authentic still use them in rulings related to ḥalāl and ḥarām.¹

A few pages later, Aḥmad Raḍā Khān speaks about Pīr Naṣīr and others of the same thought, where he says:

Some ignoramuses say that there are no authentic narrations to prove the virtue of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه. This is purely a result of their intellectual immaturity. The ḥadīth scholars speak using specific terminology! Allah alone knows where and how these ignoramuses misconstrue their words. Assuming the narrations are not ṣaḥīḥ then they are at least ḥasan. In fact, ḍa‘īf aḥādīth are also admissible in this regard (for the purposes of faḍā’il al-A‘māl).²

In another place, he also writes:

(لا يصح) لا ينفي وجود الحسن

The term: “This narration is not ṣaḥīḥ”, does not negate the possibility of it being ḥasan.³

Proving that a ḥasan ḥadīth is admissible in Islamic legislation, Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī رحمه الله writes:

هذا القسم من الحسن مشارك لا صحيح في الاحتجاج به وان كان دونه

This type of ḥasan ḥadīth, although lower in strength when compared to a ṣaḥīḥ ḥadīth, is equal in strength when formulating law.⁴

Aḥmad Yār Khān Gujarātī (d. 1391 A.H) writes:

1 *Mizān al-‘Ayn*, pg. 21.

2 *Ibid.* pg. 53.

3 *Fatāwā Riḍwiyyah*, vol. 1 pg. 26.

4 *Nuzhat al-Nadhar fī Tawdhīḥ Nukhbat al-Fiqr*, pg. 33.

A narration which is not authentic does not imply that the narration is automatically deemed ḍaʿīf. This is because a narration can be ḥasan, a category between ṣaḥīḥ and ḍaʿīf. As long as a narration is at least ḥasan in strength, it is sufficient.¹

All of the above-mentioned quotations prove that even though some people in the past may have laid such claims against Sayyidunā Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ (because of statements regarding the narrations not being ṣaḥīḥ), this does not necessarily take them out of the domain of ḥasan narrations. This needs to be understood in light of how the scholars of ḥadīth have explained the meaning of Ishāq ibn Rāhawayh’s رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ statement.

Therefore both Ibn al-ʿAsākir رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ (d. 571 A.H) and Ibn al-Kathīr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ (d. 774 A.H) explained as follows:

كتب الى ابو نصر القشيري انا ابو بكر البيهقي انا ابو عبد الله الحافظ قال سمعت ابا العباس الاصم قال سمعت ابي يقول سمعت اسحاق بن ابراهيم الحنظلي يقول لا يصح عن النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم في فضل معاوية بن ابي سفيان شيء و أصح ما روى في فضل معاوية حديث ابي حمزة عن ابن عباس ” أنه كان كاتب النبي “ فقد اخرج مسلم في صحيحه و بعده حديث العرياض : ” اللهم علمه الكتاب “ و بعده حديث ابن ابي عميرة : اللهم اجعله هاديا مهديا

Ishāq ibn Rāhawayh رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ says: “There are no ṣaḥīḥ reports from the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ indicating towards any merits of Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. The most authentic narration that reveals the virtues of Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is the narration of Abū Ḥamzah from Ibn ʿAbbās رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ that Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ used to be the scribe of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Imām Muslim رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ narrates this ḥadīth in his Ṣaḥīḥ. The next (most authentic) narration is the narration of al-ʿIrbād رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ that the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ said: “O Allah! Teach him (Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ) the Book (Qur’an).” The final narration is from Ibn Abī ʿUmayrah that the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ said: “O Allah! Grant him (Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ) guidance and let him be a guidance for others.”²

1 Jāʿa al-Ḥaqq, pg. 350.

2 Tārīkh Madīnah wa Dimashq, vol. 21 pg. 193; Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah, vol. 8 pg. 122.

Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 911 A.H) has a similar statement:

وقال السيوطي الشافعي أصح ما ورد في فضل معاوية حديث ابن عباس ”أنه كاتب النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم“ فقد اخرجته مسلم في صحيحه و بعده حديث العرباض رضي الله عنه :”اللهم علمه الكتاب“ و بعده حديث ابن ابي عميرة : ” اللهم اجعله هاديا مهديا ”

The most authentic narrations that reveal the virtues of Mu‘āwiyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ is the narration of Abū Ḥamzah from Ibn ‘Abbās رَحِمَهُ اللهُ: “Mu‘āwiyah used to be the scribe of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.” Imām Muslim رَحِمَهُ اللهُ narrates this ḥadīth in his *Ṣaḥīḥ*. The next (most authentic) narration is the narration of Al-‘Irbād رَحِمَهُ اللهُ that the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ said: “O Allah! Teach him (Mu‘āwiyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ) the Book (Qur’an).” The final narration is from Ibn Abī ‘Umayrah that the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ said: “O Allah! Grant him (Mu‘āwiyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ) guidance and let him be a guidance for others.”¹

Ibn Ḥajar al-Makkī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 974 A.H) says:

قيل عبر البخارى بقوله باب ذكر معاوية و لم يقبل فضائله و لا مناقبه لأنه لم يصح في فضائله شيء كما قاله ابن راهويه و ذلك أن تقول : ان كان المراد من هذه العبارة أنه لم يصح منها شيء على وفق شرط البخارى فأكثر الصحابة كذلك اذا لم يصح شيء عنها ، و ان لم يعتبر ذلك القيد فلا يضره ذلك لما يأتي ان من فضائله ما حديثه حسن حتى عند الترمذي كما صرح به جامعه و ستعلمه مما يأتي . و الحديث الحسن لذاته كما هنا حجة إجماعا بل الضعيف في المناقب حجة أيضا ، و حينئذ فما ذكره ابن راهويه بقدير صحته لا يخذش في فضائل معاوية

It has been said that when Imām Bukhārī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ began mentioning the details of Mu‘āwiyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ, he did so under the heading: “The Chapter Concerning Mu‘āwiyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ”, instead of saying: “The Chapter Concerning the Virtues of Mu‘āwiyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ” because Ishāq ibn Rāhawayh رَحِمَهُ اللهُ said there are no ṣaḥīḥ narrations substantiating his virtue. If what is meant by the statement: “There are no ṣaḥīḥ narrations concerning the virtues of Mu‘āwiyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ”, implies that there are no ṣaḥīḥ narrations according to the conditions of Imām Bukhārī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ concerning the virtues of Mu‘āwiyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ then most of the Ṣaḥābah would be

1 *Tanzīḥ al-Sharīah*, vol. 2 pg. 8.

in a similar situation as Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. And if the conditions of Imām Bukhārī are not implied then the statement would be superfluous because there are indeed narrations, which are ḥasan according to Imām Tirmidhī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ (as can be found in his *Jāmi‘*) proving the virtues of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. And as you will come to know, a narration which is innately ḥasan can be used as proof (in order to formulate laws of Sharī‘ah). In fact ḍa‘īf narrations are also considered a valid form of proof for *faḍā’il* (virtues). For that reason, whatever was stated by Ishāq ibn Rāhawayh, assuming it to be true, will not have a negative impact on the virtues of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.¹

In light of what has been mentioned, it is clear that Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ did in fact have the honour and virtue of being a scribe of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, as is reported by Imām Muslim رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ in his *Ṣaḥīḥ*. In fact, this narration is the most authentic narration in his favour. Therefore, the allegation of no virtue being established for Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, on account of no ṣaḥīḥ narration being reported, is invalid. The remaining narrations (in his favour), according to the scholars of ḥadīth, meet the criteria of ḥasan. The level of ḥasan aḥādīth, as mentioned previously, is that it is admissible for the purpose of formulating Sharī‘ law.

‘Allāmah al-Farhārawī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ (d. 1239 A.H) writes:

فان اريد بعدم الصحة عدم الثبوت فهو مردود لما مر بين المحدثين فلا ضير فان فسحتها
ضيقة و عامة الاحكام و الفضائل انما تثبت بالاحاديث الحسان لعزة الصحاح و لا
ينحط ما في المسند و السنن عن درجة الحسن و قد تقرر في فن الحديث جواز العمل
بالحديث الضعيف في الفضائل فضلا عن الحسن و قد رأيت في بعض الكتب المعتبرة
من كلام الامام مجد الدين بن الاثير صاحب ميزان الجامع حديث مسند احمد في
فضيلة معاوية صحيح الا اني لا استحضر الكتاب في الوقت و لم ينصف الشيخ عبد
الحق الدهلوى رحمه الله في شرح سفر السعادة فانه اقر الكلام المصنف و لم يتعقبه
كتعقبه على سائر تعصباته

If what is meant by “There is nothing ṣaḥīḥ to establish the virtues of Mu‘āwiyah” is that his virtues are not proven, then this is incorrect. However, if the statement is to be understood in a more technical way— as understood

¹ *Taṭhīr al-Jinān wa l-Lisān*, vol. 109.

by the scholars of ḥadīth— then it has no real negative connotation. The reason being that the number of ṣaḥīḥ narrations are so few in number that most rulings and virtues are established by ḥasan aḥādīth. In fact, many aḥādīth found in the *Sunan* collections and the *Musnad* of Imām Aḥmad are narrations lower (in authenticity) than ḥasan. It is a known fact amongst the scholars of ḥadīth that even ḍaʿīf narrations are admissible for establishing virtues, let alone ḥasan narrations. I have even seen the likes of Mujaddid Ibn al-Athīr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ mentioning that there are ṣaḥīḥ narrations to be found showing the virtues of Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ in the *Musnad* of Imām Aḥmad. Unfortunately, I cannot seem to remember at this moment which book he mentions this in. ʿAbd al-Ḥaqq al-Dehlawī did not do justice in his commentary on *Safar al-Saʿādah*. He did not criticise the author on this point, as was his habit in other parts of the book.¹

A few aḥādīth on the virtues of Sayyidunā Muʿāwiyah

The following is a list of a few aḥādīth, recorded by the Muḥaddithīn, enumerating the virtues of Sayyidunā Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ:

It has been narrated from Sayyidunā ʿAbd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī ʿUmayrah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ that the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ said:

اللهم علمه الكتاب و الحساب و قه العذاب

O Allah! Teach him (Muʿāwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ) the Book (Qurʿan) and inheritance and protect him from the punishment (of the hereafter).²

Sayyidunā al-ʿIrbād رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ said that he heard the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ saying:

اللهم علم معاوية الكتاب و الحساب و قه العذاب

1 *Al-Nihāyah*, pg. 39.

2 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 121; Ḥāfiẓ al-Dhahabī: *Tārīkh al-Islām*, vol. 2 pg. 309; *Aʿalām al-Nubalāʾ*, vol. 4 pg. 288; *Al-Iṣābah*, vol. 2 pg. 164; *Musnad Aḥmad*, vol. 1 pg. 466; *Majmaʿ al-Zawāʿid*, vol. 9 pg. 594. Ḥāfiẓ al-Dhahabī says:

All of the narrators of this narration are reliable. But there is a difference of opinion as to whether or not ʿAbd al-Raḥmān is a companion. The predominant view is that he is in fact a companion.” (*Tārīkh al-Islām*, vol. 2 pg. 309)

Mujaddid Alf-e Thānī also says:

The narrators of this narration are all reliable. (*Maktūbāt*, letter: 251).

O Allah! Teach Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ the Book (Qur’an) and inheritance and protect him from the punishment (of the hereafter).¹

Sayyidunā ‘Abd al-Raḥmān ibn Abī ‘Umayrah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ said that the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ made the following supplication for Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ:

اللهم اجعله هاديا مهديا واهد به . قال الترمذى حسن غريب

O Allah! Make him (Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ) a guide, grant him guidance and grant others guidance through him. Imām Tirmidhī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ says: “This narration is ḥasan gharīb.”²

Sayyidunā ‘Umayr ibn Sa’d رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ said:

Do not mention anything but good about Mu‘āwiyah, as I have heard the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ saying:

اللهم اهده

O Allah! Guide him (Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ).³

Commentary from Ibn Kathīr regarding the above narrations

All four narrations mentioned above have been reported by Ibn Kathīr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ in his book, *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* (references given). After quoting these narrations, Ibn al-Kathīr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ comments:

و اكتفينا بما أوردناه من الاحاديث الصحاح و الحسان و المستجدات عما سواها من
الموضوعات و المنكرات

1 *Musnad Aḥmad*, vol. 4 pg. 57; *Ṣaḥīḥ Ibn Ḥibbān*, vol. 6 pg. 37; *Tārīkh al-Islām*, vol. 2 pg. 309; *Majma‘ al-Zawā‘id*, vol. 9 pg. 594; *Al-Istī‘āb*, vol. 3 pg. 474; *A‘alām al-Nubalā’*, vol. 4 pg. 288; *Tārīkh al-Kabīr*, vol. 8 pg. 204; *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 120; *Mawāriḍ al-Ḍamān*, pg. 566; *Kanz al-‘Ummāl*, vol. 6 pg. 109. ‘Allāmah ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Farhārāwī says (quoting Ibn al-Athīr) that his narration is authentic. (*Al-Nāhiyah*, pg. 39).

2 *Tirmidhī*, pg. 574; *Al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr*, vol. 7 pg. 204; *Tārīkh al-Islām*, vol. 2 pg. 310; *Mishkāt al-Masābiḥ*, pg. 579; *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 121; *A‘alām al-Nubalā’*, vol. 4 pg. 288; *Mawāriḍ al-Ḍamān*, pg. 566; *Ḥilyah al-Awliyā’*, vol. 8 pg. 358; *Al-Mu‘jam al-Awsaṭ*, vol. 1 pg. 380.

3 *Al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr*, vol. 4 pg. 290; *Tirmidhī*, pg. 547; *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 122.

We have sufficed in choosing only the ṣaḥīḥ, ḥasan, and jayyid (good) narrations. We have refrained (from mentioning) the mawḍū‘ and munkar (rejected) narrations.¹

Additional Corroboration

We will now mention a few more authentic narrations pertaining to the virtues of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. We advise the critics to reflect upon it with an open-mind.

In *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, under the chapter: “What has been reported regarding war with the Romans”, the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ has been reported to have said:

أَوَّلُ جَيْشٍ مِنْ أُمَّتِي يَغْزُونَ الْبَحْرَ قَدْ أَوْجَبُوا

The first army from my community to use the ocean (engage in naval warfare) will have made Jannah compulsory for themselves.²

There is consensus in the Ummah that the “first army” refers to the army of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. Does this authentic narration not count in favour of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ? Is it not a great virtue to be guaranteed Jannah? Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 852 A.H) and Ḥāfiẓ Badr al-Dīn al-‘Aynī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 855 A.H) said:

قال المهلب في هذا الحديث منقبة لمعاوية لأنه أول من غزا البحر

Al-Muhlib says regarding this narration: “This narration is in reference to Mu‘āwiyah, for indeed he was the first person to fight in the ocean.”³

This is a great bounty bestowed upon Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ that in this world he earned the glad tidings of Jannah. Therefore, the allegation against him of holding no virtue is baseless.

Sayyidunā ‘Abd al-Malik ibn ‘Umayr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ reports that the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ said:

1 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 132.

2 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, vol. 1 pg. 410; *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Muslim*, vol. 2 pg. 141.

3 *Fatḥ al-Bārī*, vol. 6 pg. 102.

يا معاوية ! ان ملكت فأحسن

O Mu'āwiyah! If you are given authority over people, be good with them.¹

Ibn Ḥajar al-Makkī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ comments about this narration:

و الحديث حسن كما علمت ، فهو مما يحتج به على فضل معاوية رضي الله عنه

As you are aware, this is a ḥasan narration. It is amongst those from which the virtue of Mu'āwiyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ is substantiated.²

Further Corroboration

To be a scribe in the honorable court of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ is itself a great virtue. In the books of biographical accounts, wherever the names of the scribes are mentioned, the name of Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ is also found.³

To serve the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ is the most honorable act, more valuable than the entire world. Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ was repeatedly granted the noble task of serving the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

Sayyidunā Ibn 'Abbās رَحِمَهُ اللهُ one day mentioned:

عن ابن عباس رضي الله عنه عن معاوية قال قصرت عن رأس رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم
وسلم بمشقص

Mu'āwiyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ said: "I (had the opportunity) to cut a portion of the Messenger of Allah's صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ blessed hair."⁴

Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ had in his possession, for seeking blessings, strands of the Messenger of Allah's صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ blessed hair and some of the clippings of his blessed nails. He requested that he be buried with these blessed remnants and his request was fulfilled.⁵

1 *Al-Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah*, vol. 11 pg. 147; *Al-Maṭālib al-Āliyah*, vol. 4 pg. 108.

2 *Al-Ṣawā'iq al-Muhriqah*, pg. 218.

3 For more details please refer to *Al-Istī'āb*, vol. 3 pg. 365; *Majma' al-Zawā'id*, vol. 9 pg. 357; *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 21; *Jawāmi' al-Sīrah*, pg. 20.

4 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, vol. 1 pg. 233; *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Muslim*, vol. 1 pg. 408.

5 *Tārīkh al-Khulafā*, pg. 70.

Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه participated in many battles: Ḥunayn, Ṭā’if, and Tabūk, wherein the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم offered his special attention to the respective participants. This was such an honour for him, that the critics of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه will find themselves in a quagmire trying to deny this amazing reality. He was also present with the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم on Ḥajjat al-Wadā‘ (the Farewell Hajj). It is mentioned:

After the Ḍuhr ṣalāh, the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم mounted his camel and prepared for his return to Madīnah. He seated Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه directly behind him and began his Ṭawāf al-Ifāḍah, also known as the Ṭawāf al-Ṣadr and Ṭawāf al-Ziyārah.¹

Aside from being a Ṣaḥābī of the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم, Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه also enjoyed the station of being a *faqīh* (jurist) and a Mujtahid. The status of being a Ṣaḥābī alone is the highest position a Muslim can attain and all the relevant verses and aḥādīth of the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم in praise of the Ṣaḥābah will apply to him as well. Ibn Qayyim (d. 751 A.H) said:

و مراده و مراد من قال ذلك من اهل الحديث : انه لم يصح حديث في مناقبه بخصوصه

When the Ahl al-Sunnah say: “There is nothing ṣaḥīḥ reported regarding the virtues of Mu‘āwiyah”, they imply thereby that his respective virtues fall under the broader spectrum of virtues as mentioned in the Qur’ān and Sunnah.

The comment of Ḥāfiẓ Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī

The comments of Ḥāfiẓ al-Suyūṭī رحمته الله (d. 911 A.H) in his famous book *Tārīkh al-Khulafā’* have been misconstrued and made to seem as if it corroborates the claims of the critics. The alleged comment of Ḥāfiẓ al-Suyūṭī رحمته الله is said to appear on page 139 of *Tārīkh al-Khulafā’* but after an extensive search, this comment of Ḥāfiẓ al-Suyūṭī رحمته الله is nowhere to be found; neither on page 139 or anywhere else. However, regarding Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه he does mention:

For quite some time during the era of nubuwwah, Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه had the honorable task of recording *waḥī* (revelation). As an official scribe, he is also responsible for narrating one hundred and sixty three aḥādīth. Ṣaḥābah and

¹ *Ḍiyā al-Nabī*, vol. 4 pg. 768.

Tābi‘īn such as Ibn ‘Abbās, Ibn ‘Umar, Ibn Zubayr, Abū al-Dardā, Jarīr al-Bajalī, Nu‘mān ibn Bashīr, Ibn Musayyib, Ḥumayd ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān رضي الله عنه; all narrated aḥādīth from him. He was extremely tolerant and insightful. There are many narrations showing his virtue, including a narration recorded by Imām Tirmidhī رضي الله عنه in which the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم made the following supplication for Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه: “O Allah! Grant him (Mu‘āwiyah) guidance and make him a guidance for others.” Imām Aḥmad رضي الله عنه also narrates a ḥadīth on the authority of Al-‘Irbād ibn Sāriyah رضي الله عنه who said that he heard the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم saying: “O Allah! Teach him (Mu‘āwiyah) the Book (Qur’an) and inheritance and protect him from the punishment (of the hereafter).” Both Ibn Abī Shaybah رضي الله عنه and Al-Ṭabarānī رضي الله عنه narrate from ‘Abd al-Malik ibn ‘Umayr رضي الله عنه that Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه said (when he heard the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم saying: “O Mu‘āwiyah! When you are given authority over people, be good to them”): “At that time I realized that I will become a khalīfah.”¹

Shāh Walī Allāh Muḥaddith Dehlawī رحمته الله says:

You should know well that Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه was a senior and esteemed Ṣaḥābī of the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم. Never should you have any ill-feelings towards him, neither should you suffer from the sickness of engaging in any negative dialogues towards him; for if you do, you have committed a grave sin.²

Another angle

Let us for a moment leave aside all these proofs and consider this statement to be true; will it strip Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه of all his privileges and credentials?

Even if *Fath al-Bārī* quotes Imām Aḥmad رحمته الله (that the narrations in favour of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه have no origin), this does not imply that there are absolutely no authentic narrations regarding the virtues of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه. Imām Aḥmad رحمته الله himself in his *Musnad*³ has reported many narrations proving the virtues of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه. If to deny all the fabricated narrations means to completely invalidate all narrations (even if it be authentic), then Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه would not be the only one with nothing positive

1 *Tārīkh al-Khulafā*, pg. 68.

2 *Izālat al-Khafā*.

3 *Musnad Aḥmad*, vol. 4 pg. 127, 216.

attributed to him. In fact, Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ would also have nothing positive attributed to him, simply because the most number of fabrications have been attributed to him. Ḥāfiẓ al-Dhahabī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 748 A.H) has quoted ‘Āmir al-Sha‘bī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ saying:

ما كذب على احد من هذه الامة ما كذب على علي رضي الله عنه

In this Ummah, no one has had more lies attributed to him than ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.¹

Ibn al-Qayyim al-Jawzī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 751 A.H) says:

قال الحافظ ابو يعلى الخليلي في كتاب الارشاد : وضعت الرافضة في علي رضي الله عنه و اهل البيت نحو ثلاث مائة الف حديث

Ḥāfiẓ Abū Ya‘lā al-Khalīlī mentions in his *Kitāb al-Irshād*: “The Rawāfiḍ fabricated three hundred thousand aḥādīth in favour of the Ahl al-Bayt.”²

In corroboration with this statement, Ibn al-Qayyim رَحِمَهُ اللهُ says:

و لا تستبعد هذا فانك لو تتبعت ما عندهم من ذلك لوجدت الامر كما قال

This is not something unlikely, for if you were to inspect whatever they have gathered, it would be just as he stated.³

After clarification from such eminent scholars, if any foolish person decides to reject all the narrations (including the authentic ones) regarding the virtues of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and the Ahl al-Bayt, in the same manner as the critics of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ have done, then the only avenue of hope left for such a person is sincere supplication for guidance.

As for the claim that there are many narrations showing the virtue of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ but not a single one is authentic, a few points are worthy of consideration in this regard:

1 *Tadhkirat al-Ḥuffāz*, vol. 1 pg. 82; *Mīzān al-I‘tidāl*, vol. 1 pg. 436.

2 *Al-Manār al-Munīf*, pg. 108.

3 *Ibid.*

- a. Is this statement being applied to all false narrations? If so, then this does not contradict our position because we also refute all fabricated narrations, whether in favour of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ or Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.

Aḥmad Raḍā Khān (d. 1341 A.H) says:

In all fairness, some narrations containing the virtues of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ have only been narrated by the Nawāṣib. Just as the Shī‘ah concocted approximately three hundred thousand aḥādīth about ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and the Ahl al-Bayt, as mentioned by Ḥāfiẓ Abū Ya‘lā and Ḥāfiẓ al-Khalīlī in *Al-Irshād*, so too the Nawāṣib fabricated certain aḥādīth about Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, as mentioned by Imām Aḥmad رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.¹

- b. If this statement implies rejecting all the narrations containing the virtues of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ then this is contrary to both reality and the actual status of narration. The Muḥaddithīn unanimously classify the narrations containing the virtues of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ as either ṣaḥīḥ or ḥasan, based on their credibility.
- c. As for ḍa‘īf narrations, scholars such as Mullā ‘Alī Qārī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ in *Al-Mawdhū‘āt al-Kabīr*², Ibn Ḥajar al-Makkī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ in *Taṭhīr al-Jinān*³, ‘Allāmah al-Sakhāwī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ in *Al-Maqāṣid al-Ḥasanah*⁴ and ‘Allāmah ‘Alī al-Kannī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ in *Tanzīḥ al-Sharī‘ah*⁵ all state that such narrations are admissible for establishing virtues. If ḍa‘īf narrations are not to be accepted then even the virtues attributed to Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ would be discarded and rejected.

The reference of Ibn Taymiyyah

The critics attempt to prove that Ibn Taymiyyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ also agreed to this view (that Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ did not enjoy any virtue). They support their claim by quoting the words of Ibn Taymiyyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ from his book *Minḥāj al-Sunnah*. He says:

1 *Fatāwā Riḍwiyyah al-Jadīd*, vol. 5 pg. 461.

2 *Al-Mawdhū‘āt al-Kabīr*, pg. 108.

3 *Taṭhīr al-Jinān*, pg. 13.

4 *Al-Maqāṣid al-Ḥasanah*, pg. 431.

5 *Tanzīḥ al-Sharī‘ah*, vol. 2 pg. 157.

There were a large number of the Banū Marwān and others, who fought alongside him during his lifetime or following his death. They would claim that he was correct in his war against ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and his judgement also correct. ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and his companions on the other hand were oppressive and their judgement as well as interpretation incorrect. Books such as *Kitāb al-Marwāniyyah* by Jāhidh have been written in support of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. In fact, a group of Mu‘āwiyah’s رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ supporters even concocted narrations about him, but all of them are based on falsehood, even though they might claim to be substantiated by strong and irrefutable arguments. Even this group, according to the Ahl al-Sunnah is incorrect. Although the opposite position adopted by the Rawāfiḍ, by comparison, is more incorrect.¹

When one reads the manner in which the words of Ibn Taymiyyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ are misconstrued and taken out of context then the words of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, which he directed towards the Khawārij, come to mind:

هذه كلمة حق يراد بها الباطل

Words of truth uttered with the intent of falsehood.²

Making such claims from the above quoted passage of Ibn Taymiyyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ is far-fetched to say the least. Firstly, Ibn Taymiyyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ was attempting to refute and contest the perception of those who believed that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was oppressive and incorrect in his decision to go to war with Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.

In no way did Ibn Taymiyyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ intend thereby that Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was on falsehood or committing an open and grave sin. Despite the fact that he acknowledges the noble status of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and believes him to be more deserving of the khilāfah than Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, he still considers their differences to fall within the realm of ijtihād or ‘strategic’ differences in interpretation (as stated previously with the reference of Ibn Ḥajar رَحِمَهُ اللهُ). However, Ibn Taymiyyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ does offer some advice, worthy of reflection. He says:

ولهذا كان من مذهب اهل السنة الامسك عما شجر بين الصحابة فانه قد ثبتت فضائلهم
و وجبت موالاتهم و محبتهم و ما وقع منه ما يكون لهم فيه عذر يخفى على الانسان و

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah*, vol. 2 pg. 207.

2 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. 7 pg. 281.

منه ما تاب صاحبه منه و منه ما يكون مغفورا فالخوض فيما شجر يوقع في نفوس كثير من الناس بغضا و ذما و يكون في ذلك هو مخطئا بل عاصيا فيضر نفسه و من خاض معه في ذلك كما جرى لأكثر في ذلك فانهم تكلموا بكلام لا يحبه الله و لا رسوله اما من ذم من لا يستحق الذم و اما من مدح امور لا يستحق المدح و لهذا كان الامسك طريقة افاضل السلف

And therefore, the belief of the Ahl al-Sunnah is to refrain from delving into the disputes of the noble Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. All of their superiority and all of their virtues are clearly proven and therefore it is incumbent upon us to love and respect them. There are reasons why certain things occurred between them, reasons which may be out of sight to the ordinary observer. For instance, it may be that they repented or for that matter have been forgiven. Therefore, anyone who involves himself in such disputes will bring about internal hatred and enmity towards them and as such will be guilty of perpetrating a sin; ultimately bringing harm upon no one but himself. Anyone who joins such people in these futile discussions (as is the case of most people) is joining a conversation which is displeasing to Allah and his Messenger ﷺ. Condemning someone who does not deserve to be condemned, or praising someone who does not deserve to be praised are both superfluous and therefore restraint and silence (in such matters) remained the way of our pious predecessors.¹

Secondly, Ibn Taymiyyah رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ writes: “One group has fabricated aḥādīth and ascribed them to the Messenger of Allah ﷺ in favour of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.” How is it possible for one to presume that all narrations ascribed to the Messenger of Allah ﷺ in favour of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ are fabricated and baseless, when the reality is that Ibn Taymiyyah رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ was only referring to such narrations that were concocted by a specific group. This by no stretch of the imagination implies that all the narrations in his favour are false. In *Fatāwā Ibn Taymiyyah*, he has praised Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ himself, saying:

و معاوية قد استكتبه رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم و قال : اللهم علمه الكتاب و الحساب و قه العذاب

¹ *Minhāj al-Sunnah*, vol. 2 pg. 219.

The Messenger of Allah ﷺ chose him (Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ) as a scribe and made the following supplication for him: “O Allah! Teach him (Mu'āwiyah) the Qur'an and inheritance and save him from your punishment.”

Did Ibn Taymiyyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ deliberately quote this narration despite knowing that it is fabricated? Will he not then fall prey to the warning of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ:

من كذب علي متعمداً فليتبوأ مقعده من النار

Whoever intentionally attributes falsehood to me, should prepare for his abode in the fire.¹

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, vol. 1 pg. 21.

The allegation of Bid'ah

In this allegation primarily two arguments are made:

1. During his rule, Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه was the founder of *bid'ah* (innovation).
2. Initiating the practice of calling the adhān and iqāmah before the 'Īd ṣalāh makes Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه guilty of committing bid'ah.

Argument one

As far as the first argument is concerned, it is unanimously agreed upon that the statements and actions of the Ṣaḥābah do not fall under the definition of bid'ah, but rather their statements and actions are to be regarded as proof for the ummah. To further understand this, please refer to the following books: *Minhāj al-Sunnah* (vol. 1 pg. 256), *I'lām al-Muwaqqi'in* (vol. 1 pg. 6), *Badā' al-Fawā'id* (vol. 4 pg. 477), *Tabaqāt al-Subkī* (vol. 1 pg. 262), *'Umdat al-Qārī* (vol. 3 pg. 323), *Kitāb al-'Ilm* (vol. 2 pg. 83), *Aḥkām* (vol. 2 pg. 140), *Izālat al-Khafā* (vol. 1 pg. 16), and *Yasurru man Ra'ā* (vol. 2 pg. 48).

Furthermore, the Ṣaḥābah are not in need of anybody's approval from the Ummah. I have already discussed this topic at length in the beginning of the book, making reference to Al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī رحمه الله. For further details please refer to: *Mirqāt* (vol. 5 pg. 517), *Usd al-Ghābah* (vol. 1 pg. 2), *Al-Istī'āb* (vol. 1 pg. 2), *Al-Iṣābah* (vol. 1 pg. 11), *Taqrīr al-Uṣūl* (vol. 2 pg. 260), *Fawātiḥ al-Raḥamūt* (vol. 1 pg. 156), and *Musāmarah* (vol. 1 pg. 158).

When the statements and actions of the Ṣaḥābah are a proof for the Ummah and they are not in need of any confirmation, how can they then become the discussion of bid'ah?

It is narrated from the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم that the successful sect will only be;

ما أنا عليه و اصحابي

Those who are upon my path and the path of my Ṣaḥābah.¹

¹ *Tirmidhī*, vol. 2 pg. 89; *Mustadrak al-Ḥākim*, vol. 1 pg. 129; *Mishkāt* vol. 1 pg. 30.

In the following statement the Messenger of Allah ﷺ clarifies that the path of salvation and guidance to be the path of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ and the Ṣaḥābah:

بأيهم اقتديتم اهتديتم

Whomsoever from amongst them you follow, you shall be rightly guided.

In this ḥadīth, together with the virtue and praise of the Ṣaḥābah being evidently clear, it also becomes apparent that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ has attached the Ṣaḥābah to himself as far as the yardstick and benchmark between truth and falsehood is concerned. The Qur’ān itself has declared the Ṣaḥābah to be the yardstick of the truth:

وَمَنْ يُشَاقِقِ الرَّسُولَ مِنْ بَعْدِ مَا تَبَيَّنَ لَهُ الْهُدَىٰ وَيَتَّبِعْ غَيْرَ سَبِيلِ الْمُؤْمِنِينَ نُوَلِّهِ مَا تَوَلَّىٰ وَنُصَلِّهِ جَهَنَّمَ ۗ وَسَاءَتْ مَصِيرًا

*Whoever opposes the Messenger after the guidance has become manifest to him and follows a path other than that of the Mu’minīn, We shall allow him to do that which he is doing and then enter him into Jahannam. It is the worst of abodes.*¹

“Path of the believers” mentioned in this verse refers to the Ṣaḥābah.

Likewise, the statement of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ:

أوصيكم بأصحابي ثم الذين يلونهم ثم الذين يلونهم فليلزم الجماعة

I exhort you regarding my Ṣaḥābah (that you follow in their footsteps) then those who come after them, then those who come after them...stringently adhere to the Jamā’ah.²

This is the reason why the Messenger of Allah ﷺ declared the Ṣaḥābah, those who followed them (Tābi’īn), and those who in turn followed the latter (Taba’ Tābi’īn) to be the *khayr al-Qurūn* (the best of eras).

1 Sūrah al-Nisā: 115.

2 *Mustadrak al-Ḥākim*, vol. 1 pg. 114; *Musnad Abū Dāwūd*, vol. 1 pg. 7.

It is reported from Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mas‘ūd رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ:

من كان مستنا فليستن بمن قد مات فان الحي لا تؤمن عليه الفتنة أولئك أصحاب محمد صلى الله عليه و سلم كانوا أفضل هذه الأمة أبرها قلوبا و أعمقها علما و أقلها تكلفا اختارهم الله لصحبة نبيه و لإقامة دينه فاعرفوا لهم فضلهم و اتبعوهم على أثرهم و تمسكوا بما استطعتم من أخلاقهم و سيرهم فإنهم كانوا على الهدى المستقيم

Whoever intends to follow, he should follow those who have already passed away, because those who are alive are not safe from tribulations. And these are the companions of Muḥammad صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, who are the best of this Ummah, purest of heart, people of most profound knowledge, and more abstinent from formalities than anyone else. Allah chose them for the companionship of his Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and to establish His religion. Recognize their virtue, follow in their footsteps, and as far as possible inculcate their lifestyle and character, because they are rightly guided and upon the straight path.¹

‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, in reply to a question, said:

فارض لنفسك ما رضي به القوم لانفسهم فإنهم على علم وقفوا و ببصر نافذ كفوا و هم على كشف الأمور كانوا أقوى بفضل ما كانوا فيه أولى فإن كان الهدى ما أنتم عليه سبقتموهم إليه

Be pleased for yourself with that way which the pious predecessors were pleased with for themselves because they had accurate knowledge, and on the basis of deep insight stayed away from these innovations. Undoubtedly, they were more able to reach the depth of matters. Their condition is the best condition, thus if the path which you have chosen opposes the path chosen by the pious predecessors, then you would be claiming to have surpassed them in guidance (May Allah protect us).²

Shāh Walī Allāh Muḥaddith Dehlawī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ writes:

1 *Mishkāt*, vol. 1 pg. 33.

2 *Abū Dāwūd*, vol. 2 pg. 277.

أقول: الفرقة الناجية هم الآخذون في العقيدة و العمل جميعا بما ظهر من الكتاب و السنة و جرى عليه جمهور الصحابة و التابعين... إلى أن قال... و غير الناجية كل فرقة إنتحلت عقيدة خلاف عقيدة السلف أو عملا دون أعمالهم

I say that the successful sect is only those who follow the Qur'ān and Sunnah in both their belief as well as in their practical lives, which the majority of the Ṣaḥābah and Tābi'īn firmly held on to, and unsuccessful will be every such sect who opposes the pious predecessors, be it in belief or action.¹

Hence, those blessed souls whose statements and actions stand as a proof for the Ummah are undoubtedly worthy of being followed and are the benchmark for guidance. How can they be accused of bid'ah? Those who accuse the Ṣaḥābah of bid'ah are unaware of the definition of bid'ah (which has been transmitted from our pious predecessors).

In fact, according to our pious predecessors any person who abandons the path of the Ṣaḥābah is regarded as having abandoned the Sunnah:

و اما ترك السنة فالخروج من الجماعة

Leaving the Ṣaḥābah is leaving the Sunnah.²

Definition of bid'ah

The definition of bid'ah as explained by the senior scholars of the Ummah is as follows:

Mawlānā Sakhāwat 'Alī Jawnpūrī al-Ḥanafī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 1275 A.H) says:

Bid'ah is any such action which is regarded to be part of dīn, to which benefit or harm in the hereafter is attributed. Whereas it is not established from the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ nor from his Ṣaḥābah.³

'Allāmah Taftāzānī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 808 A.H) states:

1 *Hujjat Allāh al-Bālighah*, vol. pg. 170.

2 *Mustadrak al-Hākim*, vol. 1 pg. 120.

3 *Risālah Taqwā*, pg. 9.

إن البدعة المذمومة هو المحدث في الدين من غير أن يكون في عهد الصحابة و التابعين
و لا دل عليه الدليل الشرعي

A detested bid'ah is that which is initiated as part of dīn, whereas it was not present during the time of the Ṣaḥābah and Tābi'īn, nor does any Shar'ī proof indicate towards it.¹

‘Allāmah ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Farḥarawī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 1239 A.H) writes:

هو كل ما حدث في الدين بعد زمن الصحابة بلا حجة شرعية

Bid'ah is every such action which was initiated after the era of the Ṣaḥābah without Shar'ī proof.²

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-Kathīr رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 774 A.H) says:

أما أهل السنة و الجماعة فيقولون في كل فعل و قول لم يثبت عن الصحابة هو بدعة
لأنه لو كان خيرا لسبقونا إليه لأنه لم يتركوا خصلة من خصال الخير إلا و قد بادروا إليها

The stance of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah is this: Every statement or action not proven from the Ṣaḥābah is bid'ah, because if there was goodness in that action then the Ṣaḥābah would have definitely preceded us in it as they did not leave out any good deed or any good quality but rather strove to attain it.³

The grand muftī of the Indian subcontinent, Muftī Kifāyat Allāh Dehlawī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 1372 A.H) mentions:

Bid'ah are those things that have no basis in Shar'īah. In other words no proof is found for it in the Qur'ān and aḥādīth, nor was it present during the era of the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, the Ṣaḥābah, the Tābi'īn, nor the Tabā' Tābi'īn.⁴

Mawlānā Karīm Bakhsh رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 1365 A.H) says:

1 *Sharḥ al-Maqāṣid*, vol. 2 pg. 271.

2 *Nabrās*, pg. 21.

3 *Tafsīr Ibn al-Kathīr*, vol. 4 pg. 157.

4 *Ta'līm al-Islām*, part 4 pg. 24.

According to the Sharῑ definition: Bid'ah is every such action which was not accepted by the majority of the three eras.¹

It is for this very reason that Sayyidunā 'Abd Allāh ibn Mas'ūd رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ narrated:

اتبعوا آثارنا و لا تبتدعوا فقد كفيتم

Follow our (i.e. the Ṣaḥābah's) footsteps and do not initiate bid'ah. The dīn upon which you are is enough for you.²

Sayyidunā Ḥudhayfah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ mentions:

كل عبادة لم يتعبدها أصحاب رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم فلا تعبدوها

Every act of worship that the Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ did not engage in, do not engage in it.³

Similarly, the fuqahā regard the abstention of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and the Ṣaḥābah from an action to be an independent proof and substantiate laws from their abstention. A few examples of this:

1. Sayyidunā 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abbās رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ said:

Do not concern yourselves about rhyming your supplications because the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and the Ṣaḥābah did not rhyme their supplications.⁴

2. It is stated in *Fatāwā al-Ālamgirī*:

To recite Sūrah al-Kāfirūn from beginning to end in one breath is *makrūh* (disliked). The reason being that it is a bid'ah, since it was not transmitted to us from the Ṣaḥābah and Tābi'īn.⁵

3. Muḥammad ibn 'Īsā al-Ṭabbā رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ (179 A.H) quotes Imām Mālik رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ saying:

1 *Ḥaqīqat al-Imān*, pg. 38.

2 *Al-Ītisām*, vol. 1 pg. 59.

3 *Ibid.* vol. 2 pg. 366.

4 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, vol. 2 pg. 938.

5 *Fatāwā al-Ālamgirī*, vol. 4 pg. 264.

كل حديث جائك من النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم لم يبلغكم أن أحدا من الصحابة فعله
فدعه

Discard every ḥadīth of the Prophet ﷺ that you find none of the Ṣaḥābah to have practiced upon.¹

Many aspects become apparent from these reports. Mainly that the statements and actions of the Ṣaḥābah are to be regarded as proof. We may lament over the present day Ahl al-ḥadīth not regarding the statements of the Ṣaḥābah to be a valid proof, but even more lamentable is that in this era such self-styled scholars have emerged, who under the pretext of defending the Sunnah label the Ṣaḥābah as innovators (May Allah protect us!). In other words, until the present era the lifestyle of the Ṣaḥābah was regarded as a defining factor between Sunnah and bid'ah but today they have become personifications of the ḥadīth:

لعن آخر هذه الأمة أولها

The latter part of the Ummah will curse its first part.

It is indeed strange that people have begun to label the Ṣaḥābah as innovators. Even more strange would be the command to follow them; how is this possible, when they are Ahl al-Bid'ah?

As for the allegation against Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, who was also a Mujtahid and would issue *fatāwā* (rulings), and from whom many Ṣaḥābah reported ḥadīth; Sayyidunā 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abbās رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ said:

ليس أحد منا أعلم من معاوية

There is none amongst us (the Ṣaḥābah present at that time) who is more learned than Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.²

Once during a discussion pertaining to witr salāh, Sayyidunā 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abbās رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ himself praised the understanding of Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ saying: "He is a *faqīh* (jurist)."³

1 *Al-Faqīh wa l-Mutafaqqih*, vol. 1 pg. 132.

2 al-Bayhaqī: *Al-Sunan al-Kubrā*, vol. 3 pg. 26.

3 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, vol. 1 pg. 531.

Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is accused of being an innovator whereas Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Abbās رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ states:

ما كان معاوية على رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم متهما

Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is not regarded as unreliable (by anyone) with regard to narrating ḥadīth from the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.¹

Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is also counted amongst those Ṣaḥābah who would issue fatāwā.²

The Ṣaḥābah reported aḥādīth from Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ numbering 163 narrations. Amongst those who have narrated from him are ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Abbās رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, ‘Abd Allāh ibn Zubayr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Abū al-Dardā رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, and ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.³ To still have the courage to accuse a Ṣaḥābī of this calibre of being an innovator is nothing but sheer audacity.

Today, if I take the name of Mohr ‘Alī Shāh (d. 1356 A.H) and label him an innovator then will any follower of Mohr ‘Alī tolerate such an allegation? Will such a statement not cause anger to his circle of followers? If the allegation of innovation does not behoove Mohr ‘Alī but would be tantamount to biased criticism, bad manners, and insolence, then can such an allegation ever be condoned towards a Ṣaḥābī?

Argument two

Pertaining to the second argument that the Sunnah of ‘Īd ṣalāh is that there be no adhān and iqāmah but Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ instituted the practice of calling the adhān and iqāmah before the ‘Īd ṣalāh. First and foremost, the question needs to be asked whether the attribution of this to Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is correct? Is the narration accusing Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ in conformity with what actually transpired? Do weak narrations have any effect in rendering a person unreliable? To what extent did Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ desire to follow the Sunnah and prevent evil?

1 *Musnad Ahmad*, vol. 4 pg. 95.

2 *l’lāmul Muwaqī’in*, vol. 1 pg. 5; *Tadribur Rāwī*, pg. 404; *Al-Isābah*, vol. 1 pg. 166.

3 *Al-Isābah*, vol. 1 pg. 122; *Usd al-Ghābah*, vol. 5 pg. 223.

For further reading, please refer to; *Majma' al-Zawā'id* (vol. 9 pg. 357), *Mishkāt* (pg. 105), *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Muslim* (vol. 1 pg. 288), *Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah* (vol. 2 pg. 351), *Sunan al-Dāramī* (pg. 200), *Tārīkh al-Madīnah al-Munawwarah* (vol. 1 pg. 132), *Al-Adab al-Mufrad* of Imām Bukhārī (pg. 144), *Musnad Aḥmad* (vol. 4 pg. 93), *Tirmidhī* (vol. 2 pg. 100), *Sunan al-Kubrā* of Imām al-Bayhaqī (vol. 4 pg. 290), and *Musnad al-Ḥumaydī* (vol. 2 pg. 273).

Is it just and fair to accuse a Ṣaḥābī, who is a strict follower of the Sunnah, as well as a mujtahid and faqīh, of innovation? Is the attribution of such a terrible crime to any person (let alone a Ṣaḥābī) correct?

In reply to this slander, we ask the same questions which were asked by the renowned Muḥaqqiq Mawlānā Muḥammad Nāfi' رَحِمَهُ اللهُ to those who slandered Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ (in the same manner):

1. Those who wish to criticise should clarify the year in which the adhān and iqāmah for the 'Īd ṣalāh was introduced.
2. Was it introduced in all the Islamic states or only in the state known as Shām (Syria)¹?
3. Was the action refuted in the areas in which it was introduced?
4. Did all the great scholars of Islam (Ṣaḥābah, Tābi'īn, and others) of that era and time accept this new innovation or was there a conflict?
5. Please clarify who refuted it and who were those in favour of it?
6. In particular to the people of the two sacred cities, did they practice upon this new innovation or did they refute it?
7. What action did the elders of the Banū Hāshim take? Did they cast their lots in favour of it or did they also disprove of it?

1 The reason being that when we study the narrations pertaining to the matter, we find Mughīrah ibn Shu'bah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, who had been appointed by Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ as the governor of Kūfah, performing the 'Īd ṣalāh without adhān or iqāmah. (*Al-Muṣannaf 'Abd al-Razzāq*, vol. 3 pg. 278; *Al-Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah*, vol. 2 pg. 168).

The matter can only be analysed after all these different aspects are taken into perspective, whilst keeping in mind the disadvantages and advantages of the matter at hand. It is the responsibility of the opposition to clarify all the above matters. If the era of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is to be criticised then the above mentioned conditions have to be clarified, and if the elders of that era had confronted the above matters in a negative manner then how were such rulings enforced? In light of this, the clarification of this dispute will have to be proven through reliable sources.

One cannot cite unreliable and flawed narrations at points of criticism, and if the senior scholars (including the Banū Hāshim) had agreed on the matter and conformed with the idea, then Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ should not have to suffer the blame of practicing on bid‘ah alone. Rather, the blame should be placed upon all, for having fallen under the umbrella of:

تعاون على الإثم والعدوان

Assisting in sin and transgression.

However, if we were to look at the true nature of these people then one would be certain that they would never be supportive of any type of sin or transgression.¹

In conclusion to this discussion, three points need to be understood:

1. A narration is often presented because of which Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is labelled an innovator. However, the status of the Ṣaḥābah is so lofty (in light of the Qur’ān and aḥādīth) that if any question is raised against them on account of some narration then the narration should be interpreted in accordance to the status that Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى has granted them. This has already been explained in the beginning of the book, with reference to the quotation of the Head Muftī of Pakistan, Muftī Muḥammad Shaḥī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 1396 A.H). We will now present two more references in this regard.

‘Allāmah Muḥyū al-Dīn al-Nawawī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ writes:

¹ *Sīrat Amīr Mu‘āwīyah*, vol. 2 pg. 326-327.

قال العلماء الأحاديث الواردة التي في ظاهرها دخل على صحابي يجب تأويلها ولا يقع في روايات الثقات الا ما يمكن تأويله

The scholars of ḥadīth have ruled that it is compulsory to render a suitable interpretation to all those narrations which might apparently seem to cast some kind of negativity upon the Ṣaḥābah.¹

Mawlānā Sayyid Ḥusayn Aḥmad al-Madanī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 1377 A.H) mentions:

The narrations recorded by the historians generally have no basis. Neither are the chain of narrators known and even if they are, there is absolutely no knowledge of the strength of the narrators, nor is the continuity and the discontinuity of the narration considered. Even in the case where some of the earlier historians have taken it upon themselves to mention the chain of narrators then too they have accepted the narrations of every insignificant and wretched person. They did not consider whether the chain of narrators was continuous or if they were flawed. This applies to all the historians whether it be Ibn al-Athīr, Ibn Quṭaybah, Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd, or even Ibn Sa‘d.

To regard such narrations to be mutawātir or acceptable is absolutely incorrect and out of place. Even amongst the reliable and mutawātir narrations, if we were to find any ṣaḥīḥ narration that is not in favour of the status and integrity of the Ṣaḥābah, then too we will deem it to be unacceptable or a suitable interpretation rendered. How then can we even consider accepting historical narrations (which have no basis).²

2. Labelling any Ṣaḥābī as an innovator makes one himself guilty of committing a bid‘ah.

‘Allāmah Abū al-Shakūr al-Sālamī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 265 A.H), a renowned scholar in rhetoric sciences, mentions:

الكلام في البدعة على خمسة أوجه - الكلام في الله والكلام في كلام الله والكلام في قدر الله والكلام في عبادة الله والكلام في أصحاب رسول الله عليه وسلم

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Muslim with the commentary of Imām al-Nawawī* vol. 2 pg. 278.

2 *Maktūbāt-e Shaykh al-Islām*, vol. 1 pg. 287 doc. 89.

Bid'ah is of five types: discussing the entity of Allah Himself and His qualities (other than that which our pious predecessors have mentioned), to bring about new opinions with regard to the text of the Qur'an, discussing the extent of Allah's power, to put forward one's own opinion with regard to the messengers of Allah, and to be self-opinionative of the Ṣaḥābah.¹

3. The accusation against Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is false to begin with and even if taken to be true then too it cannot be termed as bid'ah. Muftī Muḥammad Taqī 'Uthmānī explains:

My answer is that if a Ṣaḥābī or Tābi'ī is a mujtahid, and he bases his opinion on any kind of Shar'ī proof (even if that proof might seem weak to us), then without a doubt this will be called "ijtihād". It will not be labelled as bid'ah or innovation. In such an instance the practice of the Muslims will be upon the ruling of the Qur'an, ḥadīth and the Sunnah of the al-Khulafā' al-Rāshidīn. The individual opinion of the said Ṣaḥābī will be ruled to be weak, unpreserved, or in some circumstances can even be regarded to be an error in ijtihād, but under no circumstance can it be labelled as bid'ah.

The status of the Ṣaḥābah is very high indeed. When the *fuqahā* (jurists) of later times presented numerous opinions and rulings, which were apparently contradictory to the teachings of the Qur'an and Sunnah, these opinions were termed errors in ijtihād, because of the fact that these opinions were based on some type of Shar'ī proof. It was never termed as bid'ah.

For instance let us consider one of the opinions of Imām Shāfi'ī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, he is of the opinion that even if a person does not recite tasmiyyah intentionally when slaughtering, the animal will still be regarded to be ḥalāl (*Bidāyat al-Mujtahid* vol. 1 pg. 446), whereas it is clearly mentioned in the Qur'an:

وَلَا تَأْكُلُوا مِمَّا لَمْ يُذْكَرِ اسْمُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ

*And do not consume of that upon which the name of Allah has not been taken.*²

The majority of the *fuqahā* have refuted this view of Imām Shāfi'ī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and

¹ *Al-Tamhīd*, pg. 192.

² Sūrah al-An'ām: 121.

have ruled it to be a weak opinion, which they did not adopt. However, there is not a single scholar who accused him of having committed an act of bid'ah because of this? The reason being that Imām Shāfi'ī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ is regarded to be a mujtahid and he has supportive proof for his opinion. The proof is weak according to the majority of the 'ulamā but it is sufficient to save him from being guilty of initiating any type of bid'ah or distortion in dīn. If the meaning of bid'ah is taken in accordance to the suggested principle, then not one mujtahid will remain who will not be cut down by the sharp edge of this sword, since every one of them has one or two such opinions, which apparently seems to contradict the teachings of the Qur'ān and Sunnah. The vast majority of scholars did not agree with these opinions and refuted it but not a single person labelled their actions as bid'ah.

Indeed, the matter has to be examined whether that individual is qualified to come to such a conclusion and opinion of his own and that he does not intend to distort the teachings of dīn simply to satisfy his carnal desires. Imām Shāṭibī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ writes:

ان الرأي المذموم ما بني على الجهل واتباع الهوى من غير أن يرجع إليه و ما كان ذريعة إليه وإن كان في أصله محمودا وذلك راجع إلى أصل شرعي فالأول داخل تحت حد البدعة وتنزل عليه أدلة الذم والثاني خارج عنه ولا يكون بدعة أبدا (الإعتصام ج ١ ص ١٣١)

Verily the opinion which is frowned upon is that which is based upon ignorance and arises on account of following one's base desires (lacking support from principles of Sharī'ah) as well as that opinion which even though supported by the principles of Sharī'ah may lead to vice, even though virtuous itself. The first of the two falls under the definition of bid'ah and is subject to all the condemnation that is mentioned in our texts, but the second type can never be regarded as bid'ah.¹

Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is labelled an innovator based upon one baseless narration. We will now present one fact that is proven by a complete reliable chain of narration. We ask the opponents of Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to

¹ Haḍrat Mu'āwiyah awr Tārīkhi Ḥaqā'iq, pg. 166-167.

please reply to it. The meaning of the ḥadīth of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ is:

The 'iddah (period of waiting) of a woman whose husband has passed away will end when she gives birth.¹

Ibn Ḥajar al-ʿAsqalānī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 852 A.H) writes:

وقد قال جمهور العلماء من السلف وائمة الفتوى في الامصار ان الحامل اذا مات عنها زوجها تحل بوضع الحمل و تنقضى عدة الوفاة و خالف في ذلك على فقال تعتد اخر الاجلين و معناه انها ان وضعت قبل مضي اربعة اشهر و عشر تربصت الى الوضع اخرجه سعيد بن منصور و عبد بن حميد عن على بسند صحيح و به قال ابن عباس كما في هذه القصة و يقال انه رجع عنه و يقويه ان المنقول عن اتباعه و فاق الجماعة في ذلك

The majority of scholars are of the unanimous view that when the husband of a pregnant woman passes away, her 'iddah will terminate as soon as she gives birth. However, 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ issued a ruling contrary to it. According to him, her 'iddah is the longer of the two. This means: if she gives birth before four months and ten days then she still has to wait the complete four months and ten days, and her 'iddah will not terminate by just giving birth. In the same manner, if four months and ten days pass and she still has not given birth then she will have to wait until she gives birth.

This ruling of 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is authentically narrated on the authority of Sa'īd ibn Maṣṣūr and 'Abd ibn Ḥumayd. Ibn 'Abbās رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was also of the same opinion, but he later retracted his opinion which is supported by the rulings of his students and is in accordance with the ruling of the majority of the ummah.²

This ruling of Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is also recorded in Shī'ah books such as *Furū' al-Kāfī*³, *Man Lā yaḥḍuruḥu al-Faqīh*⁴, as well as *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām*⁵.

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, vol. 2 pg. 802; *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Muslim*, vol. 1 pg. 486.

2 *Fatḥ al-Bārī*, vol. 9 pg. 469.

3 *Ibid*, vol. 6 pg. 114.

4 *Ibid*. vol. 3 pg. 329.

5 *Ibid*. vol. 8 pg. 150.

Scrutiny of the reference- *Futūḥāt al-Makkiyyah*

After the allegations of bid‘ah against Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ have been clarified, we now return to discussing the book of Shaykh Akbar Muḥyū al-Dīn ibn al-‘Arabī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ (d. 638 A.H) entitled: *Futūḥāt al-Makkiyyah*, which was quoted in support of this claim. Citing a reference such as *Futūḥāt al-Makkiyyah* informs us that there is no credible proof supported by a chain of narrators or from the books of ḥadīth or even history to support this baseless claim. The narration in *Futūḥāt al-Makkiyyah* does not contain any chain of narrators. It should be borne in mind that Imām Muslim رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ (d. 261 A.H) quotes the statement of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mubārak رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ in the preface of his famous work, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Muslim*:

الإسناد من الدين ولو لا الإسناد لقال من شاء ما شاء

Chains of narration are part of dīn and if there were no chains of narration then anyone would say whatever he desired.¹

As far as *Futūḥāt al-Makkiyyah* is concerned, firstly, the senior scholars of the ummah have already criticised it.²

Secondly, what is the status of *Futūḥāt al-Makkiyyah* as far as its chain of narrations and status as a reference is concerned, for this we quote Mujaddid Alf-e Thānī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, which will enlighten the readers of its significance:

Respected reader! This humble servant has not the forbearance to hear such words. Instantaneously my anger arises and gives me not the chance to make any other interpretation of such words, whether they are the words of some great Yemenī shaykh or some illustrious shaykh of Syria.

We depend upon the words of Muḥammad صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and not Muḥyū al-Dīn ibn al-‘Arabī, Ṣadr al-Dīn al-Qūnawī, or ‘Abd al-Razzāq al-Kāshī. Our duty is to adhere to the divine text (nuṣūṣ) and not fuṣūṣ³. *Futūḥāt al-Madaniyyah* has made us independent of *Futūḥāt al-Makkiyyah*.⁴

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Muslim*, vol. 1 pg. 12.

2 *Al-Yawāqīt wa l-Jawāhir*, vol. 1 pg. 7; *Tārīkh Da‘wah wa ‘Azīmah*, vol. 2 pg. 158.

3 Hinting at the book of Shaykh al-Akbar, *Fuṣūṣ al-Ḥikam*.

4 *Maktūbāt Imām-e Rabbānī*, letter: 100.

Mawlānā Ḥusayn Aḥmad al-Madanī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 1377 A.H) says:

Shaykh Akbar is a pious person of a very high status and academic scholar. Considering this, it is possible that these words are not even his but rather of some heretic, falsely inserted into the text, as is understood from the words of Shaykh ‘Abd al-Wahhāb al-Sha‘rānī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ and others. Even if it is his words, it will be regarded as an error from his side. He is definitely a great scholar but he is not infallible, so the opinion of the majority of the scholars will be accepted.¹

¹ *Maktūbāt-e Shaykh al-Islām*, vol. 1 pg. 242.

Accusation of Committing a Sin

The critics of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ state:

There is no doubt with regard to the fact that ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was the rightful khalīfah and the consensus of the entire Ummah is on it. The manner in which Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ dealt with ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is not acceptable under any circumstance. Assuming this action of his to be a mere error in ijtihād and regard it to be a means of reward is indeed questionable. Arriving at a wrong conclusion after utilising all means available to him in a Sharī matter is something else. However, with regard to worldly and political matters to regard such an error, which was a reason for such great trouble and tribulation, to be a means of reward; is indeed the height of naivety and injustice. We understand the status of being a Ṣaḥābī and we hold no enmity towards Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ but we are unable, under any circumstance, to regard the actions of’ Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ to be the result of an error in ijtihād.¹

We wish to draw your attention towards a few points:

1. As far as Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ being the rightful khalīfah is concerned, no sunnī Muslim has ever disputed this fact. Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was a rightful khalīfah and he was the most deserving of khilāfah at that time.

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Taymiyyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ (d. 728 A.H) writes:

وعلى أحق الناس بالخلافة في زمنه بلا ريب عند أحد من العلماء..... من لم يربع بعلي من الخلافة فهو أضل من حمار أهله

‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was the most deserving of khilāfah in his era. This is such a reality that none of the ‘ulamā have ever doubted... the one who does not regard ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ to be the fourth khalīfah is more ignorant than a donkey.²

2. As far as the superiority of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is concerned; there can be no comparison between the ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is from amongst the fore-runners of the Muhājirīn, whereas Sayyidunā

1 *Nām wa Nasab*, pg. 532.

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah*, vol. 4 pg. 208.

Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is amongst those who embraced Islam after the conquest of Makkah. Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ in acknowledgment of being amongst those who embraced Islam later says:

By the oath of Allah! I regard you to be the most rightful of khilāfah, more rightful than me. You are from amongst the fore-runners of the Muhājirīn... I was not able to attain such an early acceptance into Islam and such closeness to the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.¹

والله إني لأعلم أن عليا أفضل مني وأحق بالأمر

By the oath of Allah, (I do not regard myself to be an equal to 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ) I fully understand that 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is superior to me and more rightful of the matter (khilāfah) than me.²

From this speech of Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, it is evident that he regarded Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ to be superior and more rightful of the khilāfah than himself. This humble servant deems it necessary to put forward this point that just as the difference between the status of Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is incomparable, in the same manner the status of those who came after (the conquest of Makkah) is not comparable to the status of Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. If the difference between these two illustrious Ṣaḥābah is as the difference between the earth and the sky then the difference between Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and those who came later, is as the distance between the first and seventh heaven.

3. The battle that ensued between Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, as explained in the beginning on the authority of Ibn Taymiyyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ and Mujaddid Alf-e Thānī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 1034 A.H), was not waged to seize the khilāfah. Instead, both parties opposed each other on the grounds of which is the best way of protecting the interests of dīn and the ummah. 'Allāmah al-Sha'rānī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 976 A.H) and 'Allāmah Kamāl al-Dīn al-Maqdasī al-Shāfi'ī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ mention while explaining the reason for the whole conflict:

1 Sulaym ibn Qays, pg. 161.

2 Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah, vol. 8 pg. 169.

وليس المراد بين علي ومعاوية المنازعة في الإمارة كما توهمه بعضهم وإنما المنازعة كانت بسبب تسليم قتلة عثمان رضي الله عنه الى عشيرته ليقتصوا منهم.

The dispute between ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was not about power and rule as assumed by some. The dispute was with regard to handing over the murderers of ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ to the family of ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ so that they may take Qiṣāṣ.¹

Mujaddid Alf-e Thānī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ reports the saying of Imām al-Ghazālī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ:

The dispute between ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was not regarding the khilāfah rather it was regarding taking Qiṣāṣ from the murderers of ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ in the beginning of ‘Alī’s رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ khilāfah.²

Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ himself said:

ما قاتلت عليا إلا في أمر عثمان

I only fought against ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ regarding the matter of ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.³

و أما الخلافة فلسنا نطلبها

As for the khilāfah, we do not seek it.⁴

Sayyidunā Abū al-Dardā رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and Sayyidunā Abū Umāmah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ attempted to resolve this dispute. Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ instructed them to take the following message to Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ:

فقولا له فليقدنا من قتلة عثمان ثم أنا أول من بايعه من أهل الشام

Hand over the murderers of ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ then I will be the first from the people of Syria to pledge allegiance to him.⁵

1 Al-Yawāqīt wa l-Jawāhir, vol. 2 pg. 77; Al-Musāmarah, vol. 2 pg. 158.

2 Maktūbāt Imām-e Rabbānī, letter: 251.

3 Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah, vol. 11 pg. 92.

4 Wak‘at al-Siffīn, pg. 70.

5 Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah, vol. 7 pg. 260.

Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, acknowledging the sincerity of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah’s رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ claim said:

والظاهر أن ربنا واحد و نبينا واحد و دعوتنا في الإسلام واحدة لا نستزيدهم في الإيمان بالله و التصديق برسوله و لا يستزيدوننا: الأمر واحد إلا ما اختلفنا فيه من دم عثمان و نحن منه براء

(Nobody should have a misconception regarding the battle that occurred between us and the people of Syria) It is obvious that our Rabb is one, our Prophet is one and our call to Islam is one. Until we have the connection of faith in Allah and affirmation of the Messenger صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, we will not demand more nor will they. All our matters were unified except that we differed regarding the matter of the blood of ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and we are free from blame.¹

Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ heard someone speaking ill of the people of Syria and admonished him:

لا تقولوا إلا خيرا إنما هم زعموا أنا بغينا عليهم و زعمنا أنهم بغوا علينا فقاتلناهم

Do not say but good about them. They thought we rebelled against them and we thought that they rebelled against us, therefore the battle occurred.²

The Shī‘ah Muḥaddith, Abū al-‘Abbās ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ja‘far al-Ḥimyarī al-Qummī reports on the authority of Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ who narrates from his father that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ used to say regarding those fighting against him:

We did not fight them due to disbelief nor did they fight us due to disbelief,

و لكننا رأينا أنا على حق و رأوا أنهم على حق

but we considered ourselves to be on the truth and they considered themselves to be on the truth.³

Once someone asked Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ regarding the martyrs of Ṣiffīn and he replied:

1 *Nahj al-Balāghah*, pg. 186, Sermon: 58.

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah*, vol. 3 pg. 61.

3 *Qurb al-Asnād*, pg. 45.

لا يموتن أحد من هؤلاء و قلبه نقي إلا دخل الجنة

Whoever passed away from them with a pure heart will enter Jannah.¹

He also said:

قال علي رضي الله عنه قتلاي و قتلا معاوية في الجنة رواه الطبراني و رجاله وثقوا

Our martyrs and the martyrs of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ are both in paradise.²

It is for this reason that at the end of the battle, Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ personally participated in the preparation and shrouding of the martyrs and himself led their janāzah ṣalāh. In the history of the world, such a battle has never occurred in which those who fought each other during the day assisted each other in the shrouding and burial of their martyrs at night.³

Mawlānā Ḥālī al-Marḥūm (d. 1935 A.H) has definitely spoken the truth when he said:

If they did indeed differ with each other

Then most certainly it was based upon sincerity

There might have been a dispute but there was no evil intent

They fight today for the peace of tomorrow⁴

4. Until now, the discussion pertained to the sincerity of both groups, now we need to determine the status of this dispute in the eyes of our Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. The Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, in many aḥādīth has hinted towards the occurrence of this battle, which indicates that the cause of this battle would be a difference in ijtihād. In the authentic ḥadīth compilation of Imām Muslim رَحِمَهُ اللهُ and the *Musnad* of Imām Aḥmad رَحِمَهُ اللهُ it has been narrated, through many authentic chains of transmission, from Abū Sa‘īd al-Khudrī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ that the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ said:

1 *Muqaddamah Ibn Khuldūn*, pg. 215.

2 *Majma‘ al-Zawā‘id*, vol. 9 pg. 594.

3 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. 7 pg. 277; *Tahdhīb Ibn al-‘Asākir* vol. 1 pg. 74.

4 *Musaddas al-Ḥālī*, pg. 25.

تمرق مارقة عند فرقة من المسلمين تقتلهم اولى الطائفتين بالحق

At the event of mutual disagreement between the Muslims, one group will exit (the boundaries of the ummah.) And from both of the remaining two groups of Muslims, the one which is closer to the truth will fight this group which has exited the fold of the ummah.¹

Muftī Muḥammad Taqī ‘Uthmānī writes under the commentary of this narration:

In this ḥadīth, the group which will “exit the Ummah” refers to the sect called the Khawārij. Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and his army, whom the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم referred to as “being closer to the truth”, killed them. It is clearly apparent from these words of the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم that the disagreement between ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه was not that of truth and falsehood, rather it was a disagreement which had scope for a difference of opinion from both parties. ‘Alī رضي الله عنه was comparatively closer to the truth. If this was not the intention of the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم then he would have said that ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and his group will be on the truth as opposed to saying that he will be closer to the truth.²

Similarly, in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* and *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Muslim*, as well as other books of aḥādīth; this ḥadīth has been transmitted with an extremely reliable chain of narration that the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم said:

لا تقوم الساعة حتى تقتتل فئتان عظيمتان تكون بينهما مقتلة عظيمة دعواهما واحدة

Qiyāmah will not take place until two great groups of Muslims fight one another. There will be severe bloodshed between them, even though their call will be the same.³

In addition, Muftī Taqī ‘Uthmānī writes:

‘Ulamā have said these two great parties refer to the groups of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه (*Sharḥ al-Muslim li l-Imām al-Nawawī* vol. 2 pg. 390) and the

1 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. 7 pg. 278.

2 *Haḍrat Mu‘āwiyah awr Tārīkhī Haqīqat*, pg. 243.

3 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, vol. 2 pg. 1054; *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Muslim*, vol. 2 pg. 390.

Messenger of Allah ﷺ referred to the call of both these groups as one. This makes it clear that their motives were not to gain power or authority. Rather both groups stood for the call of Islam and were well-wishers for the prosperity of Islam, according to their understanding. It is for this reason that during the Battle of Šiffīn, it was not clear to some of the Šaḥābah which side is on the truth. This is why they remained completely abstinent from the dispute. In fact, it is the saying of Imām Muḥammad ibn Sīrīn رَحِمَهُ اللهُ that the majority of the Šaḥābah did not participate in this battle. The question is: if the stance of Mu‘āwiyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ was clearly false and (Allah forbid) based on the disobedience of Allah, then why did such a large number of Šaḥābah not support ‘Alī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ? If they were explicitly the transgressors then it was a clear commandment of the Qur’ān that they should be fought. Why then would the majority of the Šaḥābah leave this Qur’ānic commandment? Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-Kathīr رَحِمَهُ اللهُ has also said after reporting the two aforementioned aḥādīth in his *Tārīkh*:

و فيه ان اصحاب علي رضي الله عنه ادني الطائفتين الي الحق و هذا هو مذهب أهل السنة و الجماعة ان عليا رضي الله عنه هو المصيب و ان كان معاوية رضي الله عنه مجتهدا وهو مأجور ان شاء الله (البداية و النهاية ج ٢ ص ٢٧٩)

It is also been proven from this ḥadīth that the companions of ‘Alī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ were closer to the truth from both the groups and this is the stance of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā‘ah that ‘Alī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ was correct even though Mu‘āwiyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ was a mujtahid and, Allah willing, he will also be rewarded for his ijtihād.

After mentioning the reference of Imām al-Nawawī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ, Muftī Taqī ‘Uthmānī writes:

This is the correct stance of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā‘ah, which is based on strong evidence from the Qur’ān and ḥadīth and other authentic reports as well as the overall biographies of the Šaḥābah. Now if a person’s heart, despite all these clear proofs, strong aḥādīth and opinions of the leaders of dīn; is still fascinated by the tales of Hishām al-Kalbī and Abū Mikhnaf, and based on their reports, insists on accusing Mu‘āwiyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ and proving him to be a sinner, then what can be done for him except supplicate for his guidance? Who has a remedy for that person who prefers darkness over light? Such a person should deeply consider that this matter will not only remain at Mu‘āwiyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ but will necessitate the accusation of disobedience against Umm al-Mu‘minīn

‘Ā’ishah رضي الله عنها, Ṭalḥah رضي الله عنه, Zubayr رضي الله عنه, ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ رضي الله عنه, and ‘Ubādah ibn Ṣāmit رضي الله عنه as well as the lofty group of prominent Ṣaḥābah who saw these people committing this disobedience but remained aloof from this dispute with the rest of the Muslim ummah and left ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, who was fighting against this, without any aid. They too will not be exempted from the accusation of disobedience. Thus, they will have to believe that Sa’d ibn Abī al-Waqqāṣ رضي الله عنه and Sa’īd ibn Zayd رضي الله عنه from the ‘Asharah Mubasharah and other senior Ṣaḥābah such as Abū Sa’īd al-Khudrī رضي الله عنه, ‘Abd Allāh ibn Salām رضي الله عنه, Qudāmah ibn Madhūn رضي الله عنه, Ka’b ibn Mālik رضي الله عنه, Nu’mān ibn Bashīr رضي الله عنه, Usāmah ibn Zayd رضي الله عنه, Ḥassān ibn Thābit رضي الله عنه, ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar رضي الله عنه, Abū al-Dardā رضي الله عنه, Abū Umāmah al-Bāhilī رضي الله عنه, Maslamah ibn Makhlad رضي الله عنه, and Fuḍālāh ibn ‘Ubayd رضي الله عنه; that they abandoned assisting ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and instead strengthened the force of falsehood, thus leaving the obedience of the true Imām and opting for disobedience.

If a person is ready to accept all these points, then he may call Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه a *fāsiq* (sinner) but then, as opposed to concealing his true beliefs, he should openly admit to all these points and should in clear words announce those beliefs that the reverence and sanctity of the Ṣaḥābah, the claim of them being the most virtuous and having attained the honour of being the best of nations; are all deceit. If he fails to do so then there is not the slightest difference between him and today’s politicians.¹

Keeping these requests in mind, the claims against Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه can be summarised into the following points:

1. The behavior Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه adopted against ‘Alī رضي الله عنه is in no way praiseworthy.
2. An error in ijtihād when pertaining to a Sharī ruling, after exerting all possible efforts, may be acceptable but to deem such a mistake in worldly and governmental affairs, which becomes a means of tribulation, as reward is not in line with wisdom and justice.
3. This cannot be regarded as error in ijtihād.

¹ Haḍrat Mu‘āwiyah awr Tārīkhī Haqīqat, pg. 243.

1. Mu‘āwiyah’s ﷺ behavior with ‘Alī ﷺ

As far as this claim is concerned, we have clarified this time and again that Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah ﷺ regarded Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ to be more virtuous than himself and also more rightful to the khilāfah. Yes, this is definitely true that he had vowed only to pledge his allegiance after the *qiṣāṣ* (death penalty) was carried out upon the murderers of ‘Uthmān ﷺ.

If this claim is made with regards to Ṣiffīn, then it should be borne in mind that commencement of the Battle of Ṣiffīn was carried out by Sayyidunā ‘Alī ﷺ. When the Iraqī forces reached the location of Dakhliyyah, Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah ﷺ had to unwillingly come onto the field for the purpose of defense.

Ibn Taymiyyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ writes:

لم يكن معاوية ممن يختار الحرب ابتداء بل كان من أشد الناس حرصا على أن لا يكون قتال

Mu‘āwiyah ﷺ did not initiate the battle rather he was the most desirous that the opportunity of mutual war between the Muslims should not arise.¹

Also Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah ﷺ was the first in attempting to stop the battle. When a large number of the Ṣahābah became martyrs, Mu‘āwiyah ﷺ said:

قد فنى الناس فمن للشعور؟ و من لجهاد المشركين و الكفار

If people are destroyed like this, who will protect the borders and who will fight against the mushrikīn and the kuffār?²

Ibn al-Athīr al-Jazarī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ explains that Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah ﷺ said:

هذا حكم كتاب الله بيننا و بينكم من لشعور الشام بعد أهله من لشعور العراق بعد أهله

This book of Allah is the judge between us. After the people of Syria (are destroyed), who will protect the borders of Syria? And after the people of Iraq (are destroyed), who will protect the borders of Iraq?³

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah*, vol. 2 pg. 219.

2 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. 7 pg. 273.

3 *Al-Kāmīl*, vol. 3 pg. 161.

‘Allāmah Khālid Maḥmūd writes:

In the battle of Şiffīn despite the fact that the Syrian forces were very strong and were in large numbers, Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ through the means of opened copies of the Qur’ān stopped the bloodshed and pondered deeply over solving the problem. No one should think that his staying far from the battle was due to weakness and cowardliness. That revered person who severely attacked Rome in such a way that he destroyed centuries of civilisation and the years of deficiency, such a thing cannot be perceived regarding him. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-Kathīr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ writes in *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* (vol. 8 page 133): “Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ attacked the countries of the Roman Empire sixteen times. The bravery of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ in the naval battles is from amongst the great engravings in the history of Islam, which no future misinterpretation can wash away.”¹

During the battle between Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, taking advantage of the clashes amongst the Muslims, the king of Rome gathered a large army to attack the Muslims. When Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ came to know of this, he wrote a letter to the Caesar of Rome:

If you have resolved to fulfil your motives, then I take an oath that I will reconcile with my brother ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and the name of the first warrior in the army which will be dispatched against you will be Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. I will make Constantinople into a burnt coal and I will uproot and flank your empire like uprooted carrots and radishes.²

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-Kathīr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ mentions this very same incident:

والله لئن لم تنته وترجع إلى بلادك يا لعين لأصطلحن أنا وابن عمي عليك ولأخرجنك
من جميع بلادك ولأضيقن عليك الأرض بما رحبت فعند ذلك خاف ملك الروم و
انكف

“O accursed! If you do not change your motive and do not return towards your cities then I swear by Allah, my cousin and I will reconcile against you and we will remove you from your country and will narrow the earth on you despite

1 ‘Abqāt, pg. 231.

2 *Tāj al-‘Urūs*, vol. 7 pg. 208.

its vastness.” The Caesar of Rome became fearful after reading this letter and turned back from his intention.¹

Muḥammad ibn Maḥmūd al-Āmulī رحمه الله has mentioned in his book, *Nafā'is al-Funūn* that when Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه was mentioned in the presence of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه, he said:

كان علي والله كالليث إذا دعا وكالبدر إذا بدا وكالمطر إذا ندا فقال له بعض من حضر:
أنت أفضل أم علي؟ فقال: خطوط من علي خير من آل أبي سفيان

By Allah! ‘Alī رضي الله عنه used to be like a lion when he spoke, like a full moon when he appeared, and like the rain when he would give. A person asked from the gathering: “Are you more virtuous or ‘Alī رضي الله عنه?” He replied: “A few streaks of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه are better than the family of Abū Sufyān رضي الله عنه.”²

When news of the martyrdom of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه reached Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه, he began to weep. His wife told him that whilst alive you fought him and now you weep? He replied:

ويحك! انك لا تدريين ما فقد النلس من الفضل و الفقه و العلم

Woe unto you! You do not know what great amount of knowledge and understanding people have lost through his martyrdom.³

Ḍirār al-Ṣadā’ī, who was a close associate of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, was once asked by Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه to relate to him the qualities of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. When he mentioned his qualities, Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه remarked:

رحم الله ابا الحسن رضي الله عنه! كان والله! كذلك

May Allah سبحانه وتعالى have mercy upon Abū al-Ḥasan (‘Alī رضي الله عنه). By Allah! He was definitely like that.⁴

1 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 119.

2 *Al-Nāhīyah*, pg. 23.

3 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 129.

4 *Al-Istī‘āb*, vol. 3 pg. 209.

This is a reality that even the Shī'ah can never deny. This is why the Shī'ah Mujtahid, Sayyid Hāshim al-Baḥrānī writes:

When Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ heard the qualities that 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ possessed, he could not control himself and broke down crying. He wiped his tears as they trickled down to his beard. The people in the gathering cried so much that they lost their voices. Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ said: "May Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى have mercy on Abū al-Ḥasan. By Allah! He was like this."¹

This narration can be found in a number of Shī'ah compilations, with different wording, such as *Al-Amālī* of Ṣadūq, *Durr al-Najafīyyah*, and *Sharḥ Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd*.

Respected readers! The list of these factual stories is never ending. We have mentioned only a few incidents through which you will come to understand that Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ were the true personification of the verse:

رُحَمَاءَ بَيْنَهُمْ

*They are compassionate amongst each other.*²

The differences that existed between them were not based upon evil intentions but rather were the result of misunderstandings and confusion. It is not farfetched for such disagreements to arise in a time of misunderstanding, disarray, and disorder. Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim Nānawtawī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ mentions:

The differences between Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was akin to those between Prophet Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام and Prophet Hārūn عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام. It is incumbent upon us not to find faults in them. Any disagreement and dispute between Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ should be understood and treated in the same manner as the disputes and arguments between Prophet Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام and Prophet Hārūn عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, between Prophet Yūsuf عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام and his brothers or between Prophet Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام and Khidr عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام. These incidents are mentioned in the Noble Qur'ān and there are no grounds to negate them. However, the differences between the Ṣaḥābah

1 *Hūlyat al-Abrār*, vol. 1 pg. 345.

2 *Sūrah al-Fatḥ*: 29.

رضي الله عنه are not mentioned in the Qur'ān, neither are they mentioned in the books of ḥadīth. Such tales are only mentioned in the books of history, and how can we rely on such books of history, especially those books of history authored by the Shī'ah?¹

The conduct of Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه

After studying the conduct of Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه, let us have a look at the conduct of Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه. When Sayyidunā Ibn 'Abbās رضي الله عنه suggested to Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه to allow Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه to remain as the governor of Syria, 'Alī رضي الله عنه replied:

فو الله لا أولي منهم أحدا أبدا، فإن أقبلوا فذلك خير لهم: وإن أدبروا بذلت لهم السيف

By Allah! I will never appoint anyone as a governor from those people. It would be best for them if they accept this. If they tend to be rebellious and they do not accept, then I will use the sword against them.²

He also said:

والله لا اعطيه الا السيف

By Allah! Besides the sword, I will not give Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه anything.³

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-Kathīr رحمه الله writes:

ولما ولي علي بن أبي طالب الخلافة أشار عليه كثير من أمرائه ممن باشر قتل عثمان أن يعزل معاوية عن الشام ويولي عليها سهل بن حنيف فعزله

When 'Alī رضي الله عنه became the khalīfah, the murderers of 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه advised him to dismiss Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه and replace him with Sahl ibn Ḥunayf رضي الله عنه. So he discharged him.⁴

1 *Ajwibah Arba'īn*, pg. 188.

2 *Tārīkh al-Ṭabrī*, vol. 4 pg. 440.

3 *Ibid.*

4 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 21.

Remarking on this, Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-Kathīr رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ writes:

وانتشرت الفتنة و تفاقم الأمر و اختلفت الكلمة

(After this) Evil spread amongst the people and the unity that people had through the kalimah of Islam turned into disunity.¹

Ibn Taymiyyah رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ mentions:

بل قد أشار عليه من أشار أن يقر معاويةَ على إمارته في ابتداء الأمر، حتى يستقيم له الأمر، وكان هذا الرأي أحزم عند الذين ينصحونه ويحبونه. فدل هذا وغيره على أن الذين أشاروا على أمير المؤمنين كانوا حازمين. وعلي إمام مجتهد، لم يفعل إلا ما رآه مصلحة. لكن المقصود أنه لو كان يعلم الكوائن كان قد علم أن إقراره على الولاية أصلح له من حرب صفين، التي لم يحصل بها إلا زيادة الشر وتضاعفه، لم يحصل بها من المصلحة شيء، وكانت ولايته أكثر خيرا وأقل شرا من محاربتة، وكل ما يظن في ولايته من الشر، فقد كان في محاربتة أعظم منه.

A few people advised ‘Alī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ to retain Mu‘āwiyah رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ as the governor till all matters are sorted out. This opinion was given to ‘Alī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ by those people who were well wishers of ‘Alī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ and who loved him. This clearly indicates that the people who gave advice to ‘Alī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ with regards to Mu‘āwiyah رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ were very cautious and prudent individuals. However, ‘Alī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ -who was a Mujtahid and Imām, only did that which he thought was beneficial. If he knew what would transpire and result through his decision, he would definitely have deemed leaving Mu‘āwiyah رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ as the governor to be a better option than engaging in the Battle at Şiffīn, which carried no benefit at all. In fact, it allowed more evil to spread. Retaining him as governor was a better option compared to fighting him. The evil that came about by fighting him was far more than the possibility of evil that ‘Alī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ feared would come about by leaving Mu‘āwiyah رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ as governor.²

2. Errors in political affairs cannot be termed as an error in ijtihād

The second claim made is:

¹ Ibid. vol. 7 pg. 229.

² Minhāj al-Sunnah, vol. 4 pg. 179.

An error in ijtihād when pertaining to a Shar‘ī ruling, after exerting all possible efforts, may be acceptable but to deem such a mistake in worldly and governmental affairs, which becomes a means of tribulation, as reward is not in line with wisdom and justice.

In this regard a few crucial matters need to be understood:

- a. After the oppressive murder of Amīr al-Mu‘minīn ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, an extremely difficult plight overcame the Muslim Ummah, which ultimately led to the Battles of Jamal and Şiffīn. Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, who remained in the blessed company of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ for twenty-three years, and about whom the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ said:

يحب الله ورسوله ويحبه الله ورسوله

He loves Allah and His Messenger and in turn Allah and His Messenger love him.

One who has been given the honourable title of:

اقضاهم على

The most accurate in decision making.

A personality who surpassed everyone in knowledge (in his era of khilāfah) as well as in taqwā, wisdom, understanding and far-sightedness. And now a person of this calibre says:

فانا مستقبلون امرا له وجوه و الوان لا تقوم له القلوب و لا تثبت عليه العقول و ان
الافاق قد اغامت لمحجة قد تنكرت

We are faced with such a tremendous matter which has such angles and colours to it that no heart or mind can have conviction. The horizons have become clouded and the paths confused.¹

¹ Nahj al-Balāghah, pg. 45 sermon: 92.

If this was the situation of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ then what decision and conclusion can we arrive at today, centuries after the actual events transpired, by merely studying selected reports of history? Confusion and uncertainty was truly the actual scenario the Muslim Ummah faced at the time.

- b. The insurgents and rebels hid in the midst of the Muslims and in the sacred city of Madīnah Munawwarah itself, and in the very presence of al-Masjid al-Nabawī and the blessed grave of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ they mercilessly murdered Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, shattering the foundations of the Islamic khilāfah.
- c. The rebels, in order to strengthen their cause, proclaimed false love for the family of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ in particular. They carried much influence in the various camps of the Muslims. It would not be incorrect to say that the reigns of khilāfah was in their control. Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ would say:

يملكوننا و لا يملكهم

They have control over us. And we do not have authority over them.¹

- d. The question which needs to be asked here is whether seeking qīṣāṣ for the blood of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is a minor issue or not? Who is ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ after all? He was the rightful khalīfah, the best after Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, and yet he was ruthlessly murdered after being held in house arrest for forty days. The pen is unable to write the heart breaking incident. The very same ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, when the false rumour of his martyrdom spread in the Muslim camp, the Messenger of Allah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ himself took a pledge from 1400 Muhājirīn and Anṣār to fight to the death to avenge his blood, upon which verses of the Qur’ān were revealed. The Messenger of Allah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ even went to the extent of placing his blessed hand in place of the hand of ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. Again the questioned is asked: was seeking qīṣāṣ for the blood of ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ a minor issue or not? Furthermore, is seeking qīṣāṣ not seeking to fulfil that which is *farḍ* (compulsory) in light of the following verse:

¹ Ibid. pg. 92 Sermon: 168.

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا كُتِبَ عَلَيْكُمُ الْقِصَاصُ فِي الْقَتْلِ

*O you who have imān! Qiṣāṣ has been made obligatory for you in the case of murder.*¹

It is reported in a ḥadīth:

من قتل متعمدا ادفع الى اولياء المقتول فان شائوا قتلوا و ان شائوا اخذوا الدية

If a person intentionally takes the life of a person, then he shall be given over to the heirs of the deceased. They can decide between executing him or taking *diyāh* (monetary recompense) from him.²

- e. Qiṣāṣ is indeed a law of Sharī'ah, the obligation of which is established by the Qur'ān and ḥadīth. Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه never claimed *khilāfah* or *imārah* (leadership). Mawlānā Ṣafar Aḥmad 'Uthmānī (d. 1394 A.H) states:

When 'Alī رضي الله عنه had sent a delegation to Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه to take his pledge of allegiance, Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه said: "I will most certainly pledge myself to 'Alī رضي الله عنه on condition that he take *qiṣāṣ* for the murder of 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه or he award me the task." He then recited the following verse:

وَمَنْ قُتِلَ مَظْلُومًا فَقَدْ جَعَلْنَا لَوْلِيَّهِ سُلْطٰنًا فَلَا يُسْرِفُ فِي الْقَتْلِ اِنَّهٗ كَانَ
مَنْصُورًا

*Whoever is killed unjustly, then verily We have granted authority to his heir, so let him not transgress in execution. Indeed he shall be assisted.*³

Sayyidunā 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abbās رضي الله عنه said:

At this point I became convinced that if *qiṣāṣ* for the murder of 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه was not taken then Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه would definitely take charge.⁴

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 178.

2 *Tirmidhī*, vol. 1 pg. 258.

3 Sūrah Banī Isrā'īl: 33.

4 *Izālat al-Khafā*, vol. 1 pg. 434; *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* vol. 8 pg. 21.

On the one hand, the atmosphere was rampant with the demand for the murderers of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه to be executed, and the situation was such:

حجة معاوية زمن معه ما وقع معه من قتل عثمان مظلوما و وجود قتلته باعينهم في
العسكر العراقي

The proof of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and those with him was that ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه was oppressively murdered and the murderers were present in the Iraqi army.¹

The killers of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه concealed themselves beneath the banner of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. Shāh Walī Allāh Muḥaddith Dehlawī رحمه الله writes:

The murderers of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه had no choice but to seek political refuge in ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and pledge their allegiance to him. Therefore, they strove hard to strengthen their allegiance to him and therefore displayed the utmost obedience to him; so that in whichever way their allegiance to him may be fortified.²

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Taymiyyah رحمه الله also writes:

They fabricated false narrations and invented new ideologies so that they can corrupt Islam and deviate those who are naive and gullible. They exerted themselves in the assassination of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه and this was the very first fitnah. Thereafter, they gathered around ‘Alī رضي الله عنه not because they loved ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and the Ahl al-Bayt, but rather in order to create fitnah among the Muslims. Thus, they fought alongside ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. Shortly thereafter, a group from among them labelled ‘Alī رضي الله عنه a kāfir and fought against him. They were called the Khawārij. The Khawārij were the first to wage war against the Muslims. A group from amongst them would speak ill of the three khulafā’ and they were called Rawāfiḍ.

f. Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه said that he does not have sufficient power to capture them and in reply to this two demands were made from him:

I. Hand them over to us and we will take Qiṣāṣ.

1 *Fatḥ al-Bārī*, vol. 13 pg. 288.

2 *Qurrat al-Aynayn*, pg. 143.

II. If this too is not possible then grant us permission to capture them ourselves, and absolve yourself from them.

However, despite these suggestions, the Battle of Şifḫīn was initiated by ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and not Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. In fact, Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ rather opted to defend himself. Furthermore, the battle was ended by Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.

In fact, Mawlānā ‘Abd al-Shakūr Lakhnawī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ has written:

In this battle, ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was really struggling due to the cowardice and rebellious attitude of his men.¹

If Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was truly desirous of khilāfah and leadership then he would have very conveniently brought his army in the Battle of Şifḫīn or could have attacked after the Battle of Nahrawān when Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ would have been vulnerable. Mawlānā ‘Abd al-Shakūr Lakhnawī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ further states:

After the Battle of Şifḫīn, ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ had practically lost the entire country, to such an extent that he only had Kūfah and the surroundings of Kūfah in his control.²

Shāh Walī Allāh رَحِمَهُ اللهُ mentions something very similar to this in *Izālat al-Khafā* (vol.1 pg. 479).

If Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ so wished, he could have announced his khilāfah immediately after the martyrdom of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ but he did not. How could he, whom the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ himself had praised with the virtue:

معاوية ابى سفيان احلم امتي واجودها

Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is the most tolerant of my ummah and the most generous.³

1 *Al-Khulafā al-Rāshidīn*, pg. 222.

2 *Al-Khulafā al-Rāshidīn*, pg. 216.

3 *Taṭhīr al-Jinān wa l-Lisān*, pg. 12.

How can he do such a thing? Thus, *qiṣāṣ*, which is a Sharī and religious injunction, can never be referred to as a governmental matter.

One Question

After this lengthy discussion and clarification, we wish to ask the critics one question. Mawlānā Zafar Aḥmad ‘Uthmānī رحمته الله writes:

This mystery has still not been solved. When ‘Alī رضي الله عنه knew about the disturbance and that the rebels were mischief-mongers then why did he include them in his army? Why did he award Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr and Mālik al-Ashtar al-Nakhaī such high ranking positions, when it was they who had incited this mischief. Why did he keep them with him in all of his gatherings and important affairs. They were at the forefront in the important political and war affairs. Can those who are criticising us and wish to attain the level of *ijtihād*, please take the trouble to solve this riddle for us?¹

3. Failing to understand *ijtihād*

Thirdly, the claim was made:

This cannot be regarded as error in *ijtihād*.

We are instructed to understand the Qur’ān and Sunnah through the interpretation and explanation mentioned by the pious predecessors. Any explanation of the Qur’ān or interpretation of the ḥadīth which has not been proven by the pious predecessors will be considered to be incorrect. This is the least that we have learnt from our pious ancestors. The author of *Ma’ārif al-Sunan*, the renowned Muḥaddith, Mawlānā Sayyid Muḥammad Yūsuf Binawrī رحمته الله (d. 1397 A.H) mentions:

This world is a place of truth and falsehood. In this place, falsehood disguises itself in a cloak of truth. Many times, a person considers his false ideologies to be the truth and embraces it because of which he gradually becomes mentally deranged. Eventually he does not even possess the ability to differentiate between what is right and what is wrong. This is detrimental. It is not the way of the people of the truth and research. They say: “This is my understanding”, when he himself is dwelling in misconception. When they are reprimanded

¹ *Barā’at-e ‘Uthmān*, pg. 42.

out of sincerity and goodness then they proffer an array of excuses. The way of the people of the truth is that when they are made aware of any inappropriate words they have uttered or written, they immediately return to the truth.¹

Similarly, the author of *Awjaz al-Masālik*, Mawlānā Muḥammad Zakariyyah Sahāranpūrī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ (d. 1402 A.H) writes:

The reality is that in this era of trials, a person is only considered to be a research scholar when he criticises the pious predecessors. Therefore, this unworthy one is a follower of the pious predecessors, step for step, and if this unworthy one ever does utter anything contrary to them then it will be absurd and rejected.²

To then disagree with them, and that too in the disputes of the Ṣaḥābah, which is a bridge in the chapter of īmān; sharper than a sword and finer than a strand of hair. The pious have given advice to control both the pen and the tongue in this regard, because in this chapter it is very difficult to save oneself from excess and deficiency, exaggeration and derision. A small mistake can be a means of one losing his īmān. Especially with regards to Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, extreme precaution has to be exercised. Mujaddid Alf-e Thānī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ offers a piece of advice:

O my brothers! In this matter, Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was not alone. Approximately half of the Ṣaḥābah were with him in this matter. If those who fought Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ are branded as kāfir and fāsiq (sinners), then none will remain with īmān in complete dīn, because it was due to their efforts of propagation that Islam has reached us. Only a *zindīq* (renegade), whose object is to falsify dīn, will say that it is permissible.³

It can be understood from the above that by not considering the dispute between Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to be a matter of ijtihād and describing it to be mere “stubbornness” and issuing rulings of kufr and fisq upon them, is nothing short of disbelief. The purpose of this is not to support the Ahl al-Bayt, rather it is to create doubts in Islam.

1 *Baṣā’ir wa ‘Ibar*, vol. 1 pg. 192.

2 *Makātīb Shaykh al-Ḥadīth*, pg. 502-503.

3 *Maktūbāt-e Imām Rabānī*, Letter: 251.

Now we will present a few references, wherein our senior scholars have unambiguously termed this dispute to be a matter of ijtihād.

1. Imām Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī

Imām Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash‘arī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ writes:

فأما ما جرى بين علي والزبير وعائشة رضي الله عنهم أجمعين فإنما كان على تأويل واجتهاد وعلي الإمام وكلهم من أهل الاجتهاد وقد شهد لهم النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم بالجنة والشهادة فدل على أنهم كلهم كانوا على حق في اجتهادهم وكذلك ما جرى بين سيدنا علي ومعاوية رضي الله عنهما فدل على تأويل واجتهاد

The dispute that came about between Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Sayyidunā Zubayr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and Sayyidah ‘Ā’ishah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا was based on differences in interpretation and ijtihād. Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was the khalīfah of the time. All of these great personalities had a right to exercise their judgement. The Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had given them glad tidings of Jannah and martyrdom. We can understand from this that everyone was correct in practising ijtihād. Similarly, the dispute between Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was also based on ijtihād.¹

2. Imām Abū Ishāq al-Isfarā’ini

Imām Abū Ishāq al-Isfarā’ini رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 418 A.H) states:

فإنه أي التخاصم والنزاع والتقاتل والدفاع الذي جرى بينهم ، كان عن اجتهاد قد صدر من كل واحد من رءوس الفريقين ، ومقصد سائغ لكل فرقة من الطائفتين ، وإن كان المصيب في ذلك للصواب واحدا ، وهو علي رضوان الله عليه ومن والاه ، والمخطئ هو من نازعه وعاداه ، غير أن للمخطئ في الاجتهاد أجرا وثوابا ، خلافا لأهل الجفاء والعناد ، فكل ما صح مما جرى بين الصحابة الكرام وجب حمله على وجه ينفي عنهم الذنوب والآثام

Verily, the dispute, conflict, repulsion and fighting that took place between the Ṣaḥābah was due to ijtihād that the leaders of the two groups made. Both groups had noble intentions even though only one group was correct in their ijtihād. That was the group of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and his supporters. Those

¹ *Al-Ibānah*, pg. 69.

people who disputed and fought against Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه were at fault. Nevertheless, the group that was at fault will still receive one reward. Only the oppressors and obstinate have disputed regarding this doctrine. Therefore it is wājib to expound on even the authentic narrations regarding the dispute of the Ṣaḥābah, so they can be exonerated from all blame.¹

3. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥazm al-Andalusī

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥazm al-Andalusī رحمته الله (d. 456 A.H) explains:

فبهذا قطعنا على صواب علي رضي الله عنه وصحة إمامته وأنه صاحب الحق وأن له أجرين أجر الاجتهاد، وأجر الإصابة وقطعنا أن معاوية رضي الله عنه ومن معه مخطئون مجتهدون مأجورون أجراً واحداً

Because of these (above mentioned) reasons we have strong conviction that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه was correct in his ijtihād and his position of leadership was correct and he was also right. He will be rewarded double. One reward for making ijtihād and the second reward because his ijtihād was correct. We also have conviction that Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and his supporters were also mujtahidīn but had erred in their judgement. Due to their error they will be given one reward.²

4. Imām al-Ghazālī

Imām al-Ghazālī رحمته الله (d. 505 A.H) mentions:

وما جرى بين معاوية وعلي رضي الله عنهما كان مبنيًا على الاجتهاد لا منازعة من معاوية في الإمامة

The dispute that occurred between Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه was based on ijtihād. It was not a dispute pertaining to leadership.³

1 *Sharḥ ‘Aqā’id Isfarā’inī*, vol. 2 pg. 386.

2 *Al-Faṣl fi l-Milal wa al-Niḥal*, vol. 4 pg. 161.

3 *Iḥyā’ al-‘Ulūm*, vol. 1 pg. 115.

5. 'Allāmah Ibn al-Athīr al-Jazarī

'Allāmah Ibn al-Athīr al-Jazarī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 630 A.H) elucidates:

وذهب جمهور المعتزلة إلى أن عائشة وطلحة والزبير ومعاوية . وجميع أهل العراق والشام فساق يقتالهم الإمام الحقوكل هذا جرأة على السلف تخالف السنة ، فإن ما جرى بينهم كان مبنياً على الاجتهاد

The majority of the Mu'tazilah are of the opinion that Sayyidah 'Ā'ishah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا, Sayyidunā Ṭalḥah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Sayyidunā Zubayr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, all of Iraq and Syria are classed as fāsiq because they fought against the leader. This is an audacious claim on the pious predecessors and is against the Sunnah because everything that had transpired between them was on the basis of ijtihād.¹

6. 'Allāmah Qurṭubī al-Mālikī

'Allāmah Qurṭubī al-Mālikī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 671 A.H) writes:

لا يجوز أن ينسب إلى أحد من الصحابة خطأ مقطوع به ، إذ كانوا كلهم اجتهدوا فيما فعلوه وأرادوا الله عز وجل ، وهم كلهم لنا أئمة ، وقد تعبدنا بالكف عما شجر بينهم ، وألا نذكرهم إلا بأحسن الذكر ، لحرمة الصحبة ولنهي النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم عن سبهم ، وأن الله غفر لهم وأخبر بالرضا عنهم

It is not permissible to explicitly attribute an error to the Ṣaḥābah especially when they had used their ijtihād in whatever they did and their intentions were solely to please Allah. We believe they were all guides. We have been commanded to control our tongues regarding the disputes that took place between them. We should remember them with good words because of the honour of the Ṣaḥābah, and the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ warning us not to defame them. The reason for this is because Allah has forgiven them and informed them that He is pleased with them.²

1 *Jāmi' al-Uṣūl*, vol. 1 pg. 89.

2 *Al-Jāmi' li Ahkām al-Qur'ān*, vol. 16 pg. 321.

7. Imām Muḥyu al-Dīn al-Nawawī

Imām Muḥyu al-Dīn al-Nawawī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 676 A.H) mentions:

واما معاوية رضي الله عنه فهو من العدول الفضلاء والصحابة النجباء رضي الله عنه واما الحروب التي جرت فكانت لكل طائفة شبهة اعتقدت تصويب انفسها بسببها وكلهم عدول رضي الله عنهم ومتأولون في حروبهم وغيرها ولم يخرج شئ من ذلك احدا منهم عن العدالة لانهم مجتهدون اختلفوا في مسائل من محل الاجتهاد كما يختلف المجتهدون بعدهم في مسائل من الدماء وغيرها ولا يلزم من ذلك نقص احد منهم

Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is among those who are just and among the noble Ṣaḥābah. The war that took place between them was on account of doubt amongst both groups, which they considered to be the truth. All of them are just. They have their interpretation for the internal fighting. None of the reasons are such that it can remove their quality of being just since they were all mujtahids. Their disputes occurred only in matters of ijtihād. Similarly, there were many differences of opinion in ijtihād among the mujtahidīn that came after them, only this did not bring about any dispute amongst them.¹

8. Ḥāfiẓ Imād al-Dīn ibn al-Kathīr

Ḥāfiẓ Imād al-Dīn Ibn al-Kathīr رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 774 A.H) writes:

وفيه أن أصحاب علي أدنى الطائفتين إلى الحق، وهذا هو مذهب أهل السنة والجماعة أن عليا هو المصيب وإن كان معاوية مجتهدا، وهو مأجور إن شاء الله

It is also proven from this ḥadīth that the companions of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ were closer to the truth from both the groups. This is the position and stance of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā‘ah that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was correct (in his ijtihād) even though Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ will also be rewarded in his capacity as a mujtahid.²

9. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Taymiyyah

The statements of Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Taymiyyah al-Ḥanbalī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 728 A.H) has been mentioned previously. He said:

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Muslim*, vol. 2 pg. 272.

2 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. 7 pg. 279.

ولهذا اتفق أهل السنة على أنه لا تفسق واحدة من الطائفتين وإن قالوا في إحداهما إنهم كانوا بغاة لأنهم كانوا متأولين ومجتهدين والمجتهد المخطيء لا يكفر ولا يفسق

It is for this reason that the Ahl al-Sunnah have consensus on the matter that none of the two groups are fāsiq, even though they may have called each other rebels. This is because both the groups were mujtahids. A mujtahid who errs cannot be termed as a kāfir nor a fāsiq.¹

10. ‘Allāmah al-Taftāzānī

‘Allāmah Sa‘d al-Dīn Mas‘ūd al-Taftāzānī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 808 A.H) mentions:

وليسوا كفارا ولا فسقة ولا ظلمة لما لهم من التأويل وإن كان باطلا فغاية الأمر أنهم أخطأوا في الاجتهاد وذلك لا يوجب التفسيق فضلا عن التكفير ولهذا منع علي رضي الله تعالى عنه أصحابه من لعن أهل الشام وقال إخواننا بغوا علينا

They are not kāfir and nor are they fāsiq and they cannot be classified as oppressors because they had a reason for their actions, even if it may have been incorrect. The most that can be said is that they had erred in their judgement. By this error, a person does not become a fāsiq, let alone venture into kufr. It was for this reason that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ admonished those people who were cursing the people of Syria and said to them that they are our brothers who have rebelled against us.²

11. ‘Allāmah Ibn al-Khaldūn al-Maghribī

‘Allāmah Ibn Khaldūn al-Maghribī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 808 A.H) writes:

كان طريقهم فيها الحق والاجتهاد، ولم يكونوا في محاربتهم لغرض دينوي أو لإيثار باطل أو لاستشعار حقد، كما قد يتوهمه متوهم وينزع إليه ملحد

They acted upon the truth and exercised ijtiḥād in these matters. Their internal fighting was not because of any worldly motives or obstinacy as the worshippers of imagination think and the route the heretics also take.³

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah*, vol. 2 pg. 205.

2 *Sharḥ al-Maqāṣid*, vol. 2 pg. 305.

3 *Muqaddamah Ibn Khaldūn*, pg. 205.

12. Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī

Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī رحمته الله (d. 852 A.H) explains:

واتفق أهل السنة على وجوب منع الطعن على أحد من الصحابة بسبب ما وقع لهم من ذلك ولو عرف المحق منهم لأنهم لم يقاتلوا في تلك الحروب الا عن اجتهاد وقد عفا الله تعالى عن المخطئ في الاجتهاد بل ثبت أنه يؤجر أجرا واحدا وان المصيب يؤجر أجرين كما سيأتي بيانه في كتاب الأحكام

The Ahl al-Sunnah have consensus on this matter that it is forbidden to curse the Ṣaḥābah because of the disputes that took place between them, even though the group that were on the truth may be known. This is because their internal fighting was based upon ijtihād (and not due to arrogance). Allah has forgiven those who err in their ijtihād. It also a proven fact that the mujtahid who is correct in his ijtihād receives two rewards and the mujtahid who errs receives one reward.¹

13. ‘Allāmah Ibn al-Humām

The commentator on *Hidāyah*, Imām Kamāl al-Dīn Ibn al-Humām al-Ḥanafī رحمته الله (d. 861 A.H) mentions:

وما جرى بين معاوية وعلي رضي الله عنهما كان مبنيًا على الاجتهاد لا منازعة لا معاوية في الإمامة

The events that unfolded between Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رحمته الله and Sayyidunā ‘Alī رحمته الله were based on ijtihād. Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رحمته الله did not dispute regarding the khilāfah of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رحمته الله.²

14. Ibn Ḥajar al-Makkī

Ibn Ḥajar al-Makkī al-Shāfi‘ī al-Haythamī رحمته الله (d. 974 A.H) writes:

ومن اعتقاد أهل السنة والجماعة أيضا ان معاوية لم يكن في أيام عليّ خليفة و انما كان من الملوك و غاية اجتهاده انه كان له اجر واحد على اجتهاده و اما عليّ فكان له اجران اجر على اجتهاده و اجر على اصابته

1 *Fatḥ al-Bārī*, vol. 13 pg. 34.

2 *Al-Masāmarah*, pg. 314.

Also amongst the fundamental beliefs of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah is that Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was not a khalīfah during the lifetime of 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ but he was a king. The outcome of his ijtihād is that he will receive one reward. As for 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, he will receive two rewards, one for his ijtihād and another because it was correct.¹

15. Mujaddid Alf-e Thānī

Mujaddid Alf-e Thānī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ (d. 1034 A.H) says:

The differences that occurred amongst the Ṣaḥābah were not based upon worldly desires as their inner-selves had been purified (by the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) and had transcended from *Nafs al-Ammārah* (which inclines man towards evil) to *Nafs al-Muṭma'innah* (which inclines man towards good).

Their desires had been brought in conformity with Sharī'ah. In fact there differences are termed as ijtihād and "Raising the call of truth".²

16. 'Allāmah al-Khafājī

'Allāmah Shihāb al-Dīn al-Khafājī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ (d. 1099 A.H) writes:

فيما كان بينهم من الفتن كما وقع بين علي و معاوية رضي الله عنهما أحسن التأويلات
و المحامل لأنها أمور وقعت باجتهاد منهم لا لأغراض نفسانية و مطامع دنيوية كما
يظنه الجهلة

The different trials which occurred in the era of 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ are based on favourable interpretations because these were matters based on their ijtihād. It was not due to ulterior motives or out of greed for the paltry gains of this world, as is assumed by the ignorant.³

17. Mullā 'Alī Qārī

Mullā 'Alī Qārī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ (d. 1014 A.H) writes:

فلا يشكل باختلاف بعض الصحابة في الخلافة و الامارة قلت الظاهر ان اختلاف

1 *Al-Ṣawā'iq al-Muḥriqah*, pg. 217.

2 *Maktūbāt-e Imām Rabbānī*, letter: 80.

3 *Nasīm al-Riyāḍ*, vol. 3 pg. 421.

الخلاف أيضا من باب اختلاف فروع الدين الناشئة عن اجتهاد كل لا من الغرض
الديوى الصادر عن الحظ النفسي

The objection should not be raised against this saying of the Prophet ﷺ that some of the Ṣaḥābah differed in the matter of khilāfah and governorship, as according to me, apparent differences in khilāfah also fall under the category of subsidiary differences; which were all based on the ijtihād of each involved and not ulterior motives relating to one's personal inclinations.¹

18. 'Allāmah 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Farhārawī

'Allāmah 'Abd al-'Azīz al-Farhārawī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 1240 A.H) states:

وقال اهل السنة كان الحق مع علي وان من حاربه منخطئ في الاجتهاد فهو معذور وان
كلا من الفرقين عادل صالح ولايجوز الطعن في احد منهم

The Ahl al-Sunnah hold the opinion that 'Alī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ was on the truth and those who waged war against him had erred in their ijtihād and are thus exonerated. Both parties are just and pious. Therefore it will not be permissible to revile any of them.²

19. Mawlānā Rashīd Aḥmad Ghanghohī

Mawlānā Rashīd Aḥmad Ghanghohī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 1323 A.H) writes:

And whatever occurred from some of them, whether it is regarding the war waged against Amīr Mu'āwiyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ or any other deficiency of human-nature, it is an error based on ijtihād.³

20. Mawlānā Sayyid Ḥusayn Aḥmad Madanī

The illustrious Shaykh of the Arab and non-Arabs, Mawlānā Ḥusayn Aḥmad Madanī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 1377 A.H) elucidates:

The A'imma of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah regard the differences of the Ṣaḥābah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ as errors of ijtihād.⁴

1 *Mirqāt al-Mafātīḥ*, vol. 11 pg. 367.

2 *Al-Nibrās*, pg. 307.

3 *Hidāyat al-Shī'ah*, pg. 29.

4 *Maktūbāt-e Shaykh al-Islām*, vol. 3 pg. 43.

21. Muftī Muḥammad Shafi

The grand Muftī of Pakistan, Mawlānā Muftī Muḥammad Shafi رحمۃ اللہ علیہ (d. 1395 A.H) explains:

Especially concerning the disagreement of the Ṣaḥābah رضی اللہ عنہم, just as the ummah has consensus that it is necessary to revere both parties and it is impermissible to revile any one of them, on the same note there is consensus that in the Battle of Ṣiffīn, ‘Alī رضی اللہ عنہ was on the truth and Mu‘āwiyah رضی اللہ عنہ with his companions on the other side were at fault. However, their fault is categorised as an error of ijtihād, which does not qualify as a sin in Sharī‘ah, such that one will be taken to task by Allah. On the contrary, after exhausting one’s abilities in applying the requisites of ijtihād, if one happens to err in his conclusion; he too will not be deprived of reward and will be awarded a single reward. It is the consensus of the ummah that this dispute of the Ṣaḥābah falls in the same category of ijtihād differences which will not cause a blemish to any party or individuals. In this way, truth has been differentiated from the false and the reverence and honour of the Ṣaḥābah upheld. This has to be added to the fact that remaining silent and not delving into their disputes has been given preference and therefore it would not be permissible to delve into those narrations discussing the opposition party at the time of war without any valid cause.¹

22. Khawājah Shams al-Dīn Siyālwi

Khawājah Shams al-‘Ārifīn رحمۃ اللہ علیہ (d. 1300 A.H), who was the spiritual mentor of Mohr ‘Alī Shāh Golrawī, has mentioned the following in his advices:

The conversation thereafter led to the battle that took place between ‘Alī رضی اللہ عنہ and Mu‘āwiyah رضی اللہ عنہ upon which Khawājah Shams al-‘Ārifīn mentioned: “The cause of dissention and disagreement between ‘Alī رضی اللہ عنہ and Mu‘āwiyah رضی اللہ عنہ is based on ijtihād and not due to opposition.” Thereafter he mentioned: “O dervish! Although Mu‘āwiyah رضی اللہ عنہ was at fault, a mujtahid who errs still gets a single reward. Therefore it is highly detestable for a dervish to vilify the honour of the Ṣaḥābah.”²

These are a mere twenty one references from reliable sources of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā‘ah which were penned down after a very superficial search, whereas

1 *Maqām-e Ṣaḥābah*, pg. 89-90.

2 *Mir’āt al-‘Āshiqīn*, pg. 109.

the reality is that there is not a single proficient scholar of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah who stated that the differences between them were based upon opposition and not on ijtihād; rendering an alternate excuse for the course taken by Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.

Mujaddid Alf-e Thānī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ went to the extent of saying:

فلا جرم خطأ معاوية خير من صوابهما ببركة الصحبة

The error of Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ surpasses the accuracies of 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and Uways al-Qarnī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, through the blessing of the company of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

Therefore, the entire life of good deeds of the critics of Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and their mentors combined cannot equal the reward Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ accrued through this error in ijtihād.

Closing statement

In conclusion, I would like to present the view of Mujaddid Alf-e Thānī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ in which he explained that errors of ijtihād are acceptable according to the Ahl al-Sunnah:

وكتب القوم مشحونة بالخطأ الاجتهادي كما صرح به الامام الغزالي والقاضي ابوبكر وغيرهما. پس تفسیق و تضلیل در محاربان حضرت امیر جائر نباشد

And the works of the 'ulamā of the Ahl al-Sunnah are filled with opinions based on errors in ijtihād, as has been clearly mentioned by Imām al-Ghazālī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and Qāḍī Abū Bakr al-Bāqillānī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, and others. Therefore it will not be permissible to brand those who fought 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ as sinners or astray.¹

This leaves no need for further elucidation on the topic. However, the words of the author of *Nām wa Nasab*' are worth mentioning here:

When a big group of understanding people accept something, then the disagreement of a few weak-minded in some journals will not make any difference.²

1 *Maktūbāt-e Imām Rabbānī*, letter: 251.

2 *Nām wa Nasab*, pg. 457.

The ijtihād of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ

Beloved Readers! You have continuously been reading about ijtihād and errors in ijtihād, therefore I would like to present before you the following question to add to your knowledge.

The burning question is: what was the issue of contention between the two since Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was seeking retaliation for the murder of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ too was in favour of the same? At times, great events are based on minute issues and the consequences more severe. The actual issue of importance might be something small or even abstract yet the fruits and consequences turn out to be major. This is exactly what transpired in the disputes of the Ṣaḥābah. All that occurred was that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ agreed to the necessity of punishing the murderers but differed concerning the hastiness of the issue, which eventually led to a battle between them.

Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ preferred, based on his ijtihād, to first attend to the stability of the khilāfah before meeting out justice and until all the regions were not reinstated under the khilāfah, its power and strength should not be directed towards punishment and seizing the criminals. Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ on the other hand, based on his ijtihād¹, was of the opinion that punishing the murderers of

1 It should be noted that ijtihād is necessary for a mujtahid and a mujtahid is confined to practicing on his own ijtihād. It is not imperative for a mujtahid to be correct in every decision of his. When an issue revolves around opinions then the possibility of him reaching the correct decision as well as erring arises and his contemporaries who are mujtahidīn have the right to differ with him. However, to the mujtahid, he may regard his opinion to be correct and true, and therefore according to the majority of ‘ulamā, it is not permissible for him to follow another mujtahid. Although, whether the mujtahid has indeed erred or reached a correct decision is another topic altogether.

The world renowned Muḥaqqiq, Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-Humām رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 861 A.H) writes:

المجتهد بعد اجتهاده في الحكم ممنوع من التقليد فيه اتفاقا والخلاف قبله والاكثر ممنوع

It is unanimously agreed that a mujtahid cannot follow anyone in a ruling after applying his own ijtihād. The difference of opinion is before he has applied his own ijtihād, can he follow someone else or not, and here too, most of the ‘ulamā are of the view that he cannot. (*Al-Taḥrīr*, pg. 540)

continued

Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ itself will lead to the stability of the Islamic Empire. His proposal was that if Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ himself attended to the retaliation then well and good, otherwise he should hand over the murderers to the heirs of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, thereby acting upon the ruling of the Qur’ān:

فَقَدْ جَعَلْنَا لَوْلِيِّهِ سُلْطٰنًا

We have granted authority to his heir.

In this case, he would readily pledge his allegiance to him. If Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is unable to establish justice and bring the assassigators and rebels to book then how can he be worthy of attending to the great requirement of the khilāfah as he himself said:

أيها الناس إن احق الناس بهذا الامر اقواهم عليه واعلمهم بامر الله فيه

O people! The most worthy of khilāfah is he, who is most profound in establishing and seeing to its smooth running and is most well-versed with regards to the disposition of it according to the law decreed by Allah.¹

continued from page 152

Hāfiẓ Ibn al-Humām رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ in another book of his states:

والوجه الصحيح ان المجتهد مامور بالعمل بمقتضى ظنه اجماعا

The correct unanimous opinion is that a mujtahid is required to practice upon his ijtihād. (*Faṭḥ al-Qadīr*, vol. 5 pg. 491)

‘Allāmah Abū Bakr ibn Mas‘ūd al-Kāsānī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ (d. 587 A.H) writes:

لان المجتهد مامور بالعمل بما يؤدي اليه اجتهاده فحرم عليه تقليد غيره

It is impermissible for a mujtahid to follow someone else due to the command that he should follow his own ijtihād. (*Badā’i‘ al-ṣanā’i‘*, vol.7 pg.54)

Mujaddid Alf-e Thānī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ (d. 1034 A.H) also writes:

The crux of the matter is that each one had his own opinion and it is a known fact that every mujtahid should necessarily follow his own ijtihād. The difference of opinions, thus inevitably led to a dispute and dissention as each one perceived the necessity of acting in accordance to his ijtihād and opinion. (*Maktūbāt-e Imām Rabbānī*, letter: 36)

Mawlānā Qāsim Nānawtawī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ (d. 1297 A.H) writes:

Secondly, the mujtihadīn are required to follow their ijtihād. It is not permissible for them to follow other mujtihadīn and even if it is permissible, it is not necessary. (*Maktūbāt-e Qāsimī*, pg. 8)

¹ *Nahj al-Balāghah*, pg. 94.

However, if Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ concentrated on meeting out punishments and neglected the khilāfah, it could have proven to have been more detrimental for the Islamic Empire. It is for this reason that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was of the view to first unify and strengthen the disorganised and disordered powers and thereafter punish the murderers of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. In this delicate situation, the views of both parties can be accommodated and it will not be permissible to regard any side as sinners or transgressors, even though the senior Ṣaḥābah were also of the opinion that the khilāfah should first be established. Despite all this, to still cavil and clamour over the faults of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, thinking it to be a means of great success and the pinnacle of expressing one’s love for the Ahl al-Bayt is preposterous and the following poem aptly fits:

اين خيال اسٹ محال اسٹ جنون

This is mere conjecture, impossible, and madness.

Hāfiẓ Ibn al-‘Asākir رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ (d. 261 A.H) narrates regarding Imām Abū Zur‘ah al-Rāzī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ (d. 261 A.H) that once somebody said to him: “I hold ill feelings for Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.” On enquiring about the reason, the latter exclaimed: “He fought against ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.” Imām Abū Zur‘ah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ replied:

ويحك ان رب معاوية رحيم أو خصم معاوية خصم كريم فأيش دخولك بينهما أرضي الله
عنهما

Woe to you! The Rabb of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is Most Merciful and his rival (‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ) the most gallant. Who are you to then intrude when Allah is pleased with both of them?¹

The reference of Mawlānā ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Jāmī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ

The writings of Mawlānā ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Jāmī al-Naqshbandī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is often quoted. He said:

One group denied pledging allegiance to ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and they erred in their rebelliousness.

1 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 131.

Mawlānā Jāmī رحمته الله in the same treatise writes in a poem:

And the other Ṣaḥābah who differed with ‘Alī رحمته الله in the matter of khilāfah (i.e. Mu‘āwiyah رحمته الله), the truth at that juncture was with ‘Alī رحمته الله and waging war against him was an appalling error.¹

In reply to this it should be noted that the majority of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā‘ah regard the dispute between Sayyidunā ‘Alī رحمته الله and Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رحمته الله to be an error in ijtihād. This has been elucidated over the previous pages with references to the stalwarts amongst the ‘Ulamā’ of Islam. Regarding the aforementioned author, by whose writings Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رحمته الله and his entire group have been branded as rebels, which also includes a great number of the Ṣaḥābah according to the count of Mujaddid Alf-e Thānī رحمته الله; this will only be used by a deviant whose intention is to falsify dīn itself. Can anyone who claims that Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رحمته الله and his group are sinners, which comprised of many other Ṣaḥābah as well, still be regarded as a follower of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā‘ah? As for the poems of Mawlānā Jāmī رحمته الله, we find no need to comment since its refutation is clear from the following wise words of Mujaddid Alf-e Thānī رحمته الله (d. 1034 A.H):

Mawlānā ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Jāmī has exceeded the limits by calling an error in ijtihād an “appalling error”. It is a great injustice to label this as anything more than an error. Thereafter what Mawlānā Jāmī mentioned that “if he is worthy of being cursed...” too is inappropriate. This is not the place of refutation nor a place of confusion! If this was mentioned regarding Yazīd it would be understandable but saying such things about Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رحمته الله is extremely detestable. It has been narrated in ḥadīth on the authority of reliable narrators that the Messenger of Allah صلی الله علیه وسلم made the following supplication for Mu‘āwiyah رحمته الله:

اللهم علمه الكتاب و الحساب و قه العذاب

O Allah! Grant Mu‘āwiyah رحمته الله the knowledge of the Qur’ān and the laws of inheritance and protect him from the punishment.

1 *Nām wa Nasab*, pg. 533.

2 *Maktūbāt-e Imām Rabbānī*, letter: 251.

On another occasion the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said:

اللهم اجعله هاديا مهديا

O Allah! Make him a guide for others and guide him as well.

The supplication of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ is readily accepted. After taking all of this into consideration, it is apparent that this statement of Mawlānā Jāmī was uttered in error. Furthermore, Mawlānā Jāmī in this poem did not clearly mention any names. Instead he said “and the other Ṣaḥābī”. This depicts a sense of unhappiness with the Ṣaḥābah and for this reason we beseech Allah ﷻ saying: “O Allah! Do not take us to task over our forgetfulness and mistakes.”¹

Shī'ah insertions in the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah

When we walk through the corridors of history, we are yet to find an example equal to the damage and destruction the Rawāfiḍ have inflicted upon Islam and the Muslims. If Islam had not been the final religion upon which the divine seal of protection was attached, the mischief of Rafḍ or Shī'ism would have been sufficient to destroy Islam. This was that movement of kufr and hypocrisy whose ultimate purpose was to cause mischief and anarchy on earth. It has played a major role in many of the catastrophic attacks upon the ummah.

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Taymiyyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 728 A.H) writes:

ومنهم من ادخل على الدين من الفساد ما لا يحصيه إلا رب العباد فملاحدة الاسماعلية و
النصيرية وغيرهم من الباطنية المنافقين من بابهم دخلوا واعداء المسلمين من المشركين
واهل الكتاب بطريقهم وصلوا واستولوا بهم على بلاد الاسلام و سبوا الحريرم وأخذوا
الاموال واسفكوا الدم الحرام وجرى على الامة بمعاونتهم من فساد الدنيا والدين ما لا
يعلمه الا رب العالمين إذ كان اصل المذهب من احداث الزنادقة المنافقين²

Amongst them are those who injected such poisons into dīn, which cannot be counted except by Allah ﷻ, such as the Ismā'īliyyah and Nuṣayriyyah and

1 Ibid.

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah*, vol. 1 pg. 3.

other hypocrites from the Bāṭiniyyah, who used this avenue to attack Islam. Similarly it was through this means that the enemies of Islam from amongst the polytheists and Christians intervened and conquered the lands of the Muslims, captured our womenfolk and children, looted our wealth and shed the blood of the innocent civilians. In short, the Shī'ah were the chief orchestrators behind such great catastrophes afflicting the religious and worldly lives of the Muslims, the extent of which is known to Allah alone. All of this is because the roots of the Shī'ah religion originate from the hypocrites and infidels.¹

The harms caused to the monumental works of the Ahl al-Sunnah

Leave aside the tumult and bloodshed the Rawāfiḍ were instrumental in, the damage which the literature of the Ahl al-Sunnah suffered at their hands is most devastating. We will present a summary of such incidents, in the words of Shāh 'Abd al-'Azīz Muḥaddith Dehlawī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ (d. 1239 A.H). The readers should observe the manner in which the Rawāfiḍ have tampered with the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah and interpolated it with their own narrations and thereby deceived not only the general masses but the elite too.

1. **Sixteenth deception:** Their 'Ulamā' under the guise of Taqīyyah portrayed themselves to be muḥaddithīn of the Ahl al-Sunnah and began acquiring the knowledge of ḥadīth from the famous Sunnī Muḥaddithīn. They memorised authentic chains of narration and beautified themselves with outward abstinence and taqwā. When the 'Ulamā' began relying on them, they began combining their fabricated narrations with authentic narrations, due to which the masses as well as some scholars were fooled. However, all praise is due to Allah who brought to the fore Muḥaddithīn of such calibre, who skillfully sieved through the narrations and eradicated all these interpolations.
2. **Nineteenth deception:** They inspect the names in the authentic narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah and if they find any to have a name or title similar to one of their (Shī'ī) narrators, they attribute his (Shī'ī) narrations to the narrators of the Ahl al-Sunnah. This complicates matters since both names or titles are identical.

1 Ibid.

3. **Twenty first deception:** They compile books containing insults and accusations against the Ṣaḥābah with clear refutation of the creed of the Ahl al-Sunnah and publish it, attributing it to some high ranking scholar of the Ahl al-Sunnah.
4. **Twenty second deception:** They quote derogatory remarks about the Ṣaḥābah and connotations rejecting the creed of the Ahl al-Sunnah from rare books which cannot be found.
5. **Thirtieth deception:** With great fervour, they cast the impression that a certain scholar is an ‘extremist’ Sunnī and some even go the extra mile in calling him a Khārijī (or Nāṣibī) after which they ascribe such opinions to him which are in favour of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah Imāmiyyah sect and falsifies the way of the Ahl al-Sunnah. The purpose of this is to confuse the onlooker, by alluding him into thinking that if a ‘hardcore’ Sunnī of this calibre quotes such narrations without criticising it then it must definitely have some basis.
6. **Thirty second deception:** A group of the Shī‘ah scholars with great difficulty and tireless efforts search for rare books of tafsīr and history which are uncommon to the ‘Ulamā’ and students of the Ahl al-Sunnah. They then alter it, so that it conforms to the Shī‘ah creed and refutes the beliefs of the Ahl al-Sunnah.
7. **Thirty sixth deception:** Another way of deception adopted by them is by interpolating and forging the poems of the leaders of the Ahl al-Sunnah. They achieve this by fabricating a few couplets on the same rhyme of the initial poem, in accordance with their whims, which emphatically negates the belief of the Ahl al-Sunnah and then include it in the actual poem. This type of discrepancies are usually carried out in the poems of famous accepted poets of the Ahl al-Sunnah such as Shaykh Farīd al-Dīn al-‘Aṭṭār رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ، Shaykh al-Wāḥidī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ، Shams al-Tabrīzī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ، Ḥakīm al-Sunā’ī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ، Mawlānā Rūmī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ، Ḥāfiẓ al-Shirāzī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ، Khawājah Quṭb al-Dīn Dehlawī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ، and others.

Aside from these, the Shī‘ah have not even left Imām Shāfi‘ī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ alone and have conspired and interpolated his poems as well.¹

1 Summary of *Tuhfā Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah*.

We have concisely presented seven ways of their deception for the benefit of the readers, whereas Shāh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ has indicated a hundred and seven ways of their deception.

Are the books of the esteemed Sūfiyyah free from discrepancies?

Just as īmān and Islam are two independent branches of dīn, on the same line, iḥsān too is an independent branch attending to the perfection of dīn which begins with:

انما الاعمال بالنيات

Actions are judged by intentions.

and finally manifests itself with:

ان تعبد الله كأنك تراه

To worship Allah with complete consciousness as if you are seeing Him.

Our history of Islam is replete with examples of the concurring existence of the teaching of the Qur’ān and the Sunnah together with the rectification of the inner soul and heart which gradually adopted the name of Taṣawwuf. Taṣawwuf has many other names as well, such as Ṭarīqah, Sulūk, Iḥsān, ‘Ilm al-Akhlāq, ‘Ilm al-Qalb, etc., but it is more commonly known as Taṣawwuf. In essence, some actions pertain to the outer limbs and some pertain to the inner. The aforementioned category is known as *A‘māl Zāhirah* (outward actions or Sharī‘ah) and the latter is known as *A‘māl Bāṭinah* (inward actions or Ṭarīqah). The position of the outward actions is like the similitude of the body, while the inward actions playing the role of the soul. In this way, each component is in need of the other.

Shāh Walī Allāh Muḥaddith Dehlawī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ states:

Sharī‘ah without Ṭarīqah is a mere philosophy and theory and Ṭarīqah without Sharī‘ah eventually leads to apostasy and infidelity.¹

¹ *Tashīl Qaṣd al-Sabīl*, pg. 8.

What is the reality of this Taṣawwuf or Ṭarīqah, for this we will reproduce a comprehensive definition from ‘Allāmah al-Shāmī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ:

هو علم يعرف به انواع الفضائل وكيفية اكتسابها وانواع الرذائل وكيفية اجتنابها

Taṣawwuf is that branch of knowledge which deals with the varieties of noble character together with its method of attainment and the varieties of ill-traits and how to abstain from it.¹

The extent to which purifying ones heart is necessary can be well understood from the following quote of Mawlānā Ashraf ‘Alī Thānwī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ (d. 1366 A.H):

The aspect of Sharī‘ah which deals with inward actions is called Taṣawwuf or Sulūk and the aspect dealing with outward actions is called Fiqh. The subject matter of Taṣawwuf concerns reformation of character and the objective is attaining the pleasure of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى. The methodology adopted is complete adherence to the laws of Sharī‘ah. So to say, Taṣawwuf is the soul and perfection of dīn which purifies a person’s soul from ill-traits and bad manners and beautifies his character with virtuous actions and upright morals and ethics, thereby acquiring attentiveness to Allah, which is the objective of life. Therefore, Taṣawwuf and Ṭarīqah are definitely not contrary to Sharī‘ah; rather it is necessary for every Muslim to be a sūfī, without which he cannot become a complete Muslim.²

It is a reality upon which the sūfiyyah and the ‘ārifīn have unanimously agreed; just as that Taṣawwuf which is taught and recommended by Islam is a means of guidance for the universe, in a like manner that Taṣawwuf which is adopted from other sources besides Islam (which entered into the ummah after the fourth century) demolishes and destroys the fabric of a Muslim’s īmān. It is for this reason that we find from the likes of Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Taymiyyah رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ (d. 728 A.H) and Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Qayyim رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ (d. 751 A.H) to the likes of Mawlānā Ashraf ‘Alī Thānwī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ (d. 1366 A.H) and Mawlānā Sayyid Ḥusayn Aḥmad Madanī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ (d. 1377 A.H), and every other reformist of the ummah, that they zealously called for jihād against all un-Islamic forms of Taṣawwuf and repeatedly warned the Muslims of its harms. The poem of Dr. Iqbāl Marḥūm very aptly discusses this un-Islamic Taṣawwuf:

1 *Radd al-Muḥtār*, vol. 1 pg. 127.

2 *Shari’ah wa Taṣawwuf*, pg. 16.

This is a very delicate matter, so guide me to your pleasure
Protect me from falling into your displeasure through this path (Taṣawwuf)

Just as Islam remains un-blemished through the wanderings of a few individuals, similarly a blanket rule cannot be placed over Taṣawwuf due to the deviation of a few sūfīyyah.

The causes of un-Islamic ideas being mixed into Islamic Taṣawwuf

How did un-Islamic Taṣawwuf find its way into Islam? Hereunder we mention the explanation of Professor Salīm Chishtī رحمته الله:

At the time when the Qarmatians began their efforts of propagation, Taṣawwuf had already begun amongst the Muslims and (its) various schools had already been established. For the sake of being accepted in the circles of the sūfīyyah, the Qarmatians portrayed themselves to be the same, i.e. they began misleading the sūfīyyah in the garb of Taṣawwuf. Thus, mixing un-Islamic beliefs into Taṣawwuf, they laid the foundations for un-Islamic Taṣawwuf in Iran, which gradually spread amongst all the Muslims and became merged into Islamic Taṣawwuf, to the extent that it had become impossible for the general masses to distinguish between Islamic and un-Islamic Taṣawwuf.¹

On the one hand, the *Qarmatians* (imposters and heretics) accustomed the Muslims to un-Islamic Taṣawwuf. On the other hand, with great dexterity, they interpolated the works of upright sūfīyyah and with it misled the Muslims with their false beliefs. The great thinker of Islam, Mawlānā Sayyid Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī Nadwī رحمته الله (d. 1420 A.H), writes in the biography of Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Taymiyyah رحمته الله (d. 728 A.H):

Some incautious and denominationally prejudiced authors have attributed such statements to him which necessitate *kufr* (disbelief) according to the general belief system of the Ahl al-Sunnah and the vast majority. Such statements have been attributed to him which denote disrespect and disparagement of the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم (May Allah save us and all the Muslims from such an act). Such treatment has not only been meted out to Ibn Taymiyyah رحمته الله but other elders of the ummah have also been subject to this ploy of the antagonists. Not only has such statements and beliefs been attributed to them

1 *Islāmī Taṣawwuf mein Ghair Islāmī Nazriyyāt kī Āmezish*, pg. 31.

of which they were completely innocent, but such content has been introduced into their books which necessitates disbelief and deviation.¹

These enemies of Islam have went a step further, by themselves authoring separate books (that contained statements of disbelief) and attributing them to well-known sūfiyyah, after which they circulated it among the masses. Mawlānā Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī Nadwī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ says:

The same approach was faced by Ḥujjat al-Islām Imām al-Ghazālī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ. A very large group of the scholars believe that *Al-Maḍnūn bihī alā Ghayr Ahlihī*, *Al-Maḍnūn bihī alā Ahlihī*, *Ma‘ārij al-Quds* and *Mishkāt al-Anwār* are books which are unfounded and attributed to other than their actual author. The adversaries and evil-wishers of Imām al-Ghazālī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ authored them and thereafter attributed them to him.

Imām al-Sha‘rānī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ and others believe this practice to have been carried out and interpolation to have taken place in the contents and subject matter of the books of Shaykh Muḥyū al-Dīn Ibn al-‘Arabī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ.²

The great mystic, Imām al-Sha‘rānī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 976 A.H.) writes in connection with his own book, an interesting incident which serves as an eye-opener. He states in *Al-Yawāqīt wa l-Jawāhir*:

وكذلك دسوا عليّ أنا في كتابي المسمى: البحر المورود، جملة من العقائد الزائفة وأشاعوا تلك العقائد في مصر ومكة نحو ثلاث سنين، و أنا بريء منها كما بينت ذلك في خطبة الكتاب لما غيرتها وكان العلماء كتبوا عليه وأجازوه فما سكنت الفتنة حتي أرسلت إليهم النسخة التي عليها خطوطه، وكان ممن انتدب لنصرتي الشيخ الإمام ناصر الدين الكتاني المالكي رضى الله تعالى عنه، ثم إن بعض الحسدة أشاع في مصر ومكة أن علماء مصر رجعوا عن كتاباتهم على مؤلفات فلان كلها، فشك بعض الناس في ذلك فأرسلت نسخة للعلماء ثالث مرة فكتبوا تحت خطوطهم: كذب والله من ينسب إلينا أننا رجعنا عن كتابتنا على هذا الكتاب وغيره من مؤلفات فلان، وعبارة سيدنا ومولانا الشيخ ناصر الدين المالكي - فسح الله تعالى في أجله - بعد الحمد لله وبعد، فما نسب إلى العبد من الرجوع عما كتبته بخطي على هذا الكتاب وغيره من مؤلفات فلان باطل باطل باطل.

1 *Tārīkh Da‘wat wa Aẓīmat*, vol. 2, pg. 157.

2 *Ibid.* pg. 158.

Similarly, they have interpolated against me as well, in my book named *Al-Baḥr Al-Mawrūd*, a collection of deviated beliefs and they have spread such beliefs in Egypt and Makkah for close to three years, whereas I am free of it (i.e. these beliefs that they have interpolated) as I have clarified in the prologue of the book when I edited it. The scholars have written regarding it (i.e. what I have written) and consented to it. Thus, the crisis only subsided, when I dispatched to them (i.e. these scholars) the copy which had on it their handwritings. From amongst those who rose to support me was Shaykh Imām Nāṣir al-Dīn al-Kattānī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ, the Mālikī scholar. Thereafter, some jealous individuals promulgated in Egypt and Makkah that the scholars of Egypt had retracted what they had written with regards to all the works of so-and-so. Hence, (as a result of such propaganda) some people doubted in that (matter). So I dispatched the copy to the scholars for the third time. Thus, they wrote below their handwriting: “By the oath of Allah, whoever attributes to us that we have retracted our support for this book and others that the author has written has lied upon us.” The words of Sayyidunā Mawlānā Nāṣir al-Dīn, the Mālikī scholar – May Allah increase his lifespan – after praising Allah were: “As for what follows, that which has been attributed to the servant (i.e. referring to himself), viz. retracting from what I have written (with my own hand) regarding this book and others from amongst the works of so-and-so is false, (it is) false.”¹

There are many examples of this interpolation and falsification (which the Qarmatians and heretics effected within the writings of the noble sūfiyyah) which may be observed in the book of the honourable Professor Salīm Chishtī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ, *Islāmī Taṣawwuf mein Ghayr Islāmī Naẓriyyāt ki Āmezish* (The Mixing of un-Islamic ideas into Islamic Taṣawwuf).

The reason for the interpolation in the books of the sūfiyyah

Due to the fact that the honourable sūfiyyah were overwhelmed with observing good thoughts of others, many matters according to them were excluded from (the aspect) of academic criticism, even though the worldly abstinence of these people (i.e. the sūfiyyah) is accepted by one and all. Professor Salīm Chishtī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ writes:

The weakness of these sūfiyyah was that they were neither scholars of ḥadīth nor were they historians. Over and above that, as a matter of fact, according to

1 *Al-Yawāqīt wa l-Jawāhir*, vol. 1 pg. 7.

these people (i.e. the sūfīyyah) academic criticism and scholarly appraisal – all of it – entered into (the domain of) disrespect. The Taṣawwuf of Junayd رَحِمَهُ اللهُ was: “We will evaluate every issue, making the Qur’ān and Sunnah the criterion. If anything contradicts the Qur’ān and Sunnah, then it is rejected, regardless of whoever’s tongue it was emitted from. However, in the ninth century after hijrah, with the wicked endeavours of the Qarmatians, the mindset of the Sunnī sūfīyyah changed and instead of observing whether the statement was good or evil, they began looking at the one who stated it. In other words, no matter how mentally or reportedly incongruous a narration was, if it was attributed to any pious person, then by this mere attribution to him it was considered worthy of being relied upon; while academically reviewing and examining it would be construed as disrespect. It is for this reason that for centuries false narrations continued to be passed down and today no person has the moral courage to declare them untrue, and thus relinquish his popularity and reputation.¹

Mawlānā Najm al-Dīn Islāhī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ, the *khalīfah* (spiritual vicegerent) of the Shaykh of the Arabs and non-Arabs, Mawlānā Sayyid Ḥusayn Aḥmad Madanī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ, writes in the sub-notes of (the book) *Maktūbāt-e Shaykh al-Islām*:

In the books of the sūfīyyah (the statement): “We have returned from the lesser jihād to the greater jihād” has been asserted as being an authentic ḥadīth. However, Ibn Ḥajar al-‘Asqalānī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ reports that Imām Nasā’ī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ said it to be the words of Ibrāhīm ibn ‘Ulayyah. The assertion of the words is a strong indication that this cannot be the words of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Furthermore, such an eminent scholar of ḥadīth such as Shāh ‘Abd al-‘Azīz رَحِمَهُ اللهُ has not seen it in any of the books of ḥadīth. Thus, the decision of (what is) ḥadīth and (what is) not ḥadīth should be made in light of the principles and standards of the scholars of ḥadīth, because if the opinion of a master in the field is not accepted then immunity will be lost and the Sharīah will continue to lose its credit. The unfortunate sūfīyyah who were overtaken by maintaining good thoughts (of people), where did they have the time to critically examine (statements)? Nor was it their habit (to do so). Whatever they heard or witnessed, they believed to be true. By this (concept) of theirs of maintaining good thoughts (of people), the words of any person being the statement of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ will not be established.²

1 *Islāmī Taṣawwuf mein Ghayr Islāmī Naḥriyyāt ki Āmezish*, pg. 84-85.

2 *Maktūbāt-e Shaykh al-Islām*, vol. 1, p. 324.

Mujaddid Alf-e Thānī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهَا writes:

One should know that in each of those issues wherein a difference of opinion exists between the scholars and the sūfiyyah, if one examines them carefully then it would become apparent that the truth is on the side of the scholars. The underlying reason for this is that the basis for following the Ambiyā' according to the scholars is their perfection of nubuwwah which encompasses their knowledge as well, whereas according to the sūfiyyah it is their perfection of wilāyah and is confined to their knowledge. Hence, the knowledge derived from nubuwwah will undoubtedly be superior and true compared to that which is derived from the wilāyah.¹

The condition of Mawlānā Jāmī's رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهَا books

Mawlānā 'Abd al-Raḥmān Jāmī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهَا (d. 898 A.H.) is recognised in the circles of the Ahl al-Sunnah as a sūfī, eloquent poet and a linguist; more so when his poems of love and reverence for the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ are recited by the orators in their unique way, wherein an ecstatic atmosphere is created. Nevertheless, the question which needs to be asked: Are the books of Mawlānā Jāmī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهَا free from interpolations like the books of other sūfiyyah, or did the Shī'ah distort them as well; inserting statements contrary to the belief system of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah? The late Professor Salīm Chishtī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهَا writes:

The plague of interpolation and falsification had become so widespread in the poems of the sūfiyyah that when Mawlānā Jāmī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهَا arrived in Baghdad, there was a throng of Rawāfiḍ present there. They raised a few objections against Mawlānā's book *Silsilat al-Dhahab*. A certain Rāfiḍī wrote some poetry, filled with exaggeration with regards to the status of Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and attributed it to Mawlānā.

A debate was arranged in the Jāmī' Masjid of Baghdad, the purpose of which was for the Rawāfiḍ to present their objections. Nevertheless, the first objection raised was against those poems which the Rāfiḍī attributed to Mawlānā. It was the Ahl al-Sunnah who raised the objection against those poems.²

1 *Maktūbāt-e Imām Rabbānī*, letter: 266.

2 For further details of this incident, refer to *Ḥayāt al-Jāmī* by Dr. 'Alī Asghar Ḥikmat, p. 83.

From this incident, I merely wish to point out that a favourite pursuit of the Ismā'īlyyah, Qarāmiṭah and Rawāfiḍ was to distort the words of the sūfī poets; inserting poems filled with exaggeration regarding Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, and at times declaring the divinity of Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ (or disparagement for Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ).

One might ask how they dared to do such a thing and the response will be that all schools and followers of the sūfīyah – without exception – admire Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, honour him and regard him worthy of reverence. The specific reason for this is that from amongst the four links (of Taṣawwuf) three links culminate from Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. It is for this reason that wherever the sūfī poets impressively praised the merits of the three khulafā', they expressed even greater praise for Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Therefore, the Rawāfiḍ and Qarāmiṭah did not find it difficult to make insertions to their poems. Suppose Mawlānā Jāmī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ compiled a poem regarding the status of Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ comprising of twenty-one verses; if anyone were to discreetly insert two or three verses into this poem raising Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to a deity, it would easily pass unnoticed.¹

A few examples of interpolation in *Shawāhid al-Nubuwwah*

We will now present a few references to the book of Mawlānā Jāmī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ, *Shawāhid al-Nubuwwah*. You be the judge whether these are the beliefs of the Shī'ah or of the Ahl al-Sunnah.

1. Mawlānā Jāmī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ mentions in his book the incident of a monk embracing Islam at the hands of Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and writes that when becoming a Muslim he recited the following:

أشهد أن لا إله إلا الله وأشهد أن محمدا عبده ورسوله وأشهد أنك علي وصي رسول
الله

I bear witness that there is none worthy of worship except Allah and Muḥammad صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ is His servant and Messenger, and I bear witness that you, 'Alī, are the waṣī of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.²

1 *Islāmī Taṣawwuf mein Ghayr Islāmī Nazriyyāt ki Āmezish*, p. 45-46.

2 *Shawāhid al-Nubuwwah*, p. 155, *Rukn-e Sādis dar Bayān-e Dalāil wa Shawāhid*.

Is the belief of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ being the wasī of the the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ the belief of the Shī‘ah or that of the Ahl al-Sunnah?

Mawlānā Jāmī might have intended to say that just as it is necessary to bear witness to the oneness of Allah and the nubuwwah of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ when becoming a Muslim, so too is it necessary to recognise the virtue and merit of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, which is why Mawlānā Jāmī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ mentions this incident without any criticism or doubt under the *karāmāt* (miraculous feats) of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.

2. Mawlānā Jāmī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ writes:

Amīr al-Mu‘minīn ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is the first of twelve A‘immah.¹

Is the belief in twelve A‘immah a belief of the Ithnā ‘Ashariyyah or that of the Ahl al-Sunnah?

3. Mawlānā Jāmī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ writes:

After the martyrdom of Amīr al-Mu‘minīn Imām Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, Muḥammad ibn Ḥanafiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ came to visit Sayyidunā Zayn al-‘Ābidīn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ one day and said to him: “Due to the fact that I am elder than you and I am also your uncle, thus I am more deserving and worthy of khilāfah than you are. Therefore hand over the weapons of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ to me.” Imām Zayn al-‘Ābidīn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ retorted: “O my uncle! Fear Allah. Do not quarrel regarding what you have no right to.” After much discussion, they both accepted to make the *al-Ḥajr al-Aswad* (Black Stone) the arbitrator and sought a judgment from it. Thus, the *al-Ḥajr al-Aswad* (Black Stone) bore witness to the leadership of Imām Zayn al-‘Ābidīn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.²

The belief of Imāmāh being a divine decree of Allah is a Shī‘ī concept and the exact words mentioned above can be found in the most relied upon Shī‘ah books such as *Uṣūl al-Kāfī* vol. 1 pg. 48, and *Al-Shāfī* vol. 2, p. 314. The Ahl al-Sunnah have no connection to this false belief.

1 *Shawāhid al-Nubuwwah*, p. 150, *Rukn-e Sādis dar Bayān-e Dalāil wa Shawāhid*.

2 Summarized from *Shawāhid al-Nubuwwah*, p. 169, *Rukn-e Sādis dar Bayān-e Dalāil wa Shawāhid*.

4. Mawlānā Jāmī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ has mentioned in his book that the birth of Imām Mahdī took place in the home of Imām Ḥasan al-‘Askarī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ. Furthermore he has mentioned that he spoke in his childhood.¹

This too is a belief of the Shī‘ah. For further details, refer to the book of Mawlānā Ḍiyā al-Raḥmān al-Fārūqī al-Shahīd رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ (d. 1417 A.H.), Imām Mahdī, and for an exhaustive rebuttal refer to *Mirqāt al-Mafātīḥ*, the commentary of *Mishkāt al-Maṣābīḥ* by Mullā ‘Alī Qārī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ (d. 1041 A.H.) vol. 10, p. 179-180.

5. Mawlānā Jāmī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ has written in *Shawāhid al-Nubuwwah* that Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ was poisoned by his wife, Ja’dah, on the instruction of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ², whereas ‘Allāmah Ibn Khaldūn رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ (d. 808 A.H.) writes:

And what has been reported that Mu‘āwiyah رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ poisoned him in conjunction with his wife, Ja’dah bint al-Ash’ath is from the fabricated narrations of the Shī‘ah. It is farfetched that Mu‘āwiyah رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ would carry out such an act.³

6. Contrary to the majority of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā‘ah, the opinion of Mawlānā Jāmī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ regarding Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ is that he committed a grave error which – Allah forbid – necessitates a companion of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ becoming a fāsiq, which in itself is a fundamental tenet of the Shī‘ah faith.

I will suffice on these six points and will address the issue again if necessity arises. Ultimately, our readers should make the decision for themselves whether it is possible for a stringent follower of the Ahl al-Sunnah to hold these types of beliefs. If these texts were written by Mawlānā Jāmī himself then no doubt Mawlānā Jāmī is a Shī‘ah. However, if he did not write this then our claim is proven that some deviants inserted these words in Mawlānā Jāmī’s works. Allah alone knows the number of Muslims in the last six hundred years who were ruined by such writings on account of the prominence and virtue of Mawlānā Jāmī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ. Even if these texts were to be accepted as interpolated, still the enemies of Islam have succeeded in

1 *Shawāhid al-Nubuwwah*, p. 198, *Rukn-e Sādis dar Bayān-e Dalāil wa Shawāhid*.

2 *Shawāhid al-Nubuwwah*, pg. 163.

3 *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn*, vol. 2, pg. 1135.

their objective, and even if these interpolated texts were to now be erased, it would be tantamount to:

Stitching silk over coarse cloth

The status of Mawlānā Jāmī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ

There is significant difference of opinion regarding the personality of Mawlānā ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Jāmī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ. Some have classified him to be from amongst those who were inclined towards Shī‘ism, while others have openly stated that he was amongst those who practised *taqīyyah* (dissimulation) and a far cry from being a member of the Ahl al-Sunnah but rather a Shī‘ah in his beliefs and doctrines.

Furthermore, they claim that the poems he composed in praise of the four khulafā’ are all also based on *taqīyyah*, as the beliefs Mawlānā Jāmī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ propagated in his books, especially in *Shawāhid al-Nubuwwah*, are clearly Shī‘ī beliefs. Sayyid ‘Ārif Nawshāhī in his biography of Mawlānā Jāmī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ, entitled *Jāmī*¹, writes under the chapter of the beliefs of Mawlānā Jāmī:

1. He was a Shī‘ah inclined towards the Ahl al-Sunnah.²
2. Briefly, in light of the content of the above-mentioned book (*Shawāhid al-Nubuwwah*) it is clear that the author is a Sunnī, whose heart is free from sectarianism and together with this, he is inclined towards the beliefs of the Imāmiyyah sect.³
3. In the ideas of Jāmī there is proof of a mixture of Shī‘ah and Sunnī beliefs.⁴
4. Iranian Shī‘ah who hold Jāmī in high regard, will go out of their way to prove Jāmī to be a devout Shī‘ah. He will regard these poems and statements of Jāmī which mention praise for the three khulafā’ as *taqīyyah*. Consequently, they refer to the following part of his final poem in his book, *Sajjāt al-Abrār*, wherein he criticizes the three khulafā’ and praises ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ by implication and insinuation:

1 *Mīzān al-Kutub* by the late Mawlānā Muḥammad ‘Alī, pg. 511-513.

2 *Jāmī*, pg. 254.

3 *Ibid*, pg. 255.

4 *Ibid*.

The lion of Allah extended his claws
Towards the three, who were more cunning than foxes.¹

The Shī'ah scholar 'Abbās al-Qummī writes in his *Al-Kunā wa l-Alqāb* regarding Jāmī

رحمۃ اللہ

المولی عبد الرحمن بن أحمد بن محمد الدشتی الفارسی الصوفی النحوی الصرفی الشاعر الفاضل ... ويقال له الجامي لأنه ولد ببلدة جام من بلاد ما وراء النهر سنة ٨١٧ هـ ... وله سبحة الأبرار وشواهد النبوة في فضائل النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم والأئمة عليهم السلام ... وهل هو من علماء السنة كما هو الظاهر منه بل من المتعصبين كما هو الغالب على أهل بلاد تركستان وما وراء النهر ولذا بالغ في التشنيع القاضي نور الله مع مذاقه الوسيع، أو أنه كان ظاهرا من المخالفين وفي الباطن من الشيعة الخالصين، ولم يبرز ما في قلبه تقية كما يشهد بذلك بعض أشعاره، منها ما عن سبحة الأبرار قوله:

پنجه در کن اسد اللہی را * بیخ پر کن دو سه روباہی را

واعتقده السيد الأجل الأمير محمد حسين الخاتون آبادي سبط العلامة المجلسي (وينقل) حكاية في ذلك مسندا وحاصلها أن الشيخ علي بن عبد العالي، كان رفيقا مع الجامي في سفر زيارة أئمة العراق عليهم السلام وكان يتقيه فلما وصلوا إلى بغداد ذهبوا إلى ساحل الدجلة للتنزه فجاء درويش قلندر، وقرأ قصيدة غراء في مدح مولانا أمير المؤمنين عليه السلام ولما سمعها الجامي بكى وسجد وبكى في سجوده، ثم أعطاه جائزة ثم قال في سبب ذلك اعلم أنني شيعي من خالص الإمامية ولكن التقية واجبة وهذه القصيدة مني وأشكر الله أنها صارت بحيث يقرأها القارئ في هذا المكان. ثم قال الخاتون آبادي: وأخبرني بعض الثقة من الأفاضل نقلا عن من يثق به أن كل من كان في دار الجامي من الخدم والعيال والعشيرة كانوا على مذهب الإمامية، ونقلوا عنه أنه كان يبالح في الوصية بأعمال التقية سيما إذا أراد سفرا والله العالم بالسرائر.

Moulā 'Abd al-Rahmān ibn Aḥmad ibn Muḥammad al-Dashtī al-Farsī al-Sūfī al-Naḥwī al-Sarfī, the poet and scholar. He was called Jāmī because he was born in Jām, a town in Mā Warā al-Nahr, in the year 718 A.H. Amongst his works are *Sajjāt al-Abrār* and *Dalā'il al-Nubuwwah*, which discusses the virtues of the

1 Ibid. 256.

Prophet ﷺ and the honourable Imāms. Was Jāmī a scholar from the Ahl al-Sunnah as is apparent or more precisely an extremist Sunnī, as is famous in Turkistan and the areas of Mā Warā al-Nahr, which could be the reason why, despite being inherently lenient, he severely reprimanded Qāḍī Nūr Allāh al-Tustarī. Or perhaps he might have outwardly portrayed himself to be from the opposition (Ahl al-Sunnah) and inwardly was a devout Shī'ah and out of taqīyyah did not expose what he truly believed? This (second possibility) is endorsed by some of his poetry such as the following poem in *Sajjāt al-Abrār*:

پنجه در کن اسد اللہی را * بیخ پر کن دو سه رویایی را

The lion of Allah extended his claws
Towards the three, who were more cunning than foxes

This is further supported by the story mentioned by Amīr Sayyid Ḥusayn al-Khatūn Ābādī, the grandson of Mullā Muḥammad Bāqir al-Majlisī. The summary of this narration is as follows:

Shaykh 'Alī ibn 'Abd al-'Ālī once accompanied Jāmī on a journey towards Iraq to visit the graves of the saints. He would embark on these journeys by means of taqīyyah. When they reached Baghdad both went to the shores of the Tigris River. Meanwhile a dervish arrived and recited a few heart-rendering couplets in praise of Moulā Amīr al-Mu'minīn 'Alī رضی اللہ عنہ. When Jāmī heard this poem, he began sobbing and fell into prostration, reduced to tears. He further gave the poet a gift and told him: "You should be aware that I am a Shī'ah and a devout follower of the Imāmiyyah but taqīyyah is necessary. These poems are my collection and I thank Allah that he has spread it to this extent." Thereafter Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Khatūn Ābādī said: "An authentic exemplary narrator has reported this to me on the authority of authentic narrators that the entire household of Jāmī, near and far, are all upon the beliefs of the Imāmiyyah and have been given strict orders by Jāmī to practise taqīyyah; especially when he undertakes journeys and Allah alone is the Knower of secrets."¹

The story narrated by 'Abbās al-Qummī can also be found in *Dīwān Kāmil Jāmī Bakhshish Dahm* pg. 194.

1 *Al-Kunā wa l-Alqāb*, vol. 2 pg. 138-9.

Our stance

Due to the fact that wherever Shī'ah beliefs are mentioned in the books of Mawlānā Jāmī, it is also accompanied with the beliefs of the Ahl al-Sunnah, no precise conclusion can be made. However, since the senior 'Ulamā' of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah always accepted Mawlānā 'Abd al-Raḥmān Jāmī رحمته الله as a Sunnī sūfī and counted him as one of the Muslim poets, always praising him and entertaining good thoughts regarding him; we too will not accept the irrational conclusions the Shī'ah have arrived at regarding him. As far as these references are concerned, my claim is as follows:

The *Sabbā'iyyah* (those who curse the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم), Bāṭiniyyah and enemies of the Ṣaḥābah have deliberately created doubts in the beliefs of the famous sūfīyyah, thereby confusing those who hold them in high regard with the doubt that they could have adopted taqīyyah or that they had inclinations towards Shī'ism. The purpose of such ploys would be to incline others towards Shī'ism as well, making it easier to convert them to what they would refer to as the "Religion of your fore-fathers". This claim will be proven in due time. The tombs of majority of the Sunnī saints in Pakistan have been taken over and are cared for by people of the Imāmiyyah sect and they inform their ignorant followers that these saints were in actual fact followers of the Imāmiyyah. What a strange spectacle it has become that the tomb of a Sunnī is now being taken care of by a Shī'ah trustee! Without doubt, this is the 'poisoned apple' which this sect has used for the past thousand years, claiming that the sūfīyyah and awliyā' were followers of the Imāmiyyah sect, so that the general masses will be inclined to follow in their footsteps.

Basic principles to protect oneself from Shī'ah conspiracies by Mawlānā Qāsim Nānawtawī رحمته الله

Mawlānā Muḥammad Qāsim Nānawtawī رحمته الله has mentioned in his famous book, *Hadiyyat al-Shī'ah*, six basic principles to be applied before accepting the words of any book or author in order to protect the ummah from the evils and conspiracies of the Shī'ah. It is imperative that we scrutinize any reference given by the Shī'ah or anyone affected by them using these principles. If the reference conforms to these principles then it will be accepted by all means, and if not then it will be rejected or alternatively interpreted. He says:

Firstly, as a precaution, the book at hand must be that of a notable and trustworthy author. Just as there are many grades of authors old and young, trustworthy and untrustworthy, those with understanding and those without, in the same way books are also of many grades. The unfaithful and irreligious have written the names of many great scholars in their works but have also filled their books with hundreds of false claims and narratives. Likewise, most of the great works of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah for the benefit of the people were left in their unedited form so that they could be reviewed but due to circumstances, this revision did not take place and eventually this unedited magnum opus fell into the wrong hands. Some of these books were considered extremely rare and valuable and others were even considered lost. However, these were later found in the hands of irreligious and like-minded people. They eventually added their fabricated narrations to these books and attributed it to them when debating the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah in order to silence them. Referencing such books is a common practice amongst the Shī'ah. Therefore it is of utmost importance to first question a reference when debating with them. Thereafter it should be seen if the reference is reliable. Gauging the reliability is based upon the six basic principles:

Principle 1

The purpose of the author must be to explain and expound upon facts and not merely to gather whimsical fairy tales or storytelling. If this is not the case then a genre of flowery and colourful stories, fairy tales, strange and fictitious narrations will become widespread.

Principle 2

The author should be unbiased, and his accuracy and trustworthiness in narration should also be well-known such that no doubts arise at the mention of his name. If this is not the requirement, then should not the volumes of heroic tales sung by the young girls in praise of their forefathers and the cowardice of their enemies also be accepted? And what is the value of any narration if the words of every individual is taken into consideration? If we unify our call and accept every deviant belief and the Ahl al-Sunnah begin to accept the Shī'ah chain of narrators and vice versa, turning a blind eye to differences in the strength of narrators and weaknesses as well as differences in their memory and truthfulness etc., then what reliance would remain in narration?

Principle 3

The author should possess an acceptable degree of expertise on the topic at hand regardless of his truthfulness or reliability. He should not be a personification of the proverb:

Half a Mullā is as dangerous for īmān as half a doctor is for health

Principle 4

The fourth principle to be considered is that any book despite possessing the afore-mentioned qualities should be well-known and accepted by the earlier generation of scholars, who also possess the afore-mentioned qualities and it should be passed down through a reliable chain. If this were not the case then the Bible and Torah should have been as reliable as the final revelation of the Noble Qur’ān.

Principle 5

The fifth principle is that the author must make it a precondition upon himself to only narrate authentic and established narrations, like those from the *Ṣiḥāḥ Sittah*¹; whose authors placed the condition of only narrating what is authentic (according to them) because of which they are called “Ṣiḥāḥ”. So if any book has been compiled in an unedited form by the author with the intention that he will in due time differentiate between right and wrong, true and false and delete any unauthentic narrations (as was done by Imām Bukhārī رحمته الله and Imām Muslim رحمته الله) or that he will explicitly mention which narrations are authentic, fabricated, or weak following the narration (as Imām Tirmidhī رحمته الله had done) but coincidentally fate did not allow the author the opportunity to fulfil this desire and his soul was taken prior to completing his task, then the book will not be considered reliable because every author compiles his book all-encompassing with the intention of sifting through it later. There are many narrations mentioning that Imām Bukhārī رحمته الله sifted through six hundred thousand aḥādīth to compile his *Ṣaḥīḥ*. Imām ‘Abd al-Razzāq رحمته الله narrates from Imām Bukhārī رحمته الله himself that he compiled all of these aḥādīth in an unedited form on three different occasions before settling on the *Bukhārī* of his *Ṣaḥīḥ*. This is mentioned in the second or third chapter of the foreword to *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*’ printed in Delhi by Aḥmadī Publications.

1 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Muslim*, *Tirmidhī*, *Abū Dāwūd*, *Nasā’ī*, and *Ibn Mājah*.

In any case, these types of unedited masterpieces attributed to great scholars of ḥadīth do exist. If Imām Bukhārī رحمته الله had compiled all of his *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* and before sifting through them left this temporary abode, would we still consider it reliable even though it would be the work of Imām Bukhārī رحمته الله himself? Everyone knows that if this were the case then Imām Bukhārī رحمته الله would not have undertaken the job of sifting through them. Imām Bukhārī رحمته الله is himself testifying to the fact that the unrevised version of his book is unreliable. So why should we rely upon the work of any scholar of ḥadīth solely based on the attribution of a ḥadīth or narration to him without a secondary revision? If any book of this sort is found, no matter how great a scholar the author may be, it is considered unreliable and unacceptable; not only to the scholars but even to the common layman. In any case, this point should be kept in mind that many people may fall into this trap merely because of the name of a great scholar.

Principle 6

If several narrations differ from each other, reaching a level of contradiction and it cannot be conclusively established which of them is not authentic then preference will be given based on the strength of the chain of narrators. If this were not the case then the Shī'ah would have to accept that their narrations and the narrations of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah are both correct.¹

Mawlānā Qāsim Nānawtawī رحمته الله speaking further on the topic says:

These tricks of the Shī'ah have been carried out with ease in books which are uncommon. For this reason, the scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah consider their books like the Bible and the Torah in severity and have deemed them unreliable. Their narrations will be gauged against the narrations from the reliable books of the Ahl al-Sunnah. Those narrations which will conform with our narrations will be upheld and those contradicting our narrations will be considered deceitful innovations. As for narrations which are not categorized as being conformist or contradictory to our narrations but stand alone, they are the same as those narrations that contradict our narrations, if they disagree with logical reasoning. The reason being that even though it may not contradict our narrations, they definitely do not lend support to them.

¹ *Hadiyyat al-Shī'ah*, pg. 255-258.

Subsequently, even if a narration appears in any of their works and there is no apparent meddling by them nor does this contradict a narration of the *Ṣiḥāh*, even then this narration will be approached with scepticism and not used as a proof by us, it will be considered similar to a narration of the Bible or the Torah i.e. we will not negate nor affirm it.¹

Conclusion

The above mentioned details make it clear that the *ijtihād* of Mawlānā Jāmī رحمته الله cannot be used as a proof against the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah. According to the scholars of Islam, Mawlānā Jāmī رحمته الله is regarded as a great *sūfī*, a poet, and an *imām* in the sciences of grammar and language. However, he is not considered to be a *muḥaddith*, *muffasir* or a *faqīh*. The scholars of Islam have agreed that the opinions of the *sūfīyyah* will not be considered as a valid proof in *Sharī'ah* regarding matters of *ḥalāl* and *ḥarām*. Mujaddid Alf-e Thānī رحمته الله (d. 1024 A.H) said it most beautifully:

The actions of the *sūfīyyah* regarding *ḥalāl* and *ḥarām* are not a proof. It is sufficient for us to consider them excused and not rebuke them leaving their matter to Allah. Here we shall consider what *Imām* Abū Ḥanīfah رحمته الله, *Imām* Abū Yūsuf رحمته الله, and *Imām* Muḥammad رحمته الله have to say and not what Abū Bakr al-Shiblī or Abū al-Ḥasan al-Nūrī said.²

The rule of *Imām* Ibn al-Jawzī رحمته الله is no secret:

إذا وقع في الإسناد صوفي فاغسل يديك منه

When a *sūfī* appears in the chain of narration then dust that narration off your hands.³

Mawlānā Sayyid Ḥusayn Aḥmad Madanī رحمته الله (d. 1377 A.H) said:

The reality is that these are great scholars in the field of *Taṣawwuf* and *Ṭarīqah*, but not scholars of the external and *Sharī'ah*. The *A'imma* of this field are *Imām* Abū Ḥanīfah رحمته الله, *Imām* Muḥammad رحمته الله, and *Imām* Abū Yūsuf رحمته الله and the *fuqahā*. It is their opinions which will be upheld as proof in this field. The

1 *Hadiyyat al-Shī'ah*, pg. 260-261.

2 *Maktūbāt-e Imām Rabbānī*, letter: 266.

3 *Al-'Alālat al-Nāji'ah*, pg. 77.

legal verdicts of Shaykh ‘Abd al-Qādir al-Jilānī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ, Shaykh Junayd al-Baghdādī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ, Shaykh Khawājah Bahā’ al-Dīn al-Naqshbandī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ, Shaykh Khawājah Muḥyū al-Dīn al-Sanjārī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ will not be considered as reliable proofs although they may have been giants in the field of Ṭarīqah.

لكل فن رجال

Every field has its experts.¹

‘Allāmah Qāḍī Ibrāhīm al-Ḥanafī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ (d. 1000 A.H) says:

Those ascetics who are not of the people of ijtihād will be viewed as laymen. Their opinions will not be relied upon. If their opinions conform to reliable books then we will take them into consideration.²

Shaykh ‘Abd al-Ḥaqq Muḥaddith Dehlawī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ (d. 1025 A.H) writes:

The way of any sūfī shaykh is not a proof, rather a proof will be drawn from the Qur’ān and Sunnah.³

It was said most beautifully by one of the ascetics:

The saying and actions of any shaykh is not a proof, rather hold fast to the sayings of Allah and the actions of Muḥammad صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.

It becomes clear from the above that the words of the sūfiyyah are not a proof in the rulings of ḥalāl and ḥarām except when in conformity to the Sharī‘ah. When we are not allowed to draw proof from their words in matters of fiqh then how can we draw proof from their words in the matter of ‘aqīdah (beliefs)? Especially in one as delicate as the differences of the Ṣaḥābah and more so where their opinions contradict the opinion of the majority? In such a case, a ṣaḥīḥ ḥadīth will not even be taken into consideration. Aḥmad Raḍā Khān Barelwī said:

With regards to beliefs, the ṣaḥīḥ aḥādīth of Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī and Ṣaḥīḥ al-Muslim will be put aside when they are not explicit or mutawātir, so what can be said

1 *Maktūbāt-e Shaykh al-Islām*, vol. 3 pg. 225.

2 *Nafā’is al-Izhār tarjama Majālis al-Abrār*, pg. 127.

3 *Akhbār al-Akhyār*, pg. 93.

about weak narrations. Hypothetically, if Jāmī had not been accused of being a Shī'ah and even if the additions of the Shī'ah had not been established in his book, then too his words would still be rejected because of his contradiction of the vast majority of the scholars.¹

Reference to Mawdūdī

Often reference to the book of Abū al-A'la al-Mawdūdī, *Khilāfat wa Mulūkiyyat* is quoted. In this book, Mawdūdī has levelled several accusations and objections against Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه.

Mawdūdī (d. 1974) is considered amongst the leading authors and writers of recent times. Just as he had been blessed with the qualities of vast research, mastery of composition, open-mindedness, and a mind for critical analysis; he lacked the right channels of education and spiritual reformation. Along with this, he remained in the company of the astray and secularly deranged and began to use his pen as his means of livelihood. All of this overshadowed his talents. His nature became self-centred. His greatest talent lay in his composition and style of writing articles and on this point even we acknowledge and admit to his mastery in penmanship. But what more can be said? Unfortunately, the fervour and severity with which he was affected by western philosophies and modern ideologies is evident in his writings regarding the Ambiyā', the Ṣaḥābah, and the pious predecessors. He wittingly and wholeheartedly became the spokesperson for falsehood. On account of his liberal mindedness and boldness, the respect for these great personalities was not taken into cognisance. He considered his criticism of the Ambiyā', Ṣaḥābah, and pious predecessors to be his “academic duty” and a “search for truth”, and would label anyone who stood up to defend the purity of these esteemed personalities as an advocate for “concealing the truth” and referred to their proofs as “by-the-way pleasantries” and “irrational interpretations”. He viewed lending an ear to their proofs as “endangering one’s capacity to differentiate between right and wrong”. He viewed following the pious predecessors as “intellectual slavery” and would mock such adherence. Taqlīd according to him was “even more severe than sinning”. He claimed to possess the understanding of the scholars of earlier generations without acknowledging their role as transmitters of knowledge. He considered the principles of ḥadīth and its transmission in this era as “nonsense of earlier generations”. He viewed Taṣawwuf

1 *Fatāwa Riḍwiyyah*, vol 2 pg. 505.

as a “drag of heroine” and Sūfism as a “sickness”. Although Mawdūdī may have written some beneficial works but it is as the Qur’ān says:

اِثْمُهُمَا اَكْبَرُ مِنْ نَفْعِهِمَا

Its harm outweighs it benefits.

Before I discuss excerpts from Mawdūdī’s works to prove my point, I would like to quote a passage written by the grand Muftī of Pakistan, Mawlānā Muftī Muḥammad Shafī رحمته الله, regarding Mawdūdī, which has been written in a very honest and moderate tone. He says:

According to this humble slave, the fundamental mistake made by Mawdūdī is that he adhered to his personal ijtihād in matters of ‘aqīdah (beliefs) and aḥkāṃ (practice) where his ijtihād contradicted the majority of the early scholars, even though the requirements of ijtihād were not found in him. Based on this core mistake, many of his views in his literature are incorrect and contradictory to the vast majority of the scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā’ah.

Along with this, he has chosen an unacceptable style of criticism aimed at the early scholars and Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم which is absolutely incorrect, especially in his work *Khilāfat wa Mulūkiyyat*. He not only criticises some of the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم, but abuses them and renders them blameworthy. Even after being alerted to this gross injustice by many scholars, he still continued to adhere to the view which contradicts the approach of the scholars of Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā’ah. Moreover, the general effect of his literature, which results in complete loss of trust in the earlier generation of scholars, can be sensed on those who read his works. According to us, this trust plays a major role in the preservation of dīn. Without it, a person can become completely misguided, despite having the purest of intentions. Yes, it is not correct for me to put him on the same list of those who outright reject ḥadīth, the Qādiyānī, or those who have legitimised clear prohibitions like interest, alcohol, and gambling by misinterpreting the Qur’ān and Sunnah, as some of his writings may have defended Islam against some of the groups mentioned above in western educated circles. However, if someone takes this statement of mine as a basis to say that I agree with the views of Mawdūdī that he held contrary to the majority of the scholars, then this is completely incorrect and contrary to the truth. As according to the rules of any group, Mawdūdī and Jamā’at Islamī are two separate entities. As

a rule, whatever may be said regarding Mawdūdī cannot necessarily be said about Jamā‘at Islamī. However, practically Jamā‘at Islamī not only made the literature of Mawdūdī their academic pride and basis of practice but have made defending it with tongue and pen a routine and their apparent symbol. This is proof that the members of Jamā‘at Islamī hold the same view. However, there are certain individuals who differ with Mawdūdī in his views and we do not include them in this general ruling.

Regarding prayer, the ruling is that only that person should be made imām who adheres to the ideology of Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā‘ah. Therefore, those people that stand with the views of Mawdūdī should not be made imām if one has the choice. However, if one does pray behind a follower of Mawdūdī his prayer would be correct.¹

The contentious Orientalist ‘masterpiece’ of Mawdūdī

As if what Mawdūdī had written in his many works was not enough, he went on to write *Khilāfat wa Mulūkiyyat*, which he considered to be a great service to Islam. The book calls out to the Orientalists, Shī‘ah, and Khawārij, challenging them: “Do you think you can equal me when it comes to writing openly against personalities such as the great khalīfah ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه, ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, Ṭalḥah رضي الله عنه, Zubayr رضي الله عنه, ‘Ā’ishah رضي الله عنها, Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه, Abū Mūsā al-Ash‘arī رضي الله عنه, and ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ رضي الله عنه?”

There is no doubt that the scars left on the minds of people by the Shī‘ah and Orientalists are far less than what Mawdūdī alone has left by writing this one book. I do not want to delve into discussion regarding the authenticity of all of the Orientalists narrations that raise objection upon the honourable Ṣaḥābah and how much consideration Mawdūdī has given to honesty and integrity when narrating them. Over and above this, what right does Mawdūdī possess in raising objections against these pure souls? With the grace of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى, scholars of this nation have exposed the reality of *Khilāfat wa Mulūkiyyat* with undeniable and irrefutable proofs, which can be easily referenced if one so wishes.² One can understand Mawdūdī’s method of research from his own words when he says:

1 *Jawāhir al-Fiqh*, vol. 2 pg. 171-172.

2 A few references: *Haḍrat Mu‘āwiyah aur Tārīkhī ḥaqāiq* by Mufti Muḥammad Taqī ‘Uthmānī, ‘*Ādilāna Dīfā*’ by Mawlānā Sayyid Nūr al-Ḥasan Bukhārī رحمته الله. *Shawāhid al-Taḥaddus awr Tardīd-e Ilzāmat* by Haḍrat Mawlānā Muḥammad Mīa Anṣārī.

I have adopted an open-minded approach and not restricted myself with regards to them (i.e. trustworthy early scholars).¹

I do not believe it is necessary to say anything more after having quoted this statement of his. This statement alone is a clear reflection of the unacceptability of his writings and research.

Several references of Mawdūdī's 'liberal' approach

1. The reality of human weakness can be understood from the incident of Ādam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام; because of one instantaneous emotional urge under the influence of satanic greed, he absent-mindedly lost control of his inner-self and fell from the lofty position of obedience into the throes of disobedience.²
2. Even the Ambiyā' were not safe from the dangers of the evil inner-self. This is why high ranking Ambiyā' such as Dāwūd عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام were warned by Allah سُبحانه وتعالى as mentioned in the Qur'ān:

وَلَا تَتَّبِعِ الْهَوَاءَ فَيُضِلَّكَ عَنْ سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ

*And do not follow your whims, lest it lead you away from the path.*³

3. Carnal desire played a role in the actions of Dāwūd عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام. It played a role in the misuse of his authority. It was such an action which tainted the image of an obedient and just man of authority.⁴
4. The basis of this was merely that Dāwūd عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام was affected by the general Jewish society when he asked for divorce from Auria.⁵
5. It so happens that in delicate and emotional circumstances even the most high and honourable human being such as a Prophet succumbs to his human weakness for a short period of time but as soon as he realises it or Allah سُبحانه وتعالى

1 *Khilāfat wa Mulūkiyyat*, pg. 320.

2 *Tafhīm al-Qur'ān*, vol. 2 pg. 133.

3 *Tafhīm al-Qur'ān*, pg. 163.

4 *Tafhīm al-Qur'ān*, vol. 4.

5 *Ibid.* vol. 2 pg. 56.

admonishes him for dropping from the desired standard, he immediately repents and in rectifying his mistake does not waste even a single moment. What better way of explaining the conduct of Nūḥ عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام, when he saw his own young son drowning in front of him causing him much pain. However, when Allah سُبحانه وتعالى alerted him to the fact that his son had chosen to follow disbelief and on the mere basis of blood relation, he should not adhere to this sentiment based on ignorance, he immediately abandoned this chain of thought. He immediately turned a blind eye to the pain in his heart and treaded the path that Islam calls for.¹

6. Before being graced with nubuwwah even Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام committed a major sin by killing a human.²
7. In reality, innocence is not an essential part of nubuwwah. However, Allah سُبحانه وتعالى has protected them from mistakes for the benefit of carrying out their duty as Ambiyā' in a proper way. If Allah سُبحانه وتعالى removes this protection for even a short while, then even Ambiyā' can make mistakes and forget just as other humans do. This is a fine point that Allah سُبحانه وتعالى intentionally removes this protection from the Ambiyā' at some point in time and allows them to err so that people understand them to be humans and not gods.³
8. ...until even the Ambiyā' committed mistakes and were even punished for it.⁴
9. Yūnus عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام showed deficiency in carrying out his prophetic duty. It seems that he showed impatience and left his job before time.⁵
10. This is the reason that the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ was given the Arabs who had the highest level of potential, because if, Allah forbid, he had been given weak spirited, unenthusiastic, and unreliable people, do we think he would have achieved the same results?⁶

1 Ibid, vol. 4 pg. 344.

2 *Rasā'il wa Masā'il*, vol. 1 pg. 22.

3 *Tafhīm al-Qur'ān*, vol. 2 pg. 56.

4 *Tarjumān al-Qur'ān*, May 1955, pg. 31.

5 *Tafhīm al-Qur'ān*, vol. 2 pg. 312.

6 *Tārīkh-e Islāmī ki Akhlāqī Bunyāde*, pg. 20-21.

- 11.(Mawdūdī says in the commentary of Sūrah al-Naṣr)...in this manner when the mission he was given drew near to completion, he was commanded not to have pride by thinking that this is his accomplishment. Your Rabb is the only one Who is free from any deficiency and fault. So on the accomplishment of your mission, praise and glorify Him and ask Him: “O my Master! Forgive me for any shortcomings and deficiencies that have occurred on my part in these twenty-three years of service in carrying out my duty.”¹
- 12.The Ṣaḥābah time and again misunderstood the essence of jihād in the path of Allah.²
- 13.(He writes regarding the Ṣaḥābah, who participated in the battle of Uḥud) in whichever society interest in rife there will always be two types of ethical deficiencies due to the effects of interest. The people consuming the interest will be afflicted with materialism, avarice, and greed and those involved in paying interest will have anger, frustration, and jealousy. Both of these factors played a vital role in the defeat at Uḥud.³
- 14.‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه upon whom this great task was entrusted did not possess those special qualities which the other forerunners of that time possessed. Therefore the ways of ignorance gained an opportunity to enter into the Islamic social structure.⁴
- 15.Even those rulings passed by the Rightly Guided Khulafā’ as judges were not legislated within Islam.⁵
- 16.Whilst distributing the booty, Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه also violated the vivid teachings of the Qur’ān and clear Sunnah.⁶

1 *Qur’ān ki Chār Bunyādī Istilāḥe*, pg. 156.

2 *Ibid.* pg. 57-59.

3 *Ibid.* vol. 1 pg. 287-288.

4 *Tajdid wa Iḥyā al-Dīn*, pg. 23.

5 *Tarjumān al-Qur’ān se Mawdūdī Madhab*, pg. 66.

6 *Ibid.*

17. ‘Alī رضي الله عنه assigned Mālik ibn Ḥārith al-Ashtar and Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr governing posts whereas it was well known that these two had a hand in the killing of ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه.¹

18. ‘Ā’ishah رضي الله عنها and Ḥafṣah رضي الله عنها became bold and discourteous in their speech towards the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم.²

19. If one glances through history one will not find a perfect reformer to have been born. ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz nearly achieved this but fell short.³

20. In the fiqh of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah رضي الله عنه, one would notice many rulings based upon mursal, Mu‘ḍal, and *Munqaṭi‘* (disjointed) aḥādīth, whereby a strong ḥadīth was discarded to adopt a weak ḥadīth. On the one hand the ḥadīth instructs one thing but Imām Abū Ḥanīfah رضي الله عنه rules something else. Similarly, the case of Imām Mālik رضي الله عنه and Imām Shāfi‘ī رضي الله عنه is no different.⁴

21. The foremost issue which disturbs me from the time of Mujaddid Alf-e Thānī رضي الله عنه until the era of Shāh Walī Allāh رضي الله عنه is that as far Taṣawwuf is concerned they did not completely gauge the ailments of the Muslims. Thereafter they gave them such solutions from which they were truly meant to abstain from.⁵

22. There is no need for tafsīr of the Qur’ān. A profound professor with an in-depth knowledge of the Qur’ān has an aptitude for understanding and teaching the Qur’ān in a modern manner.⁶

These are but a few examples of the ‘priceless criticisms’ of Mawdūdī from his ‘ocean of research’. He began writing in accordance to the commands of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى but was overtaken by emotions, failing to save himself from its blemishes, and regarded it to be the absolute truth. What a picture it creates in the minds of the general masses, who have not delved into the depths of theoretical and academic study.

1 Ibid. pg. 146.

2 *Haft Roz Asia*, pg. 134.

3 *Tajdīd wa Ihyā al-Dīn*, pg. 21.

4 *Tafhīm al-Qur’ān*.

5 *Tajdīd wa Ihyā al-Dīn*, pg. 73.

6 *Tanqīhāt*, pg. 193.

How much and to what point will the connection with the Ambiyā', Ṣaḥābah and awliyā' remain intact. In our opinion, after relying on these criticisms one will be overwhelmed by an inferiority complex and self-defeat. Is this what you would call "The establishment of dīn", "The renewal of dīn" or "The revival of dīn"?

In this regard, let us analyse another point mentioned by Mawdūdī, which proves the free-thinking nature and vanity of Mawdūdī. He writes:

And we see this ignorance except from a minority (i.e. Jamā'at Islāmī) amongst the Muslim community throughout the world, whether it be a layman or a qualified scholar, a wise old man or fresh graduate from college and university, the manner and approach of each varies distinctively but they are all equally ignorant when it comes to the reality and essence of Islam.¹

Examine another dangerous and troublesome claim made by him, namely; the Muslims who deny the teachings of Jamā'at Islāmī and Mawdūdī have the same position as the Jewish people. He said:

At this moment in time, I wish to be frank in saying that there is a particular claim of theirs which is similar to ours and that is something will arise within the Muslims which will bring upon them very difficult times. When the truth is polluted by scattered arrays of falsehood then there is a valid reason for the Muslims not to accept or take sides with such a deviated group. However, when truth manifests itself in a pristine form and those who outwardly claim Islam are invited towards it, they have no choice but to take their side in rendering service, which is the basic objective of the Muslim global community. This is opposed to not taking sides with them and adopting the same opposition that was held by the Jewish people before them. In this case, these are the only two ways. Now because this effort of preaching and inviting has prevailed in India, this horrific hour of trial and tribulation has definitely come upon the Muslims of India. As for the rest of the countries, we are preparing to convey our message to them. If we are successful in doing so then whoever hears our message, the Muslims will face the same trial and tribulation.²

1 *Tafhīm al-Qur'ān*, vol. 1 pg. 36.

2 *Rudādi Jamā'ati Islāmī*, vol. 2 pg. 17-18.

Ponder over the danger of this claim. The essence of which is that it is identical to the claim of the Ambiyā', and only a Prophet and Messenger has the right to make such a claim; no other reformist has the right to decree those who deny him to be Jews. We now wish to quote an enlightening and distinct remark of Mawlānā Muḥammad Yūsuf Ludhiyānwī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ (d. 1421 A.H), which encapsulates his life and ideology:

One can gauge from the philosophies of Mawdūdī regarding the Qur'ān, Sunnah of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, and the Sunnah of the al-Khulafā' al-Rāshidīn how corrupted his mind is when it comes to the fundamental sources of Islamic law. He does not consider the ijtihād of any person to be reliable, besides his own. Therefore his understanding of dīn is based solely on his own intellectual ability and capacity of ijtihād.

The points mentioned above clearly points out the deviated mindset he possessed and as I have mentioned previously, the list of his misunderstandings is extremely long. In my humble opinion, Mawdūdī is not from amongst the people of truth who followed in the footsteps of the pious predecessors nor from the Ahl al-Sunnah. The reality is that he understood and interpreted dīn through his own intellect and understanding, regardless of how far he differed with the pious predecessors.

The major reasons for Mawdūdī's shortcomings, in my opinion are as follows:

1. He did not seek knowledge from any teacher but studied on his own. Perhaps, he regarded it as unnecessary for a literate person to seek knowledge from another.
2. In his youth, Mawdūdī had befriended a few deviated individuals, who played a major role in building his personality. He relates the story himself:

Two and a half years of experience has taught me that if one wishes to spend his life with honour then it is necessary for him to stand on his own feet. There is no way to achieve independence but through tireless efforts. I was gifted with literary skills and through simple passive reading, this was further improved. It was during this time that I became acquainted with Niyāz Fataḥpūrī. His company became a great motivation for me.... in conclusion, due to all these reasons it was decided that writing should become my means of living.

3. Even the most intelligent people in the world, if they do not receive correct upbringing then they later take matters into their own hands. They always consider themselves to be very capable and elite, while the rest of the world seems insignificant to them. This is exactly what happened to Mawdūdī. Allah ﷻ had gifted him with the best of abilities but unfortunately his intellect was overrun by his emotions. He attained such a level of wishful and unproductive thinking that in the eyes of the elders of the ummah, he became a unique example of deviation. This wishful and unproductive thinking became the means of his downfall and self-admiration.
4. The effects of the modern age overawed him to such an extent that he found it difficult to present dīn in its pristine form. It was for this reason that he deemed it necessary to reform and shape dīn in accordance to the times of the modern age, unconcerned whether this was true reform or whether Islam would be saved by it. Just as following the mainstream has become the call of today, he attempted to shape Islamic law in line with the mainstream.
5. Considering all of the above, the might of his pen coupled with his bold writing spurred him to exceed the bounds of etiquette, which is due to the seniors of this ummah. Obscenity and disrespect was common place and prevalent in all his works. If only someone as intelligent and apt as Mawdūdī had received the proper scholastic upbringing then he would have been a means of blessings for this ummah and a source of pride.

According to the author of *Nām wa Nasab* overlooking the services rendered by Mawdūdī is pure partisanship¹; which is why we have quoted the ‘spectacular services’ rendered by Mawdūdī, from his own books. We ask the reader to be just in his outlook and gauge whether these were truly services to dīn and if overlooking it can be termed as partisanship? Bear in mind that these references are a few drops from the “oceans of effulgence” of Mawdūdī.

Was Mawdūdī a Deobandī?

Any claim made of Abū al-A‘lā al-Mawdūdī being a Deobandī is false and mere conjecture. The works of Mawdūdī make it vividly clear that he had no regard for

¹ *Nām wa Nasab*, pg. 534.

the ‘Ulamā’ of Deoband. Just as he had considered it his mission in life to criticise the Ambiyā’, Ṣaḥābah, and pious predecessors so too was it his mission to criticise and attack the ‘Ulamā’ of Deoband. In addition, it was the ‘Ulamā’ of Deoband who took upon themselves the task of refuting his deviations. There is probably no other school of thought that has come close to the efforts they made in refuting him and succeeded in doing it. The ‘Ulamā’ of Deoband have personally addressed him and warned him of his mistakes. They attempted to protect the general masses from his poisonous and corrupt beliefs through lectures and books. In this regard, instead of referring to my own books, I will now refer you to two trustworthy scholars, who are not of the same school of thought as myself (so as to emphasise my point without any biased sentiment). These two ‘Ulamā’ are:

1. Arshad al-Qādarī, who wrote: “The ‘Ulamā’ of Deoband consider the system and ideology of Jamā‘at Islamī as invalid and disastrous for the ummah at large.”¹
2. Mushtāq Aḥmad Nizāmī, who writes in his book, *Jamā‘at Islamī ka Shīsh Mahal* that he has deduced from the lectures of Mawlānā Ashraf ‘Alī Thānwī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ, Mawlānā Sayyid Ḥusayn Aḥmad Madanī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ, Mawlānā Aḥmad ‘Alī Lāhorī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ, Mawlānā Qārī Muḥammad Ṭayyib Qāsimī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ, Mawlānā Shams al-Ḥaqq Afghānī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ, and Mawlānā Khayr Muḥammad Jālandharī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ; that the ideologies and beliefs of Mawdūdī are unacceptable.²

The world is fully aware that the ‘Ulamā’ of Deoband are followers of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ. I earnestly wish to say that in the world today, there is a general widespread of Ḥanafī followers and more specifically in the Asian subcontinent. We will at another time mention the virtues and accolades of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ and the detailed services rendered by the ‘Ulamā’ of Deoband in defending the fiqh of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ. Our opposition are completely devoid of such services and honours. Returning to our initial discussion; pertaining to the issue of taqlīd, the ‘Ulamā’ of Deoband are ardent supporters of taqlīd whereas Mawdūdī says:

According to me it is impermissible and a sin or worse for a man of knowledge to make taqlīd.³

1 *Jamā‘at-e Islāmī*, pg. 7-8.

2 *Jamā‘at-e Islāmī ka Shīsh Mahal*, pg. 5-8.

3 *Rasā’il wa Masā’il*, vol. 1 pg. 244.

Our standpoint on taqlīd is manifest, now study his ruling on the issue:

Ḥanafī, Sunnī, Deobandī, Ahl al-ḥadīth, Barelwī, Shī'ah, etc. are all products of ignorance.¹

Also:

I do not consider the Ahl al-ḥadīth nor the Ḥanafī or Shawāfi to be accurate in what they say.²

After all these statements it is impossible to consider Mawdūdī a Ḥanafī or a Deobandī and to do so is outright dishonesty and ignorance. Mawdūdī writes:

It is our firm belief that besides this line of effort all other avenues are invalid.³

In reality, Mawdūdī fell prey to independent thinking and abandoning taqlīd. It is for this reason that in the fourteenth century he could not see anybody correct except himself.⁴

1 *Mulakhas Khutbāt-e Mawdūdī*, pg. 128.

2 *Rasā'il wa Masā'il*, vol. 1 pg. 235.

3 *Tarjumān al-Qur'ān*, vol. 26 pg. 111.

4 To truly understand the beliefs of Mawdūdī refer to the following books:

- a. *Mawdūdī Madhab* by Mawlānā Qāḍī Maẓhar Ḥusayn Chakwālī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ
- b. *Ilmi Muhāsabah* by Mawlānā Qāḍī Maẓhar Ḥusayn Chakwālī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ
- c. *Al-Ustādh al-Mawdūdī* by Mawlānā Sayyid Muḥammad Yūsuf Binnorī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ
- d. *Fitnā Maudūdīyyat* by Mawlānā Muḥammad Zakariyyah Sahāranpūrī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ
- e. *Mawdūdī ke Sāth merī Rifāqat ki Sarguzisht aur ab Merā Mauqaf* by Mawlānā Muḥammad Manẓūr Nu'mānī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ
- f. *Mawdūdī Ṣāhib aur Takhrīb-e Islām* by Mawlānā Rashīd Aḥmad Ludhiyānwī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ
- g. *Ikhtilāf-e Ummah awr Sirāṭ al-Mustaqīm* of Mawlānā Yūsuf Ludhiyānwī رَحْمَةُ اللهِ عَلَيْهِ.

The accusation of poisoning Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ

Amongst the false allegations directed towards Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is the poisoning of Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. The claim is made that Ja‘dah (the wife of Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ) was the one who poisoned him upon the incitement of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. The following references are cited to support this claim, which we will examine individually:

1. *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* vol. 8 p. 43
2. *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* vol. 4 p. 202
3. *Ibn al-‘Asākir* vol. 4 p. 202
4. *Sirr al-Shāhādātayn* p. 4
5. *Tārīkh Ibn al-Athīr* vol. 3 p. 228
6. *Tārīkh al-Khamīs* vol. 2 p. 292
7. *Shawāhid al-Nubuwwah* p. 173
8. *Al-Iṣābah fī Tamīz al-Ṣaḥābah* vol. 1 p. 375
9. *Ḥayāt al-Ḥayawān* vol. 1 p. 54
10. *Murūj al-Dhahab* vol. 2 p. 303
11. *Tuḥaf al-‘Uqūl* p. 291
12. *Al-Istī‘āb* vol. 1 p. 374

Let us now sequentially study the books often quoted as reference for this allegation, so as to ascertain whether these authors did in fact accuse Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ of poisoning Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ or not?

1. *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*

When we turn to the pages indicated above, we find the following text:

و عندي أن هذا ليس بصحيح و عدم صحته عن أبيه معاوية بطريق الأولى

According to me, this is not ṣaḥīḥ (that Yazīd poisoned Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ) and to a greater extent, it is incorrect to possess this belief regarding his father, Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.¹

1 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 43.

2. *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*

After a superficial check of *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* I did not find this text. However, according to the renowned research scholar, Mawlānā Muḥammad Nāfi‘ (may Allah ﷻ elevate him), this narration is not mentioned in *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*¹. This is also the conclusion of the famous historian, Mawlānā Shāh Mu‘īn al-Dīn Nadwī. He writes:

Despite searching for this incident in Ṭabarī, I did not find it.²

If this narration is found in *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, then please present a correct and precise reference so that it can be scrutinised and the relevant reply given.

3. *Tārīkh Ibn al-‘Asākir*

In *Tahdhīb al-Tārīkh Ibn al-‘Asākir*, this incident is mentioned without any chain of narration. In *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq*, Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-‘Asākir رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 571 A.H) has mentioned this incident with its chain of narration as follows:

قال: و أنا محمد بن سعد أنا محمد بن عمر نا عبد الله بن جعفر عن عبد الله بن حسن.....و قد سمعت بعض من يقول كان معاوية قد تلتطف لبعض خدمه أن يسقيه سما³

Thus, the narrator of this incident is Muḥammad ibn ‘Umar al-Wāqidī. Wāqidī has fabricated many baseless and abandoned narrations. This narration too is amongst them. The Muḥaddithīn have severely criticised him, a few examples of which we will mention here:

- a. Imām Bukhārī has referred to him as *Matrūk al-ḥadīth* (one whose narrations are discarded).
- b. Imām Aḥmad states: “Together with Wāqidī being a great liar, he alters aḥādīth as well.”
- c. Imām Shāfi‘ī states: “All the books of Wāqidī are filled with deception.”

1 *Sīrat Mu‘āwiyah*, vol. 2 pg. 201.

2 *Sīyar al-Ṣaḥābah*, vol. 6 pg. 102.

3 *Tārīkh Madīnah Dimashq*, vol. 3 pg. 283-284.

- d. Yahyā ibn Mu‘īn has regarded him as *ḍa‘īf* (weak).
- e. Imām Nasā‘ī states: “Four liars who would fabricate lies against the Prophet ﷺ are famous, the first being Wāqidī, a resident of Madīnah Munawwarah.”¹
- f. Ibn Nadīm, also a historian, writes regarding Wāqidī:

و كان يتشيع حسن المذهب يلزم التقية و هو الذي روى أن عليا عليه السلام كان من معجزات النبي صلي الله عليه وسلم كالعصا لموسى وإحياء الموتى لعيسى وغير ذلك من الأخبار

Wāqidī was reasonably Shī‘ah in his standpoints. He regarded *taqīyyah* (dissimulation) as necessary. He is the same person who has narrated that ‘Alī رضي الله عنه was amongst the *mu‘jizāt* (miracles) of the Prophet ﷺ just as the staff was a miracle of Mūsā عليه السلام and giving of life to the deceased was a miracle of ‘Īsā عليه السلام, as well as similar types of narrations.²

Keeping this in mind, how can the above mentioned narration be utilized as a proof?

4. *Sirr al-Shāhādātayn*

The name of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه is not mentioned in *Sirr al-Shāhādātayn* with regards to the incident of poisoning.

5. *Tārīkh Ibn al-Athīr al-Jazarī*

‘Allāmah Ibn al-Athīr al-Jazarī رحمه الله in *Al-Kāmil fi al-Tārīkh* has attributed the poisoning to Ja‘dah bint al-Ash‘ath ibn Qays al-Kindī.

في هذه السنة توفي الحسن ابن علي سمته زوجته جعدة بنت الاشعث بن قيس الكندي

In this year (49 A.H), Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī رضي الله عنه passed away. His wife, Ja‘dah bint al-Ash‘ath ibn Qays al-Kindī poisoned him.³

1 *Tahdhīb al-Tahdhīb*, vol. 7 pg. 342, 346; *Mīzān al-I’tidāl*, vol. 3 pg. 362, 363.

2 Ibn Nadīm: *al-Fahrist*, pg. 111.

3 Ibn al-Athīr: *al Kāmil*, vol. 3 pg. 182; *Usd al-Ghābah*, vol. 2 pg. 15.

Ibn al-Athīr رحمته الله has also mentioned that Sa‘īd ibn al-‘Āṣ رحمته الله, the governor of Madīnah Munawwarah appointed by Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رحمته الله, led the Janāzah ṣalāh of Sayyidunā Ḥasan رحمته الله in the presence of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رحمته الله.¹

6. *Tārīkh al-Khamīs*

The historian Al-Diyār Bakrī, has mentioned the incident of poisoning in his *Tārīkh*. He has attributed the action to Ja‘dah bint al-Ash‘ath and not Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رحمته الله.

ثم دخلت عليه من الغد و هو وجود بنفسه و الحسين عند رأسه فقال يا أخي من تتهم قال لما أقتلته قال نعم قال إن يكن الذي أظن فالله أشد بأسا و أشد تنكيلا و إلا فما أحب أن يقتل بي برئ و في رواية قال والله لا أقول لك ممن سقاني ثم قضي - و قد ذكر يعقوب بن سفيان في تاريخه أن جعدة بنت الاشعث بن قيس الكندي كانت تحت الحسن ابن علي فرعموا أنها سمته

(‘Amr ibn Ishāq reports) The following day, I came before Ḥasan رحمته الله, whilst he was in the throes of death. Ḥusayn رحمته الله was at his head. He asked, “Brother! (Who gave you poison?) Who do you suspect?” Ḥasan رحمته الله enquired, “Why are you asking? Will you kill him?” When Ḥusayn رحمته الله replied in the positive, Ḥasan رحمته الله said, “If it is the person who I think it is, then Allah has greater power and will give him a severe punishment. If it is not him then I do not like that an innocent person be killed because of me.” Another narration states that he said, “By Allah! I will never mention to you who gave it to me to drink.” Saying so, he passed away. Ya‘qūb ibn Sufyān has mentioned in his *Tārīkh* that Ja‘dah bint al-Ash‘ath was in the wedlock of Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī رحمته الله. They thought that she had poisoned him.²

7. *Shawāhid al-Nubuwwah*

There are many things mentioned in *Shawāhid al-Nubuwwah* which are contrary to the beliefs of the Ahl al-Sunnah; for example the belief of 1) Imāmah of twelve Imāms, 2) the concept of Imāmah being a divine decree from Allah, 3) Imām Mahdī’s birth in the house of Ḥasan al-‘Askarī رحمته الله, 4) Sayyidunā ‘Alī رحمته الله being the *wasī* (successor) of the Prophet صلی الله علیه و سلم, and that this is included in the *kalimah* (declaration of

1 *Usd al-Ghābah*, vol. 2 pg. 15.

2 *Tārīkh al-Khamīs fī Ahwālī Anfus al-Nafīs*, vol. 2 pg. 293.

faith)¹. Thus, finding such a narration in a book such as this comes as no surprise at all and will not serve as proof against us.

8. *Al-Iṣābah fi Tamīz al-Ṣaḥābah*

Ibn al-Ḥajar رَحِمَهُ اللهُ after mentioning the different views regarding the year of the demise of Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَحِمَهُ اللهُ states:

و يقال انه مات مسموما قال ابن سعد أخبرنا إسماعيل عن عمير بن إسحق دخلت أنا و صاحب لي على الحسن بن علي فقال لقد لفظت طائفة من كبدي و إني قد سقيت السم مرارا فلم اسق مثل هذا فأتاه الحسين بن علي فسأله من سقاه فأبى أن يخبر رحمه الله

It has been said: “He passed away due to poisoning.” Ibn Sa’d says that Ismā’īl informed us from ‘Umayr ibn Iṣḥāq who said: “I and a friend of mine came before Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ. He said: “A portion of my liver has fallen out. I have been poisoned a number of times. However, I have not been poisoned as severely as this time.” Ḥusayn ibn ‘Alī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ came to him and asked him who had given him the poison. However, he refused to divulge the name (May Allah shower His mercy on him!).”²

It should be noted from the words of Ibn al-Ḥajar رَحِمَهُ اللهُ that according to him the incident of Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَحِمَهُ اللهُ passing away due to poisoning is doubtful, which is why the words “it has been said (يقال)” has been mentioned, which is a sign that there is weakness in the narration.

9. *Ḥayāt al-Ḥayawān*

‘Allāmah Kamāl al-Dīn Muḥammad ibn ‘Īsā al-Damīrī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 808 A.H) has attributed the poisoning to a lady by the name of Muqaddamah bint al-Ash‘ath.

و كان الحسن قد سم سمته امرأته مقدمة بنت الأسعث

Ḥasan رَحِمَهُ اللهُ was poisoned. His wife, Muqaddamah bint al-Ash‘ath poisoned him.³

1 *Shawāhid al-Nubuwwah*, pg. 159, chapter 6; *Shawāhid al-Nubuwwah*, pg. 180, chapter 6; *Shawāhid al-Nubuwwah*, pg. 212, 213, chapter 6; *Shawāhid al-Nubuwwah*, pg. 164, chapter 6.

2 *Al-Iṣābah*, vol. 2 pg. 65, 66.

3 *Ḥayāt al-Ḥayawān*, vol. 1 pg. 73.

10. *Murūj al-Dhahab*

The author of *Murūj al-Dhahab*, the historian Abū al-Ḥasan al-Baghdādī (d. 346 A.H) adhered to the Shī'ah doctrines. In *Al-Kunā wa l-Alqāb*¹, *A'yān al-Shī'ah*², and *Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl*³, he has been described as an ardent Shī'ah. However, he has also mentioned the incident of the poisoning in his history, *Murūj al-Dhahab*, but did not mention the name of the person who administered the poison:

على بن الحسين بن علي بن أبي طالب قال : دخل الحسين علي عمي الحسن بن علي لما سقي السم فقام لحاجة الإنسان ثم رجع فقال لقد سقيت السم عدة مرار فما سقيت مثل هذا فقال لقد لفظت طائفة من كبدي فرأيتني أقلبه يعود في يدي فقال له الحسين يا أخي من سقاك قال و ما تريد بذلك ؟ فإن كان الذي أظنه فالله حسيبه و إن كان غيره فما أحب أن يؤخذ بي برئ فلم يلبث بعد ذلك إلا ثلاثا حتي توفي و ذكر أن امرأته جعدة بنت الأشعث بن قيس الكندي سقته السم و قد كان معاوية دس إليها⁴

Sayyidunā Zayn al-Ābidīn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ has mentioned: “My father, Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ came before my uncle Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ when he had been poisoned. Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ went to relieve himself. When he returned, he remarked: “I have been poisoned a few times before, but never like this. I have excreted portions of my liver. I saw myself turning it over and over with a stick in my hand.” Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ asked him, “O my brother! Who gave you poison?” Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ asked, “Why do you wish to know? If it is the person who I think then Allah is sufficient for him. If it is someone else then I do not like for an innocent person to be punished on account of me.” He only remained alive for three days after this.” It has been mentioned that his wife, Ja’dah bint al-Ash’ath ibn Qays al-Kindī had given him poison and that Mu’āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ had instigated her.”

It is worthy of note that the Shī'ah historian, Mas’ūdī, could not find any reliable narration regarding this ‘fairy-tale’. The narration quoted above consists of two parts. In the actual narration, the name of the person who administered the poison is not mentioned. The second portion has been added in, as his manner of writing attests. In this second portion, the name of Sayyidunā Mu’āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ has been

1 Vol. 3 pg. 184.

2 Vol. 1 pg. 156.

3 Vol. 2 pg. 282.

4 *Murūj al-Dhahab*, vol. 3 pg. 5.

mentioned. However, the status of this additional portion can be understood from the words “It has been mentioned (ذَكَرَ)”, which is utilized in the Arabic language to indicate an extremely weak report. This word shows that this ‘fairy-tale’ is not credible and is uncertain.

Points to ponder

Now we will analyse this narration logically:

a. If we were to accept that portions of the liver were able to enter the stomach and were then excreted at the time of relieving himself, then can this fact ever be accepted that a person with a refined temperament like Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would turn it over in his hands and look at it. According to us this is farfetched indeed.

b. When Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ asked his brother, Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, the name of the one who had poisoned him, the latter refused to mention it, yet somehow the opponents to Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ have come to know of it.

c. The words of Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ indicate that Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was uncertain as to who had poisoned him. It was merely a feeling or suspicion, as is clear from the words “Who I think it is” (أظنه). There is no need to mention that an Islamic ruling cannot be passed on a mere feeling or suspicion.

d. If one ponders over the statement of Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, one will be convinced that Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ had no role in the poisoning. If he had been poisoned then it could have been anyone but Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, as Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ answered his brother with the following words:

فإن كان الذي أظنه فالله حسيبه وإن كان غيره فما أحب أن يؤخذ بي برئ

If it is the person who I think, then Allah is sufficient for him. If it is someone else then I do not like that an innocent person be punished due to me.

From this statement, it is clear that whoever Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ had in mind could have been easily reprimanded and that could be anyone but Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, since he was the khalīfah and high ruler, making it extremely difficult and virtually

impossible for him to be apprehended. Who could apprehend him or the person he had appointed to carry out the task (if he had done so)? The words of Sayyidunā Ḥasan رضي الله عنه make it clear that his suspicion (not certainty) was that the person who poisoned him was an ordinary person who could be easily caught and convicted. It is for this reason he said: “I do not like that an innocent person be punished due to me.”

When this fabricated narration is analysed from a logical perspective, we learn:

- I. Ḥasan رضي الله عنه did not have absolute knowledge of the person who administered the poison.
- II. He only had a suspicion about someone. However, he refused to divulge the name.
- III. There is no other means by which we can ascertain who gave the poison. With the death of Ḥasan رضي الله عنه, this suspicion which he had will also terminate. Now let alone knowledge and conviction, one cannot even possess the slightest suspicion.¹

11. *Tuḥaf al-‘Uqūl*

Despite an extensive search, we could not locate this book. If a copy of the text with the chain of narrators could be provided then a relevant reply can be given.

12. *Al-Istī‘āb*

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr رحمته الله (d. 464 A.H) writes regarding the poisoning, after naming Ja’dah bint al-Ash’ath as the guilty one:

و قالت طائفة كان ذلك بتدسيس معاوية إليها

A small group state: “Ja’dah bint al-Ash’ath poisoned Ḥasan رضي الله عنه and this was upon the incitement of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه.”²

Yes! A very small Shī‘ah group. The agents of the Shī‘ah claimed that Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه instructed her to poison him. However, reality has no connection with this. Such incidents cannot be established with words which show weakness

1 The monthly journal *Da‘wat Amīr Mu‘āwiyah*, pg. 106-109.

2 *Al-Istī‘āb*, vol. 1 pg. 440.

such as “A small group states” (قالت طائفة), “It is mentioned” (ذكر) or “It has been said” (يقال).

After clarifying the reality of the references often cited, we will now present the clear narrations of three great honourable scholars (in addition to those of Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-Kathīr رَحِمَهُ اللهُ and ‘Allāmah Ibn al-Khuldūn رَحِمَهُ اللهُ which have already been discussed in the preceding pages), in which they have explicitly negated the slander made against Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. It should be borne in mind that the proficiency and integrity of these scholars are unanimously accepted.

1. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Taymiyyah al-Ḥarrānī

أن معاوية سم الحسن فهذا مما ذكره بعض الناس و لم يثبت ذلك بينة شرعية أو إقرار معتبر ، و لا نقل يجزم به و هذا مما لا يمكن العلم به فالقول به قول بلا علم

Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ poisoning Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ: this is a claim made by some that can neither be proven by any Sharī testimony or reliable confession, nor any definite text. This is such a matter that knowledge of it is impossible to ascertain. To make such a claim is a claim without knowledge.¹

2. Ḥāfiẓ Shams al-Dīn al-Dhahabī

و قالت طائفة كان ذلك بتدسيس معاوية إليها و بذل لها على ذلك و كان لها ضرائر قلت هذا شيء لا يصح فمن الذي اطلع عليه

A small group stated: “Ja‘dah bint al-Ash‘ath poisoned Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ upon the incitement of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and for the accomplishment of which he rewarded her generously. She also had co-wives, I (i.e. Al-Dhahabī) say, This is not correct. Who is the one who came to know of it?²

3. ‘Allāmah ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Farhārāwī

أنه بهتان عظيم و خرافات المؤرخين مما لا يعتمد عليها

This is a great slander and tales of the historians, which cannot be relied upon.³

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah*, vol. 2 pg. 225.

2 Al-Dhahabī: *Tārīkh al-Islām*, vol. 3 pg. 40.

3 *Al-Nāhīyah*, pg. 43.

The above mentioned statements of these honourable scholars make it abundantly clear, by the grace of Allah, that Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ had no role to play in the martyrdom of Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.

Logically also, it is clear that Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ faced no imminent danger from Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, since Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ had handed over the khilāfah to him. Throughout his life, Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ received an income and gifts from Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and no such incident occurred, which can reveal that there were any ill-feelings or malicious intentions between the two.

ولما جاء الكتاب بموت الحسن بن علي اتفق كون ابن عباس عند معاوية فعزاه فيه فأحسن تعزيتيه ورد عليه ابن عباس ردا حسنا كما قدمنا

When the letter informing of the demise of Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ reached Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Ibn ‘Abbās رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ happened to be present. Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ consoled him in a most beautiful manner. Thereafter Ibn ‘Abbās رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ answered him in an even better manner, as has been mentioned before.¹

After uttering these words of condolence, Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ said to Ibn ‘Abbās رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ:

لا يسؤك الله و لا يحزنك في الحسن بن علي فقال ابن عباس لمعاوية لا يحزنني الله و لا يسؤني ما أبقى الله أمير المؤمنين

May Allah protect you from difficulties, and not cause you to grieve regarding Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. Ibn ‘Abbās رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ answered: “May Allah not sadden me and place me in difficulties as long as Allah keeps Amīr al-Mu‘minīn (i.e. Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ) alive.”²

These reports prove with certainty that Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ bore no enmity or ill-feelings towards Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. Now the question arises; who did he have enmity with? This is a matter which has to be pondered over. In one lecture of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, a slight indication is found as to who bore enmity to Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. Amīr al-Mu‘minīn ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ said:

1 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 304.

2 *Ibid.* vol. 8 pg. 138.

قال علي يا أهل العراق او يا أهل الكوفة لا تزوجوا حسنا فإنه رجل مطلق قال علي ما زال الحسن يتزوج و يطلق حتى حسبت أن يكون عداوة في القبائل

‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ said, “O people of Iraq! O people of Kūfah! Do not give your daughters in marriage to Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, as he is a person who divorces profusely.” ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ said, “Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ continued marrying and divorcing until I began to realise that many tribes would bear enmity towards him.”¹

Keeping this in mind, a possible suspect behind the poisoning could be one of his previous wives. The clear evidence points to the fact that attributing the poisoning to Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is merely defamation and slander.

If Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ (Allah forbid!) had indeed played a role in the poisoning, then Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would have broken his pledge of allegiance immediately and sought to avenge the blood of his brother. He would never have allowed the Umayyad governor, Sa‘īd ibn al-‘Ās, to perform the Janāzah ṣalāh of his brother. He would not have travelled to Damascus thereafter to meet with Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, nor would he have accepted the gifts and allowances granted to him, and he would never have participated in the Battle of Constantinople under the leadership of Yazīd ibn Mu‘āwiyah; all after the demise of Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-Kathīr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ (d. 774 A.H) states:

و لما توفي الحسن كان الحسين يفتد إلى معاوية في كل عام فيعطيه و يكرمه و قد كان في الجيش الذين غزوا القسطنطينية مع ابن معاوية يزيد في سنة إحدى و خمسين

After the demise of Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ used to go to Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ every year, who would grant him gifts and honour him. He participated in the Battle of Constantinople under Yazīd, the son of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ in 51 A.H.²

1 *Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah*, vol. 5 pg. 254.

2 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 150.

The accusation of an illusory truce

Some attempt to use the words of the ḥadīth:

هدنة على دخن

There will be an illusory truce

To undermine the truce between Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. A few points need to be taken note of in reply to this distortion.

1. The truce was fulfilment of the glad tidings of the Messenger of Allah

صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ

The portion mentioned above is an extract of a lengthy ḥadīth detailing the signs of Qiyāmah. It neither mentions Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ nor Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ nor a place or a time. It is incorrect to ascribe this indistinct prophecy to the truce between Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ because it has been reported in a ṣaḥīḥ ḥadīth that the the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, while delivering a *khuṭbah* (sermon) on the mimbar turned towards Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ (who was still an infant at the time) and said:

ان ابني هذا سيد و لعل الله ان يصلح به فئتين عظيمتين من المسلمين

This son of mine is a leader and it is possible that Allah will unite two large groups of the Muslims through him.¹

After such a clear prophecy, which describes perfectly the reconciliation which Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would be instrumental in, it is absolutely incorrect to substantiate that this truce was illusory based upon an indistinct ḥadīth, which also bears no relation to the description of the Ṣaḥābah in the Qur'ān:

رُحَمَاءَ بَيْنَهُمْ

*They are compassionate amongst each other.*²

1 Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī, vol. 1 pg. 373.

2 Sūrah al-Fath: 29.

Furthermore, the Messenger of Allah ﷺ having high hopes for this truce, addressed Ḥasan رضي الله عنه as a leader, and praised the actions he would carry out. All of this indicates that this truce would be correct and not illusory.

2. Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah’s kindness towards the Ahl al-Bayt

After this truce, Sayyidunā Ḥasan رضي الله عنه and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه never experienced any shortcoming from Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه nor did they experience any difficulty from him, and Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه never broke any of the promises he made to them. Abū Ḥanīfah al-Dīnwarī (d. 282 A.H) writes:

قالوا ولم ير الحسن ولا الحسين طول حياة معاوية منه سوءا في انفسهم ولا مكروها و
لا قطع عنهما شيئا مما كان شرط لهما ولا تغير لهما عن بر

Historians state that Ḥasan رضي الله عنه and Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه never experienced any difficulty throughout the life of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه nor anything they disliked. Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه never broke any of the conditions they agreed upon nor did he change in his kind treatment towards them.¹

3. The stipends Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah designated for the Ahl al-Bayt

During his khilāfah, Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه always showed kindness and generosity towards Sayyidunā Ḥasan رضي الله عنه, Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه and the other Ahl al-Bayt, examples of which fill the books of history. The senior members of the Banū Hāshim would present their needs before Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and he in turn would gladly fulfil all their needs. This continued until his demise. This in itself is a separate discussion which cannot be adequately discussed in this brief treatise. However, we will suffice with mention of a few such incidents.

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-Kathīr رحمه الله (d. 774 A.H) writes:

فلما استقرت الخلافة لمعاوية كان الحسين يتردد اليه مع اخيه الحسن فيكرمهما معاوية
اكراما زائدا ويقول لهما مرحبا و اهلا و يعطيهم عطاء جزيلا

When the khilāfah of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه was established, Ḥasan رضي الله عنه along with his brother would visit Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه, and he would be extremely hospitable toward them. He would welcome them and present them with lavish gifts.²

1 *Al-Akhhbār al-Ṭuwāl*, pg. 225.

2 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 150, 151.

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-Kathīr رَحِمَهُ اللهُ also writes:

وروى الاصمعي قال: وفد الحسن و عبد الله بن زبير على معاوية فقال مرحبا و اهلا بابن رسول الله و امر بثلاث مائة الف و قال لابن زبير مرحبا و اهلا بابن عمه رسول الله و امر له بمائة الف

Ḥasan رَحِمَهُ اللهُ and ‘Abd Allāh ibn Zubayr رَحِمَهُ اللهُ came to Mu‘āwiyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ. Mu‘āwiyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ said: “Welcome to the son of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.” and he ordered three hundred thousand (dirhams) to be given to him. He then said to ‘Abd Allāh ibn Zubayr رَحِمَهُ اللهُ: “Welcome to the son of the paternal aunt of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.” and ordered him to be given one hundred thousand (dirhams).¹

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-‘Asākir رَحِمَهُ اللهُ writes:

ان الحسن و الحسين كانا يقبلان جوائز معاوية

Verily Ḥasan رَحِمَهُ اللهُ and Ḥusayn رَحِمَهُ اللهُ would accept the gifts of Mu‘āwiyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ.²

It appears in another narration:

عن عبد الله بن بريده قال : قدم الحسن بن علي على معاوية فقال لا جيزتك بجائزة ما اجزت بها قبلك و لا اجيز بها احدا بعدك فاعطاه اربع مائة الف

Once Ḥasan رَحِمَهُ اللهُ visited Mu‘āwiyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ and Mu‘āwiyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ said to him: “I will give you such a large amount that I have never given to any person before you nor will I give to any person after you.” He then gave him four hundred thousand (dirhams).³

In a similar manner, Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-Kathīr رَحِمَهُ اللهُ has reported the yearly stipend Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَحِمَهُ اللهُ would receive from Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ:

كان له (الحسن بن علي) على معاوية في كل عام جائزة و كان يفد اليه فرما اجازة باربع مائة الف درهم و راتبه في سنة مائة الف

1 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. 7 pg. 137.

2 *Tārīkh Madīnah Damashq*, vol. 59 pg. 195.

3 *Al-Iṣābah*, vol. 2 pg. 64.

Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would receive a yearly stipend from Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would travel to visit him every year. Many a time, Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would gift him with four hundred thousand dirhams and his yearly stipend was one hundred thousand.¹

Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would also keep himself informed of the needs of Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and whenever the need arose he would assist them. The historian al-Balādhurī (d. 279 A.H) has reported an incident in this regard that once Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ went to visit Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and during their conversation the latter said to him:

يا ابن اخى بلغنى ان عليك ديناً قال ان على دينا قال و كم هو؟ قال مائة الف قال فقد امرنا لك بثلاث مائة الف ثم قال مائة الف لقضاء دينك و مائة الف تقسمها فى اهل بيتك و مائة الف لخاصة بذانك

O son of my brother! It has reached me that you are in debt. Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ replied: “Yes! I am in debt.” He enquired how much it was and Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ replied that it was one hundred thousand. Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ said: “I have ordered for you to be given three hundred thousand; one hundred thousand for your debt, one hundred thousand to distribute among your household and one hundred thousand especially for you.”²

Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ maintained the exact same relationship with Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-Kathīr رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ reports:

ولما توفى الحسن كان الحسين يفد الى معاوية فى كل عام فيعطيه ويكرمه

After the demise of Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would visit Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ every year. Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would grant him (what he needed) and honour him.³

In a similar manner, Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would honour the brother of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, Sayyidunā ‘Aqīl ibn Abī Ṭālib رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, who had stood in against Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ during the Battle of Ṣiffīn, but did not physically participate in the battle. Ḥāfiẓ al-Dhahabī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ (d. 748 A.H) writes in his biography:

1 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 40.

2 *Kitāb al-Ansāb wa l-Ashrāf*, pg. 84, 85.

3 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 151.

ووفد على معاوية...فأتى معاوية فاعطاه مائة الف

He travelled to meet Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ...he came before Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, who gave him one hundred thousand (dirhams).¹

The generosity of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ towards Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ja‘far رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, who was the son-in-law of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, has been reported by Imām Ḥākim:

وفد عبد الله بن جعفر على معاوية فامرله بالف درهم

‘Abd Allāh ibn Ja‘far رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ travelled to meet Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, who ordered him to be given two million dirhams.²

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-‘Asākir رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ (d. 571 A.H) has reported a similar narration:

كان لعبد الله بن جعفر من معاوية الف الف درهم في كل عام

‘Abd Allāh ibn Ja‘far رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ would receive a stipend of one million dirhams every year from Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.³

To what extent must we continue discussing the kindness and generosity of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ towards the Banū Hāshim... in conclusion we will quote one more narration:

ان معاوية كان يجيز في كل عام الحسن و الحسين و عبد الله بن عباس و عبد الله بن جعفر بن ابي طالب كل واحد منهم بالف الف درهم

Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ would send yearly stipends to Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Abbās رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, and ‘Abd Allāh ibn Ja‘far رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ; all of them would receive one million dirhams each (in the form of stipends and gifts) every year.⁴

1 al-Dhahabī: *Tārīkh al-Islām*, vol. 2 pg. 84, 85.

2 *Mustadrak al-Ḥākim*, vol. 3 pg. 67.

3 *Tārīkh Madīnah Damashq*, vol. 59 pg. 195.

4 *Laṭā’if al-Ma’ārif*, pg. 21-22.

4. The Banū Hāshim participate in the campaigns of jihād during the khilāfah of Mu‘āwiyah

The senior Ṣaḥābah of the Banū Hāshim participated in the campaigns of jihād during the khilāfah of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ also participated in the campaigns waged by Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and in particular he participated in the campaign on Constantinople, under the authority of Yazīd ibn Mu‘āwiyah. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-Kathīr رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ expands:

و لما توفى الحسن كان الحسين يفتد الى معاوية فى كل عام فيعطيه و يكرمه و قد كان فى الجيش الذين غزوا القسطنطينية مع ابن معاوية يزيد فى سنة احدى و خمسين

After the demise of Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would visit Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ every year, who would grant him (what he needed) and honour him. He was also part of the army that marched on Constantinople under Yazīd ibn Mu‘āwiyah in 51 A.H.¹

Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Abbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ also joined this expedition, Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-Kathīr رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ writes:

و معه جماعة من سادات الصحابة منهم ابن عمر و ابن عباس و ابن زبير و ابو ايوب الانصارى

Accompanying him was a group comprising of the most eminent Ṣaḥābah such as Ibn ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, Ibn ‘Abbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, Ibn Zubayr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, and Abū Ayyūb al-Anṣārī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.²

Sayyidunā Qutham ibn ‘Abbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was amongst the younger Ṣaḥābah and was the foster brother of Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. He has had the honour of entering the grave of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ when burying him and was the last to come out of it. He joined the army waging jihād in Khurāsān during the khilāfah of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. When the battle of Samarqand took place, he joined that expedition under the leadership of Sa‘īd ibn ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān, wherein he was martyred. Ḥāfiẓ al-Dhahabī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ writes:

1 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 150; *Tahdhīb Tārīkh Ibn al-‘Asākir*, vol. 4 pg. 311.

2 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 32.

قال الزبير: سار قثم ايام معاوية مع سعيد بن عثمان الى سمرقند فاستشهد بها

During the khilāfah of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Qutham رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ joined the expedition on Samarqand under Sa‘īd ibn ‘Uthmān where he was martyred.¹

It is evidently clear from these narrations that the Ahl al-Bayt recognised Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ as the rightful khalīfah after the truce between him and Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and they would participate in the campaigns he waged without any hesitation.

5. The Ahl al-Bayt adhered stringently to the conditions of the treaty

The pledge of allegiance that the Ahl al-Bayt gave to Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ as well as the conditions they agreed upon were adhered to stringently by the Ahl al-Bayt right until the demise of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. This is the reason why Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ replied to Ḥujar ibn ‘Adī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ in the following manner when urged to rebel against Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ:

انا قد بايعنا و عاهدنا لا سبيل الى نقض بيعتنا

We have pledged our allegiance and taken oaths; now there is no way of breaking it.²

Sayyidunā Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ later wrote the following letter to Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ:

فكتب اليه الحسين اتانى كتابك و انا بغير الذى بلغك عنى جدير و الحسنات لا يهدى لها الا الله و ما اردت لك محاربة ولا عليك خلافا

I have received your letter and whatever you have heard regarding me is incorrect. With certainty it is only Allah who can guide towards good deeds. I do not wish to wage war against you or to oppose you.³

1 *Siyar A‘alām al-Nubalā’*, vol. 4 pg. 515.

2 *Akhbār al-Ṭuwāl*, pg. 220.

3 *Tadhib Ibn al-‘Asākir*, vol. 4 pg. 327.

6. Addressing Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah with the title of Amīr al-Mu‘minīn

After this peace treaty, the Ahl al-Bayt would address Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ with the title of Amīr al-Mu‘minīn and would often utter words of supplication for him. When Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ learnt of the demise of Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, he sent a letter of condolence to Ibn ‘Abbās رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ who replied:

لا يحزنني الله لا يسؤني ما ابقى الله امير المؤمنين

As long as Amīr al-Mu‘minīn is alive, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى will not cause us to grieve nor any harm to afflict us.¹

In a similar manner, once Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ brought the stipend to Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ personally and after searching for him handed it over. Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ then said to him:

وصل الله قرابتك يا امير المؤمنين! واحسن جزاك

May Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى maintain your family ties, O Amīr al-Mu‘minīn! And May He grant you a noble reward.²

Summary

If this truce was illusory then the worst accusation will fall upon Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Allah forbid, for handing over the khilāfah and distancing himself from it. Furthermore, he continued accepting stipends from the very person who “usurped” and “snatched” the khilāfah from him, Allah forbid.

This all makes it exceptionally clear that the truce between Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, in accordance with the prophecy of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, was absolutely correct and thereafter Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was unanimously accepted as the khalīfah. This is the reason why that year became known as ‘*Ām al-Jamā‘ah*’ (the year of unity).³

1 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 138.

2 *Tārīkh Madīnah Damashq*, vol. 46 pg. 178.

3 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 21.

Imām Abū Zur‘ah al-Rāzī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 158 A.H) has stated that the khilāfah of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ after his truce with Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was a just khilāfah based on the consensus of the Ṣaḥābah, since the Ṣaḥābah will never come to consensus on falsehood.

عن الاوزاعي قال ادرك خلافة معاوية عدة اصحاب رسول الله منهم سعد و اسامة و جابر بن عبد الله و ابن عمر و زيد بن ثابت و سلمة بن خالد و ابو سعيد ابو رافع بن خديج و ابو امامة و انس بن مالك و رجال اكثر ممن سميت باضعاف مضاعفة كانوا مصابيح الدجى و اوعية العلم حضروا من الكتاب تنزيله و اخذوا عن رسول الله تاويله

Imām al-Awzā‘ī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ said that many Ṣaḥābah were alive during the khilāfah of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, amongst them were Sa‘d رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Usāmah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Jābir ibn ‘Abd Allāh رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Zayd ibn Thābit رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Salamah ibn Khālid رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Anas ibn Mālik رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, and many more than what I have named. They were all lanterns in the darkness, vessels of knowledge, present when the Qur’ān was revealed and learnt its meaning directly from the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.¹

It is common knowledge that this ummah as individuals are not infallible but collectively they are, such that the *Ijmā‘* (consensus) of the Ṣaḥābah is no less than that proven from the Qur’ān and Sunnah. Imām Abū Bakr al-Sarakhsī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 453 A.H) writes:

ان ما اجمع عليه الصحابة فهو بنزلة الثابت بالكتاب و السنة

Whatever the Ṣaḥābah are in agreement upon is the same as that proven by the Qur’ān and Sunnah.²

Thus, those who regard this truce as illusory, in actual fact intend to deny the prophecy of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ, the *ijmā‘* of the Ṣaḥābah and the honour of Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, even if they might not verbally do so; which no Muslim would dare to perpetrate.

1 *Tārīkh Abū Zur‘ah*, vol. 1 pg. 309; *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 133.

2 *Uṣūl al-Sarakhsī*, vol. 1 pg. 318.

The claim that the khilāfah of Mu‘āwiyah was not worthy of being followed

It is claimed that the rule of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ did not bear any resemblance to the era of the *al-Khulafā’ al-Rāshidīn* (Rightly Guided Khulafā’) and therefore is not worthy of being followed. On the contrary, the rule of ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was almost a reproduction of their khilāfah and thus in light of the ḥadīth:

عليكم بستي و سنة الخلفاء الراشدين المهديين

Hold fast to my way and the way of the *al-Khulafā’ al-Rāshidīn*.

It is necessary to recognize and submit to the rule of ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz, in addition to *al-Khulafā’ al-Rāshidīn*.

Before proceeding, we need to first clarify what the term *al-Khulafā’ al-Rāshidīn* actually means. Mawlānā ‘Abd al-Shakūr Lakhnawī Fārūqī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ explains:

Occupying the position that the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ once held and to take the reins of the khilāfah is a mammoth task. Naturally, people vary in their ability to execute this task. Scholars hence divide the khilāfah into the following classes:

1) ***Al-Khilāfah al-Rāshidah al-Khāsah*** (The golden age of khilāfah, unsullied by any internal strife or dissension)

This era was marked by complete conformity to the Sunnah and was dominated by leaders who ranked amongst the earliest Muhājirīn and the foremost Ṣaḥābah of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. They accompanied the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ in all of his expeditions, such as Badr, Ḥudaybiyyah, Tabūk, and others. Their īmān was praised in the Qur’ān and their lofty station in Jannah guaranteed. The Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ also praised them, making their elevated status known to all. Moreover, he indicated that they were completely deserving of taking the reins of khilāfah after his demise.

Electing these Ṣaḥābah as khulafā’ thus became binding upon the ummah and it was these Ṣaḥābah whom Allah used to preserve and protect Islam. The scholars of Islam unanimously agree that this category of khilāfah is restricted to the first three khulafā’. History also stands as a testament to the fact that no

other leader in the history of Islam enjoyed such widespread acceptance and success.

These three khulafā' were such complete embodiments of the Sunnah that it was almost as if the Messenger of Allah ﷺ was seated behind a curtain and guiding them. It seemed as if these khulafā' were the reigns in the blessed hands of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ with him directing their movements as he desired. It was almost as if these khulafā' had a speaker over which the blessed voice and guidance of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ was transmitted.

Amongst the rule of these illustrious three khulafā', the rule of the first two khulafā' stands out.

2) ***Al-Khilāfah al-Rāshidah al-Muṭlaqah*** (The era which immediately followed, still considered to be part of the al-Khilāfah al-Rāshidah, though hampered by internal strife)

This era holds slightly less distinction than the era that preceded it, but nevertheless remains lofty in terms of accomplishment and adherence to the Sunnah.

This era too was dominated by such khulafā' whose eligibility for the position of khilāfah, īmān and character was explicitly attested to by the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. However, he did not bind the ummah to necessarily adopt their leadership.

This era consisted of the reigns of Sayyidunā 'Alī رضي الله عنه and for a brief six months, his son, Sayyidunā Ḥasan رضي الله عنه.

In a ḥadīth, the Messenger of Allah ﷺ is reported to have said:

The khilāfah will last for thirty years.

The ḥadīth refers to these first two categories (i.e. al-Khilāfah al-Rāshidah al-Khāṣah and al-Khilāfah al-Rāshidah al-Muṭlaqah).

3) ***Al-Khilāfah al-Ādilah*** (the just khilāfah)

The third category of khilāfah holds significantly less merit than its preceding two categories. Rulers of this era satisfied the conditions desired within a

leader and also fulfilled the objectives of the khilāfah. However, the eligibility of rulers of this class for the khilāfah was not specifically attested to by the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is considered to be amongst the khulafā’ of this category.

A detailed explanation of these categories can be found in Chapter One of the widely acclaimed book *Izālat al-Khafā*, by Shāh Walī Allāh Muḥaddith Dehlawī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.¹

Mawlānā Zafar Aḥmad ‘Uthmānī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ similarly states:

Those disillusioned people who quote the ḥadīth of *Tirmidhī*:

الخِلاَفَةُ بَعْدِي ثَلَاثُونَ سَنَةً

The khilāfah will remain for thirty years after me.

and as a result regard the khilāfah of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ to be only kingship should look at the following ḥadīth, recorded by both *Abū Dāwūd* and *Tirmidhī*:

Abū Bakarah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ narrates that a man related to the Messenger of Allah ﷺ that he had a dream in which he saw a scale descend from the sky. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ and Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ were both weighed, and the Messenger of Allah ﷺ was heavier. Thereafter Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ were weighed, and Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was heavier. Thereafter ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ were weighed together and ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ turned out to be heavier. The scale was then lifted. The dream saddened the Messenger of Allah ﷺ and upon hearing it said:

خِلاَفَةُ نَبِيَّةٍ ثُمَّ يُوْتِي اللهُ الْمَلِكَ مَنْ يَشَاءُ

The period of khilāfah will be like the era of nubuwwah after which Allah will give kingship to whomever He desires.²

The following few points are noted from the above ḥadīth:

¹ *Tuhfah Khilāfah*, pg. 82-84.

² *Mishkāṭ*.

- Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه was most entitled to the khilāfah after Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه, contrary to those who claim that Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه was most deserving of the khilāfah after Sayyidunā ‘Umar رضي الله عنه.
- After the rule of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه, the khilāfah will be converted to kingship. However, it is by consensus that the rule of Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه is considered to be part of the al-Khilāfah al-Rāshidah. However, it is apparent from this ḥadīth that within the al-Khilāfah al-Rāshidah, the period from the demise of the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم to the end of the khilāfah of Sayyidunā ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه stands out as most distinguished, such that it was termed as *Khilāfah Nubuwwah* (the prophetic khilāfah) by the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم himself. As explained above, Shāh Walī Allāh has termed this period as “al-Khilāfah al-Rāshidah al-Khāsah”.
- It should be noted that although this vision was only a dream, the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم accepted it and interpreted it as well. The status of dreams as proofs in the Sharī‘ah should thus not be disputed here.
- One might wonder why the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم was grieved by this dream. Allah knows best, but it could perhaps be that the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم understood from this dream that the period of al-Khilāfah al-Rāshidah al-Khāsah would not extend beyond three khulafā’. The khilāfah thereafter would never enjoy the same splendour that it experienced during the rules of these first three khulafā’. In fact, after that period, instead of fighting the forces of the kuffār, a period of civil war began and Muslims fought each other. This fighting escalated to such a point that Sayyidunā Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī رضي الله عنه was compelled to hand over the reins of khilāfah to Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه, to prevent further strife. It was only after this great act of selflessness that internal strife temporarily came to an end, and the standard of Islam could be raised again, opening the door for further conquest.¹

Commenting on the ḥadīth of *Tirmidhī*:

الخلافة بعدي ثلاثون سنة ثم تكون ملكا

¹ *Barā’ati ‘Uthmān*, pg. 63.

The khilāfah will remain after me for thirty years after which it will become kingship.

Mawlānā Ḥusayn Aḥmad Madanī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ says:

Even if one were to disregard this ḥadīth due to weakness in its chain of narration, as ḥadīth critics have done, it is still reported in another ḥadīth:

تدور رحي الاسلام لخمس و ثلاثين او ست و ثلاثين او سبوع و ثلاثين

Islamic rule will continue to thrive for thirty, thirty-six, or thirty-seven years.

This ḥadīth cannot possibly mean that Islamic rule will terminate after a mere thirty-seven years, as this is historically inaccurate. Instead this ḥadīth implies that Islam will continue to thrive with its full glory for thirty-seven years after the demise of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. Therefore, the first seven years of Mu'āwiyah's رَحِمَهُ اللهُ rule is also included in it.

Why then is the rule of Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ considered to be in a separate class from the rule of his predecessors? In *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Muslim* it is recorded that Sayyidunā Jābir ibn Samurah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ narrated from the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ:

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

This religion will remain honored and secure for the reign of twelve khulafā', all of whom will be from Quraysh.

Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ is certainly included amongst these twelve. He was an illustrious Ṣaḥābī and much progress was seen during his reign with vast territories being conquered. It is important to note that this ḥadīth specifically referred to him as a khalīfah and not as a king.

It is recorded in *Majma' al-Zawā'id* and *Jāmi' al-Saghīr* that the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ said:

ان عدة الخلفاء بعدي عدة نقباء موسى

The number of khulafā' after me will be the same as the number of chieftains from the tribes of Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ.

To elaborate further, it is stated in the Qur'ān:

وَبَعَثْنَا مِنْهُمُ اثْنَيْ عَشَرَ نَقِيبًا

And we brought forth from them twelve chieftains.

In this narration as well, we find the word “khalīfah” being used to refer to Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. The above discussion makes it abundantly clear that Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was unmistakably a khalīfah of Islam. It contradicts logic, is unjust, and utterly subjective to quote the ḥadīth of Sayyidunā Safīnah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ to prove that any rule after the al-Khilāfah al-Rāshidah is an un-Islamic rule.

In this manner, there were also various degrees within the al-Khilāfah al-Rāshidah. The earliest period was highly distinguished over the later periods. Similarly, the era of Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ surpasses the rule of those who came after him.

It should be kept in mind that no khalīfah is deserving of criticism for his rule not being included within the al-Khilāfah al-Rāshidah. This is a matter which will be decided by Allah, having no relation to our opinions or research. Is it that Sayyidunā 'Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is to blame for his reign not being considered within the al-Khilāfah al-Rāshidah al-Khāsah? Rather, this is amongst those matters referred to by the verse:

ذَلِكَ تَقْدِيرُ الْعَزِيزِ الْعَلِيمِ

*That is the decree of the All-Mighty, All-Knowing.*¹

We do not intend at all by this to say that the rule of Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and the rule of the al-Khulafā' al-Rāshidīn were on the same level but rather, we openly state that there was a significant discrepancy between the two. However, this difference was not one of justice and injustice, piety and ungodliness, truth and falsehood, or loyalty and treachery, but a difference of taking a *rukhsah* (dispensation)

¹ Sūrah Yāsīn: 38.

or not, opting for a more scrupulous route or not, being more precautious or not, and being correct in juristic deduction.

Those who see any deficiency in the rule of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ do so when comparing it to the era of the al-Khulafā’ al-Rāshidīn.

Muftī Taqī ‘Uthmānī states:

It is preposterous for a person to come along 1350 years after the era of the Ṣaḥābah and liken the rule of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ to the dirty politics of today. Without any thorough academic investigation, these devious individuals simply look at the failings of politicians today and hurl false accusations of deceit, treachery, bribery, corruption, injustice, tyranny, and cowardice at Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. There was definitely a difference between the rule of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and the al-Khulafā’ al-Rāshidīn, but this difference was not one of transgression, sin, injustice, or tyranny. Rather, the rule of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was also a just rule.¹

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Taymiyyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 728 A.H) says:

فلم يكن من ملوك المسلمين ملك خير من معاوية و لا كان الناس في زمن معاوية اذا نسبت ايامه الى من بعده و اما اذا نسبت الى ايام ابي بكر و عمر ظهر التفاصل

There was not a single king of the Muslims better than Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ nor were there ever any subjects of a king who were better than the subjects of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. This is when you compare his rule to the rule of those after him. However, when you compare the rule of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ to that of Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ or ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ then the disparity is evident.²

‘Allāmah ‘Abd al-‘Azīz al-Farhārawī (d. 1240 A.H) explains the difference between the period of the al-Khulafā’ al-Rāshidīn and the reign of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ as:

قلت لاهل الخير مراتب بعضها فوق بعض و كل مرتبة منها يكون محل قدح بانسبة الى التي فوقها ... و لذا قيل حسنات الابرار سيئات المقربين، و فسّر بعض الكبراء قوله عليه

1 *Ḥaḍrat Mu‘āwiyah awr Tārīkhī Ḥaqā’iq*, pg. 146.

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah*, vol. 3 pg. 185.

الصلوة و السلام اني لاستغفر الله في اليوم اكثر من سبعين مرة بانه كان دائم الترقى و كلما كان يترقى الى مرتبة استغفر عن المرتبة التي قبلها و اذا تقرر ذلك نقول كان الخلفاء الراشدون لم يتوسّعوا في المباحات و كان سيرتهم سيرة النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم في الصبر على ضيق العيش و الجهد... و اما معاوية فهو ان لم يرتكب منكرا لكنه توسّع في المباحات و لم يكن في درجة الخلفاء الراشدون في اداء الحقوق الخلافة لكن عدم المساواة بهم لا يوجب قدحا فيه

I say that people vary in their virtue, with some superior to others and every stage being inferior when compared to the one above it. It is in light of this that it has been said:

حَسَنَاتِ الْاِبْرَارِ سَيِّئَاتِ الْمُقْرِبِينَ

The good deeds of the righteous might be construed as a sin by the pious.

Thus, some righteous scholars have explained the statement of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ:

I seek Allah's forgiveness more than seventy times in a day

to mean that he was constantly in a state of spiritual progression towards Allah. Every time he would ascend to a higher station, he would seek Allah's forgiveness for the station that he was previously on. With this in mind, we now say that the al-Khulafā' al-Rāshidīn were extremely scrupulous in religious matters, even if there was room for permissibility (they would still refrain). Their lives and conduct were both a complete reflection of the life of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ in their patience, the difficulties they endured, and spirit of self-sacrifice.

As for Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه, even though he never committed a major sin, he was slightly more lenient when room for permissibility was present. He was not on the same level as the al-Khulafā' al-Rāshidīn, in terms of discharging the obligations of the khilāfah. However, despite this disparity, he is not worthy of any blame or criticism.¹

1 Sharḥ al-'Aqā'id, pg. 309.

‘Allāmah Khālid Maḥmūd رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ، a close and dear friend of this unworthy author, has written a comprehensive and level-headed article on the khilāfah of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ:

The khilāfah of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is between the al-Khilāfah al-Rāshidah and the general khilāfah. It was a khilāfah of justice that was a mirror image of the teachings in the Qur’ān and ḥadīth. Penalties for justice and equality were in place. However, its stage or status was on the second level of the al-Khilāfah al-Rāshidah. The four al-Khulafā’ al-Rāshidīn resembled the conduct of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ closely. Their day to day life was on the standard of patience and giving preference over themselves. They would sacrifice and go through difficulties in fulfilling the needs of the masses. They would not become complacent by seeking convenience in lawful matters, but instead they would follow the path of abstinence. Although Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ did not perpetrate any act which was in conflict to the Sharī‘ah during his khilāfah, but at times he would take the path of convenience in lawful matters, and for this practice to become a norm as time passes on is natural. The truth is that his period of rule is called a khilāfah. He did not acquire the khilāfah through inheritance, but through his expertise in politics. His first stage of leadership was in the deputation by ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, and his second stage began with the signing of the peace treaty with Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, who was the khalīfah at that time. (In the ḥadīth) The words “ثم ملكا” (thereafter the khilāfah will become kingship) the word “thereafter” should be understood in context, because only that type of rule is meant which started after those thirty years, and the rule of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ had started within the thirty years, even though it was not in the form of a completely perfect khilāfah. Yes, the khilāfah on the way of nubuwwah is only restricted to the four khulafā’. In *Nibrās*, the commentary of ‘Aqā’id al-Nasafī, the fine difference between al-Khilāfah al-Rāshidah and *al-Khilāfah al-‘Ādilah* (Righteous rule) has been explained in detail: “One cannot refute the fact that in lawful matters the four khulafā’ chose a path of abstention, and this is a path of strong determination. Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ on the other hand, on many occasions chose the path of convenience and ease in matters, and this practice is in no way detestable or objectionable. Yes, in superiority, however, it differs. Hypothetically, if we were to regard the rule of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ as a kingship for some reason, then too it will not be contradictory if it is also called a khilāfah. How is it possible that Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ could have handed over the khilāfah for a kingship? From this view

the founder of kingship will be Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ as he handed over the khilāfah, and it obvious that if this were the case then his actions should not have been praiseworthy. Whereas, the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had prophesised that Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would perform this selfless act and praised him for it; namely that two large groups of this ummah will unite as one through him.¹

This is the correct view regarding the rule of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Nonetheless, a doubt may arise and to remove it is necessary. The doubt in this case might be that the scholars have referred to Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ as a “king”, and one might ask the reason for this. ‘Allāmah Ibn Ḥajar al-Haythamī رَحِمَهُ اللَّهُ explains:

Whoever uses the word “kingship” for the rule of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, it will be taken to mean that in his rule the previously mentioned interpretations of Islamic law took place, and wherever it has been referred to as a “khilāfah”, then it is because after Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ handed over the khilāfah and on the agreement of the populace, Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ became the sole ruler and submission to him became obligatory. In light of this point of view, the obedience due to him and the rights he had over the people was the same as the al-Khulafā’ al-Rāshidīn.²

Is a Kingship condemned in Islam?

This question is imperative to understand, namely that is a kingship flatly condemned in Islam or not? Or is it that kingship is only condemned when it contradicts the laws of Sharī‘ah and its foundation built upon principles contrary to those of an Islamic khilāfah. Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى mentions in the Qur’ān:

لِمَنِ الْمُلْكُ الْيَوْمَ

*To whom does the kingdom belong today?*³

هُوَ اللَّهُ الَّذِي لَا إِلَهَ إِلَّا هُوَ ۚ الْمَلِكُ الْقُدُّوسُ

*He is Allah besides Whom there is none worthy of worship. He is the Sovereign Ruler, the Most Pure.*⁴

1 ‘Abaqāt, pg. 422-423.

2 Al-Ṣawā‘iq al-Muḥariqah, pg. 219.

3 Sūrah al-Mu‘min: 16.

4 Sūrah al-Ḥashar: 23.

Similarly, the Banū Isrā'īl requested from their Prophet (Shamwīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ) to appoint a king for them, under whom they could carry out jihād. They were informed that Allah had appointed Ṭālūt as their king. If kingship was condemned in Sharī'ah then neither would the Prophet ask such a thing from Allah nor would Allah accept his supplication.

أَلَمْ تَرَ إِلَى الْمَلَأِ مِنْ بَنِي إِسْرَائِيلَ مِنْ بَعْدِ مُوسَى إِذِ قَالُوا لِنَبِيِّ لَهُمْ ابْعَثْ لَنَا
مَلِكًا نُقَاتِلَ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ ۗ قَالَ هَلْ عَسَيْتُمْ إِنْ كَتَبَ عَلَيْكُمُ الْقِتَالُ أَلَّا تُقَاتِلُوا ۗ
قَالُوا وَمَا لَنَا أَلَّا نُقَاتِلَ فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ وَقَدْ أُخْرِجْنَا مِنْ دِيَارِنَا وَأَبْنَاءِنَا ۗ فَلَمَّا كُتِبَ
عَلَيْهِمُ الْقِتَالُ تَوَلَّوْا إِلَّا قَلِيلًا مِّنْهُمْ ۗ وَاللَّهُ عَلِيمٌ بِالظَّالِمِينَ ﴿٢٤٦﴾ وَقَالَ لَهُمْ نَبِيُّهُمْ
إِنَّ اللَّهَ قَدْ بَعَثَ لَكُمْ طَالُوتَ مَلِكًا ۗ قَالُوا أَنَّى يَكُونُ لَهُ الْمُلْكُ عَلَيْنَا وَنَحْنُ أَحَقُّ
بِالْمُلْكِ مِنْهُ وَلَمْ يُؤْتَ سَعَةً مِّنَ الْمَالِ ۗ قَالَ إِنَّ اللَّهَ اصْطَفَاهُ عَلَيْكُمْ وَزَادَهُ بَسْطَةً
فِي الْعِلْمِ وَالْجِسْمِ ۗ وَاللَّهُ يُؤْتِي مُلْكَهُ مَن يَشَاءُ ۗ وَاللَّهُ وَاسِعٌ عَلِيمٌ ﴿٢٤٧﴾

Did you not see when a group from the Banī Isrā'īl after Mūsā عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ said to their Prophet: “Appoint for us a king so that (under his leadership) we may fight in Allah’s way.” He said: “Would you then refrain from fighting after it was made obligatory for you?” They replied: “Why should we not fight in Allah’s way when we have been exiled from our homes and children?” So when fighting was ordained for them, all except a few turned away. Allah is Well-Aware of the wrong doers. Their Prophet said to them: “Allah has appointed Ṭālūt as king over you.” They said: “How can he be given kingship over us when we are more deserving of kingship than he and he has not been given any wealth?” He (the Prophet عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ) replied: “Verily Allah has chosen him over you and increased him abundantly in wisdom and stature. Allah gives His rule to whoever He wills. Allah is All-Embracing, All-Knowing.”¹

In a similar manner, Prophet Sulaymān عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ and his honorable father both were Ambiyā’ as well as kings. Regarding Prophet Dāwūd عَلَيْهِ السَّلَامُ, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى has mentioned:

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 246, 247.

وَأْتِيَهُ اللَّهُ الْمُلْكَ وَالْحِكْمَةَ

And Allah granted him (Dāwūd عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام) kingship and nubuwwah.¹

Prophet Sulaymān عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام supplicated to Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَتَعَالَى:

قَالَ رَبِّ اغْفِرْ لِي وَهَبْ لِي مُلْكًا لَا يَنْبَغِي لِأَحَدٍ مِّنْ بَعْدِي ۗ إِنَّكَ أَنْتَ الْوَهَّابُ

O my Rabb! Forgive me and grant me a kingdom that cannot be had by any other after me. Undoubtedly, You are the Great Giver.²

This subject could be discussed further but it is sufficient to understand that kingship is not something condemned in Sharī'ah, rather it is the king who may be good or bad.

The khilāfah of Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ

Now we shall mention the views of the Ṣaḥābah, Tābi'īn, and illustrious scholars of the past regarding the khilāfah of Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah, which will assist in understanding his khilāfah better and his method of rule.

1. Sayyidunā 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abbās

Sayyidunā 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Abbās رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ comments:

ما رأيت رجلا كان أخلق بالملك من معاوية

I have not seen anyone more worthy of authority than Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.³

In another narration it appears:

ما رأيت أحدا كان أحق بالملك من معاوية

I have not seen anyone more deserving of authority than Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ.⁴

1 Sūrah al-Baqarah: 251.

2 Sūrah al-Sa'd: 35.

3 Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah, vol. 8 pg. 135.

4 Ibid.

Similarly, on hearing about the demise of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, he remarked:

أما والله ما كان مثل من قبله ولا يأتي بعده مثله

By Allah! Although Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was not equal to his predecessors, but definitely there will not be anyone equal to him after him.¹

2. Sayyidunā ‘Alī

Sayyidunā ‘Alī ibn Abī Tālib رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ said:

أيها الناس لا تكرهوا إمارة معاوية، فإنكم لو فقدتموه رأيتم الرؤوس تندر عن كواهلها
كأنها الحنظل

O people! Do not be displeased with the leadership of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. By Allah! If you lose him, you will see heads being severed from its bodies like wild gourd falling from its tree.²

3. Sayyidunā Ḥasan

At the time when Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ signed the peace treaty with Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, some foolish people disapproved and rebuked him. Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ replied to them: “Do not rebuke me, for I have heard the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ saying:

لا تذهب الأيام والليالي حتى يملك معاوية.

The day and the night will refuse to alternate until Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ attains authority.³

4. Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar

Sayyidunā ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ praised him:

ما رأيت أحدا بعد رسول الله أسود من معاوية.

I have not seen anyone worthier of leadership than Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.⁴

1 *Anṣāb al-Ashrāf*, vol. 4 pg. 37.

2 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 131.

3 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 131.

4 *Tārīkh al-Islām*, vol. 2 pg. 321.

He was then asked:

فقيل له ابو بكر وعمر وعثمان وعلي فقال: كانوا والله خيرا من معاوية وافضل، معاوية
اسود

What of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, ‘Umar رضي الله عنه, ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه, and ‘Alī رضي الله عنه? He replied: “By Allah! Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, ‘Umar رضي الله عنه, ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه, and ‘Alī رضي الله عنه are better and more virtuous than Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه, but Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه is worthy of leadership.¹

5. Sayyidunā Sa‘d ibn Abī Waqqāṣ

Sayyidunā Sa‘d ibn Abī Waqqāṣ رضي الله عنه once remarked:

مارأيت أحدا بعد عثمان أقضى بحق من صاحب هذا الباب

I have not seen anyone after ‘Uthmān رضي الله عنه fulfilling rights of people better than Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه.²

6. Ka‘b al-Aḥbār

Ka‘b al-Aḥbār رضي الله عنه stated:

قال كعب لن يملك أحد من هذه الأمة ماملك معاوية.

No one surpassed Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه in the ummah regarding leadership.³

7. Imām Abū Ishāq

Imām Abū Ishāq رضي الله عنه commented:

روى أبو بكر بن عياش عن أبي اسحاق قال: مارأيت بعده مثله. يعني معاوية

I have not seen the likes of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه after him.⁴

1 *Usd al-Ghābah*, vol 5 pg. 222.

2 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 132.

3 *Anṣāb al-Ashrāf*, vol. 4 pg. 100.

4 *Al-Muntaqā*, pg. 388.

8. Imām Mujāhid

Imām Mujāhid رَحِمَهُ اللهُ said:

لو أدركتم معاوية لقلتم هذا المهدي

If you were to have seen Mu‘āwiyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ you would have said that this is Al-Mahdī.¹

9. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Taymiyyah

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Taymiyyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ has written:

وكانت سيرة معاوية مع رعيته من خيار سير الولاة، وكانت رعيته يحبونه. وقد ثبت في الصحيحين عن النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم أنه قال: ”خيار أئمتكم الذين تحبونهم ويحبونكم، وتصلون عليهم ويصلون عليكم

The conduct of Mu‘āwiyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ to his subjects was of the best amongst the leaders, and his subjects loved him. A ḥadīth is narrated in *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī* and *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Muslim* that the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ has said: :The best amongst your leaders is the one whom you love and he loves you, and you supplicate for mercy upon him and he does the same for you.²

10. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Kathīr

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Kathīr رَحِمَهُ اللهُ mentions:

وأجمعت الرعايا على بيعته في سنة إحدى وأربعين كما قدمنا، فلم يزل مستقلا بالأمر في هذه المدة إلى هذه السنة التي كانت فيها وفاته، والجهاد في بلاد العدو قائم، وكلمة الله عالية. والغنائم ترد إليه من أطراف الأرض، والمسلمون معه في راحة وعدل، وصفح وعفو

In the era of Mu‘āwiyah رَحِمَهُ اللهُ, the series of conquests continued, the word of Allah was elevated, booty from the spoils of war began to pour into the public treasury, and the Muslims began to live a life of peace, tranquillity, justice, harmony and forgiveness.³

1 *Al-‘Awāsīm min al-Qawāsīm*, pg. 205.

2 *Minḥāj al-Sunnah*, vol. 3 pg. 189.

3 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 119.

11. Ḥāfiẓ al-Dhahabī

Ḥāfiẓ al-Dhahabī رحمته الله states:

فضائل معاوية في حسن السيرة والعدل والاحسان كثيرة.

The virtues, courtesy, justice, and kindness of Mu‘āwiyah رحمته الله are innumerable.¹

After these unambiguous views of our esteemed predecessors, can one still doubt that the leadership of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رحمته الله was not exemplary?

We will now address three arguments usually raised in this discussion.

1. The khilāfah of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رحمته الله did not resemble the khilāfah of the al-Khulafā’ al-Rāshidīn.
2. Since the khilāfah of ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz رحمته الله resembled the khilāfah of the al-Khulafā’ al-Rāshidīn, it is superior to the khilāfah of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رحمته الله.
3. The khilāfah of ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz رحمته الله is worthy of emulating in light of the ḥadīth:

فعليكم بسنتي وسنة الخلفاء الراشدين المهديين

Adhere to my Sunnah and the Sunnah of the al-Khulafā’ al-Rāshidīn.²

Therefore the khilāfah of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رحمته الله is not worthy of emulating, since it does not resemble the khilāfah of the four al-Khulafā’ al-Rāshidīn.

Argument 1

Sufficient proof against this is the following testimonies:

1. Sayyidah ‘Ā’ishah رحمته الله said:

والذي سن الخلفاء بعده وحضت معاوية على العدل واتباع اثرهم.

1 *Al-Muntaqā*, pg. 388.

2 *Ibn Mājah*.

Allah guided the four Rightly Guided Khulafā' after the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, and granted Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ the ability to be just and follow in their footsteps.¹

2. The famous historian 'Allāmah Ibn Khaldūn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ says:

Since Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ followed the way of the four al-Khulafā' al-Rāshidīn, it becomes known that his khilāfah is also included amongst theirs.

وقد كان ينبغي أن تلحق دولة معاوية وأخباره بدول الخلفاء وأخبارهم فهو تاليهم في الفضل والعدالة والصحة، ولا ينظر في ذلك إلى حديث "الخلافة بعدي ثلاثون سنة" فإنه لم يصح، والحق أن معاوية في عداد الخلفاء... وحاشى الله أن يشبه معاوية بأحد ممن بعده، فهو من الخلفاء الراشدين

It would be more suitable if we mention the khilāfah of Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and his biography, in this volume alongside the four al-Khulafā' al-Rāshidīn, on account of his virtue, justice, and lofty rank amongst the Ṣaḥābah. In this regard, the ḥadīth: "Khilāfah will be thirty years after me", should not be considered, because it has not reached the required level of authenticity. The fact is that Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is amongst the al-Khulafā' al-Rāshidīn and by no means should Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ be compared to those who came after him as he is amongst the al-Khulafā' al-Rāshidīn.²

3. Shāh Ismā'īl Shahīd رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ commented:

A just ruler is considered to be a al-Khalīfah al-Rāshid (a rightly guided leader), i.e. even though he has not witnessed the era of the al-Khulafā' al-Rāshidīn, but has emulated their practice with sincerity and truthfulness.... A just ruler is like a saint between the emperors and the al-Khulafā' al-Rāshidīn. If the masses were to see the emperors, it will seem to them as if this just ruler is a rightly guided khalīfah, but if they had to see the condition of the al-Khulafā' al-Rāshidīn then they would regard this person to be a mere emperor. This is why Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ says:

1 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 131.

2 *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn*, vol. 2 pg. 1140.

لست فيكم مثل أبي بكر وعمر ولكن سترون أمراء من بعدي.

I am not of the calibre of Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه and ‘Umar رضي الله عنه amongst you, but soon you will see the condition of the leaders after me.

On this account, the era of his leadership resembles the era of nubuwwah and the al-Khulafā’ al-Rāshidīn. Therefore, it can be said that from the era of the al-Khulafā’ al-Rāshidīn until the end of his era, Islam continued progressing.¹

4. Aḥmad Raḍā Khān Barelwī was asked:

Which khilāfah is regarded amongst the rightly guided?

He replied:

Abū Bakr al-Ṣiddīq رضي الله عنه, ‘Umar al-Fārūq رضي الله عنه, ‘Uthmān al-Ghanī رضي الله عنه, ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā رضي الله عنه, Ḥasan رضي الله عنه, Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه, and ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz رضي الله عنه; their khilāfah is regarded as rightly guided.²

5. Fayḍ Aḥmad Uways Barelwī said:

The khilāfah of Amīr Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz رضي الله عنه is not entirely part of the al-Khilāfah al-Rāshidah, but it definitely resembled it.³

Argument 2

The argument still remains regarding the difference between the khilāfah of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz رضي الله عنه. In explanation of this we refer to an incident of Imām A‘mash رضي الله عنه, who is the teacher of Imām Abū Ḥanīfah رضي الله عنه; he would refer to Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه by the title of *Al-Muṣḥhaf*, on account of his innumerable praiseworthy qualities.

On one occasion in the gathering of Imām A‘mash رضي الله عنه (Sulaymān ibn Mahrān), the justice and equality of ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz رضي الله عنه was mentioned, upon which Imām A‘mash رضي الله عنه commented:

1 *Mansab al-Imāmah*, pg. 147-149.

2 *Malfūzāt Aḥmad Raḍā Khān*, vol. 3, pg. 319.

3 *Ḥaḍrat Amīr Mu‘āwiyah*, pg. 51.

كيف لو أدركتم معاوية؟ قالوا: في حلمه؟ قال: لا والله، بل في عدله.

What would you have said if you had to witness the era of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ? The people enquired: “Do you refer to his tolerance?” Imām A‘mash رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ replied: “No! Rather his just manner.”¹

His tolerance was most definitely one of his defining qualities but his justice is often overlooked. Qabīṣah ibn Jābir رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ said:

مارأيت رجلا أثقل حلما، ولا أبطأ جهلا، ولا أبعد أنا مناه.

I have not seen anyone more tolerant, far from ignorance, and dignified than Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.²

Hence, if the khilāfah of ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ resembled the al-Khilāfah al-Rāshidah then most certainly the khilāfah of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ also resembled it. In this regard we mentioned the views of Umm al-Mu‘minīn Sayyidah ‘Ā’ishah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا, ‘Allāmah Ibn Khaldūn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Shāh Ismā‘īl Shahīd رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, as well as Fayḍ Uways and Aḥmad Raḍā Khān. As far as ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is concerned; he would flog any person who would speak ill of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.³

Sayyidah ‘Ā’ishah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا, Shāh Ismā‘īl Shahīd رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, and Fayḍ Uways have regarded the khilāfah of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ to be similar to the al-Khilāfah al-Rāshidah. In fact, the followers of Fayḍ Uways declare the khilāfah of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ to be amongst the al-Khilāfah al-Rāshidah and not just similar to it.

Lastly, we mention the words of Fayḍ Uways, which he attributes to ‘Allāmah Khafājī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ:

ومن يكون يطعن في معاوية فذاك كلب من كلاب الهاوية

Whoever belittles Mu‘āwiyah is a dog amongst the dogs of *Hāwīyah* (Jahannam).

1 *Minhāj al-Sunnah*, vol. 3 pg. 185.

2 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 135.

3 *Ṭabqāt Ibn Sa‘d*, vol. 5 pg. 299.

Argument 3

It is reported in *Tirmidhī*:

فإنه من يعيش منكم بعدي فسيري اختلافا كثيرا، فعليكم بستتي وسنة الخلفاء الراشدين
المهديين، تمسكوا بها، وعضوا عليها بالنواجذ

Those of you who will live after me, will see many differences (of opinions), so hold steadfast onto my Sunnah and the Sunnah of the al-Khulafā' al-Rāshidīn, adopt it and hold on to it strongly with your teeth.¹

Now let us dive into the depths of academic research and learn who the majority of the Muḥaddithīn have indicated to be amongst the al-Khulafā' al-Rāshidīn. It is imperative to study the research of the Muḥaddithīn on this topic and then conclude who falls under the ruling of this ḥadīth.

The al-Khulafā' al-Rāshidīn are the continuous successors of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ; they are also called “The Four A'immaḥ”. Their succession was not only general governmental rule but rather the succession of the Sunnah and political authority. The Muslim community recognized them to be the successors of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ and to be the completion of his legacy.

The esteemed Shāh Walī Allāh Muḥaddith Dehlawī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ عَلَيْهِ writes:

The days of the khilāfah were a reminder of the days of nubuwwah.²

The khilāfah of Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ completed the succession of the al-Khulafā' al-Rāshidīn. However, this does not imply that the khilāfah of Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was the same as the four khulafā' who preceded him and who were commonly known to be the al-Khulafā' al-Rāshidīn or as the Qur'ān mentioned to be the guided ones. In fact, it is understood to be the termination of the al-Khulafā' al-Rāshidīn because of the prophecies of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ having materialised (such as the reconciliation with Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ). Secondly, it was not complete leadership as he handed it to Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. He stepped down and acknowledged the leadership and prowess of Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, which in

¹ *Tirmidhī*, vol. 2 pg. 92.

² *Izālat al-Khafā*, vol. 1 pg. 100.

itself turned out to be an exemplary leadership reflecting the Qur’ān and Sunnah. His succession had come into existence by reconciliation rather than replacement. All the qualities which were necessary for the al-Khulafā’ al-Rāshidīn are only truly found in the group of Muhājirīn, and amongst the khulafā’ none held these qualities except the first four khulafā’, which is why they became commonly known as the al-Khulafā’ al-Rāshidīn.

It should be borne in mind that these two pious khulafā’ (Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and Sayyidunā Mu’āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ) by the principles upon which they ruled are also understood to be Rightly Guided Khulafā’ but may not necessarily be those khulafā’ referred to by the Qur’ān as “Those who are Rightly Guided”. The reason being that this is restricted to the first Muhājirīn, and Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and Sayyidunā Mu’āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ are not amongst them. Undoubtedly, those who had acknowledged Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, Sayyidunā Mu’āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, and ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ as al-Khulafā’ al-Rāshidīn, did so after taking into account the principles upon which they governed. If this point was not to be considered than it is unanimously agreed that the al-Khulafā’ al-Rāshidīn are the first four khulafā’ only. Respected Qādī Maẓhar Ḥusayn رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, while clarifying the verse of leadership and khilāfah says:

In the verse of succession, Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَوَعَالَ declares in favour of the Muhājirīn that:

(Those who were taken out of their homes by the mushrikīn and established their homes in Madīnah by the order of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ) If we give them power and leadership in the country, then they will surely fulfil these four tasks after the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and only those four had been granted khilāfah from amongst the Muhājirīn, i.e. Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, and ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. Therefore, in light of this divine declaration, it is obligatory for those who believe in the Qur’ān to distinctly believe that the four khulafā’ of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had fulfilled the tasks described in this verse, namely establishing ṣalāh and zakāh, as well as ordaining good and preventing evil. Thus, if one denies the sincerity of these four khulafā’ after understanding the meaning of this divine declaration, then he is refuting this verse and it would mean that declaration of Allah سُبْحَانَهُ وَوَعَالَ is not true (Allah forbid). Furthermore, those who came after these khulafā’ cannot be implied as this declaration is specifically for those who were driven out from their homes, who are the Muhājirīn, and beside these four Ṣaḥābah, none of the Muhājirīn attained authority or khilāfah. In light of the above, only these four are called

al-Khulafā' al-Rāshidīn, which is the culmination of the promise made in the Qur'ān and this succession is strictly restricted to those four Companions.

In a similar manner, in the verse of succession Allah ﷻ has clearly promised to give khilāfah to those who are believers and do good deeds and were present at the time that this verse was revealed, as is indicated by the words “from amongst you (منكم)”. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ was a mercy for all the worlds, the last of the Ambiyā', and after him amongst the Muhājirīn only Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, 'Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, 'Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, and 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ obtained the post of khalīfah. It is for this reason that one can safely conclude that the promise of succession which Allah mentioned in this verse materialised in favour of these four khulafā' and it is their khilāfah that is the promised khilāfah described in the Qur'ān. If we do not accept these four A'imma to be those implied by the verse then the promise of Allah will not be true since the words “from amongst you (منكم)” - , empathically states that it can only refer to the Ṣaḥābah. Even if it be Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ or Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and even 'Umar ibn 'Abd al-'Azīz رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ or Al-Mahdī, who will appear before Qiyāmah and who will be the last guide and reviver from the ummah of Prophet Muḥammad ﷺ. After these four khulafā', whoever else has been accepted as a 'Rightly Guided Khalīfah' was on account of his rule being just and fair. They also shared the same insight as the al-Khulafā' al-Rāshidīn but nonetheless the true successors were only these first four khulafā'. It is they who are referred to in the promised succession of the Qur'ān.¹

1 *Sunnī Mawqaf*, pg. 52.

The al-Khulafā' al-Rāshidīn are four

We will now mention a few statements of well known and reputable scholars to prove this declaration.

1. Imām al-Ṭahāwī

Imām Abū Ja'far al-Ṭahāwī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ (d. 321 A.H) has written the following under the beliefs regarding the khilāfah:

و ثبت الخلافة بعد رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم و سلم اولا لابي بكر الصديق رضى الله عنه تفضيلا و تقديما على جميع الامة ثم لعمر بن الخطاب رضى الله عنه ثم لعثمان بن العفان رضى الله عنه ثم لعلى بن ابي طالب رضى الله عنه و هم الخلفاء الراشدون و الائمة المهديون

We accept and acknowledge that Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ was the first khalīfah after the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ due to his virtue over the entire Ummah. After Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, the khilāfah is then established for 'Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, followed by 'Uthmān ibn 'Affān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and then 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. These are the al-Khulafā' al-Rāshidīn and the A'imma of guidance.¹

2. Imām Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī

Imām Abū al-Ḥasan al-Ash'arī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ (d. 324 A.H) has written:

و نتولى سائر اصحاب النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم و نكف عما شجر بينهم و ندين الله بان الائمة الاربعة خلفاء راشدون مهديون فضلا لا يوازيهم فى الفضل غير هم

We love all the Ṣaḥābah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ and we stay away from the misunderstandings they had amongst themselves and we firmly believe that the four A'imma are the al-Khulafā' al-Rāshidīn and that none can come close to them in their virtue.²

3. Imām Abū Bakr al-Bāqillānī

Imām Abū Bakr al-Bāqillānī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ (d. 403 A.H) has written under the beliefs of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah:

1 'Aqīdat al-Ṭahāwī, pg. 11.

2 Kitāb al-Ibānah, Pg. 11.

يعرفون حق السلف الذين اختارهم الله سبحانه لصحبة نبيه صلى الله عليه و سلم و ياخذون بفضائلهم و يمسكون عما شجر بينهم صغيرهم و كبيرهم و يقدمون ابا بكر ثم عمر ثم عثمان ثم عليا رضوان الله عليهم و يقرون انهم الخلفاء الراشدون المهديون افضل الناس كلهم بعد النبي و يصدقون بالاحاديث التي جاءت عن رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم

The Ahl al-Sunnah wal Jamā'ah recognise the right of those pious predecessors whom Allah chose for the company of the Prophet ﷺ. They recognise the great virtue that they have and they remain aloof of the misunderstandings that existed amongst them, whether they be the senior or the junior Ṣaḥābah. They give priority to Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, then to 'Umar رضي الله عنه, then to 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه and then to 'Alī رضي الله عنه and they acknowledge that they are the Rightly Guided Khulafā' and after the Prophet ﷺ they are the most virtuous. The Ahl al-Sunnah also attests to the veracity of all those aḥādīth that are proven to be from the Prophet ﷺ.¹

4. Shaykh 'Abd al-Qādir al-Jilānī

Shaykh 'Abd al-Qādir al-Jilānī رحمه الله (d. 561 A.H) has written:

افضل هؤلاء العشرة الابرار الخلفاء الراشدون الاربعة الاخيار افضل الاربعة ابو بكر ثم عمر ثم عثمان ثم على رضى الله عنهم و لهؤلاء الاربعة الخلافة بعد النبي صلى الله عليه و سلم ثلثون سنة

The most virtuous from amongst these ten pious souls (i.e. the 'Asharah Mubasharah) are the four Rightly Guided Khulafā' who are the most superior and virtuous amongst them; (they are) Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, then 'Umar رضي الله عنه, then 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه and then 'Alī رضي الله عنه. The duration of their khilāfah after the demise of the Prophet ﷺ was for a period of thirty years.²

5. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-'Asākir

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-'Asākir al-Dimashqī رحمه الله (d. 571 A.H) has explained the beliefs of the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā'ah with regards to the Ṣaḥābah in the following words:

¹ *Kitāb al-Tamhīd*, pg. 295 on the authority of *Abaqāt*, pg. 287.

² *Aqīdat al-Ṭālibīn*, pg. 75.

و ندين بحب السلف الذين اختارهم الله لصحبة نبيه و نشئ عليهم بما اثنى الله عليهم و نتولاهم و نقول ان الامام بعد رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم ابو بكر رضى الله عنه و ان الله اعزبه الدين و اظهره على المرتدين و قدمه المسلمون للامامة بما قدمه رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم للصلوة ثم عمر بن الخطاب رضى الله عنه ثم عثمان رضى الله عنه نضر الله وجهه قتلة قاتلوه ظلما و عدوانا ثم على بن ابى طالب رضى الله عنه فهؤلاء الائمة بعد رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم و خلافتهم خلافة النبوة و تشهد للعشرة بالجنة و نتولى سائر اصحاب النبى صلى الله عليه و سلم و نكف عما شجر بينهم ندين ان الائمة الاربعة راشدون مهديون فضلا لا يوازيهم فى الفضل غيرهم و نصدق بجميع الروايات التى ثبتها اهل النقل

We have the firm belief of love for our pious predecessors whom Allah had chosen for the company of the Prophet ﷺ and we articulate their qualities and we praise them, just as Allah has articulated their qualities and praised them. Our bond with them is that of friendship and we state unequivocally that the rightful imām after the Prophet ﷺ was Abū Bakr رضى الله عنه. Allah gave this religion victory via him and made him victorious over those who turned apostate. The Muslims gave him precedence to the khilāfah just as how the Prophet ﷺ had given him precedence for the ṣalāh. Thereafter the rightful imām was ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb رضى الله عنه, and then ‘Uthmān رضى الله عنه, may Allah cause his face to radiate with light, for he was murdered oppressively. Thereafter the rightful Imām was ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib رضى الله عنه. After the demise of the Prophet ﷺ these are the four A’immah and their governance was based on the nubuwwah of the Prophet ﷺ. We testify to the Jannah of those ten Ṣaḥābah for whom the Prophet ﷺ had guaranteed Jannah. We have bonds of friendship with all the Ṣaḥābah and we remain aloof of whatever misunderstandings occurred between the Ṣaḥābah. We affirm in the court of Allah that these are the four Rightly Guided A’immah and none has the virtue that they have. We also accept all those aḥādīth which the Muḥaddithīn have accepted.¹

6. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-Kathīr

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-Kathīr رضى الله عنه (d. 741 A.H) has written:

و قد وجد منهم اربعة على الولاة و هم ابو بكر ثم عمر ثم عثمان ثم على رضى الله عنهم ثم كانت بعدهم فترة ثم وجد منهم من شاء الله

¹ *Tabyīn Kithb al-Muftarī*, pg. 160,161.

And from amongst them there were four who obtained the khilāfah in succession. They were Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, and ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. This system ended after them. Khilāfah was then attained only by those whom Allah chose.¹

7. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Taymiyyah

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Taymiyyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ (d. 728 A.H) has written:

و على اخر الخلفاء الراشدون الذين ولايتهم خلافة نبوة و رحمة

And ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was the last of the khulafā’ whose khilāfah was based on the governance of nubuwwah and mercy.²

8. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-Humām

Ḥāfiẓ Kamāl al-Dīn Ibn al-Humām رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ (d. 861 A.H) has written:

ان الخليفة الحق بعد محمد صلى الله عليه و سلم ابو بكر ثم عمر ثم عثمان ثم على و التفضيل على هذا الترتيب

After the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ the Rightly Guided Khulafā’ are Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, then ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, then ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, and then ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, and their virtue is directly related to their position in the khilāfah.³

9. Shāh Walī Allāh Muḥaddith Dehlawī

Imām al-Hind Shāh Walī Allāh Muḥaddith Dehlawī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ (d. 1176 A.H) has written:

و ابو بكر امام حق بعد رسول الله صلى اللت عليه و سلم ثم عمر ثم عثمان ثم على رضى الله عنهم ثم تمت الخلافة

After the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ the Rightful Imām was Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, then ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, then ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, and then ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, thereafter the khilāfah ended.⁴

1 *Tafsīr Ibn al-Kathīr*, vol. 3 pg. 301.

2 *Minhāj al-Sunnah*, vol. 4 pg. 121.

3 *Al-Musāmarah*.

4 *Tafhīmā al-Ilāhiyyah*, vol. 1 pg. 128.

10. Mawlānā Qāsim Nānawtawī

Ḥujjat al-Islām Mawlānā Qāsim Nānawtawī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ (d. 1297 A.H) has written:

This is true that the Ahl al-Sunnah wa l-Jamā‘ah has accepted the four close companions of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ as they are now and firmly believe that they were the Rightly Guided Khulafā’ (governing on the system of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ).¹

Together with this the Ahl al-Sunnah refer to all those who followed them as khulafā’ but those they consider worthy of bearing the title of al-Khulafā’ al-Rāshidīn are the four.²

11. Muftī Kifāyat Allāh

Muftī Kifāyat Allāh Dehlawī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ (d. 1372 A.H) has written:

After the demise of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ all the Muslims had agreed that Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ would be the vicegerent of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ. It is for this reason that he is the first khalīfah. ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ became the second khalīfah after him. ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ became the third khalīfah and thereafter ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ became the fourth khalīfah. These four are known as the Four Rightly Guided Khulafā’ and the four close companions.³

12. Mawlānā ‘Abd al-Shakūr Lakhnawī

Imām Ahl al-Sunnah Mawlānā ‘Abd al-Shakūr Lakhnawī رَحْمَةُ اللَّهِ (d. 1383 A.H) has written:

Some ‘Ulamā’ have added the names of Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ after that of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ including them amongst the Rightly Guided Khulafā’ (al-Khulafā’ al-Rāshidīn). However, I have not included them amongst the al-Khulafā’ al-Rāshidīn, following the opinion of most ‘Ulamā’ and have concluded the Rightly Guided Khulafā’ with ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. The reason for this is that the khilāfah remained only for six months with Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. He then handed over the mantle of khilāfah to Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ and also took the pledge of

1 Ajwibah Arba’in, pg. 185.

2 Ibid. pg. 187.

3 Ta’līm al-Islām, vol. 2 pg. 27.

allegiance at his hands. Now, even though Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is a companion of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and has been accorded great virtue because of it, including him amongst the al-Khulafā’ al-Rāshidīn opposes the research that has been done. The qualities necessary to be from amongst the al-Khulafā’ al-Rāshidīn are only found amongst the Muhājirīn Ṣaḥābah (those who journeyed from Makkah to Madīnah, performed hijrah, before Makkah was conquered) and Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ is not from them.¹

In the light of the explanations of the great ‘Ulamā’, by the grace of Allah, this has become clear that the al-Khulafā’ al-Rāshidīn are only four.

Aḥādīth pertaining to following the Rightly Guided Khulafā’

Now that it is established that the verses of the Qur’ān concerning khilāfah refers to the four khulafā’ of the Muhājirīn, as well as according to the opinion of the majority of ‘Ulamā’ and Muḥaddithīn, it becomes evident that the ḥadīth of the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ “Hold fast to my Sunnah...” is also in reference to these four khulafā’. Notwithstanding this clear evidence, it is necessary to further establish this point by mentioning the opinions of the illustrious Muḥaddithīn.

1. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr

Ḥāfiẓ Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr al-Qurṭubī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ (d. 463 A.H) has written:

وقال رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم ”عليكم بسنتي و سنة الخلفاء الراشدين المهديين من بعدى“ و هم ابو بكر و عمر و عثمان و على فسماهم خلفاء و قال الخلافة بعدى ثلاثون سنة ثم تكون امرة و ملكا و جبروت فتضمنت مدة الخلافة الاربعة المذكورين رضوان الله عليهم اجمعين

The Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ said: “Hold fast onto my Sunnah and the Sunnah of my Rightly Guided Khulafā’.” They were Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, and ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ. They were the ones referred to as khulafā’. The Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ also said that after me the khilāfah will remain for 30 years, thereafter will come the time of umarā’, then Kings, and then tyrannical rulers. The khilāfah for 30 years encompassed these four khulafā’.²

1 *Khulafā’ al-Rāshidīn*, pg. 238.

2 *Al-Tamhīd lī mā fī al-Muwaṭṭā’ min al-Ma‘ānī wa l-Masānīd*, vol. 3 pg. 485.

2. Ḥāfiẓ Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī

Ḥāfiẓ Jalāl al-Dīn al-Suyūṭī رحمه الله (d. 911 A.H) has expounded on this ḥadīth with the following words:

هذا من الاخبار بالغيب من الخلافة الائمة اربعة ابى بكر و عمر و عثمان و على رضى
الله عنهم

This ḥadīth prophecises the khilāfah of the four A'imma: Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, 'Umar رضي الله عنه, 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه, and 'Alī رضي الله عنه.¹

3. Abū Bakr ibn al-'Arabī

Abū Bakr ibn al-'Arabī رحمه الله (d. 543 A.H) has written in his commentary of *Tirmidhī*:

و هم الاربعة بالاجماع ابو بكر و عمر و عثمان و على رضى الله عنهم

The consensus of the ummah is that the four are Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, 'Umar رضي الله عنه, 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه, and 'Alī رضي الله عنه.²

4. Imām Sharf al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Ṭībī

Imām Sharaf al-Dīn Muḥammad al-Ṭībī رحمه الله (d. 743 A.H) has written in his commentary of *Mishkāṭ*:

و المراد بالخلفاء الراشدين ابو بكر و عمر و عثمان و على رضى الله عنهم

Al-Khulafā' al-Rāshidīn refers to Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, 'Umar رضي الله عنه, 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه, and 'Alī رضي الله عنه.³

5. Mullā 'Alī Qārī

Mullā 'Alī Qārī رحمه الله (d. 1014 A.H) has written:

قيل هم الخلفاء الاربعة ابو بكر و عمر و عثمان و على رضى الله عنهم لانه عليه الصلوة
و السلام قال الخلافة بعدى ثلاثون سنة و قد انتهى بخلافة على كرم الله وجهه

It has been stated under the explanation of this ḥadīth that the khulafā' are four; Abū Bakr رضي الله عنه, 'Umar رضي الله عنه, 'Uthmān رضي الله عنه, and 'Alī رضي الله عنه, as the Prophet

1 *Mirqāt al-Ṣa'ūd* on the authority of Abū Dāwūd, vol: 2 pg. 635.

2 *Al-Āriḍat al-Aḥwadhī*, pg. 106.

3 *Sharḥ al-Ṭībī*, vol. 2 pg. 634.

صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ has stated that the khilāfah after him will last for thirty years. This period came to an end after the khilāfah of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ¹.

6. ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Mubārakpūrī

The renowned scholar from the Ahl al-ḥadīth (according to the new terminology), Mawlānā ‘Abd al-Raḥmān Mubārakpūrī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ (d. 1353 A.H) has written:

قيل هم الخلفاء الاربعة ابو بكر و عمر و عثمان و على رضى الله عنهم لانه عليه الصلوة و السلام قال الخلافة بعدى ثلاثون سنة و قد انتهت بخلافة على كرم الله وجهه

It has been said under the explanation of this ḥadīth that the khulafā’ are four: Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, and ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, as the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had stated that the khilāfah after him will last for thirty years. This period came to an end after the khilāfah of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ².

7. ‘Allāmah Shams al-Ḥaqq Azīmābādī

‘Allāmah Shams al-Ḥaqq Azīmābādī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ (d. 1329 A.H) has written:

والخلفاء ابو بكر و عمر و عثمان و على رضى الله عنهم

The khulafā’ are Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ, and ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ³.

8. Mawlānā Idrīs Khāndhlawī

Mawlānā Idrīs Khāndhlawī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ (d. 1394 A.H) has written:

المعنيون بهذا القول هم الخلفاء الاربعة لانه قال فى حديث اخر الخلافة بعدى ثلاثون سنة و قد انتهت الثلاثون بخلافة على رضى الله عنه

What is meant by this statement is the four Rightly Guided Khulafā’ since the Prophet صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had made mention in another ḥadīth that the khilāfah period after me will be for thirty years. The thirty year period terminates after the khilāfah of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُ⁴.

1 *Mirqāt al-Mafātīḥ*, vol. 1 pg. 373.

2 *Tuḥfat al-Aḥwadhī*, vol. 7 pg. 475.

3 *‘Awn al-Ma’būd*, vol. 12 pg. 253.

4 *Al-Ta’līq al-Ṣabīḥ*, vol. 1 pg. 203.

In light of the discussion above, it has become clear that majority of the Muḥaddithīn have stipulated that the promised period of the Rightly Guided Khulafā’ encompasses only these four and aside from these four no other khalīfah is included amongst the promised Rightly Guided Khulafā’, whether they be Sayyidunā Ḥasan رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ or even ‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. Thus, to include ‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ under the auspices of this ḥadīth will be incorrect, according to the explanation of the Muḥaddithīn.

Secondly, if we accept the argument that those khulafā’ whose period of khilāfah resembles that of the Rightly Guided Khulafā’ must also be included under the general meaning of this ḥadīth, then the reply would be that it would be more necessary for us to include the khilāfah of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, as his khilāfah was in conformity to the Sunnah of the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and this fact has been most firmly established in the previous pages by the testimonies of Sayyidah ‘Ā’ishah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا, ‘Allāmah Ibn Khaldūn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Mawlānā Shāh Ismā’īl Shahīd رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Fayḍ Aḥmad Uwaysī Barelwī, and Aḥmad Raḍā Khān Barelwī.

It is an established fact that the khilāfah of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ resembled that of the al-Khulafā’ al-Rāshidīn, but some attempt to prove it did not. Aḥmad Raḍā Khān has clearly stated that the khilāfah of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is included in the khilāfah of the al-Khulafā’ al-Rāshidīn. Therefore, if the ḥadīth of “Hold fast to my Sunnah ...” includes the khilāfah of ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ then it has to most definitely include the khilāfah of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, due to the fact that his khilāfah came first.

Thirdly, if for a moment we were to accept that the khilāfah of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ did not resemble that of the Rightly Guided Khulafā’, then we should ask how is this proven? How is it known that not following the khilāfah of the Rightly Guided Khulafā’ is tantamount to not following Islam? And to what extent would it be correct to use the ḥadīth of “Hold fast to my Sunnah...” as the basis to discredit the good work done by other khulafā’? In this ḥadīth it has not been stated that besides these al-Khulafā’ al-Rāshidīn you are not to follow any other khalīfah. It is reported in a ḥadīth:

اقتدو بالذين من بعدى من اصحابى ابى بكر و عمر و اهدوا بعمار و تمسكوا بعهد ابن
مسعود

After my demise, follow those after me from my Ṣaḥābah; Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, take guidance from ‘Ammār رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and hold onto the way of Ibn Mas‘ūd رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.¹

Now because of this ḥadīth will any shallow minded person assume that following Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is not necessary or that we will not attain any guidance from Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and we will not be able to attain any bondage with him رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ?

Similarly it is stated in a ḥadīth:

استقرئوا من اربعة من عبد الله بن مسعود و سالم مولى ابى حذيفة و ابى بن كعب و معاذ
بن جبل

Learn the Qur’ān from four people; ‘Abd Allāh Ibn Mas‘ūd رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Sālim رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Ubayy ibn Ka‘b رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, and Mu‘ādh ibn Jabal رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.²

If a person were to derive this meaning from the ḥadīth that the Qur’ān should only be learnt from these four and not from Sayyidunā ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ; will you call such a person an intelligent person or a fool?

And whose statement is it that the khilāfah of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ bore no resemblance to the khilāfah of the Rightly Guided Khulafā’? What is the status of the one who made such a claim?

According to us, the difference between the khilāfah of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and ‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is just the same as the differences in the status of these two personalities. A person once asked ‘Abd Allāh Ibn Mubārak رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ as to who holds greater virtue, Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ or ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ? He replied:

والله ان الغبار الذى دخل فى انف فرس معاوية مع رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم
افضل من عمر بالف مرة صلى معاوية خلف رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم فقال
رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم سمع الله لمن حمده فقال معاوية ربنا لك الحمد فما
بعد هذا الشرف الاعظم

1 *Mishkāṭ*, pg. 578.

2 *Mishkāṭ*, pg. 574; *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, vol. 1 pg. 531; *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Muslim*, vol. 2 pg. 293.

The dust that entered the nostrils of the horse of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ when in the company of the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ is a thousand times more virtuous than ‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz رَحِمَهُ اللهُ. Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ followed the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ in ṣalāh and when the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ said:

سمع الله لمن حمده

Allah hears the one who praises Him

Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ replied:

ربنا لك الحمد

All praise belongs to you, my Rabb

What greater honour can there be than that?¹

Qāḍī ‘Ayyād رَحِمَهُ اللهُ has also reported an incident that a person asked Mu‘āfi ibn ‘Imrān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ regarding the status of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ in comparison to ‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz رَحِمَهُ اللهُ? Mu‘āfi ibn ‘Imrān became very angry and said:

لا يقاس باصحاب النبي صلى الله عليه وسلم احد معاوية صاحبه و صهره و كاتبه و
امينه على وحي الله

A Ṣaḥābī of the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ cannot be compared with anyone. Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was a Ṣaḥābī (of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ), his brother-in-law, his scribe and the one whom the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ had entrusted with the waḥī.

If we assume that the khilāfah of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ did not resemble the khilāfah of the Rightly Guided Khulafā’, it would still be incumbent to accept the fact that Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was an ardent follower of the Sunnah, Qur’ān and ḥadīth as has been clarified by the Mujtahidīn and the Fuqahā. He was an illustrious Ṣaḥābī and the ummah considers it necessary to follow and accept as proof the statements and actions of a Ṣaḥābī who was a Mujtahid.

Please refer to :(1) *Majma‘ al-Zawā‘id* Page 178 (2) *Mishkāt* page 553 (3) *Jāmi‘ al-Uṣūl* vol. 8 Page 555 (4) *Musnad Abī Dāwūd al-Ṭayālīsī* Page 33 (5) *Abū Dāwūd* vol. 2 Page 633 (6) *Kashf al-Asrār* vol. 2 Page 103 (8) *I‘lām al-Muwaqqi‘īn* vol. 4 Page 120

1 *Taṭīr al-Jinān wa l-Lisān*, pg. 10, 11.

Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah as a scribe of waḥī

The antagonists of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, in addition to their other allegations against Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, also assert that he was never a scribe of waḥī. We will now clarify any misgivings on the matter.

In Makkah, when Islam first began amongst the Quraysh, there were only seventeen individuals who could read and write. The historian Al-Balādhurī (d. 279 A.H) has written:

دخل الاسلام و في قريش سبعة عشر رجلا كلهم يكتب عمر بن الخطاب و علي بن ابي طالب و عثمان بن عفان و ابو عبيدة بن الجراح و طلحة و يزيد بن ابي سفيان و ابو سفيان بن حرب بن امية و معاوية بن ابي سفيان

When Islam first began, among the Quraysh there were only seventeen individuals who could read and write; (they were) ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Abū ‘Ubaydah ibn al-Jarrāḥ رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Ṭalḥah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Yazīd ibn Abī Sufyān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Abū Sufyān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, and Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.¹

What is the status of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ amongst these scribes? Mawlānā Shāh Mu‘īn al-Dīn Nadwī highlights:

Besides his knowledge of Islam, Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was an expert in the field of Arab customs. Due to him being an expert in this field at a time when most of the Arabs were not even acquainted with it, the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ chose him as his special scribe.²

It appears in *Majma‘ al-Zawā‘id*:

ان معاوية كان يكتب بين يدي رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم رواه الطبراني و اسناده حسن

Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ used to write before the Prophet صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ.³

In the books of historical biographies, where the scribes of the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ are mentioned, the name of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ can also be found.

1 Al-Balādhurī: *Futuḥ al-Buldān*, pg. 477.

2 *Sīyar al-Ṣaḥābah*, vol 6 pg. 131.

3 *Majma‘ al-Zawā‘id*, vol 9 pg. 596.

Please refer to the following books for further explanation, (1) *Al-Istī'āb* vol 3 pg. 470-471, (2) *Zād al-Ma'ād* vol. 1 pg. 30, (3) *Al-Iṣābah* vol. 1 pg. 121, (4) *Musnad Aḥmad* vol. 1 pg. 335 and 291.

We will now present before you proof from a few of the renowned Muḥaddithīn and historians who have accepted Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه as a scribe of waḥī.

1. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥazm al-Andalusī (d. 456 A.H):

كان زيد بن ثابت من الزم الناس لذلك ثم تلاه معاوية بعد الفتح فكانا ملازمين للكتابة بين يديه في الوحي وغير ذلك لا عمل لهما غير ذلك

Zayd ibn Thābit رضي الله عنه took the greatest responsibility of recording waḥī and after the conquest of Makkah, Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه also took up this task. These two were always in the company of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم to record waḥī or anything that the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم might instruct. This was their task and duty, they had no other duty besides this.¹

2. Ḥāfiẓ Abū Bakr ibn al-Khaṭīb al-Baghdādī (d. 463 A.H):

معاوية صاحبه و صهره و كاتبه و امينه على وحي الله عز و جل

Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه was the companion, brother in law, and scribe of the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم, and he was the one entrusted with waḥī.²

3. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar al-'Asqalānī (d. 852 A.H):

و معاوية بن ابى سفيان الخليفة صحابى اسلم قبل الفتح و كتب الوحي

Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه was a khalīfah and a Ṣaḥābī. He was favoured with Islam before the conquest of Makkah and he was a scribe of waḥī.³

4. Ḥāfiẓ Shams al-Dīn al-Dhahabī (d. 748 A.H):

و قد صح عن ابن عباس كنت العب فدعاني رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم وقال ادع لى معاوية و كان يكتب الوحي

1 *Jawāmi' al-Sīrah*, pg. 27.

2 *Tārīkh Baghdād*, vol. 1 pg. 224.

3 *Taqrīb al-Tahdhīb*, vol. 2 pg. 592.

It has been established via an authentic chain that Ibn ‘Abbās رضي الله عنه has said: “I was playing when the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم summoned me and said: “Call Mu‘āwiyah!””, Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه was the one who used to record the waḥī.”¹

5. ‘Allāmah ‘Alī ibn Burhān al-Dīn al-Ḥalbī:

قال بعضهم كان معاوية وزيد بن ثابت رضي الله عنهما ملازمين للكتابة بين يدي رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم في الوحي وغيره لا عمل لهما غير ذلك

Some ‘Ulamā’ have written that the only occupation Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and Zayd ibn Thābit رضي الله عنه had was to record both waḥī and non-waḥī in the presence of the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم. This was their only occupation.²

6. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-Kathīr (d. 774 A.H):

معاوية بن ابي سفيان... خال المؤمنين و كاتب وحى رب العالمين... والمقصود ان معاوية كان يكتب الوحي لرسول الله مع غيره من كتاب الوحي رضي الله عنهم

Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه was the uncle of the believers, the scribe of the waḥī of Allah... the purpose of this is to indicate that Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه used to record waḥī for the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم along with the other scribes of waḥī رضي الله عنهم.³

7. Ḥāfiẓ Aḥmad Ibn Ḥajar al-Haythamī al-Makkī (d. 974 A.H):

قال المدائني كان زيد بن ثابت يكتب الوحي و كان معاوية يكتب للنبي صلى الله عليه وسلم فيما بينه وبين العرب اى من وحى وغيره فهو امين رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم عليه و سلم على وحى ربه و ناهيك بهذا المرتبة الرفيعة

Madā’inī has stated that Zayd ibn Thābit رضي الله عنه was a scribe of waḥī and Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه was not only a scribe of waḥī but was the one who also wrote letters on behalf of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم to the Arabs. His elevated status can be gauged by the fact that he was the one who was entrusted with recording the waḥī.⁴

1 al-Dhahabī: *Tārīkh al-Islām*, vol. 2 pg. 309.

2 *Al-Sīrat al-Ḥalbiyyah*, vol. 2 pg. 447.

3 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 119.

4 *Tathīr al-Jinān*, pg. 10.

8. Imām Shihāb al-Dīn al-Qaṣṭalānī (d. 923 A.H):

معاوية بن ابى سفيان صخر ولد حرب كاتب الوحي لرسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم

Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān, the son of Ṣakhr ibn Ḥarb, was a scribe of waḥī for the Messenger of Allah ﷺ.¹

9. 'Allāmah Shihāb al-Dīn al-Khafājī (d. 1099 A.H):

معاوية صاحبه و صهره لانه اخو زوجته حبيبة بنت ابى سفيان ام المؤمنين و كاتبه لما ثبت انه احد كتابه صلى الله عليه و سلم و امينه على وحيه لانه بعد ان استكتبه كان يكتب ما ينزل عليه من الوحي و لو لم يستامنه ما استكتبه الوحي

Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was the Ṣaḥābī of the Prophet ﷺ as well as his brother-in-law, as the wife of the Prophet ﷺ, Ummī Ḥabībah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا was his sister. Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was also the scribe of the Prophet ﷺ as it is proven that he was one of the scribes of the Prophet ﷺ and one entrusted with recording waḥī because he was instructed by the Prophet ﷺ to write down the waḥī that was revealed to him. Had he not been trustworthy he would not have been asked to record the waḥī.²

10. Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-'Asākīr (d. 1383 A.H):

معاوية بن ابى سفيان خال المؤمنين و كاتب الوحي رب العالمين

Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ is the uncle of the believers and the scribe of the waḥī of the Rabb of the universe.³

11. Mawlānā 'Abd al-Shakūr Lakhnawī (d. 1383 A.H):

During the Battle of Ḥunayn, Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was the companion of the Prophet ﷺ and he was appointed to record waḥī.⁴

12. 'Allāmah 'Abd al-Ḥayy al-Kattānī (d. 1382 A.H):

قال القضاعي فان لم يحضر احد منهم كتب الوحي من حضر من الكتاب و هم معاوية و جابر بن سعيد بن العاص

1 *Al-Nihāyah*, pg. 18.

2 *Nasim al-Riyāḍ*, vol. 3 pg. 430.

3 *Tārīkh Madīnah Damashq*, vol. 59 pg. 55.

4 *Izālat al-Khafā*, vol. 1 pg. 472.

Al-Qaḍā'ī has stated that if the scribes of the Prophet ﷺ were not present then those who were present would record the waḥī. Amongst them were Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and Jābir ibn Sa'īd ibn al-Āṣ رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and others.

He adds:

و انما كان اكثرهم مداومة على ذلك بعد الهجرة زيد بن ثابت ثم معاوية بعد الفتح

After hijrah, Zayd ibn Thābit رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ held the most responsibility of recording waḥī followed by Mu'āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ after the Conquest of Makkah.¹

13. 'Allāmah Muḥammad al-Khiḍrī:

The names of those who are quite famous in writing down the waḥī are as follows: Zayd ibn Thābit رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, these two were constantly in the company of the Prophet ﷺ recording the waḥī and other things as well. They had no other work besides this.²

14. Muftī Taqī 'Uthmānī :

The scribes of waḥī number close to forty, but the most famous from amongst them are:

Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, 'Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, 'Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, 'Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Ubayy ibn Ka'b رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, 'Abd Allāh ibn Abī Sarḥ رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Zubayr ibn 'Awwām رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Khālid ibn Sa'īd ibn al-Āṣ رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Abān ibn Sa'īd ibn al-Āṣ رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Ḥanzalah ibn al-Rabī' رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Mu'ayyib ibn Abī Fāṭimah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, 'Abd Allāh ibn Arqam al-Zuharī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Shuraḥbīl ibn Ḥasanah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, 'Abd Allāh ibn Rawāḥah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, 'Āmir ibn Fuhayrah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, 'Amr ibn al-Āṣ رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Thābit ibn Qays ibn Shammās رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Mughīrah ibn Shu'bah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Khālid ibn Walīd رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Mu'āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, and Zayd ibn Thābit رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.³

15. 'Allāmah Sayyid Maḥmūd Aḥmad Raḍwī Barelwī :

'Allāmah Sayyid Maḥmūd Aḥmad Raḍwī Barelwī, while making reference to their founder, Aḥmad Raḍā Khān Barelwī, writes:

1 *Al-Tartīb al-idāriyyah*, pg. 117.

2 *Tārīkh al-Tashrī' al-Islāmī*, pg. 12.

3 *'Ulūm al-Qur'ān*, pg. 179.

After accepting Islam, Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه never remained aloof from the service of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم. He remained with the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم and recorded the waḥī. The respect he had for the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم remained firm in his heart even after the demise of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم.¹

16. Dr. 'Abd al-Raḥmān 'Īsā (Teacher at Jāmi'ah Imām Muḥammad ibn Sa'ūd):

He has written a book entitled *Kuttāb al-waḥī*, and in it he has categorised the scribes of waḥī into two groups:

وهم كتاب التنزيل الحكيم وغيره وهم ستة ... معاوية بن ابي سفيان يكتب في التنزيل الحكيم وفيما بين النبي وبين العرب ... وكان هو وزيد بن ثابت ملازمين للكتابة بين يدي رسول الله في الوحي وغيره لا عمل لهما غير ذلك

Those who recorded waḥī and that which was not waḥī, they were six... Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه recorded the waḥī and other correspondences between the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم and the Arabs... Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه and Zayd ibn Thābit رضي الله عنه with great regularity wrote the waḥī in the presence of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم. They had no other occupation besides this.²

17. Khaṭīb Tabrīzī (d. 743 A.H):

كان هو وابوه مسلمة الفتح من المؤلفلة قلوبهم وهو احد الذين كتبوا لرسول الله صلى اللن عليه وسلم الوحي

Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه and his father accepted Islam on the day of the conquest of Makkah. They were from the Mu'alaffat al-Qulūb, and Mu'āwiyah رضي الله عنه was from those who recorded the waḥī.³

18. Imām Abū Ishāq al-Shāṭbī:

و ذكر اهل السير انه كان لرسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم كتاب يكتبون له الوحي وغيره منهم عثمان و على و معاوية و المغيرة بن شعبة و ابي بن كعب و زيد بن ثابت و غيرهم

1 *Shān-e Ṣaḥābah*, pg. 22.

2 *Kitāb al-Waḥī*, pg. 66.

3 *Al-Ikmāl fī Asmā' al-Rijāl*, pg. 617.

The scholars of *sīrah* have stated that the scribes of the Prophet ﷺ wrote both *waḥī* and non-*waḥī*. Amongst them were ‘Uthmān رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Mughīrah ibn Shu‘bah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, Ubayy ibn Ka‘b رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, and Zayd ibn Thābit رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.¹

19. Shāh Mu‘īn al-Dīn Nadwī:

Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was not lacking in knowledge and had great experience in writing. It was on account of this that the Prophet ﷺ appointed him as the scribe of *waḥī*.²

20. Aḥmad Yār Khā Gujarati Barelwī:

Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was not only the Scribe of *waḥī* for the Prophet ﷺ, but also wrote the letters of the Prophet ﷺ to the kings that was dictated to him.³

21. Muḥammad ibn ‘Alī ibn Ṭabā Ṭabā’ī ibn Ṭiqṭaqā:

The well-known Shī‘ah historian Ibn Ṭabā Ṭabā’ī has written:

و اسلم معاوية و كتب الوحي جملة من كتبه بين يدي رسول الله صلى الله عليه و سلم

Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ accepted Islam and was part of that group of people who constantly wrote the *waḥī*.⁴

It is evident from this explanation that Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was indeed a scribe of *waḥī* and since it is proven that he was a scribe of *waḥī*, it stands to reason that he would be just and trustworthy, for no one would be chosen as a scribe except if he possessed these qualities.

It appears in a narration that this position was granted to Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ by the Prophet ﷺ on the command of Allah. On one occasion Jibrīl عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام came to the Prophet ﷺ and said:

1 *Al-I’tisām*, vol. 1 pg. 134.

2 *Tārīkh al-Islām*, vol. 2 pg. 43.

3 *Amīr Mu‘āwiyah*, pg. 47.

4 *Al-Fakhr fī Ādāb al-Sulṭāniyyah*, vol. 8 pg. 120.

يا محمد اقرئ معاوية السلام و استوص به خيرا فانه امين الله على كتابه و وحيه و نعم
الامين

O Muḥammad ﷺ! Convey my greetings to Mu'āwiyah ﷺ and instruct him to do good, for he is the one entrusted with writing the waḥī and he is an excellent trustworthy person.¹

In another ḥadīth, it is stated that the Prophet ﷺ had consulted Jibrīl عليه السلام whether Mu'āwiyah ﷺ should be appointed as a scribe of waḥī and Jibrīl عليه السلام replied:

استكتبه فانه امين

Appoint him as a scribe, for he is indeed trustworthy.²

You may now decide for yourself whether the claims that Sayyidunā Mu'āwiyah ﷺ was not a scribe of waḥī are true or not? Whether being a scribe of the Prophet ﷺ is a common trait or not? And whether the words and the instructions of the Prophet ﷺ are not indirect waḥī?

The statement of Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Taymiyyah رحمه الله when refuting such accusations from the Rawāfiq, should suffice for every sceptic:

فهذا قول بلا حجة و لا علم

This (that Mu'āwiyah ﷺ was not from the scribes of waḥī) is a claim without any proof or knowledge.

Thereafter he lists the scribes of waḥī:

Abū Bakr ﷺ, 'Umar ﷺ, 'Uthmān ﷺ, 'Alī ﷺ, 'Amir ibn Fuhayrah ﷺ, 'Abd Allāh ibn Arqam ﷺ, Ubayy ibn Ka'b ﷺ, Thābit ibn Qays ﷺ, Khālid ibn Sa'īd ibn al-Āṣh ﷺ, Ḥanzalah ibn al-Rabī' al-Asadī ﷺ, Zayd ibn Thābit ﷺ, Mu'āwiyah ﷺ, Shuraḥbīl ibn Ḥasanah ﷺ.³

1 Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah, vol. 8 pg. 120.

2 Ibid.

3 Minhāj al-Sunnah, vol. 2 pg. 214.

Closing remarks

Respected readers! By the grace of Allah! It has become apparent that the objections and criticisms levelled against Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه are weak and feeble.

In conclusion, I would like to present to all the cynics, the advice of Sayyidunā Rabī‘ ibn ‘Āmir رضي الله عنه:

معاوية بن ابى سفيان ستر اصحاب رسول الله فاذا كشف الرجل السترا اجترأ على ما وراءه

Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه is the veil of the Ṣaḥābah of the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم. If any person opens this veil he becomes audacious upon others behind the veil.¹

To what extent does this audaciousness extend? The words of Muftī Aḥmad Yār Khān Gujarati Barelwī (d. 1391 A.H) is presented here:

Come! Allow me to narrate to you the discussions of those people whose hearts are sick. Listen and take lesson. A few people were having the following discussion regarding Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه:

- **First person:** Friends! Amīr Mu‘āwiyah was a great oppressor and sinner. He was a great enemy to the Ahl al-Bayt. He rejected the khilāfah of ‘Alī al-Murtaḍā رضي الله عنه and because of him thousands of Muslims lost their lives. The Muslim women became widows and their children became orphans. He had caused ‘Alī رضي الله عنه much harm and those who cause harm to ‘Alī رضي الله عنه cause harm to the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم. He who has caused harm to the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم has caused harm to Allah. How can such a person be a true Muslim? It is a tragedy that there are people who consider him to be pious man.
- **Second person:** Friends! Do not even talk about it, sometimes from an insignificant person significant words are spoken. They had become so accustomed to harming the Ahl al-Bayt for many years that they even forgot to ask for forgiveness. ‘Ā’ishah, Ṭalḥah, Zubayr (people from the ‘Asharah Mubasharah and the blessed wife of the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم) and

1 Al-Khaṭīb: *Tārīkh Baghdād*, vol. 1 pg. 223.

those who assisted ‘Ā’ishah and Mu‘āwiyah in the Battle of Jamal and Şiffīn, all these people hated the Ahl al-Bayt. They all went to war against ‘Alī رضي الله عنه.

- **Third person:** Friends! My heart yearns for me to say that Imām Ḥasan رضي الله عنه should not have taken the pledge at the hands of the sinner Mu‘āwiyah. Imām Ḥasan رضي الله عنه displayed great cowardice when he not only made peace with Mu‘āwiyah but even relinquished the khilāfah to him. He should have been like his brother Imām Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه who wanted to oppose them. May my life be sacrificed for Imām Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه! He gave his life but he was not prepared to take the pledge at the hands of the accursed Yazīd. Imām Ḥasan رضي الله عنه should have at least taken a lesson from his Honourable Father, ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, who fought against ‘Ā’ishah and Mu‘āwiyah and he did not concern himself with any loss when it comes to protecting the khilāfah. Why did Imām Ḥasan رضي الله عنه not do this?
- **Fourth person:** Friends! What happened to Imām Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه when Imām Ḥasan رضي الله عنه made peace? He too remained silent and did not even make his brother see reason. He did not even cut off ties with his brother. Had he put an end to the rule of Mu‘āwiyah then Karbalā’ would never have happened. Why did Imām Ḥusayn رضي الله عنه remain silent and not display the bravery he had displayed at the time of Karbalā’? Friends! This is a perplexing issue indeed, what can be said and what cannot?
- **Fifth person:** Friends! The issue is far greater than that. I do wish to speak about it but if you were to examine the issue more deeply then you will find that the major mistakes were committed by ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. He made peace with Mu‘āwiyah after fighting with him and was pleased to split the khilāfah in two. The root of all the problems was this peace treaty of ‘Alī رضي الله عنه. A major mistake occurred because of this peace treaty. The blame lies with ‘Alī رضي الله عنه, he was the lion of Allah, and if he were to have ended the authority of Mu‘āwiyah from the very beginning then these incidents would not have occurred.
- **Sixth person:** Friends! If you want to know the truth, then the person who initiated the entire problem was ‘Umar رضي الله عنه. He made Mu‘āwiyah the governor of Syria during his khilāfah. Had he not made him the governor then the desire to become the khalīfah would not have been planted. The root of all these trials was ‘Umar رضي الله عنه.

- **Seventh person:** Friends! Our belief is that Allah bestowed the Prophet ﷺ with knowledge of the unseen. Why did the Prophet ﷺ allow Mu‘āwiyah, who was an enemy of the Ahl al-Bayt, to join his company and then even appoint him as the scribe of wahī? By marrying his sister, Ummī Ḥabībah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهَا, the Prophet ﷺ made him his brother-in-law and by mentioning his virtue instilled courage in Mu‘āwiyah. Most definitely the Prophet ﷺ slipped up in this matter. The eating from the forbidden tree by Prophet Ādam عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام and the Prophet ﷺ allowing Mu‘āwiyah to remain in his company was the reason for all this tribulation.
- **Eighth person:** Friends! I cannot understand why the Qur’ān describes the Ṣaḥābah of the Prophet ﷺ as:

أَشِدَّاءُ عَلَى الْكُفَّارِ رُحَمَاءُ بَيْنَهُمْ

Severe against the disbelievers and compassionate amongst themselves.

because when we look into the history of the warfare amongst the Ṣaḥābah, we will find that they were thirsty for each other’s blood, they drove their swords through each other by the thousands. Either this verse of the Qur’ān is incorrect and someone tampered with it or those people who participated in the Battles of Jamal and Ṣiffīn were not Ṣaḥābah. Their warfare is a terrible stigma to our Islam.

These are the discussions of those people who consider themselves to have the correct beliefs and consider themselves to be true Muslims and at the same time despise Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. Reflect as to how the hatred of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ leads to the termination of a person’s īmān.

If this discussion has to continue then neither the Ṣaḥābah will be safe from being condemned, nor the Ahl al-Bayt. As a matter of fact, honour and respect for the Messenger of Allah ﷺ and the Noble Qur’ān will no longer remain in the heart.¹

Describing those who transgress the limits of exaggeration, the author of *Nām wa Nasab* says:

¹ *Amīr Mu‘āwiyah*, pg. 8-11.

It is a shame that when the eyes are thickly covered with prejudice, it will reject even the Qur’ān and Sunnah. Their condition is such that they will not respect Allah or the Prophet ﷺ and from this you can determine the respect they show to others.¹

Amongst the duties of nubuwwah, entrusted to the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, was the duty of purification. Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ spent time in the company of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ yet the critics state that he had obtained no virtue, hated ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, was prone to commit contemptuous deeds, was the originator of many innovative acts in the dīn of Islam, allowed the prevalence of pagan tribal customs and poisoned the grandson of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. Thus, he possesses no qualities that will make it necessary for this ummah to follow him in his Sunnah. On the contrary, he possessed such depraved mannerisms which are ‘authentically’ proven by historical fact (as is claimed).

We wish to ask that if this was the character of Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ then what purification of his inner-self took place when he was in the company of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ? Is this not a corroboration of the Iranian leader, Khomeini, who said:

Every Prophet who came, did so to spread justice. Their purpose was to spread justice throughout this world but they were unsuccessful. Even the final Prophet ﷺ came to spread justice and educate the people he was sent to, but he too was unsuccessful.²

Is there any person of knowledge and research, who is not aware of the discourse of Mujaddid Alf-e Thānī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ on īmān and love for the Ṣaḥābah, wherein he discussed the incident of Qirṭās. While doing so, he explained the core principles which lay rest to all the insults levelled against the Ṣaḥābah. His lecture crushed all these whimsical arguments directed towards the Ṣaḥābah and obliterated the research done by those who oppose the Ṣaḥābah. He said:

May Allah grant us guidance and steadfastness on the straight path. You should know that those doubts some people have regarding the Ṣaḥābah and

1 *Nām wa Nasab*, pg. 489.

2 Khomeini: *Ittiḥād wa Yakjihātī*, pg. 15.

those objections with which they intend to discredit the Ṣaḥābah; if they were to study them justly, after accepting the virtue and importance of the best of mankind, the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, and acknowledge that their inner and outer selves have been purified by him, then they would understand that these were the pious and great personalities of Islam, whose day and night, whose objective, secret or otherwise, whose every moment was spent in strengthening the dīn and uplifting the kalimah of Islam. Due to the love they had for the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, they bid farewell to their families and tribes, to their children and their beloved wives, their much-loved homelands and properties, their springs and farmlands, their plantations and rivers. They gave preference to the pure desires of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ over their own. They gave preference to the love of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ over their wealth and their children. They saw waḥī being revealed and the angels making their appearance. They witnessed the miracles and the manifest signs of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, so much so that the *ghā'ib* (unseen) became the *shahādah* (seen) for them and their *'ilm al-Yaqīn* (to know that something is true) became *'Ayn al-Yaqīn* (total and complete conviction). These are those blessed people whose praise Allah mentions in the Qur'ān, "I am pleased with them and they are pleased with me". In another verse Allah says: "This is their description in the Torah and the Injīl". Now if this is the virtue and speciality of all the Ṣaḥābah in general then what can be said about the status of the great Ṣaḥābah; namely the al-Khulafā' al-Rāshidīn.

After a few lines, he wrote:

If these critics have any desire for justice, they would acknowledge the greatness of the company of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ through which they will realise the noble status of the Ṣaḥābah, then they would see their doubts as gold plated deceptions and they would lower their levels of credence and reliance upon such whimsical notions. If they cannot cease from fixating on the principle of their misunderstanding and pointing fingers of deception then at least they should acknowledge that their doubts are unfounded. The fact is that their objections are rejected by the glaringly truthful realities, which is the Qur'ān and Sunnah.¹

Mujaddid Alf-e Thānī رحمه الله in this introduction, whilst mentioning some preludes

1 *Maktūbāt-e Imām Rabbānī*, letter: 96.

of the incident of Qirṭās, has answered the famous objections of the Shī'ah and in a few words highlighted the extent to which this incorrect chain of thought will lead.

He then states:

According to this lowly person, the example of these doubts is exactly like an intelligent person who comes to a company of fools. They see a stone but due to his deceptive proofs and pretentious arguments, he establishes that the stone is gold. These poor people who are helpless in answering him, in the face of these 'proofs', due to their inability to assess, now begin to doubt whether that is a stone or in fact a piece of gold. They go against that which they can see before them with their very own eyes and are prepared to accept it as gold. They consider their own estimation to be unreliable. However, the intellectual is required to apply his mind and reject these deceptive proofs and arguments.

This is the exact same scenario; the piety and great status of the three al-Khulafā' al-Rāshidīn is established by the Qur'ān. It is as if we are witnessing this reality with our own eyes but then a foolish group come along, who use pretentious arguments and proofs to revile the Ṣaḥābah. Their proof is the same as that shrewd fellow who tries to convince people through reasoning that the stone in his hand is gold and through logic he makes fools of honest people.¹

A good dream about the people of Ṣiffīn

As we conclude, I wish to include a few dreams that the great scholars and elders of the ummah had seen and mentioned in their books, as a form of glad tidings. This was not necessary to do but these types of dreams bring some type of solace to our hearts. The reason for this is because the doors of nubuwwah have been sealed and there is only this window that now remains open. Sayyidunā Anas ibn Mālik رضي الله عنه has narrated that the Prophet صلى الله عليه وسلم has said:

الرويا الحسنة من الرجل الصالح جزء من ستة و اربعين جزءاً من النبوة

A good dream seen by one who is pious is one out of forty-six parts of nubuwwah.²

1 *Maktūbāt-e Imām Rabbānī*.

2 *Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī*, vol. 2 Pg. 1034.

‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Abbās رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ has narrated from the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ:

يا ايها الناس لم يبق من المبشرات النبوة الا رويا الصالحة يراها المسلم او ترى له

O people! The only thing left of the glad tidings of nubuwwah is good dreams, which a Muslim will see or someone will see on behalf of him.¹

This blessing was granted especially to Prophet Yūsuf عَلَيْهِ السَّلَام from amongst the Ambiyā’. Amongst the Ṣaḥābah, it was ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ who was gifted with this and from amongst the Tābi‘īn, it was Ibn Sīrīn رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ.

The dream of Abū Maysarah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ

‘Amr ibn Sharjīl رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, who was better known as Abū Maysarah and was a famous student of ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and ‘Abd Allāh ibn Mas‘ūd رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, and had participated in the Battle of Ṣiffīn on the side of ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. He relates that he was extremely perturbed and worried about the battle:

قال رأى فى المنام ابو ميسرة عمرو بن شرجيل و كان من افضل اصحاب عبد الله قال رايته كاني ادخلت الجنة فرايت قبابا مضروبة فقلت لمن هذه؟ فقيل هذه لذى الكلاع و حوشب و كانا ممن قتل مع معاوية يوم صفين قال قلت فاين عمار و اصحابه؟ قالوا امامك قلت و كيف و قد قتل بعضهم بعضا قال قيل انهم لقوا الله فوجدوه واسع المغفرة قال فقلت فما فعل اهل النهر قال لقوا برحا

Whilst in this condition, I saw in a dream that I entered Jannah and in it there were tents. I asked for who these tents were and I was told that these are for Dhū al-Kilā‘ and Ḥawshab, who were fighting on the side of Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ during the Battle of Ṣiffīn and were martyred. I then asked where is ‘Ammār and his friends رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ? I was told that they were ahead. I asked: “How is this possible, when they had killed each other.” I was told that they had met Allah and found him to be extremely merciful. I then asked what happened to the people of Nahrawān (the Khawārij) and I was told that they were dealt with harshly.²

1 Abū Dāwūd, vol. 1 pg. 127.

2 Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah, vol. 5 pg. 290.

The dream of ‘Umar Ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ

The following dream has been recorded in the famous book of Ḥāfiẓ Ibn al-Kathīr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*. Imām al-Ghazālī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ (d. 505 A.H) has also recorded it in his famous book, *Kīmīyā’i Sa‘ādat* and Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Qayyim رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ (d. 751 A.H) in his book, *Kitāb al-Rūḥ*. The following is taken from *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*:

عن عمر بن عبد العزيز قال رايت رسول الله صلى الله عليه وسلم في المنام و ابو بكر و عمر جالسان عنده فسلمت عليه فيبينما انا جالس اذ اتى بعلي و معاوية فادخلا بيتا و اجيف الباب و انا انظر فما كان باسرع من ان خرج علي و هو يقول قضى لى و رب الكعبة ثم كان باسرع منه ان خرج معاوية و هو يقول غفر لى و رب الكعبة

‘Umar ibn ‘Abd al-‘Azīz رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ said: “In my dream I visited the Messenger of Allah صَلَّى اللهُ عَلَيْهِ وَسَلَّمَ and Abū Bakr رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and ‘Umar رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ were sitting in his company and I greeted them. While I was sitting, ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ and Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ were brought and entered the room. The door to that room was then closed. It was not long before ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ exited and said: “By the Rabb of the Ka‘bah! Judgement has been passed in my favour.” Shortly thereafter Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ exited and said: “By the Rabb of the Ka‘bah! I have been forgiven.”¹

These were dreams about the people who participated in the Battle of Ṣiffīn. Now I would like to present before you a dream of Pīr Bāqir ‘Alī about Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ, who was amongst those who always held Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ in contempt but after seeing this dream, he sought forgiveness for his previous beliefs. His name was Muḥammad Bāqir ‘Alī Shāh and he says:

You people deliver your lectures about Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ from books and you present your proofs against him but I would like to present to you my personal experience. One day at ten in the morning whilst speaking to a person I said: “The battle that Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ waged against ‘Alī رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ was one filled with much excessiveness, this was all I said and suddenly in my heart this thought occurred that I have uttered something terrible with regards to Mu‘āwiyah رَضِيَ اللهُ عَنْهُ. At the same time I felt that my spiritual goodness came to an end. I spent the entire day in worry and when night came and I fell asleep. I dreamt and in my dream I saw an old patio, my spiritual Shaykh Khawājah Nūr al-Ḥasan

1 *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah*, vol. 8 pg. 130.

Shāh the deputy of Shaykh Sher Muḥammad Sharaqpurī spent his entire life spiritually benefiting on this patio and it was here that he passed away as well. Suddenly there was a knock on the door of the room and the Messenger of Allah ﷺ entered. Behind the Messenger of Allah ﷺ was ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and behind him was Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه. ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه both stood on the right of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ and Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه stood in silence whereas ‘Alī رضي الله عنه addressed me angrily saying: “The fight was between Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and myself, what right do you have to interfere with it?” He repeated this sentence thrice. I asked for forgiveness but received no reply. These three great personalities then left. For six months thereafter I was not visited by my Shaykh. My spiritual growth was halted until I was blessed with a vision of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ in a dream and then my spiritual growth continued.¹

Now listen to another dream wherein Sayyidunā ‘Alī رضي الله عنه admonished those who disrespect Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه.

There was a sayyid who despised Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه and always raised objections against Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه. Once whilst studying the books of Mujaddid Alf-e Thānī رحمه الله، he came across a passage in which Mujaddid Alf-e Thānī رحمه الله praised Sayyidunā Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه. His anger overpowered him to the extent that he flung the book aside. Later that night, he saw a dream. Mujaddid Alf-e Thānī رحمه الله came to him and took hold of both his ears and said: “You disrespectful fiend! You have objected to my writings whereas everything I have written is true. If you have no conviction in this I will take you to ‘Alī رضي الله عنه and you can ask him for yourself.” Pulling him by his ears he took him before ‘Alī رضي الله عنه where he complained that this person was the enemy of Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه. His enmity for Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه drove him to throw away my literature.” ‘Alī رضي الله عنه said: “The companions of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ hold a lofty position. You should never have enmity with any of them nor should you speak ill of them. What Shaykh Aḥmad (Mujaddid Alf-e Thānī) has written about Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه is correct.” The sayyid was surprised to hear this and started to present the proofs against Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه. Listening to this ‘Alī رضي الله عنه remarked: “It seems that reality has not settled in this fools heart. Give him a blow against his chest so that he can repent from the sin of harbouring ill feelings for Mu‘āwiyah رضي الله عنه. Shaykh Aḥmad did this and in the morning when

1 *Tuḥfah Ja‘fariyyah*, vol. 2 pg. 321.

that Sayyid awoke, he felt the pain of a heavy blow on his chest. There was also a mark on his chest as a result of the blow.

O Allah safeguard our īmān and our deeds and grant us death on guidance.

Respected readers! Despite my undertaking to refrain from any offensive comments, I might have did so at times, I ask the readers to forgive me if I have offended anyone but every person who has a right, has the right to defend himself as well, as the poem goes:

When the illness of a person changes, the prescription also changes
You may apply ointment but surgery is also required

Allah is my witness, I have written these words with a grieved heart. My intention was only to present the proof of the Ahl al-Sunnah and my intention was not to belittle anyone.

My style of speech may not be perfect
But perhaps my words may penetrate the heart

Muftī Taqī ‘Uthmānī has given such a beautiful advice:

The Ṣaḥābah are the foundations of the structure of Islam. If one brick of this structure is slightly removed from its place, the entire structure of Islam will also crumble. We should strive to remove all the misunderstandings that exist about the Ṣaḥābah رضي الله عنهم. The purpose of this discussion is also the same.¹

O Allah! Create within this unworthy one the power to make others understand and in the hereafter grant this sinful one of the favours You will bestow upon those who are the defenders of the Messenger of Allah صلى الله عليه وسلم and the Ṣaḥābah, so that he too can be successful.

Lastly, we quote the words of Mawlānā ‘Alī Sher Haydarī, as a caution to all:

The words of the scholars are considered as law by the masses, so be cautious of what you say. First and foremost, you should avoid giving references to weak

1 *Haḍrat Mu‘āwiyah awr Tārīkhi Ḥaḳīqat*, pg. 161.

books and if references from such books are unavoidable then please make reference to the imperfections of those books, so that when people read those books they are not wrongly influenced by it.

A final word

In addition to the above, I would like to present before the readers the advice of Qāḍī Abū Bakr ibn al-‘Arabī رَحِمَهُ اللهُ (d. 543 A.H), whose advice in this age may be deemed to be angelic and eternal:

وقد بينت لكم انكم لا تقبلون على انفسكم فى دينار بل فى درهم الا عدلا بريئا من التهم
سليما من الشهوة فكيف تقبلون فى احوال السلف و ما جرى بين الاوائل ممن ليس له
مرتبة فى الدين فكيف فى العدالة

I have explained to you all that you will never accept in a monetary ruling except the testimony of one who is just, free from suspicion and any personal vendetta. How then can you accept the words of a man whose sense of justice is pathetic and who does not even have any importance in Islam when it pertains to the conditions of the pious predecessors and what transpired between them?¹

May Allah guide us to those actions and words that He loves and pleases Him.
Verily all praise belongs to Allah, Rabb of the entire universe.



1 *Al-‘Awāsīm min al-Qawāsīm*, pg. 252.