**The narrated incident of the Saqeefah and its related matters**

بسم الله الرحمن الرحيم

All praise belongs to Allah, we praise Him, seek His help and forgiveness. We seek refuge in Allah from the evil of our inner selves and from the bad deeds from our acts. Whomsoever Allah guides none can lead him astray and whomever Allah leads astray none can guide him. I bear witness that there is no deity worthy of worship other than Allah alone, who has no partner, and I bear witness that Muhammad is His slave and Messenger; His cherished and beloved, chosen specially from all His creation.

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا اتَّقُوا اللَّـهَ حَقَّ تُقَاتِهِ وَلَا تَمُوتُنَّ إِلَّا وَأَنتُم مُّسْلِمُونَ

**O you who have believed, fear Allah as He should be feared and do not die except as Muslims [in submission to Him]** (Aali ‘Imran: 102).

يَا أَيُّهَا النَّاسُ اتَّقُوا رَبَّكُمُ الَّذِي خَلَقَكُم مِّن نَّفْسٍ وَاحِدَةٍ وَخَلَقَ مِنْهَا زَوْجَهَا وَبَثَّ مِنْهُمَا رِجَالًا كَثِيرًا وَنِسَاءً ۚ وَاتَّقُوا اللَّـهَ الَّذِي تَسَاءَلُونَ بِهِ وَالْأَرْحَامَ ۚ إِنَّ اللَّـهَ كَانَ عَلَيْكُمْ رَقِيبًا

**O mankind! Fear your Lord, who created you from one soul and created from it its mate and dispersed from both of them many men and women. And fear Allah, through whom you ask one another, and the wombs. Indeed, Allah is ever, over you, an Observer** (An-Nisa’: 1).

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا اتَّقُوا اللَّـهَ وَقُولُوا قَوْلًا سَدِيدًا ﴿٧٠﴾ يُصْلِحْ لَكُمْ أَعْمَالَكُمْ وَيَغْفِرْ لَكُمْ ذُنُوبَكُمْ ۗ وَمَن يُطِعِ اللَّـهَ وَرَسُولَهُ فَقَدْ فَازَ فَوْزًا عَظِيمًا

**O you who have believed, fear Allah and speak words of appropriate justice. (70) He will [then] rectify for you your deeds and forgive you your sins. And whoever obeys Allah and His Messenger has certainly attained a great success** (Al-Ahzab: 70).

إِنَّ خَيْرَ الْحَدِيثِ كِتَابُ اللَّهِ، وَخَيْرَ الْهَدْيِ ْهَدْيِ مُحَمَّدٍ، صَلَّى اللَّهُ عَلَيْهِ وعَلَى آله وَسَلَّمَ، وَشَرُّ الأُمُورِ مُحْدَثَاتُهَا، وَكُلُّ بِدْعَةٍ ضَلالَةٌ

“Verily, the best speech is the Book of Allah, the best guidance is the guidance brought by Muhammad (saw) and the worst of matters are the newly invented matters and every innovation is misguidance”.

And the most perfect and continuous prayers and peace be upon our Prophet; Muhammad, and upon his righteous and pure family and his sincere and striving companions. Indeed, he is the most excellent example and model.

Thereafter: I found during the comprehensive study of what has been named “The condition of being from Quraish in respect to the Imamah (leadership)” that the evidential argument primarily revolved around the incident of the Saqeefah and what has been claimed in that the essence of the argument on that day had been concerning the “The condition of being from Quraish in respect to the Imamah (leadership)”. And that the Ansar only retreated from appointing one of them as the Amir (leader) when they were informed by the text and as a result they were unable to transgress or find any escape from that.

Indeed, some distinguished personalities have claimed that this has been related by Tawaatur. They then established upon it an “**Usool**” (foundation) and above it, “**Castles**” in the air. Here is Imam Ar-Raaziy saying in “Al-Mahsool” (4/368): [Firstly: It has been narrated by Tawaatur that on the day of the Saqeefah, when Abu Bakr, may Allah be pleased with him, presented his argument to the Ansar by stating that the A’immah (leaders) are from Quraish, whilst being specified by the generality of the statement of Allah تعالى: “Obey Allah, Obey the Messenger and those in authority among you”, they accepted that and they did not deny it. No one said how can you bring as evidential argument information that we are not definitely certain of its authenticity. When no one from among them said that, we knew that **this was a settled ‘Asl (basis) among them**].

Building “castles” upon foundations, bases and pillars in the air is worse than the one who has:

أَسَّسَ بُنْيَانَهُ عَلَىٰ شَفَا جُرُفٍ هَارٍ فَانْهَارَ بِهِ فِي نَارِ جَهَنَّمَ ۗ وَاللَّهُ لَا يَهْدِي الْقَوْمَ الظَّالِمِينَ

**Laid the foundation of his building on the edge of a bank about to collapse, so it collapsed with him into the fire of Hell? And Allah does not guide the wrongdoing people** (At-Tawbah: 109).

Due to the great seriousness of this matter, I sought direction from Allah in relation to undertaking a study of the Saqeefah in a precise and independent manner. I quickly discovered that this could not be carried out via a detailed study of its narrations alone and of what has been named “The condition of being from Quraish in respect to the Imamah (leadership)”. But rather it was also necessary to thoroughly examine all that related to it and to subject these matters to a deep and precise study. The most significant of those connected and related matters are:

**Firstly**: The foundations of the Bai’ah (pledge) of Abu Bakr, his public Bai’ah and his first Khutbah (speech).

**Secondly**: The position of Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah, may Allah be pleased with him, in relation to the incident of the Saqeefah.

**Thirdly**: The non-attendance of ‘Ali bin Abi Talib, may Allah be pleased with him, at the Bai’ah of Abu Bakr and the reasons for that.

**Fourthly**: Disclosing and exposing the most significant lies surrounding the Saqeefah.

**Fifthly**: **Destroying** the legend of the storming or burning of the house of Fatimah the daughter of Muhammad, the blessings of Allah be upon her and her father.

The subject matter is thorny and has been corrupted by factional desires, struggles between schools of thought (Madhaahib) and the desires of those in authority. In truth it is a minefield and no one who delves into it cannot escape and be saved apart from the one who is sincere to Allah, seeks the truth alone and by way of clear evidence, guards his inner self and desires closely and supplication to Allah, saying: “O Allah, by Your Knowledge of the unseen and by Your Power over creation, let me live if You know that life is good for me, and let me die if You know that death is good for me. O Allah, I ask You to grant me fear of You in private and in public. **I ask you for the word of truth in times of contentment and anger**. I ask You for moderation in wealth and in poverty. I ask you for blessings never ceasing and the coolness of my eye (i.e. pleasure) that never ends. I ask You for contentment after Your decree and I ask You for a life of coolness after death. I ask You for the delight of gazing upon Your Face, and the joy of meeting You, without any harm and misguiding trials befalling me. O Allah, adorn us with the beauty of Iman and make us guides who are guided”.

We ask Allah, Al-‘Azheem, to bring benefit from this research and to make all our acts purely for His sake, verily He is capable over every matter. And blessings and peace be upon His slave and Messenger Muhammad and upon his righteous and pure family, his sincere and striving companions, with a permanent and abundant blessings and peace until the Day of Judgement. And all praise belongs to Allah the Lord of the Worlds.

**The narrated incident of the Saqeefah and its related matters**

**From the well-known evidential arguments presented by those who state that being from the Quraish is a condition for the position of Imamah (leadership), is that they state that Abu Bakr presented this argument to the Ansar on the day of the Saqeefah and as a result they retreated from giving the Bai’ah (pledge of allegiance) to a man from among them and (instead) gave the Bai’ah to Abu Bakr**.

**We say**: This claim is incorrect. The incident of the Saqeefah has reached us via the most authentic chains of transmission in this world from the Amir ul-Mu’mineen ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab. He was an **eyewitness** to this momentous and grave incident and from those who participated in a fundamental and substantial manner in the debate that took place concerning it. It is therefore inconceivable that he forgot the evidential argument of making belonging to Quraish a condition for taking the post of the Imamah (leadership), if such argumentation even took place in origin. That is particularly as the subject matter of the Saqeefah revolved entirely around the issue of the Imamah (leadership) and to whom it would be given. In addition, ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab is characterised by the peak of reliability, truthfulness and trustworthiness, whilst he didn’t have the least amount of personal interest to lie in respect to this particular aspect. Indeed, the absolute opposite is true. If he had wanted to lie, his interest would have been to claim that the debate had been settled by confronting the Ansar with the conditionality of being from Quraish for the position of the Imamah. This is especially as he mentioned the entire incident in the Jumu’ah speech upon the Minbar of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ in the Masjid of Al-Madinah in the presence of a great gathering of the Ansar who had been present at the Saqeefah. No one objected to what he said, none reminded him and no one refuted him. That was in the presence of the distinguished personalities from the forerunners of the Muhajirin, the Ansar and those who participated in the battle of Badr. They are the leaders of truthfulness and those whom Allah decisively specified with His pleasure and Paradise, without reservation or condition. At the forefront of whom was the Imam of guidance, the triumphant lion of Allah, the Imam of the East and West, ‘Ali bin Abi Talib, may Allah’s blessings be upon him, who in respect to the conveyance from the final Prophet of Allah ﷺ was like the status of Harun to Musa (peace be upon them). He had without doubt investigated what took place in the Saqeefah and examined its information. He had a great concern to know the reality of what happened in it and particularly as he had a primary participation in the events accompanying it, despite not being in attendance in the Saqeefah itself. It is inconceivable that he would betray the conveyance from Allah and His Messenger which Allah, concerning which Allah had made him an assistant (Wazir) to His Prophet, and then remain silent and refrain from correcting the speech of ‘Umar and completing what he had failed to mention from the essential matters or deny him if he, Allah forbid, had been concealing the truth. The following is the Hadith in full:

- Imam Al-Bukhari recorded in his Sahih (Vol: 6, p 2503, Hadith: 6442) with an Isnad (chain of transmission) of the highest level of authenticity via the path of Salih bin Kabsan from Az-Zuhriy:

[Abdul ‘Aziz bin Abdullah related to us from Ibrahim bin Sa’d, from Salih, from Ibn Shihab, from ‘Ubaidullah bin Abdullah bin ‘Utbah bin Mas’ud, from Ibn ‘Abbas, who said:

I used to teach (the Qur'an to) some people of the Muhajirin (emigrants), among whom there was Abdur Rahman bin ‘Auf. While I was in his house at Mina, and he was with ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab during ‘Umar's last Hajj. ‘Abdur-Rahman came to me and said: “Would that you had seen the man who came today to the Amir (leader) of the Believers (‘Umar), saying: “O Chief of the Believers! What do you think about so and so who says: “If ‘Umar should die, I will give the pledge of allegiance to such and such person, as by Allah, the pledge of allegiance to Abu Bakr was nothing but a prompt sudden (or spontaneous) action that occurred”. ‘Umar became angry and then said: “Allah willing, I will stand before the people tonight and warn them against those people who want to deprive the others of their rights (the question of rulership)”. ‘Abdur-Rahman said: “I said: “O Chief of the believers! Do not do that, for the season of Hajj gathers the riffraff and the rabble, and it will be they who will gather around you when you stand to address the people. And I am afraid that you will get up and say something, and some people will spread your statement and may not say what you have actually said and may not understand its meaning, and may interpret it incorrectly, so you should wait till you reach Al-Madinah, as it is the place of emigration and the Sunnah, and there you can come in touch with the knowledgeable and noble people, and tell them your ideas with confidence. The knowledgeable people will understand your speech and place it in its proper context”. On that, ‘Umar said: “By Allah! Allah willing, I will do this in the first speech I will deliver before the people in Al-Madinah”. Ibn `Abbas added: We reached Al-Madinah at the end of the month of Dhu l-Hijjah, and when it was Friday, we went quickly (to the Masjid) as soon as the sun had declined, and I saw Sa’id bin Zaid bin ‘Amr bin Nufail sitting at the corner of the Minbar (pulpit), and I too sat close to him so that my knee was touching his knee. After a short while `Umar bin Al-Khattab came out and when I saw him coming towards us I said to Sa’id bin Zaid bin ‘Amr bin Nufail: “Today ‘Umar will say such a thing as he has never said since he was chosen as the Khalifah”. Sa’id was in denial of my statement and said: “What thing do you expect ‘Umar to say the like of which he has never said before?” ‘Umar sat on the pulpit and when those calling for the prayer had finished their call ‘Umar stood up. He glorified and praised Allah in a manner that is fitting. He (then) said: “I am now going to tell you something which has been decreed for me to say. I do not know; perhaps it portends my death, so whoever understands and remembers it, must narrate it to the others wherever his mount takes him, but if somebody is afraid that he does not understand it, then it is unlawful for him to tell lies against me. Verily, Allah sent Muhammad ﷺ with the truth and revealed upon him the Kitab (Al-Qur’an) and from that which Allah revealed was the verse of the Rajm (stoning the married person who commits illegal sexual intercourse). We used to recite this verse, understood and memorized it. Allah's Messenger ﷺ carried out the punishment of stoning and so did we after him. I fear that after a long time has passed, somebody will say: “By Allah, we do not find the verse of the Rajm in Allah's Book” and thus they will go astray by leaving an obligation which Allah has revealed. And the punishment of the Rajm in the Book of Allah is a right to be imposed upon any married person from the men and women who has committed illegal sexual intercourse, if the evidential proof has been established or conception or confession occurs. Then, we (also) used to recite among the verses in Allah's Book: “Do not claim to be the offspring of other than your fathers, as it is disbelief (ingratitude) on your part that you claim to be the offspring of other than your real father”. Then Allah's Messenger ﷺ said: “Do not pour praise upon me excessively as ‘Isa, son of Mary was praised, but call me Allah’s Slave and His Messenger”. I has reached me that a speaker amongst you says: “By Allah, if `Umar should die, I will give the pledge of allegiance to such and such person”. None of you should deceive themselves by saying that the pledge of allegiance given to Abu Bakr was a matter that occurred suddenly (or spontaneously) and was completed (as such). Indeed, it was like that, but Allah protected (the people) from its evil, and there is none among you who people turn to like Abu Bakr. Whoever gives the pledge of allegiance to anybody among you without consultation from the Muslims, then neither the person who is given the pledge nor the person who gave the pledge of allegiance are to be followed, lest they both should be killed. **Indeed, it is from our news (i.e. events that came to pass) that when Allah caused His Prophet ﷺ to pass away, the Ansar acted contrary to us and gathered as a whole in the Saqeefah (shelter/garden) of Bani Sa’idah. ‘Ali and Zubair and whoever was with them**, **stayed back from us, whilst the Muhajirin (emigrants) had gathered around Abu Bakr**. I said to Abu Bakr: “Let's go to these Ansari brothers of ours”. So we set out seeking them and when we approached near to them we met two righteous men from them who informed us of the decision the Ansar were heading to. They asked: “O group of Muhajirin (emigrants)! Where are you heading to?' We replied: “We are heading to these Ansari brothers of ours”. They said to us: “You shouldn't go near them. Carry on with your affair.' I said: “By Allah, we will certainly go to them”. We then proceeded until we reached them at the Saqeefah (shelter/garden) of Bani Sa’idah. We then saw that there was a man who was wrapped up sitting among them. I asked: “Who is that?” They said: “It is Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah”. I asked: “What is the matter with him?” They said: “He is sick”. After we sat for a while, the one from among them speaking stated the Tashahhud and praised Allah with what is befitting to Him. He then said: “Thereafter, we are Allah's Ansar (helpers) and regiment (military vanguard) of Islam, while you, O gathering of the Muhajirin (emigrants) are a small group and some among you came wanting to hinder us from our original (rightful) position and deprive us of this matter (i.e. the leadership)”. When the speaker fell silent, I intended to speak as I had prepared a speech (in my mind) which I was pleased with and which I wanted to deliver in the presence of Abu Bakr, as I used to seek to please him somewhat. Then, when I wanted to speak, Abu Bakr said: “Be at ease” and I disliked angering him (so I assented). Then Abu Bakr spoke and he was wiser and more commanding than me. By Allah, he did not leave a sentence that I liked in my own prepared speech, but he said the like of it or better than it spontaneously. After a pause he said: “O Ansar! You are deserving of all the good qualities that you have mentioned concerning yourselves, **however this matter (of leadership) will never be acknowledged except to this community of the Quraish as they are the best of the Arabs in terms of lineage and homeland**. I am contented to propose for you either of these two men, so provide the oath of allegiance (Bai’ah) to either of them as you wish”. Abu Bakr then held my hand and Abu Ubaidah bin al-Jarrah's hand who was sitting amongst us and I had not disliked anything he said apart from that. For by Allah, that I be brought forth and have my neck chopped without that drawing sin to me was more beloved to me than becoming the ruler over an Ummah (nation), one of whose members is Abu Bakr, unless at the time of my death my own self suggests something I did not feel at that time. And then one of the Ansar said: “I am the post upon which the camel rubs itself to satisfy the itching (i.e. I am a noble), and I am like a high class palm tree! O Quraish. There should be one ruler from us and one from you”. Then there was a hue and cry among the gathering and their voices rose to the point that I feared there might be a great disagreement. I then said: “O Abu Bakr! Extend your hand”. He held his hand out and I pledged allegiance to him, and then all the emigrants gave the Pledge of allegiance followed by the Ansar. And so we prevailed over Sa’d bin Ubadah (whom Al-Ansar wanted to make a ruler). Someone from the Ansar then said: “You have killed Sa’d bin Ubadah”. I replied: “May Allah kill Sa`d bin Ubadah”. ‘Umar then said: “By Allah, we did not find at that time we were present in a matter greater than the allegiance pledged to Abu Bakr as we were afraid that if we left the people, they might give the pledge of allegiance after us to one of their men. In such a case we would either have given the pledge to them upon that which we were not content with or we would have opposed them and caused great corruption. **Therefore, whoever gives the Bai’ah (pledge of allegiance) to a man (to become the Khalifah) without consulting the Muslims, then he should not be followed nor the one who gave him the pledge, lest both of them should be killed”**].

Imam Al-Baihaqiy also recorded the same Hadith in his Sunan Al-Kubra (Vol: 8/p: 142/Hadith: 16312).

- Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal recorded it in his Musnad (Vol: 1/p: 55/ Hadith: 391) with a Sahih Isnad via the path of Malik from Az-Zuhriy:

[Ishaq bin ‘Isa At-Tabba’ related to us from Malik bin Anas, from Ibn Shihab, from Ubaidullah bin Abdullah bin ‘Utbah bin Mas’ud, from Ibn ‘Abbas with similar to it (i.e. the previously mentioned Hadith), except that he (‘Umar) said: “Indeed, he was the best of us when the Messenger of Allah ﷺ passed away. ‘Ali, Az-Zubair and those with them stayed behind in the house of Fatimah, the daughter of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, may Allah be pleased with her. The entirety of the Ansar stayed back from us in the Saqeefah of Bani Sa’idah whilst the Muhajirin had gathered around Abu Bakr, may Allah be pleased with him. I then said to him: “O Abu Bakr, set off with us to our brothers from the Ansar”. We then set off leading them until we met two righteous men. They mentioned to us what the people were doing and said: “Where are you going to O assembly of the Muhajirin”. I said: “We are seeking to go to those brothers of ours of the Ansar”. They said: “You should not go to them and carry on with your own affair O assembly of the Muhajirin”. I replied: “By Allah, we are certainly going to them”. We set off until we came to them in the Saqeefah (shelter/garden) of Bani Sa’idah. We then saw that they were meeting together and between them was a man who was wrapped up. I asked: “Who is that?” They said: “Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah”. I asked: “What is the matter with him?” They said: “Sickness”. When we had sat down their speaker stood and then praised Allah ‘Azza Wa Jalla with what is fitting for Him and said: “Thereafter, we are the Ansar (helpers) of Allah and regiment (military vanguard) of Islam, while you, O gathering of the Muhajirin (emigrants) are a small group and some among you came wanting to hinder us from our original (rightful) position and deprive us of this matter (i.e. the leadership)”. Then when he stopped speaking, I wanted to speak and I had prepared (in my head) a speech that was pleasing to me. I wanted to say it before Abu Bakr, may Allah be pleased with him, as I used to seek to please him somewhat. Abu Bakr, may Allah be pleased with him, then said (to me): “Be at ease”. I disliked angering him and he was more knowledgeable and commanding than me. By Allah, he did not leave a sentence that I liked in my own prepared speech, but he said the like of it or better than it spontaneously. After a pause he said: “O Ansar! You are deserving of all the good qualities that you have mentioned concerning yourselves, however **the Arabs have not acknowledged this matter (of leadership) except to this community of the Quraish as they are the best of the Arabs in terms of lineage and homeland**. I am contented to propose for you either of these two men, so provide the oath of allegiance (Bai’ah) to either of them as you wish”. Abu Bakr then held my hand and Abu Ubaidah bin al-Jarrah's hand who was sitting amongst us and I had not disliked anything he said apart from that. For by Allah, that I be brought forth and have my neck chopped without that drawing sin to me was more beloved to me than becoming the ruler over an Ummah (nation), among whom is Abu Bakr, unless something within myself were to change at the time of death. Then one of the Ansar said: “I am the post upon which the camel rubs itself to satisfy the itching (i.e. I am a noble), and I am like a high class palm tree! There should be one ruler from us and one from you O assembly of Quraish”. I asked Malik: “What is the meaning of I am the post upon which the camel rubs itself to satisfy the itching (i.e. I am a noble) and I am the high class palm tree?” He replied: “It is as if he is saying he is the cleverest”. He ‘(Umar) said: Then there was a hue and cry among the gathering and the voices were raised to the point that I feared there might be a great disagreement. I then said: “O Abu Bakr! Extend your hand”. He held his hand out and I pledged allegiance to him, and then the emigrants gave him the pledge of allegiance (Bai’ah) followed by the Ansar. And so we prevailed over Sa’d bin Ubadah (whom Al-Ansar wanted to make a ruler). Then someone from the Ansar then said: “You have killed Sa’d”. I replied: “May Allah kill Sa’d bin Ubadah””].

- Imam Ibn Hibban recorded it in his Sahih (Vol:2/p.158/Hadith:414) also with a Sahih Isnad via Malik from Az-Zuhriy:

[Al-Hasan bin Sufyan Bansa and Ahmad bin ‘Ali bin Al-Muthanna in Mosul and Al-Fadl bin Al-Habbab Al-Jumahiy in Al-Basra informed us of it, whilst the wording here is that of Al-Hasan. They said: Abdullah bin Muhammad bin Asmaa’ bin Akh Juwairiyah bin Asmaa’ related to us. He said: My paternal uncle Juwairiyah bin Asmaa’ related to us from Malik bin Anas, from Az-Zuhriy, from Ubaidullah bin Abdullah bin ‘Utbah bin Mas’ud, who informed him that Abdullah bin ‘Abbas informed him of similar to it (the Hadith), except that he said: “Indeed, it was from our news that when the Messenger of Allah ﷺ passed away, ‘Ali and Az-Zubair stayed back from us and the entirety of the Ansar were away from us having gathered together in the Saqeefah of Bani Sa’idah, whilst the Muhajirin had gathered around Abu Bakr. Whilst we were in the house of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ a man came calling out from behind the wall saying: “Come out to be O Ibn ul-Khattab”. I said: “Leave me be. We are too occupied to be disturbed by you”. He then said: “Indeed, a matter has occurred that necessitates your attention. The Ansar have met together in the Saqeefah of Bani Sa’idah so catch up to them before a matter takes place and war will pursue between you and them as a result”. I said to Abu Bakr: “Set off with us to these brothers of ours from the Ansar”. So, we set off leading them. We met Abu ‘Ubaidah bin Al-Jarrah and Abu Bakr took hold of his hand and walked between me and him until we approached close to them when we came across two righteous men. They mentioned what the people (i.e. the Ansar) were doing and asked: “Where are you heading to O gathering of the Muhajirin?” I said: “We are heading to our brothers from those Ansar”. They said: “You should not approach them O assembly of Muhajirin but (rather) carry on with your (own) affair”. I said: “By Allah, we are certainly going to them”. We set off until we came to them and they were in the Saqeefah (shelter/garden) of Bani Sa’idah. Among them was a man who was wrapped up. I asked: “Who is that?” They said: “Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah”. I asked: “What is the matter with him?” They said: “Sickness”. When we had sat down their speaker spoke. So, he praised Allah with what is fitting for Him and said: “Thereafter, we are the Ansar (helpers) of Allah and regiment (military vanguard) of Islam, while you, O gathering of the Muhajirin (emigrants) are a small group and some among you came wanting to hinder us from our original (rightful) position and deprive us of this matter (i.e. the leadership)”. Then when he stopped speaking, I wanted to speak and I had prepared (in my head) a speech that was pleasing to me. I wanted to deliver it before Abu Bakr as I used to seek to please him somewhat. Abu Bakr said (to me): “Be at ease” and so I disliked angering him. Abu Bakr then spoke and he was wiser and more commanding than me. By Allah, he did not leave a word that I liked in my own prepared speech, but he said the like of it or better than it spontaneously until he became silent. Abu Bakr said the Tashahhud and praised Allah with what is fitting for Him. Then he said: “Thereafter, O Ansar! What you have mentioned concerning the goodness in you, then you are deserving of that. **However, the Arabs have will never acknowledge this matter (of leadership) except to this community of the Quraish as they are the best of the Arabs in terms of lineage and homeland.** I am contented to propose for you either of these two men, so provide the oath of allegiance (Bai’ah) to either of them as you wish”. Abu Bakr then held my hand and Abu Ubaidah bin al-Jarrah's hand who was sitting among us. I did not dislike anything he said apart from that. For by Allah, that I be brought forth and have my neck chopped without that drawing sin to me was more beloved to me than becoming the leader over an Ummah (nation), among whom is Abu Bakr, unless something within myself were to change at the time of death. Then when Abu Bakr finished his speech one of the Ansar said: “I am the post upon which the camel rubs itself to satisfy the itching (i.e. I am a noble), and I am like a high class palm tree! There should be one ruler from us and one from you O assembly of Quraish”. Then there was a hue and cry among the gathering and the voices were raised to the point that I feared there might be a great disagreement. I then said: “O Abu Bakr! Extend your hand”. He held his hand out. He then pledged allegiance to him and the emigrants the Ansar gave the Bai’ah (pledge) to him. And thus we prevailed over Sa’d bin Ubadah (whom Al-Ansar wanted to make a ruler). Then someone from the Ansar then said: “You have killed Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah”. Then I said whilst angry: “May Allah kill Sa’d bin Ubadah as verily he is the companion of Fitnah (discord) and evil”].

- It has also been recorded in the Musannaf of Imam Abdur Razzaq (Vol:5/p439/Hadith:9758) with an Isnad of the greatest level of authenticity via the path of Ma’mar from Az-Zuhriy:

[Abdur Razzaq related from Ma’mar, from Az-Zuhriy, from Ubaidullah bin Abdullah bin ‘Utbah, from Ibn ‘Abbas, similar to it (i.e. the Hadith) except he said: “Indeed, he was from the best of us when the Messenger of Allah ﷺ passed away. ‘Ali, Az-Zubair and those with them stayed back from him in the house of Fatimah and the Ansar stayed back from us in their entirety in the Saqeefah (shelter/garden) of Bani Sa’idah. The Muhajirin gathered around Abu Bakr, may Allah’s mercy be upon him. I said: “O Abu Bakr, set off with us to our brothers from the Ansar”. We then set off leading them. We then met two righteous men from the Ansar who had witnessed the (the battle of) Badr. They asked: “Where are you heading, O assembly of the Muhajirin?” We said: “We are seeking our brothers from those Ansar”. They said: “Return and carry on with your own affair amongst you”. I said: “You do the same for we are certainly going to them”. We reached them and saw that they were gathered in the Saqeefah of Bani Sa’idah with a man between them who was wrapped up. I asked: “Who is that?” They said: “This is Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah” I asked: “What is the matter with him?” They said: “He is sick”. He (‘Umar) said: Then the Khatib (speaker) of the Ansar stood (to address them). He praised Allah with what is fitting for Him and then said: “Thereafter, we are the Ansar (helpers) of Allah and regiment (military vanguard) of Islam, while you, O gathering of the Muhajirin (emigrants) are only a small group from us and some among you came wanting to hinder us from our original (rightful) position and deprive us of this matter (i.e. the Khilafah)”. I had prepared something to say in mind and wanted to deliver it before Abu Bakr. I used to seek to please him somewhat Abu Bakr, may Allah be pleased with him, somewhat and he was wiser and more commanding than me. Then when I wanted to speak he said: “Be at ease” and I disliked to disobey him. Abu Bakr, may Allah be pleased with him, then praised Allah and praised Him with what is fitting for Him. He (‘Umar) then said (continuing): By Allah, he did not leave a word that I prepared in my head except that he mentioned it or better than it spontaneously. He then said: “**The Arabs will never acknowledge this matter (i.e. leadership) except to this community of the Quraish as they are the best of the Arabs in terms of lineage and homeland**. And I am content to propose for you these two men so give the Bai’ah (pledge of allegiance) to whomever of them you wish” He (‘Umar) said: Then he took hold of my hand and the hand of Abu Ubaidah bin Al-Jarrah. He said: By Allah, I did not dislike anything that he (Abu Bakr) said except for this statement. That I be brought forth and have my neck chopped without that drawing sin to me was more beloved to me than becoming the leader over an Ummah (nation), among whom is Abu Bakr. Then when Abu Bakr finished a man from the Ansar said: “I am the post upon which the camel rubs itself to satisfy the itching (i.e. I am a noble), and I am like a high class palm tree! There should be one ruler from us and one from you O assembly of Quraish, or otherwise we would cause war between us and you to break out”. (Ma’mar said: Qatadah said: Then ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab said: Two swords do not fit in one scabbard but rather from us are the ‘Umaraa’ (leaders) and from you the Wuzaraa’ (assistants)). Ma’mar said: Az-Zuhriy said in his Hadith with the (same) Isnad: The hue and cry then became great among us to the point that a feared a major disagreement. I then said: O Abu Bakr, extend you hand for me to give you the Bai’ah (pledge of allegiance). He ‘Umar (said): So, he extended his hand and I gave him the pledge of Allegiance (Bai’ah), the Muhajirun gave the Bai’ah and the Ansar gave the Bai’ah. He said: We prevailed over Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah. Then someone said: “You have killed Sa’d”. I replied: “May Allah kill Sa’d””].

- Imam Ibn Hibban recorded it in his Sahih (Vol:2/p145/Hadith:413) with a Sahih Isnad (chain of transmission) via the path of Hushaim from Az-Zuhriy:

[Abu Ya’la related to us from Suraij bin Yunus, from Hushaim who said: I heard Az-Zuhriy relate from Ubaidullah bin Abdullah from Ibn ‘Abbas similar to it (the Hadith) except he said: “Indeed, he was from the best of us of the day that Allah caused His Messenger ﷺ to pass away. The Muhajirun gathered to Abu Bakr while the Ansar stayed back from us in the Saqeefah of Bani Sa’idah. I then said to Abu Bakr: “Go with us to our brothers from the Ansar so that we may look at what they are doing”. We left leading them. Then we met two righteous men from them (the Ansar). They asked: “Where are you going O ssembly of Muhajirin?” I said: “We are going to our brothers from the Ansar”. They said: “You should not go to them. Carry on with your (own) affair O assembly of the Muhajirin”. I then said: “By Allah we will not return until we have gone to them”. We then came to them and saw that they were gathered together in the Saqeefah of Bani Sa’idah with a man who was wrapped up between them. I asked: “Who is that?” They answered: “Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah”. I asked: “What is the matter with him?” They replied: “He is sick”. When we sat down their speaker stood and praised Allah and praised Him with what is fitting. He then said: “Thereafter, we are the Ansar (helpers) of Allah and the regiment (military vanguard) of Islam and a group of you have come to us O gathering of Muslims and they desire to have the matter (leadership) for themselves and remove us from our original (rightful) position”. ‘Umar said: When he became silent I wanted speak and I had prepared a speech (in my head) pleasing to me which I wanted to deliver in front of Abu Bakr as I use to seek to please him somewhat. He was wiser and more commanding than me, so he took my hand and told me to sit. I disliked angering him (i.e. so I complied). He then spoke and by Allah he did not leave anything from what I had prepared in my speech except that he said its like or better than it spontaneously. He praised Allah and praised Him with what is fitting and then said: “Thereafter, what you have mentioned of good qualities, then you are deserving of that. **However, the Arabs will never acknowledge this matter (leadership) except to this community of the Quraish. They are the best of the Arabs in terms of homeland and lineage.** I propose to you one of these two men, so, give the Bai’ah (pledge) to whichever of them you wish”. And he took hold of my hand and the hand of Abu ‘Ubaidah bin Al-Jarrah whilst he was sitting between us. I did not dislike anything of his speech apart from that and by Allah that I be brought forth and have my neck struck without incurring sin was more beloved to me than being made the leader over a people among whom was Abu Bakr. Then a young man from the Ansar said: “I am the post upon which the camel rubs itself to satisfy the itching (i.e. I am a noble), and I am like a high class palm tree! There should be one ruler from us and one from you O assembly of Quraish”. There was a great hue and cry and I feared a major disagreement. So, I said: “Extend your hand O Abu Bakr”. He extended it and I gave the Bai’ah (pledge of allegiance) to him and the Muhajirun and Ansar gave him the Bai’ah. We prevailed over Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah and one of them said: “You have killed Sa’d” and I said: “May Allah kill Sa’d””].

- The Hadith was also recorded in “Tareekh Dimashq” of ibn ‘Asakir (30/283) via the path of Sufyan bin ‘Uyainah from Az-Zuhriy:

[‘Aaliyan Abu Sa’d Ahmad bin Muhammad bin Al-Baghdadi, Abu Bakr Muhammad bin Shujaa’ and Abu Tahir Muhammad bin Abi Nasr bin Abi Al-Qasim related it to us saying: Abu Al-Muzhaffar Mahmood bin Ja’far At-Tamimi related to us from the paternal uncle of his father Abu Abdullah Az-Zubair bin Abi Bakr, from Sufyan bin ‘Uyainah, from Az-Zuhriy, from Ubaidullah bin Abdullah bin ‘Utbah, from Ibn ‘Abbas who said it (the Hadith), except that he said: “It was from our news that when the Messenger of Allah ﷺ passed away, the Ansar with Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah stayed away from us and ‘Ali, Az-Zubair and those with them stayed back from us in the house of Fatimah. The Muhajirun gathered to Abu Bakr and so I said to Abu Bakr: “O Abu Bakr, set off with us to our brothers from the Ansar”. So, we set off, I, Abu Bakr and Abu Ubaidah bin Al-Jarrah. We then met two righteous men from the Ansar who had been present at the battle of Badr, ‘Uwaimir bin Sa’idah and the other Ma’n bin ‘Adiy. They asked: “Where are you heading O gathering of the Muhajirin?” We said: “We are heading to our brothers from those Ansar”. They said: “Return and carry on with your (own) affair amongst yourselves”. I said: “By Allah, we will certainly go to them”. Then (when we got there) we saw that they were gathered together in the Saqeefah of Bani Sa’idah and there in the middle of them was a man wrapped up. I said: “Who is this?” They said: “Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah”. I asked: “What is the matter with him?” They answered: “He is sick”. Then when we had sat, the speaker from the Ansar stood and praised Allah and praised Him with what is fitting. He then said: “Thereafter, we are the Ansar (helpers) of Allah and the regiment (military vanguard) of Islam and you O assembly of the Muhajirin are a community from us. And a group from your people have come forward” ‘Umar said (continuing): “You wish to hinder us from our original (rightful) position and prevent us from the matter (leadership)”. Then when he was silent, I wanted to speak. He said: I had prepared in myself a speech that I wanted to deliver before Abu Bakr and I used to seek to please him somewhat. It was like that when he came near me and he was wiser. I went to speak and Abu Bakr said to me: “Be at ease” and I disliked to anger him. He then praised Allah and then by Allah he did not leave anything from what I had prepared in myself except that he mentioned it or better than it. He said: “Thereafter, what you have mentioned concerning yourselves in respect to good qualities, then you are worthy of that. **But the Arabs will not acknowledge this matter (leadership) except to this community of Quraish, they are the best of the Arabs in terms of homeland and lineage**. And I propose to you one of these two men. So, give the Bai’ah (pledge of allegiance) to whichever one of them you wish”. He then took my hand and the hand of Abu Ubaidah bin Al-Jarrah. By Allah, I did not dislike from his speech anything other than that and to have been brought forward to have my neck cut as long as it did not incur sin would have been more beloved to me than to become the leader over a people among whom was Abu Bakr. Then Al-Habbab bin Al-Mundhir Al-Salmiy stood and said: I am the post upon which the camel rubs itself to satisfy the itching (i.e. I am a noble), and I am like a high class palm tree! There should be one leader from us and one from you O assembly of Quraish. If you wish we will prepare for war to breakout between us”. Voices were then raised and a hue and cry broke out, to the point that I feared that a major disagreement would occur. So, I said: “O Abu Bakr, extend your hand”. So, he extended his hand and I gave him the Bai’ah (pledge), Abu ‘Ubaidah gave him the pledge, the Muhajirun gave him the pledge and then the Ansar gave him the Bai’ah. And we prevailed over Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah. Then one of the Ansar said: “You have killed Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah” and I said: “May Allah kill Sa’d””].

**I say**: It has been said that Sufyan bin ‘Uyainah is the one who inserted the names of ‘Uwaimir bin Sa’idah, Ma’n bin ‘Adiy and Al-Habbab bin Al-Mundir, that it was not from the speech of ‘Umar in the original Hadith and that the names were only known from other Ahadeeth. However, this is very unlikely as the origin of the Hadith has come from other paths as found in the Seerah of Ibn Hisham and the Musnad of Ibn Abi Shaibah, which we will present now by Allah’s permission.

- It has been recorded in the Seerah of Ibn Hisham (2/656), in full-length with a Sahih Isnad via Abdullah bin Abi Bakr (bin Muhammad bin ‘Amr bin Hazm), from Az-Zuhriy:

[Ibn Ishaq said: From the Hadith of the Saqeefah when the Ansar gathered together in it, that Abdullah bin Abi Bakr related to me from Ibn Shihab Az-Zuhriy, from Ubaidullah bin Abdullah bin ‘Utbah bin Mas’ud, from Abdullah bin ‘Abbas, that he related similar to it (i.e. the Hadith of the speech of ‘Umar), except he said: “It is from our news that when Allah caused his Prophet ﷺ to pass away, the Ansar acted contrary to us and their nobles met in the Saqeefah of Bani Sa’idah. ‘Ali bin Abi Talib, Az-Zubair bin Al-‘Awwam and those with them also kept back from us whilst the Muhajirin gathered to Abu Bakr. I then said to Abu Bakr: “Set off with us to those brothers of ours from the Ansar”. So, we set off leading them until we met (on the way) two righteous men from them. They mentioned to us what the people (i.e. Ansar) were engaged in and asked: “Where are you heading O gathering of Muhajirun?” We said: “We are heading to those brothers of ours from the Ansar”. They said: “You should not approach them O gathering of Muhajirun. Rather, carry on with your own affair”. I said: “By Allah, we will certainly go to them”. We set off (again) until we came to them in the Saqeefah of Bani Sa’idah and then we saw in the middle of them a man who was wrapped up. I asked: “Who is that?” They said: Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah”. I asked: “What is the matter with him?” They said: “He is sick”. When we had sat down their speaker said the Tashahhud and praised Allah with what is fitting. He then said: “Thereafter, we are the Ansar (helpers) of Allah and you O Muhajirun are a small group from us and a group from you have come forward. He said: They want to hinder us from our original (rightful) position) and steal the matter (leadership) from us”. Then when he was silent I wanted to speak and I had prepared in myself a speech that pleased me which I wanted to deliver in front of Abu Bakr because I used to like to please him somewhat. Abu Bakr then said: “Be at ease O ‘Umar” and I disliked angering him. He then spoke and he was more knowledgeable than me and commanding. By Allah he did not leave a word that had pleased me from what I had prepared except that he said it spontaneously; the like of it or better than it, until he finished speaking. He said: “As for what you have mentioned of good qualities, then you are deserving of that. **However, the Arabs will never acknowledge this matter (leadership) except to this community of the Quraish. They are the best of the Arabs in terms of lineage and homeland.** I propose to you one of these two men, so, give the Bai’ah (pledge) to whichever of them you wish”. He then took hold of my hand and the hand of Abu ‘Ubaidah bin Al-Jarrah whilst he was sitting between us. I did not dislike anything of his speech apart from that and by Allah that I be brought forth and have my neck struck without incurring sin was more beloved to me than being made the leader over a people among whom was Abu Bakr. Someone from the Ansar then said: “I am the post upon which the camel rubs itself to satisfy the itching (i.e. I am a noble), and I am like a high class palm tree! There should be one ruler from us and one from you O assembly of Quraish”. A great hue and cry erupted to the point that I feared a major disagreement. So, I said: “Extend your hand O Abu Bakr”. He extended it and I gave the Bai’ah (pledge of allegiance) to him. Then the Muhajirun gave him the Bai’ah and then the Ansar. We prevailed over Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah and one of them said: “You have killed Sa’d” and I said: “May Allah kill Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah””].

- It was recorded by Imam Abu Bakr bin Abi Shaibah in his Musannaf (Vol:6/p:431/Hadith:37043) via Ibn Ishaq:

[Abdul ‘Aa’laa related to us from Ibn Ishaq, from Abdul Malik bin Abi Bakr, from Az-Zuhriy, from Ubaidullah bin Abdullah bin ‘Utbah, from Ibn ‘Abbas, that he said similar to it (the Hadith of ‘Umar’s speech), except he said: “Indeed, it was from the affairs of the people was that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ passed away that we came together and it was said to us: “The Ansar have gathered together in the Saqeefah of Bani Sa’idah with Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah to give him the Bai’ah (pledge of allegiance to become the leader)”. Then I, Abu Bakr and Abu Ubaidah bin Al-Jarrah arose to go to them frightened that they would cause a rupture in Islam. We met (on the way) two righteous men from the Ansar, a man of truthfulness, ‘Uwaim bin Sa’idah and Ma’n bin ‘Adiy. They said: “Where are you heading?” We said: “Your people due to what we have heard concerning your affair”. They said: “Go back for verily you will never be opposed and nothing will be giving that you dislike”. However, we refused except to continue on. I had prepared a speech that I wanted to deliver. We continued until we came to the people (the Ansar in the Saqeefah) and they were sticking close to Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah there whilst he was sick and upon a bed for him. When we arrived to them they spoke and said: “O gathering of Quraish, let there be from us an Ameer (leader) and from you an Ameer”. Al-Hubab bin Al-Mundhir then arose and said: “I am the post upon which the camel rubs itself to satisfy the itching (i.e. I am a noble), and I am like a high class palm tree! If you so desire then we will respond with war”. Abu Bakr then said: “Be at ease”. He then went to speak and said: “Listen O ‘Umar”. He then praised Allah with what is fitting and said: “Verily, we do not deny your virtue, your striving and sacrifice in Islam or your right that is obligatory upon us (to acknowledge), **however you are aware that this community from the Quraish are of a status among the Arabs which none other have and that the Arabs will not come together except upon a man from among them. We are the ‘Umaraa’ (leaders) and you are the Wuzaraa’ (assistants)**, so fear Allah, do not cause rupture or rifts in Islam and do not be the first to innovate (or cause a crime) in Islam. Indeed, I propose for you one of these two men”, indicating to me and Abu Ubaidah bin Al-Jarrah, “So, whichever of them you give the Bai’ah (pledge of allegiance) to, will be trustworthy (or reliable)”. He (‘Umar) said: By Allah. Nothing remained from what I had liked to say myself except that he said it on that day, apart from this final statement. By Allah, to be killed and then brought back to life and then killed again and be brought back to life, in other than the act of disobedience, would be preferable to me than to be an Ameer (leaders) over a people whom Abu Bakr was among them. I then said: “O gathering of the Ansar, O gathering of the Muslims, the most rightful person with the matter of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ (i.e. leadership), after him, is the second when they were in the cave, Abu Bakr has clear precedence”. I then took his hand and a man from the Ansar preceded me and struck his hand before I struck his hand. I then struck his hand (i.e. giving the pledge) and the people followed in succession and Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah was distanced from. The people then said: “Sa’d has been killed” and I responded: “Kill him, may Allah kill him”].

**I say**: This is what has come in the original that Abdul Malik bin Abi Bakr related it, however, the preponderant view is that this was a slip of the pen and error because Abdul Malik bin Abi Bakr bin Abdur Rahman bin Al-Harith bin Hisham Al-Makhzoumiy Al-Madaniy was from the teachers (Shuyukh) of Az-Zuhriy and not from his students. Rather, it should have stated Abdullah bin Abi Bakr bin Muhammad bin ‘Amr bin Hazm Al-Ansariy Al-Madaniy. And both of them (in any case) are Thiqah (reliable and trustworthy) and Ma’mun (secure of defect).

- It also came recorded in the “Tabaqaat Al-Kubra” (3/462) with a summarized worded form:

[Muhammad bin ‘Umar related to us from Ma’mar and Muhammad bin Abdullah, from Az-Zuhriy, from Ubaidullah bin ‘Utbah, from Ibn ‘Abbas, from ‘Umar ibn Al-Khattab, who said: “That when Allah caused his Prophet ﷺ to pass away, the Ansar gathered together in the Saqeefah of Bani Sa’idah and Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah was with them. They were consulting in respect to giving the Bai’ah (pledge of allegiance for leadership) to him. The news of that reached Abu Bakr and ‘Umar, may Allah be pleased with them. They then set off until they reached them and some people of the Muhajirin were with them. Then speech and dialogue took place between them and the Ansar concerning giving the Bai’ah to Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah. The speaker of the Ansar stood and said: “I am the post upon which the camel rubs itself to satisfy the itching (i.e. I am a noble), and I am like a high class palm tree! Let there be from us an Ameer (leader) and from you’re an Ameer, O assembly of Quraish”. There was then a great hue and cry and voices were raised. ‘Umar said: I said to Abu Bakr: “Extend your hand” He extended his hand and I gave him the Bai’ah (pledge), the Muhajirun gave him the Bai’ah and the Ansar. We prevailed over Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah and he had been wrapped up among them. I asked: “What is the matter with him?” They said: “Sickness”. One of them said: “You have killed Sa’d”. So, I said: “May Allah kill Sa’d”. Verily, by Allah, we did find in what we found from our affair a stronger matter than giving the Bai’ah to Abu Bakr. We had feared that if we had left the people (Ansar) without their being a Bai’ah, they would have given the Bai’ah in our absence. Then, we would either have to give them the Bai’ah upon that which we were not content with, or we have opposed them and there would have been corruption (Fasad)”].

**I say**: Muhammad bin ‘Umar Al-Waqidiy is **Thiqah (trustworthy, reliable), an Imam in Maghaziy and Tareekh (Battles (Seerah) and History)**. Those who classified him as Da’eef (weak) or left him made a gross error. Here, he summarised well without fault, however, he did not mention the details of what took place in terms of discussion and dialogue.

- The name of the one who said: “If ‘Umar was to pass away I would give the Bai’ah to so and so” was mentioned in “Ansaab Al-Ashraaf” of Al-Baladhuri (1/581/1176):

[Bakr bin Al-Haitham related to me from Hisham bin Yusuf, from Ma’mar, from Az-Zuhriy, from Ubaidullah bin Abdullah, from Ibn ‘Abbas, may Allah be pleased with them both, who said: “It reached me that ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab wanted to give the Khutbah (speech) on the day of Jumu’ah. I set off early when the sun was still rising. Then when the callers to prayer had finished, he (‘Umar) delivered the Khutbah (speech) and said: “I am going to say something that it is a sign of the coming of my death. Whoever understands it, then let him relate it wherever his mount takes him. And whoever fears that he does not understand it, then I do not permit for anyone to lie against me”. He then said: “It has reached me that Az-Zubair said: “If ‘Umar passed away, I would give the Bai’ah (pledge) to ‘Ali and the Bai’ah of Abu Bakr was only a sudden (or spontaneous) occurrence”. He lied by Allah. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ had established his standing and chose him as the pillar of the Deen over others. He said: “Allah and the believers refuse except Abu Bakr and so are there any from among you whom the people look to (i.e. in terms of stature or status) like they do to him?””].

However, Bakr bin Al-Haitham, the Sheikh (teacher) of Al-Baladhuri, as far as I am aware, is not acknowledged in respect to the Hadith. Al-Hafizh (ibn Hajar) said concerning this Isnad, that it is “**Qawiy**” (Strong). It is apparent from his narrations in general that he is from the people of Sidq (truthfulness), however the Hadith was with him for a long time and was not memorised. As such, he mixed between the timings of the events (i.e. he brought some forward and moved some back). He also summarised in an improper manner and was not precise in the wording as was required, thus making the meaning unclear. Some of that may have been from Hisham bin Yusuf. It was in contrast to the narration of Abdur Razzaq from Ma’mar. Consequently, if the narrators from Ma’mar differ the evidential proof rests with Abdur Razzaq (i.e. preference is given to what he related).

This then is what ‘Umar ibn Al-Khattab said with his loudest voice upon the Minbar (pulpit), in the main Hadith mentioning this subject area: [**…** **Indeed, it is from our news (i.e. events that came to pass) that when Allah caused His Prophet ﷺ to pass away, the Ansar acted contrary to us and gathered in their entirety in the Saqeefah (shelter/garden) of Bani Sa’idah. ‘Ali and Zubair and whoever was with them**, **stayed back from us, whilst the Muhajirin (emigrants) had gathered around Abu Bakr …**]. Therefore, ‘Ali, Az-Zubair, alongside most of Bani Hashim and perhaps some of the Muhajirin, had withdrawn and they did not attend the Saqeefah. In addition, they were not among the majority of the Muhajirin when they gathered together, which was inevitably in the Masjid. The context and scene dictate finding preponderant that ‘Ali and those with him only withdrew to the side in order to study the matter of the state and the Khilafah, a matter which other narrations affirm. There is therefore no validity to the emotional and widely imaginative claims that he had been preoccupied with the preparation of the Prophet ﷺ. That is because on that first day, Monday, no Ghusl (washing of the body), shrouding or digging of the grave took place. Rather, that happened on the third day, Wednesday. Indeed, that was to enable the people, as individuals and groups, to enter (Al-Madinah) to bid farewell to the Prophet ﷺ. Then, when the news of the meeting of the Ansar in the Saqeefah reached Abu Bakr and ‘Umar, regardless of the manner of how it reached them and what took place in terms of discussion with the informants from the Ansar, they decided to set off to the Saqeefah to prevent the occurrence of that which could have major negative consequences. That is whilst it did not occur to them that the matters would develop towards what happened. All of that was a **sudden** (or spontaneous) occurrence, which led to the slip of Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah , Al-Hubab bin Al-Mundhir and those from the Ansar who were on their side. There was no conspiracy nor stealthy infiltration behind the back of ‘Ali bin Abi Talib who was preoccupied (as they claim) with the preparation of the Prophet ﷺ.

- The part that concerns us here has come related from a Sahabi from the Ansar of Bani Zuraiq, with a Sahih Isnad of the highest level of authenticity, recorded in the Musannaf of Ibn Abi Shaibah (235 (14/569/38206):

[Abu Usamah related to us from Ibn ‘Awn, from Muhammad, from a man from Bani Zuraiq, who said: When that day happened Abu Bakr and ‘Umar set off until they came to the Ansar. Abu Bakr then said: “O assembly of the Ansar, verily we do not deny your right and no believer denies your right. And by Allah we have not attained good accept that you participated with us in it. **However, the Arabs will not be content and will not affirm except upon a man from Quraish because they are the purest of people in language, the best of the people in reputation, the best in homeland and most significant of the Arabs**. So hasten to ‘Umar to give him the Ba’iah (the pledge). He (the Ansari) said: They said: “No”. ‘Umar said: “Why?” “We fear that preference will be given (over merit)” ‘Umar said: “As long as I live then no” and he said: “Give the Bai’ah to Abu Bakr”. Abu Bakr then said to ‘Umar: “You are stronger than me” ‘Umar said: “You are better than me”. They said that a second time to each other. Then on the third time ‘Umar said to him: “Verily, my strength for you is by your favour”. He (the Ansari) said: Then they gave the Bai’ah to Abu Bakr”. Muhammad (in the chain of transmission) said: “At the time of the Bai’ah to Abu Bakr the people brought Abu Ubaidah bin Al-Jarrah (forward) and then he said: “Do you bring me whilst among you is the third of the three (meaning Abu Bakr)” Ibn ‘Awn asked: “Who is the third of the three?” He said: It refers of the statement of Allah: “The second of the two when they were in the cave” (At-Tawbah: 40)].

It is apparent from the wording of the narration that the Ansari from Bani Zuraiq was an eyewitness who was present at the Saqeefah and had memorised from the speech of Abiu Bakr details concerning the political status of the Quraish among the Arabs whilst others summarised what he said. This is therefore a corroboration for ‘Umar ibn Al-Khattab, Ibn ‘Abbas and Az-Zuhriy, even if these were not in need of any corroboration!

- There is another affirmation of the story, in summarised form, related by the Mother of Believers ‘Aa’ishah the daughter of Abu Bakr, who for certain did not attend the Saqeefah and as such its origin is inevitably her father, as recorded in Sahih Al-Bukhari (5/6/3667):

[Isma’eel bin Abdullah related to us from Sulaiman bin Bilal, from Hisham bin ‘Urwah, who said: ‘Urwah bin Az-Zubair informed me from ‘Aa’ishah, may Allah be pleased with her, the wife of the Prophet ﷺ: That the Messenger of Allah ﷺ passed away when Abu Bakr was in (the place of) As-Sunah (Isma’eel said it means Al-‘Aaliyah). ‘Umar stood and was saying: “By Allah the Messenger of Allah ﷺ has not died”. ‘Umar (later on) said: “By Allah! Nothing occurred to my mind (at that time) except that”. He said: “That Allah will resurrect him and he will cut the hands and legs of some men”. Then Abu Bakr came and uncovered the face of Allah's Messenger ﷺ, kissed him and said: “Let my mother and father be sacrificed for you, you are good in life and in death. By the One in whose hand is my soul, Allah will never make you taste the two deaths”. Then he went out and said: “O oath-taker! Don't be hasty”. When Abu Bakr spoke, ‘Umar sat down. Abu Bakr praised and glorified Allah and said: “Verily, whoever worshipped Muhammad ﷺ, then Muhammad has died, but whoever worshipped Allah, then Allah is ever living and does not die”. Then he recited Allah's Statement:

إِنَّكَ مَيِّتٌ وَإِنَّهُم مَّيِّتُونَ

**Verily, you are to die, and indeed, they are to die** (Az-Zumar: 30).

And he recited:

وَمَا مُحَمَّدٌ إِلَّا رَسُولٌ قَدْ خَلَتْ مِن قَبْلِهِ الرُّسُلُ ۚ أَفَإِن مَّاتَ أَوْ قُتِلَ انقَلَبْتُمْ عَلَىٰ أَعْقَابِكُمْ ۚ وَمَن يَنقَلِبْ عَلَىٰ عَقِبَيْهِ فَلَن يَضُرَّ اللَّهَ شَيْئًا ۗ وَسَيَجْزِي اللَّهُ الشَّاكِرِينَ

**Muhammad is not but a Messenger. [Other] Messengers have passed on before him. So, if he was to die or be killed, would you turn back on your heels [to unbelief]? And he who turns back on his heels will never harm Allah at all, but Allah will reward the grateful** (3.144).

He said: The people were crying. He said: The Ansar had assembled with Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah in the Saqeefah of Bani Sa’idah. They said (to the emigrants): “Let there be one Ameer (leader) from us and an Ameer from you”. Then Abu Bakr, Umar bin Al-Khattab and Abu ‘Ubaidah bin Al-Jarrah went to them. ‘Umar then went to speak but Abu Bakr silenced him. 'Umar later on used to say, "By Allah, I intended only to say something that I had prepared which appealed to me and I was afraid that Abu Bakr would not convey it”. Then Abu Bakr spoke and his speech was very eloquent (and far-reaching). He said in his speech: “We are the Umaraa’ (leaders/rulers) and you (Ansar) are the Wuzaraa’ (i.e. assistants)”. Hubab bin Al-Mundhir said: “No, by Allah we won't accept this. Rather, let there be a leader from us and a leader from you”. Abu Bakr said: “No, we will be the Umaraa’ (leaders/rulers) and you will be the Wuzaraa’ (assistants), as they (i.e. Quraish) are the best amongst the Arabs in terms of homeland and regard (origin and descent). So, give the Bai’ah (pledge) to either ‘Umar or Abu ‘Ubaidah bin Al-Jarrah”. ‘Umar said (to Abu Bakr), “Rather, we will give the Bai’ah (pledge) to you, for you are our chief, the best amongst us and the most beloved of all of us to Allah's Messenger ﷺ”. ‘Umar then took his hand and gave the pledge of allegiance to him and the people also gave the pledge of allegiance to Abu Bakr. Someone said: “You have killed Sa’d bin Ubadah”: ‘Umar said: “May Allah kill him”.

Abdullah bin Salim said relating from Az-Zubaidiy who said: Abdur Rahman bin Al-Qasim informed from Al-Qasim that ‘Aa’ishah, May Allah be pleased with her, said: The Prophet (on his death-bed) looked up and said thrice: “(Amongst) the Highest Companion”. She then related the Hadith: She said: “They did not deliver a speech except that Allah brought benefit by it. ‘Umar struck fear into the people and among them was hypocrisy, so Allah repelled them by that. Then Abu Bakr made the people seek the guidance and made them aware of the truth that was obliged upon them, so that they left reciting:

وَمَا مُحَمَّدٌ إِلَّا رَسُولٌ قَدْ خَلَتْ مِن قَبْلِهِ الرُّسُلُ ۚ أَفَإِن مَّاتَ أَوْ قُتِلَ انقَلَبْتُمْ عَلَىٰ أَعْقَابِكُمْ ۚ وَمَن يَنقَلِبْ عَلَىٰ عَقِبَيْهِ فَلَن يَضُرَّ اللَّهَ شَيْئًا ۗ وَسَيَجْزِي اللَّهُ الشَّاكِرِينَ

**Muhammad is not but a Messenger. [Other] Messengers have passed on before him. So, if he was to die or be killed, would you turn back on your heels [to unbelief]? And he who turns back on his heels will never harm Allah at all, but Allah will reward the grateful** (3.144)].

**I say**: Isma’eel bin Abdullah is Isma’eel bin Abdullah bin Abdullah bin Uwais bin Malik bin Abi ‘Aamir Al-Asbahiy, Abu Abdullah bin Abi Uwais Al-Madaniy (the nephew of Imam Malik). He is not that precise whilst his brother Abu Bakr Abdul Hamid bin Abdullah bin Abi Uwais is stronger and more reliable than him by grades (or levels).

- It has also been recorded in “At-Tabaqaat Al-Kubra” of Ibn Sa’d (2/268):

[Abu Bakr bin Abdullah bin Abi Uwais related to us from Sulaiman bin Bilal from Hisham bin ‘Urwah, from his father, from ‘Aa’ishah: “That the Prophet ﷺ died while Abu Bakr was in As-Sunah (a place). ‘Umar then arose and begin to say: By Allah, the Messenger of Allah ﷺ has not died!” She (‘Aa’ishah) said: ‘Umar (later) said: “By Allah, nothing other than that came to my mind and that Allah would raise him and he would cut the hands and feet of men”. Abu Bakr then came and uncovered the face of the Prophet ﷺ, kissed him and said: “May my father and mother be ransomed for you! You were good in life and death. By the One in whose hand is my soul Allah will not make you taste the two deaths ever!” He then went out and said: “O one who is make oaths, be at ease!” He did not say anything to Abu Bakr and ‘Umar sat. Abu Bakr then said Al-Hamdu Lillah and praised Allah with what is fitting. He then said: “Indeed, whoever was worshipping Muhammad then indeed Muhammad has died and whoever was worshipping Allah then Allah is ever living and does not die”. He then recited:

إِنَّكَ مَيِّتٌ وَإِنَّهُم مَّيِّتُونَ

**Verily, you are to die, and indeed, they are to die** (Az-Zumar: 30).

And he recited:

وَمَا مُحَمَّدٌ إِلَّا رَسُولٌ قَدْ خَلَتْ مِن قَبْلِهِ الرُّسُلُ ۚ أَفَإِن مَّاتَ أَوْ قُتِلَ انقَلَبْتُمْ عَلَىٰ أَعْقَابِكُمْ ۚ وَمَن يَنقَلِبْ عَلَىٰ عَقِبَيْهِ فَلَن يَضُرَّ اللَّهَ شَيْئًا ۗ وَسَيَجْزِي اللَّهُ الشَّاكِرِينَ

**Muhammad is not but a Messenger. [Other] Messengers have passed on before him. So, if he was to die or be killed, would you turn back on your heels [to unbelief]? And he who turns back on his heels will never harm Allah at all, but Allah will reward the grateful** (3.144).

The people then began to cry and the Ansar gathered to Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah in the Saqeefah (shelter or garden) of Bani Sa’idah. They (the Ansar) said: “Let there be an Ameer (leader) from us and an Ameer from you”. Then Abu Bakr, Umar bin Al-Khattab and Abu ‘Ubaidah bin Al-Jarrah went to them. ‘Umar then went to speak but Abu Bakr silenced him. 'Umar later on used to say, "By Allah, I intended only to say something that I had prepared which appealed to me and I was afraid that Abu Bakr would not convey it”. Then Abu Bakr spoke and his speech was very eloquent (and far-reaching). He said in his speech: “We are the Umaraa’ (leaders/rulers) and you (Ansar) are the Wuzaraa’ (i.e. assistants)”. Hubab bin Al-Mundhir said: “No, by Allah we won't ever accept this. Rather, let there be a leader from us and a leader from you”. Abu Bakr said: **“No, but rather we are the ‘Umaraa’ (leaders/rulers) and you will be the Wuzaraa’ (assistants), for they are the best amongst the Arabs in terms of homeland and regard (origin and descent)** (meaning the Quraish) So, give the Bai’ah (pledge) to either ‘Umar or Abu ‘Ubaidah bin Al-Jarrah”. ‘Umar said (to Abu Bakr), “Rather, we will give the Bai’ah (pledge) to you, for you are our chief, the best amongst us and the most beloved of all of us to Allah's Messenger ﷺ. ‘Umar then took his hand and gave the pledge of allegiance to him and the people also gave the pledge of allegiance to Abu Bakr. Someone said: “You have killed Sa’d bin Ubadah”: ‘Umar said: “May Allah kill him!”]. This narration is more entitled to be given precedence over the narration recorded by Al-Bukhari due to the status of Abdul Hamid.

The following is therefore everything said by Abu Bakr or a summary of what he said:

- **This matter (of leadership) will never be acknowledged except to this community of the Quraish as they are the best of the Arabs in terms of lineage and homeland**.

- **The Arabs have not acknowledged this matter (of leadership) except to this community of the Quraish as they are the best of the Arabs in terms of lineage and homeland**.

- **The Arabs have will never acknowledge this matter (of leadership) except to this community of the Quraish as they are the best of the Arabs in terms of lineage and homeland**.

- **The Arabs will never acknowledge this matter (i.e. leadership) except to this community of the Quraish as they are the best of the Arabs in terms of lineage and homeland**.

- **The Arabs will never acknowledge this matter (leadership) except to this community of the Quraish. They are the best of the Arabs in terms of homeland and lineage**.

- **The Arabs will not acknowledge this matter (leadership) except to this community of Quraish, they are the best of the Arabs in terms of homeland and lineage**.

- **The Arabs will never acknowledge this matter (leadership) except to this community of the Quraish. They are the best of the Arabs in terms of lineage and homeland**.

**- However, you are aware that this community from the Quraish are of a status among the Arabs which none other have and that the Arabs will not come together except upon a man from among them. Therefore, we are the Umaraa’ (leaders) and you are the Wuzaraa’ (assistants)**.

- **However, the Arabs will not be content and will not settle except upon a man from Quraish because they are the purest of people in language, the best of the people in reputation, the best in homeland and most significant of the Arabs** [Or in summary: **They are the best of Arabs in terms of homeland (Dar) and original Arab descent**].

This represents a purely political and interest based argumentation and does not include within it any Shar’iy condition (Shart) of being from Quraish for the contraction of the Bai’ah and validity of the Imamah (position of leadership), **where the Bai’ah would be prohibited to be given to other than someone from Quraish merely due to lineage or descent and doing so would be a Ma’siyah (sinful act of disobedience) to Allah**. **By greater reason, it is not possible for Al-Hashimiyah (to be a Hashemi) to be a condition for the validity of the contraction of the Bai’ah, where such a Bai’ah would be prohibited and become a sinful act of disobedience to Allah**. Rather, it only represented the Maslahah (interest) of Islam, the well-being of the Ummah and the state, which would never be accomplished unless the people are brought together and there would be no hope in bringing the Arabs together at that time, in that decisive historical moment, upon other than someone from Quraish.

It is very unlikely that the Hadith stating that “The A’immah (leaders) are from Quraish” had not reached anyone in attendance. If ‘Umar had been engaged in trading in the markets and consequently missed many Hadith, there is no doubt that Abu ‘Ubaidah was in the company of the Prophet ﷺ more than him. As for Abu Bakr then he was the closest friend to the Prophet ﷺ even prior to the Prophethood and there was barely a day in which he did not meet him in the morning or the evening. What about the large gathering of the Ansar: Is it conceivable that none from among them heard the report?! Or that they concealed it and especially in the case where Abu Bakr brought up the subject of being from Quraish, Al-Hubab bin Al-Mundhir made threats, an uproar took place and the signs of discord appeared, to the point that ‘Umar was compelled to give the Bai’ah to Abu Bakr in a sudden (or spontaneous) manner … However, Allah protected from its potential evil consequences.

We could therefore be sure that they or some of them had heard the Hadith and known for certain that:

1 - That it was purely a prophecy concerning the future and even in such a case it did not necessarily mean that “**All** the A’immah (leaders) would be from Quraish” but rather only refers to the overwhelming majority. Therefore, this would not be a condition for leadership until the Day of Judgement.

2 - Or it could only be informing about the reality at the time of the speech of the Prophet ﷺ, meaning that the leaders of the Arabs and their commanders **now** are from Quraish: “The best (Akhyaar) leaders for the best and the wicked or corrupt (Fujjaar) leaders for the corrupt” as has been stated in a group of Ahadeeth. “And that none will dispute (the authority) of their best (and they are Muhammad ﷺ and the forerunners of the Muhajirin) except that Allah will throw him on his face into the fire (as he would be opposing the Prophet ﷺ). This reality however went away and passed by with the passing of the Prophet ﷺ and as such it is mot a condition for leadership until the Day of Judgement and is not even an affirmed Prophecy.

Whatever the case, it did not however cross their mind, neither in a state of wakefulness or a disturbing nightmare, that it was not a mere Khabar (informative report) or that it stipulated a Hukm Shar’iy. There is therefore no wonder that they did not mention it. They only changed their mind due to being convinced of the soundness of the argument of Abu Bakr, their great concern for Islam and their giving preference to the interest (Maslahah) of the Muslims over their own prosperity. That is where they were as Allah تعالى said:

وَالَّذِينَ تَبَوَّءُوا الدَّارَ وَالْإِيمَانَ مِن قَبْلِهِمْ يُحِبُّونَ مَنْ هَاجَرَ إِلَيْهِمْ وَلَا يَجِدُونَ فِي صُدُورِهِمْ حَاجَةً مِّمَّا أُوتُوا وَيُؤْثِرُونَ عَلَىٰ أَنفُسِهِمْ وَلَوْ كَانَ بِهِمْ خَصَاصَةٌ ۚ وَمَن يُوقَ شُحَّ نَفْسِهِ فَأُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الْمُفْلِحُونَ

**And those who, before them, had homes (in Al-Madinah) and had adopted the Faith, love those who emigrate to them, and have no jealousy in their breasts for that which they have been given, and give them (emigrants) preference over themselves, even though they were in need of that. And whosoever is saved from his own covetousness, such are those who will be the successful** (Al-Hashr: 9).

Therefore, by Allah whom there is no Ilah other than Him, Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah not qualified for leadership as compared to Abu Bakr (due to its conditions). Consequently, there is similarly no validity to what Imam Abu Muhammad ‘Ali bin Hazm said in respect to this issue. That is where it was stated in “Usool ul-Ahkam” by Ibn Hazm (7/127): [The difference of those who differed with the Khilafah of Abu Bakr was only due to being forgetful of the text. As for the Ansar, **when they remembered after having previously forgotten** to the point where one of them said “From us an Ameer (leader) and from you an Ameer” and some of them requested that they take turns (i.e. in leadership). The clear evidence (Burhan) for our opinion is that ‘Ubadah bin As-Samit Al-Ansari related from the Messenger of Allah ﷺ that the Ansar gave him (the Prophet ﷺ the Bai’ah) upon the basis that they would not dispute the authority of its people and that Anas bin Malik Al-Ansari related from the Messenger of Allah ﷺ that the A’immah (leaders of rulers) are from the Quraish. Due to **that and what is similar to that**, the Ansar changed their position and had it not been for that they would not have changed their view to follow that of other than them. May Allah’s refuge be sought from the view that the opinion of the Muhajirin is more entitled or worthy to be followed than the opinion of the Ansar. Rather, they are equal in terms of examination and conducting affairs amongst themselves and all of them are of such virtue and precedence]. This represents a slight error because he attributed the change of position of the Ansar to a number of matters including the narration of Anas of the Hadith: “The A’immah (leaders or rulers) are from the Quraish”. If he had revised the Hadith of the Saqeefah he would have known that the Hadith (of Anas) was not mentioned at all during it. **It may be that the Imam Abu Muhammad bin ‘Ali bin Hazm himself forgot the Hadith of Al-Bukhari (**concerning the Saqeefah**)**. Therefore, Glorified be He who:

لَا إِلَٰهَ إِلَّا هُوَ الْحَيُّ الْقَيُّومُ ۚ لَا تَأْخُذُهُ سِنَةٌ وَلَا نَوْمٌ ۚ لَّهُ مَا فِي السَّمَاوَاتِ وَمَا فِي الْأَرْضِ ۗ مَن ذَا الَّذِي يَشْفَعُ عِندَهُ إِلَّا بِإِذْنِهِ ۚ يَعْلَمُ مَا بَيْنَ أَيْدِيهِمْ وَمَا خَلْفَهُمْ ۖ وَلَا يُحِيطُونَ بِشَيْءٍ مِّنْ عِلْمِهِ إِلَّا بِمَا شَاءَ ۚ وَسِعَ كُرْسِيُّهُ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضَ ۖ وَلَا يَئُودُهُ حِفْظُهُمَا ۚ وَهُوَ الْعَلِيُّ الْعَظِيمُ

**La Ilaha Illa Huwa (none has the right to be worshipped but He), the Ever Living, the One Who sustains and protects all that exists. Neither slumber, nor sleep overtake Him. To Him belongs whatever is in the heavens and whatever is on earth. Who is he that can intercede with Him except with His Permission? He knows what happens to them (His creatures) in this world, and what will happen to them in the Hereafter. And they will never compass anything of His Knowledge except that which He wills. His Kursi extends over the heavens and the earth, and He feels no fatigue in guarding and preserving them. And He is the Most High, the Most Great** [Ayat ul-Kursiy Al-Baqarah:255].

In addition, when ‘Umar gave his speech at the top of his voice ten years after that, no one corrected him to rectify his act by reminding him of the Hadith. That is whilst such a reminder, correction or objection occurred in many places which were much less significant and serious.

It is also odd that Al-Hafizh (Ibn Hajar), even though he was alert to the Hadith of the “A’immah (leaders) being from Quraish” not having been mentioned in origin within the report recorded by Al-Bukhari concerning the incident of the Saqeefah, in contrast to what the majority claimed, he nevertheless made a hideous slip when he claimed that it came mentioned “**by its meaning**”. That is as the following was stated in Fat’h ul-Baariy by Ibn Hajar (7/32): [Ibn At-Teen said: The Ansar only said from us an Ameer (leader) and from you an Ameer upon the basis of what they knew from the custom of the Arabs in terms of no-one became the leader of a tribe apart from someone from that tribe. Then when they heard “The A’immah (leaders) are from Quraish” they gave up their position and submitted to it. I say: Concerning the Hadith related to the leaders being from Quraish, then the mention of who recorded it with this wording shall be mentioned in the Kitab (Book) of Al-Ahkam, **whilst it (the Hadith) did not come up in this story except by its meaning**].

Yes, by its meaning only if we were to interpret the Ahadeeth with the meaning: The A’immah (leaders) of the Arabs whilst their leaders **now** are Quraish: The best as leaders for the best and the corrupt leaders for the corrupt, and no one disputes their best (who are Muhammad ﷺ and the early forerunners of the Muhajirin) except that Allah will throw him upon his face into the fire (because he is opposing the Prophet ﷺ). Consequently, this does not represent a condition for the Imamah (leadership) until the establishment of the Last Hour and it is not even representative of an affirmed prophecy (Nubu’ah Sadiqah).

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

**- Section: Other narrations concerning the grounds of the Bai’ah (pledge of allegiance) of Abu Bakr, his public Bai’ah and his first public speech:**

There are Sahih and Hasan narrations concerning the Bai’ah of Abu Bakr which agree with and affirm the main Hadith of the Saqeefah. Among them is the story of Rafi’ bin Abi Rafi’ At-Ta’iy:

- It came mentioned in the Musnad of Imam Ahmad (1/215/42) as follows with a Sahih Isnad (chain of transmission):

[‘Ali bin ‘Ayyash related to us from Al-Walid bin Muslim, from Yazid bin Sa’id bin Dhi ‘Aswan Al-‘Ansiy, from Abdul Malik bin ‘Umair Al-Lakhmiy, from Rafi’ At-Ta’iy, the companion of Au Bakr in the Ghazwah of Sulasil. He said: I asked him about what was said from their Bai’ah (pledge of obedience). He said whilst speaking about what the Ansar said, what he said to them and what ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab said to the Ansar, and what he reminded them of in terms of him saying **my Imamah (leadership) to them was by the command of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ during his sickness, so they gave me the Bai’ah due to that** and I accepted it from them. I feared that there would be Fitnah (discord) and after that Riddah (apostasy)]. This exact same narration is also found in the Ahadeeth Al-Mukhtaaah [Extracted from the Mukhtarah (selected) Ahadeeth which were not recorded by Al-Bukhari and Muslim in their Sahih collections) (1/134/47): Al-Mubarak bin Abi Al-Ma’aaliy related to us in Baghdad that Habatullah bin Muhammad informed them a reading of it from Al-Hasan bin ‘Ali, from Ahmad bin Ja’far, from Abdullah bin Ahmad who said: My father related exactly the same to me].

- It is recorded also in the book “Al-Lataa’if Min ‘Uloom Al-Ma’aarif” (3/7) with the following wording:

[Abu Al-Fat’h Isma’eel bin Al-Fadl As-Sarraj related to us from Abu Tahir bin Abdur Rahim, from ‘Ali bin ‘Umar Al-Hafizh, from Abu Muhammad Al-Hasan bin Ahmad bin Sa’id Ar-Ruhaawiy, from Al-‘Abbas bin ‘Ubaidullah bin Yahya, from Abu Muhammad Anas bin Abi Unaisah Ar-Ruhaawiy, from Al-Walid bin Muslim, from Yazid bin Sa’id bin Dhi ‘Asawan, from Abdul Malik bin ‘Umair, from Rafi’ bin ‘Amr At-Ta’iy from Abu Bakr As-Siddeq, may Allah be pleased with him, That: ‘Umar said to the Ansar on the day of the Saqeefah: “Do you know that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ commanded Abu Bakr to lead the people in prayer?” They answered: “Yes”. He said: “So which of you is content in himself to lead Abu Bakr?!” They said: “None of us”. He then said: (He related it from Yazid, other than Al-Walid as well”. He means by that the chain is secured (or safe) from Tadlis (manipulation of the chain) by Al-Walid bin Muslim.

- It has also been mentioned in “Tareekh Dimashq” of Ibn ‘Asakir (30/299) with a more complete wording:

[Abu Al-Hasan ‘Ali bin Muslim Al-Faradiy related to us from Abu Al-Qasim bin Abi Al-‘Alaa, from Abu Muhammad bin Abi Nasr, from Al-Qasim bin Abi Al-‘Aqib, from Abu Abdul Malik Ahmad bin Ibrahim Al-Qurashiy, from Muhammad bin ‘Aa’idh from Al-Walid bin Muslim, from Yazid bin Sa’id bin Dhi ‘Asawan, from Abdul Malik bin ‘Umair or other than him, from Rafi’ At-Ta’iy, that he asked Abu Bakr concerning his acceptance of their Bai’ah on that day whilst he had (previously) made an oath (or promise) not to take leadership over two people. He said: “When we came to the Ansar I spoke and I said: “O assembly of the Ansar! If you view that you should not precede the Muhajirin in a matter, (then know that) Allah has brought Islam together through you and given in honour by you. So, don’t let the division of its people be by your hands”. ‘Umar spoke and said: “O assembly of the Ansar! Do you know that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ commanded Abu Bakr to lead you in the Salah (prayer) during his sickness?!” They said: “Yes!” He said: “So, who from among you dares to be advanced before him?!” They said: “None of us”. He (the narrator) said: Then Sa’d said: “Then give him the Bai’ah, if we have given him the Bai’ah!” ‘Umar said: “Yes”. He then took their oath (or promise) that if he was to give Bai’ah to him, that they would give the Bai’ah to him. ‘Umar then struck the hand of Abu Bakr and the Ansar gave the Bai’ah upon the Khalifah being from us and that from them would be the Wuzaraa’ (assistants). Therefore, I accepted that due to the fear of division in Islam”].

**I say**: Concerning the statement attributed to Sa’d: “Then give him the Bai’ah, if we have given him the Bai’ah!”, it is vague or unclear in meaning and I believe it most likely that some distortion has taken place or a summarisation in the transmission, and that the intended meaning was a challenge with the meaning: You cannot give him the Bai’ah until we give him the Bai’ah … or something similar to that. This part “Then Sa’d said: “Then give him the Bai’ah, if we have given him the Bai’ah!” ‘Umar said: “Yes”. He then took their oath (or promise) that if he was to give Bai’ah to him, that they would give the Bai’ah to him” has been a perplexing issue for most of the narrators. They did not understand it and consequently omitted it.

- The report came mentioned from a nice angle in “Tareekh Dimashq” of Ibn ‘Asakir (30/300) via another path:

[Abu Al-Qasim Habatullah bin Abdullah bin Ahmad related to us from Abu Bakr Al-Khateeb, from ‘Ali bin Al-Qasim bin Al-Husain (who was a witness in Basra), from ‘Ali bin Ishaq Al-Madara’iy, from Al-‘Abbas bin Muhammad Ad-Dawriy, from Ahmad bin Abdullah bin Yunus, from Fudail bin ‘Iyaad, from Al-A’amash, from Sulaiman bin Maseerah, from Tariq bin Shihab, from Rafi’ bin Abi Rafi’, who said: I used to a man who was covetous over the people. I used to bury water in ostrich nests and draw from it until it was demanded for the uncultivated land and then I would release it. At the time of the Ghazwah (military expedition) of Dhata As-Salasil, the Messenger of Allah ﷺ dispatched an army and appointed ‘Amr bin Al-‘Aas over it (as its commander). The people of Ash-Sham were proud of it. The army included Abu Bakr As-Siddeeq. He ﷺ commanded them to call the Muslims they came across to join the army. They passed by us in our homes and called us to join. I said: “By Allah, I will choose a man to be in his company”. So, I accompanied Abu Bakr. He (Rafi’) said: He wore a Fadakiy garment. When he rode, he would peg it and when he set down, we would all clothe ourselves with it. It was due to this that Hawazin derided him when they said: “Is it to the possessor of the pegs that we should give the pledge of allegiance to after the Messenger of Allah ﷺ?!”. He (Rafi’) said: We completed the military expedition and I hoped for something so I asked Abu Bakr saying: “I have accompanied you and I have a right due from you and so, I would like you to give me some advice. That is because I cannot always come to Al-Madinah”. He said: I had wanted to do that even if he had not said it: “Worship Allah, do not associate any partner with him, establish the Salah, give the Zakah, make Hajj to the House, fast Ramadan and do not become the Ameer (leader) over two men!”. I said: “Concerning that I worship Allah, establish the Salah, give the Zakah, make Hajj of the House, fast Ramadan, I understand. However, I don’t understand the statement “Do not take leadership over two men: That is by Allah, people do not attain goodness and honour in the Dunya (life of this world) except by leadership?!” He said: “You asked me for my endeavour (i.e. best advice) and I provided it for you: Verily, the people entered into Islam willingly or unwillingly. **They are the protected and charges of Allah and in the protection (Dhimmah) of Allah. So, whoever wrongs (or oppresses) anyone from the, he has violated the Dhimmah (protection) of Allah**. If the sheep of his neighbour or camel of his neighbour one of you would extend his muscles to his neighbour and Allah would be his neighbour from behind him”. Then when the Prophet ﷺ passed away and Abu Bakr became the leader after him. He said: I said (to myself): “This is my companion who said to me what he said (i.e. concerning leadership). I will certainly go to him!” So, I arrived in Al-Madinah and sought him out in privacy until I approached him. He (Rafi’) said: So, I greeted him with Salam (peace) and acquainted myself with him and he with I. I then said to him: “Do you remember a matter that you once said to me?” He asked: “What was it?” He (Rafi’) said: I said: “Your statement: And do not become the Ameer (leader) over two men!?” He said: “Yes, indeed I do. However, the people were only just out of the time of disbelief and I feared for them. My companions kept at me until they placed it (i.e. the leadership) over me, against my liking!”. He (Rafi’) said: **By Allah, he did not stop apologising to me until I pardoned him**”].

- Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal recorded the following in his Musnad (1/21/133) with a Hasan Isnad:

[Mu’awiyah bn ‘Amr related to us from Za’idah, from ‘Asim, from Zirr, from Abdullah – Also, from Husain bin ‘Ali, from Za’idah, from ‘Asim, from Zirr, from Abdullah, who said: When the Messenger of Allah ﷺ passed away the Ansar said: “From us and Ameer (leader) and from you and Ameer”. ‘Umar, may Allah be pleased with him, then went to them and said: “O assembly of the Ansar, do you not know that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ commanded Abu Bakr, may Allah be pleased with him, to lead the people (in prayer), so who from among you feels content in himself to be placed before Abu Bakr, may Allah be pleased with him?”. The Ansar said: “We seek refuge in Allah from putting ourselves before Abu Bakr, may Allah be pleased with him”].

Imam Abdullah bin Hanbal recorded it in “Fada’il As-Sahabah” (1/182/190), An-Nasa’iy in his Sunan (2/75/777), Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal in his Musnad (1/396/3765) and (1/405/3842), An-Nasa’iy in his Sunan Al-Kubra (1/279/853), Al-Baihaqiy in his Sunan Al-Kubra (8/152/16363), Imam Abu Bakr bin Abi Shaibah in his Musannaf (2/118/7165) and (7/432/37044) and others besides them. Imam Al-Hakim recorded it is his Mustadarak (3/70/4423) and said: [This Hadith is Hasan Sahih in its Isnad but they (Al-Bukhari and Muslim) did not record it].

- It is recorded in “Ansaab Al-Ashraaf” of Al-Baladhuri (1/580/1175) as follows:

[‘Amr bin Muhammad An-Naaqid related to me from Al-Husain Al-Ju’fiy, from Za’idah, from ‘Asim bin Bahdalah, from Zirr bin Hubaish, from Abdullah bin Mas’ud, that he said: When the Messenger of Allah ﷺ passed away, the Ansar said: “From us an Ameer (leader) and from you and Ameer”. He (Ibn Mas’ud) said: Then ‘Umar went to them and said: “O assembly of the Ansar, do you not know that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ commanded Abu Bakr to lead the people in prayer?” They said: “Indeed, yes (we are aware)”. He said: “So, who from among you feels content in himself to be placed before Abu Bakr after that?” They said: “We seek refuge in Allah that we place ourselves before Abu Bakr”].

- Imam An-Nasa’iy recorded it in his Sunan Al-Kubra (5/37/8109) with a Jayyid (good) Isnad:

[Qutaibah bin Sa’id related to us from Humaid bin Abdur Rahman, from Salamah bin Nubait, from Salim bin ‘Ubaid (He said: He was from the people of As-Suffah), who said: The Ansar said: “From us an Ameer and from you an Ameer”. ‘Umar said: “Two swords in one scabbard do not work”. He then took the hand of Abu Bakr and said: “Who possesses these three: ‘When he says to his companion’ who is his companion? ‘When they were both in the cave’, who are they both? ‘Verily Allah is with us’, who is He with?” He (‘Umar) then gave him the Bai’ah (pledge of allegiance over leadership). He then said: “Give him the Bai’ah” and then the people gave him the best and most beautiful Bai’ah].

Imam An-Nasa’iy recorded it in his Sunan Al-Kubra (6/355/11219) in summarized form as follows:

[Nasr bin ‘Ali related to us from Abd bin Dawud: Salamah bin Nubait said Nuaim bin Abi Hind related to us from Nubait bin Shareet, from Salim bin Ubaidullah: That when the Messenger of Allah ﷺ passed away, the Ansar said: “From us an Ameer (leader) and from you and Ameer”. ‘Umar then said: “Who possesses the like of these three (qualities): ‘When they were both in the cave’, who were they both? ‘When he said to his companion’, who is he (being referred to)? ‘Don’t grieve for verily Allah is with us’, who are they both?” He then extended his hand and the people gave him a good and beautiful Bai’ah (pledge of allegiance over leadership)].

- It also came recorded in Musnad Ash-Shamiyeen of At-Tabarani (4/155/2988) via the most Sahih chains (Asanid) of the Dunyaa:

[Abu Zur’ah related to us from Abu Al-Yaman, from Shu’aib. (And) Abdur Rahman bin Jabir related to us from Bishr bin Shu’aib bin Abi Hamzah, from his father, from Az-Zuhriy, from Anas bin Malik, that he heard the latter Khutbah (speech) of ‘Umar when Abu Bakr sat upon the Minbar (pulpit) of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. That was the day after the Messenger of Allah ﷺ passed away. ‘Umar said the Tashahhud (Bearing testimony to their being no deity worthy of worship other than Allah and that Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah) and Abu Bakr remained silent. He then said: “Thereafter, indeed I said something to you yesterday whilst the matter was not like I said. By Allah, I did not find what I said in the Book of Allah nor in the covenant that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ assigned to me. However, I had hoped that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ lived until he be the last living from among us. Consequently, if Muhammad has indeed died, then Allah has placed among you a light that you are guided by just as Allah guided Muhammad ﷺ by it. So hold fast to it and be guided just as Allah guided Muhammad ﷺ by it”. He then mentioned Abu Bakr and said: “Verily, Abu Bakr is the companion of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ and the second of the two. He has the most right among the Muslims for his matter (i.e. to be the Khalifah (successor) of the Messenger ﷺ. Therefore, arise and pledge allegiance to him”].

- It also came reported in Musnad Ash-Shamiyeen of At-Tabarani (3/9/1699):

[Wathilah bin Al-Hasan Al-‘Irqiy related to us from Kathir bin Ubaid Al-Hadh’dha’, from Baqiyah, from Muhammad bin Al-Walid Az-Zubaidiy, from Az-Zuhriy, from Anas bin Malik: That he heard the latter Khutbah (speech) of ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab … He then relates the Hadith like the Hadith of Shu’aib and added: A group from among them had already given him the Bai’ah (pledge of allegiance upon leadership) prior to that in the Saqeefah of Bani Sa’idah, whilst the public Bai’ah was upon the Minbar (pulpit].

- It was similarly recorded in Tareekh ul-Islam (Version: Tadmuriy 3/12) with an Isnad of the utmost authenticity: [Al-Walid bin Muslim said: Muhammad bin Harb related to me from Az-Zubaidiy, from Az-Zuhriy from Anas … the same Hadith].

- Al-Bukhari recorded it in his Sahih (6/2639/6793):

Ibrahim bin Musa related to us from Hisham, from Ma’mar, from Az-Zuhriy, from Anas bin Malik, may Allah be pleased with him: That he heard the latter Khutbah (speech) of ‘Umar … He then related similar to the Hadith as Az-Zubaidiy with the addition: Az-Zuhriy said from Anas bin Malik: I heard ‘Umar saying to Abu Bakr on that day. Rise to the Minbar (pulpit) **as he remained on it** until he ascended the Minbar and then the people on mass gave him the Bai’ah”].

- Imam Abdur Razzaq As-San’aniy recorded it in his Musannaf (5/437/9756): [Ma’mar related to us from Az-Zuhriy who said: Anas bin Malik informed me similar to the Hadith of Al-Bukhari except that he said: Az-Zuhriy said Anas informed me: He said: **“I saw ‘Umar driving Abu Bakr to the Minbar”**].

The Hadith has other paths recorded by Al-Bukhari and others which are similar in what has been stated. However, Ibn Ishaq recorded like it but also added the first Khutbah of Abu Bakr:

- It came recorded in the Seerah of Ibn Hisham [Version: As-Saqaa (2/660)] with a Sahih Isnad:

[Ibn Ishaq said: Az-Zuhriy related to me from Anas bin Malik who said: “The day after Abu Bakr was given the Bai’ah (pledge) in the Saqeefah Abu Bakr sat upon the Minbar (pulpit). ‘Umar then stood and spoke before Abu Bakr. He said Al-Hamdu Lillah and praised Allah with what is fitting. He then said: “O People, yesterday I said something to you that I have not found in the Book of Allah and it was not a covenant that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ assigned to me. Rather, I used to view that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ would take care of our affair and be the last of us. Indeed, Allah has kept among you His Book through which Allah guided His Messenger ﷺ. If you hold fast to it Allah will guide you to that which He guided him to. Allah has gathered your affair upon the best of you, the companion of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, the second of the two when they were in the cave. So, arise and give him the Bai’ah (pledge)”. The people then gave Abu Bakr a public Bai’ah following the Bai’ah that had preceded in the Saqeefah. Abu Bakr then spoke. He said Al-Hamdu Lillah and praised Allah with what is fitting. He then said: “Thereafter, O people, I have been appointed as the ruler over you whilst I am not the best of you. If I act well, then assist me and if I act badly, then rectify me. Sidq (truthfulness) is an Amanah (trust) and lying is betrayal. The weak among you is strong in my sight until I provide him with his right, if Allah wills and the strong among you is weak in my sight until I take the right from him, if Allah wills. A people do not abandon Jihad in the way of Allah except that Allah strikes them with humiliation (or disgrace) and an evil immoral act (Fahishah) does not spread among a people at all except that Allah will cover them with tribulation. Obey me as long as I have obeyed Allah and His Messenger. If I have disobeyed Allah and His Messenger, then there is no obedience to me obliged upon you. Stand for the prayer, may Allah have mercy upon you”]. It is also in the History of At-Tabari “Tareekh Ar-Rusul Wa l-Mulook, Wa Silah Tareekh At-Tabari” (3/210)]: [Ibn Humaid related it to us from Salamah, from Muhammad bin Ishaq].

- The Khutbah (speech) of Abu Bakr came recorded by itself in “Al-Amwal” of Al-Qasim bin As-Salam (12/8):

[‘Ali bin Hashim bin Al-Barid bin ‘Urwah related to me from his father. He said: Abu Bakr, may Allah be pleased with him, gave a speech. He said Al-Hamdu Lillah and praised Allah with what is fitting. He then said: “Thereafter, I have been appointed as the ruler over your affair whilst I am not the best of you. However, the Qur’an descended and the Sunnah of the Prophet ﷺ was set. He taught us and we became aware. And know O people that the most intelligent intelligence in the guidance (or he said: Fear and consciousness of Allah. Abu ‘Ubaid was unsure. He said that he finds fear and consciousness of Allah to be most preponderant) … And that the weakest or most impotent of impotence is Al-Fujoor (corruption and indecency). And that the strongest from among you is weak in my sight until I have taken his right and the weakest from among you is strong in my sight until I have given him his right. O people, I am only a follower whilst I am not an innovator. If I have acted well, then assist me, and if I have strayed, rectify me. I say this statement of mine and I seek Allah’s forgiveness for me and you all].

It has been recorded exactly like this in “Al-Khutub Wa l-Mawaa’izh” by Abu ‘Ubaid (186/119). You will also find it via Abu ‘Ubaid in “Majlis Yaum ul-Jumua’ah” (9/8) and in “At-Tabaqaat Al-Kubra” [Edition: Al-‘Ilmiyah (3/136)] and [Edition: Dar Sadir: (3/182)] as follows:

[Ubaidullah bin Musa related to us from Hisham bin ‘Urwah. Ubaidullah said: I believe that he related it from his father. And he said: “Fear or consciousness of Allah”].

It was recorded also via Ibn Sa’d in “Al-Muntazhim Fee Tareekh Al-Mulook Wa l-Umam” (4/68-69), in “Ansaab ul-Ashraaf” of Al-Baladhuri (1/590/1195) and in “Tareekh Dimashq” of Ibn ‘Asakir (30/301) via ‘Abdah from Hisham, among others.

- The following came stated in “Al-Amwaal” of Al-Qasim bin Salam (12/9):

[‘Ali bin Hashim (meaning Ibn ul-Barid) related to us from Isma’eel bin Abi Khalid, from Qais bin Abi Hazim (or other than him) from Abu Bakr … similar to that (i.e. the Hadith of his speech). It is also mentioned exactly as it is in “Al-Khutub Wa l-Mawaa’izh” of Abu ‘Ubaid (187/120). The first Isnad of Abu Ubaid Al-Qasim is Mursal of the highest quality whilst the second is Muttasil (continuous in chain) Sahih. The Khabar (reported tradition) is therefore of the highest level of authenticity and especially alongside the corroborations and supportive evidences that we have presented in our book “Muhaasabat ul-Hukkaam” (Accounting the Rulers) and they can be revised there.

- Imam Abdullah bin Ahmad bin Hanbal recorded in “Fadaa’il As-Sahabah” (1/162/147) with a Sahih Isnad to its end although it is Mursal:

[Ahmad bin Muhammad bin Ayub related to us from Abu Bakr (meaning bin ‘Ayyash), from ‘Amr bin Maymun, from his father: That ‘Umar said to Abu Bakr: “Extend your hand for us to give you the Bai’ah (pledge)”. He said: “Why would you give me the Bai’ah, as by Allah I am not the one with the most Taqwaa (piety) from among you and I am not the strongest of you. The one with the most Taqwaa from us is Salim (meaning the Mawla of Abu Hudhaifah) and the strongest of us is ‘Umar”. “Extend your hand: “When they (Muhammad SAW and Abu Bakr) were in the cave, and he ﷺ said to his companion (Abu Bakr): Be not sad (or afraid), surely Allah is with us” (i.e. Referring to At-Taubah: 40). He said: They then gave him the Bai’ah and allocated for him two thousand Dirham. He said: “Increase this amount for me as you have prevented me from trading whilst I have dependents”. So, they increased the amount by 500 Dirham and allocated for him a sheep every day which he would feed the Muslims with. He said: “Give my family its head and its trotters (feet)” and so they did].

- Indeed, it has been reported that he sought from the people to be released from his position following ‘Ali bin Abi Talib’s Bai’ah to him, however they refused this from him. This is what came mentioned in “Fadaa’il As-Sahabah” (1/133/103): [My father related to me from Taleed bin Sulaiman from Abu Al-Jahhaf]. He also said in “Fadaa’il As-Sahabah” (1/151/133): [Ahmad bin Abdul Jabbar related to us from Muhammad bin ‘Abbad Sandula, from Taleed bin Sulaiman, from Abu Al-Jahhaf Dawud bin Abi ‘Awf] and again in “Fadaa’il As-Sahabah” (1/132/101): [Abdullah bin ‘Umar Abu Abdur Rahman Al-Qurashiy related to me from ‘Ali bin Hashim bin Al-Bared, from his father, from Abu Al-Jahhaf, that he said: When Abu Bakr was given the Bai’ah (pledge), then ‘Ali and his companions gave him the Bai’ah, he arose three times asking the people to be released from the duty of leadership, saying: “O people, I have rescinded your Bai’ah, is there anyone who dislikes (or objects)?” ‘Ali stood in the front of the people saying: “By Allah, we will not depose you and you will not seek to be deposed ever. The Messenger of Allah put you forward to lead the people in the prayer, so who then can put you back?!]. This is a strong (Qawwiy) Mursal narration and there is no issue (Ba’s) with it.

**I say**: What has been presented is sufficient, by Allah’s will, for any seeker of the truth. There is no mention at all here or there (anywhere) of the condition of being from Quraish. All that was mentioned was: His companionship in the cave and his leadership over the prayer in the Prophet’s Masjid which none except the Prophet ﷺ led the prayer in, in his capacity as the head of state and ruler of Al-Madinah, or the one whom the Prophet ﷺ deputised over Al-Madinah with that description of being a ruler. It wasn’t because he was the most knowledgeable of the Book of Allah as the most knowledgeable were Ubay bin Ka’b, ‘Ali bin Abi Talib and a group from the Ansar, and possibly Abdullah bin Mas’ud, may Allah be pleased with them all, without rival.

There is also no room here for the statement of the Prophet ﷺ: **“Whoever I am his Mawla (friend/supporter), then ‘Ali is his Mawla. O Allah, take as a friend whoever has befriended him and take as enemy whoever has taken him as an enemy”**. That is because there is no relationship between the Wilayah here with the Khilafah and leadership as the people of foolishness from the deluded have imagined. Rather, the Wilayah here is referring to another matter, as is detailed in its context. For that reason, no one mentioned it or used it as an evidential argument, not even the Imam of guidance ‘Ali bin Abi Talib, as will be addressed later.

In addition, Abu Bakr did not seek the leadership night or day. It was ‘Umar that pressured him to the Minbar and he only accepted it due to fear of Fitnah. It was a sudden (or spontaneous) occurrence through which Allah protected from its (potential) evil consequences, just as it appears that he wanted to rescind the post.

In addition, there is no clear or unclear text indicating that Abu Bakr, may Allah be pleased with him, had the right to the Khilafah as has been claimed by the foolish fanatics of those claiming adherents of the Sunnah and the Hadith. Just as there is no clear or unclear text indicating to ‘Ali’s right to the Khilafah. No one from the hundreds if not in excess of one thousand who attended the Saqeefah understood the statement of their Prophet ﷺ “**Whoever I am his Mawla (friend/supporter), then ‘Ali is his Mawla. O Allah, take as a friend whoever has befriended him and take as enemy whoever has taken him as an enemy**”, whilst all or the majority of them had heard it on the day of “**Ghadeer Khumm**” (which has reached us by way of a Tawatur which would remove someone from his mind before removing him from Islam through denial of its occurrence), understood that it meant the appointment of ‘Ali bin Abi Talib as the Khalifah of the Prophet ﷺ in respect to being head of state. Even the small number of the Ansar from whom it has been related (in a singular irregular report) that they said: “We will not give the Bai’ah (pledge) except to ‘Ali” did not present as evidence the narration of “**Ghadeer Khumm**”. Therefore, there was no conspiracy against ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, as the feeble-minded Saba’iyah (excessive Shi’ah group from the lineage of Abdullah bin Saba’a) Rawaafid or the foolish malicious orientalists have claimed.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

**- Section: The stance of Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah, may Allah be pleased with him:**

- The following came recorded in “At-Tabaqaat Al-Kubra” [Edition: Al-‘Ilmiyah (3/463)]:

[Muhammad bin ‘Umar related to. He said: Muhammad bin Salih related to me from Az-Zubair bin Al-Mundhir bin Abi Usaid As-Sa’idiy: That Abu Bakr sent for Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah (saying): “Come and give the Bai’ah as the people have given the Bai’ah and your people have given the Bai’ah”. He replied: “No, by Allah. I will not give the Bai’ah until I shoot you with what my quiver (full of arrows) contains and I fight you with those who follow me from my people and clan”. When the news reached Abu Bakr, Bashir bin Sa’d said: “O Khalifah of the Messenger of Allah, he has stubbornly refused and he will not give you the Bai’ah (pledge) even if he is killed. He will not be killed and the Khazraj will not fight even if the Aws are killed. Therefore, leave him be as the matter has been settled for you. He cannot harm you. He is but a man by himself as long as he is left”. Abu Bakr accepted the advice of Bashir and consequently left Sa’d. Then (later) when ‘Umar was the leader he met Sa’d upon the path of Al-Madinah and said: “Hello, O Sa’d” and Sa’d said: “Hello, O ‘Umar”. Umar said: “You are the companion of what you are not a companion of?” Sa’d said: “Yes, I am that and this matter (i.e. the leadership) has now arrived to you. Your companion, by Allah was more beloved to us than you and I have come to dislike your proximity”. ‘Umar said: “The one who dislikes his neighbour’s proximity turns away from him”. Sa’d said: “As for me, I am not seeking to delay that and I am turning to a proximity of someone better than you”. He (the narrator) said: It was not long after that he emigrated to Ash-Sham (Greater Syria) at the start of the period of the Khilafah of ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab and he then (later) died in Hawran].

It has been related in “Tareekh Dimashq” of Ibn ‘Asakir (20/265): [I received from Abu Ghalib bin Al-Banaa, from Abu Ishaq Al-Barmakiy, from Abu ‘Umar Bin Hayyawiyah, from his uncle, may Allah’s mercy be upon him, a worded version. Abu Talib bin Yusuf related it to us from Abu Muhammad Al-Jawhariy (through a reading), from Abu ‘Umar bin Hayyawiyah, from Al-Hasan Ahmad bin Ma’roof, from Al-Husain bin Al-Fahm, from Muhammad bin Sa’d, from Muhammad bin ‘Umar Al-Aslamiy].

Even if this (Isnad) appears to be Munqati’ (interrupted) it is not. That is because Az-Zubair bin Al-Mundhir bin Abi Usaid As-Sa’idiy did not relate except from his father from his grandfather. Az-Zubair has related few Hadith, of good repute and there is no Ba’s (problem or issue) with him, by Allah’s will, whilst Al-Bukhari has recorded from him in a connected (Maqroon) manner. His father, Al-Mundhir is Thiqah (trustworthy and reliable), from the senior Tabi’een (generation following the Sahabah) and was born during the lifetime of the Prophet ﷺ. The Prophet ﷺ was asked to sit in his living quarters and it was he who changed his name to Al-Mundhir. It is for that reason that some considered him to be from the Sahabah. Abu Usaid Malik bin Rabi’ah bin Al-Badan As-Sa’idiy is a Sahabah who fought in the battle of Badr and was well-known by his Kunyah (Father of (Abu) name). Muhammad bin ‘Umar Al-Wafidiy is Thiqah (trustworthy and reliable) as previously mentioned and those who classified him as weak or did not relate from him committed a major, indeed fatal error. This Isnad (chain of transmission) is therefore sufficient to afform the incident in respect to its content, regardless of its wordings and its sharpness. It is supported by the Ijma’ (consensus) of the people (scholars) of Hadith and history in respect to him passing away in Ash-Sham (Greater Syria).

Ibn Kathir said in “Al-Bidayah Wa-n-Nihayah” [Edition: Ihyaa’ At-Turaath (7/40): [**As for his death in the land of Ash-Sham, then that has been affirmed**, and the most well-known view is that it occurred in Hawran. Muhammad bin ‘Aa’idh Ad-Dimashqiy related from Abdul ‘A’alaa, from Sa’id bin Abdul ‘Aziz, that he said: [The first city that was opened (conquered) from Ash-Sham was Busra and Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah passed away in it]]. This is the end of the speech of Ibn Kathir and there is nothing problematic in it. That is because the Busra of Ash-Sham is located on the plains of Hawran and it was its capital in the past. That is whilst the capital of Hawran in more recent times is Dar’a, the city of the free hero revolutionaries.

- The following was recorded in “Ansaab Al-Ashraaf” of Al-Baladhuri (1/589/1193):

[Rawh bin Abdul Mu’min related to me from ‘Ali bin Al-Madaa’iniy, from Sufyan bin ‘Uyainah, from ‘Amr bin Dinar, from Abu Salih: That Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah **went to Ash-Sham and was killed in it**]. All of these are Thiqaat (trustworthy and reliable relaters). ‘Ali bin Al-Madaa’iniy is Abu Al-Hasan ‘Ali bin Hafs Al-Madaa’iniy, who was settled in Baghdad and concerning whom there is a consensus regarding his authenticity. Abu Hatim was alone when he said: [He is Salih (upright or solid) in the Hadith. His Hadith are written but not used as evidential proof]. It takes the Hukm (ruling) of the Muttasil (continuous chain) and evidential proof (Al-Hujjah) is established by it. That is because Salih As-Samman is Thiqah Thabat (trustworthy and reliable) of standing. He witnessed “Ad-Dar” with ‘Uthman and he met the sons of Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah and his friends who witnessed Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah leaving to go to Ash-Sham and his being killed there. They were eyewitnesses and knew these matters with certainty.

- The following was reported in “At-Tabaqaat Al-Kubra” of Ibn Sa’d [Edition: Al-‘Ilmiyah (3/463)]:

[Muhammad bin ‘Umar related to us from Yahya bin Abdul ‘Aziz bin Sa’id bin Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah from his father, who said: Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah passed away in Hawran from the land of Ash-Sham two and a half years into the Khilafah of ‘Umar. (Muhammad bin ‘Umar said: It is like he passed away in year 15). Abdul ‘Aziz said: Al-Madinah did not know of his death until some boys at the well of Munabbih or the well of Sakan, whilst in the severe heat of midday, heard a voice saying from inside the well:

**We have killed the chief of the Khazraj Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah … And we struck him with two arrow shafts and we did not miss his heart**

He boys were frightened and memorised that day. They found out (later) that this was the day that Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah died. He had only sat to urinate in a latrine. He was encountered and died then and there. They found him and his skin had turned green].

- It was recorded in “Tareekh Dimashq” of Ibn ‘Asakir (20/268) as follows:

[Abu Bakr Muhammad bin Shujaa’ related to us from Abu ‘Amr bin Mandah, from Al-Hasan bin Muhammad bin Yusuf, from Abu Al-Hasan Al-Lubnaniy, from Abu Bakr bin Abi Ad-Dunya, from Muhammad bin Sa’d, from Muhammad bin ‘Umar, who related exactly the same until he reached his statement “He died there and then”. Ibn ‘Askair said: [It was related by Al-Husain bin Al-Fahm from Muhammad bin Sa’d from Al-Waqidiy, from Yahya bin Abdul ‘Aziz, from his father: Who related similar to it except that he said Uftutila with a Faa’ (instead of Uqtutila) and he added: They found him and his skin had turned green]. **I say**: We are not concerned to delve into the story of the Jinn, even if it is well-known. The important point concerning us here is only the place and manner of his death.

- The following came reported in “Ansaab Al-Ashraaf” of Al-Baladhuri (1/583/1179):

[Muhammad bin Musaffa Al-Himsiy related to us from Baqiyah bin Al-Walid, from Az-Zubaidiy, from Az-Zuhriy, who said: ‘Umar gave a speech to the people one day and said: Indeed, the Bai’ah of Abu Bakr was a sudden (or spontaneous) occurrence and Allah protected from its (potential) evil (consequences). The Ansar had gathered together in the Saqeefah of Bani Sa’idah to give the Bai’ah (pledge over leadership) to Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah. Al-Hubab bin Al-Mundhir said: “We are the military regiment (or vanguard) of Islam and you O Muhajirin, let there be from us an Ameer (leader) and from you an Ameer, so that the matter between us will be like an anchovy split in half”. Abu Bakr then spoke and he was rightly guided. He said: “We are Quraish and the A’immah (leaders) are from us, whilst you are our brothers and our Wuzaraa’ (assistants). You have provided refuge and support, and so may Allah recompense you with goodness”. **They then gave him the Bai’ah with the exception of Sa’d. He departed and then went to Ash-Sham**]. This is Mursal and its transmitters are Thiqaat (trustworthy and reliable). In addition, each statement from its statements has supportive evidences.

- However, the following was also recorded in “Ansaab Al-Ashraaf” (1/589/1193):

[Al-Madaa’iniy related from Ibn Ju’dabah, from Salih bin Kaisan, from Abu Mikhnaf, from Al-Kalbiy and other than them both: That Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah did not give the Bai’ah (pledge) to Abu Bakr and departed for Ash-Sham. ‘Umar then dispatched a man and said: “Call him to give the Bai’ah and meet him in seclusion. If he refuses, then seek help with Allah against him”. The man then went to Ash-Sham and found Sa’d at a wall of Huwarain. He called him to give the Bai’ah and he replied: “I will never give the Bai’ah to someone from Quraish”. He said: “Then I will fight you”. He said: “Why would you fight me”. He said: “Are you not outside from what the Ummah has entered into?” He said: “As for the Bai’ah, then I am outside (of that)”. **He then shot him with an arrow and killed him**].

This is a repugnant abhorrent lie from Al-Kalbiy or from other than him or one of his Shuyukh (teachers). As for the narration of Ju’dabah from Salih bin Kaisan then I have no doubt that it was dictated to Ibn Ju’dabah by some of the Fasiqeen (sinfully rebellious) people of Baghdad whilst he was heedless. That is because what need did ‘Umar have for the Bai’ah of Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah when the matter had settled for Abu Bakr prior to that and at that time. The Ummah with its Khazraj, its Aws, its Ansar and Muhajirin, Arabs and non-Arabs had gathered around him (and his leadership) and was occupied in Jihad, conquests, consecutive victories and great accumulating spoils of war. Had ‘Umar done that, then he would have been misguided. Allah forbid that he had done such a thing and if so, he would not have been from the rightly guided?!

It appears to me that this story has been fabricated by the criminal hypocrite Mu’awiyah bin Sufyan or some of his lackeys, in order to make it an instrument to compel the people to give the Bai’ah and to kill those who did not give the Bai’ah, just as he himself did, Allah’s curse be upon him, with tens of thousands of the people of Iraq (through his lackeys covering himself behind them, like the criminal Ziyad bin ‘Ubaid or Ibn Sumayyah or Ibn Abi Sufyan or Ibn Abihi or whatever you wish to name him with and the criminal Samarah bin Jundub. At the forefront of those who will killed by treachery was Abu Abdur Rahman Hujr bin ‘Adiy Al-Adbar Al-Kindiy and his companions from the martyrs, in an action that Mu’awiyah oversaw directly himself. So, woe to him for Hujr and the companions of Hujr, woe to him for Hujr and the companions of Hujr.

The important point here is that Sa’d was killed in Ash-Sham (Greater Syria). If we were to discount the matter of the wronged “Jinn” and remove its occurrence, then the Romans are more appropriate to warrant the accusation of being behind it. That is because the land was still a land at war (Dar Harb), the attack and retreat of warfare was continuing and the spies and ambushes were spread here and there. That is if he was killed by an arrow. Otherwise, it could have been stroke or heart failure. An eloquent man possessing a vivid imagination would not have been incapable of improvising the two lines of poetry and attributing them to the Jinn. It is not permissible to believe in the story of the Jinn, even from eye-witnesses, in the absence of a clear evidence (Burhan) from the divine revelation (Wahy) or the necessary dictates of the mind and senses. None of that is present here in this case. There are only a host of Mursal reports that are not relied upon:

- At-Tabarani reported in his “Mu’jam Al-Kabir” (6/16/5360): [Ishaq bin Ibrahim Ad-Dabariy related to us from Abdur Razzaq and the following is its wording. Al-Hakim also recorded it in his Mustadrak (3/283/5103): [Muhammad bin ‘Ali As-San’aniy related to us in Makkah from Ishaq bin Ibrahim, from ‘Abbad, from Abdur Razzaq] and Imam Abdur Razzaq As-San’aniy in his Musannaf: (3/597/6778). All of them related from: [Ma’mar, from Qatadah who said: Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah stood to urinate and then returned. He said: “**Indeed,** **I feel something in my back**”. He did not stay long after that except he died and then the Jinn mourned him saying: “We killed the chief of the Khazraj Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah … We shot him with two arrows and it did not miss his heart”].

- The following was recorded in “A’alaam An-Nubalaa’” [Edition: Hadith (3/171)]: [Al-Asma’iy said: Salamah bin Bilal related to us from Abu Rajaa’ who said: Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah was killed in Ash-Sham. A Jinn struck him with an arrow in Hawran].

- The following was recorded in “At-Tabaqaat Al-Kubra” [Edition: Al-‘Ilmiyah (7/247)]: [Yazid bin Harun related to us from Sa’id bin Abi ‘Arubah who said: I heard Muhammad bin Sireen relate that: Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah was urinating whilst standing. When he returned, he said to his companions: “**Indeed, I feel a crawling (sensation)**” and then he died. They then heard the Jinn saying: “We have killed the chief of the Khazraj Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah … We shot him with two arrows and we did not miss his heart”].

- Al-Hakim recorded in his Mustadrak (3/283/5102): [Abu Bakr Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Balwih related to me from Abu Muslim, from Bakkar bin Muhammad, from Ibn ‘Awn]. At-Tabarani recorded it in his “Mu’jam Al-Kabir” (6/16/5359): [Abu Muslim Al-Kishiy related to us from Abu ‘Asim, from Ibn ‘Awn]. And Al-Harith/Al-Haitham related it in his Musnad (Az-Zawa’id) (1/207/67): [Abu ‘Asim related to us from Ibn ‘Awn]. The following is the wording (of the narration) as shared by all of them: [From Muhammad bin Sireen that he said: Whilst Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah was urinating standing, he leaned over and died, The Jinn killed him. They said: “We killed the chief of the Khazraj Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah. We shot him with two arrows and we did not miss his heart”].

- However, the following was recorded in “Al-‘Aqd Al-Fareed” (5/14): [Sa’id bin Abi ‘Arubah related from Ibn Sireen, who said: Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah was struck by an arrow. **He found something buried in his body and then died**. The Jinn cried and said: “We killed the chief of Al-Khazraj … Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah … We shot him with two arrows … And, we did not miss his heart]. It was therefore a sensed material arrow from the arrows or human beings. That is in the case where Ibn Abd Rabbih Al-Andalusiy, the collator of “Al-‘Aqd Al-Fareed”, had excelled in his transmission from a reliable source.

- The following also came recorded in “Al-‘Aqd Al-Fareed” (5/14): [Maymun bin Mahran related from his father who said: Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah was struck with arrows in a Hammam (latrine) in Ash-Sham and was killed].

**I say**: Here, as well, the collator of “Al-‘Aqd Al-Fareed” Ibn Abd Rabbih Al-Andalusiy has excelled in transmitting from a reliable source. The narration of the reliable Imam, the Faqih (jurist) Maymun bin Mahran Ar-Raqiy, represents the most preferential of narrations (to take) as his father Mahran was a Sahabi from Ash-Sham and possibly an eyewitness to the incident.

Hopefully, what has preceded is sufficient and is enough, by Allah’s permission, to enable us to be certain that Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah found within himself severe emotional upset in relation to what took place at the Saqeefah. He refrained from giving the Bai’ah (regardless of the authenticity of the very angry statements attributed to him) and emigrated to Ash-Sham, where he was killed as a Shaheed (martyr), may Allah be pleased with him. Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah, who was selected as a Naqeeb (chief) at ‘Aqabah (the second pledge) was present at all of the events, which included Badr, according to the correct view. He carried the banner of the Ansar in all of the events and he was from among the first forerunners of the Ansar for whom Jannah has been affirmed, those whom:

رَّضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ وَرَضُوا عَنْهُ وَأَعَدَّ لَهُمْ جَنَّاتٍ تَجْرِي تَحْتَهَا الْأَنْهَارُ خَالِدِينَ فِيهَا أَبَدًا ۚ ذَٰلِكَ الْفَوْزُ الْعَظِيمُ

**Allah is pleased with them and they are pleased with Him, and He has prepared for them gardens beneath which rivers flow, wherein they will abide forever. That is the great success** (9: 100).

With his great precedent in Islam, even if he was an experienced chief who was fond of glory and leadership, it is not conceivable from him that he would disobey Allah and His Messenger by refraining from giving the Bai’ah had he heard directly or indirectly from a trustworthy and sound source that the A’immah (leaders) are not permissible to be from other than Quraish.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

**- Section: The delay of the Bai’ah of ‘Ali bin Abi Talib, blessings be upon him:**

- Imam Al-Bukhari recorded in his Sahih (4/1550/3998): [Yahya bin Bukair related to us from Al-Laith]. Imam Muslim recorded in his Sahih (3/1381/1759): [Muhammad bin Rafi’ related to us from Hujain from Laith. Imam Ibn Hibban recorded in his Sahih (14/575/6607): [Muhammad bin Al-Hasan bin Qutaibah related to us from Yazid bin Mawhab, from Al-Laith bin Sa’d]. All of them related via the path of ‘Uqail bin Khalid Az-Zuhriy and the following is the Lafzh (wording) recorded by Al-Bukhari: [related from ‘Uqail, from Ibn Shihab, from ‘Urwah, from ‘Aa’ishah: That Fatimah, peace be upon her, the daughter of the Prophet sent to Abu Bakr asking him for her inheritance from the Messenger of Allah from that which Allah had bestowed upon him in Al-Madinah and Fadak, in addition to what remained from the fifth of Khaibar. Abu Bakr then said: The Messenger of Allah said that we are not inherited. What we leave (behind) is Sadaqah (charity). The family of Muhammad can only take sustenance from this wealth (or property). By Allah! I will not make any change from the situation of the Sadaqah of the Prophet (and will keep it) as observed during his lifetime, and I will dispose with it as Allah's Messenger ﷺ used to dispose of it. Therefore, Abu Bakr refused to give Fatimah anything. Fatimah was upset with Abu Bakr in relation to that. She disassociated from him and did not speak to him until she passed away. She lived for six months after the Prophet. When she passed away her husband ‘Ali buried her at night without informing Abu Bakr and he said the funeral prayer by himself. When Fatimah was alive, the people used to give respect to ‘Ali, but after her death, ‘Ali noticed a change in the people's attitude towards him. Consequently, ‘Ali sought reconciliation with Abu Bakr and to give him the Bai’ah (pledge of allegiance) **as he had not given the Bai’ah during those months**. ‘Ali sent for Abu Bakr saying: “Come to us, but do not let anybody come with you” as he disliked that ‘Umar should come. ‘Umar said (to Abu Bakr): “No, by Allah, you do not enter upon them alone”. Abu Bakr said: “What do you fear they will do to me? By Allah, I will certainly go to them”. So, Abu Bakr went to them. ‘Ali then said the Tashahhud and said (to Abu Bakr): “We know well your virtue and what Allah has given you, and we have not begrudged the good that Allah has bestowed upon you. **However, you acted alone excluding us in the matter (of leadership) whilst we viewed that we had a share in relation to it** because of our near relationship to Allah's Messenger ﷺ. At that, Abu Bakr's eyes flowed with tears. And when Abu Bakr spoke, he said: “By Him in Whose Hand is my soul, keeping good relations with the relatives of Allah's Messenger ﷺ is dearer to me than to keep good relations with my own relatives. But as for the trouble which arose between me and you concerning this property, then I did my best to spend it according to what is good, and I did not leave any matter which I saw Allah's Messenger ﷺ doing, except that I did it”. On that ‘Ali said to Abu Bakr: “I will give you the Bai’ah (of allegiance) tomorrow”. Then when Abu Bakr performed the Zhuhr prayer, he ascended the pulpit and uttered the Tashahhud and then mentioned the matter of ‘Ali, his delay in respect to giving the Bai’ah and the excuses that he provided. He then sought forgiveness. ‘Ali then stated the Tashahhud, extolled Abu Bakr's right, and said, that he had not done what he did begrudging Abu Bakr or denying what Allah had favoured him with. (He said): “**However, we considered that we too had a right to participate in this matter (of rulership) and that he (i.e. Abu Bakr) excluded us in this matter and we felt upset in ourselves**”. The Muslims were happy with that and said: “You have done the right thing”. The Muslims then became close to ‘Ali when he returned the matter to its right footing].

- Imam Ibn Hibban recorded it in his Sahih (11/155/4823) with a Sahih Isnad (chain of transmission) upon the conditionality of the two Sheikhs (Al-Bukhari and Muslim) via the path of Shu’aib from Azh-Zuhriy:

[Muhammad bin Ubaidullah bin Al-Fadl Al-Kalaa’iy related to us in Homs from ‘Amr bin Uthman bin Sa’id, from his father, from Shu’aib bin Abi Hamzah, from Az-Zuhriy, from ‘Urwah bin Az-Zubair, that ‘Aa’ishah informed him that Fatimah the daughter of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ sent to Abu Bakr asking him about her inheritance from the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, from that which Allah had bestowed upon His Messenger. Fatimah, may Allah’s pleasure be upon her, was at that time requesting the Sadaqah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ in Al-Madinah and Fadak, in addition to what remained from the fifth of Khaibar. ‘Aa’ishah said: Abu Bakr then said: That the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said: “We are not inherited from. What we leave behind is Sadaqah. The family of Muhammad only eat from this wealth. They do not receive above what they need for sustenance (food)” And I, by Allah, will not change anything in respect to the Sadaqah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ from the situation it had been upon during the life of the Messenger of Allah. I will act in it just as the Messenger of Allah ﷺ acted. Therefore, Abu Bakr refused to pay anything from it to Fatimah. Fatimah was then upset with Abu Bakr, she disassociated from him and did not speak to him until she passed away. She lived for six months following the death of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. When she passed away, ‘Ali bin Abi Talib, may Allah’s pleasure be upon him, buried her, whilst he did not inform Abu Bakr of it and ‘Ali performed the prayer over her. ‘Ali had received a level of respect from the people during the life of Fatimah. Then when Fatimah, may Allah’s pleasure be upon her, passed away, the people’s respect departed from him to the point that he felt estranged from them. ‘At that time ‘Ali sought to reconcile with Abu Bakr and to give him the Bai’ah, as he had not given the Bai’ah (pledge) during those months. He sent (a message) to Abu Bakr stating: “Come to us and do not bring anyone with you” as ‘Ali disliked that ‘Umar attend due to what he knew of **‘Umar’s strong position against them**. ‘Umar said to Abu Bakr: By, Allah, you should not go to them alone”. Abu Bakr replied: “What is feared that they will do to me? By Allah, I will certainly go to them”. Abu Bakr arrived, then ‘Ali uttered the Tashahhud and then said: “Verily, we have known O Abu Bakr your virtue and what Allah has bestowed upon you, and we do not begrudge any goodness that Allah has provided you with. **However, you excluded us from the matter (of leadership) whilst we considered that we had a right (of participation) in it”**. He then mentioned their close relations to the Messenger of Allah ﷺ and their right. He continued to speak until the eyes of Abu Bakr flowed with tears. Then when Abu Bakr spoke he said: “By the One in whose hand is my soul, the close relations of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ are more beloved to me than my own direct relations. As for the matter that was dispute between me and you in respect to these Sadaqaat, then I have not deviated in respect to them from the good and I have not left in relation to them any matter that I saw the Messenger of Allah ﷺ doing related to them, except that I did it”. ‘Ali then said: “I will give the Bai’ah tomorrow”. Then, when Abu Bakr had prayed Zhuhr and risen to the Minbar (pulpit) he uttered the Tashahhud and mentioned the situation of ‘Ali, his delay in respect to giving the Bai’ah and the excuses that he provided. ‘Ali then stated the Tashahhud, extolled Abu Bakr's right, and said, that he had not done what he did begrudging Abu Bakr or denying the favour that Allah had favoured him with. (He said): “**However, we considered that we too had a right to participate in this matter (of rulership) and that he (i.e. Abu Bakr) excluded us in this matter and we felt upset in ourselves**”. The Muslims were happy with that and said to ‘Ali: “You have done the right thing”. The Muslims then became close to ‘Ali when he returned to the matter upon its right footing].

- Al-Bukhari also recorded it in a summarised form with gaps in it in his Sahih (3/1361/3508):

[Abu l-Yaman related to us from Shu’aib, from Az-Zuhriy, from ‘Urwah bin Az-Zubair, from ‘Aa’ishah: That Fatimah sent a message to Abu Bakr requesting him for her inheritance from that which Allah had bestowed upon His Messenger requesting the Sadaqah of the Prophet that was in Al-Madinah and Fadak, in addition to what remained of the fifth of Khaibar. Abu Bakr said: “The Messenger of Allah said: “We are not inherited from, what we leave behind is Sadaqah. The family of Muhammad only eat from this wealth (meaning the wealth or property of Allah) and they are not to have in excess of the sustenance (or food) that they require”. By Allah, I will not change anything related to the Sadaqat of the Prophet, from that which they were upon during the lifetime of the Prophet and I will act in respect to them by that which the Messenger of Allah acted”. ‘Ali uttered the Tashahhud and then said: “Verily, O Abu Bakr we have known your virtue”. He then mentioned their close relations to the Messenger of Allah and their right. Abu Bakr spoke and said: “By the One in whose hand is my soul, the close relations of the Messenger of Allah are more beloved to me than my own direct relations].

- Imam Abdullah bin Ahmad bin Hanbal in his “Fadaa’il As-Sahabah” (1/364/531) only recorded the aspect related to the Bai’ah via the path of Ma’mar from Az-Zuhriy with an Isnad that is of a level of authenticity:

[Muhammad bin Ibrahim Al-Asbahani, the neighbour of Abu Bakr bin Abi Dawud related to us from Abu Mas’ud, from Abdur Razzaq, from Ma’mar, from Az-Zuhriy, from ‘Urwah, from ‘Aa’ishah: That ‘Ali said to Abu Bakr: “By Allah, we did not refrain from giving you the Bai’ah due to a denial from us of your virtue and not due to begrudging the goodness that Allah provided you with. **However, we viewed that we had a right in this matter but you excluded us from it**”. He then mentioned his close relation to the Messenger of Allah ﷺ until Abu Bakr cried. He was then silent. Abu Bakr then uttered the Tashahhud and said: “By Allah the close relations to the Messenger of Allah ﷺ are more beloved to me than my own relations. And by Allah, I have not deviated in respect to these monies (or properties), which was an issue between us and you, from good. However, I heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ saying: “We are not inherited from. What we leave behind is Sadaqah. The family of Muhammad only take sustenance from this wealth”. And by Allah, I have not left a matter that he did in relation to this matter (Sadaqah) except that I did it, by Allah’s will”. ‘Ali said: “I will give you the Bai’ah tomorrow”. Then, when Abu Bakr had prayed the Zhuhr prayer, he turned to the people and excused ‘Ali with some of what he had provided of excuses. ‘Ali then stood. He mentioned Abu Bakr, his virtue and precedence. He then stood before him and gave him the Bai’ah (pledge). The people then turned towards ‘Ali and said: “Well done and you have done what is right”. The people then became close to ‘Ali after he brought the matter to its right footing].

**I say**: Muhammad bin Ibrahim Al-Asbahani is Abu Abdullah Muhammad bin Ibrahim bin Muhammad bin Al-Walid Al-Kataniy Al-Asbahani Al-Hafizh, from the A’immah (great scholars) of Hadith who is relied upon in respect to information concerning the Sahabah and the ‘Ilal (defects), as has been mentioned in “Tadhkirat ul-Huffazh” (3/785/777). Abu Mas’ud is Ahmad bin Al-Furat bin Khalid Ad-Dabbiy Ar-Raziy from Asbahan. He is Thiqah (classified as trustworthy and reliable) and Hafizh (of good memory) as was mentioned in “Taqreeb At-Tahdheeb” (1/83/88), and Allah knows best.

- The following came recorded in “Ansaab Al-Ashraaf” of Al-Baladhuri (1/586/1186):

[Al-Madaa’iniy related from Abu Juza, from Ma’mar, from Az-Zuhriy, from ‘Urwah, from ‘Aa’ishah, who said: ‘Ali did not give the Bai’ah to Abu Bakr until Fatimah passed away after six months. When she passed away, he sought reconciliation with Abu Bakr. He sent (a message) to him asking him to come to him. ‘Umar said to him (Abu Bakr): “Don’t go to him by yourself”. He (Abu Bakr) replied: “And what are they going to do to me?” So, Abu Bakr went to him. ‘Ali said: “By Allah, we do not begrudge what Allah has bestowed upon you in terms of virtue and goodness. **However, we consider that we had a share (i.e. a right of participation) in the matter which we were excluded from**”. Abu Bakr said: “By Allah, the close relations of the Messenger of Allah are more beloved to me than my own close relations”. ‘Ali continued to mention his right and close relations until Abu Bakr cried. He (‘Ali) then said: “Your appointment (i.e. for me to give you the Bai’ah) is tomorrow”. When Abu Bakr had prayed Zhuhr he addressed the people and mentioned ‘Ali and his Bai’ah (pledge). ‘Ali then said: “I did not hold back from giving the Bai’ah to Abu Bakr because I was not aware of his right. **But rather, we considered that we had a share in the matter which we were excluded from (participating in)**. He then gave the Bai’ah to Abu Bakr and the Muslims said: “You have done what is right and done well”]. However, Abu Juza Nasr bin Tareef is Matrook (discarded) and accused of lying. Despite that, it appears that in this case he preserved it and spoke the truth.

- Imam Al-Baihaqiy reported it in his “Sunan Al-Kubra” (6/300/12512) in a more complete manner via the path of Ma’mar from Az-Zuhriy:

[Abu Muhammad Abdullah bin Yahya bin Abdul Jabbar related to us in Baghdad from Isma’eel bin Muhammad As-Saffar, from Ahmad bin Mansur, from Abdur Razzaq, from Ma’mar, from Az-Zuhriy, from ‘Urwah. From ‘Aa’ishah, may Allah be pleased with her: That Fatimah and Al-‘Abbas, may Allah be pleased with them, went to Abu Bakr enquiring about their inheritance from the Mesenger of Allah ﷺ. At that time, they requested his land from Fadak and his share from Khaibar. Abu Bakr said to them: “I heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ saying: [We are not inherited from. What we leave behind is Sadaqah. The family of Muhammad only eat (or sustained) from this property (or money)] And verily, I will not leave a matter I saw the Messenger of Allah ﷺ doing, except that I will do it”. Fatimah was angry at this, dissociated from him and did not speak to him until she died. ‘Ali then buried her at night and did not inform Abu Bakr, may Allah be pleased with him, about it. ‘Aa’ishah, may Allah be pleased with him, said: ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, had a level of respect from the people during the life of Fatimah, may Allah be pleased with her. Then when she passed away the regard of the people departed from him. Ma’mar said: I asked Az-Zuhriy: How long did Fatimah remain living after the Prophet ﷺ? He said: Six months. A man then said to Az-Zuhriy: So, ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, did not give him the Bai’ah until Fatimah, may Allah be pleased with her, passed away? He said: In no one from Bani Hashim did (as well)]. Imam Al-Baihaqiy then said: [Al-Bukhari related it in his Sahih from two angles (or paths) from Ma’mar and Muslim related it from Ishaq bin Rahuwaih and others from Abdur Razzaq. **The statement of Az-Zuhriy concerning ‘Ali’s refraining from giving the Bai’ah to Abu Bakr, may Allah be pleased with him, until the passing away of Fatimah, may Allah be pleased with her, is Munqati’ (interrupted)**, whilst the Hadith of Sa’id Al-Khudriy, may Allah be pleased with him, in respect to him giving the Bai’ah during the public Bai’ah (pledge) following the Saqeefah, is more Sahih (authentic). And it is possible that Az-Zuhriy meant his keeping away after the (public) Bai’ah and then his renewing it a second time and his undertaking of its obligations, and Allah knows best].

**I say**: Imam Al-Baihaqiy is mistaken with this context in which the interruption of Ma’mar to Zuhri came and the inserted question of the other man came. That is because he thought the story of the delay of the Bai’ah of ‘Ali, Allah’s pleasure be upon, was from the speech of Az-Zuhriy in a Mursal form and as such it is Munqati’ (interrupted). This, however, is not valid due to the testimony of the other paths which we have previously presented from **Ma’mar himself**. In addition, Shu’aib bin Abi Hamzah and ‘Uqail bin Khalid are not of a lower level than Ma’mar in respect to relating from Az-Zuhriy. Indeed, they are definitely, when combined, equal to him or even above him. That is because it was stated in “Al-Jarh Wa-t-Ta’deel” (7/43/243): [Abdur Rahman related to us from my (i.e. his) father, from Mahmoud bin Ibrahim bin Samee’, from Musa bin Ayub, from Makhlad bin Al-Husain, who said: I heard Yunus bin Yazid Al-Ailiy saying: “‘Uqail used to accompany Az-Zuhriy in travel and when he was resident”. Abu bakr bin Abi Khaithamah related to us in what he wrote to me: Al-Walid bin Shujaa’ related to us from Makhlad bin Al-Husain who said: “I heard Yunus bin Yazid Al-Ailiy saying: “‘Uqail used to accompany Az-Zuhriy in his travel and his residence”. Abdur Rahman related to us. He said: It was read upon Al-Abbass bin Muhammad, he said: Yayha bin Ma’een said: “The people have verified in respect to (relating from) Az-Zuhriy: Malik bin Anas, Ma’mar, Yunus, ‘Uqail, Shu’aib bin Abi Hamzah and Sufyan bin ‘Uyainah”. Abdur Rahman related to us. He said: I asked my father about ‘Uqail bin Khalid, whether he is more beloved to you than Yunus and he said: “‘Uqail is more beloved to me than Yunus and ‘Uqail has no issue (Ba’s) with him”. I said: This is how it came to us however it is apparent that this is a slip of the pen or tongue, rather he meant: “‘Uqail is more beloved to me than Yusuf, but Yusuf there is no issue or problem (Ba’s) with him”. Abdur Rahman related to us. He said: Abu Zur’ah was asked about ‘Uqail bin Khalid and he said: “Thiqah Sadooq (trustworthy/reliable and truthful)”. Abdur Rahman related to us. He said: My father was asked which of ‘Uqail and Ma’mar was more reliable and he said: [‘Uqail is more reliable and was the writer of a book. Az-Zuhriy was in Ailah and Az-Zuhriy had a place of residence there and he (‘Uqail) would record from him there]. As for the Hadith of Abu Sa’id Al-Khudriy, then it is apparently authentic, however, it is Ma’lool (has a non-apparent defect or weakness) as we shall explain soon with Allah’s will.

- Imam Abu Bakr bin Abi Shaibah recorded in his Musannaf (7/430/37040): [‘Affan related to us from Wuhaib, from Dawud, from Abu Nadrah, from Abu Sa’id, who said: When the Messenger of Allah ﷺ passed away, the speakers of the Ansar stood and a man from them began to say: “O assembly of the Muhajirin, when the Messenger of Allah ﷺ used to appoint someone from you, he would couple him with a man from us. As such, we view that two men should assume this matter (the ruling), one of them from you and the other from us”. He (the narrator) said: The speakers of the Ansar followed one after the other. Then Zaid bin Thabit stood up and said: “The Messenger of Allah ﷺ was from the Muhajirin and the Imam should only be from the Muhajirin whilst we are his Ansar (helpers and supporters), just we as were the Ansar of the Messenger of Allah”. Abu Bakr then stood and said: “May Allah recompense you with goodness O assembly of the Ansar and make firm your speaker” he then said: “By Allah, had you done other than that, we would not have reconciled with you”].

Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal recorded it in his Musnad (5/186/21657) as follows: [‘Affan related to us from Wuhaib, from Dawud, from Abu Nadrah, from Abu Sa’id Al-Khudriy, that he said it (i.e. the Hadith)]. At-Tabarani recorded it in his “Mu’jam Al-Kabir” (5/115/4785) as follows: [Ahmad bin Al-Qasim bin Al-Musawir Al-Jawahariy related it from ‘Affan bin Muslim, from Wuhiab bin Khalid, from Dawud bin Abi Hind, from Abu Nadrah, from Abu Sa’id Al-Khudriy, may Allah be pleased with him: That he said it (i.e. the Hadith)]. It is recorded among the Ahadeeth of ‘Affan bin Muslim (Page: 308, in the Electronic Shamela Library: 371): [Wuhaib bin Khalid related to us from Dawud bin Abi Hind, from Abu Nadrah, from Abu Sa’id Al-Khudriy, may Allah be pleased with him: That he said it]. At-Tayalisiy recorded it in his Musnad (1/84/602) as follows: [Wuhaib related to us from Dawud bin Abi Hind, from Abu Nadrah, from Abu Sa’id: That he said it]. It has also been recorded in “Tareekh Dimashq” of Ibn ‘Asakir (19/314) via At-Tayalisiy: [ Abu ‘Ali Al-Haddad informed us of it, then Abu l-Qasim bin As-Samarqandiy related it to us from Yusuf bin Al-Hasan. They related it from Abu Nu’aim Al-Hafizh from Abdullah bin Ja’far bin Ahmad, from Yunus bin Habib, from Abu Dawud Sulaiman bin Dawud].

I say: It is definite that Abu Sa’id was not present at the Saqeefah and did not hear what took place there. He presented it in a summarised manner similar to what ‘Umar related. What Zaid bin Thabit said (if he did say it) is an addition for us and it has no relationship to the subject of (the leader) being from Quraish. It is only a reference to the seniority of the Muhajirin and their preceding the Ansar. However, the speech attributed to Abu Bakr “Had you done other than that, we would not have reconciled with you” does not resemble the speech of Abu Bakr in respect to what is familiar to him. In addition, he had not gone there as a disputant in origin for him to even need to be talking about reconciliation.

- However, Al-Hakim recorded it in his Mustadrak (3/81/4457) with a **serious addition**:

[Abu l-‘Abbas Muhammad bin Ya’qub related to us from Ja’far bin Muhammad bin Shakir, from ‘Affan bin Muslim, from Wuhaib, from Dawud bin Abi Hind, from Abu Nadrah, from Abu Sa’id Al-Khudriy. May Allah be pleased with him, who related similar to what preceded, and added: Then Zaid bin Thabit took the hand of Abu Bakr and said: “This is your Sahib (companion or master), so give him the Bai’ah (pledge over leadership) and then set off”. Then when Abu Bakr sat upon the Minbar (pulpit), he looked at the faces of the people present but did not see ‘Ali and so, asked about him. Some people from the Ansar then **brought him**. Abu Bakr said: “Cousin and son-in-law of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, have you desired to cause a division among the Muslims?” He said: “There is no cause for censure O Khalifah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ” and then he gave him the Bai’ah. He then did not see Az-Zubair bin ‘Awwam and so asked concerning him until **they brought him**. He then said: “Cousin and follower of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, have you desired to cause a division among the Muslims?” He then replied with a similar statement: “There is no cause for censure O Khalifah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ” and then he gave him the Bai’ah”].

Al-Hakim said: [This Hadith is Sahih upon the conditionality of the two Sheikhs (Al-Bukhari and Muslim) but they did not record it]. Adh-Dhahabi was silent in respect to it and was therefore correct. Al-Baihaqiy related it in his “Sunan Al-Kubra” (8/143/18315) via Al-Hakim and other than him in its full form: [Abdullah Al-Hafizh related to us by dictation and Abu Muhammad bin Abi Hamid Al-Muqriy by reading from Abu l-‘Abbas Muhammad bin Ya’qub … the same as what Al-Hakim recorded].

Imam Al-Baihaqiy in his “Kitab Al-I’tiqaad” (p: 350), immediately after presenting the exact Hadith mentioned above, as was recorded in his “Sunan Al-Kubra” (8/143/16315) followed up with: [And Abu l-Hasan ‘Ali bin Muhammad bin ‘Ali bin As-Saqqaa Al-Isfarayiniy related to us from Abu ‘Ali Al-Hasan bin ‘Ali Al-Hafizh, from Abu Bakr Muhammad bin Ishaq bin Khuzaimah and Ibrahim bin Abi Talib who said: Bundar bin Bashshar related to us from Abu Hisham Al-Makhzumiy, from Wuhaib: He then mentioned it (i.e. the Hadith) with its Isnad and meaning, except he said: ‘Umar arose and then said: “Your speaker has said the truth. However, if you had said other than this, we would not have agreed with you”. He then took the hand of Abu Bakr and said: “This is your Sahib (companion or master), so, give him the Bai’ah (pledge over leadership)”. ‘Umar then gave him the Bai’ah and the Muhajirin and Ansar gave him the Bai’ah].

It was also recorded in “Tareekh Dimashq” of Ibn ‘Asakir (30/276) via the path of Al-Baihaqiy and other than it: [Abu Al-Ma’aaliy Abdullah bin Ahmad Al-Marwaziy Al-Halwaniy related to us from Abu Bakr bin ‘Ali bin Khalf, from Al-Hakim Abu l-Hasan ‘Ali bin Muhammad Al-Mahrajaniy … And Abu l-Qasim Ash-Shahamiy related to us from Abu Bakr Al-Baihaqiy, from Abu l-Hasan ‘Ali bin Muhammad bin ‘Ali Al-Hafizh Al-Isfarayiniy, who both said: Abu ‘Ali Al-Husain bin ‘Ali Al-Hafizh related it to us].

**I say**: For some reason most of the classical A’immah (Scholars) omitted the addition which the two Imams Al-Hakim and Al-Baihaqiy preserved for us. We do not know if that was due to their doubting its reliability “even though it is Sahih because it is **Munaqati’ (interrupted) Batil (false/invalid) and Makdhoob (fabricated/false)**” and due to the inconsistency of its textual content (Matn), which is most likely (Rajih). Or, they omitted it due to applying caution and to delve into disputes between the Sahabah?!

As for the defect (‘Illah) that we previously indicated to, then it is apparent that Wuhaib bin Khalid Al-‘Ajlaan, despite being from the major Huffazh (memorisers) of Al-Basra who are reliable and trustworthy, heard the main part of it directly from Abu Sa’id and then Dawud bin Abi Hind directly related the rest of it in a Mursal form. Consequently, Wuhaib believed that it is one single Hadith from beginning to end. That is especially as Wuhaib bin Khalid had been imprisoned and had lost his sight. He used to dictate what he had memorised and he may have therefore related it from his memory. That is whilst the memory is not like the writing. The **evidence** for that is:

- What came in the Sunnah of Abdullah bin Ahmad (2/554/1292) with a **Mursal** chain: [Ubaidullah bin ‘Umar Al-Qawaririy related to me from Abdul A’ala, from Dawud bin Abi Hind, from Abu Nadrah, who said: When the people gathered to Abu Bakr, may Allah be pleased with him, he said: “What is the matter, I don’t see ‘Ali here?”. He (the relater) said: Some men from the Ansar went and **they** **brought him**. He (Abu Bakr) said to him: “O ‘Ali, you say that you are the cousin and son-in-law of the Messenger of Allah?” ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, said: “There is no cause for censure O Khalifah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. Extend your hand”. He extended his hand and then he gave him the Bai’ah. Then Abu Bakr said: “What is the matter, I don’t see Az-Zubair here?” He (the relater) said: Some men from the Ansar went and **they brought him**. He (Abu Bakr) said to him: “O ‘Az-Zubair, you say that you are the cousin and close follower of the Messenger of Allah?” Az-Zubair said: “There is no cause for censure O Khalifah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. Extend your hand”. He extended his hand and then he gave him the Bai’ah]. Abdul A’ala is from the Huffazh of Al-Basrah and from their well-versed scholars and his level is not lower than Wuhaib.

- There is also what came recorded in “Ansaab Al-Ashraaf” of Al-Baladhuri (1/585/1183) with a Mursal chain via Al-Jurairiy instead of Dawud bin Abi Hind: [Hudbah bin Khalid related to me from Hammad bin Salamah, from Al-Jurairiy, from Abu Nadrah who said: When the people gave the Bai’ah to Abu Bakr, ‘Ali and Az-Zubair kept away. He then sent ‘Umar Ibn Al-Khattab and Zaid bin Thabit to them. They arrived at ‘Ali’s house and knocked upon the door. Az-Zubair looked through a gap and went back to ‘Ali and said: “These two men are from the people of Jannah (Paradise) and we shall not fight them”. He said: “Open the door for them”. They then went with them until they came to Abu Bakr. Abu Bakr then said: “O ‘Ali, you are the cousin and son-in-law of the Messenger of Allah and you say: I have more right to this matter (i.e. leadership). No, by Allah, I have more right than you”. He said: “There is no cause for censure O Khalifah of the Messenger of Allah. Extend your hand and I will give you the Bai’ah (pledge)”. He then extended his hand and he gave him the Bai’ah. Then he said to Az-Zubair: You say that you are the cousin of the Messenger of Allah, his follower and knight and that I have a greater right to this matter. No, by Allah, I have more right than you”. He said: “There is no cause for censure O Khalifah of the Messenger of Allah. Extend your hand”. He then extended his hand and he gave him the Bai’ah].

- Some of that also came recorded in “Ansaab Al-Ashraaf” of Al-Baladhuri (1/585/1182) with a Mursal chain: [Muhammad bin Sa’d related to me from ‘Affan, from Shu’bah, from Al-Jurairiy, from Abu Nadrah, who said: “Some of the people took their time to give the Bai’ah to Abu Bakr and so he said: “Who is more entitled (or more worthy) of this matter than me? Am I not the first who prayed? Am I not this and am I not this? …” And he went on to mention virtuous acts that he had undertaken with the Prophet ﷺ”].

- The following also came recorded in “Ansaab Al-Ashraaf” of Al-Baladhuri (1/586/1186) with a Mursal chain: [Al-Madaa’iniy related from Abu Juza, from Al-Jurairiy, from Abu Nadrah: That ‘Ali kept back from the Bai’ah to Abu Bakr and so he said: “What has prevented you from giving the Bai’ah whilst I was in this matter prior to you?]. Yes, it is true that Abu Juza bin taref is Matrook (discarded) and accused of lying, not due to the weakness of memory or lack of accuracy but rather due to lack of trust (Amanah). He related Ahadeeth from some of the Shuyukh via an intermediary and then omitted the intermediary and **expressed** (or claimed) that he heard it, which is blatant lying. This is a type that has ben afflicted by the Shaytan seeking to raise the level of the Isnad. It is feared from him that the Mawquf will be raised and the Mursal connected and not the opposite. However, he in this case here he brought it in a Mursal form and as such it is necessary to be relied upon.

The Irsaal (i.e. what is Mursal) from Al-Jurairiy is therefore Thabit (established or reliable), there is no Shubhah (questionable doubt) in it and what came in “As-Seerah An-Nabawiyah of Ibn Kathir” (4/495) is not maligned or impaired by the statement that it came in a Mursal form via Al-Jurairiy: [‘Ali bin ‘Asim related it from Al-Jurairiy, from Abu Nadrah, from Abu Sa’id Al-Khudriy]. That is because:

**Firstly**: The (direct hearing) of Shu’bah is certain and likewise Hammad bin Salamah, who was from the great scholars (A’immah) of Basrah (88-167 AH), from Sa’id bin Iyaas Al-Jurairiy, who was from the A’immah (scholars) of the Tabi’een in Al-Basrah. His hearing (or receiving) is long-standing, Sahih and Thabit (reliable) for certain prior to the change in Al-Jurairiy which was observed in respect to his memory at the end of the year 142 AH, whilst he passed away in the year 144 AH, may Allah’s mercy be upon him. That is while most of the Shuyukh of ‘Ali bin ‘Asim Wasitiy (105-210 AH) were from Kufa. It is therefore most likely that he began seeking knowledge in Kufa and then only entered Al-Basrah or Makkah later and then heard (or received) from Al-Jurairiy following the change that occurred to his memory, just like ‘Isa bin Yunus and his peers.

**Secondly**: ‘Ali bin ‘Asim is not that well-versed and is known for making many errors and to insist upon them, to the point that some accused him of lying, which is a hideous injustice and exaggeration that is not permissible. That is because the man is **Thiqah** (trustworthy/reliable). In any case, ‘Ali bin ‘Asim is generally not of the level of Shu’bah and Hammad bin Salamah in respect to memorisation and in relation to Al-Jurairiy specifically, until the camel enters the eye of the needle (i.e under any circumstances).

**It is possible that some may claim that the Munqati’ (interrupted) Mursal addition of Abu Nadrah is strengthened by other narrations:**

- That is like what came recorded in “As-Sunan Al-Kubra” of Al-Baihaqiy (8/152/17030): [Abu Abdullah Al-Hafizh related to us from Muhammad bin Salih bin Hani’, from Al-Fadl bin Muhammad Al-Baihaqiy, from Ibrahim bin Al-Mundhir Al-Hizamiy, from Muhammad bin Fulaij, from Musa bin ‘Uqbah, from Sa’d bin Ibrahim, from Ibrahim bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf: **That, Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf was with ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab, may Allah be pleased with them both and Muhammad bin Maslamah broke the sword of Az-Zubair, may Allah be pleased with them both**. Then Abu Bakr stood and addressed the people. He excused himself to them and said: “By Allah, I was not at all eager for the position of leadership for a single day or night. I did not desire it and I did not ask Allah for it secretly or openly. However, I feared the occurrence of Fitnah (discord). In the position of leadership I have no rest. I have been appointed to a great matter which I don’t have the strength for it and no two hands except by the strengthening of Allah. I had wished that the strongest of the people in relation to it would be in my place today”. The Muhajirun accepted what he said from him and what he excused himself with. ‘Ali and Az-Zubair, may Allah be pleased with them both, said: “We were not angry except that we were not present at the consultation and we view that Abu Bakr is the most worthy or entitled of the people for it (the leadership) after the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. He was the companion of the cave, the second of the two. We know his honour and eminence and the Messenger of Allah ﷺ commanded him to lead the people in the prayer whilst he was still living”].

- It has also come reported in the select Ahadeeth of the “Maghaziy of Musa bin ‘Uqbah” by Yusuf bin Muhammad bin ‘Umar bin Qadi Shuhbah who passed away in the year 789 Ah (19/94): [Musa bin ‘Uqbah related to us from Sa’d bin Ibrahim, from Ibrahim bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf: **That Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf, may Allah be pleased with him, was with ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab, may Allah be pleased with him, that day. And that he broke Az-Zubair’s sword. And Allah is most aware about its breaking.** Then Abu Bakr stood and addressed the people. He excused himself to them and said: By Allah, I was not at all eager for the position of leadership for a single day or night. I did not desire it and I did not ask Allah for it secretly or openly. However, I feared the occurrence of Fitnah (discord). In the position of leadership I have no rest. I have been appointed to a great matter which I don’t have the strength for it and no two hands except by the strengthening of Allah. I had wished that the strongest of the people in relation to it would be in my place today”. The Muhajirun accepted what he said from him and what he excused himself with. ‘Ali and Az-Zubair, may Allah be pleased with them both, said: “We were not angry except that we were not present at the consultation and we view that Abu Bakr is the most worthy or entitled of the people for it (the leadership) after the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. He was the companion of the cave, the second of the two. We know his honour and eminence and the Messenger of Allah ﷺ commanded him to lead the people in the prayer whilst he was still living”].

- Imam Al-Baihaqiy presented it in “Al-I’tiqaad” (p: 350) just as it was recorded in his “Sunan Al-Kubra”. He then added: [Similarly, Isma’eel bin Ibrahim bin ‘Uqbah related it from his uncle Musa bin ‘Uqbah. Muhammad bin Ishaq bin Yasar also mentioned it in Al-Maghaziy and he said in relation to Abu Bakr’s excusing himself to ‘Ali and others from those who kept back from giving the Bai’ah: “By Allah, we did not conclude that (the Bai’ah) in the absence of those who were nor present from it except due to the fear of the occurrence of Fitnah (discord) and escalation of the situation, even though I disliked that. Had it been different to that I would not have loved for anyone to have been present more than you and those like you in station”. He then looked over the people and said: “O People, this is ‘Ali bin Abi Talib and there is no Bai’ah to me upon his neck whilst he has a choice in his affair. Indeed, and all of you have a choice in respect to your Bai’ah to me. If you view that it should be given to other than me, then I will be the first to give him the Bai’ah”. Then when ‘Ali heard that, what had felt inside him dissipated, and he said: “There is no dissolution. We do not view anyone for it other than you”. He then extended his hand and gave him the Bai’ah alongside the group of people with him and all of the people were said similar to that. So, they returned the matter to Abu Bakr and he was the Khalifah (successor) of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. And that was because he selected him to lead the Salah (prayer) after him. They used to call him the Khalifah (successor) of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ until he died].

- Its origin is found in Al-Hakim’s “Al-Mustadrak ‘Ala s-Sahihaini” (3/70/4422). Then Al-Hakim said: [This Hadith is Sahih upon the conditionality of the two Sheikhs (Al-Bukhari and Muslim), but they did not record it]. Adh-Dhahabi commented in “At-Talkhees”: [It is upon the conditionality (Shart) of Al-Bukhari and Muslim].

**I say**: Yes, that is true, however there are transmitters in it whom Muslim did not relate from even though they have been classified as being Thiqaat (reliable and trustworthy transmitters) by others. The Isnad is Jayyid Qawwiy (Good and strong) if Musa bin ‘Uqbah heard it from Sa’d bin Ibrahim and if Ibrahim bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf had heard it from his father Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf, as he did not state that he had heard it, nor did he indicate that it was related from someone. Imam Ibrahim bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf was definitely not present at the mentioned events and the furthest back event that he witnessed, as has been said, is the day of the Dar (house and the siege of ‘Uthman). It is definite that his mother was Umm Kulthum the daughter of ‘Uqbah bin Abi Mu’ait, the first of those who made Hijrah (migration) after the treaty of Al-Hudaibiyah in the seventh year. Surah Al-Mumtahinah was revealed concerning her. She annulled her marriage and married Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf after it has been absolved. The birth of Ibrahim bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf was therefore in the end of the seventh year or beginning of the eighth at the earliest. Therefore, his age during the events of the Saqeefah would not have exceeded his fourth year, whilst he did not exceed eighty-eight years when he died in the year 96 AH. Consequently, it is inconceivable for him to have been 95 years old as is found with Abu Nu’aim:

The following came mentioned in “Ma’rifat As-Sahabah” by Abu Nu’aim (1/212/733): [Ahmad bin Muhammad bin Jabalah related to us from Abu l-‘Abbas As-Sarraj, from Abu Yunus Al-Madeniy, from Ibrahim bin Al-Mundhir, from (?!) Ibrahim bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf, who was known by the Kunya of Abu Ishaq and passed away in the year 96 AH, whilst he was 95 years old. His mother was Umm Kulthum the daughter of ‘Uqbah, the first female emigrant who migrated from Makkah to Al-Madinah and concerning whom Surah Al-Mumtahinah was revealed]. Rather, the preponderant view is that he was born following the death of the Prophet ﷺ.

In any case, in the main text of the narration recorded by Al-Hakim and Al-Baihaqiy: [**That, Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf was with ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab, may Allah be pleased with them both and Muhammad bin Maslamah broke the sword of Az-Zubair, may Allah be pleased with them both**], there was no mention of Fatimah or her house at all, whilst she, may the blessings of Allah be upon her, had definitely only died and been buried a few days before that. There is also no details concerning Muhammad bin Salamah breaking the sword of Az-Zubair in relation to how and why that took place. The rest of the incident is unclear. If that had really taken place, it would not be conceivable unless the four of them (‘Umar bin Al-Khattab, Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf, Muhammad bin Salamah and Az-Zubair bin Al-‘Awwam) were in the Masjid and close to the Minbar (pulpit). Then a heated exchange of words took place between them, Az-Zubair (who was quick tempered) became angry, unsheathed his sword and the Muhammad bin Salamah rushed with quick thinking to disarm him of the sword and broke it before something bad took place. That was while Abu Bakr with ‘Ali by his side wanted to ascend the Minbar to execute what he had been agreed the day before with ‘Ali. So, Abu Bakr hastened to ascend the Minbar … to the end of the story.

However, this possibility is strongly muddied as ‘Aa’ishah was watching this, just as her father had informed her concerning what had taken place on the previous day at ‘Ali’s house. She was listening, watching and following precisely from her room what was taking place in the Masjid. It is therefore extremely unlikely that such a serious matter took place, whilst there was no justification for not relating it and especially as she was aware of the suffering of her sister Asmaa’ from the sternness of Az-Zubair and his rough treatment of her. Why would she cover for him and for such a heinous error such as that?! In addition, Az-Zubair bin Al-‘Awwam, during that earlier period, was from the supporters of ‘Ali and from those who had refrained from giving the Bai’ah alongside him. As such, there was a prime opportunity to cast his badness upon ‘Ali (to discredit him), may the pleasure of Allah and peace be upon him. So, how could ‘Aa’ishah have missed this opportunity whilst she bore in herself towards ‘Ali (since the incident of the Ifk) that which is well-known?!

The obscurity is increased further by the wording of the text found in the selected Ahadeeth of the Maghazi of Musa bin ‘Uqbah: [**That Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf, may Allah be pleased with him, was with ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab, may Allah be pleased with him, that day. And that he broke Az-Zubair’s sword. And Allah is most aware about its breaking]**. This is at odds with what preceded. There is no mention of Muhammad bin Salamah at all and there is no convincing explanation for the manner of how Az-Zubair’s sword broke, if the sword was even at all broken, nor of the one who broke it!

It appears to me that Imam Ibrahim received the main part of the story from an unreliable source which was inserted with caution. He made it fair seeming by mentioning his father Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf and did not exaggerate in the details that did not occur, in order to get passed the sharpness of Imam Ibrahim bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf. Therefore, in reality, there was no unsheathing of a sword, no breaking of it and none of that took place in this world at all. Az-Zubair and the rest of the group of ‘Ali had attended with ‘Ali. There is no doubt that he had informed them of the crying of Abu Bakr, his apology of the previous day and what he had agreed upon with Abu Bakr. The atmosphere was therefore one of release and reconciliation. So, from where did the (story of) unsheathing swords come from?!

As for the remainder of the Hadith, then it is supported by the Hadith of the Mother of the Believers, ‘Aa’ishah, even if it was more detailed. That is as it contained statements related to the favour and virtue of ‘Ali and Abu Bakr’s affirmation of that, which ‘Aa’ishah did not wish to relate and as such omitted it, due to what she felt towards ‘Ali, may Allah’s blessings be upon him, in terms of the well-known rupture (between them).

As for the speech attributed to both ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, and Az-Zubair: [We were not angry except that we were not present at the consultation and we view that Abu Bakr is the **most worthy or entitled of the people for it (the leadership) after the Messenger of Allah** ﷺ. He was the companion of the cave, the second of the two. We know his honour and eminence and the Messenger of Allah ﷺ commanded him to lead the people in the prayer whilst he was still living], it is not possible to view it to be reliable. Rather, with this wording it is **most unlikely**, due to the following reasons:

**Firstly**: If this had been said in the Masjid in front of everyone as is **claimed** in this narration. It is not conceivable that the Mother of the Believers, ‘Aa’ishah, the daughter of Abu Bakr, would have failed to transmit it, whilst she was following and listening to what was taking place in the Masjid at the time of the Zhuhr prayer, with complete interest and focus. That is because her father, without doubt, had informed her of the great news; the reconciliation with ‘Ali and his appointed time to give the Bai’ah. That is especially as she transmitted to us in detail: “‘Ali then stated the Tashahhud, extolled Abu Bakr's right, and said, that he had not done what he did begrudging Abu Bakr or denying the favour that Allah had favoured him with. (He said): “**However, we considered that we too had a right to participate in this matter (of rulership) and that he (i.e. Abu Bakr) excluded us in this matter and we felt upset in ourselves**”. It is therefore not possible that ‘Ali, may Allah’s blessing be upon him, said: “We view that Abu Bakr is the **most worthy or entitled of the people for it (the leadership) after the Messenger of Allah** ﷺ” or something similar to that and then ‘Aa’ishah, may the pleasure of Allah and peace be upon her, not rejoice and indeed be ecstatic with such a statement!

**Secondly**: It has been related concerning ‘Ali bin Abi Talib, may Allah’s pleasure and peace be upon him, with chains of transmission which are stronger than the chain of this narration, from numerous alternative paths, which establish certain knowledge, stating that he, may the blessings of Allah and His pleasure be upon whim, believed, rightly or wrongly, that he was the most entitled or worthy from among the people for the Khilafah. We will present them, by Allah’s permission, in an attached independent section at the end of the research paper.

As for what was presented from Imam Muhammad bin Ishaq in his “Maghazi” as mentioned by Imam Al-Baihaqiy in “Al-I’tiqaad”: [And he said in relation to the apology or excusing of Abu Bakr to ‘Ali and others from those who had held back from giving the Bai’ah (that he said): ““By Allah, we did not conclude that (the Bai’ah) in the absence of those who were nor present from it except due to the fear of the occurrence of Fitnah (discord) and the escalation of the situation, even though I disliked that. Had it been different to that I would not have loved for anyone to have been present more than you and those like you in station”. He then looked over the people and said: “O People, this is ‘Ali bin Abi Talib and there is no Bai’ah to me upon his neck whilst he has a choice in his affair. Indeed, and all of you have a choice in respect to your Bai’ah to me. If you view that it should be given to other than me, then I will be the first to give him the Bai’ah”. Then when ‘Ali heard that, what had felt inside him dissipated, and he said: “There is no dissolution. We do not view anyone for it other than you”. He then extended his hand and gave him the Bai’ah alongside the group of people with him and all of the people were said similar to that. So, they returned the matter to Abu Bakr and he was the Khalifah (successor) of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. And that was because he selected him to lead the Salah (prayer) after him. They used to call him the Khalifah (successor) of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ until he died].

There is no doubt that this narration is more complete and has more integrity. In addition, there is no surprise that some of it was not found in the Hadith of ‘Aa’ishah, particularly: “Abu Bakr’s seeking from the people to give up the position and his advancing ‘Ali over himself”. That is because her stance towards ‘Ali is well-known and famous and nothing of the previously mentioned dubious matters return back to him. There is no wonder in respect to this as Muhammad bin Ishaq is not the Imam of Maghazi alone but rather he is the Ameer ul-Mu’mineen (The Leader of the Believers) in respect to the Hadith (in spite of what some have said regarding him).

- Abu Bakr’s request to the people to be discharged from the office (of the Khilafah), following the Bai’ah of ‘Ali bin Abi Talib to him, has been reiterated in what was related by Imam Abdullah bin Ahmad bin Hanbal in “Fadaa’il As-Sahabah” (1/133/102): [My father related me from Taleed bin Sulaiman, from Abin Al-Jahhaf], in “Fadaa’il As-Sahabah” (1/151/133): [Ahmad bin Abdul Jabbar related to us from Muhammad bin ‘Abbad Sandula, from Taleed bin Sulaiman. From Abu Al-Jahhaf Dawud bin Abi ‘Awf] and in “Fadaa’il As-Sahabah” (1/132/101): [Abdullah bin ‘Umar Abu Abdur Rahman Al-Qurashi related to me from ‘Ali bin Hashim bin Al-Bareed, from his father Al-Jahhaf, who said: “When Abu Bakr was given the Bai’ah and ‘Ali and his followers gave him the Bai’ah, he (Abu Bakr) stood three times requesting from the people that he be discharged (i.e. from the office of the Khilafah). He said: “O people, I have rescinded your Bai’ah, is there anyone who objects?” He said: ‘Ali stood at the front of the people and said: “By Allah, we will not absolve you and we will ever not seek that you be discharged. The Messenger of Allah advanced you to lead the people in prayer, so who then can dismiss you]. This is Mursal with no Ba’s (problem or issue) with it.

In any case, there is nothing in the reports of the two Imams; Ibrahim bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf in the Musnad narration of Musa bin ‘Uqbah and Muhammad bin Ishaq bin Yasar, that supports the Mursal narration of Abu Nadrah. Indeed, it is contrary to it.

These reports are contradictory with the last line of the Mursal report of Humain bin Abdur Rahman Al-Humairiy, which we will present in full below, by Allah’s permission, as came stated in “Tareekh At-Tabari”: [Az-Zubair took out his sword and said I will not sheathe it until ‘Ali is given the Bai’ah. The news of that reached Abu Bakr and ‘Umar and so ‘Umar said: “Take the sword of Az-Zubair and smash it upon a rock”. He said: ‘Umar then set off to them and arrived to them both in a weary state. He then said: Either you will both give the Bai’ah in compliance (or obedience) or you will give the Bai’ah against your will”. So, they both gave the Bai’ah].

These reports also contradict what Musa bin ‘Uqbah said in his “Maghazi”, in a **Mursal narration without an Isnad (chain of transmission)**: [That men from the Muhajirin were angry with the Bai’ah that had been given to Abu Bakr, including ‘Ali and Az-Zubair. They entered the house of Fatimah, the daughter of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, whilst bearing weapons. ‘Umar bin AL-Khattab went to them among a group of the Muhajirin and the Ansar including among them Usaid bin Hudair, Salamah bin Salamah bin Waqash Al-Ash’halyan and Thabit bin Qais bin Shammas Al-Khazraji. They spoke to them to the point that one of the people took the sword of Az-Zubair and struck it against a rock until it broke]. It was presented like this without an isnad (chain of transmission). If this indeed happened at all, then it must have been following the death of Fatimah and it is inconceivable that it took place during her life without their being an exchange of words with the group or a reprimand and rebuke from her to them. In addition, who would dare to approach the house of the daughter of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ in this manner, even if some of relaters from the feeble-minded Rawaafid have claimed contrary to that.

If this was meant to have happened following the death of Fatimah, then it is even more unlikely. They were meant to be seeking refuge in the house of Fatimah due to their weakness. Then Az-Zubair came out with his sword (and in one narration, he stumbles) and his sword is taken and smashed, whilst ‘Ali is not here or there (in this whole affair). And all of this was supposed to have happened within sight of the Mother of the Believers ‘Aa’ishah (whose house, as is known, was adjoined to the house of Fatimah), and yet she passed up the opportunity to take this out against ‘Ali by mentioning this shameful incident?!

- The authenticity of the speech attributed to Abu Bakr in his Khutbah is supported by what Imam Abdullah bin Ahmad bin Hanbal recorded in “Fadaa’il As-Sahabah” (1/406/626): [Al-Husain related to us from ‘Ubadah bin Ziyad, from Musa Al-Asadiy, from Yahya bin Al-‘Alaa Ar-Raazi, from Ja’far, from his father and Abu Al-Bakhtariy Al-Madaniy, from Ja’far, from his father and from Abdus Salam bin Abdullah, from ‘Ikrimah, from Ibn ‘Abbas: That Abu Bakr said: “By the One in whose hand is my soul, I did not take it out of desire for it nor the wish to have preference over anyone of the Muslims. I was not at all eager for it for even a single day or night and I did not ask Allah ‘Azza Wa Jalla (in supplication) for it in secret or openly. I have been appointed in a great matter that I have no power (or capability) over unless Allah assists me upon it].

**I say**: This Isnad (chain or transmission) is independent from the Isnad of Al-Hakim. Therefore, if we were to add to it what has been authenticated, without any Shubhah (dubiousness) attached to it, related from Rafi’ bin Abu Rafi’ At-Ta’iy and his rebuking of Abu Bakr, definiteness is obliged in respect to the speech attributed to Abu Bakr: ““By Allah, I was not at all eager for the position of leadership for a single day or night. I did not desire it and I did not ask Allah for it secretly or openly. However, I feared the occurrence of Fitnah (discord). In the position of leadership I have no rest. I have been appointed to a great matter which I don’t have the strength for it and no two hands except by the strengthening of Allah. I had wished that the strongest of the people in relation to it would be in my place today”. Consequently, there is no validity to what has come related from the rejectable and void Mursal narrations which stated that Abu Bakr said: “O ‘Ali, you are the cousin of the Messenger of Allah and his son-in-law, then you say: I am most entitled to this matter (i.e. leadership). **No, by Allah, I am more entitled than you**” or that he said: “**Who is more entitled (or more worthy) of this matter than me? Am I not the first who prayed? Am I not this and am I not this? …**” And he went on to mention virtuous acts that he had undertaken with the Prophet ﷺ” May Allah forbid that such rotten falsehood come from Abu Bakr, may Allah’s pleasure and peace be upon him. These represent nothing more than lies that have been fabricated by hypocrites from Bani Umayyah, may Allah curse them, through which they seek to diminish the Imam of guidance and the triumphant lion of Allah, Ali bin Abi Talib, in addition to the cursing of ‘Ali which they used to engage in upon the Minbars (pulpits) and then deceive the people of dim wittedness and stupidity from the Sunhadiyah (Ahl us-Sunnah Wa-l-Hadith) with it.

**I say**: In any case, there is nothing in the previous narrations that indicates that they refer to the day of the public Bai’ah and second day following the Saqeefah. Also, the speech of Abu Bakr in his Khutbah does not resemble what is known concerning his first Khutbah, which we have previously presented a part of, and it is not fitting in origin to the situation of the day of the public Bai’ah. It is therefore apparent that it took place after a period of time in which matters occurred which caused Abu Bakr to apologise and to reaffirm that he had not at all been eager to take the position of leadership and he reinforced that by seeking to be dismissed from the post.

Consequently, the Hadith of Musa bin ‘Uqbah, upon the assumption of its authenticity, does not support and indeed falsifies the Mursal narration of Abu Nadrah which Wuhaib was deluded with, when he made it connected from the path of Abu Sa’id Al-Khudriy and attached it to the main part of the Hadith which is authentic without doubt. The matter is therefore not like Imam Ibn Kathir believed it to me when he said: [This Isnad (chain) is Sahih and Mahfoozh (preserved) from the Hadith of Abu Nadrah Al-Mundhir bin Malik bin Qit’ah, from Abu Sa’id Sa’d bin Malik bin Sinan Al-Khudriy. It contains a great benefit and that is the Bai’ah of ‘Ali bin Abi Talib, either on the first or second day following the death. This is the Haqq (truth), as ‘Ali bin Abi Talib did not separate from As-Siddeeq at any time and did not cease praying behind him in any prayer from the prayers, as we shall mention. He also went out with him to Dhu l-Qassah when As-Siddeeq went out unsheathing his sword desiring to the fight the people of apostacy (Ahlu r-Riddah), as we will shortly elaborate upon. However, when Fatimah, may Allah be pleased with her, reproached As-Siddeeq due to what she wrongly believed in terms of her being entitled to the inheritance of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, and was unaware of what As-Siddeeq, may Allah be pleased with him, informed her of, in that he ﷺ had said: “We are not inherited from, what we leave behind is Sadaqah”. As such he prevented her, others from his wives and uncle from the inheritance based upon this explicit text, which we explain its is right context. She asked him for ‘Ali, her husband, to look into the Sadaqah of the land which was in Khaibar and Fadak, but he did not accede to her in that as he viewed that it was his right to undertake all that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ used to carry out. That is as he was the truthful, pious, right guided and follower of the truth, may Allah be pleased with him. Consequently, she became upset and angry whilst she was only an infallible woman from among humankind. She then did not speak to As-Siddeeq until she died, may Allah be pleased with her, and ‘Ali needed to take into consideration her temperament somewhat (during that period). Then, when she passed away six months after the death of her father ﷺ, ‘Ali viewed that he should renew his Bai’ah with Abu Bakr, may Allah be pleased with him, as we will mention later, Allah willing, from the Sahihain (Al-Bukhari and Muslim) and other sources, alongside the Bai’ah he had already given prior to the burial of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. The authenticity of this is increased by what Musa bin ‘Uqbah stated in his “Maghazi” from Sa’d bin Ibrahim who said: [My father related to me that his father Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf was with ‘Umar and that Muhammad bin Maslamah broke Az-Zubair’s sword. Then Abu Bakr addressed the people. He apologised to the people and said: “By Allah, I was not eager for the position of leadership for even a day or night and I did not ask Allah for it in secret or openly”. The Muhajirun accepted what he said and ‘Ali and Az-Zubair said: “We were not angry except because we were kept away from the consultation. And verily, we view that Abu Bakr is the worthiest (or most entitled) of the people for it (i.e. the position of leadership). Indeed, he is the companion of the cave and we know his honour and experience. And the Messenger of Allah ﷺ commanded him to lead the people in prayer whilst he was (still) living”]. It is a Jayyid (good) Isnad and to Allah belongs the praise]. This is word for word what came mentioned in “Al-Bidayah Wa-n-Nihayah” of the Hajr edition (8/92-93).

**However**, one’s love for a thing makes one blind and deaf, and Ibn Kathir hates the objectionable statements of the Rafidah and wishes to falsify them by any means. However, the falsehood is only falsified by the Haqq (truth) and not by other than it. May Allah’s refuge be sought for the matter to be other than that because Allah is Al-Haqq Al-Mubeen (The Manifest truth) and His statement is Al-Haqq Al-Mubeen:

بَلْ نَقْذِفُ **بِالْحَقِّ عَلَى الْبَاطِلِ** فَيَدْمَغُهُ فَإِذَا هُوَ زَاهِقٌ ۚ وَلَكُمُ الْوَيْلُ مِمَّا تَصِفُونَ

Rather, We fling the **truth against the falsehood**, so it destroys it, and behold, it vanishes. And woe to you for that (lie) which you ascribe (Al-Anbiya’: 18).

In both past and recent times Imam Ibn Kathir was not the only one to have been fooled by this **false addition**. The following came stated in “Al-Bidayah Wa-n-Nihayah” of the Hajr edition (9/416): [Al-Hafizh Abu ‘Ali An-Naisaburiy said: I heard Ibn Khuzaimah saying: Muslim bin Al-Hajjaj came to me and asked me concerning this Hadith. So, I wrote it for him on a parchment and read it upon him. He then said: “This Hadith is equal to a sacrificial camel (Badanah)” I said: “It is equal to a Badanah?! Rather, it is equal to a Badrah”]. I say: A Badrah is a bag full of Deenars which I believe customarily be equal to 100 Deenar which is 800 Badanah. Al-Ustadh ‘Ali Muhammad As-Sallabiy in 2Al-Inshiraah Wa Raf’u d-Daiq” in the Seerah of Abu Bakr (p: 169): [From that which indicates to the significance of the Sahih Hadith of Sa’id Al-Khudriy is that Imam Muslim bin Al-Hajjaj, the author of “Jami’ As-Sahih” which is the most authentic of the books of Hadith after “Sahih Al-Bukhari”, went to his Sheikh the Imam Al-Hafizh Muhammad bin Ishaq bin Khuzaimah and asked him about this Hadith. Ibn Khuzaimah wrote the Hadith for him and Muslim said to his Sheikh Ibn Khuzaimah: “This Hadith is equal to a Badanah” and Ibn Khuzaimah said in response: “This Hadith is not just equal to a Badanah, but rather it is equal to a Badrah of money”].

**I say**: No Badanah, no Badrah and not even some pennies and verily to Allah do we belong and to him shall we return. It may be that Imam Muslim became aware after that of the defect of this Hadith with its addition or doubted in its authenticity as he did not record it in his Sahih but rather only recorded the Hadith of ‘Aa’ishah which Al-Bukhari and the majority of the A’immah (Scholars) recorded. And Allah is most knowledgeable and best in judgement.

**Consequently, the authenticity of the Hadith of the Mother of the Believers, As-Siddeeqah ‘Aa’ishah the daughter of As-Siddeeq, has been ascertained without a considered doubt and it has pushed away any claimed opposition. It has established that ‘Ali, may Allah’s pleasure and peace be upon him, believed that he was more entitled or worthy for the Khilafah and that he found within himself the feeling of pain (i.e. in respect to what happened). Then he only gave the Bai’ah six months or so following the Saqeefah. This is what Ibn Al-Atheer accurately concluded in “Al-Kamil Fee At-Tareekh” (10/54) when he said: [The correct view is that the Ameer ul-Mu’mineen (Leader of the Believers) did not give the Bai’ah except after six months, and Allah is most knowledgeable].**

There is therefore no need for the loathsome and absurd undertaking and to engage in contentious wrangling with what is false, like that which Imam Ibn Kathir got entangled in when he said in his “Al-Bidayah Wa-n-Nihayah” (9/417): [This is fitting in respect to ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, which is indicated to by the reports, his attendance with him in the congregational prayers and his departure alongside him (for battle) to Dhu l-Qassah, following the death of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, which we will present, in addition to his extension of advice and consultation to him. As for what came later in terms of his Bai’ah to him (i.e. Abu Bakr), following the death of Fatimah, who passed away six months after her father ﷺ, **then that is understood to represent a second Bai’ah**, which removed what had occurred in terms of coldness in relations due to what had ben said concerning the inheritance and his (Abu Bakr’s) preventing them of that due to the text from the Messenger of Allah ﷺ in his speech: “We are not inherited from. What we leave (behind) is Sadaqah”, concerning which we have previously presented its chains of transmission and its wordings, and to Allah belongs all praise. We have written these paths in in a thorough manner in the book which we dedicated to the Seerah of As-Siddeeq (Abu Bakr), may Allah be pleased with him, in addition to what he transmitted of Ahadeeth from the Messenger of Allah ﷺ and what has been related concerning him in terms of Ahkam which were categorised in accordance with the categories of knowledge. And to Allah belongs all praise and graciousness].

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

**Section: Refutation (or response to) of Ustadh Doctor Khalid Kabir ‘Alaal:**

It may be worth mentioning here as well that Ustadh Doctor Khalid Kabir ‘Alaal, who is a member of the teaching department in the faculty of history and geography as the high school for teachers in Bouzareah, was also deceived by the false addition to the Hadith of Abu Sa’id Al-Khudriy in his valuable study: “Examination of the stance of ‘Ali bin Abi Talib towards the Khilafah of Abu Bakr”. There is no fault or blame in that upon the Ustadh as many of the major scholars have been deceived by it and Ibn Kathir is sufficient evidence for that, the statements of whom we have only just presented. However, Doctor Khalid Kabir ‘Alaal added upon what had been stated by those who preceded him by presenting a number of supportive evidences which he believed strengthened that narration. I was therefore not capable, due to the relationship between me and Allah, to leave that without undertaking an examination or revision:

**The first supporting evidence**: Doctor Khalid Kabir ‘Alaal said: [The first of them is that the related report has been authenticated that (some nights) after the death of the Messenger ﷺ, Abu Bakr prayed the ‘Asr prayer and ‘Ali bin Abi Talib was with him. Then, when the prayer had finished, they left walking together. They then found Al-Hasan playing with the boys in the road. Abu Bakr carried him and said: “O, by my father, he resembles the Prophet and he does not resemble ‘Ali” whilst ‘Ali laughed. **This incident took place nights after death of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ and did not take place after six months**. Had ‘Ali bin Abi Talib been disputing with Abu Bakr and refrained from giving him the Bai’ah, he would have isolated from him and this warm brotherly relationship would not have existed (between them). Therefore, they were praying together, walking together and joking with each other].

I say: Doctor Khalid Kabir ‘Alaal is referring to the following Hadith:

- Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal recorded in his Musnad (1/8/40): [Muhammad bin Abdullah bin Az-Zubair related to us from ‘Umar bin Sa’id, from Ibn Abi Mulaikah, from ‘Uqbah bin Al-Harith, who said: I left with Abu Bakr As-Siddeeq, may Allah be pleased with him, from the ‘Asr prayer, **some nights** following the death of the Prophet ﷺ, and ‘Ali, peace be upon him, was walking by his side. They passed by Hasan bin ‘Ali playing with some boys. He (Abu Bakr) then carried him upon his shoulders whilst saying “O, by my father, he resembles the Prophet and he does not resemble ‘Ali”. He said: And ‘Ali was laughing (at that)]. It has been reported exactly like this also in “Fadaa’il As-Sahabah” (2/768/1351) and Abu Ya’la recorded it in his Musnad (1/42/38): [Al-Qawaririy related it to us from Abu Ahmad Az-Zubairiy and it included the wording “some nights”]. Ibn Abi ‘Asim ‘Amr Ash-Shaibani recorded it in “Al-Aahaad Wa-l-Mathaaniy” (1/299/409): [Abu Bakr bin Abi Shaibah related it to us from Muhammad bin Abdullah Al-Asadiy … And it does not include the wording “**some nights**”].

This wording of “**Some nights**” was only related by Abu Ahmad Muhammad bin Abdullah Az-Zubair Az-Zubairiy Al-Asadiy, which was related from him by each of Ahmad bin Hanbal and Al-Qawaririy, whilst Abu Bakr bin Abi Shaibah did not relate it!

- Al-Bukhari related it without the wording via the path of Abdullah bin Mubarak in his Sahih (3/1370/3540): [Abdan related to us from Abdullah from ‘Umar bin Sa’id bin Abi Husain, from Ibn Abu Mulaikah, from ‘Uqbah bin Al-Harith, who said: I saw Abu Bakr. He carried Al-Hasan whilst he was saying: “By my father, he resembled the Prophet and does not resemble ‘Ali” and ‘Ali was laughing]. Abu Ahmad Az-Zubairiy is not superior to Al-Mubarak nor ‘Abdan.

- Al-Bukhari also related it without the wording via the path of Abu ‘Asim An-Nabeel in his Sahih (3/1302/3349): [Abu ‘Asim related to us from ‘Umar bin Sa’id bin Abi Husain, from Ibn Abu Mulaikah, from ‘Uqbah bin Al-Harith, who said: Abu Bakr performed the ‘Asr prayer and then left walking. He then saw Al-Hasan playing with the boys. He picked him upon his shoulders and said: “By my father, he resembles the Prophet and does not resemble ‘Ali” whilst ‘Ali laughed]. Al-Hakim recorded it in his “Mustadrak” (3/184/4784) as follows: [Abu Al-Husain Muhammad bin Ahmad Al-Qantariy related to us in Baghdad from Abu Qilabah, from Abu ‘Asim, from ‘Umar bin Sa’id bin Abi Husain, from his father, from Ibn Abi Mulaikah, from ‘Uqbah bin Al-Harith: That Abu Bakr As-Siddeeq, may Allah be pleased with him, came across Al-Hasan bin ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with them both. He then embraced him and said: “By my father, he resembles the Prophet and does not resemble ‘Ali”, whilst ‘Ali was laughing]. Al-Hakim said: [This Hadith is Sahih upon the Shart (conditionality) of the two Sheikhs (Al-Bukhari and Muslim)]. Abu Ahmad Az-Zubairiy is not superior to Abu ‘Asim.

- An-Nasa’iy recorded it in his Sunan Al-Kubra without the wording (5/49/8161) via Ath-Thawriy: [Muhammad bin Abdullah bin Al-Mubarak related to us from Abu Dawud, from Sufyan, from ‘Umar bin Sa’id, from Ibn Abi Mulaikah, from ‘Uqbah bin Al-Harith, who said: I was with Abu Bakr when he passed by Al-Hasan. He then placed him upon his neck and said: “By my father, he resembles the Prophet ﷺ and does not resemble ‘Ali”. ‘Ali was with him and began to laugh]. At-Tabarani recorded it in his “Mu’jam Al-Kabir” (3/21/2527): [Muhammad bin Abdullah Al-Hadramiy related to us from Abdullah bin Al-Hakam bin Abi Ziyad, from Abu Ziyad, from Abu Dawud Al-Hafariy, from Sufyan, from ‘Umar bin Sa’id, from Ibn Abi Mulaikah, from ‘Uqbah bin Al-Harith, who said: I was with Abu Bakr, may Allah be pleased with him, when he passed by Al-Hasan bin ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with them. He placed him upon his neck and said: “By my father, he resembles the Prophet ﷺ and does not resemble ‘Ali”. ‘Ali was with him and began to laugh, may Allah be pleased with them all]. Abu Ya’la also recorded the following in his Musnad (1/42/39): [Zuhair bin Harb related to us from Qubaisah, from Sufyan, from ‘Umar bin Sa’id bin Abi Husain, from Ibn Abi Mulaikah, from ‘Uqbah bin Al-Harith, who said: I saw Abu Bakr carrying Al-Hasan bin ‘Ali and saying: “O, by my father, he resembles the Prophet and does not resemble ‘Ali”. Ali was with him smiling]. Abu Ahmad Az-Zubairiy is not superior to Ath-Thawriy.

There is no doubt that the addition of the Thiqah (one who is reliable and trustworthy) is accepted. That is unless Adillah (evidences) or Qaraa’in (connotations) establish the addition’s irregularity, which is the case here. That is because Ahmad Az-Zubairiy came later and was the student of Ath-Thawriy. Therefore, the receival of Ath-Thawriy and Ibn ul-Mubarak from their Sheikh ‘Umar bin Sa’id bin Abi Husain is inevitably more long standing and prior. Similarly, Abu ‘Asim is more long standing as he is from the generation of Ibn ul-Mubarak, except his death was later after surpassing ninety years of age. It is therefore likely that Abu Ahmad Az-Zubairiy received from ‘Umar bin Sa’id bin Abi Husain when he was elderly.

Whatever the case, whether the addition was from ‘Umar bin Sa’id bin Abi Husain due to his elderly age or from Abu Ahmad Az-Zubairiy, the preponderant view is that it is irregular and as such it is not permissible to depend upon it.

In addition, even if the addition “by (some) nights” was established by way of Tawatur (definite concurrent transmissions), it does not definitely indicate that ‘Ali did not delay in giving the Bai’ah and it is not an evidence indicating that he had given the Bai’ah. And who has even claimed that he had disassociated or isolated himself from the Masjid or did not attend the congregation during the period of time in which he had not given the Bai’ah?! May Allah’s refuge be sought. And who said that he was no longer someone who had a sense of humour as he has always had, may Allah’s pleasure and peace be upon him?! May Allah’s refuge be sought.

Indeed, if someone was to say: It is more fitting for that to have been prior to the Bai’ah in the case where Allah willed that Abu Bakr pass by Al-Hasan bin ‘Ali whilst he was playing, whereby Abu Bakr seized the “golden opportunity” to hug him, carry him upon his shoulders and joke with him using the same sentence that Fatimah, blessing and peace be upon her, the daughter of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ used to dance and bound with, saying: “By my father, he resembles the Prophet and does nor resemble ‘Ali”. That had a magical impact in ‘Ali and as such he could not contain himself from laughing or burst out laughing. If someone were to say that, it would have been more likely to be correct. As such, this supportive evidence is like what the people in Egypt say in their nice dialect “It is the witness (or supportive evidence) of that which has not seen anything!”.

**The second supporting evidence**: Doctor Khalid Kabir ‘Alaal said: [The report has been authenticated that after two months and some days following the death of the Messenger ﷺ, Abu Bakr As-Siddeeq went out to the town of Dhu l-Qassah, on the outskirts of Al-Madinah Al-Munawwarah, with his sword unsheathed to fight against the apostates. Some of the Sahabah opposed his decision (to go out personally), advised him to return to Al-Madinah and let them assume the task. Among them was ‘Ali bin Abi Talib. He took hold of Abu Bakr’s ride and said to him: “Where are you going O Khalifah of the Messenger of Allah. I say to you what the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said on the day of (the battle of) Uhud: Put your sword away, do not afflict us with distress us with your life. And return to Al-Madinah. That is because, by Allah, if we were afflicted with distress through you, there would never be order for Islam”” And so he heard and returned back (to Al-Madinah)].

**I say**: There is no blame here upon Doctor Khalid Kabir ‘Alaal as he is not a Hadith critic, but rather the great blame is only upon the classical Imams like Imam Ibn Kathir as he was form the Imams of Fiqh and Hadith who presented this report without making clear its invalidity.

First, I will present the statements of the A’immah (Scholars/Imams):

- The following came stated in “Al-Bidayah Wa-n-Nihayah” [Edition: Ihyaa’ At-Turath (6/346)]: [Ad-Daraqutniy related from the Hadith of Abdul Wahhab bin Musa Az-Zuhriy, from Malik, from Ibn Shihab, from Sa’id bin Al-Musayyib, from Ibn ‘Umar, that he said: When Abu Bakr set off towards Al-Qassah and settled upon his riding animal, ‘Ali took hold of its reins and said: “Where are you going O Khalifah of the Messenger of Allah? I will say to you what the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said on the day of Uhud: ‘Put your sword away, do not afflict us with distress us with your life’. And return to Al-Madinah. That is because, by Allah, if we were afflicted with distress through you, there would never be order for Islam” And so returned back (to Al-Madinah) … **This Hadith is Ghareeb via Malik** and Zakariya As-Saajiy related it from the Hadith of Abdul Wahhab, from Musa bin Abdul ‘Aziz bin ‘Umar bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf Az-Zuhriy, from Abu Az-Zinnad, from Hisham bin ‘Urwah, from his father, from ‘Aa’ishah who said: My father went out with his sword unsheathed (i.e. for battle) riding his riding animal to the valley of Al-Qassah. ‘Ali bin Abi Talib then came and took hold of the reins of his riding animal and said: “Where are you going O Khalifah of the Messenger of Allah? I will say to you what the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said on the day of Uhud: ‘Put your sword away, do not afflict us with distress us with your life’. And return to Al-Madinah. That is because, by Allah, if we were afflicted with distress through you, there would never be order for Islam” And so he returned back (to Al-Madinah) and the army continued on]. And he did not add upon his statement which he made concerning the first Hadith: “**This Hadith is Ghareeb via Malik**”. Rather, he was completely silent upon the second. Attributing the two Hadith to Abdul Wahhab from Musa bin Abdul ‘Aziz bin ‘Umar bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf Az-Zuhriy alone represents a horrendous Tadlis (manipulation of the Isnad) if done intentionally and a terrible shortcoming if done out of heedlessness. That is because it gives the impression that there is no one in the Isnad other than those mentioned who require examination in respect to their conditions, may Allah forgive him. **And it is this that represents the trap that Doctor Khalid Kabir ‘Alaal fell into**!

- As-Suyutiy, who is from the Huffazh, said in “Tareekh Al-Khulafaa’” (p: 61): [Ad-Daraqutniy recorded from Ibn ‘Umar that he said: When Abu Bakr set off towards Al-Qassah and settled upon his riding animal, ‘Ali took hold of its reins and said: “Where are you going O Khalifah of the Messenger of Allah? I will say to you what the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said on the day of Uhud: ‘Put your sword away, do not afflict us with distress us with your life’. And return to Al-Madinah. That is because, by Allah, if we were afflicted with distress through you, there would never be order for Islam”] It was presented like this without the Isnad (chain of transmission) and he did not make any comment, placing the sole responsibility upon Ad-Daraqutniy, and therefore he was not just in respect to that.

- The same applies in respect to Shihab ud-Deen bin Hajar Al-Haitamiy As-Sa’diy Al-Ansari (Sheikh ul-Islam!) in his “As-Sawaa’iq Al-Muhriqah ‘Ala Ahl ur-Rafd Wa d-Dalaal Wa z-Zandiqah” (1/46): [Ad-Daraqutniy recorded from Ibn ‘Umar that he said: When Abu Bakr set off towards Al-Qassah and settled upon his riding animal, ‘Ali took hold of its reins and said: “Where are you going O Khalifah of the Messenger of Allah? I will say to you what the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said on the day of Uhud: ‘Put your sword away, do not afflict us with distress us with your life’. And return to Al-Madinah. That is because, by Allah, if we were afflicted with distress through you, there would never be order for Islam”] This was also presented without the Isnad (chain of transmission) and he did not make any comment, placing the sole responsibility upon Ad-Daraqutniy, and therefore he was not just in respect to that.

- It also came mentioned in “Ma’aarij Al-Qubool BiSharh Sullam Al-Wusool” (3/1137): [As related by Ad=Daraqutniy via Malik from Ibn Shihab, from Sa’id bin Al-Musayyib, from Ibn ‘Umar, may Allah be pleased with them both, that he said: When Abu Bakr set off towards Al-Qassah and settled upon his riding animal, ‘Ali took hold of its reins and said: “Where are you going O Khalifah of the Messenger of Allah? I will say to you what the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said on the day of Uhud: ‘Put your sword away, do not afflict us with distress us with your life’. And return to Al-Madinah. That is because, by Allah, if we were afflicted with distress through you, there would never be order for Islam” He then returned … It was also related by Zakariya As-Saajiy from the Hadith of Abdul Wahhab bin Musa bin Abdul ‘Aziz bin ‘Umar bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf and also from Az-Zuhriy via Abu Az-Zinnad, from Hisham bin ‘Urwah, from his father, from ‘Aa’ishah who said: My father went out with his sword unsheathed (i.e. for battle) riding his riding animal to the valley of Al-Qassah. ‘Ali bin Abi Talib then came and took hold of the reins of his riding animal and said: “Where are you going O Khalifah of the Messenger of Allah? I will say to you what the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said on the day of Uhud: ‘Put your sword away, do not afflict us with distress us with your life’. And return to Al-Madinah. That is because, by Allah, if we were afflicted with distress through you, there would never be order for Islam” And so he returned back (to Al-Madinah) and the army continued on].

This represents a hideous Tadlis (manipulation of the Isnad) from Hafizh bin Ahmad bin ‘Ali Al-Hakamiy (DoD: 1377 AH) because the mention of some of the Isnad “Malik from Ibn Shihab, from Sa’id bin Al-Musayyib, from Ibn ‘Umar” gives the impression that it is authentic, whilst there is a terrible error in the second Isnad “From the Hadith of Abdul Wahhab bin Musa bin Abdul ‘Aziz bin ‘Umar bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf and also from Az-Zuhriy”. Rather it is “From the Hadith of Abdul Wahhab bin Musa bin Abdul ‘Aziz bin ‘Umar bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf Az-Zuhriy”. Therefore, the wording “also” has no origin to it. Perhaps it is found in many places like this, similar to this or **even worse than it**, accompanied by the certainty of its authenticity.

**We will now present the origins of the Isnad (chain of transmission):**

- The following came stated in the “Mu’jam” of Ibn ul-A’arabiy (2/791/1618): [Zakariya bin Yahya As-Saajiy related to us from **Abu Ghaziyah Muhammad bin Yahya bin Abdul ‘Aziz bin ‘Umar bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf Az-Zuhriy**, who said: Abdul Wahhab bin Musa bin Abdul ‘Aziz bin ‘Umar bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf related to me from Ibn Abu Az-Zinnad, from Hisham bin ‘Urwah, from his father, from ‘Aa’ishah, who said: My father went out with his sword unsheathed (i.e. for battle) riding his riding animal to Al-Qassah. ‘Ali bin Abi Talib then came and took hold of the reins of his riding animal and said: “Where are you going O Khalifah of the Messenger of Allah? I will say to you what the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said on the day of Uhud: ‘Put your sword away, do not afflict us with distress us with your life’. And return to Al-Madinah. That is because, by Allah, if we were afflicted with distress through you, there would never be order for Islam” And so he returned back (to Al-Madinah) and the army continued on].

- And the following came stated in “Ath-Thaamin ‘Ashr Min Al-Khila’iyaat” (p: 0/55): [Abu Hazim Muhammad bin Al-Husain bin Muhammad bin Khalaf Al-Farraa’ informed us: Abu l-Hasan ‘Ali bin ‘Umar bin Ahmad bin Mahdiy Ad-Daraqutniy related to us from Abdur Rahman bin Isma’eel bin Sahl Al-Basriy, from the origin of his book, he said: Zakariya bin Yahya bin Abdur Rahman Al-Faqeeh related to us, he said: **Abu Ghaziyah Muhammad bin Yahya bin Abdul ‘Aziz bin ‘Umar bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf** related to us from Abdur Rahman bin Abi Az-Zinnad, from Hisham bin ‘Urwah, from his father, from ‘Aa’ishah, who said: When the apostacy occurred my father departed for Dhu l-Qassah to fight the apostates. When he had settled upon his riding animal ‘Ali, peace be upon him, took hold of the reins of his riding animal and said: “O Khalifah of the Messenger of Allah, where are you going? I will say to you what the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said on the day of Uhud: ‘Put your sword away, do not afflict us with distress us with your life’. And return to Al-Madinah. That is because, by Allah, if we were afflicted with distress through you, there would never be order for Islam”. And so he returned].

- It came in recorded in “Al-Mashyakah Al-Baghdadiyah” of Ibn Tahir As-Salafiy (Printed edition: 11/2/7) as follows: [Abu Bakr Al-Mufid narrated to us from Zakariya bin Yahya bin Abdur Rahman As-Saajiy, from **Abu ‘Awaanah Muhammad bin Yahya bin Abdul ‘Aziz bin ‘Umar bin ‘Awf**, from Abdul Wahhab bin Musa bin Abdul ‘Aziz bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf, from Abdur Rahman bin Abi Az-Zinnad, from Hisham bin ‘Urwah, from his father, from ‘Aa’ishah, may Allah be pleased with her, that she said: My father went out with his sword unsheathed (i.e. for battle) riding his riding animal to Al-Qassah. ‘Ali bin Abi Talib then came and took hold of the reins of his riding animal and said: “Where are you going O Khalifah of the Messenger of Allah? I will say to you what the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said on the day of Uhud: ‘Put your sword away, do not afflict us with distress us with your life’. And return to Al-Madinah. That is because, by Allah, if we were afflicted with distress through you, there would never be order for Islam” And so he returned back (to Al-Madinah) and the army continued on]. I say: Abu ‘Awaanah is definitely a misprint. It is rather Abu Ghaziyah.

- The following came stated in “Tareekh Dimashq” of Ibn ‘Asakir (30/316): [Abu Talib ‘Ali bin Abdur Rahman related to us from Abu l-Hasan Al-Khal’iy, from Abu Muhammad bin An-Nahhas, from Abu Sa’id bin Al-A’arabiy, from Zakariya bin Yahya As-Saajiy … And Abu Abdullah Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Ibrahim related to us in his book, and then Abu l-Qasim Fadaa’il bin Al-Hasan bin Al-Fat’h related to us from Sahl bin Bishr, both of whom said: Muhammad bin Al-Husain At-Taffal related to us from Muhammad bin Ahmad Adh-Dhuhliy, from Abu Yahya Zakariya bin Yahya bin Abdur Rahman As-Saajiy, from **Abu Ghaziyah Muhammad bin Yahya bin Abdul ‘Aziz bin ‘Umar bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf Az-Zuhriy**, from Abdul Wahhab bin Musa bin Abdul ‘Aziz bin ‘Umar bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf Az-Zuhriy, from Ibn Abi Az-Zinnad, from Hisham bin ‘Urwah, from his father, from ‘Aa’ishah, who said: My father went out with his sword unsheathed (i.e. for battle) riding his riding animal to Al-Qassah. ‘Ali bin Abi Talib then came and took hold of the reins of his riding animal and said: “Where are you going O Khalifah of the Messenger of Allah? I will say to you what the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said on the day of Uhud: ‘Put your sword away, do not afflict us with distress us with your life’. And return to Al-Madinah. That is because, by Allah, if we were afflicted with distress through you, there would never be order for Islam” And so he returned back (to Al-Madinah) and the army continued on].

- The following also came stated in “Ath-Thaamin ‘Ashr Min Al-Khila’iyaat” (p: 0/54): [Abu Hazim Muhammad bin Al-Husain bin Muhammad bin Khalaf Al-Farra’ Al-Baghdadiy related to us from Al-Hasan ‘Ali bin ‘Umar bin Ahmad Ad-Daraqutniy Al-Hafizh in Baghdad, who said: Abu Abdullah Muhammad bin Isma’eel bin Ishaq bin Bahr Al-Faqeeh, related to me by dictation from his book, he said: Abu Al-Usbu’ Sahl bin Sawadah Al-Ghafiqiy and Muhammad bin Fairawuz Al-Baghdadiy related to us in Tinnees, they said: Abu Ghaziyah Muhammad bin Yahya Az-Zuhriy related to us from Abu l-‘Abbas Abdul Wahhab bin Musa Az-Zuhriy, from Malik bin Anas, from Ibn Shihab, from Sa’id bin Al-Musayyib, from Ibn ‘Umar, who said: When Abu Bakr As-Siddeeq, may Allah be pleased with him, set off towards Dhu l-Qassah in relation to the affair of the apostates. He was settled upon his riding animal and (then) ‘Ali bin Abi Talib, peace be upon him, took hold of the reins of his riding animal and said: “Where are you going O Khalifah of the Messenger of Allah? I will say to you what the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said on the day of Uhud: ‘Put your sword away, do not afflict us with distress us with your life’. And return to Al-Madinah. That is because, by Allah, if we were afflicted with distress through you, there would never be order for Islam” And so he (Abu Bakr) returned back (to Al-Madinah)].

**I say**: This incident did not take place in this world at all. ‘Aa’ishah did not narrate about it, just as Ibn ‘Umar, ‘Urwah. Ibn ul-Musayyib, Hisham bin ‘Urwah, Ibn Shihab Az-Zuhriy, Malik, Abdur Rahman bin Abi Az-Zinnad did not narrate it. Had it taken place then the people would have set off to travel to Al-Madinah to receive it from Malik and it would have reached us by way of At-Tawatur (definite concurrent reports). The strongest most preponderant (or likely) view as well is that Abu l-‘Abbas Abdul Wahhab bin Musa bin Abdul ‘Aziz bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf Az-Zuhriy did not hear (or receive) this at all whether in wakefulness or sleep. **Rather, it is only an invented fabricated lie fabricated by the animal liar**: Abu Ghaziyah Muhammad bin Yahya bin Abdul ‘Aziz bin ‘Umar bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf Az-Zuhriy, the nephew of Abu l-‘Abbas Abdul Wahhab bin Musa bin Abdul ‘Aziz bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf Az-Zuhriy:

- The following came in “Ad-Du’afaa’ Wa l-Matrookeen” (The weak and discarded) of Ad-Daraqutniy (3/131/481): [Muhammad bin Yahya Az-Zuhriy, Abu Ghaziyah, Madaniy (i.e. from Al-Madinah), (when) relating from Abdul Wahhab bin Musa, **he fabricates**]. In “Ad-Du’afaa’ Wa l-Matrookeen” of Ibn ul-Jawziy (3/106/3239) the following came stated: [Muhammad bin Yahya Az-Zuhriy, Abu Ghaziyah Al-Madaniy: He relates from Abdul Wahhab bin Musa and from Musa bin Wardan: Al-Azdiy said: (He is) Da’if (weak) and Ad-Daraqutniy said: (He is) **Matrook** (discarded)]. The following was stated in “Mawsoo’ah Al-Aqwaal” (Collection of statements) of Abu l-Hasan Ad-Daraqutniy, in respect to the Hadith narrators and their defects (2/636/3419): [Muhammad bin Yahya Az-Zuhriy, Abu Ghaziyah As-Saghir, Al-Madaniy, was in Egypt. Ad-Daraqutniy said: Madaniy (who related) from Abdul Wahhab bin Musa: He fabricated. In “Ad-Du’afaa’ Wa l-Matrookeen” (482), he said: Matrook. In “Al-Mizan” 4 (8299) Ad-Daraqutniy said in relation to the “Gharaa’ib of Malik”:

Abu Bakr Al-Khayash Al-Misriy related to us from Muhammad bin Abdullah bin Hakeem, in Egypt, from Abu Ghaziyah Muhammad bin Yahya Az-Zuhriy, from Abdul Wahhab bin Musa, from Malik, from Ibn Shihab, from Sa’id bin Al-Musayyib, from Abdullah bin ‘Umar. He said: When ‘Ali assumed the leadership. He mentioned the story concerning that. ‘Ali said: Abu Bakr preceded me to four (matters) … to the remainder of the Hadith. Ad-Daraqutniy said: This has not been affirmed from Az-Zuhriy, nor Malik and this Abu Ghaziyah is As-Saghir, whose Hadith are rejected. He then mentioned via the path of ‘Aleel bin Ahmad. He said: And he was Thiqah (trustworthy/reliable). Abu Ghaziyah Muhammad bin Yahya related to us from Abu l-‘Abbas Abdul Wahhab bin Musa with this Isnad from Ibn ‘Umar, may Allah be pleased with him. It was raised by “Al-Yamin Mindabah or Ma’thamah” and he said: It is not Sahih (authentic) from neither Malik nor Az-Zuhriy, **and the Haml (responsibility) in respect to it is upon Abu Ghaziyah** “Lisan Al-Mizan” 5 (8231)].

As for Abu l-‘Abbas Abdul Wahhab bin Musa Az-Zuhriy Al-Madaniy, then he was also settled in Egypt, **There is no Ba’s (problem or issue) with him**. The following came stated in “Al-Muntazhim Fee Tareekh Al-Mulook Wa l-Umam” (10/220/1182): [Abdul Wahhab bin Musa bin Abdul ‘Aziz, Ab l-‘Abbas Az-Zuhriy. He relates from Malik and Ibn ‘Uyainah and was appointed over the law enforcement in Fustat of Egypt. He passed away on Ramadan in this year (meaning: 210 AH). The following came stated in “Mawsoo’ah Al-Aqwaal” (Collection of statements) of Abu l-Hasan Ad-Daraqutniy, in respect to the Hadith narrators and their defects (2/430/2266): [Abdul Wahhab bin Musa, Abu l-‘Abbas, Az-Zuhriy. Ad-Daraqutniy said: “There is no Ba’s (issue or problem) with him” and also said: “Thiqah (trustworthy/reliable)” in Lisan Al-Mizan” 4 (5422 and 5766). However, his nephew Abu Ghaziyah (or more appropriately Abu Khaziyah [The father of disgrace]) perpetrated a crime against him and as such, some believed him to be subject to accusation or suspicion. So, for example, Adh-Dhahabi said in “Mizan Al-I’tidal” (2/684/5326): [Abdul Wahhab bin Musa: Related from Abdur Rahman bin Abi Az-Zinnad with the Hadith: Verily Allah brought my mother to life for me and she believed in me … To the end of the Hadith. It is not known who this animal liar is, as this Hadith is a lie and in contradiction to what has been authenticated in that he ﷺ sought permission of his Lord to ask for forgiveness for her, but He did not permit him to do that].

It is for this reason that we used the expression “**Animal liar**” for Abu Khaziyah (the father of disgrace) Muhammad bin Yahya Az-Zuhriy which is a fair recompense for the crime that he perpetrated against his virtuous and truthful uncle Abu l-‘Abbas Abdul Wahhab bin Musa Az-Zuhriy.

The lieu of this report, concerning Abu Bakr’s departure to Dhu l-Qassah, is also reaffirmed by the revision of what the scholars of history and reports have recorded concerning the same incident:

- The following came in the history of At-Tabari “Tareekh Ar-Rusul Wa l-Mulook, Wa Silah Tareekh At-Tabari” (3/247): [Then he departed with those who departed towards Dhu l-Qassah among those who had been on the mountain paths of that side of the city. **Then the Muslims said to him**: We implore you by Allah O Khalifah of the Messenger of Allah from exposing your life (i.e. to danger)! “That is as if you were to be afflicted the people would not have order and your status is more severe against the enemy. So, dispatch a man (i.e. to command the army) and then if he is afflicted, you can appoint another”. He then said: “No, by Allah, I will not do that and I will support you (or be an example) by my own self (or life)”. They then departed following him until they reached Dhu Hisa and Dhu l-Qassah. An-Nu’man, Abdullah and Suwaid were upon what they were upon, until they set down upon the people of Ar-Rabadhah at Al-Abraq. They then fought each other, Allah defeated Al-Harith and ‘Awf, and Al-Hutai’ah was taken as a captive. ‘Abs and Banu Bakr fled. Abu Bakr remained a few days at al-Abraq. Banu Dhubyan had dominated the country and he said: “It is [henceforth] forbidden for Banu Dhubyan to control this country as Allah has given it to us as spoils and expelled them from it”]. **Here, there is no mention of ‘Ali and the narration reflects Abu Bakr’s insistence to go out for war**.

- There is also no mention of ‘Ali in the Tareekh (history) of Khalifah bin Khayyat (p: 102): [‘Ali bin Muhammad related from Maslamah, from Dawud, from ‘Amir and Abu Ma’shar, from Yazid bin Ruman: That Abu Bakr went out (for battle) to Dhu l-Qassah and intended to go himself. **So, the Muslims said to him**: “You do not gain anything by going out (for battle) by your own self and we do not know why you are intending that. Instead, appoint a man whom you are assured by and trust, and return to Al-Madinah. That is as you have left it whilst it is boiling with hypocrisy. And so he appointed Khalid bin Al-Walid as the commander over the people and placed Thabit bin Qais bin Shammas in command of the Ansar specifically, whilst Khalid was in overall command over them all. And he (Abu Bakr) commanded him (Khalid) to go out against Tulayhah and Abu Bakr presented a stratagem. He said to Khalid: I will meet with you at such and such a place].

- The following also came stated in the history At-Tabari “Tareekh Ar-Rusul Wa l-Mulook, Wa Silah Tareekh At-Tabariy (3/243)”: [As-Sariy related to me from Shu’aib, from Saif, from Sahl bin Yusuf, from Al-Qasim bin Muhammad, who said: The Messenger of Allah died. Then, Asad, Ghatafan and Tayyi' gathered around Tulayhah (i.e. under his leadership)]. He (At-Tabari) then presented their news until their coming to Al-Madinah requesting that they be relieved of the duty of giving the Zakah, followed by Abu Bakr’s rejection of that. [After Abu Bakr expelled the delegation, he stationed a group upon the mountain passes of Al-Madinah: **Ali, Az-Zubair, Talhah and Abdallah bin Mas’ud** and enjoined the people of Al-Madinah to attend the Masjid. And he said to them: “The land has sunk into disbelief, and their delegation has seen that you are few and that you would be unaware whether you were approached by day or by night! The nearest of them is (only) a stage away from you]. The mention here of ‘Ali and Az-Zubair is only from the lies of the great swindler, liar and fabricator, Saif bin ‘Umar At-Tamimiy Ad-Dabbiy, who was accused of Az-Zandaqah (disbelief) and was the solitary narrator of the fables of the exploits or adventures of Abdullah bin Saba’!

- There was also no mention of ‘Ali, Az-Zubair or Talhah in relation to the matter of guarding Al-Madinah within the “Tareekh” of Khalifah bin Khayyat (p: 101): [Abu Bakr’s departure to Dhu l-Qassah: He then set out to Dhu l-Qassah and appointed Sinan Ad-Damriy over Al-Madinah in his stead and Ibn Mas’ud over the mountain passes of Al-Madinah. Abdul Wahhab related from Yahya bin Sa’id, that Abu Bakr said: “If they were to withhold from me a string or rope (i.e. of Zakah), I would fight them”. ‘Ali bin Muhammad bin Abdullah bin ‘Umar Al-Ansari related to us from Hisham bin ‘Urwah, from his father, who said: Abu Bakr departed from Al-Madinah halfway through (the month of) Jumada Al-Aakhirah. ‘Ali bin ‘Uthman bin Abdur Rahman related from Az-Zuhriy, who said: Abu Bakr set out to Dhu l-Qassah with ten days remaining of Jumada Al-Uolaa, following the arrival of Usamah bin Zaid. He set down in it which was two Bareeds (a measure of distance) away from Al-Madinah from the direction of the route to Iraq and he appointed Sinan Ad-Damriy over Aal-Madinah in his stead and **Abdullah bin Mas’ud to guard the mountain passes of Al-Madinah**].

- The following came stated in “Tareekh ul-Islam” of Adh-Dhahabi (2/20): [‘Urwah and other than him related: Then Abu Bakr departed among the Muhajirin and the Ansar until he reached water place adjacent to Najd. The Arab Bedouins fled with their offspring. Abu Bakr then spoke to the people and they said: “Return to Al-Madinah, the children and women. And place a man in command over the army’. They persisted with their request upon him until he agreed to return and placed Khalid bin Al-Walid as the commander. He said to him: “If they submit and give the Sadaqah (i.e. Zakah), then whomsoever from you wishes, he can return”. Abu Bakr then returned to Al-Madinah. Other than him said: His march took place in Jumada Al-Aakhirah. Then he reached Dhu l-Qassah which was two Bareeds and miles away from Al-Madinah from the direction of the route to Iraq. And that he appointed Sinan Ad-Damriy in his stead over Al-Madinah and Abdullah bin Mas’ud over the protection of the mountain passes of Al-Madinah]. The same has been mentioned exactly in “Siyar A’alaam An-Nubalaa’”, the modern edition (2/378). **Therefore, even Adh-Dhahabi was not convinced of the narration of At-Tabari as he did not mention ‘Ali or Az-Zubair in relation to guarding Al-Madinah**. Consequently, this false invented report is not suitable except to be regarded as a false witness and may Allah’s refuge be sought.

**The third supporting evidence**: Doctor Khalid Kabir ‘Alaal said: [When the Messenger of Allah ﷺ passed away, Al-‘Abbas and Fatimah, may Allah be pleased with them, went to Abu Bakr As-Siddeeq asking him for their inheritance from the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, which included his land from Fadak and his share from Khaibar. He apologised and said to them that he heard the Prophet ﷺ say: “We are not inherited from. What we leave (behind) is Sadaqah. The family of Muhammad only eat from this wealth”. The fact that they went to him requesting the inheritance is therefore and evidence that they both acknowledged him as the Khalifah of the Muslims].

**We say** (in response): It is clear that the share of the Prophet ﷺ of Khaibar and his land of Fadak, whether it was the known distinguished piece of land or known share, was kept in the public treasury (Bait ul-Maal) and Abu Bakr had placed his hand upon it when he assumed the authority. Therefore, Al-‘Abbas and Fatimah, may Allah be pleased with them, going to Abu Bakr was only due to it being in his possession and under his authority. There is nothing in that indicating acknowledgement or non-acknowledgement of his legitimacy to possess those specific properties or in respect to his authority being legitimate in origin. People have always in the past and present continued to raise matters to those in executive authority and those wielding power, requesting that which they believe to be their legitimate or legal rights, even if they do not acknowledge the legitimacy of that authority, indeed, even if they detest and curse it in their hearts and perhaps are secretly working to overthrow and remove it.

**The fourth supporting evidence**: Doctor Khalid Kabir ‘Alaal said: [It has been narrated via a good (Jayyid) isnad that when Abu Bakr As-Siddeeq, may Allah be pleased with him, was given the Bai’ah (pledge of allegiance over leadership), he addressed them (the people) and said to them that he had not been eager to take the position of leadership and that he had not asked for it. The people accepted that from him. ‘Ali and Az-Zubair, may Allah be pleased with them, interposed and said: “We were not angered except that we were kept back from the consultation. And verily, we view that Abu Bakr is most entitled (or worthy) of people for it. Indeed, he is the companion of the cave and we ware aware of his honour and goodness. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ commanded him to plead the people in prayer whilst he was still living”]. Their speech here therefore indicates that they were somewhat angered (or upset) when they did not attend the Bai’ah of Abu Bakr at the Saqeefah, as they had been absent from it like many of the Sahabah. However, despite that, they gave the Bai’ah to Abu Bakr in the public Bai’ah and acknowledged his favour, goodness and that he had most right from among the Sahabah for the Khilafah].

**I say** (in response): We have thoroughly dealt with this narration a short while ago and we have clarified that it is possible to be sure of the authenticity and reliability of the speech of Abu Bakr, in contrast to the speech attributed to both ‘Ali and Az-Zubair, may Allah be pleased with them, which we have weighed to be false (or invalid). We established that this narration conversely invalidates the defective addition of the Hadith of Abu Sa’id Al-Khudriy. It is therefore supporting evidence against it (i.e. supporting evidence for suspicion) and not supporting evidence for it. Therefore, it does not represent supporting evidence (defence).

**The fifth supporting evidence**: Doctor Khalid Kabir ‘Alaal said: [It has been related with a Sahih Isnad that when Abu Bakr was given the Bai’ah for the Khilafah, Abu Sufyan bin Harb went to ‘Ali bin Abi Talib and said to him: “What’s going on with this matter (i.e. the Khilafah), that it goes to the fewest and the lowest of the Quraish (i.e. the tribe of Taim that As-Siddeeq was affiliated to). If you wish I would descend against him (i.e. Abu Bakr) with horses and men”. ‘Ali then said to him: “How frequently you have been hostile to Islam and its adherents O Abu Sufyan, but that did not harm it in the least. **Indeed, we have found Abu Bakr qualified (or appropriate) for it**”. There is therefore in this narration a clear indication that ‘Ali did not reject the Khilafah of Abu Bakr and that he gave him the Bai’ah when he rebuked Abu Sufyan and said: “Indeed, we have found Abu Bakr qualified (or appropriate) for it”. Had he rejected the Bai’ah and believed that Abu Bakr had usurped the Khilafah from him, he would have cooperated with Abu Sufyan to overthrow Abu Bakr and Banu Umayyah and Banu Hashim would have cooperated with them, as they were the most powerful tribes of Quraish. However, he did not do that and responded to Abu Sufyan with stern words. It is clear from this incident that it took place directly following the Bai’ah of Abu Bakr for the Khilafah and during the lifetime of Fatimah the daughter of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. Ibn Jarir At-Tabari stated this explicitly, which indicates that ‘Ali had given the Bai’ah at the same time as the people gave him the Bai’ah and did not refrain from giving it].

**I say** (in response): Let us begin by studying the paths of this story of Abu Sufyan:

- The following came mentioned in “Fadaa’il Al-Khulafaa’ Ar-Rashideen” by Abu Nu’aim Al-Asbahani (p: 152/192): [Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Muhammad related to us from Muhammad bin Sahl bin As-Sabbah, from ‘Amr bin ‘Ali, from Sahl bin Yusuf, from Malik bin Mighwal, from Abu Ash-Sha’thaa’ Al-Kindiy, from Murrah Al-Hamdaniy, from Ab Al-Abjar Al-Akbar, who said: Abu Sufyan bin Harb went to ‘Ali and said: “What’s going on with this matter, that it goes to the fewest and the lowest of the Quraish? If you wish I would go out in support of you with horses and men”. ‘Ali then said to him: “O Abu Sufyan, how frequently you have been hostile to Islam and its adherents. Indeed, we have found Abu Bakr qualified (or appropriate) for it”].

- The following came recorded in “Al-Mustadrak ‘Ala s-Sahihaini” of Al-Hakim (3/83/4462): [Abdullah bin Al-Husain Al-Qaadiy related to me, in Mar’w, from Al-Harith bin Abi Usamah, from Muhammad bin Sabiq, from Malik bin Mighwal, from Abu Ash-Sha’thaa’ Al-Kindiy, from Murrah At-Tayyib, who said: Abu Sufyan bin Harb went to ‘Ali and said: “What’s going on with this matter, that it goes to the fewest and the lowest of the Quraish (meaning Abu Bakr)? If you wish, I will descend upon it with horses and men”. ‘Ali then said to him: ““How frequently you have been hostile to Islam and its adherents O Abu Sufyan, but that did not harm it in the least. Indeed, we have found Abu Bakr qualified (or appropriate) for it”]. Al-Hakim did not comment upon it, however Adh-Dhahabi voluntarily said: [It’s Sanad is Sahih]!

- However, Imam Abdur Razzaq As-San’aaniy recorded the following in his Musannaf (5/451/9767): [Abdur Razzaq related to us from Ibn Mubarak, from Malik bin Mighwal, from Ibn Abjar, who said: When Abu Bakr, may Allah be pleased with him, was given the Bai’ah, Abu Sufyan went to ‘Ali and said: “The lowest of the Quraish has overcome you in this matter. By Allah, I will descend upon it with horses and men (i.e. use force)”. He said: I said: “You still remain an enemy to Islam and its adherents, but that has not harmed Islam or its adherents at all. Verily, we have seen that Abu Bakr is suitable for it] This came via ‘Ibn Abjar’.

- Imam Ibn Jarir recorded in the history of At-Tabari “Tareekh Ar-Rusul Wa l-Mulook, Wa Silah Tareekh At-Tabari” (3/209): [Muhammad bin Uthman bin (Abi) Safwan Ath-Thaqafiy related to me from Abu Qutaibah, from Malik (meaning Ibn Mighwal), from Ibn ul-Hurr, who said: Abu Sufyan said to ‘Ali: “What is the matter with the matter that it goes to the least of the tribal communities of Quraish! By Allah, if you wish, I will descend against him with horses and men!” He said: Then ‘Ali said: “O Abu Sufyan, you have continued to be hostile to Islam and its adherents but that did not harm it in the least! We have found Abu Bakr to be qualified (or fit) for it”]. This came via Ibn ul-Hurr.

**I say**: “Ibn Abjar” and “Ibn Al-Hurr”, one of these must necessarily be a misstatement. The preponderant (or most likely) view is that “Ibn Abjar” is correct because most of those who have cited the Hadith of Ibn Al-Mubarak have stated it like that, just as has been demonstrated in “Hayat us-Sahabah” (2/245): [Abdur Razzaq recorded it from Ibn Abjar], in “Al-Istee’aab Fee Ma’rifat il-As’haab” (4/1679): [Ibn ul-Mubarak mentioned from Malik bin Mighwal, from Ibn Abjar]. That is whilst it has been misstated as “Ibn Abi Bujair” in “Ar-Rasaail” of Al-Maqrizi (p: 36) and as “Abu Al-Khair”!! in another place in “Al-Istee’aab Fee Ma’rifat il-As’haab” (3/974).

**I say**: There is no harm if the correct name is “Ibn ul-Hurr” as Al-Hasan bin Al-Hurr bin Al-Hakam Al-Ja’fiy (or An-Nakha’iy) Al-Kufiy, Abu Muhammad, who was settled in Damascus and was the maternal uncle of Husain Al-Ja’fiy, is upstanding Thiqah (trustworthy and reliable relater), from the fifth generation who passed away in the year 133 AH, as was mentioned in “Taqreeb At-Tahdheeb” (1/159/1224).

**I say**: However, the most substantiated view is that the relater is Ibn Abjar. He is Abdul Malik bin Sa’id bin Hayyan bin Abjar Al-Kufiy Al-Kannani (and it is said Al-Hamdaniy). He is also Thiqah (trustworthy and reliable) and of virtue. He is likely to be from the sixth generation. He was a doctor and would treat the people free of cost. Al-Hafizh erred when he stated that he was the one whom Sufyan Ath-Thawriy advised to pray over when he died in Basrah. Rather, that was his son, the righteous man: Abdur Rahman bin Abdul Malik bin Sa’id bin Hayyan bin Abjar.

The Isnad of Abdur Razzaq and At-Tabari is therefore Mursal, indeed Mu’adal (where two or more narrators are missing from the chain). That is because Ibn Abjar did not meet any of the Sahabah as there is between him and the time of Abu Bakr two men (and possibly one man but that is very unlikely). The same applies in respect to Ibn ul-Hurr, except that he is a little closer to the time. It has been said that he heard (or received) Hadith from Abu At-Tufail ‘Amir bin Wathilah.

However, it appears to me, by indication of the narration of Abu Nu’aim and Al-Hakim, as we will discuss soon, that the Isnad is: Malik bin Mighwal from Abu Ash-Sha’thaa’ Al-Kindiy, from Murrah At-Tayyib from Abu Al-Abjar Al-Akbar. Consequently, both bu Ash-Sha’thaa’ Al-Kindiy and Murrah At-Tayyib were dropped (or omitted) from the Isnad.

**I say**: As for the narration (Riwayah) of Abu Nu’aim and Al-Hakim, then it is apparent that there is an omission in the Isnad of Al-Hakim. Abu Al-Abjar Al-Akbar (or perhaps: Ibn Al-Abjar Al-Akbar) was omitted, or some of them did not know him and as such omitted him. Therefore, the considered Isnad is necessarily that of Abu Nu’aim because the relaters in the Isnad of Abu Nu’aim to Malik bin Mighwal are above the relaters of the Isnad of Al-Hakim (and all of them in both Isnads are Thiqaat (trustworthy and reliable to the last of them). And because the addition of the Thiqah (trustworthy narrator) is accepted and it is not permissible to reject it unless there is a compelling reason to do so.

As for Abu Ash-Sha’thaa’ Al-Kindiy, then we did not find a mention of him except for what came stated in “At-Tareekh Al-Kabir” (8/363/3342): [Yazid bin Muhaasir Abu Ash-Sha’thaa’ Al-Kindiy. His designate name (Kunaa) is Muhammad bin Abdullah bin Numair], what came mentioned in “Al-Jarh Wa t-Ta’deel” (9/287/1221): [Yazid bin Muhaasir Abu Ash-Sha’thaa’ Al-Kindiy is Kufi (from Kufa). He related from “Saqat” (i.e. someone omitted) while Abu Ishaq Al-Hamdaniy, Abu Al-‘Anbas, Yunus bin Abi Ishaq and Abu Sinan Ash-Shaibaniy related from him]. Also, what came stated in “Al-Jarh Wa t-Ta’deel” (9/391/1845): [Abu Ash-Sha’thaa’ Al-Kufiy related from Ibn ‘Umar and Ibn ‘Abbas, while Abu Sinan Ash-Shaibaniy, Sa’id bin Sa’id Ath-Tha’labiy related from him. I heard my father saying that he is not named and he is Kufiy (from Kufa). ‘Ali bin Al-Madeeniy said: Abu Ash-Sha’thaa’, whom Abu Ishaq Al-Hamdaniy, Yunus bin Abi Ishaq, Abu Al-‘Anbas and Abu Sinan related from, is Al-Kindiy whilst he is not Saleem. I heard my father saying: Abu Ash-Sha’thaa’ Al-Kindiy, his name is Yazid bin Muhaasir and he disagreed with ‘Ali in respect to that]. And what came stated in “Al-Kunaa Wa l-Asmaa’” of Imam Muslim (1/424/1600): [Abu Ash-Sha’thaa’ (is) Yazid bin Muhaasir Al-Kindiy]. What came mentioned in “Fat’h ul-Bab Fi l-Kunaa Wa l-Alqaab” (420/3784): [Abu Ash-Sha’thaa’ is: Yazid bin Al-Muhaajir Al-Kindiy. His designate name (Kunaa) is Muhammad bin Abdullah bin Numair]. The following also came mentioned in “Al-Kunaa Wa l-Asmaa’” of Ad-Dulaabiy (2/642): [And Abu Ash-Sha’thaa’ Al-Kindiy (is Yazid bin Al-Muhaajir]. It came like this “Muhaajir” however it is most likely to be a writing error. Similarly, the following came mentioned in in “Al-Muqtana Fee Sard Al-Kunaa” (1/305/3039): [Yazid bin Muhaasir Al-Kindiy: He heard (or received from) Ibn ‘Umar, his statement]. Also, in “Tabseer Al-Muntabih Bi-Tahrir Al-Mushtabih” (4/1326): [And Abu Ash-Sha’thaa’ (is) Yazid bin Muhaasir Al-Kindiy, (he related) from Ibn ‘Umar, his statement ended]. Consequently, this man (Abu Ash-Sha’thaa’) has not related a lot and he is not very well-known. We will see Allah’s guidance (Istikhaarah) and say that he was from the people of Sidq (truthfulness) and his Hadith are Hasan and Qawwiy (strong) by Allah’s will.

Murrah At-Tayyib is Murrah bin Shaaraheel Al-Hamdaniy Al-Bukailiy, Abu Isma’eel Al-Kufiy, who is known as Murrah At-Tayyib (the good) and Murrah Al-Khair (the good). He is Thiqah (trustworthy and reliable), a devout worshipper and well-known. There is a consensus upon his trustworthiness and truthfulness. He is from the transmitters of the two Sheikhs (Al-Bukhari and Muslim) and the Jama’ah (collectors of the Sahih books).

As for Abu Al-Abjar Al-Akbar or Ibn Al-Abjar Al-Akbar, then I do not know him and I did not find anyone who has made a biography of him. However, we will be lenient and say that he may have been a Sahabiy and among the Sahabah there was Ghalib bin Abjar Al-Muzaniy and perhaps it is him. Or he could be a Thiqah (trustworthy and reliable narrator) from the senior Taabi’een, from the best generations of mankind.

Even with this leniency in respect to critiquing the Isnad (chain of transmission), it is not possible to ascertain the authenticity of every wording and part of the narration. That would only be possible to say had Abu Al-Abjar Al-Akbar been an eye witness who was present and heard (directly), or had taken it directly from ‘Ali bin Abi Talib, Al-‘Abbas or one of those few who had been present and directly heard. It is not conceivable that a scheming, prudent and devious politician like Abu Sufyan would have spoken this in a congregational Masjid or open roadway (or path). The story is therefore Mursalah (missing the last link in the Isnad) and there is nothing in its wordings that indicates to hearing directly, being in attendance or hearing it from an attendee, even by way of ‘An’anah. That is even if the origin of the story is established, by Allah’s permission, especially in light of the testimony of the following narrations, despite the interruptions in the chains and something to be said about their transmitters:

- The following came recorded in the history of At-Tabari “Tareekh Ar-Rusul Wa l-Mulook, Wa Silah Tareekh At-Tabari” (3/209): [It was related to me from Hisham, from ‘Awaanah, who said: When the people gathered upon the Bai’ah of Abu Bakr, Abu Sufyan came forward and he was saying: “By Allah, I see a cloud of smoke (‘Ajaajah) which nothing but blood can extinguish. 0 family of 'Abd Manaf, where is Abu Bakr that he should be the master of your affairs! Where are ‘Ali and Al-‘Abbas, the two who have been made weak (Mustad'afaan) lowly?!” And he said (to ‘Ali): “0 Abu Hasan, extend your hand so that I may give you the Bai’ah (oath of allegiance”. But ‘Ali refused and so he began to chant the proverbial verses of poetry of al-Mutalammis (the one seeking a matter):

**No one remains in a state of ignominy that is intended for him … except the two lowly things; a domestic donkey and a wooden peg [of a tent].**

**The former is turned back to his state of ignominy by a piece of worn-out rope … while the latter's head is broken and no one mourns.**

‘Ali rebuked him and said: “By Allah, you have not intended by this anything apart from to stir up dissension (Fitnah). By Allah, you have continuously desired evil for Islam. We have no need for your advice”].

- The following also came mentioned in the history of At-Tabari “Tareekh Ar-Rusul Wa l-Mulook, Wa Silah Tareekh At-Tabari” (3/210): [Hisham bin Muhammad said: Abu Muhammad Al-Qurashi informed me: He said: When Abu Bakr was given the Bai’ah (pledge of allegiance), Abu Sufyan said to ‘Al and Al-‘Abbas: You two are the lowly! He then began to chant the proverbial lines of poetry:

**A domestic donkey knows disgrace (or humiliation), but a free man and a well-built camel, soft in joints, deny it.**

**No one bears an unjust state that is intended for him, except the two lowly things: a domestic donkey and a wooden peg.**

**The former is turned back to its state of ignominy by a piece of worn-out rope, while the latter's head is broken and no one mourns].**

However, all that has preceded may be disturbed by the following:

- What came stated in the history of At-Tabari “Tareekh Ar-Rusul Wa l-Mulook, Wa Silah Tareekh At-Tabari” (3/209): [When Abu Bakr succeeded [the Prophet], Abu Sufyan said: “What has Abu Faseel (young camel i.e. Abu Bakr’s clan is not distinguished) to do with us? Indeed, it (i.e. the authority) belongs to the Banu ‘Abd Manaf”. He (the narrator said): It was said to him: “He has appointed your son as a governor”, he replied: “He maintained close ties of kinship with him”].

I say: This is Mursal and it is Hasan Qawwiy (strong) without doubt. It does not contain harsh language from Abu Sufyan, no apparent striving to stir sedition (Fitnah) or a threat of bringing horses and men for war. It rather only reflects disparagement for Abu Bakr and his tribe of Bani Taim by mentioning Bani Abd Manaf, in addition to his expediency and contentment in respect to gaining a little, in line with:

وَمِنْهُم مَّن يَلْمِزُكَ فِي الصَّدَقَاتِ فَإِنْ أُعْطُوا مِنْهَا رَضُوا وَإِن لَّمْ يُعْطَوْا مِنْهَا إِذَا هُمْ يَسْخَطُونَ

**And among them are some who criticize you concerning the [distribution of] charities. If they are given from them, they approve; but if they are not given from them, at once they become angry** (At-Tawbah: 58).

However, the most preponderant and likely view, and Allah is all knowledgeable, is that this speech of Abu Sufyan was only related to another later occasion after the four armies were sent to Ash-Sham (Greater Syria) and that it was perhaps said publicly without any relationship to his specific speech to ‘Ali and Al-‘Abbas. As such, there is no contradiction between the two narrations. In addition, Abu Sufyan was a devious scheming hypocrite and indeed was from the chiefs of scheming and hypocrisy, who spoke on every occasion in accordance with what suited him.

**I say**: The affirmation of the statement “We found Abu Bakr qualified (or fitting) for it” is not of the level which is relied upon and the narration does not contain that which indicates that this took place said on the day of the public Bai’ah. Rather, it is very possible that this happened after the Bai’ah given to Abu Bakr after six months. Abu Sufyan, who was from the cunning and shrewd men of Quraish, was cautiously monitoring the situation and conspiring secretly. Then when that all failed and ‘Ali gave the Bai’ah to Abu Bakr, Abu Sufyan’s hopes were dashed, his anger erupted and lost control of himself. Then, what was concealed became apparent and the hypocrisy manifested itself.

If someone was to object due to the statement recorded by At-Tabari “When the people had gathered upon the Bai’ah to Abu Bakr” and state that this is not conceivable to have been except on the day of the public Bai’ah, on the day following the Saqeefah, then we say in response:

(1) - This is not conceded or undisputed. Indeed, it is more likely for it to have been after the Bai’ah of ‘Ali, may the pleasure of Allah and peace be upon him, and similarly that of Az-Zubair and those who had gathered with the house of Fatimah, may the peace of Allah be upon her. At that time, it is correct to say: “When the people had gathered upon the Bai’ah of Abu Bakr”, especially as the majority of Bani Hashim, who were the distinguished personalities of Quraish, had not given the Bai’ah (prior to that). This is what is apparent, without the least doubt, from the context of Imam Muhammad bin Ishaq in his “Maghazi”, as was mentioned by Imam Al-Baihaqi in “Al-I’tiqad”: [And he said in relation to the apology of Abu Bakr to ‘Ali and others from those who had held back from giving the Bai’ah (that he said): “By Allah we were nor driven to complete that in the absence of those who were not in attendance except due to the fear of Fitnah and the incident getting out of hand, and even if I disliked it. Had it not been for that, nobody would have been more beloved to me to have attended than you apart from those who similar to your status. He then turned to address the people and said: **O People, this is ‘Ali bin Abi Talib. There is no Bai’ah to me upon his neck and he has the choice in his affair. Indeed, you all have the choice in respect to your Bai’ah to me. If you view that there is someone other than me, then I will be the first to give him the Bai’ah**. When ‘Ali heard that all that had entered him dissipated and he said: “There is no dissolution. We do not view anyone for it other than you”. He then extended his hand and gave him the Bai’ah alongside the group of people with him and **all of the people** were said similar to that. So, they returned the matter to Abu Bakr and he was the Khalifah (successor) of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. And that was because he selected him to lead the Salah (prayer) after him. **They used to call him the Khalifah (successor) of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ until he died**]. Here it is like Ibn Ishaq is saying that which carries the meaning: [**That all of the people, after the Bai’ah of ‘Ali and his companions, were calling Abu Bakr the Khalifah of the Messenger of Allah**].

(2) - If it is permissible to use this as evidence, then what came in the same narration concerning the speech of ‘Ali should also be used as evidence “By Allah, you have not intended by this anything apart from to stir up dissension (Fitnah). By Allah, you have continuously desired evil for Islam. We have no need for your advice”. This statement did not contain a mention of the qualification of Abu Bakr nor his contentment of his Khilafah. Rather, it was only a deterring rebuke directed at Abu Sufyan and to stop him in his tracks.

**I say**: Therefore, the attempt of the devious scheming hypocrite Abu Sufyan to stir Fitnah (discord) and split the Islamic unity, is established without question or doubt. Even if every wording or sentence itself is not affirmed, the overall picture is established without doubt. It may be that the following narration recorded by Imam At-Tabari is the best of the narrations and the most complete, which should be relied upon:

- It came as follows in the history of At-Tabari “Tareekh Ar-Rusul Wa l-Mulook, Wa Silah Tareekh At-Tabari” (3/209): ): [It was related to me from Hisham, from ‘Awaanah, who said: When the people gathered upon the Bai’ah of Abu Bakr, Abu Sufyan came forward and he was saying: “By Allah, I see a cloud of smoke (‘Ajaajah) which nothing but blood can extinguish. 0 family of 'Abd Manaf, where is Abu Bakr that he should be the master of your affairs! Where are ‘Ali and Al-‘Abbas, the two who have been made weak (Mustad'afaan) lowly?!” And he said (to ‘Ali): “0 Abu Hasan, extend your hand so that I may give you the Bai’ah (oath of allegiance”. But ‘Ali refused and so he began to chant the proverbial verses of poetry of al-Mutalammis (the one seeking a matter):

**No one remains in a state of ignominy that is intended for him … except the two lowly things; a domestic donkey and a wooden peg [of a tent].**

**The former is turned back to his state of ignominy by a piece of worn-out rope … while the latter's head is broken and no one mourns.**

‘Ali rebuked him and said: “By Allah, you have not intended by this anything apart from to stir up dissension (Fitnah). By Allah, you have continuously desired evil for Islam. We have no need for your advice”].

Even if the sentence “We found Abu Bakr to be qualified for it” was affirmed or a statement similar to that, within the dialogue with Abu Sufyan, it is not necessarily an expression indicating to the conviction of Imam Abu Al-Hasan ‘Ali bin Abi Talib that Abu Bakr was more worthy or entitled than him, rather it reflects a form of **argumentative address** that intended to cut off the useless discussion with Abu Sufyan and stop him in his tracks. It is like saying: “Abu Bakr is more worthy of it than you. You are only of those who were granted freedom (i.e. at the conquest of Makkah), and you have always continued to be hostile to Islam and its adherents, so leave this scheming and it would be better for you!” or something close to that in meaning. That is in the case where the most preponderant or likely view is that took place after the Bai’ah of ‘Ali bin Abi Talib to Abu Bakr, may Allah’s pleasure be upon them both, and Abu Bakr’s requesting the people to allow him to step down, then Ali’s and the majority’s insistence upon not accepting such a resignation and upon reaffirming the Bai’ah.

As for the statement of Doctor Khalid bin Kabir ‘Alaal: [Had he rejected the Bai’ah and believed that Abu Bakr had usurped the Khilafah from him, he would have cooperated with Abu Sufyan to overthrow Abu Bakr and Banu Umayyah and Banu Hashim would have cooperated with them, as they were the most powerful tribes of Quraish], then this contains a major exaggeration and indeed a great excess of imagination.

**Firstly**: The belief of ‘Ali that he is more worthy for the Khilafah and his abstention from giving the Bai’ah does not dictate by necessity that he considered Abu Bakr to be a criminal usurper who deserves to be fought against. The Imam of guidance ‘Ali bin Abi Talib is more fearful of Allah, deeper in knowledge and better in insight and managing the politics of the Dunyaa (world) to slide down to such a shallow thinking: Where it would either be an immediate Bai’ah, hearing and obeying, complete allegiance and support, or (on the other hand), confrontation, hostility, unsheathing of swords and the cutting of necks. Where then is the isolation from the authority, not supporting it, and perhaps migration from his land just as Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah did, followed by abstention from obedience by way of peaceful civil disobedience and then confrontation by words, criticism and rebuke and so on?!

**Secondly**: Even if we were to concede for the sake of argument, in spite of the extremists of the Shi’ah and Rawaafid, that ‘Ali believed that Abu Bakr had usurped the Khilafah from him, that he was a criminal and even a disbeliever who deserved to be fought, ‘Ali bin Abi Talib was not of the feeble-mindedness to have sought support from the hypocrite deposed chief of Quraish, the old enemy of Islam or from Banu Umayyah, the enemies of Bani Hashim since 100 years, and then wrest the matter (Khilafah) from Abu Bakr who was from a weak tribe and then assume it, or to let Abu Sufyan who was from a powerful tribe, possessed great funds and had warm ties with the tribes of Greater Syria and the Roman state, participate with him in that. However, Doctor Khalid Kabir ‘Alaal was harmed by his Wahabi Salafi Khalifah, repugnant factionalism blinded his sight, and as a result he gave free reign to his unruly unhealthy imagination.

**The sixth supporting evidence**: Doctor Khalid Kabir ‘Alaal said: [There is no Shar’iy justification to support the claim that ‘Ali refrained from giving the Bai’ah to Abu Bakr or delayed in respect to giving it by six months. That is because the Qur’an Al-Karim has settled the matter of the Khilafah as it has made it Shura (consultation) among the Muslims and the Messenger of Allah ﷺ passed away without having charged anyone after him with the charge of command and compulsion. Just as it has been authenticated that ‘Ali bin Abi Talib used to say: “The best of people after the Messenger ﷺ are Abu Bakr and ‘Umar”. And he said: “The prophet ﷺ did not assign for us anything in respect to the leadership”. Consequently, is it valid for it to be said after this that ‘Ali refrained from giving the Bai’ah to Abu Bakr or delayed giving it for six months?].

So, in response we say to the Ustadh Doctor Khalid Kabir ‘Alaal: **You have spoken well, yes this is the truth, that “The Qur’an Al-Karim has settled the matter of the Khilafah as it has made it Shura (consultation) among the Muslims and the Messenger of Allah ﷺ passed away without having charged anyone after him with the charge of command and compulsion”. It is hoped, may Allah reward you, that you make this plain to the claimants to Salafiyah, those who hurt our heads with the obligation to obey the one who has usurped the authority. Indeed, they have lied against Allah and His Messenger and inserted this rottenness, indeed Kufr (disbelief, into the books of ‘Aqaa’id (Beliefs).**

In these current days of ours Ustadh Doctor Hakim bin Abisan Al-Matairi published his valuable book “Freedom or the Cataclysm” (Al-Hurriyah Aw At-Tufaan” and then as a result the astray fanatical Wahabi sect to launch attack after attack upon him, which is ongoing to this day. Therefore, if Allah had enlightened the mind of Doctor Khalid Kabir ‘Alaal so that he understood this as it should be understood, especially after the debates and arguments that have taken place between the groups of the Ummah and inside each of these groups among their jurists and Mutakallameen, and after the revisions and change in positions that have occurred over the past fourteen centuries, that does not mean that this has taken place in all the minds, with there being no difference in this regard between a Sahabiy and a Taabi’iy, a Salaf and Khalaf.

**We say**: Let us leave behind the world of idealisms and let us return to the historical reality. Consequently, the question here is: Was everyone aware of the true reality of Shura with all of its dimensions following the death of the Prophet ﷺ?! I do not believe that to have been the case. Yes, it is true that the narrations from ‘Umar make apparent that he was the best of the people of his time in terms of understanding this. That is despite the issue of Al-Kalaalah, which is clearer than the sun, having perplexed him and similarly the giving from the Bait ul-Mal which Allah had made a notification in the Dunya which has no relationship to virtue or precedence in Islam, as Abu bakr stated, was contradicted by ‘Umar when he distinguished between the people, and then (later) regrated that.

As for Uthman, then there are indications that he did not understand Shura or the limitations of the mandatory powers (or jurisdiction) of the Imam, with the same depth of understanding as ‘Umar had, or that he was weak in relation to its application, or that he understood and applied it but Banu Umayyah conspired against him, betrayed him, stabbed him in the back and planned with complete slyness to kill him when they saw that he was reversing his errors. That was to lay the ground to leap upon the Minbar (Pulpit) of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, which they jumped upon after that just like monkeys jump upon something. That is as they took the property of Allah as dynasties, the slaves of Allah (people) as servants and the Deen of Allah as an income. As such disaster struck and the door to major Fitnah (discord) was opened.

Consequently, would there be any surprise that Imam ‘Ali either did not understand the Shura as it was meant to be understood or believed that his closeness to the Prophet ﷺ, his precedence in Islam and his feats in battle and war provided him with the specific and exceptional right.

Or, that he understood it as it should be understood, which is the view that we are sure of due to our certainty in the breadth of knowledge of the Imam of guidance ‘Ali bin Abi Talib, may Allah’s pleasure and peace be upon him, representing the gateway to the Prophetic knowledge, and due to his distinguished judicial prowess and acumen which made him the most judicious of the Ummah i.e. the one who possessed the greatest ability to apply the generalities upon the partialities in respect to incidents (and realities). However, despite that, he considered the incident of the Saqeefah to have been a spontaneous occurrence (just as ‘Umar admitted explicitly at the top of his voice), whilst the obligation, in his view, for example, on the following day, was that instead of the public Bai’ah, **which ‘Umar harassed Abu Bakr to go ahead with**, the matter should have been revisited where the door would be opened to elections and nominations, for the voting to be recast, whilst Abu Bakr remained leading the people in prayer and managing their affairs until the time of the Shura’s completion.

It should not be said that this is an imaginary demand which is not possible to have been accomplished through the means available at that time. We say: Indeed, similar to that happened from the Prophet ﷺ on the day of Hunain when he proposed to the people to return the captives of Hawazin in exchange for shares from the future spoils of war. This led to an uproar and so he commanded them to return to their homes and then inform their chiefs about their demands so that their chiefs can raise them to him ﷺ (in written form without doubt). The matter of the Khilafah therefore has a greater precedence to have such deliberation and procedures. This is what Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf did after that when he asked the inhabitants of Al-Madinah, one household after the other, and one person after the other. Then the majority chose ‘Ali upon the condition of abiding by the Sunnah (way) of the two Sheikhs (Abu Bakr and ‘Umar) and if he did not agree then their selection would be Uthman, upon the basis of the same condition. Whatever the case may be, all we have mentioned is in harmony and does not contradict with the anger (or displeasure) of ‘Ali, the blessings of Allah be upon him, and his delay in respect to giving the Bai’ah.

**The seventh supporting evidence**: Doctor Khalid Kabir ‘Alaal said: [There are two reports that do not have an Isnad which I will mention as two weak supportive evidences to strengthen the previous supportive evidences and which are incorporated with them. **The first Khabar (report)**: That when the Arabs apostatised, following the death of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. Abu Bakr dispatched the army of Usamah to the north of the Arabian Peninsula. The soldiers left in Al-Madinah Al-Munawwarah were few and many of the Arabs coveted it and launched an attack against it. Abu Bakr assigned guards upon the entry points of Al-Madinah staying with the military personnel to protect it. Included among those whom he assigned to be guards were: ‘Ali bin Abi Talib, Az-Zubair bin Al-‘Awwam, Talhah bin Ubaidullah, Sa’d bin Abi Waqqas and Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf, may Allah be pleased with them all. Consequently, is it conceivable for ‘Ali and Az-Zubair to be among the assigned commanders of Abu Bakr whilst they had not given him the Bai’ah and not acknowledged the legal legitimacy of his Khilafah? Does their presence among the guards of Abu Bakr not indicate that they had given him the Bai’ah, were in his service, that he had confidence and trust in them and that they were brothers who had love, affection and cooperation between them? **The second Khabar (report)**: It has been related concerning Abu Bakr that when the Arabs apostatised and requested from him to exempt from giving the Zakah, followed by his refusal of their demand, he consulted the senior Sahabah in respect to their affair. Among them were: ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab, ‘Ali bin Abi Talib, Talhah bin Ubaidullah and Az-Zubair bin Al-Awwam, may Allah be pleased with them all. They said to him: “Yes we should accept that from them”. However, he (Abu Bakr) opposed them and insisted upon fighting them and rejecting their demand. This incident occurred immediately following the death of the Prophet ﷺ and the Bai’ah to Abu Bakr. As such, had ‘Ali and Az-Zubair been in opposition to him and rejecting his Khilafah, they would have disassociated from him and would not have been among his consultants].

**We say in response**:

As for the first report of the participation of ‘Ali and Az-Zubair in the leadership of the guards of Al-Madinah, then the most preponderant (or likely) view is that is false, as we have previously mentioned. The most affirmed view is that it was placed under the command of Abdullah bin Mas’ud. In addition, ‘Ali and Az-Zubair were from the heroes possessing a high sense of honour and experience in fighting and they were highly concerned with the honours of the Muslims and their sanctities. I therefore have no doubt that they participated or volunteered in respect to the guarding. Is it conceivable for Abdullah bin Mas’ud to have said to them: “Return back because you have not yet given the Bai’ah” rather than welcoming them and indeed handing the command over to them or allowing them to share with him in it?!

**As for the second report**: If this is affirmed, whilst I do not believe it to be affirmed except in its main part, then there is still no evidential proof (Hujjah) in it. That is because the Shura (consultation) usually took place in the Masjid before the Muslims at large whilst the senior Muslims were from the first rows. I am certain that ‘Ali and Az-Zubair did not ever keep away from the Jama’ah (congregation) of the Muslims and did not at all fall back from the first rows, may Allah’s refuge be sought from that. Consequently, when Abu Bakr consulted those present in relation to the subject matter of the apostates, it was not possible for ‘Ali, Az-Zubair or other than them, due to their relationship with Allah, to refrain from giving advice and extending their consultation in this vital serious matter. Similarly, it was not possible for Abu Bakr or other than him, due to their relationship with Allah, to refuse or reject that or to say to them: “I do not accept your consultation because you have not yet given the Bai’ah”. Indeed, I am certain that Abu Bakr would have been pleased with the participation of ‘Ali in the consultation and rejoiced with it as a step towards removing the gap and for the affection and purity among them to be restored.

In any case, the claim that ‘Ali, in addition to Az-Zubair and Talhah, advised that those withholding the Zakah should be exempted from it is an extremely unlikely matter. Rather, it was ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab alone who raised that with Abu Bakr repeatedly until Abu Bakr chided him and doubt in respect to that remained in him until he died. Had ‘Ali (Az-Zubair and Talhah) shared with ‘Umar in his objection that would have been transmitted to us and would not have been hidden from anyone.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

**- Section: Lies concerning the Saqeefah:**

Despite the reported incident of the Saqeefah having been recorded with the most Sahih chains of transmission of the Dunyaa (world), some Mursal or Muttasal narrations have been recorded through narrations of those who are weak, discarded and liars, which contain fabricated sentences concerning the issue and other matters of dispute among the Muslims which people have circulated because they conform to their desires:

- Ahmad bin Hanbal recorded the following in his Musnad (1/5/18) with a Sahih Isnad until the Thiqah (trustworthy and reliable) Faqeeh (Jurist) Humaid bin Abdur Rahman: [‘Affan related to us from Abu ‘Awanah, from Dawud bin Abdullah Al-Awdiy, from Humaid bin Abdur Rahman, who said: The Messenger of Allah ﷺ passed away whilst Abu Bakr was in a detached part of Al-Madinah. He (the narrator) said: He then came and uncovered his face and kissed him. He said: “May my father and mother be ransom for you. How good (and pure) you are in life and death Muhammad ﷺ and I swear by the Rabb (lord) of the Ka’bah” … He then mentioned the Hadith … He (the narrator said: Abu Bakr and ‘Umar then set off being led until they came to them. Abu Bakr then spoke and he did not leave anything out which had been revealed concerning the Ansar or mentioned by the Messenger of Allah ﷺ in relation to them except that he mentioned it and he said: “You are aware that the Messenger of Allah said: ‘If mankind went down a valley and the Ansar went down a valley, I would go down the valley of the Ansar’ **And you are aware O Sa’d (Ibn ‘Ubadah) that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said whilst you were sitting:** **‘The Quraish are the Wulaat (rulers) of this matter and so the righteous of the people follow their righteous and the wicked (or corrupt) follow their wicked’. He (the narrator) said: So, Sa’d said to him: “You have spoken the truth. We are the Wuzaraa’ (assistants) and you are the ‘Umaraa’ (leaders/rulers)”].**

- It is also in the “Tareekh Al-Umam Wa l-Mulook” of At-Tabari (2/233) with rejected (Munkar) additions: [Zakariya bin Yahya Ad-Darir related to us from Abu ‘Awanah, from Dawud bin Abdullah Al-Awdiy, from Humaid bin Abdur Rahman Al-Himyariy, who said: The Messenger of Allah ﷺ passed away and Abu Bakr was in a detached part of Al-Madinah. He then came and uncovered the sheet from his face and kissed him. He said: May my father and mother be ransomed for you. How good and pure you are in life and death. Muhammad has passed away by the Rabb (Lord) of the Ka’bah. He (the narrator) said: He then set off to the Minbar (pulpit of the Masjid) and found ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab standing threatening the people and saying: “The Messenger of Allah is alive and not dead. He will go out after those who spread lies about him, cut off their hands and strike their necks and crucify them”. Abu Bakr spoke to him and told him to listen but ‘Umar refused to listen. So, Abu Bakr

said: Verily Allah said to His Prophet ﷺ:

إِنَّكَ مَيِّتٌ وَإِنَّهُم مَّيِّتُونَ \* ثُمَّ إِنَّكُمْ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ عِندَ رَبِّكُمْ تَخْتَصِمُونَ \* ثُمَّ إِنَّكُمْ يَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ عِندَ رَبِّكُمْ تَخْتَصِمُونَ

**Verily, you (O Muhammad ﷺ) will die and verily, they (too) will die. (30) Then, on the Day of Resurrection, you will be disputing before your Lord** (Az-Zumar: 30-31).

And:

وَمَا مُحَمَّدٌ إِلَّا رَسُولٌ قَدْ خَلَتْ مِن قَبْلِهِ الرُّسُلُ ۚ أَفَإِن مَّاتَ أَوْ قُتِلَ انقَلَبْتُمْ عَلَىٰ أَعْقَابِكُمْ

**Muhammad is not but a Messenger. [Other] Messengers have passed on before him. So, if he was to die or be killed, would you turn back on your heels [to unbelief]?** (Aali ‘Imran: 144).

He continued until he concluded the Ayah. (Then he said): “Whoever had been worshipping Muhammad, then his deity that he worshiped is dead. And whoever was worshipping Allah, Who has no partner, then Allah is ever living and does not die”. Some of those from the companions of Muhammad, who we met, swore that they had not known that those two verses had been revealed until Abu Bakr recited them on that day. Then, a man suddenly came and said: “The Anaar have gathered in the Saqeefah of Banu Sa’idah to give the Bai’ah (oath of allegiance over leadership) to a man from among them. They say: Let us have an Ameer (leader) from us and let there be an Ameer from the Quraish”. Abu Bakr and 'Umar set off (as though each of them led the other) until they came to them. ‘Umar wanted to speak but Abu Bakr prevented him and he (‘Umar) said: “I will not

disobey the successor (Khalifah) of the Prophet ﷺ twice in one day”. Abu Bakr spoke and did not leave out anything that was either revealed about the Ansar or was mentioned by the Messenger of Allah ﷺ in relation to them except that he mentioned it. He said: You know that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said: ‘If mankind went down a valley and the Ansar went down a valley, I would go down the valley of the Ansar’ And you are aware O Sa’d (Ibn ‘Ubadah) that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said whilst you were sitting: ‘The Quraish are the Wulaat (rulers) of this matter and so, the righteous of the people follow their righteous and the wicked (or corrupt) follow their wicked’. He (the narrator) said: So, Sa’d said to him: “You have spoken the truth. We are the Wuzaraa’ (assistants) and you are the ‘Umaraa’ (leaders/rulers)”.

'Umar said: “Extend your hand, 0 Abu Bakr, so that I may give you the Bai’ah (oath of allegiance”. Abu Bakr replied: “Rather, you should do it O ‘Umar as you are stronger than me to undertake it”. He (the narrator) said: And Umar was the most severe of the two men. He said: And each of them wanted the other to open his hand so that he could strike it (i.e. give the Bai’ah). ‘Umar then opened Abu Bakr's hand and said: "My strength is for you alongside your strength” and the people gave their oath of allegiance seeking to verify the Bai’ah. ‘Ali and Az-Zubair stayed away. **And Az-Zubair unsheathed his sword and said: “I will not sheathe it until ‘Ali is given the Bai’ah”. The news of this reached Abu Bakr and ‘Umar. Then ‘Umar said: “Take the sword off Az-Zubair and strike him with a rock. He (the narrator) said: ‘Umar set off towards them and came to them both weary. He said: “You will certainly give the Bai’ah willingly or you will give the Bai’ah against your will”. And so they gave the Bai’ah]**.

**I say**: This is Mursal and Sahih until its end. However, Humaid bin Abdur Rahman Al-Himyariy Al-Basriy, who is a Thiqah (trustworthy and reliable) jurist (Faqeeh), took some of from a liar, especially the sentence: “**And you are aware O Sa’d (Ibn ‘Ubadah) that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said whilst you were sitting: ‘The Quraish are the Wulaat (rulers) of this matter and so, the righteous of the people follow their righteous and the wicked (or corrupt) follow their wicked’. He (the narrator) said: So, Sa’d said to him: “You have spoken the truth. We are the Wuzaraa’ (assistants) and you are the ‘Umaraa’ (leaders/rulers)**” and worse than that: “**And Az-Zubair unsheathed his sword and said: “I will not sheathe it until ‘Ali is given the Bai’ah”. The news of this reached Abu Bakr and ‘Umar. Then ‘Umar said: “Take the sword off Az-Zubair and strike him with a rock. He (the narrator) said: ‘Umar set off towards them and came to them both weary. He said: “You will certainly give the Bai’ah willingly or you will give the Bai’ah against your will”. And so they gave the Bai’ah**”, who manipulated (Tadlees) the chain with Imam Ahmad (or ‘Affan) and so he omitted it. And we have previously indicated to its falseness (or invalidity)!

**Consequently**: There is no meaning to the statement of Ustadh Raghib As-Sarjani in his book: “As-Saahib Wa l-Khalifah: Abu Bakr As-Siddeeq” when he was deceived by this repulsive lie and said: [As-Siddeeq, may Allah be pleased with him, said: “You have known O Sa’d! That the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said whilst you were sitting: ‘The Quraish are the Wulaat (rulers) of this matter and so, the righteous of the people follow their righteous and the wicked (or corrupt) follow their wicked’”. This law which was set by him ﷺ (that Quraish are the rulers of this matter) is therefore a very explicit law. And despite all of the discussions, arguments and dialogues that took place in the Saqeefah and amidst all this debate, Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah replied to Abu Bakr As-Siddeeq by a wonderous statement and with a peculiar simplicity, when he said: “You have spoken the truth. You are the ‘Umaraa’ (leaders/rulers) and we are the Wuzaraa’ (assistants)”. It was like this in terms of simplicity. And so, the only and single statement that Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah said from the time that the Muhajirin entered the Saqeefah until this moment was: “You have spoken the truth. You are the ‘Umaraa’ (leaders/rulers) and we are the Wuzaraa’ (assistants)”. He stated it like that with this simplicity. In this way, Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah, the head of the Ansar, their senior figure, chief and primary candidate for the Khilafah decisively affirmed the Khilafah belonging to the Quraish and not the Ansar. It is necessary for us to pause to take in this occurrence for a lengthy period as it is a unique occurrence. Come and let us analyse this wondrous position within the Islamic history and attempt to extract from it some lessons: Firstly: The Hadith which As-Siddeeq, may Allah be pleased with him, mentioned, represented a clear legislation from the Messenger of Allah ﷺ and the matter (or issue) which contains legislation is not open to Ijtihad].

**I say**: Ustadh As-Sarjani then continues with his imaginative analyses, foolish romanticism and idealism upon the windmills of socialism!

- The following came recorded in “Tareekh Ad-Dimashq” of Ibn ‘Asakir (30/286/6439) with a Jayyid (good) Isnad to the Imam Al-Faqeeh (the jurist) Ath-Thiqah (trustworthy and reliable) Imam Al-Hasan bin Abi Al-Hasan Al-Basriy: [Abu As-Sa’ud Ahmad bin ‘Ali bin Muhammad Al-Wa’izh related to us from Abu Al-Husain Ahmad bin Muhammad bin An-Naqoor and Abu ‘Ali Muhammad bin Wishah Ar-Rassiy … And Abu l-Qasim bin As-Samarqandiy related to us from Ahmad bin Muhammad bin An-Naqoor. They both said: ‘Eisa bin ‘Ali bin ‘Eisa related from Abu ‘Ubaid ‘Ali bin Al-Husain bin Harb, from Abu As-Sikkeen Zakariya bin Yahya, from the uncle of Abu Zahr bin Hisn, from his grandfather Humaid bin Manhab, who said: I visited Al-Hasan bin Abi Al-Hasan. I was alone with him and said to him: “O Abu Sa’id, have you not seen what the people are in in terms of Ikhtilaaf (difference or disagreement)?” And so, he said to me: “O Abu Yahya, four people made good the affair of the people and two corrupted it: As for those who made good the affair of the people, then they were ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab on the day of the Saqeefah of Bani Sa’idah when Quraish said “Let there be a leader from us” and the Ansar said “Let there be an Ameer for us” and then ‘Umar said to them: **“Do you not know that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said “The A’immah (leaders) are from Quraish””? and they replied: “Yes, indeed (we have)”**. He said: “Do you not know that he commanded Abu Bakr to lead the people in prayer?” They replied: “Yes, indeed (we have)”. So, who from among you would put himself before Abu Bakr? They said: “None of us” and the Ansar consequently surrendered (the matter) to them. Had ‘Umar not brought this evidential argument, the people would have disputed this Khilafah until the Day of Judgement. And Abu Bakr As-Siddeeq when the Arabs apostatised and he consulted the people in respect to them. Then all of them advised that he accept from them the Salah (prayer) and exempt them from the Zakah. And then he said: “By Allah, if they withheld from me a camel string which they had previously been giving to the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, I would strive against them (in Jihad). Had Abu Bakr not done that, the people would have abandoned the Zakah until the Day of Judgement. And Uthman bin ‘Affan when he gathered the people upon this recital (Qiraa’ah) when they had previously been reading seven Ahruf (readings). Those were accusing those and saying our recital (Qiraa’ah) is better that your Qiraa’ah, to the point where some were close to declaring others as disbelievers. Then, Uthman gathered them together upon this Harf (reading) and had Uthman not done that, the people would have abandoned the Qur’an until the Day of Judgement. And ‘Ali bin Abi Talib when he fought the people of Basrah. Then when he finished with them he divided among his companions what their military base contained and they said to him: “O Amir ul-Mu’mineen, will you not divide among us their slaves and women?” He asked: “Which of you would take ‘Aa’ishah within his share?” They said: “And who would take the Mother of the Believers within their share?” He (‘Ali) [then] said: “Do you think that those whose husbands have been killed have fulfilled the ‘Iddah (waiting period) of four months and ten days and have inherited the quarter and the eighth”. They said: “Yes”. He said: “Then, I have not seen them to be female slaves and had they been female slaves they would not have had an Iddah (waiting period) and would not have inherited”. Had ‘Ali not done that, then the people would not have known how the people of the Qiblah (i.e. Muslims) are meant to be fought against. As for the two who corrupted the affair of the people, then that was ‘Amr bin Al-‘Aas the day he advised Mu’awiyah to raise the Masaahif (plural of Mus’haf) and then the Khawarij passed judgment, thus making this form of judgement persist until the Day of Judgement. And Al-Mugheera bin Shu’bah who was the governor of Mu’awiyah over Kufa. He wrote to Mu’awiyah: “If you read this letter of mine then I am coming from afar”. He then took his time in his travel. Then when he arrived to him he (Mu’awiyah) said to him: “What made you come so slowly?” He said: “A matter by Allah that I was planning and preparing”. He asked: “What is it?” He said: “The Bai’ah to Yazid after you”. He asked: “And have you done (or accomplished) that?” He said: “Yes”. He said: “Return to your work as you are appointed over it”. Then when he left Mu’awiyah his companions said to him: “What is behind you (i.e. your intention) O Mugheerah?” He said: “Behind me, by Allah, is that I have placed the feet of Mu’awiyah in the stirrup of rebellion (Baghy) and he will remain in it until the Day of Judgement”. Al-Hasan said: “It was due to this that those ones gave the Bai’ah to their sons and had that not been the case, Shura (consultation) would have remained until the Day of Judgement”].

**I say**: The opinions of Al-Hasan, who was from among the greatest Imams of the Tabi’een in every category of knowledge, Fiqh, piety and giving up the worldly life are solid opinions of the highest level, however he was known for his good heartedness and to believe everyone who spoke to him. As such he was deceived by the lie: [**“Do you not know that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said “The A’immah (leaders) are from Quraish”? and they replied: “Yes, indeed (we have)”**].

- The following came mentioned in “Ansaab Al-Ashraaf” of Baladhuri (1/581-582/1177): [Muhammad bin Sa’d related to me from Muhammad bin ‘Umar Al-Waqidiy, from Abu Ma’mar, from Al-Maqburiy and Yazid bin Ruman the Mawla of the family of Az-Zubair, from Ibn Shihab, who said: Whilst the Muhajirun were in the quarters of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ after Allah had taken him back to himself, and ‘Ali and Al-‘Abbas were preoccupied with him, Ma’n bin ‘Adiy and ‘Uwaim bin Sa’idah suddenly came and said to Abu Bakr: “There is a door to Fitnah (discord) that if Allah does not close through you, it will never ever be closed. Sa’id bin ‘Ubadah is in the Saqeefah of Bani Sa’idah and they want to give him the Bai’ah (pledge over leadership)”. Abu Bakr, ‘Umar and Abu ‘Ubaidah then set off until they came to the Saqeefah. There they saw Sa’d upon a rug leaning upon a pillow and he had a fever. Abu Bakr then said to him: “What is your opinion O Abu Thabit?” He replied: “I am a man from among you”. Then Al-Hubab bin Al-Mundhir said: “Let there be from us an Ameer (leader) and from you an Ameer. As such, if a Muhajiry does something among the Ansar, the Ansari will respond to him, and if the Ansari does something with the Muhajirun, the Muhajiry will respond to him. I am the post upon which the camel rubs itself to satisfy the itching (i.e. I am a noble), and I am like a high class palm tree. If you wish we will separate and return the matter to war. Who disputes with me?” ‘Umar wished to speak but Abu Bakr said to him: “Be at ease”. Abu Bakr then said: “We are the first of the people to embrace Islam, the best of them in terms of homeland, most noble in lineage and the closest to the Messenger of Allah ﷺ in terms of relations. You are our brothers in Islam and partners in the Deen. You provided support, refuge and assisted. May Allah reward you with goodness. However, we are the ‘Umaraa’ (leaders or rulers) and you are the Wuzaraa’ (assistants). The Arabs will never submit except to this community of the Quraish. **A large number from among you know that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said: “The A’immah (Imams / leaders) are from Quraish”.** As such it is more appropriate that you do not contest your brothers from the Muhajirin in that which Allah has designated for them”. Al-Hubab then said: “We do not hold a grudge against you or your companions. Rather, we only fear that the matter falls into the hands of a people we have fought and then they are spiteful against us”. Abu Bakr said: “If you obey my command, you will give the Bai’ah (pledge over leadership) to one of these two men. Abu ‘Ubaidah (who was on his right) or ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab (who was at his left side)”. ‘Umar then said: “Whilst you are still living? It is not the right of anyone to put you back from your standing which the Messenger of Allah ﷺ established you in. So, extend your hand”. He then extended his hand and ‘Umar gave him the Bai’ah, Usaid bin Hudair gave him the Bai’ah, the people gave him the Bai’ah and the people congested around Abu Bakr. The Ansar then said: “You have killed Sa’d” and they had nearly trampled upon him. ‘Umar then said: “Kill him, as he is the companion (or source) of Fitnah (discord)”. And so the people gave Abu Bakr the Bai’ah. He said and Ibn Ruman said: It has been said that the first from the Ansar to give the Bai’ah was Bushair bin Sa’d. They then brought Abu Bakr to the Masjid and gave him the Bai’ah. Al-‘Abbas and ‘Ali heard the Takbir in the Masjid whilst they had not yet finished washing the body of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. ‘Ali said: “What is this?” Al-‘Abbas said: “This has not happened at all like this. For that reason, I said what I said”. **He (the narrator) said: ‘Ali set off and then said: “O Abu Bakr, do you not see that we have a right in this matter?” He said: “Of course, but I feared Fitnah (discord) and I have been appointed in a great (significant) matter”. ‘Ali said: “I am aware that the Messenger of Allah ﷺcommanded you to lead the Salah and that you are the second of the two. However, we had a right and we were not consulted and may Allah forgive you”. And he then gave him the Bai’ah].**

I say: “From Abu Ma’mar” appears to be a misstatement and it should rather be: Abu Ma’shar Najeeh As-Sanadiy, the author of the Maghazi, who was truthful but not precise and he became greatly confused in his last two years. Muhammad bin ‘Umar Al-Waqidiy is Thiqah (trustworthy and reliable) as we have previously mentioned, and whoever classified him as weak (Da’if) or as discarded (Matruk) committed a gross error.

We have only presented this Mursal narration due to reasons that include:

**(1)** - When Az-Zuhriy came with Mursal narrations, which include when he presents a narration that he has formulated by his own speech or combined together different narrations, just as the authors of the Maghazi (Battles and history) did, and like what is apparent in this story here, he came with wondrous matters. There is therefore no surprise that the classical A’immah (Imams) would say: “The Mursal narrations of Az-Zuhriy resemble the wind”. And the wind that is intended here is that which exists from the backside and not that wind of the type that destroyed ‘Aad.

**(2)** - Az-Zuhriy is from the signs of Allah in respect to truthfulness, Hifzh (preservation and memory) and precision. He did not confuse narrations and he did not insert a Hadith into another Hadith like the case in respect to this Mursal narration which resembles the Hadith of the chapter or topic in many sentences (or statements). Therefore, when he attributes a narration, it is a definite evidential proof (Hujjah) as agreed upon by the consensus of the classical A’immah (Scholars / Imams).

**(3)** -In origin and in principle the Mursal and Munqati’ do not establish a Hujjah (evidential proof). This Khabar (reported narration) and the previous two reports are sufficient to establish this and the fabricated story of the Gharaneeq (Exalted cranes) [referring to the story of the satanic verses recorded in some early books of history which is fabricated] is also an example of that. Whoever builds or bases his Deen upon this can blame no one apart from himself and it was upon this basis that the People of the Book were destroyed and ruined because most of what they have is Mursal and Munqati’, the majority of which are lies and fabrications which produced delusions (superstitions) and tribulations.

- The following came recorded in “Ansaab Al-Ashraaf” of Baladhuri (1/583/1177): [‘Ali bin Muhammad Al-Mada’iniy related from Ibn Ju’dabah, from Az-Zuhriy, from ‘Ubaidullah bin Abdullah bin ‘Utbah bin Mas’ud, from Ibn ‘Abbas: That ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab gave a Khutbah (public speech) and said in it: “So and so persons have said: ‘If ‘Umar was to die, we would give the Bai’ah to ‘Ali and his Bai’ah would then be concluded, as it was only a sudden (or spontaneous) with Abu Bakr through which Allah protected from its (potential) evil’ **but they have lied. By Allah, the Bai’ah to Abu Bakr was not a sudden (or spontaneous) occurrence**. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ assigned him in his place and selected him for the Deen to the exclusion of others. And he said: “Allah and the believers refuse all apart from Abu Bakr”. Is there anyone from among you whom the necks incline towards like they do to Abu Bakr? Therefore, whoever gives the Bai’ah to a man without a Mashoorah (consultation), then he is deserving of being killed. Verily, I swear by Allah, men will certainly be prevented, their hands and feet cut and be crucified upon the trunks of date palms. I inform you that when Allah took his Messenger (in death), the Ansar gathered in the Saqeefah of Bani Sa’idah whilst the Muhajirin gathered to Abu Bakr. A speaker from the Ansar spoke and said: “We are the Ansar, the (military) regiment of Islam and you O gathering of the Muhajirin are a (small) group here, and here they want to exempt us from our original right and seize away our matter”. I wanted to speak and I had prepared a speech that I wanted to present in front of Abu Bakr. Then Abu Bakr said: “Be at ease O ‘Umar”. Abu Bakr spoke and he did not leave a word that had pleased me except that he said it alongside what was like that until he became silent. He then said: “What has been reported (of good qualities) then you are deserving of it. But we are from those whom we are from. The Arabs will never acknowledge the matter except to this tribal community of the Quraish. **And he ﷺ has said: “This matter after me belongs to Quraish”**”. Then Al-Hubab bin Al-Mundhir, one of Bani Salimah, said: “We have known your virtue. However, let there be from us and Ameer (leader) and from you an Ameer. That would be more fitting so that one of us does not clash with his companion. If you do not do so, then I am the post upon which the camel rubs itself to satisfy the itching (i.e. I am a noble), and I am like a high class palm tree!” Then Bushair bin Sa’d said: “The matter between us and you is like an anchovy split in half” So I said: “And you as well O one eyed one? I implore you by Allah, **have you not heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ saying: “The A’immah (leaders) are from Quraish?”” He said: “O Allah, yes”**, in spite of myself. I then said: So, what are still talking about?” And Abu Bakr said: “I invite you towards any of the Muhajirin you wish, whether it is ‘Umar or other than him” It was this from the words of Abu Bakr that I disliked. For me to be put forward to have my neck struck was preferable to me than I remove him from the standing that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ had established him in. Then Abu Bakr said: “We are the ‘Umaraa’ (leaders) and you are the Wuzaraa’ (assistants), brothers in the Deen and the most beloved people to us”. So, Allah removed the insinuations of Shaytan from them”. Az-Zuhriy said: Ma’n used to say: I love that I do not die until I affirm the Messenger of Allah ﷺ in death like I affirmed him in life. And he was martyred on the day of (the battle of) Al-Yamamah]. Al-Baladhuri then said: [Ibn ‘Abbas related to me from his father, from Abu Mikhnaf, from Muhammad bin Ishaq similar to it]. He said similar to it and not exactly the same as it and so we do not know whether or not it contains the same fabricated statement **“They have lied. By Allah, the Bai’ah to Abu Bakr was not a sudden (or spontaneous) occurrence”** and then the statement: Then Bushair bin Sa’d said: “The matter between us and you is like an anchovy split in half” So I said: “And you as well O one eyed one? I implore you by Allah, **have you not heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ saying: “The A’immah (leaders) are from Quraish?”” He said: “O Allah, yes”**, in spite of myself”.

**We say**: Whatever Allah wished came to be: Yazid bin ‘Iyad bin Yazid bin Ju’dabah Al-Laithi, Madaniy who settled in Basrah, is Matruk (discarded) and disreputable and there is a consensus upon his weakness. As for the other Isnad, then it only reaches Ibn Ishaq and is Munqati’. It is likely that Ibn Ishaq only took it from Az-Zuhriy.

This **shameless Umayyad Naasibiy (those opposed to ‘Ali) lie or fabrication** has also spread to the books of Fiqh, Aqeedah, Adab and Seerah, whilst some have built upon it palaces in the air. Examples of that include:

- What came stated in “Al-Farq Baina Al-Firaq” by Abdul Qadir Al-Baghdadiy (p: 13): [Then, after that, they differed in respect to the Imamah (post of leadership). The Ansar conceded to willingly giving the Bai’ah to Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah Al-Khazraji and the Quraish (then said) that the Imamah cannot be except to the Quraish. Then the Ansar willingly conceded to the Quraish **when the statement of the Prophet ﷺ “The A’immah are from Quraish” was related to them**. This disagreement remains until today because the Diraar or the Khawarij stated that the Imamah is permitted to go to other than the Quraish].

- The following came stated in “At-Tabseer Fee Ad-Deen Wa Tamyeez Al-Firqah An-Naajiyah ‘An Al-Firaq Al-Haalikeen” by Al-Isfraa’eeniy: (p: 20): [The theird: There difference (or disagreement0 concerning the Imamah (position of leadership). That is as the Ansar said let there be from us and Imam (leader) and from you an Imam. The debate continued among them in respect to that until As-Siddeeq, may Allah be pleased with him, ascended the pulpit and gave a speech. He recited upon them the His statement تعالى:

لِلْفُقَرَاءِ الْمُهَاجِرِينَ الَّذِينَ أُخْرِجُوا مِن دِيَارِهِمْ وَأَمْوَالِهِمْ يَبْتَغُونَ فَضْلًا مِّنَ اللَّهِ وَرِضْوَانًا وَيَنصُرُونَ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ ۚ أُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الصَّادِقُونَ

For the poor emigrants who were expelled from their homes and their properties, seeking bounty from Allah and [His] approval and supporting Allah and His Messenger, [there is also a share]. Those are the Saadiqoon (truthful) (Al-Hashr: 8).

He then named us as being truthful (Saadiqoon) and stated that Allah had commanded the believers to be with the truthful when He تعالى said:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا اتَّقُوا اللَّهَ وَكُونُوا مَعَ الصَّادِقِينَ

O you who have believed, fear Allah and be with those who are truthful (At-Tawbah: 119).

**He then related to them that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said: The A’immah are from Quraish”. They affirmed him in respect to his narration and conceded the issue**. They agreed to his statement and this disagreement was also removed due to the blessing of As-Siddeeq. Then (later), a disagreement arose in respect to it due to a people from the Khawarij when they said that the Khilafah was permitted for other than the Quraish, as we will come to mention by Allah’s will].

**We say**: Bravo! With the like of these shameless fabrications we attain ““At-Tabseer Fee Ad-Deen Wa Tamyeez Al-Firqah An-Naajiyah ‘An Al-Firaq Al-Haalikeen””?! (The name of the Book: **The clear sight in respect to the Deen and distinguishing the saved sect (or group) from the sects (or groups) of those who are destroyed (in hell)**”.

- The following came stated in “Al-‘Awaasim min Al-Qawaasim” by ibn ul-‘Arabiy [Edition of the Awqaaf of Saudi (p: 43)]: [The Ansar gathered in the Saqeefah of Bani Sa’idah consulting one another and not knowing what they should do. The news of that reached the Muhajirun and they said: “Let’s send for them so that they come to us”. Abu Bakr then said: “Rather, we should walk to them”. The Muhajirun then set off towards them, including Abu Bakr, ‘Umar and Abu ‘Ubaidah. They held back from speaking and some of the Ansar said: “Let there be an Ameer (leader) from us and from you an Ameer”. Abu Bakr then said a lot of correct things, he spoke a lot and was correct. Included in what he said was: “We are the ‘Umaraa’ (leaders) and you are the Wuzaraa’. **Verily, the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said: “The A’immah are from Quraish” (الأَئِمَّةُ مِنْ قُرَيش)**].

- The following was mentioned in “Al-Intisar Fee Ar-Radd ‘Ala l-Mu’tazilah Al-Qadariyah Al-Ashraar” (3: 818): [And this is indicated to by when the Ansar gathered together in the Saqeefah of Bani Sa’idah and whoever from among them coveted that did so. The discussion among them went on for a lengthy time **until Abu Bakr and ‘Umar, may Allah be pleased with them, related to them the statement of the Prophet** ﷺ: **“The A’immah are from Quraish” (الأَئِمَّةُ مِنْ قُرَيش)**. They (the Ansar) then reversed their opinion and submitted and followed. Had they not known the authenticity of this from the Prophet ﷺ, they would have rejected it and found fault in it, especially in a situation such as this. Disputing, arguments, unsheathing of swords and the muddling of speech had occurred. However, in place of that they fell back from their position and Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah, who was from the chiefs of the Ansar said to Abu Bakr and ‘Umar: “You are the ‘Umaraa’ (leaders) and we are the Wuzaraa’ (assistants)” and a consensus was convened over that].

Whatever Allah wished to be came to be: In this manner **the lie (or fabrication) compounded to the point that it was called: An Ijmaa’ (a consensus!!)** based upon a lie. Verily to Allah we belong and to Him will we return.

- The following came stated in “As-Sawaa’iq Al-Muhriqah ‘Alaa Ahlu r-Rafd Wa d-Dalaal Wa z-Zandaqah” (1/41): [Some of the Ansar disliked giving the Bai’ah to Abu Bakr and said: “Let there be an Ameer (leader) from us and from you an Ameer”. **Abu Bakr repelled them with the Khabar (reported narration) of “The A’immah (leaders) are from Quraish”**. They then submitted to him and obeyed him].

- The following was mentioned in “Minhaj ‘Ulamaa’ Al-Hadith Wa s-Sunnah Fee Usool ud-Deen” (p: 42): [They (meaning the Sahabah) adopted from the Shar’a a definite evidential proof (Hujjah) and a highest judge. This truth appeared in numerous situations following the passing of the Messenger ﷺ. From among them was the day of the Saqeefah when some of the Ansar said: “From us an Ameer (leader) and from you and Ameer”. Then the Khabar (reported tradition) of the Messenger ﷺ came stating **that the A’immah are from Quraish. They then submitted to the obedience of Allah and His Messenger ﷺ** and did not pay attention to the opinion of those who viewed other than that due to their knowledge that the truth has precedence over the opinions of men].

- The following came stated in “Aqeedah Ahlu s-Sunnah Fee As-Sahabah” by Nasir bin ‘Ali (2/521): [As for the manner and way through which the Bai’ah of As-Siddeeq, may Allah be pleased with him, was completed, then when the Rabb (Lord) جل وعلا took His Prophet ﷺ (in death) and transported him to His Jannah and the Dar (home) of His Karaamah, the Ansar gathered together in the Saqeefah of Bani Sa’idah in the Madinah of the Messenger ﷺ. They wanted to contract the Imamah (leadership) to Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah and news of that reached Abu Bakr and ‘Umar, may Allah be pleased with them. They then set off to the meeting of the Ansar among men of the Muhajirin. When they reached them a dialogue took place between them in relation to the matter of the Khilafah in the case where the affair of the Ansar was unsettled and were demanding the matter (leadership) for themselves or to share in it with the Muhajirin. Abu Bakr then made them know that the Imamah (leadership) cannot belong to other than Quraish **and he used the statement of the Prophet ﷺ as evidential proof “The A’immah (leaders) are from Quraish”**. They then submitted to that yielding and returned to the truth in obedience]/

I say: It is apparent that this author has no knowledge or ‘Aql (mind) like the majority of the claimants of the Salafiyah in Saudi. That is because he presented the correct report in full, as we have presented it above, after a few lines and then did not raise his head (i.e. to read the rest). The author is: Nasir bin ‘Aa’idh Hasan Ash-Sheikh.

- The following came in “Al-I’tisam” of Ash-Shatibiy [Edition: Ash-Shaqeer Wa Al-Hameed Wa As-Seeniy (3/329)]: [Do you not see the companions (i.e. attendees) of the Saqeefah when they were disputing in respect to the Imarah (leadership), to the point that some of the Ansar said: “From us an Ameer (leader) and from you and Ameer”. **Then the reported narration (Khabar) of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ was brought stating that the A’immah (leaders) are from Quraish**. They then submitted to the obedience to Allah and His Messenger and did not pay attention to the opinion of those who viewed other than that, due to their knowledge that the Haqq (truth) takes precedence over the opinions of men].

- The following came mentioned in “Al-Hujaj Al-Bahirah Fee Ifhaam At-Ta’ifah Al-Kafirah Al-Fajirah” (p: 91): [So, Abu Bakr and ‘Umar went to them. There (the Ansar’s) speaker stood, said Al-Hamdu Lillah and praised Allah. He said in his Khutbah: “We are the regiment (military vanguard) of Islam, we gave refuge to the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, we supported him and we have the most right to the Imamah”. ‘Umar, may Allah be pleased with him: “I had prepared a speech to deliver before Abu Bakr, then when I intended to speak Abu Bakr prevented me and said: “Be at ease O ‘Umar”. He then spoke with better than I had come up with (to say). He said: “What you have mentioned concerning yourselves in terms of good (and virtue) then you are deserving of that. However, the Imamah (leadership) does not connect to you”. They said: “(Let there be) an Ameer from us and Ameer from you”. **Abu Bakr said, may Allah be pleased with him, said: “The Prophet ﷺ said: “The A’immah (leaders) are from Quraish”**. Abu Bakr did not rise from his place of sitting until the collective of the Ansar had given him the Bai’ah (pledge over the leadership)”].

**I say**: In this manner the adept lies (or fabrications) came to be from the “Al-Hujaj Al-Bahirah Fee Ifhaam At-Ta’ifah Al-Kafirah Al-Fajirah” (The dazzling evidential proofs to silence the disbelieving and wicked group)!!

- The following came in “Risaalah Radd Ar-Rawaafid” (p: 10 in the Electronic Shamela library): [Then the text from the Prophet ﷺ that the Khalifah after him would be to ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, is not established. Rather, the evidence establishes its negation. Had it existed, it would have been transmitted by way of Tawatur because it is from what fulfils the requirements to be transmitted, like the killing of the Khateeb upon the Minbar. In addition, had it been a text in relation to this matter, ‘Ali would have used it as evidential evidence to prevent Abu Bakr from the Khilafah, **just as Abu Bakr prevented the Ansar by his statement ﷺ: “The A’immah are from Quraish”** which led them (the Ansar) to submit to him without discussion].

- The following came mentioned in the Tafsir of Ar-Raaziy “Mafaateeh Al-Ghaibi Aw At-Tafsir Al-Kabir” (3/571): [And I know that Al-Qadiy, Al-Jubba’iy and Al-Hasan say: This form establishes generality and Abu Hashim says: It does not establish generality. We say: What indicates to it being generality is some angles. The first: That when the Ansar requested the Imamah (leadership) **Abu Bakr, may Allah be pleased with him, argued against them with evidence, using his statement ﷺ “The A’immah are from Quraish”**, and the Ansar submitted to that evidential argument. Had the plural defined (Mu’arraf) with the Laam of the Jins (kind) not been indicative of Al-Istighraaq (encompassing generality) that Dalaalah (indication) would not have been validated. That is because the statement of ours “Some of the A’immah are from Quraish” does not negate the presence of an Imam from other peoples. As for all of the A’immah (leaders) being from Quraish, it negates some of the A’immah being from other than them].

This **atrocity** was repeated in “Al-Mahsool” by Ar-Raaziy: (2/357): [However, if it was not then it is for Al-Istighraaq (encompassing generality) contrary to the view of Al-Waqifiyah and Abu Hisham. We have perspectives: The first is that when the Ansar requested the Imamah, Abu Bakr, may Allah be pleased with him, argued against them with evidence, using his statement ﷺ “The A’immah are from Quraish”, and the Ansar accepted that evidential argument. Had the plural defined (Mu’arraf) with the Laam of the Jins (kind) not been indicative of Al-Istighraaq (encompassing generality) that Dalaalah (indication) would not have been validated. That is because his statement ﷺ “The A’immah are from Quraish”, had its meaning been some of the A’immah are from Quraish, it would oblige not negating the existence of an Imam from another people. As for all of the A’immah (leaders) being from Quraish, then that negates some of the leaders being from other than them].

**I say**: Even more hideous than that is that he claimed that this has come by way of **At-Tawatur** (definite concurrent reports), in the case where he stated in “Al-Mahsool” (4/368): [The first: It is that it has been related by way of **At-Tawatur** that on the day of the Saqeefah, when Abu Bakr, may Allah be pleased with him, argued against the Ansar with evidence, using his statement ﷺ “The A’immah (leaders) are from Quraish”, whilst it represents a specification to the generality to the statement of Allah تعالى:

أَطِيعُوا اللَّهَ وَأَطِيعُوا الرَّسُولَ وَأُولِي الْأَمْرِ مِنكُمْ

Obey Allah and obey the Messenger and those in authority from amongst you (An-Nisa’: 59).

They accepted it and no one objected, just as no one said to him “How can you argue as evidence against us with a Khabar (related report) that we are not certain of its authenticity”. As none from among them said that we knew that it represented an established origin in their view].

- Ibn ul-Arabiy presents more lies to us and adorns them with loathsome rhyming, in the case where the following came stated in Ibn ul-Arabiy’s “Ahkam ul-Qur’an” [Edition: Al-‘Ilmiyah (2/416)]: [The sixth situation: It is the miserableness of the situation and the crisis of disorder. When the Messenger of Allah ﷺ passed away, the matter became unsettled, the people became agitated, their speech became confused, they were longing for a head (leader) to refer to manage them. The Ansar gathered in the Saqeefah of Bani Sa’idah, they had the migration, among them was the Dawhah (large tree with branches providing shelter) and the Muhajirun were over them Nuzul (lodging). And Shaitan took to misguiding the hearts of some of them. He seduced the Ansar to contract the matter (of leadership) to a man from among them. Then came the Muhajirun came. They had gathered to Abu Bakr and they said: “Let’s send for them to come (to us)” and Abu Bakr said: “No, Shouldn’t we go to them in their location?” He was disputed with about that, but he was adamant, went forth and the Muhajirun followed him until they reached the Ansar at their location. They then exchanged statements. The Ansar said among their speech: “From us an Ameer (leader) and from you and Ameer”. Abu Bakr presided over the happenings by his right and spoke upon the dictates of the Deen and what conforms to it. He said: “O gathering of the Ansar, you have known that we are the group of the Messenger of Allah, his close clan, the origin of the Arabs and leaders of the people. And the Prophet ﷺ has said: **“The A’immah (leaders) are from Quraish until the final hour is established**. And Allah has named as in His Book as As-Saadiqoon (truthful) when He said:

لِلْفُقَرَاءِ الْمُهَاجِرِينَ الَّذِينَ أُخْرِجُوا مِن دِيَارِهِمْ وَأَمْوَالِهِمْ يَبْتَغُونَ فَضْلًا مِّنَ اللَّهِ وَرِضْوَانًا وَيَنصُرُونَ اللَّهَ وَرَسُولَهُ ۚ أُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الصَّادِقُونَ

For the poor emigrants who were expelled from their homes and their properties, seeking bounty from Allah and [His] approval and supporting Allah and His Messenger, [there is also a share]. Those are the Saadiqoon (truthful) (Al-Hashr: 8).

And He has named you Al-Muflihoon (successful), when He said:

وَالَّذِينَ تَبَوَّءُوا الدَّارَ وَالْإِيمَانَ مِن قَبْلِهِمْ يُحِبُّونَ مَنْ هَاجَرَ إِلَيْهِمْ وَلَا يَجِدُونَ فِي صُدُورِهِمْ حَاجَةً مِّمَّا أُوتُوا وَيُؤْثِرُونَ عَلَىٰ أَنفُسِهِمْ وَلَوْ كَانَ بِهِمْ خَصَاصَةٌ ۚ وَمَن يُوقَ شُحَّ نَفْسِهِ فَأُولَٰئِكَ هُمُ الْمُفْلِحُونَ

And those who, before them, had homes (in Al-Madinah) and had adopted the Faith, love those who emigrate to them, and have no jealousy in their breasts for that which they have been given (from the booty of Bani An-Nadir), and give them (emigrants) preference over themselves, even though they were in need of that. And whosoever is saved from his own covetousness, such are they who will be the successful (Al-Hashr: 9).

And Allah commanded you to be with us where we are, when He said:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا اتَّقُوا اللَّهَ وَكُونُوا مَعَ الصَّادِقِينَ

O you who have believed, fear Allah and be with those who are truthful (At-Tawbah: 119).

The Prophet has said to you: “You will see after me favouritism (or nepotism) and so remain patient until you meet me upon the Hawd””. He then said to us at the end of his Khutbah that he was delivering: “I advise you to be good to the Ansar, to accept from their good people and to overlook those who have done wrong from them. If you had anything in this matter you would not have seen favouritism and he would not have advised you”. When they observed that from his knowledge and became aware of his speech they remembered the Haqq (the truth). They then submitted to him and committed to his judgement. ‘Umar then hastened to Abu ‘Ubaidah and said to him: “O Abu ‘Ubaidah, extend your hand so that I give you the Bai’ah”. Abu ‘Ubaidah then said: “I have not heard from you such an error in speech in Islam before this. Would you give me the Bai’ah whilst Abu Bakr is among you?” ‘Umar then said to him: “O Abu Bakr, extend your hand so that I give you the Bai’ah”. Abu Bakr then extended his hand, he gave him the Bai’ah and the people gave him the Bai’ah. And the Haqq (truth) came to its origin and the Den entered from its door].

**I say**: In this manner the lie developed; from a lie (or fabrication) within the reported narration of the Saqeefah by the mention of “**The A’immah are from Quraish**”, which no one at all presented as an evidential argument on the day of the Saqeefah, to a lie against Allah and His Messenger: “**The A’immah are from Quraish until the final hour is established**”.

We have not found, following an extensive investigation and search with the use of the computer, the following sentence: apart from Al-Qaadiy Abu Bakr Muhammad bin Abdullah bin Al-‘Arabiy Al-Mu’aafiriy Al-Ishbeeliy Al-Malikiy Al-Andulusiy [Ibn ul-‘Arabiy] (DoD: 543 AH), in his book “Ahkam ul-Qur’an”. The man was not only a loathsome Omayyad, but indeed a great liar, who lied against Allah and His Messenger!

- The following came in “As-Sunnah Al-Muftara ‘Alaihaa” of Salim Al-Bahnasawiy (p: 109): [The claims of the Shi’ah and Rafidah that the Sahabah knew this text but did not submit to it represents stubbornness and arrogance with falsehood. And their claim that ‘Ali left it due to Taqiyah (a form of deception) is a lie and fabrication. He had been among the protective force of his people with their large number and courage. And the Ansar said: “From us an Ameer (leader) and from the Muhajirun an Ameer” and he used as evidential proof against them the Hadith “The A’immah are from Quraish”. So how did they accept that and yet not say that there was a Hadith related to the Imamah (leadership) of ‘Ali?].

- And the following was stated in “Al-Ahkam As-Sultaniyah” of Al-Maawardiy (p: 20): [And it (i.e. the Imamah) is to be from Quraish: That is due to the text mentioning that and the convening of the Ijmaa’ (consensus) upon it. No consideration should be given to the opinion of Dirar, when he went outside of the norm and permitted it for all of the people. That is because Abu Bakr As-Siddeeq, may Allah be pleased with him, used as evidence, on the day of the Saqeefah to repel them from the Khilafah when they were giving the Bai’ah to Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah, the statement of the Prophet ﷺ: “**The A’immah are from Quraish**”. They then withdrew their exclusive claim to it (the Imamah) and gave up the claim to share in it, when they said: “From us an Ameer and from you and Ameer”. That was in submission to his narration and belief in its reported content. And they accepted his statement: “We are the ‘Umaraa’ (leaders) and you are the Wuzaraa’ (assistants)”. And the Prophet ﷺ said: “Give precedence to Quraish and to not give precedence to yourselves over them”].

- The following came stated in “Al-Inshiraah Wa Raf’u d-Daiq Fee Seerah Abu Bakr As-Siddeeq” by As-Sallaabiy (p: 126): [From these texts the picture is made clear in respect to the issue of the ‘Aimmah are from Quraish and that the Ansar submitted to Quraish within these guiding principles and upon these bases. This is what they confirmed in their Bai’ah (pledge) to the Messenger of Allah: “Upon hearing and obeying, patience over favouritism, and that they would not dispute the matter (or authority) of its people unless they see Kufr Bawah (manifest disbelief) for which they have a Burhan (proof) from Allah”. The Ansar possessed a complete conception concerning the issue of the Khilafah, it was not unknown to them and the Hadith “The A’immah are from Quraish” was related by many from them, whilst those who were unaware of it remained silent when Abu Bakr As-Siddeeq related it to them. For that reason, none of the Ansar took him to task when he used it as evidence. That is because the matter of the Khilafah was completed by way of consultation and referring in judgement to the Shar’iyah and ‘Aqliyah (rational) texts which affirmed the rightfulness of Quraish over it. In addition, it has not been heard from any of the Ansar, following the Bai’ah of the Saqeefah, that he called for the Khilfah to be given to him, which confirms the conviction of the Ansar and their attestation to what had been arrived at in terms of results. By that, the view collapses and falls down that says: The Hadith of the A’immah are from Quraish is a slogan that the Quraish raised to seize the Khilafah from the Ansar or that it is an opinion of Abu Bakr and not a Hadith related from the Messenger. Rather, that it was (merely) a Quraishi political idea that was widespread at that period of time, reflecting the weight of Quraish among the Arab community at that time. As such, attributing these Ahadeeth to Abu Bakr or stating that they are only a slogan of Quraish, is no more than a form of the forms of distortion which the history of the rightly guided age and that of the beginnings of Islam was subjected to].

- Imam Al-Fahl Abu Muhammad ‘Ali bin Hazm also erred in this issue where he said in “Al-Ahkam Fee Usool ul-Ahkam” of Ibn Hazm (7/127): [The differing of those who differed in relation to the Khilafah of Abu Bakr was due to the forgetfulness of the text. As for the Ansar, then when they were reminded, after having forgotten prior to that to the point where one of them said “From us an Ameer and from you an Ameer” and some of them called for alternation. The clear proof (Burhan) for what we have said is that ‘Ubadah bin As-Samit Al-Ansariy related from the Messenger of Allah ﷺ that the Ansar had given him the Bai’ah upon not disputing the matter (or authority) of its people and Anas bin Malik Al-Ansariy related from the Messenger of Allah ﷺ that **the A’immah are from Quraish**. Due to this and what resembled it, the Ansar gave up their opinion and that was not because they were giving up their opinion for the opinion of others, may Allah’s refuge be sought, from the notion that the opinion of the Muhajirun was of more worth than the opinion of the Ansar. Rather, examination and deliberation were equal amongst them all and all of them are of virtue and precedence].

**I say**: This is a relatively minor error and it may be that he himself forgot the text of the Hadith of Al-Bukhari.

- In contrast to this, the Sheikh Najm ud-Deen bin ‘Ali bin Ahmad bin Abdul Wahid bin Abdul Mun’im At-Tarsusiy Al-Hanafiy (DoD: 758 AH), was unimpaired by these gross errors when he used his mind, revised and cast out blind imitation in his “Tuhfah At-Tark Feemaa Yajibu An Ya’mala Fil Mulk” (p: 73): [The Hadith “The A’immah (leaders) are from Quraish” was only related from the statement attributed to Abu Bakr when he was addressing Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah: “You have known O Sa’d that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ said whilst you were sitting (present): ‘The Quraish are the Wulaat (rulers) of this matter and so the righteous of the people follow their righteous and the wicked (or corrupt) follow their wicked’. He (the narrator) said: So, Sa’d said to him: “You have spoken the truth. We are the Wuzaraa’ (assistants) and you are the ‘Umaraa’ (leaders/rulers)”. This Hadith is refuted due to its meaning being deficient and not fitting for the speech of the Prophethood and the fact that Sa’d himself did not give the Bai’ah to Abu Bakr or ‘Umar and refused to acknowledge the Imamah (leadership) in Quraish. In addition, the Sanad of the Hadith is Munqati’ (interrupted) because the one who related it, Humaid bin Abdur Rahman, is a Taabi’iy and he did not meet the Messenger ﷺ nor was he present at the time of the incident of the Saqeefah or Bai’ah of Abu Bakr, just as he did not state the name of the Sahabiy whom he related from. For these reasons there is no evidential proof (Hujjah) in it. In addition, Abu Bakr himself, may Allah be pleased with him, when Rafi’ At-Ta’iy asked him about what had been said concerning the Bai’ah, he spoke to him about what the Ansar had said, what he said to them, what ‘Umar said and what he mentioned to them in terms of his leadership to them (i.e. over the prayer) by the command of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, during his sickness. That they then gave him the Bai’ah for that reason and that he had accepted it due to fear of the occurrence of Fitnah (discord) followed by apostacy. This Khabar (narrated report) is Sahih and it does not contain any mention of the Khilafah belonging to Quraish].

**I say**: He was correct in respect to that which most of the major A’immah (scholars) were mistaken. This Sheikh, who is barely known, judged correctly, due to the favour of Allah and His blessing:

لِّئَلَّا يَعْلَمَ أَهْلُ الْكِتَابِ أَلَّا يَقْدِرُونَ عَلَىٰ شَيْءٍ مِّن فَضْلِ اللَّهِ ۙ وَأَنَّ الْفَضْلَ بِيَدِ اللَّهِ يُؤْتِيهِ مَن يَشَاءُ ۚ وَاللَّهُ ذُو الْفَضْلِ الْعَظِيمِ

[This is] so that the People of the Book may know that they are not able [to obtain] anything from the bounty of Allah and that [all] bounty is in the hand of Allah; He gives it to whom He wills. And Allah is the possessor of great bounty (Al-Hadid: 29).

Fabrications and fables concerning the Saqeefah spread in the books of history and books of the Shi’ah, most of which are worse than what we have mentioned, concerning which we will not spend it much time discussing. They include among them:

- What came mentioned in the history of At-Tabari, “Tareekh Ar-Rusul Wa l-Mulook (2/233): [Ibn Humaid related to us from Jarir, from Mughirah, from Abu Ma’shar Ziyad bin Kulaib, from Abu Ayub, from Ibrahim, who said: When the Prophet ﷺ passed away, Abu Bakr was absent and so he came after three. No one dared to uncover his face **until his exterior turned ashen**. [When] Abu Bakr [came, he] uncovered [the Prophet's] face, kissed [his forehead] between his two eyes, and said: “May my father and mother be ransomed for you! How good you were in life, and how good you are in death!” Then he went out, praised Allah and extolled Him, saying: “Whoever was worshipping Allah, then Allah is ever living and does not die; and whoever was worshipping Muhammad, then Muhammad has died”. Then he recited:

وَمَا مُحَمَّدٌ إِلَّا رَسُولٌ قَدْ خَلَتْ مِن قَبْلِهِ الرُّسُلُ ۚ أَفَإِن مَّاتَ أَوْ قُتِلَ انقَلَبْتُمْ عَلَىٰ أَعْقَابِكُمْ

**Muhammad is not but a Messenger. [Other] Messengers have passed on before him. So, if he was to die or be killed, would you turn back on your heels [to unbelief]?** (Aali ‘Imran: 144).

‘Umar had been saying that he had not died and was threatening the people with death in respect to that. The Ansar gathered in the Saqeefah of Bani Sa’idah to give the Bai’ah (pledge over leadership) to Sa'd bin ‘Ubadah. The news of that reached Abu Bakr, so he came to them in the company of ‘Umar and Abu ‘Ubaydah bin al-Jarrah. He asked: “what is this?” They replied: “Let there be an Ameer (leader) from us and an Ameer from you”. Abu Bakr said: “From us are the Umaraa’ (leaders) and from you are the Wuzaraa’ (assistants)”. Abu Bakr then said: “I am pleased [to present] to you one of these two men: ‘Umar or Abu ‘Ubaydah. Some people came to the Prophet ﷺ asking him to send a trustworthy man with them. He ﷺ said: “I will send a truly trustworthy man with you”. So, he sent Abu ‘Ubaydah bin al-Jarrah and I am pleased to present to you Abu ‘Ubaydah”. ‘Umar then stood up and said: “Who among you would be agreeable to put back two feet which the Prophet ﷺ gave precedence to (i.e. Abu Bakr)?” ‘Umar then gave him the Bai’ah and the people gave him the Bai’ah. Then the Ansar or some of the Ansar said: “We will not give the Bai’ah to anyone apart from ‘Ali”].

**I say**: This is a weak (Da’if) Munqati’ (interrupted) Isnad (chain of transmission) and the first sentence: [When the Prophet ﷺ passed away, Abu Bakr was absent and so he came after three. No one dared to uncover his face **until his exterior turned ashen**. [When] Abu Bakr [came, he] uncovered [the Prophet's] face, kissed [his forehead] between his two eyes, and said: “May my father and mother be ransomed for you! How good you were in life, and how good you are in death!] is a lie without doubt. That is because Abu Bakr was only absent in the elevated part of Al-Madinah at a few hours travelling distance as dictated by the majority of the narrations that decisively ascertain that. He attended on the morning that he passed away and the Saqeefah occurred on the same day. There is nothing new in the remainder of the narration apart from the statement attributed to some of the Ansar: [**We will not give the Bai’ah to anyone apart from ‘Ali**]. If that does have an origin to it, it is not conceivable for that to have been except from a very small group.

- The following was also recorded in the history of At-Tabari, “Tareekh Ar-Rusul Wa l-Mulook (2/244): [Hisham related from Abu Mikhnaf who said: Abdullah bin Abdur Rahman said: The people then came from every side to give the Bai’ah to Abu Bakr and they were virtually trampling upon Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah. Some people from the companions of Sa’d said: “Be careful of Sa’d and do not step upon him”. ‘Umar said: “Kill him, may Allah kill him”. He then stood upon his head and said: “I intend to step upon you until your arm is dislocated”. At this Sa'd took hold of ‘Umar's beard and said: “By Allah, if you remove a single hair from it, you will return with no front teeth in your mouth”. Then Abu Bakr said: “Take it easy ‘Umar. Kindness would be more effective at this

Time”. So ‘Umar turned away from him. Sa'd said: “By Allah, if I had the strength to get up, you would have heard from me in the regions and streets [of Al-Madinah], roaring in a way that would make you and your companions take cover; by Allah, I shall join to you a group among whom you would be a follower, not followed. [Now] carry me from this place”. So, they carried him and took him into his house. He was left for several days; then he was sent for and told: “Come and give the Bai’ah (pledge of allegiance), as the people [generally] had done so and your tribe as well”. But he said, "By Allah, I shall not do it, until I have shot at you with whatever arrows are in my quiver, and have reddened the head of my spear, and struck you with my sword, as long as my hand controls it. I will fight you with my family and those who obey me of my tribe. I swear by Allah, [even] if the Jinn gathered to you with all the people, I would not give the oath of allegiance to you, until I am brought forth before my Rabb (Lord) and know what my reckoning is”. When Abu Bakr was informed of this, ‘Umar said to him: “Keep on at him until he gives the oath of allegiance’. But Bashir bin Sa'd said: “He is unyielding and has refused. He will not give the oath of allegiance to you even if he were to be killed and he would not be killed without his children and family and a party of his kinsmen being killed with him. So, leave him be. Leaving him will not harm you. He is only one man”. So, they left him alone. They accepted the advice of Bashir bin Said and consulted him whenever it was deemed appropriate to do so. Sa’d did not pray with their prayer and did not congregate with them (for the Jumu’ah prayer). He would perform the Hajj but did not accompany them in the

multitudes. He continued like this until Abu Bakr died.

Ubaidullah bin Sa’d related to us, he said: My uncle Saif bin ‘Umar informed us from Sahl and Abu Uthman informed us from Ad-Dahhak bin Khalifah, who said: When Al-Hubab bin al-Mundhir stood up, he drew his sword and said: “I am their much-rubbed little rubbing post and their propped little palm tree loaded with fruit. I am [like] the father of a cub in the lion's den, related to the lion [as son to father]”. Then ‘Umar attacked him, striking his hand so that the sword dropped out, and then took hold of it. He then pounced upon Sa’d and they all fell upon him. The people gave the Bai’ah one after the other [to Abu Bakr] and Sa’d gave the oath of allegiance. It was an action undertaken spontaneously, like those spontaneous acts that occurred during the Jahiliyyah (pre-Islamic times). Abu Bakr stood aside from it. Someone said, when Sa'd was being stepped upon: “You have killed Sa’d” to which `Umar replied: “May Allah kill him, he is a hypocrite”. ‘Umar then struck the sword upon a rock, breaking it.

Ubaidullah bin Sa’id related to us, he said: My uncle Ya’qub related to me from Saif, from Mubash’shir, from Jabir, who said: Sa'd bin ‘Ubadah said to Abu Bakr on that Day: “Oh assembly of Muhajirun, you begrudge me the position of leadership (Imarah) and you and my tribe have coerced me to give the oath of allegiance”. At this they replied: “Had we had coerced you upon division but you had come to the collective unity (Jama'ah), you would have been in a good position. However, we forced [you] to unity. As such, there is no separating from it. If you withdraw a hand from obedience, or divide the Jama’ah (collective), we will strike off that which your two eyes are in (i.e. your head)”].

**I say**: Mursal and Munqati’ (interrupted) chains which have concluded with rotten textual contents. The last is a pure fabrication and it may be from the fabrications and forgeries of Saif bin ‘Umar the great liar (Dajjal) and fabricator, who was accused of Zandaqah (heresy). That is because Sa’d was not forced or compelled to give the Bai’ah at all. What proceeded it, also via the path of Saif bin ‘Umar the Dajjal (great liar) and fabricator, who was accused of Zandaqah (heresy), presents to us freestyle wrestling between ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab and Al-Hubab bin Al-Mundhir, in which ‘Umar won the championship. In the first (narration) he took hold of the beard and freestyle between ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab and Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah commenced, which was stopped by the intervention of Abu Bakr, who was playing the role of the wrestling referee.

- A wondrous fabrication came recorded in the “Tareekh” (History) of Al-Ya’qubiy (2/127), some of which would make a grieving person laugh: [(Concerning the Khabar (reported related incident) of the Saqeefah of Bani Sa’idah and the Bai’ah to Abu Bakr): The Ansar met in the Saqeefah of Bani Sa’idah on the day that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ passed away and was washed. They seated Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah Al-Khazraji, they had bandaged him and placed cushioning for him. The news of this reached Abu Bakr, ‘Umar and the Muhajirun. They came hastily and the people then moved away from Sa’d. Abu Bakr, ‘Umar and Abu ‘Ubaidah bin Al-Jarrah came forward and said: “O assembly of the Ansar! The Messenger of Allah is from us and we have more right to his position”. The Ansar said: “Let there be an Ameer (leader) from us and an Ameer from you”. Abu Bakr said: “From us are the Umaraa’ (rulers) and from you are the Wuzaraa’ (assistants)”. Thabit bin Qais bin Shamas, the Khatib (speaker) of the Ansar stood. He spoke and mentioned their virtues. Abu Bakr then said: “We do not refute your virtue and what you have meant of virtue then you are worthy of that. However, Quraish have a greater claim to Muhammad than you. This is ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab, concerning whom the Messenger of Allah said: “O Allah, give strength to the Deen by him! And this is Abu ‘Ubaidah bin Al-Jarrah, concerning whom the Messenger of Allah said: “The Ameer (leader) of this Ummah! So, give the Bai’ah Pledge) to whoever of them both you wish!” They (‘Umar and Abu ‘Ubaidah) refused this from him and said: “By Allah, we will certainly not come before you. You are the companion of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ and the second of the two”. Abu ‘Ubaidah struck the hand of Abu Bakr, then ‘Umar and then all who were with him from the Quraish gave the Bai’ah.

Then Abu ‘Ubaidah called out: “O gathering of the Ansar! You were the first to provide support and so do not be the first to change and shift”. Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf stood and said: “O gathering of the Ansar! Even if you are people possessing virtue, there is none among you equal to Abu Bakr, ‘Umar and ‘Ali”. Al-Mundhir bin Arqam stood and said: “We do not deny the virtue of those who you have mentioned. However, there is a man among them, if he sought this matter, nobody would dispute with him in it”, meaning ‘Ali bin Abi Talib. Then Bashir bin Sa’d from the Khazraj rushed forward and he was the first to give the Bai’ah to Abu Bakr from the Ansar, followed by Usaid bin Hudair Al-Khazraji. The people then went to give the Bai’ah until men were jumping upon the cushioning of Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah and to the point that he was stepped upon. ‘Umar said: “Kill Sa’d! May Allah kill Sa’d”.

Al-Baraa’ bin ‘Azib came and knocked upon the door of Bani Hashim. He said: “O gathering of Bani Hashim, Abu Bakr has been given the Bai’ah (pledge of allegiance)”. Some of them then said: “The Muslims did not (in the past) bring about an occurrence that we were absent from, whilst we have a greater claim to Muhammad”. Al-‘Abbas said: “They did it, by the Rabb (Lord) of the Ka’ba”. That is whilst the Muhajirun and the Ansar had no misgivings in respect to ‘Ali. When they left the living quarters Al-Fadl bin Al-‘Abbas, who was the tongue (speaker) of the Quraish, and said: “O gathering of Quraish, the Khilafah is not established to you by way of misrepresentation whilst we are its rightful people to the exclusion of you and our companion has more right to it than you. ‘Utbah bin Abi Lahab stood and said:

**I did not believe that the matter would depart \*\*\* From Hashim and then from them from Abu Al-Hasan (‘Ali).**

**From the first of people in Iman and precedence \*\*\* And the most knowledgeable of the people in the Qur’an and the Sunnah.**

**And the last of the people who was with the Prophet, And the one who \*\*\* Jibril assisted in the Ghusl and shrouding.**

**The one who has what they do not have, they do not contest with him \*\*\* And the people do not have what he has of goodness.**

‘Ali sent a message to him to restrain him. A people from the Muhajirun and the Ansar held back from giving the Bai’ah to Abu Bakr and were inclined towards ‘Ali bin Abi Talib. They included Al-‘Abbas bin Abdul Muttalib, Al-Fadl bin Al-‘Abbas, Az-Zubair bin Al-‘Awwam bin Al-‘Aas, Khalid bin Sa’id, Al-Miqdad bin ‘Amr, Salman Al-Farisiy, Abu Dharr Al-Ghifari, ‘Ammar bin Yasir, Al-Baraa’ bin ‘Azib and Ubayy bin Ka’b. Abu Baskr then sent for ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab, Abu ‘Ubaidah bin Al-Jarrah and Al-Mughirah bin Shu’bah, and said: “What is your opinion (concerning the matter)?” They said: “The opinion is that you meet Al-‘Abbas bin Abdul Muttalib and give him a share in this matter and to those who follow him from his descendants. In that way you will cut off the domain of ‘Ali bin Abi Talib which, as an argument for you against ‘Ali, if he (Al-‘Abbas) sides with you”. Then Abu Bakr, ‘Umar, Abu ‘Ubaidah bin Al-Jarrah and Al-Mughirah set off reaching Al-‘Abbas at night. Abu Bakr them praised Allah and extolled Him. He then said: “Verily, Allah sent Muhammad as a Prophet and as a Waliy (protector and caretaker) for the believers. He bestowed blessings upon them by making him be amongst them, and He chose for himself what he had. Then, he left affairs for the people to choose for themselves in respect to their interest which concerns them. They then chose me as a Waliy (ruler) over them and to be a caretaker for their affairs. I assumed that and I do not fear with the assistance of Allah and His strengthening weakness, helplessness nor cowardice. My Tawfiq (success) is only by Allah, upon Him I have Tawakkul (reliance) and to Him to I turn (in repentance). Yet, it still reaches me of someone discrediting saying something that brings disagreement upon the generality of the Muslims, taking you as refuge. So, be his impenetrable fortress and his singular speech. Either you enter along with the people in respect to what they have come together upon or you divert them from what you have inclined towards. We have come to you wanting that you have a share in this matter that would be yours and belonging to those who came after you from your descendants, in the case where you were the paternal uncle of the Messenger of Allah and the people have seen your standing and the standing of your companion from you. And be at ease Bani Hashim, for verily the Messenger of Allah ﷺ was from us and from you”.

‘Umar bin Al-Khattab said: “All of that is correct by Allah and there is something else. We did not come here in need of anything from you but rather due to disliking for there to be discrediting from you of that which the Muslims have gathered together upon, leading to an escalation of the problematic matter with you and them. So, look to your own selves”.

Al-‘Abbas praised Allah, extolled him and said: “Verily, Allah sent Muhammad as you have described, as a Prophet and a Waliy for the believers, thereby bestowing blessings upon his Ummah through him, until Allah took him back to Himself. And He chose for Him what he had and he left for the Muslims their affairs to chose for themselves in order to attain the truth and not incline towards the misguidance of the desires. If you were with the Messenger of Allah then that is a right that you have taken and if you are with the believers, then we are from them. We have not forwarded in your affair a presupposition, nor have we sanctioned an intermediary, just as we have not become resentful. If this affair is only obligatory for you with believers, then it is not obligatory if we are averse. How far off is your statement in terms of them discrediting you from your statement that they chose you and took your side. And how far off is your being named with the Khalifah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ from your statement that he freed the affairs for the people to chose and then they chose you. As for what you said in terms of what you will give to me, then if it was the right belonging to the Muslims, then it is not for you to pass judgement in it. And if it belonged to us, then we will not be satisfied with some of it without the rest. And be at ease, for verily the Messenger of Allah ﷺ is from a tree of which we are its branches and you its neighbours”. They then departed from him. From those who abstained from giving the Bai’ah to Abu Bakr was Abu Sufyan bin Harb and he said: Are you content O Bani Abd Manaf for other than you to assume this matter (i.e. the leadership) over you?” And he said to ‘Ali bin Abi Talib: “Extend your hand for me to give you the Bai’ah” whilst Qusayy was with ‘Ali and he said:

**Bani Hashim do not covet the people in respect to yourselves \*\*\* Especially Taim bin Murrah or ‘Adiy.**

**The matter is not except amongst you and belonging to you \*\*\* And it is for none except Abu Hasan ‘Ali.**

**Abu Hasan, so, hold fast to it by a resolute hand \*\*\* That is because you are with the matter which time has hoped for.**

**And verily person throws Qusayy behind him \*\*\* The mighty protection and the people from Ghalib Qusayy.**

Khalid bin Sa’id was absent (at the time). He then came, went to ‘Ali and said: “Let me give you the Bai’ah, for verily by Allah there is no one among the people who is as worthy for the position of Muhammad than you”. A collective gathered to ‘Ali bin Abi Talib requesting him to accept the Bai’ah for himself and so, he said to them: “Set off in the morning upon this with shaven heads”. Then none except three did that.

The news reached Abu Bakr and ‘Umar that a group from among the Muhajirin and the Ansar had met with ‘Ali bin Abi Talib in the house of Fatimah the daughter of the Messenger of Allah. They then came in a group and attacked the house. ‘Ali then came out with a sword. ‘Umar met him, wrestled him, threw him down and broke his sword. They then entered the house and Fatimah came out and said: “By Allah, you will leave or I will expose my hair and I will complain to Allah!” They departed, those who were in the house exited and the people stayed outside for some days. Then one after another began to give the Bai’ah but ‘Ali did not give the Bai’ah until after six months and it has (also) been said forty days].

**I say**: I do not believe that there is a need for me to comment upon this and I will find it sufficient to express my astonishment that the Naqib (chief deputy) Usaid bin Hudair bin Simak bin ‘Utaik bin Nafi’ bin Imri’i Al-Qais bin Zaid bin Abdul Ash’hal Al-Awsiy had somehow transformed into a Khazraji!

- An inconsistent summary, the majority of which had no chain of transmission, containing blatant lies came stated in “Maqaalaat Fee At-Tashyee’” of Al-‘Askariy (40/22) as follows: [The historians have related the following saying: The Ansar met in the Saqeefah of Bani Sa’idah and left the washing Janazah (funeral preparations) of the Messenger of Allah to his family. They said: “We will appoint Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah in this matter after Muhammad”. They brought Sa’d out to them whilst he was sick … He praised Allah and extolled Him. He then mentioned the precedence of the Ansar in respect to the Deen, their favour (or virtue) in Islam, their provision of strength to the Prophet, his companions, their Jihad against his enemies until the Arabs were set right and that the Messenger died whilst being pleased with them”. And he (Sa’d) said: “They have sought to seize the matter (leadership) to the exclusion of the people”. They answered him unanimously: “Your opinion is agreeable and your speech is correct. And we will never oppose your opinion. We will appoint you to this matter (position of leadership)” (2).

Abu Bakr and ‘Umar heard of this and hastened to the Saqeefah. Abu Bakr spoke. He praised Allah and extolled Him. He then mentioned the precedence of the Muhajirun in respect to affirming (or believing in) the Messenger over all the Arabs. And he said: “They are the first to worship Allah upon the land and to believe in the Messenger. And they are his Awliyaa’ (friends and protectors), his tribal community and those most entitled to this matter after him. None except the wrongdoer would dispute them in that”. He then mentioned the virtue of the Ansar and said: “There is nobody after the forerunners of the Muhajirun in our view of your standing. Therefore, we are the Umaraa’ (leaders or rulers) and you are the Wuzaraa’ (assistants). You will not be ignored in consultation and we will not judge the affairs without you”. Al-Hubab bin Al-Mundhir stood and said: “O gathering of the Ansar, take hold of your affair. Verily, the people are in your shadow and shade. No one would dare to oppose you. And do not differ among yourselves so that your opinion is corrupted as a result and your affair will collapse upon you. And if those refuse what you have heard, then let there be from us an Ameer (leader) and from them and Ameer”. ‘Umar then said: “How wrong is that view two do not come together in one rope … By Allah, the Arabs will not accept for you to lead them whilst its Prophet is from other than you. However, the Arabs will not decline that someone assumes the responsibility of their affair from those whom the Prophethood was among, where the affair was given to someone from them. We have for anyone who rejects that clear evidence and manifest proof. Who is it that will dispute with us the authority of Muhammad and his leadership whilst we are his Awliyaa’ and his tribal community, except the one who is guided by falsehood or inclined to sinfulness or entangled it destructiveness?” Al-Hubab bin Al-Mundhir then stood and said: “O gathering of the Ansar, take hold over your hands and do not listen to what this one said and his companions. They will take your share of this matter away. Therefore, if they refuse you what you have asked them, then vacate them from this land and assume the responsibility of these affairs over them. That is because you, by Allah, are more entitled to this matter than them. It was by your swords that those who did not follow the Deen followed it. I am the post upon which the camel rubs itself to satisfy the itching (i.e. I am a noble), and I am like a high class palm tree. However, by Allah, if you wish we will make it a matter of war”. ‘Umar said: “In that case, may Allah kill you”. He responded: “Rather, may he kill you”. Abu ‘Ubaidah then said: “O gathering of the Ansar, if you are the first to provide support and strength, then do not be the first to change and alter”. Bashir bin Sa’d Abu Nu’man bin Bashir then stood and said: “Verily, by Allah, if we were of the best virtue in terms of engaging the Mushrikeen in Jihad and have attained precedence in this Deen, then we did not desire by that except the pleasure of our Lord, obedience to our Prophet and exertion for our own selves. We should not be arrogant over others due to that and we do not seek anything from the Dunya for that. Verily, Allah has bestowed His blessing upon us through that. Indeed, Muhammad ﷺ was from Quraish and his people are more entitled to it”. When the Aws saw what Bashir bin Sa’d did, what the Quraish invited to, and what the Khazraj were demanding in terms of appointing Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah as the Ameer (leader), some of them said to others among them: “By Allah, if the Khazraj assumed the leadership over you once, they will continue to have that virtue over you and they will never grant you a share alongside them in it. So, stand and give the Bai’ah to Abu Bakr”. They then arose towards him and gave him the Bai’ah. Then what Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah and the Khazraj had agreed in respect to appointing him over their affair came crashing down] (3).

And the following came in another narration: [Abu Bakr said: “This is ‘Umar and this is Abu Ubaidah, so, give the Bai’ah to whichever of the two you wish”. They then both said: “By Allah, we will not assume this matter over you”. Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf then stood and spoke. He said: “O gathering of the Ansar, if you are indeed upon virtue, there is nevertheless not among you anyone equal to Abu Bakr, ‘Umar and ‘Ali”. Al-Mundhir bin Al-Arqam then stood and said: “We do not deny a virtue of what you have mentioned. Indeed, there are among them a man who if he requested this matter nobody would dispute with him in respect to it”, meaning ‘Ali bin Abi Talib] (4). Then when the hue and din became great and the disagreement intensified, ‘Umar said to Abu Bakr: “Extend your hand so that I may give you the Bai’ah” and then the Bai’ah was undertaken. In another narration it was stated that ‘Umar threatened to kill whoever opposed what he and his companions were upon: “By Allah none shall oppose us except that we would kill him” (5)].

I say: We have previously presented the purely political evidential argument of Abu Bakr and it does not contain within it, neither closely or distantly, any mention of the like of statement “They are the first to worship Allah upon the land and to believe in the Messenger. And they are his Awliyaa’ (friends and protectors), his tribal community and those most entitled to this matter after him. None except the wrongdoer would dispute them in that”. **The purpose behind this fabricated lie is clear**: It is to establish evidential proof against Abu Bakr and to characterise him with transgression as he placed himself before the one who was more entitled to be placed first: ‘Ali bin Abi Talib.

In addition, the lie of the statement “They left the Janazah of the Messenger of Allah and his family to wash him” has been previously explained on a number of occasions. That is because there was no Ghusl (washing of the body) or burial on the first day. Rather, this was only said in order to stir the emotions. Then the speech attributed to a man, who appears to have been from the Ansar called Al-Mundhir bin Al-Arqam “We do not deny a virtue of what you have mentioned. Indeed, there are among them a man who if he requested this matter nobody would dispute with him in respect to it (meaning ‘Ali bin Abi Talib)” is to reinforce the lie of the preoccupation of ‘Ali, may the blessings of Allah be upon him, with the preparation of the Prophet. That was whilst the people had turned upon their heels competing against each other over the leadership to seize away his right in respect to it. Concerning this Al-Mundhir bin Al-Arqam, then it is known who he is from the creation of Allah and no mention of him has been made in this world, according to my knowledge, except in this situation. It is may be that he never existed in this world at all and was not contained within a female’s womb. In addition, Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf did not attend the Saqeefah at all and so what is the purpose of inserting him within its context?! The answer is clear: It is to establish that he participated in the conspiracy from the beginning and the unlawful usurpation of the right of the trustee of the Prophet, blessings of Allah be upon them both. There is therefore no surprise for the conspiracy to have been completed years after that with the Bai’ah that was given to Uthman and the subsequent betrayal of ‘Ali.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

**- Section: The fabricated lie of the burning or storming of the house of Fatimah:**

The only thing that is certain is what ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab said with his loudest voice upon the Minbar, in the main Hadith related to this subject area: [**… “Indeed, it is from our news (i.e. events that came to pass) that when Allah caused His Prophet ﷺ to pass away, the Ansar acted contrary to us and gathered in their entirety in the Saqeefah (shelter/garden) of Bani Sa’idah. ‘Ali and Zubair and whoever was with them, stayed back from us, whilst the Muhajirin (emigrants) had gathered around Abu Bakr …”**]. Therefore, ‘Ali, Az-Zubair and alongside them most of Bani Hashim, and possibly a small number of the Muhajirun, had retreated to the side and did not attend the Saqeefah. At the same time, they were not with the majority of the Muhajirin who had gathered, without question, inside the Masjid. The context and general scene dictates outweighing that ‘Ali and those with him, only stood aside in order to study amongst each other the affair of the state and the Khilafah, which is reinforced by other narrations. There is therefore no validity to the emotional and run-away imaginative claims that he had been preoccupied with the preparation of the Prophet ﷺ. That is because, on that the first day, Monday, no washing, shrouding or digging of the grave was undertaken. Rather, that took place on the third day, Wednesday. And when the news of the meeting of the Ansar in the Saqeefah reached Abu Bakr and ‘Umar, regardless of the manner of how it reached them and the dialogue that may have taken place between them and the Ansar who had informed them, the two of them decided to set off to the Saqeefah in order to prevent them from falling into that the consequences of which are not praiseworthy. It did not come to their minds that the matters would develop in the manner that they did. All of that was a **sudden (or spontaneous) occurrence**. There was therefore no conspiracy, no infiltration or stealth that took place behind the back of ‘Ali bin Abi Talib who had been preoccupied, which they claimed to have been in the preparation of the Prophet ﷺ.

However, ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab did not mention anything about what happened after that in respect to ‘Ali and his companions, beyond being at odds and withdrawing to the side. Had something serious occurred, in origin, it would have merited a mention. ‘Umar was not well known for diplomacy, gentle speech and embellishing events. Indeed, he was closer to roughness and severity in his speech. Consequently, had what was attributed to Az-Zubair in respect to violent situations and the breaking of the sword been a true reality that happened, ‘Umar would not have hesitated to mention it to rebuke Az-Zubair and as a deterrent to him and others, to prevent them from repeating something similar to that. That is especially as he concluded his speech with a stern and severe judgement: “**Whoever gives the pledge of allegiance to anybody among you without consultation from the Muslims, then neither the person who is given the pledge nor the person who gave the pledge of allegiance are to be followed, lest they both should be killed**”.

Then the confrontation between Fatimah the daughter of Muhammad, peace and blessings of Allah be upon her, and Abu Bakr took place in relation to the inheritance of the Prophet ﷺ. She was then angered by that and did not speak to Abu Bakr until she passed away. ‘Ali and those alongside him remained withdrawn with her, refraining from giving the Bai’ah, as we have presented previously. That was:

**Firstly**: Due to respect for Fatimah the daughter of Muhammad, peace and blessings of Allah be upon them.

Secondly: Because of what was stated in the text: “**However, we viewed that we had a share in the matter but it was excluded from us and so we found hurt in ourselves**”. This is like that which is certain from the Hadith of the Mother of Believers ‘Aa’ishah the daughter of Abu Bakr, may Allah’s pleasure be upon them, and is supported by Hasan and Sahih Mursal narrations which we have previously mentioned.

‘Aa’ishah did not mention any incident or occurrence between the isolation of ‘Ali bin Abi Talib and his refraining from giving the Bai’ah until the death of Fatimah the daughter of Muhammad, peace and blessings of Allah be upon them, and ‘Ali’s invitation to her father, Abu Bakr, to come to his house on the condition that ‘Umar did not accompany him, as ‘Ali had disliked that. She did not mention the reason for that dislike other than the **severity of ‘Umar’s condemnation of them**. Had there been that which was worthy of being mentioned, due to it being relevant to the standing and context of the story, especially if it had been negative in relation to ‘Ali, she would not have hesitated to relate it due to what existed between them in terms of the well-known rupture (or being at odds with each other).

Consequently, we seek Allah’s guidance and say: All of the claims concerning the siege of the house of Fatimah. Or the attempt to storm it, or the threat to burn it down, in addition to the story of Az-Zubair coming out with his sword unsheathed, followed by his defeat or tripping over and the taking of his sword from him and breaking it … that all of that is a lie and fabrication which did not take place in this world at all.

However, we will not suffice ourselves by reaffirming what we have already presented, but rather we will also attempt to clarify the true reality of the one who inserted the lie and fabricated it. From the first and oldest of these fabricated lies is:

- What was recorded by Al-Hakim in his “Mustadrak” (3/81/4457): [Abu l-‘Abbas Muhammad Ya’qub related to us from Ja’far bin Muhammad bin Shakir, from ‘Affan bin Muslim, from Wuhaib, from Dawud bin Abi Hind, from Abu Nadrah, from Abu Sa;id Al-Khudri, may Allah be pleased with him, who said similar to what preceded, and added: Then Zaid bin Thabit took the hand of Abu Bakr and said: “This is your Sahib (companion or master), so give him the Bai’ah (pledge over leadership) and then set off”. Then when Abu Bakr sat upon the Minbar (pulpit), he looked at the faces of the people present but did not see ‘Ali and so, asked about him. Some people from the Ansar then **brought him**. Abu Bakr said: “Cousin and son-in-law of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, have you desired to cause a division among the Muslims?” He said: “There is no cause for censure O Khalifah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ” and then he gave him the Bai’ah. He then did not see Az-Zubair bin ‘Awwam and so asked concerning him until **they brought him**. He then said: “Cousin and follower of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, have you desired to cause a division among the Muslims?” He then replied with a similar statement: “There is no cause for censure O Khalifah of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ” and then he gave him the Bai’ah”]. Al-Hakim said: [This Hadith is Sahih upon the Shart (conditionality) of the two Sheikhs (Al-Bukhari and Muslim) but they did not record it]. Adh-Dhahabi did not comment upon it and was correct in that. Al-Baihaqiy recorded it in his “Sunan Al-Kubra” (8/143/16215) via Al-Hakim and other than him in its complete form: [Abu Abdullah Al-Hafizh related it to us by dictation and Abu Muhammad bin Abi Hamid Al-Muqriy by recital upon him. They (both) said: [Al-‘Abbas Muhammad bin Ya’qub related to us … with the same as what Al-Hakim recorded].

- Similarly, there is that which came recorded in “Ansaab Al-Ashraaf” of Al-Baladhuri (1/585/1183) with a Mursal chain via Al-Jurairiy instead of Dawud bin Abi Hind: [Hudbah bin Khalid related to me from Hammad bin Salamah, from Al-Jurairiy, from Abu Nadrah who said: When the people gave the Bai’ah to Abu Bakr, ‘Ali and Az-Zubair kept away. He then sent ‘Umar Ibn Al-Khattab and Zaid bin Thabit to them. They arrived at ‘Ali’s house and knocked upon the door. Az-Zubair looked through a gap and went back to ‘Ali and said: “These two men are from the people of Jannah (Paradise) and we shall not fight them”. He said: “Open the door for them”. They then went with them until they came to Abu Bakr. Abu Bakr then said: “O ‘Ali, you are the cousin and son-in-law of the Messenger of Allah and you say: I have more right to this matter (i.e. leadership). No, by Allah, I have more right than you”. He said: “There is no cause for censure O Khalifah of the Messenger of Allah. Extend your hand and I will give you the Bai’ah (pledge)”. He then extended his hand and he gave him the Bai’ah. Then he said to Az-Zubair: “You say that you are the cousin of the Messenger of Allah, his follower and knight and that I have a greater right to this matter. No, by Allah, I have more right than you”. He said: “There is no cause for censure O Khalifah of the Messenger of Allah. Extend your hand”. He then extended his hand and he gave him the Bai’ah].

**I say**: We have explained above the falsity of this addition in terms of chain of transmission (Sanad) and textual content (Matn) and its contradiction with reliably affirmed Sahih narrations. Specifically the Hadith narrated by ‘Aa’ishah. It is clear here that this great abominable liar, the fabricator of this **rottenness**, was seeking some matters, which included:

**Firstly**: To portray ‘Ali and Az-Zubair in a bad light, theses two heroic commanders, each of whom was equal to a thousand or more men, by portraying them as:

1 – Rebels who were attempting split the unity of the Muslims.

2 – That they were brought forth in a lowly humiliated state under escort, just like criminals are brought; being led like cattle.

3 – Followed by their reversal of view and the giving of their Bai’ah in a humiliating subservient manner.

**Secondly**: To invent a **legislative precedent** attributed to Abu Bakr justifying coercion upon the Bai’ah by way of force, thus making the leadership that is taken by force valid and obliging obedience to the criminal usurper.

**Thirdly**: To lay the premise, by way of abominable slyness and underhandedness, for the existence of animosity between ‘Ali and ‘Umar, which became serious with ‘Umar’s coercion of ‘Ali for him to marry his daughter Umm Kulthum the daughter of ‘Ali. Then, ‘Ali remained, Allah forbid, and Allah’s blessings be upon him, lowly, submissive, resentful and practising a form of hypocrisy (which they call: **Taqiyyah**). Then when ‘Uthman assumed the rule, ‘Ali took advantage of his weakness and good nature. He then planned and conspired, then punced upon ‘Uthman and killed him!!

Wishing for these matters and possibly additional matters, was the motive behind this heinous crime; the crime of lying against the first forerunners from the Muhajirin and the Ansar, and especially those who participated at Badr. When the **motive of the crime** is known, it becomes easy to become aware of the **criminal**. It is without doubt the underhanded hypocrite Mu’awiyah bin Abi Sufyan, either himself directly or via one of his henchmen, may the curse of Allah, His angels and all mankind be upon them. We have mentioned above his beneficial interest in relation to attributing the crime of the assassination of Sa’d bin ‘Ubadah to ‘Umar bin AL-Khattab, the rightly guided and upright Ameer ul-Mu’mineen.

It is strange that this abominable Omayyad Nasibiy (one who has animosity towards ‘Ali) fabricated lie fooled generations of the foolish straying fanatical Sab’iyah Rawaafid, from those who fraudulently and falsely made claim to At-Tashayyu’ (i.e. Shi’ism and followers of ‘Ali), whilst true Tashayyu’ is free and innocent of them. They are those concerning whom Imam Ash-Sha’biy said: [Had they been animals, they would have been donkeys and had they been from the birds, they would have been vultures]. Consequently, they believed this lie to the point that some of them said about Umm Kulthum the daughter of ‘Ali, may the pleasure and peace of Allah be upon her, Umm (the mother of) Zaid bin ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab, may Allah’s pleasure and peace be upon them: [That Farj (source of children) that we were robbed of]. In addition, some of them insane and completely irrational stories. We seek refuge in Allah from the dull wittedness of the donkey!

- The following came mentioned in “Ifhaam Al-A’adaa Wa l-Khusoom” (p: 100): [And Bakr Al-Jawhariy also said in the book of the Saqeefah, from what was transmitted to him: When Abu Bakr was given the Bai’ah Az-Zubair and Al-Miqdad were at variance among a Jama’ah (group) with ‘Ali who was at the house of Fatimah. They were consulting and revising their affairs. ‘Umar then departed until he reached the house of Fatimah and said: “O daughter of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, there are none from the creation more beloved to us than your father and none are more beloved to us after your father than you. However, by Allah, if that group gathers at your house, that would not prevent me from commanding the burning down of the house over them”].

- A similar and more complete narration was recorded in the Musannaf of Ibn Abi Shaibah (235) (14.567/38200): [Muhammad bin Bishr related to us from Ubaidullah bin ‘Umar, from Zaid bin Aslam, from his father Aslam: That when Abu Bakr was given the Bai’ah after the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, ‘Ali and Az-Zubair entered the house of Fatimah the daughter of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, where they were consulting and revising in respect to their affair. When the news of that reached ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab he departed until he reached the house of Fatimah and said: ““O daughter of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, there are none from the creation more beloved to us than your father and none are more beloved to us after your father than you. However, by Allah, if that group gathers at your house, that would not prevent me from commanding that the house be burned down over them”. He (the narrator) said: Then when ‘Umar left, they came to her and she said: “Do you know that ‘Umar came to me and that he made an oath by Allah that if you return he will burn down the house upon you. By Allah, he will fulfil what he swore he would. So, leave uprightly, hold back your opinion and do not return to me”. And so, they departed from her and did not return to her until they had given the Bai’ah to Abu Bakr].

**I say**: This is a fabricated lie like the Mursal reports of Abu Nadrah mentioned previously. The Isnad (chain of transmission) is like the sun, of the highest level of authenticity until it reaches Aslam the Mawla (slave) of ‘Umar. He, for certain, did not witness the scene and was not in Al-Madinah at that time when those incidents occurred for him to have heard the testimony for this and received the speech concerning that from someone who had directly observed those incidents. That is because ‘Umar purchased him during his Hajj in the 12th Hijri year following the passing of more than a year of the death of Fatimah the daughter of the Muhammad, peace and blessing of Allah be upon them. That is as Fatimah, may the blessings of Allah be upon her, died in the 11th Hijri year within six months, at most, of the death of her father ﷺ. Aslam also did not state that he had heard it from ‘Umar like for instance if he had said: ‘Umar related to me, or I heard ‘Umar saying or something similar to that. Rather, it is only a narration with An’anah (Note: A narration that simply states: That (An) something happened or was said without mentioning the one who related it) alone.

Someone may say: Aslam heard the story from ‘Umar and related it as he had heard it. I say: If we were to concede that for the sake of argument in respect to the beginning of the narration until his statement: “Then when ‘Umar left”, from where did he hear the remainder of the narration “Then when ‘Umar left, they came to her and she said: “Do you know that ‘Umar came to me and that he made an oath by Allah that if you return he will burn down the house upon you. By Allah, he will fulfil what he swore he would. So, leave uprightly, hold back your opinion and do not return”. And so, they departed from her and did not return to her until they had given the Bai’ah to Abu Bakr”? That is because all of that took place after ‘Umar had left from that which he was not present at, did not hear or witness. Consequently, Aslam definitely did not hear that from ‘Umar. Where then did Aslam obtain that from?! It is inconceivable that he obtained it from either ‘Ali, may Allah’s pleasure be upon him, or Az-Zubair whilst they did not relate it to anyone else in then world apart from Aslam. It is not possible for it to have been obtained from Fatimah the daughter of Muhammad, may the blessings and peace of Allah be upon them, unless it was by way of an intermediary, whilst it is inconceivable for there to have been an intermediary that Fatimah related this to in origin during the stage of her final sickness?! None remains after that apart from ‘Aa’ishah the daughter of Abu Bakr whose house was adjoined to the house of Fatimah. That is in the case where she heard the allegedly claimed speech of ‘Umar with his loud speech, then eavesdropped to hear what ‘Ali and Az-Zubair (who according to the narration had been absent) when they attended. Had this in fact happened ‘Aa’ishah would have leapt upon it and related it due to what it contained in terms of the feebleness of Fatimah and her (claimed) failure to support her husband and her renouncing of his responsibility, when she (was claimed to have) said: “By Allah, he will fulfil what he swore he would. So, leave uprightly, hold back your opinion **and do not return to me**”. We have previously related the Sahih narration of ‘Aa’ishah and it doesn’t contain a trace of this at all, even though (due to how she felt about ‘Ali) she greatly summarised the speech of her father related to the virtue of ‘Ali and his standing and did not mention a word related to his offer to step down and his concession to ‘Ali!

As for the beginning of the related report then it is not plausible: “‘Ali and Az-Zubair entered the house of Fatimah the daughter of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, where they were consulting and revising in respect to their affair”. It is as if ‘Ali use to live outside of his house, the house of Fatimah, and came to be in need of seeking her permission to enter to consult with Az-Zubair. Or may be Fatimah, may the peace and blessings of Allah be upon her, had kicked him out and he was living in the Masjid or in a tent in the Baqee’?! These are all lies that even the grieving person would laught at. In addition, this contradicts the other narrations which claim that ‘Ali, Az-Zubair and a group from Bani Hashim had fortified themselves in the house of Fatimah, which are also fabricated lies and fables. That is because the house of Fatimah only consisted of a small room or two and there was no door apart from the one leading to the Masjid. It was not a fort like the fort of Ka’b bin Al-Ashraf and whoever is in any doubt concerning that, then he can reference the plans of the Qabr Ash-Shareef (Honourable grave) and what is surrounding it, where he will find the residence!

Someone might say: You have not been fair because the beginning of the Hadith was greatly summarised in the report of Ibn Abi Shaibah, however it is consistent and conceivable in the narration of Al-Jawhariy, which stated: “When Abu Bakr was given the Bai’ah Az-Zubair and Al-Miqdad were at variance among a Jama’ah (group) with ‘Ali who was at the house of Fatimah. They were consulting and revising their affairs”. We say: No problem, we accept that, even though the narration of Al-Jawhariy in his book “As-Saqeefah Wa Fadak” came without an isnad and came incomplete where it ended with the sentence “the burning down of the house over them”. As such, we do not know what the relationship of this is with the narration of Ibn Abi Shaibah which was presented by the author of “Ifhaam Al-A’adaa Wa l-Khusoom” directly after that, with a wording that conforms to that in the Musannaf of Ibn Abi Shaibah: Is it from another path other to Aslam, which is preponderant, or from another man?

The book “As-Saqeefah Wa Fadak” is unfortunately lost to this day and only some of it has been preserved in the Sharh (explanation) of “Nahj ul-Balaghah” by ‘Izzu d-Deen Abdul Hamid bin Abi Al-Hadid (DoD: 656 AH) and subsequently taken and edited by Doctor Sheikh Muhammad Haadi Al-Ameeniy (Published by the company: Al-Kutubiy for printing and publishing, in Beirut – Lebanon).

From where then did Aslam take these implausible stories?! Aslam is well known to relate from Mu’awiyah bin Abi Sufyan, the refuge of the hypocrites, chief of the confederates and commander of the rebellious faction (Al-Firqah Al-Baaghiyah) inviting to the fire, and to have companionship with Marwan bin Al-Hakam, the coward son of the coward, the detested son of the detested.

Therefore, the great liar who fabricated this did not dare to add more than this as he was aware that the alertness of Aslam, his knowledge (in spite of what exists in terms of the soundness of the breast (good and open nature) and the possible inattentiveness of the righteous) would not enable him to increase “the audacity” any further than this. In addition, there is nothing in the narration concerning a confrontation between the people than can be relied upon. There was no “**storming**” of the house of Fatimah, no “**drawing of a sword or its being broken**”, nor was there any mention of ‘Ali and Az-Zubair being led by force under guard in a humiliated state to give the Bai’ah. Rather, they willingly went to give the Bai’ah, perhaps in order to repel the potential or anticipated harm from the house of Fatimah, as claimed in the narration.

Some foolish people have argued that Al-Bukhari had also recorded by way of “Al-An’anah” another story concerning ‘Umar, whilst Al-Bukhari did not record except that which was Muttasal (connected) and Sahih. **I say**: It may be that they are referring to the following narration:

- Sahih Al-Bukhari (5/126/4177): [Abdullah bin Yusuf related to me from Malik, from Zaid bin Aslam, from his father that: The Messenger of Allah ﷺ was proceeding at night on one of his journeys and ‘Umar bin Al- Khattab was going along with him. ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab asked him about a matter but the Messenger of Allah ﷺ did not answer him. ‘Umar asked him again, but he did not answer him and he asked him again (for the third time) but he did not answer him. On that `Umar bin Al-Khattab addressed himself saying: “May your mother be bereaved of you, O ‘Umar, for you have asked the Messenger of Allah three times, yet he has not answered you on any occasion”. ‘Umar said: “Then I spurred my camel on and came in front of the other Muslims, and I was afraid that something might be revealed in the Qur’an in connection to me. I had hardly waited for a moment when I heard somebody calling me. He said: “So, I said: “I was afraid that something might have been revealed about me in the Qur’an”. Then I came to the Messenger of Allah ﷺ and greeted him. He (i.e. the Prophet) said: “Tonight there has been revealed to me, a Surah which is dearer to me than what the sun has risen over” and then he recited:

إِنَّا فَتَحْنَا لَكَ فَتْحًا مُّبِينًا

Verily! We have granted you (O Muhammad) A manifest victory (Al-Fat’h: 1)].

I say:

**Firstly**: There is no comparison between the “An’anah” here and that which is in the reported narration of Ibn Abi Shaibah. That is because the textual content here is all from the speech of ‘Umar and what he witnessed. There is therefore no blame upon Al-Bukhari to exert himself in Ijtihad and consider that the statement “That the Messenger of Allah …” represents an acceptable shortening or summarisation for the statement: “I heard ‘Umar saying: That the Messenger of Allah …”. That is because the textual content (Matn) supports and affirms that. Similarly, there is no reasonable justification to doubt that Aslam heard this directly from ‘Umar as he was the one who was most attached to ‘Umar after his son.

**Secondly**: Who has said that Al-Bukhari is infallible and that it is impossible for him to record other than which is Muttasal (connected) and Sahih. That is because there are more than one Hadith, even if few in number, which Al-Bukhari believed to be Muttasal and Sahih whilst they are Munqati (interrupted) and invalid. An example of that is the Hadith:

إِنَّ ابْنِي هَذَا سَيِّدٌ، وَلَعَلَّ اللَّهَ أَنْ يُصْلِحَ بِهِ بَيْنَ فِئَتَيْنِ عَظِيمَتَيْنِ مِنَ الْمُسْلِمِينَ

This son of mine is a Sayyid (master) and may Allah make peace between two big groups of Muslims through him.

And similarly, the Hadith:

أَخْرِجُوا الْمُشْرِكِينَ مِنْ جَزِيرَةِ الْعَرَبِ

Expel the Mushrikoon (polytheists) from the Arabian Peninsula.

That is in addition to a few others which are all Batil (invalid and false) and fabricated lie!

There then arose generations of the foolish straying fanatical Sab’iyah Rawaafid, from those who fraudulently and falsely made claim to At-Tashayyu’ (i.e. Shi’ism and followers of ‘Ali), those concerning whom Imam Ash-Sha’biy said: “Had they been animals, they would have been donkeys and had they been from the birds, they would have been vultures”. They then added to the story, embellished it and added footnotes and commentary. As a result, foolish and repugnant narrations emerged which are difficult for a sound mind to arrange, unless his brain was like a donkey’s brain, may Allah’s refuge be sought from that.

That is like the following examples:

- The following came stated in “Ifhaam Al-A’adaa Wa l-Khusoom” (p: 100): [Abu Al-Fadl Ja’far bin Al-Fadl bin Ja’far bin Muhammad bin Musa bin Al-Hasan bin Al-Furat Al-Misriy, who is well known as Ibn Khanzabah, in the book “Al-Gharar” in respect to what was transmitted from him: Zaid bin Aslam said: I was from those who carried the firewood with ‘Umar bin AL-Khattab to the house of Fatimah when ‘Ali and his companions refrained from giving the Bai’ah. ‘Umar said to Fatimah: “Exit from the house or I will burn it and those inside it”. He said: And in the house were ‘Ali, Fatimah, Al-Hasan, Al-Hussein and a group from among the companions of the Prophet”. Fatimah said: “You would burn it over my son?” He said: “By Allah, I will unless you exit and give the Bai’ah”.

**I say**: The mention of Zaid bin Aslam is from the erroneous errors of the narrators or a slip of the pen in some of the transcripts. It was rather Aslam the Mawla (slave) of ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab, whom the great liars made out to be attendance and not just in attendance but indeed one of those carrying the firewood to the door of Fatimah!

It appears that the one fabricating this imagined that Fatimah had been fortified in a fortress like those of Khaibar, that would need firewood to be carried to its door in order to burn it, in the case where a torch or a wick (which were mentioned in other reports) would not have been sufficient. The artistic cinematic picture is clear. If indeed Aslam had undertaken the role of the firewood carriers, then ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab would in such a case be equivalent to being Abu Lahab (a father of the flames)!

- The following came stated in “Ifhaam Al-A’adaa Wa l-Khusoom” (p: 98): [Abu Bakr Ahmad bin Abdul ‘Aziz Al-Jawhariy said in the book of the Saqeefah, according to what was transmitted from him: When Abu Bakr sat upon the Minbar (pulpit), ‘Ali, Az-Zubair and some people from Bani Hashim were in the house of Fatimah. ‘Umar then came to them and said: “By the One in whose hand is my soul, you will certainly go to give the Bai’ah or **I will certainly burn the house down upon you**”. Az-Zubair then went out with his sword drawn. A man from the Ansar grabbed hold of him with Ziyad bin Labeed. He knocked him with a part of the sword and so Abu Bakr called out to him from the Minbar: “Strike the rocks with it”. Abu ‘Amr bin Khumash said: I saw the rock which had that strike upon it and it is said: This is the strike of the sword of Az-Zubair].

**Believe it or do not believe it**: There is not only here the threat to burn down the house but what resembles a sword battle whilst Abu Bakr is upon the Minbar directing the battle as if he is the head of **the Mafia**. And naturally, the (claimed) speech of ‘Umar was omitted here: “O daughter of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, there are none from the creation more beloved to us than your father and none are more beloved to us after your father than you” which came stated in the older narrations. That is to increase the portrayal of ‘Umar in terms of repugnance and disgracefulness, and to fill the breasts with hatred and resentfulness against him. The story then developed to include the testimony of Abu ‘Amr bin Khumash, that he saw the rock that had the strike of the sword marked in it, concerning which it is said: [That it is the strike of the sword of Az-Zubair].

Of course, nobody asked himself from where did that prominent large rock come from, upon which the strike of the sword could manifest itself, to arrive at the Masjid of the Messenger of Allah, between the house of Fatimah and her father’s Minbar ﷺ, which was upon a sandy plain and covered with small pebbles. And how did this rock continue to remain in its place as an obstruction for those performing the prayer and corrupting the joining and straightening of the rows, until the time of Abu ‘Amr bin Khumash!

**Let us delve in this a little**, to examine this Abu ‘Amr bin Khumash who relates from his father from ‘Umar (in respect to the Zakah of the Jilaad, the Udum and Ji’aab (skins and hides), as came recorded in “Masaa’il Al-Imam Ahmad” by his son Abdullah (p: 163/611): [He related to us, he said: My father related to me from Yahya bin Sa’id, from Yahya bin Sa’d, from Abdullah bin Abi Salamah, from Abu ‘Amr bin Khumash: ‘Umar said to him: “Give the Zakah of your property” and he used to sell Al-Udum and Al-Ji’aab. He said: It was Udum and Ji’aab (skins and hides). His people said].

And he related from Malik bin Al-Hadathan (his seeing of Abu Dharr when Uthman summoned him after he exchanged harsh words with Mu’awiyah, as was stated in “Tareekh Al-Madinah” of Ibn Shabbah (3/1034): [I used to listen in the company of Abu Dharr and there was no one more beloved to me to see and meet than him. Then Mu’awiyah wrote to Uthman (saying): “If you have a concern for Ash-Sham (Greater Syria), then remove Abu Dharr from it as he has disturbed the people here”. And so, Uthman, may Allah be pleased with him, wrote to him commanding him to come to him. When he arrived, the people called out amongst each other (saying): “This is Abu Dharr”. So, I went out to see him among those who were looking. He entered the Masjid and prayed two Rak’ah. He then went to Uthman, may Allah be pleased with him, until he reached him. He did not insult him or caution him. Uthman, may Allah be pleased with him, said: “Where were you when the milk camels of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ were being raided?” He said: “I was at the well getting water to drink”. Abu Dharr then raised his voice to his loudest and recited:

وَالَّذِينَ يَكْنِزُونَ الذَّهَبَ وَالْفِضَّةَ وَلَا يُنفِقُونَهَا فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ

And those who hoard up gold and silver and do not spend it in the Way of Allah (At-Tawbah: 34).

Until the end of the Ayah (verse). Uthman, may Allah be pleased with him, then commanded that he (Abu Dharr) should depart for Az-Zabadah].

**I say**: The truth is that this ‘Amr bin Khumash would not have reached the age of discernment, where he could have seen the claimed scratch markings of the rock and to have examined its related events, until approximately the 30th year after Hijrah or after that. That would mean that the rock had remained at least for a minimum of twenty years in its place for the tourists to enjoy! If only they had placed a dome upon it and left it as a historical monument (like the Maqam of Ibrahim!!!).

Perhaps someone may argue: It is like the narration mentioned above has its origins in what was taken from the narration of Imam Az-Zuhriy (DoD: 124 AH) who said: [Men from the Muhajirin were angered in respect to the Bai’ah of Abu Bakr, may Allah be pleased with him. Among them were ‘Ali bin Abi Talib and Az-Zubair bin ‘Awwam, may Allah be pleased with them. They entered the house of Fatimah, the daughter of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, whilst carrying weapons. ‘Umar, may Allah be pleased with him, then came to them among a group of Muslims which included: Usaid and Salamah bin Salamah bin Waqash from Bani Abdul Ash’hal. It was also said that the group included Thabit bin Qais bin Ash-Shamas, the brother of Bani Al-Harith bin Al-Khazraj. One of them then took the sword of Az-Zubair from him and struck a rock with it until he broke it]. Musa bin ‘Uqbah (DoD: 140) related it from his Sheikh Az-Zuhriy and Abdullah bin Ahmad (bin Hanbal) related it via his path in “As-Sunnah” (2/553-554).

**I say**: What was this then?! The speech of Az-Zuhriy is contrived from statements and Mursal reports, concerning which none except Allah know their origin. There is not a single letter in them that is Musnad (i.e. Its Isnad is connected from beginning to end). We have already mentioned the report of Aslam the Mawla (slave) of ‘Umar and can be described as better or some of it can be characterised by Al-Isnad (i.e. being connected), and (yet) it does not contain anything of this. There was no drawing of swords, no back and forth (skirmishes) and no breaking of a sword upon that famous rock!!

We have already presented examples of the weakness of the Mursal reports of Az-Zuhriy and their lack of substance. There is therefore no wonder that the classical Imams said: “The Mursal reports of Az-Zuhriy resemble the wind” in the case where the wind here is that which is passed from the backside and not that affliction that destroyed ‘Aad. That is not to mention the low grade of Az-Zuhriy in respect to presenting history in a convincing and coherent manner. That matter should be left to the specialists from among the A’immah (scholars), like Muhammad bin Ishaq bin Yasar and Muhammad bin ‘Umar Al-Waqidiy. It is sufficient that Az-Zuhriy be a reliable narrator and source of evidential proof, and a sign from among the signs of Allah in relation to honesty, preservation and excellence. As for Al-Maghazi (i.e. Seerah) and history, then that requires different intellectual aptitudes and kinds of understanding, critiquing, astuteness and the ability to outweigh between matters, besides mere memorisation and excellence in respect to narration.

- The following came mentioned in “Ifhaam Al-A’adaa Wa l-Khusoom” (p: 98): [Abu Bakr Al-Jawhariy also said in the book of the Saqeefah, according to what was transmitted from him and was similarly related in another narration: That Sa’d bin Abi Waqqas was with them in the house of Fatimah, just as Al-Miqdad bin Aswad was there. They had gathered in order to give the Bai’ah to ‘Ali, peace be upon him. ‘Umar then came to them **to burn down the house over them**. Az-Zubair went out to him with his sword and Fatimah, peace be upon her, came out crying and screaming].

**And in this manner**: The story developed. The burning of the house was no longer merely a threat but rather there was an actual attempt to undertake the crime. There was also the addition of Fatimah, the daughter of Muhammad, may the peace and blessings of Allah be upon them, exiting the house in flight from the fire, as is apparent, whilst crying and screaming. Also, the cramming inside the house was increased with the addition of Sa’d bin Abi Waqqas and Al-Miqdad bin Al-Aswad. As for Al-Miqdad, then that would be understandable as he was a close friend of Ali’s, may Allah’s pleasure and peace be upon them. However, how was Sa’d bin Abi Waqqas brought into this story?! The narrator did not enlighten us in respect to what these two heroes did when Fatimah exited the house crying and screaming. Perhaps they were busy putting out the fire!? As for ‘Ali bin Abi Talib, whom, according to the narration, the people had gathered to give the Bai’ah to, then it is not known where he is during all of this: Perhaps he was fleeing over the back fence before being apprehended and then brought in a humiliated state (like the leading of cattle) to give the Bai’ah (to Abu Bakr)?!

- - The following came mentioned in “Ifhaam Al-A’adaa Wa l-Khusoom” (p: 98): [And Abu Bakr Al-Jawhariy also said in the book of “As-Saqeefah”, according to what was transmitted from him from Ash-Sha’biy. He said: Abu Bakr asked: “Where is Az-Zubair?” It was said: “At ‘Ali’s and he is wearing his sword”. He (Abu Bakr) then said: “Arise O ‘Umar, arise O Khalid bin Al-Waleed, and set off until you reach them”. And so, they set off. ‘Umar entered and Khalid stood at the door of the house from outside. ‘Umar then said to Az-Zubair: “What is the meaning of this sword?” He responded: “We will give ‘Ali the Bai’ah”. ‘Umar then plunged at it (the sword) and struck a rock with it, breaking it. He then took the hand of Az-Zubair, brought him to his feet and shoved him. And he said: “O Khalid, take hold of him”/ he then said to ‘Ali: “Arise and give the Bai’ah to Abu Bakr”. He didn’t stand up and remained sitting. So, he (‘Umar) took him by his hand and said: “Stand” but he refused to stand. And so, he heaved him and pushed him just as he had pushed Az-Zubair. He ejected him from the house and Fatimah began to cry out and then ran to the door of the room and said: “O Abu Bakr, how quickly you have assaulted the house of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ and by Allah, I will not speak to ‘Umar until I meet Allah”].

**I say**: As for this case here, then ‘Umar has been portrayed as the raiding champion and charging knight: Stripping Az-Zubair of his sword, throwing him to the ground (as if he was no more than a baby) and handing him over to Khalid (who had abandoned fighting the apostates in Najd and found himself in Al-Madinah due to some obscure reason!!). then he did similar to that to ‘Ali bin Abi Talib and then led him in a humiliated, lowly and submissive state. The narration also includes an additional energetic reprimand to Abu Bakr from Fatimah, the daughter of Muhammad, may the peace and blessings of Allah be upon them. And of course, all of that is completely contradictory to the narration of Aslam!

- The following came stated in “As-Saqeefah Wa Fadak” of Al-Jawhariy (1/62): [Abu Zaid ‘Umar bin Shabbah related to us from Ibrahim bin Al-Mundhir, from Ibn Wahb, from Ibn Luhai’ah. from Abu Al-Aswad, who said: ‘Ali and Az-Zubair were angered and so, entered the house of Fatimah with weapons. ‘Umar then came among a gang (group) which included Usaid bin Hudair, Salamah bin Salaamah bin Waqash, who were both from Bani Al-Ash’hal. Fatimah, peace be upon her, cried out and implored Allah. They then took away the swords of ‘Ali and Az-Zubair and struck the wall with them until they broke them. ‘Umar then ejected them and led them on until they gave the Bai’ah. Then Abu Bakr stood, addressed the people and apologised to them saying: “My Bai’ah was a spontaneous occurrence through which Allah protected from its evil consequences. And I feared the occurrence of Fitnah (discord). By Allah, I did not covet it (i.e. the leadership) for a single day at all. And I have been appointed in a great matter which I do not have the strength or hands. I wished that the strongest of people would be over it in my place” and he began to apologise to the people, and so, the Muhajirun accepted his excuse … ‘Ali and Az-Zubair said: “We were not angered except in respect to the matter of consultation (i.e. the absence of it). Indeed, we regard Abu Bakr to be the most entitled of the people to it (i.e. the leadership). He was the companion of the cave, we know that he has Sunnah and the Messenger of Allah ﷺ commanded him to lead the people in prayer whilst he was still living”].

**I say**: This is even more peculiar. The two swords of ‘Ali and Az-Zubair are taken away and then they are struck against the wall this time, instead of the antique rock, until they were broken. Then ‘Umar led them, just like sheep or donkeys are led, until they gave the Bai’ah. The remainder are obvious lies and it is enough of an evil to have heard them. Of course, the donkey who fabricated this and the donkey using it as evidence has missed the fact that this narration pulverises the view of the divine text (i.e. indicating that the person of leadership was specified in the revelation) from its basis. That is because it states: **‘Ali and Az-Zubair were only angered because of the absence of the Mashurah (consultation)**!

- The following came mentioned in “Tareekh Al-Umam Wa l-Mulook” of At-Tabariy (2/233): [Ibn Humaid related to us from Jurair, from Mughirah, from Ziyad bin Kulaib, who said: ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab arrived at the house of ‘Ali and inside were Talhah, Az-Zubair and some men from the Muhajirin. He (‘Umar) said: “By Allah, I will burn down (the house) over you, or you will come out to give the Bai’ah (pledge)”. So, Az-Zubair went out to him with his sword drawn. He then stumbled and his sword fell from his hand. They then pounced upon him and took it (or him)].

There are fabricated lies even more horrendous than these which arouse disgust, like: Fatimah, the daughter of Muhammad, may the blessings of Allah and peace be upon them both, hit her stomach or chest breaking her ribs and causing her pregnancy to miscarry!!!

- The following came mentioned in “Ansaab Al-Ashraaf” of Al-Baladhuri (1/586/1184): [Al-Mada’iniy related from Maslamah bin Muharib, from Sulaiman At-Taimiy and from Ibn ‘Awn: That Abu Bakr sent a message to Ali for him to give the Bai’ah, however, he did not give the Bai’ah. ‘Umar then came with a group. Fatimah met him at the door and Fatimah said: “O Ibn (son of) Al-Khattab, are you planning to burn my door down upon me?” He replied: “Yes, and this is the strongest in respect to what your father came with”. ‘Ali then came and gave the Bai’ah. He said: “I had resolved to not leave my house until I had gathered (or brought together) the Qur’an”].

- The following came stated in “Ifhaam Al-A’adaa Wa l-Khusoom” (p: 104): [The splendid Sayyid, the authority of guidance (Ash-Sharif Al-Murtada Abu l-Qasim ‘Ali bin Al-Hussein bin Musa bin Muhammad bin Musa bin Ibrahim bin Al-Imam Musa Al-Kazhim [DoD: 436 AH], the master of the ‘Ulamaa’ (scholars) of the Ummah and the reviver of the traces of the Imams and the Mujaddid (rejuvenator) of the Imamiyah Madh’hab at the beginning of the 400’s), may he rest in peace, related this great wrongdoing in his book “Ash-Shaafiy”, from some of the major personalities of the people, when he said: Al-Baladhuri related from Al-Mada’iniy, from Muslim bin Muharib, from Sulaiman At-Taimiy, from Ibn ‘Awn: That Abu Bakr sent a message to ‘Ali wanting him to give the Bai’ah but he did not give the Bai’ah. And so, ‘Umar arrived (i.e to ‘Ali’s home) with a piece of burning wood. Fatimah met him at the door and said: “O son of Al-Khattab, do you plan to burn down my door upon me?” He said: “Yes, and this is the strongest in respect to what your father came with”. ‘Ali then came and gave the Bai’ah].

**I say**: Here, he did not mention the speech attributed to ‘Ali, may the pleasure and peace of Allah be upon him, and so I wonder what prevented him from doing so?!

**I further say**: The reason preventing him is clear: If the beginning of the story is affirmed in relation to establishing the audacity of ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab (may Allah forbid) against the house of Fatimah, then it necessary to correct its remainder in relation to establishing the cowardice of ‘Ali bin Abi Talib (may Allah forbid) and his being brought in a lowly and humiliated state to give the Bai’ah followed by his apologising by way of an excuse, which was more heinous than the action: ““I had resolved to not leave my house until I had gathered (or brought together) the Qur’an”. This means that he was not only cowardly but was rather in reality a cowardly liar. This story carries the odour of the enemies of Allah, the underhanded Nawaasib (those who have animosity towards ‘Ali), who used it to attack the donkeys of the Saba’iyah (excessive Shi’ah group from the lineage of Abdullah bin Saba’a) Rawaafid.

**And I say**: There is no need for us to study the Isnad at all. That is because neither Abu Al-Mu’tamar Sulaiman bin Tarkhan At-Taimiy Al-Basriy (DOB: 46 AH, DoD: 142 AH), nor Abu ‘Awn Abdullah bin ‘Awn bin Artaban Al-Muzaniy Al-Basriy (DoD: 150 AH) were around at the time of Abu Bakr and perhaps there parents were not even around at his time. That is upon the assumption that they even related that in origin. We say that because Maslamah bin Muharib, who related it from them, is Malsamah bin Muharib bin Muslim bin Ziyad. Therefore, the grandfather of his father was the underhanded criminal Ziyad bin Ubaid (or Ibn Samiyah or called Abu Sufyan), may Allah’s curse be upon him. In addition, inconsistent reports are narrated from this Malamah bin Muharib and some aspects of the recital (Al-Qiraa’ah). Al-Mada’iniy, who is a reliable and trusted (relater), was fooled by his being from the reciters of the Qur’an and as a result related from him this **rottenness**. This Maslamah bin Muharib is either completely incompetent and does not know what comes out from his head, just receiving and giving, or (which is more likely), he is **a great liar (Dajjal)**, has inherited underhandedness and An-Nasb (animosity towards ‘Ali) from the grandfather of his father Ziyad and consequently fabricated the story or received it from one of the liars and stole it or put together as Isnad himself.

- The author of “Ifhaam Al-A’adaa Wa l-Khusoom” (p: 104) then, following the above quoted text, added to it by stating: [This report has been related by the Shi’ah via many paths, but the only way is for it to have been related by the Shuyukh of the scholars of Hadith of the masses. And from the calamities which caused the eyes of Islam and the Deen to cry and from the events that scalded the hearts of the believers and those of Yaqeen (certain belief), is what ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab perpetrated in terms of a great wrongdoing which caused the miscarrying of the unborn child from the womb of our Sayyidah (female master) Fatimah Az-Zahraa’ (peace be upon her) and this **ghastly occurrence** has **reached the level of At-Tawatur and Yaqeen (certainty) among the people of the manifest truth**. However, **from the manifest marvels in respect to the word of Haqq (truth) being raised high and the elevation of the grade of (Sidq) truthfulness**, is that Ibrahim bin Sayyar bin Haniy Al-Basriy (well-known by the name of An-Nizham), who was from the major scholars of the Mu’tazilah and major opponents, admitted to the occurrence of this ghastly incident with full clarity and explicitness, which is impossible to hide or deny, as some of the masters of impudence and disgrace have done. Abu Al-Fat’h Muhammad bin Abdul Karim Ash-Shahrastani (548 AH), in his book “Al- Milal Wa n-Nihal”, when mentioning the statements of An-Nizham, stated: ‘Umar struck the stomach of Fatimah on the day of the Bai’ah until the foetus was made to fall from her stomach and he was calling out “Burn it down with whoever is in it” and none were in the house apart from ‘Ali, Fatimah, Al-Hasan and Al-Hussein. And salah ud-Deen Khalil bin Aibak As-Safadiy said in “Al-Waafiy Bil-Wafayaat” in his biography of Nizham, when mentioning his statements: And he said: That ‘Umar struck the stomach of Fatimah on the day of the Bai’ah until the unborn child was cast from her stomach … [end of quote]. One must take advantage of the admission of this man who is from the major scholars of the masses in respect to the occurrence of this great incident and calamity. And do not be fooled and do not pay attention to the rejection of Ash-Shahrastani and the deception of As-Safadiy as they are detached from the acceptance of the truth and submitting to it. **And (also) from the marvels of the elevation of the truth**, is that Abu Bakr Ahmad bin Muhammad As-Sarriy At-Tamimiy Al-Kufi (well-known by the name of Ibn Abi Daarim), whose eminence Adh-Dhahabi extolled in “Tadhkirat ul-Huffazh”, in the case where he affirmed him to be a Hafizh Musnad and Muhaddith (scholar of Hadith) of Al-Kufa, and he mentioned that he heard (i.e. received Hadith) from Ibrahim bin Abdullah Al-Ghaffar, Ahmad bin Musa Al-Hammad, Musa bin Harun, Mateen and ‘Addah, and he also mentioned that Al-Hakim, Abu Bakr bin Mardawaih, Abu l-Hasan Al-Hamamiy, Yahya bin Ibrahim Al-Mazakiy, Abu Bakr Al-Hibriy, Al-Qadiy and others, whilst the knowledge of the compiler of Tadhkirat ul-Huffazh by Adh-Dhahabi is not concealed … that he (Abu Bakr Ahmad) lifted the veil and submitted to the truth and correct view when he affirmed the narration related to this great wrongdoing and major crime perpetrated by ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab. Adh-Dhahabi stated in “Al-Mizan”, in relation to Ibn Abi Daarim: And Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Hammad Al-Kufi Al-Hafizh said after dating his life: He was upright in affair most of his life and then in his latter life he related a lot from what Al-Muthaalib read to him. He would be in his attendance and a man would read to him: That ‘Umar kicked Fatimah until the unborn child was miscarried … [end of quote]. It is obvious to those of intelligence and minds that the attribution of At-Tashayyu’ and Ar-Rafd to Ibn Abi Daarim, as appears from the speech of Adh-Dhahabi in “At-Tadhkirah” and “Al-Mizan”, is a corrupted audacious move and a badly sold fabrication. It is known to anyone who follows the statements of those who oppose, that if they observe a man of understanding admitting the truth and what is correct, they attribute to him At-Tashayyu’ or Ar-Rafd on some occasions, and on other occasions they characterise him as being untruthful and a liar. However, (unfortunately) the truth does not even entice the people of doubt and suspicion].

**I say and with Allah is At-Tawfeeq**: As for Ibrahim bin Sayar bin Haani Al-Basriy, who is known by the name of An-Nizham (DoD: 231), then the following came mentioned concerning him in “Tareekh Baghdad” (Bashaar printed edition: 6/623/3084): [Ibrahim bin Sayar Abu Ishaq An-Nizham was a resident of Baghdad. He was one of the knights from the people of arguments (An-Nazhar and Al-Kalam) against the Mu’tazilah Madh’hab. He has many written works related to that. He was also refined and had poetry possessing precise meaning upon the methodology of the Mutakallamin. And Abu Uthman Al-Jahizh has men tales concerning him].

The man if therefore from among the knights of debate and argumentation, from the refined people and people of poetry. He is (therefore) not from the verified people of narration and reporting history. Even if he was from among them, then it is not impossible that he be deceived by a or false testimony narration. That is because even the Messengers of Allah who are infallible in respect to the conveyance from Allah are not immune to that.

Consequently, An-Nizham’s admission or acknowledgement of the occurrence of this incident does not prove or establish anything and is not valid as evidence for anything, let alone being **from the manifest marvels in respect to the word of Haqq (truth) being raised high and the elevation of the grade of (Sidq) truthfulness.** However, the author of “Ifhaam Al-A’adaa Wa l-Khusoom”, claimed before that, that the reported narration of this **ghastly occurrence** has **reached the level of At-Tawatur and Yaqeen (certainty) among the people of the manifest truth**. As such, the mind of the man has ceased to function properly as he is unable to distinguish his right hand from his left.

In addition, we have not been able to locate the context in which An-Nizham “admitted” to that. It is highly possible that it took place in a debate in order to put pressure on the opposing party, upon the basis of: “Let us concede that for the sake of argument … etc”!

As for Abu Bakr Ahmad bin Muhammad bin As-Sarriy At-Tamimiy Al-Kufi, who was known by the name of Ibn Abi Daarim, then the following is what came mentioned about him in “Lisan Al-Mizan” (Abu Ghaddah printed edition: 1/609/759): [Ahmad bin Muhammad bin As-Sarriy bin Yahya bin Abi Daarim, the Muhaddith (scholar of Hadith) Abu Bakr Ar-Rafidiy AL-Kadhdhab (great liar). He died in the beginning of the year 352 AH and it has been said: That he met Ibrahim Al-Qisar. He related from Ahmad bin Musa Al-Himar (the donkey) and Musa bin Harun and ‘Addah. Al-Hakim related from him and said: Rafidiy who is not Thiqah (reliable and trustworthy).

Muhammad bin Ahmad Hammad Al-Kufi Al-Hafizh said after dating his death: He was upright in affair most of his life. Then in his latter life he related a lot from what Al-Muthaalib read to him. A man would attend to him and read upon him: That ‘Umar kicked Fatimah until she miscarried her unborn child. And in another reported narration, he said in respect to “And Fir’awn came” ‘Umar and “From before him” Abu Bakr and “Al-Mu’tafikaat” ‘Aa’ishah and Hafsah (Note: Reference to Surah Al-Haaqqah Aayah: 9), and so I removed it for that. Then when the people made this innovated Adhaan he fabricated a Hadith, the text of which was: “Fire comes out from the ground of Aden attaining the anger of the family of Muhammad” so I removed it. And **Ibn Sa’id** came to me in respect to this Hadith. He asked me and spoke much about him mentioning him with complete repugnance. So, I abandoned his Hadith and I removed all that I had (previously) written about (or from) him.

They use him as evidence for the Adhaan (call to prayer). It is claimed that he heard from Musa bin Harun, from Al-Hamaniy, from Abu Bakr bin ‘Ayyash, from Abdul ‘Aziz bin Rafi’, from Abu Mahdhurah, may Allah be pleased with him, that he said: I was a boy and the Prophet ﷺ said to me: “Place at the end of your Adhaan: Come to the best act”. This was related to us by a collective from the Hadramiy, from Yahya bin Al-Hamaniy, but rather it was: “Place at the end of your Adhaan: The prayer is better than the sleep”. I henceforth abandoned him and did not attend his Janazah (funeral)].

**I say**: The Ibn Sa’id indicated to here is Abu Al-‘Abbas Ahmad bin Muhammad bin Sa’id, who was known by the name of Ibn ‘Uqdah. He was Al-Hafizh Al-Hujjah Al-Kabir (major scholarly authority) and the Muhaddith (Hadith scholar) of Kufa (DoD: 332 AH). He was Thiqah Ma’mun (reliable and trusted). He was Shi’ah (It has been said Zaidi Jarudiy) and perhaps some mules of the Sunhadiyah classified him to be weak due to his affiliation to Shi’ism but there is no value in their foolishness. ‘Uqdah was the title given to his father due to his knowledge in respect to At-Tasreef An-Nahw (i.e. the grammar of the Arabic language) and ‘Uqdah was pious and ascetic. Abu Al-Fadl bin Hinzabah Al-Wazir related from Ad-Daruqutni, who said: The people of Kufa held a consensus that since the time of Ibn Mas’ud they had not seen someone as knowledgeable as Abu Al-‘Abbas bin ‘Uqdah. It has been said that his books numbered 600! He had writings which included: “At-Tareekh Wa Dhikr Man Rawa Al-Hadith”, “Akhbar Abi Hanifah Wa Musnadah”, “Al-Wilayah Wa Man Rawa Ghadeer Khumm”, “Al-Aadaab”, “Ash-Shi’ah Min Ashab ul-Hadith”, “Sulh Al-Hasan Wa Mu’awiyah” and the book “Tafsir Al-Qur’an”.

As for Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Hammad bin Sufyan, Abu Al-Hasan Al-Kufi Al-Hafizh (DoD: 384 AH), was the Muhaddith (scholar of Hadith) of Kufa following the death of Abu Al-‘Abbas bin ‘Uqdah. He is also Thiqah Ma’mun (Reliable and trusted).

It can be observed that Abu Al-‘Abbas bin ‘Uqdah, who was Shi’iy, and the remainder of the A’immah (scholars), including Abu Abdullah Al-Hakim, the compiler of “Al-Mustadrak”, whom some attributed to be towards Shi’ism, did not reject Ibn Abi Daarim because he was Raafidiy (although he was that), not because he was from the “‘Aammah” of the “Khusoom” (opponents) as claimed by the author of “Ifhaam Al-A’adaa Wa l-Khusoom”, and not due to the Hadith concerning ‘Umar kicking Fatimah and causing her to miscarry her unborn child. That is because it had been related prior to him and was well known during the time of Ibrahim bin Sayar An-Nizham. He himself had related it as it had been conveyed to him. However, he was rejected due to the Hadith of the Adhaan and the Hadith “Fire comes out from the ground of Aden attaining the anger of the family of Muhammad””.

Consequently, this man’s narration (Ibn Abi Daarim) of the Hadith concerning the “Kicking of Fatimah” is not of any value or worth, even if he came with the most Sahih chain of transmission in the world (although it appears that he did not do that in this report in origin). That is because lying has been established against him in other than this report. It is therefore not at all from “The marvels of the signs of the elevation of the truth”, however, the author of “Ifhaam Al-A’adaa Wa l-Khusoom” had been made blind by the religious delusion and reversed matters making its high its low and he began to think with his backside!

From another angle, some of the Sunhadiyah donkeys believed the fabricated lie of the storming of the house of Fatimah, may the blessings of Allah be upon her, and fabricated speech upon the tongue of Abu Bakr, may Allah’s pleasure and peace be upon him, which gave the appearance of regret, despite the storming of the house being justified, as the people (inside) had gathered (according to the claim of the fabricated narration) to prepare to fight and engage in war.

- The following came stated in the “Tareekh” (History) of Al-Ya’qubiy (DoD: Approx. 290 AH) (2/141 and p: 159 in the Electronic Shamela library): [Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf entered (the house of Abu Bakr) during the sickness from which he passed away. He said: “How have are you O Khalifah of the Messenger of Allah on this day?” He said: “I have awoken a Mawla (servant). You have increased upon me beyond what I had (in terms of burden). If you see that I have appointed a man from among you, then all of you become irritated and everyone demands it for himself”. Abdur Rahman said: “By Allah, I have not known your companion except to be Salih (righteous) and Muslih (seeking to make things upright and righteous), so do not be distressed in respect to the Dunya (life of this world)!” He said: “I have not grieved except in three matters, which I regret having done, and there are three matters which I did not do, which I regret not doing. And there are three matters which I regret not asked the Messenger of Allah ﷺ about. As for the three that I did, then I regret assuming the responsibility of this matter (i.e. leadership) and that ‘Umar did not come ahead of me. I would then have been a better Wazir (assistant) than I was an Ameer (leader). And I regret searching the house of Fatimah, the daughter of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ **and bringing men into it, even if that meant bringing war against me**.And I regret burning to death Al-Fajaa’a As-Sulamiy. I should have either killed him cleanly or let him go alive. And the three that I wished that I had done. Then if only I had brought Al-Ash’ath bin Qais for his neck to be struck as it appears to me that he does not see an evil except that he assists in it. And I wish that I had dispatched Abu Ubaidah to Al-Maghrib (Western lands) and ‘Umar to the land of Al-Mashriq (Eastern lands), as in such I case I would have sent my two hands out in the way of Allah. I wish that I had not sent Khalid bin Al-Walid to Buzakhah but rather gone myself, so that I would have been a repellent to him in the way of Allah. And the three that I wished I had asked the Messenger of Allah ﷺ about, (then they were): To whom does this matter (i.e. the leadership) belong? Then none would dispute concerning it. And do the Ansar have any share in it? And about the paternal aunt and maternal aunt, do they inherit or not? I have not taken anything from your Dunya. I have personally undertaken in respect to the property of Allah and the Fai’ (booty) of the Muslims the position of the guardian in relation to the property of the orphan. If he is self-sufficient, he refrains and if he is impoverished, he eats in a good (and fair manner). And indeed, the Waliy ul-Amr (ruler) after me is ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab. And I have borrowed money from the Bait ul-Maal (treasury), so when I die, sell my garden in such a place and return it to the Bait ul-Maal]. This was related like this without an Isnad (chain or transmission) or it was left to something from the transmitted origins, according to the methodology of the later writers and historians.

- The following came stated in “Muruj Adh-Dhahab” by Al-Mas’udiy (DoD: 346 AH), (1/290 in the Electronic Shamela Library): [When he was on his death bed he said: “I have not regretted anything apart for three matters that I did, that I wish I had left be. And three matters that I did not do, which I wish that I had done. And there were three matters which I wish I had asked the Messenger of Allah ﷺ about. As for the three that I did and wish that I had left, then I wish that I had not searched the house of Fatimah **and he mentioned a lot concerning that**. And I wish that I had not burned to death Al-Fajaa’ah, but rather let him go alive or killed him cleanly. And I wish that on the day of the Saqeefah of Bani Sa’idah that I had cast the matter (of leadership) upon the neck of one of the two men, where he would have been the Ameer (leader) and I would have been the Wazir (assistant). And the three that I left but wish that I had done, then I wish that I struck the neck of Al-Ash’ath bin Qais when he came as a captive, as it appears to me that he does not see an evil except that he assists in it. And I wish that I had cast ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab upon Al-Mashriq (Eastern lands) and then I would have extended my right hand and left hand in the way of Allah. And I wish that the day I prepared the army to fight the apostates and returned, that I would have remained in my place, then if the Muslims were to make peace they would do so, and if not, I would be at the front of the meeting or support”. Abu Bakr had gone out with the army until a part of Al-Madinah and that was the well-known location at Dhu l-Qussah. “And the three matters which I wish that I had asked the Messenger of Allah ﷺ about, then I wish that I asked him to whom the matter (i.e. leadership) belongs, so that its matter is not disputed. And I wish that I asked him concerning the inheritance of the paternal aunt and the brother’s daughter (niece), as I have something in myself (in terms of questions or uncertainty) concerning these two matters. And I wish that I had asked him whether the Ansar have a share in this matter (i.e. leadership and ruling), so that we provide them with it].

**I say**: Al-Mas’udiy is unable to go beyond his hateful partisanship and so he replaced the sentence: “And bringing men into it (i.e. Fatimah’s house), even if that meant bringing war against me” as was included by Al-Ya’qubiy for example, which he had been deceived by and believed to be Sahih (authentic), with speech that was Mudallas (manipulated) and holds no meaning: “And he mentioned a lot concerning that”.

**And now we will examine the foundations (Usool) of the chains of transmission related to these narrations:**

- The following came recorded in the “Mu’jam” of At-Tabarani (1/17/41), with perhaps the most complete wording: [Abu Az-Zinbaa’ Rawh bin Al-Faraj Al-Misriy, related to us from Sa’id bin ‘Ufair, from ‘Ulwan bin Dawud Al-Bajaliy, from Humaid bin Abdur Rahman bin Humaid bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf, from Salih bin Kaisan, from Humaid bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf, from his father, who said: I entered the residence of Abu Bakr, may Allah be pleased with him, to visit him during his sickness from which he later passed away from. I gave him Salam (greeting) and asked him how he was on this day? He sat upright and so I said: “You have awoken recovered from your sickness Al-Hamdu Lillah (All praise belongs to Allah)”. He said: “As for me, then I am as you see, suffering (in pain) and you have added to my suffering. I have taken from you a covenant for what happens after me. I have chosen, who in my view is the best of you, however all of you show irritation hoping that the matter (i.e. leadership) goes to him. I have seen the Dunyaa coming, it has not yet arrived but is coming. You will decorate your houses with fences of silk and cushions of brocade. Then you will be pained to lie on Azeri wool as any one of you would be pained to sleep on thorns. By Allah, that any one of you be brought forth to have his head chopped off, for [something] other than the Hadd (prescribed punishment), would be better for him than plunging into the depths of this (Dunyaa (life of this world). As for me, then I have not regretted anything except for three matters that I did, which I wish I had not done, three matters that I did not do, which I wish that I had done, and three matters which I wish I had asked the Messenger of Allah ﷺ about. As for the three that I did but wished that I had not done, then I wish that I had not **searched the house of Fatimah but rather left it and even if it had been locked with hostile intent against me**. And I wish that on the day of the Saqeefah of Bani Sa’idah, I had cast the matter (of leadership) upon the neck of one of the two men: Abu Ubaidah or ‘Umar, where he would be the Ameer ul-Mu’mineen (Leader of the believers) and I would be his Wazir (assistant). And I wish that when I dispatched Khalid bin Al-Waleed to the people of apostacy, I would have stationed myself in Dhul Qussah. Then, if the Muslims were victorious, they would have been victorious, and if not then I would have been a support and assistance. As for that which I wish that I had done: Then, I wish that on the day Al-Ash’ath was brought to me as a captive, that I struck his neck (there and then), as it appears to me that evil curves towards him. And I wish that on the day I was brought Al-Fajaa’ah As-Sulamiy, I did not burn him to death, but rather killed him cleanly or let him go alive. And I wish that when I directed (or dispatched) Khalid bin Al-Waleed to Ash-Shaam (Greater Syria), that I would have dispatched ‘Umar to Iraq. In such a case, I would have extended my right and left hands in the way of Allah ‘Azza Wa Jalla. As for the three matters that I wish that I had asked the Messenger of Allah ﷺ about, then I wish that I had asked him about to whom this matter (of leadership) belongs, so that its (rightful) people are not disputed with? And I wish that I had asked him whether the Ansar have a cause in this matter (i.e. leadership). And I wish that I had asked him concerning the paternal aunt and the daughter of the brother (niece) (i.e. inheritance)? As I have something in myself (in terms of questions or uncertainty) concerning these two matters].

- It came mentioned in “Al-Ahadeeth Al-Mukhtaarah” (1/7/12) as follows: [Abu Al-Fakhr As’ad bin Sa’id bin Mahmoud Al-Asbahaaniy informed us by reading whilst we were listening in Asbahaan. It was said to him: Fatimah bint Abdullah Al-Jawazdaaniyah informed you of a reading upon her and you were listening: Muhammad bin Abdullah bin Zaid informed us from Abu l-Qasim Sulaiman bin Ahmad At-Tabarani …. followed by the full Hadith related by At-Tabarani].

- It came mentioned in “Tareekh Dimashq” by Ibn ‘Asaakir (30/422): Abu ‘Ali Al-Hasan bin Ahmad and a group in their books informed us, they said: Abu Bakr Muhammad bin Abdullah bin zabadah informed us from Sulaiman bin Ahmad, from Abu Az-Zinbaa’ Rawh bin Al-Faraj Al-Misriy, related to us from Sa’id bin ‘Ufair, from ‘Ulwan bin Dawud Al-Bajaliy … etc … in full in terms of Sanad (chain of transmission) and Matn (textual content) as recorded by At-Tabarani].

- It came recorded in “Al-Yawaaqeet Al-‘Ushriyah Min Kalam Khair il-Bariyah” (1/12/36): [Abu Az-Zinbaa’ Rawh bin Al-Faraj Al-Misriy, related to us from Sa’id bin ‘Ufair, from ‘Ulwan bin Dawud Al-Bajaliy, from Humaid bin Abdur Rahman bin Humaid bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf, from Salih bin Kaisan, from Humaid bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf, from his father, who said it …. Exactly like the Hadith recorded by At-Tabarani].

- Its beginning alone was recorded in “Ma’rifat us-Sahabah” by Abu Nu’aim (1/31/102) and (1/117/94 in the Electronic Shamela library) and in “Hulyat ul-Awliyaa’ Wa Tabaqaat Al-Asfiyaa’” (1/34) as follows: [Sulaiman bin Ahmad related to us from Abu Az-Zinbaa’ Rawh bin Al-Faraj Al-Misriy … with its full (complete) Sanad and Matn until his statement: “…would be better for him than to melt into the deluge of the Dunya””].

- It came recorded in “Al-Amwaal” of Al-Qasim bin Salam, with a slight shortening or summarization (174/353) and (1/339, 318 in the Electronic Shamela Library): [He said: Sa’id bin ‘Ufair related to me from ‘Ulwan bin Dawud, the Mawla of Abu Zur’ah bin ‘Amr bin Jarir, from Humaid bin Abdur Rahman bin Humaid bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf, from Salih bin Kaisan, from Humaid bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf, from his father Abdur Rahman, who said: I entered the residence of Abu Bakr to visit him during his sickness which he passed away from. I gave him Salam (greetings) and said: “I do not see that you are unwell Al-Hamdu Lillah (All Praise belongs to Allah) and do not be grieved over the Dunya (life of this world), for verily, by Allah, we have not known you except to be righteous and working to uphold righteousness”. He said: “As for me, then I do not grieve over anything apart from three matters I did, which I wish I had not done, three matters that I did not do, which I wish that I had done, and three matters which I wish that I had asked the Messenger of Allah ﷺ about. As for the three that I did but wish that I had not done, then I wish that I had not done **such and such due to a peculiarity that he mentioned – Abu ‘Ubaid said: I do not want to mention them** … and I wish that on the day of the Saqeefah of Bani Sa’idah I had cast the matter upon the neck of one of the two men: ‘Umar or Abu Ubaidah, so that he could have been the Ameer (leader) and I would have been the Wazir (assistant). And I wish that when I directed Khalid bin Al-Waleed to (fight) the apostates, I had stayed in Dhu l-Qussah. Then if the Muslims had been victorious, they would have been victorious, and if not, I would have been ready to meet (in battle) or be a support (reinforcement). As for the three matters which I left, but wish that I had done, then I wish that on the day that Al-Ash’ath bin Qais was brought to me as a captive, I had struck his neck, as it appears to me that he did not see an evil except that he assisted in it. And I wish that on the day that Al-Fujaa’ah was brought to me, I had not burnt him to death, but rather killed him cleanly or let him go alive. And I wish that when I sent Khalid to the people of Ash-Shaam (Greater Syria), I had also sent ‘Umar to Iraq. In such a case I would have extended my two hands, my right and my left in the way of Allah. As for the three matters which I wish that I had asked the Messenger of Allah ﷺ about, then I wish that I had asked him: To whom does this matter (leadership) belong? So that none would dispute with its rightful people. I wish that I had asked: Do the Ansar have a share in this matter (leadership)? And I wish that I had asked him about the inheritance of the paternal aunt and the son of the sister (niece), As I have something in myself (in terms of questions or uncertainty) concerning these two matters].

**I say**: This includes a great Tadlees (manipulation) in the case where he exchanged the sentence: “(I wish that I had not) **searched the house of Fatimah but rather left it and even if it had been locked with hostile intent against me**” for the sentence: “(I wish that I had not done) **such and such due to a peculiarity that he mentioned – Abu ‘Ubaid said: I do not want to mention them**”.

- It came mentioned in “Ad-Du’afaa’ Al-Kabir” by Al-‘Uqaily (3/419/1461), with more information and important paths: [‘Ulwan bin Dawud Al-Bajaliy and it is said (that his name is) ‘Ulwan bin Salih. His Hadith are not corroborated and they are not known except by him. Adam bin Musa related to me, he said: I heard Al-Bukhari who said: ‘Ulwan bin Dawud Al-Bajaliy and it is said (that his name is) ‘Ulwan bin Salih is **Munkar Al-Hadith** (i.e. his Hadith are weak and contrary to those of reliable narrators). And this Hadith: Yahya bin Ayyub Al-‘Allaaf related it to us from Sa’id bin Kathir bin ‘Ufair, who said: ‘Ulwan bin Dawud related to us from Humaid bin Abdur Rahman bin Humaid bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf, from Salih bin Kaisan, from Humaid bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf, from his father, who said: I entered the residence of Abu Bakr, may Allah be pleased with him, to visit him during his sickness from which he later passed away from. I gave him Salam (greeting) and asked him how he was on this day? He sat upright and so I said: “You have awoken recovered from your sickness Al-Hamdu Lillah (All praise belongs to Allah)”. He said: “As for me, then I am as you see, suffering (in pain) and you have added to my suffering. I have taken from you a covenant for what happens after me. I have chosen, who in my view is the best of you, however all of you show irritation hoping that the matter (i.e. leadership) goes to him. I have seen the Dunyaa coming, it has not yet arrived but is coming. You will decorate your houses with fences of silk and cushions of brocade. Then you will be pained to lie on Azeri wool as any one of you would be pained to sleep on thorns. By Allah, that any one of you be brought forth to have his head chopped off, for [something] other than the Hadd (prescribed punishment), would be better for him than plunging into the depths of this (Dunyaa (life of this world). You will be the first to lead people astray tomorrow, so that you will turn them from the way to the right and left. 0 guide of the way, it is either the light of (light of) dawn or evil!. He said: Then Abdur Rahman said to him: “Do not speak much about your situation, for by Allah you have not wanted except goodness, your companion is upon goodness, and the people are not except of two categories: Either a man that sees what you have seen and therefore there is no disagreement from him to you, or a man who sees other than that and is only offering to you his opinion”. He was then silent for a while and then Abdur Rahman said to him: “I do not see that a problem with you Al-Hamdu Lillah and so do not grieve over the Dunyaa. For by Allah, we have not known you except to be Salih (righteous) and Muslih (seeking to make things upright and righteous). He then said: “As for me, then I have not regretted anything except for three matters that I did, which I wish I had not done, three matters that I did not do, which I wish that I had done, and three matters which I wish I had asked the Messenger of Allah ﷺ about. As for the three that I did but wish that I had not done, then I wish that I had not **searched the house of Fatimah but rather left it and** **even if it had been locked with hostile intent against me**. And I wish that on the day of the Saqeefah of Bani Sa’idah, I had cast the matter (of leadership) upon the neck of one of the two men: Abu Ubaidah or ‘Umar, where he would be the Ameer ul-Mu’mineen (Leader of the believers) and I would be his Wazir (assistant). And I wish that when I dispatched Khalid bin Al-Waleed to the people of apostacy, I would have stationed myself in Dhul Qussah. Then, if the Muslims were victorious, they would have been victorious, and if not then I would have been a support and assistance. As for that which I wish that I had done: Then, I wish that on the day Al-Ash’ath was brought to me as a captive, that I struck his neck (there and then), as it appears to me that evil curves towards him. And I wish that on the day I was brought Al-Fajaa’ah As-Sulamiy, I did not burn him to death, but rather killed him cleanly or let him go alive. And I wish that when I directed (or dispatched) Khalid bin Al-Waleed to Ash-Shaam (Greater Syria), that I would have dispatched ‘Umar to Iraq. In such a case, I would have extended my right and left hands in the way of Allah ‘Azza Wa Jalla. As for the three matters that I wish that I had asked the Messenger of Allah ﷺ about, then I wish that I had asked him about to whom this matter (of leadership) belongs, so that its (rightful) people are not disputed with? And I wish that I had asked him whether the Ansar have any share in this matter (i.e. leadership). And I wish that I had asked him concerning the inheritance of the paternal aunt and the daughter of the sister (niece)? As I have something in myself (in terms of questions or uncertainty) concerning these two matters.

- Yahya bin Uthman related it to us, from Abu Salih, from Al-Laith, from ‘Ulwan bin Salih, from Salih bin Kaisan, that Abdur Rahman bin Humaid bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf informed him: That Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf entered upon the residence of Abu Bakr As-Siddeeq, may Allah be pleased with him … He then mentioned the like of it (i.e. the aforementioned text of the Hadith).

- Rawh bin Al-Faraj related it to us from Yahya bin Abdullah bin Bukair, from Al-Laith, from ‘Ulwan, from Salih bin Kaisan, from Humaid bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf, from his father, from Abu Bakr, may Allah be pleased with him … He then mentioned the like of it (i.e. the aforementioned text of the Hadith).

Ibn Bukair said: **Then ‘Ulwan bin Dawud came to us and related it to us just as Al-Laith related it to us**.

- Ahmad bin Ibrahim bin Muhammad bin Maisan Al-Khawlani related to us from Muhammad bin Rumh, from Al-Laith bin Sa’d, from ‘Ulwan, from Salih bin Kaisan, from Humaid bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf, from his father: That he entered upon Abu Bakr during his sickness from which he passed away … He then mentioned the like of it (i.e. the aforementioned text of the Hadith).

- Yahya bin Uthman related to us from Abu Salih, from Al-Laith, from ‘Ulwan bin Salih, from Salih bin Kaisan: That Mu’awiyah bin Abi Sufyan, may Allah be pleased with him: Came to Al-Madinah on the first Hajj that he made following the gathering of the people to him (i.e. his assuming of leadership). He met Al-Hasan, Al-Husain and some men from Quraish. He then headed to the house of Uthman bin ‘Affan. When he went towards the door of the house ‘Aa’ishah, the daughter of ‘Uthman cried out and bewailed her father. Mu’awiyah then said to those who were accompanying him: “Depart to your homes as I have a need to see to in this house”. They left and he entered. He quietened ‘Aa’ishah and commanded her to stop. He said to her: “O daughter of my brother, the people have given us authority and so we provide for them the appearance of forbearance masking anger behind it, whilst they give the appearance of obedience whilst behind that is resentment. We have sold them that and they have sold us this. If we were to give them other than what they have purchased, we would have decreased their right. Each man among them has his supporting group. If we were to infringe upon them, they would infringe upon us. It would then not be known whether the matter would fall in our favour or against us. For you to have been the daughter of the Amir ul-Mu’mineen (Leader of the Believers) is better than you being a female slave from among the slaves of the Muslims, and I am a good successor for you following your father …

‘Ulwan is not known except by this **with the inconsistency of the Isnad and having no corroboration for it**. Yahya bin Uthman informed us that he heard Sa’id bin ‘Ufair saying: “‘Ulwan bin Dawud was a **Zaaqooliy from the Zawaaqeel**”] [Here ends the quote from Al-‘Uqaily].

**I say**: The Zawaaqeel are a group from the Kurds in Al-Jazeera (The Jazeera of Iraq) who became famous for thievery and stealing during those times. It is like Sa’id bin ‘Ufair is accusing him of stealing the narrations and the Hadith i.e. putting together chains of transmission (Asaneed) upon the textual contents (Mutoon) from other paths or inserting textual contents (Mutoon) to a Musnad Hadith (i.e. with a full chain).

- It came as follows in “Tareekh Dimashq” of Ibn ‘Asaakir (59/154): [Abu Al-Barakaat Al-Anmaatiy informed us from Abu Bakr Muhammad bin Al-Muzhaffar bin Bakran, from Abu Al-Hasan Al-‘Ateeqiy, from Yusuf bin Ahmad, from Abu Ja’far Al-‘Uqaily, from Yahya bin Uthman (meaning Ibn Salih), from Abu Salih, from Al-Laith, from ‘Ulwan bin Salih, from Salih bin Kaisan … until its end … just like what came in “Ad-Du’afaa Al-Kabir” by Al-‘Uqailiy].

**I say**: The mention of ‘Ulwan bin Salih in the narration of Abu Salih Abdullah bin Salih Al-Juhaniy, the transcriber of Al-Laith, from Imam Al-Laith bin Sa’d, (in the two reports above) only reflects a lapse of mind or oversight from him, which is most likely, or from some who related from him. Only the following is correct: ‘Ulwan from Salih bin Kaisan. For that reason, as will be mentioned soon, Yahya bin Abdullah bin Bukair asked this ‘Ulwan concerning the name of his father because Al-Laith bin Sa’d only mentioned: “‘Ulwan” alone without attribution (to his father). That is because the man is ‘Ulwan bin Dawud!

- The following came recorded in the “Tareekh” (History) of At-Tabari via the path of Al-Laith bin Sa’d (2/619): [Yunus bin Abdul A’alaa related to us from Yahya bin Abdullah bin Bukair, from Al-Laith bin Sa’d, from ‘Ulwan, from Salih bin Kaisan, from Humaid bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf, from his father: That he entered upon Abu Bakr As-Siddeq, may Allah be pleased with him, during his illness that he passed away from, and he appeared to be concerned. Abdur Rahman said to him: “You have awoken recovered Al-Hamdu Lillah”. Abu Bakr, may Allah be pleased with him, replied: “Is that what you see?” He said: “Yes”. He (Abu Bakr) said: “I have entrusted your affairs to him who I feel is the best of you. Each of you is irritated by that, for each wants the matter (of leadership) to be his instead. You have seen that the Dunyaa (world) has opened up. When it opens up, it continues to come on until you adopt curtains of silk and pillows of silk brocade. Then you will be pained to lie on Azeri wool as any one of you would be pained to sleep on thorns. By Allah, that any one of you be brought forth to have his neck to be struck, for [something] other than the Hadd (prescribed punishment), would be better for him than plunging into the depths of this Dunyaa (life of this world). You will be the first to lead people astray tomorrow, so that you will turn them from the way to the right and left. 0 guide of the way, it is either the (light of) dawn or evil!” I said to him: “Take it easy, may Allah have mercy upon you, as it will only weaken you in your condition. The people, concerning this matter of yours, are divided between two types of men. Either a man who shares your view and is therefore with you, or a man who opposes your view and in that case is an adviser to you and your companion, as you like (the situation to be). You have remained Salih (righteous) and Muslih (seeking to make things upright and righteous), and you do not grieve for anything from this Dunyaa (material life of this world). Abu Bakr, may Allah be pleased with him, said: “Indeed, I do not grieve for anything from this world, except for three matters which I did that I wish I had left aside, three matters that I left aside which I wish I had done, and three matters which I wish I had asked the Messenger of Allah ﷺ concerning. As for the three that I did but wish that I had left aside, then I wish that I had not **searched the house of Fatimah for anything and even if they had locked it with hostile intent against me**. I wish that I had not burnt to death Al-Fujaa’ah As-Sulamiy but rather killed him cleanly or let him go free alive. And I wish that on the day of the Saqeefah of Bani Sa’idah, that I had cast the matter (of leadership) upon the neck of one of the two men: ‘Umar and Abu Ubaidah. Then one of them would have been the Ameer (leader) and I would have been a Wazir (assistant). As for those (matters) which I left aside, then I wish that on the day Al-Ash’ath bin Qais was brought to me as a captive, that I would have struck his neck, as it appears to me that he does not see an evil except that he assists in it. And I wish that when I dispatched Khalid bin Al-Walid to (fight) the people of apostacy, that I had stayed at Dhu l-Qussah, so that if the Muslims had been victorious, they would have been victorious, but if they had been defeated, I would have been able to engage or be a reinforcement. And I wish that when I sent Khalid bin Al-Walid to Ash-Shaam (Greater Syria), I had (also) sent ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab to Iraq. In that I case I would have extended both of my two hands in the way of Allah (and he stretched forth his two hands). And I wish that I had asked the Messenger of Allah ﷺ to whom this matter (of leadership) belongs? So that no one would dispute it. And I wish that I had asked him whether the Ansar have a share in the matter (of leadership)? And I wish that I had asked him about the inheritance of the daughter of the brother (niece) and the paternal aunt, as I have in myself uncertainties concerning them both (i.e. these two issues).

Yunus said to me: Yahya said to us: ‘Ulwan then came to us following the death of Al-Laith and I asked him about this Hadith. He then related to me **just as Al-Laith bin Sa’d had related to me, word for word**. And he informed me that it was he who had related it to Al-Laith bin Sa’d **and I asked him about the name of his father and he informed me that he was ‘Ulwan bin Dawud**].

- It was also recorded in the “Tareekh” of At-Tabari (2/620) with the following chain: [Muhammad bin Isma’eel Al-Muradiy related to me from Abdullah bin Salih Al-Misriy, from Al-Laith bin Sa’d, from ‘Ulwan bin Salih, from Salih bin Kaisan, from Humaid bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf: That Abu Bakr As-Siddeeq, may Allah be pleased with him, said: (He then mentioned a similar version to the above and he did not say in it that he heard it from his father. Abu Ja’far said: Abu Bakr, prior to becoming occupied with the affairs of the Muslims, was a trader. His house was in As-Sunh and then he moved to Al-Madinah].

**I say**: All of the paths agree upon: “Humaid bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf (related) from his father” and therefore the omission of “from his father” (in this chain) is a transcription error or from the errors of Muhammad bin Isma’eel Al-Muradiy or Abdullah bin Salih Al-Misriy.

- It was recorded as follows in “Al-‘Aqd Al-Fareed” (5/20): [Abu Salih related from Muhammad bin Waddah, from Muhammad bin Rumh bin Muhajir At-Tujeebiy, from Al-Laith bin Sa’d, from ‘Ulwan, from Salih bin Kaisan, from Humaid bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf, from his father: That he entered upon Abu Bakr, may Allah be pleased with him, during his sickness that he passed away from and he found him to be wakeful (or alert). He (Abdur Rahman) said: “You have awoken recovered Al-Hamdu Lillah”. Abu Bakr said: “Do you see that?” He said: “Yes”. He said: “I am like that because of the severity of the pain and what I have experienced from you O assembly of the Muhajirin is more severe upon me than my pain. I have entrusted your affair (of leadership) to the one I view in myself to be the best of you, but each of you is irritated by that, wanting the matter to belong to him instead. You have seen that the Dunyaa (world) has opened up. When it opens up, it continues to come on until you adopt curtains of silk and pillows of silk brocade. Then you will be pained to lie on Azeri wool as any one of you would be pained to sleep on thorns. By Allah, that any one of you be brought forth to have his neck to be struck, for [something] other than the Hadd (prescribed punishment), would be better for him than plunging into the depths of this Dunyaa (life of this world). You will be the first to lead people astray tomorrow, so that you will turn them from the way to the right and left. 0 guide of the way, it is either the (light of) dawn or evil!” I said to him: “Take it easy, may Allah have mercy upon you, as it will only weaken you in your condition. The people, concerning this matter of yours, are divided between two types of men. Either a man who shares your view and is therefore with you, or a man who opposes your view and in that case is an adviser to you and your companion, as you like (the situation to be). We have not known except that you have intended goodness. You have remained Salih (righteous) and Muslih (seeking to make things upright and righteous), and you do not grieve for anything from this Dunyaa (material life of this world). He replied: “Yes, indeed, I do not grieve for anything from this world, except for three matters which I did that I wish I had left aside, three matters that I left aside which I wish I had done, and three matters which I wish I had asked the Messenger of Allah ﷺ concerning. As for the three that I did but wish that I had left aside, then I wish that I had not **searched the house of Fatimah for anything and even if they had locked it with hostile intent against me**. I wish that I had not burnt to death Al-Fujaa’ah As-Sulamiy but rather killed him cleanly or let him go free alive. And I wish that on the day of the Saqeefah of Bani Sa’idah, that I had cast the matter (of leadership) upon the neck of one of the two men: ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab and Abu Ubaidah bin Jarrah. Then one of them would have been the Ameer (leader) and I would have been a Wazir (assistant). As for those (matters) which I left aside and wish that I had done them, then I wish that on the day Al-Ash’ath bin Qais was brought to me as a captive, that I had struck his neck, as it appears to me that he does not see an evil except that he assists in it. And I wish that when I dispatched Khalid bin Al-Walid to (fight) the people of apostacy, that I had stayed at Dhu l-Qussah, so that if the Muslims had been victorious, they would have been victorious, but if they had been defeated, I would have been able to engage or be a reinforcement. And I wish that when I sent Khalid bin Al-Walid to Ash-Shaam (Greater Syria), I had (also) sent ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab to Iraq. In that I case I would have extended both of my two hands in the way of Allah. As for the three matters that I wish that I had asked the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, then I wish that I had asked the Messenger of Allah ﷺ to whom this matter (of leadership) belongs? So that no one would dispute it. And I wish that I had asked him whether the Ansar have a share in the matter (of leadership)? So that none would wrong them in respect to their share. And I wish that I had asked him about the inheritance of the daughter of the brother (niece) and the paternal aunt, as I have in myself uncertainties concerning them both (i.e. these two issues)]. **I say**: I presented the text in full, even though it conforms that which preceded it, to make clear the Amanah (trust) and Itqaan (precision) of the author of “Al-‘Aqd Al-Fareed” Abu ‘Amr Ahmad bin Abd Rabbih Al-Qurtubiy .

- It came as follows in “Khulasah ‘Aqabaat Al-Anwaar” (3/323): [Abu ‘Umar Ahmad bin Abd Rabbij Al-Qurtubiy said: Abu Salih said: Muhammad bin Waddah informed us, he said: Muhammad bin Ramj bin Muhajir At-Tajeebiy related to me from Al-Laith bin Sa’d, from ‘Ulwan, from Salih bin Kaisan, from Humaid bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf, from his father: That he entered upon Abu Bakr, may Allah be pleased with him, during the sickness from which he passed away, and found him to be wakeful (or alert) … and so on, word for word, as was mentioned in “**Al-‘Aqd Al-Fareed**”.

However, it came recorded in “Tareekh Dimashq” (30/417), by Ibn ‘Asaakir, with a significant Isnad: [Abu Al-Barakaat Abdullah bin Muhammad bin Al-Fadl Al-Farawiy and Umm Al-Mu’ayyid, who is known by the name of Jumu’ah bint Abu Harb Muhammad bin Al-Fadl bin Abi Harb, informed us, saying: Abu Al-Qasim Al-Fadl bin Abu Harb Al-Jarjaniy informed us from Abu Bakr Ahmad bin Al-Hasan, from Abu Al-‘Abbas Ahmad bin Ya’qub, from Al-Hasan bin Mukram bin Hassan Al-Bazzar Abu ‘Ali, in Baghdad, from **Abu Al-Haitham Khalid bin Al-Qasim, from Laith bin Sa’d, from Salih bin Kaisan**, from Humaid bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf, from his father: That he entered upon Abu Bakr, may Allah be pleased with him, visiting him during his sickness that he passed away from and he found him to be wakeful (or alert). He (Abdur Rahman) said: “You have awoken recovered Al-Hamdu Lillah”. Abu Bakr said: “Do you see that?” He said: “Yes”. He said: “I am in severe pain and what I have experienced from you O Muhajirin is more severe upon me than my pain. I have entrusted your affair (of leadership) to the one I view in myself to be the best of you, but each of you is irritated by that, wanting the matter to belong to him. You have seen that the Dunyaa (world) has opened up. When it opens up, it continues to come on until you adopt curtains of silk and pillows of silk brocade. Then you will be pained to lie on Azeri wool as any one of you would be pained to sleep on thorns. By Allah, that any one of you be brought forth to have his neck to be struck, for [something] other than the Hadd (prescribed punishment), would be better for him than plunging into the depths of this Dunyaa (life of this world). You will become the first to lead people astray tomorrow, so that you will turn them from the way to the right and left. 0 guide of the way, it is either the (light of) dawn or evil!” I said to him: “Take it easy, may Allah have mercy upon you, as it will only weaken you in your condition. The people, concerning this matter of yours, are divided between two types of men. Either a man who shares your view and is therefore with you, or a man who has a different view to yours and in that case is an adviser to you in accordance to what you know and your companion, as you like (it to be). We have not known you except that you have intended goodness. You have remained Salih (righteous) and Muslih (seeking to make things upright and righteous), whilst you do not grieve over this Dunyaa (material life of this world). He replied: “Yes, indeed, I have not come to grieve over anything from this world, except for three matters which I did and three matters that I had not asked the Messenger of Allah ﷺ concerning. As for the three that I did but wish that I had left aside, then I wish that on the day of the Saqeefah of Bani Sa’idah, that I had cast the matter (of leadership) upon the neck of one of the two men, meaning ‘Umar and Abu Ubaidah. Then one of them would have been the Ameer (leader) and I would have been a Wazir (assistant). And I wish that I had not **searched the house of Fatimah even if they locked it with hostile intent against me**. AndI wish that I had not burnt to death Al-Fujaa’ah As-Sulamiy but rather killed him cleanly or let him go free alive. As for the three (matters) which I left aside and wish that I had done them, then I wish that the day I sent Khalid bin Al-Walid to Ash-Shaam (Greater Syria), I had (also) sent ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab to Iraq. In that I case I would have extended both of my two hands in the way of Allah. And I wish that on the day Al-Ash’ath bin Qais was brought to me as a captive, I had struck his neck, as it appears to me that he does not see an evil except that he assists in it. And I wish that I had asked the Messenger of Allah ﷺ to whom this matter (of leadership) belongs after him? So that no one would dispute it. And I wish that I had asked the Messenger of Allah ﷺ whether the Ansar have a share in the matter (of leadership)? And I wish that I had asked him about the inheritance of the daughter of the brother (niece) and the paternal aunt, as I have in myself uncertainties concerning them both (i.e. these two issues)] [End]. Then Ibn ‘Asaakir said: [This is how Khalid bin Al-Qasim Al-Madaa’iniy related it from Al-Laith and he omitted from it ‘Ulwan bin Dawud and I have come across the Hadith of Al-Laith (previously) and it includes the mention of ‘Ulwan (i.e. in the Isnad)].

- It also came recorded in “Tareekh Dimashq”, by Ibn ‘Asaakir (30/419) as follows: [Abu Abdullah Al-Khallal and Abu Al-Qasim Ghanim bin Khalid informed us of it: They said: Abu At0Tayyib bin Shammah informed us from Abu Bakr bin Al-Muqriy, from Muhammad bin Zabban, from Muhammad bin Rumh, from Al-Laith, from ‘Ulwan, from Salih bin Kaisan, from Humaid bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf, from his father: That he entered upon Abu Bakr during his sickness and he found him to be wakeful (or alert). Abdur Rahman said: “You have awoken recovered Al-Hamdu Lillah”. Abu Bakr said: “Do you see that?” He said: “Yes”. He said: “I am like that because of the severity of the pain and due to what I have experienced from you O assembly of the Muhajirin is more severe upon me than my pain. I have entrusted your affair (of leadership) to the one I view in myself to be the best of you, but each of you is irritated by that, wanting the matter to belong to him instead. You have seen that the Dunyaa (world) has opened up. When it opens up, it continues to come on until you adopt curtains of silk and pillows of silk brocade. Then you will be pained to lie on Azeri wool as any one of you would be pained to sleep on thorns. By Allah, that any one of you be brought forth to have his neck to be struck, for [something] other than the Hadd (prescribed punishment), would be better for him than plunging into the depths of this Dunyaa (life of this world). You will be the first to lead people astray tomorrow, so that you will turn them from the way to the right and left. 0 guide of the way, it is either the (light of) dawn or evil!” I said to him: “Take it easy, may Allah have mercy upon you, as it will only weaken you in your condition. The people, concerning this matter of yours, are divided between two types of men. Either a man who shares your view and is therefore with you, or a man who disagrees with your view and in that case is an adviser to you and your companion, as you like (the situation to be). We have not known except that you have intended goodness. You have remained Salih (righteous) and Muslih (seeking to make things upright and righteous), and you do not grieve for anything from this Dunyaa (material life of this world). He replied: “Yes, indeed, I do not grieve for anything from this world, except for three matters which I did that I wish I had left aside, three matters that I left aside which I wish I had done, and three matters which I wish I had asked the Messenger of Allah ﷺ concerning. As for the three that I wish that I had left aside, then I wish that I had not **searched the house of Fatimah for anything**. And I wish that I had not burnt to death Al-Fujaa’ah As-Sulamiy but rather killed him cleanly or let him go free alive. And I wish that on the day of the Saqeefah of Bani Sa’idah, that I had presented the matter (of leadership) upon the neck of one of the two men: ‘Umar and Abu Ubaidah. Then one of them would have been the Ameer (leader) and I would have been a Wazir (assistant). As for those (matters) which I left aside, then I wish that on the day Al-Ash’ath bin Qais was brought to me as a captive, that I had struck his neck, as it appears to me that he does not see an evil except that he assists in it. And I wish that when I dispatched Khalid bin Al-Walid to (fight) the people of apostacy, that I had stayed at Dhu l-Qadiyahh, so that if the Muslims had been victorious, they would have been victorious, but if they had been defeated, I wish ... And I wish that when I sent Khalid bin Al-Walid to Ash-Shaam (Greater Syria), I had (also) sent ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab to Iraq. In that I case I would have extended both of my two hands in the way of Allah. And I wish that I had asked the Messenger of Allah ﷺ to whom this matter (of leadership) belongs? So that no one would dispute it. And I wish that I had asked him whether the Ansar have a share in the matter (of leadership)? And I wish that I had asked him about the inheritance of two; the daughter of the brother (niece) and the paternal aunt, as I have in myself uncertainties concerning them both (i.e. these two issues)] [End].

**I say**: It came like this “**searched the house of Fatimah for anything**” without the addition “**even if they locked it with hostile intent against me**” which is present in the narration of Muhammad bin Rumh and as such the omission is from the one who narrated it from him. Ibn ‘Asaakir then said: [And other than Al-Laith related it from ‘Ulwan and he added between himself and between Salih bin Kaisan a man (relator)].

- It also came recorded in “Tareekh Dimashq”, by Ibn ‘Asaakir (30/420), with a slight omission and obvious slip of the pen: [Abu Al-Qasim bin As-Susiy and Abu Talib Al-Husainy said: ‘Ali bin Muhammad informed us from Abu Muhammad bin Abi Nasr, from Abu Al-Hasan Khaithamah bin Sulaiman, from Abu Muhammad Abdullah bin Zaid bin Abdur Rahman An-Nahrani, from Al-Walid bin Az-Zubair, from ‘Ulwan bin Dawud Al-Bajaly, from Abu Muhammad Al-Madaniy, from Salih bin Kaisan, from Humaid bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf, from his father, who said:

I entered upon Abu Bakr during his sickness from which he passed away and I found him to be wakeful (or alert). So, I said: “You have awoken recovered Al-Hamdu Lillah”. Abu Bakr said: “As for me, then I am like that due to pain. And you O assembly of the Muhajirin have made for me trouble. I have taken a covenant from you and made as a successor over you the one I view to be the best of you, but each of you is irritated by that, viewing that the matter should belong to him. You have seen that the Dunyaa (world) has opened up. When it opens up, it continues to come on until you adopt curtains of silk and pillows of silk brocade. Then you will be pained to lie on Azeri wool as any one of you would be pained to sleep on thorns. By Allah, that any one of you be brought forth to have his neck to be struck, for [something] other than the Hadd (prescribed punishment), would be better for him swimming into the deluges of the Dunyaa (life of this world). You will be the first to lead people astray tomorrow, so that you will turn them from the way to the right and left. 0 guide of the way, it is either the (light of) dawn or evil!” I said to him: “Take it easy, may Allah have mercy upon you, as it will only weaken you in your condition. By Allah, you have not intended except goodness and verily the companion of you both you love and you love. Abdur Rahman then said to him: “I do not see a problem with you Al-Hamdu Lillah, so don’t grieve over anything from the Dunyaa. By Allah, we have not known except that you were Salih (righteous) and Muslih (seeking to make things upright and righteous). He (Abu Bakr) said: “As for me, then I do not grieve for anything from this world, except for three matters which I did that I wish I had left aside and three matters which I wish I had asked the Messenger of Allah ﷺ concerning. As for the three that did, then I wish that I had not **searched the house of Fatimah, even it was locked with hostile intent against me**. And I wish that on the day of the Saqeefah of Bani Sa’idah, that I had disposed of the matter (of leadership) upon the neck of one of the two men: ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab or Abu Ubaidah bin Al-Jarrah. And I wish that when the Arabs apostatised, that I would have stayed at Dhu l-Qussah. Then, if the Muslims were victorious, they would have been victorious, but if they were defeated, I would have been a source or reinforcement. As for the three that I left, then I wish that on the day Al-Ash’ath bin Qais was brought to me as a captive, that I had struck his neck, as it appears to me that he does not see an evil except that he assists in it. And I wish that I had not burnt to death Al-Fujaa’ah but rather killed him cleanly or let him go free alive. That I sent Khalid bin Al-Walid to Ash-Shaam (Greater Syria) to ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab to Iraq. Then, I would have extended both of my right and left hands in the way of Allah. As for the three maters that I wish that I had asked the Messenger of Allah ﷺ about, then I wish that I had asked the Messenger of Allah ﷺ whether the Ansar have a share in this matter (of leadership)? And I wish that I had asked him about the inheritance of the paternal aunt and the daughter of the brother, as I have in myself uncertainties concerning them both (i.e. these two issues)].

- ‘Ulwan said: And **Al-Maajishoon** related to me from Salih bin Kaisan, from Humaid bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf from his father, the same as it].

- It came recorded as follows in “Tareekh ul-Islam” of Imam Adh-Dhahabi (4/209): [‘Ulwan bin Dawud Al-Bajaly related from Humaid bin Abdur Rahman, from Salih bin Kaisan, from Humaid bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf, from his father … And it was (also) related by Al-Laith bin Sa’d from ‘Ulwan, from the same Salih, that he (Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf) said: I entered upon Abu Bakr visiting him during his sickness. I gave Salam (greetings) to him and asked him how he was on this day. He said: “Al-Hamdu Lillah, I am recovered (or clear). As for me, then I am as you see me in pain and you have made for me trouble to accompany my pain. I have made a covenant for you after me and I have chosen for you the best of you in my view. But all of you are irritated due to that, hoping that the matter (leadership) goes to him”. He then said: “I do not regret anything except for three matters that I did, three that I did not do and three matters that I wish that I had asked the Messenger of Allah ﷺ about. I wish that I had not **searched the house of Fatimah, even it was locked with hostile intent against me**. I wish that on the day of the Saqeefah of Bani Sa’idah, I had cast the matter upon the neck of ‘Umar or Abu Ubaidah. I wish that I had sent Khalid bin Al-Walid to the apostates whilst I had stayed in Dhu l-Qussah. Then if the Muslims were victorious (all would be fine), but if not, I would have been a reinforcement and cover. And I wish that on the day that Al-Ash’ath was brought to me as a captive, that I would have struck his neck, as it appears to me that there is no evil except that he flies towards it. I wish that the day Al-Fujaa’ah As-Sulamiy was brought to me, that I had not burnt him to death, but rather just killed him (cleanly) or let him go alive. I wish that when I dispatched Khalid bin Al-Walid to Ash-Shaam (Greater Syria), I had dispatched ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab to Iraq. Then I would have extended both my right hand and left hand in the way of Allah. And I wish that I had asked the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, to whom this matter (of leadership) belongs and then none would dispute it. And that I asked him whether the Ansar have a share in this matter and that I had asked him about the (inheritance of the) paternal aunt and daughter of the brother, as I have in myself uncertainties in respect to them.

It was related like this and in a longer version (as follows): **Ibn Wahb from Al-Laith bin Sa’d, from Salih bin Kaisan**, which was also recorded by Ibn ‘Aa’idh].

**We say**: The above is all that we have found after a very thorough investigation and if anyone finds additional chains of transmission and paths, then we would be grateful for them to be provided to us. Let us begin by critiquing the serious chain of transmission which omitted to mention ‘Ulwan: “**Abu Al-Haitham Khalid bin Al-Qasim from Laith bin Sa’d, from Salih bin Kaisan**, from Humaid bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf, from his father”.

- Khalid bin Al-Qasim Abu Al-Haitham Al-Madaa’iniy he is from the proficient major liars of the Hufaazh (collectors of Hadith), concerning whom there is a consensus to discard him, as was mentioned in “Tareekh Baghdad” (Bashar Edition: 9/239/4356): [Khalid bin Al-Qasim Abu Al-Haitham Al-Madaa’iniy heard (or received) from Al-Laith bin Sa’d, Isma’eel bin Ja’far, Hammad bin Zaid, Ubaidullah bin ‘Amr Ar-Raqqiy, Sa’id bin Abdur Rahman Al-Jamahiy and Abu Isma’eel Al-Mu’addab. He accompanied Al-Laith bin Sa’d from Baghdad to Makkah and also departed with him to Egypt. As such, he used to relate from him a lot. Al-Hasan bin Mukram, Al-Harith bin Abi Usamah and other than these two related from him … followed by a long biography, which included **wonderous matters** in terms of his lying and his (false) attribution Hadith of Hadith to the Shuyukh]. He used to add to the chains of transmission, making the Munqati’ (interrupted) Muttasal (connected), and omitting the Da’if (weak) and Majhool (unknown) narrators, to make the weak chains strong. There was friendship and affection between himself and Abu Zakariya Yahya bin Ma’een. He knew him well and wrote a lot from him before discarding him and burning his books alongside the books of Abdul ‘Aziz bin Abaan. Abu Zakariya said: [If a man intends to lie in respect to the Hadith, Allah will make plain his affair. And Khalid bin Al-Haitham was from the most reliable, intelligent and cunning of people, then look how he fell in relation to a small number of Ahadeeth, when Allah wished to make evident his affair].

‘Ulwan is definitely present in this Isnad (chain of transmission) and Khalid Al-Madaa’iniy only omitted. If it was to be said that similar to this has come from other than Khalid, as Adh-Dhahabiy mentioned: [It was related like this and in a longer version (as follows): **Ibn Wahb from Al-Laith bin Sa’d, from Salih bin Kaisan**, which was also recorded by Ibn ‘Aa’idh], then **we say in response**: This is from that which this major proficient liar attributed to Ibn Wahb, if this was indeed actually in truth from the books of Ibn Wahb, and not from the errors of the transcribers or product of the narrators. That is because the books of Ibn Wahb were not given the same level of care and attention as most other books were. Imam Abdullah bin Wahb is too noble and reliable to have perpetrated such a Tadlees (manipulation of the Isnad); a repugnant Tadlees of Taswiyah (adjustment).

- However, the following came recorded in “Al-Muntakhiab Min ‘Ilal Al-Khallal” (1/296/196): [Muhanna said: I asked Ahmad concerning the Hadith: Al-Laith bin Sa’d, from Salih bin Kaisan, from Humaid bin Abdur Rahman, from his father: That he entered upon Abu Bakr during his sickness and gave his Salam, then he (Abu Bakr) said: As for me, then I have not regretted except three matters that I did … to the end of the Hadith? Ahmad said: “It is not Sahih”. I asked: “How is that?” He said: “It was taken from **the book of Ibn Daabb**, and he fabricated it in attribution to Al-Laith”.

Al-Khallal said: Abu Bakr bin Sadaqah said: This Hadith was related from ‘Ulwan bin Dawud Al-Bajaliy from the people of Qarqisiya (Circesium), and he relates these Ahadeeth, from Ibn Daabb. I saw that this Hadith from among his Hadith, was **from Ibn Daabb**, whilst there is no issue with ‘Ulwan in himself].

**I say**: This contains many beneficial points, which include:

1) That the Hadith is present in the book of Ibn Daabb, as was known to Imam Ahmad, and similarly by the testimony of Al-Hafizh Ath-Thiqah Al-Hujjah Abu Bakr Ahmad bin Muhammad bin Abdullah bin Sadaqah.

2) That Imam Ahmad had not come across other than the path of Khalid Al-Madaa’iniy and as such, passed judgment upon it that it had been falsely attributed to Al-Laith. However, the matter is not like that, as the Hadith is definitely related from Al-Laith. This however is not strange as Imam Ahmad did not give great attention to the Hadith of the Maghaziy, Seerah and Tareekh (history).

3) That Abu Bakr bin Sadaqah, who was Iraqi from Baghdad did not come across other paths which ‘Ulwan bin Dawud in which he was inconsistent or lied. That is because most of them were Egyptian or Shaamiy paths, and due to this he passed judgement that there was no issue in ‘Ulwan bin Dawud. That was despite him knowing (of) ‘Ulwan bin Dawud al-Bajaliy and ascribed him, correctly, to the origin of Qarqisiya (Circesium).

In addition, Imam Al-Hafizh Al-Hujjah, the Leader of the Believers in respect to the Hadith, ‘Ali bin ‘Umar Ad-Daraqutniy, did not grasp the paths, as is evident from his speech in “Al-‘Ilal Al-Waaridah Fee Al-Ahadeeth An-Nabawiyah” (1/181/9): [And he was asked about the Hadith of Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf, from Abu Bakr As-Siddeeq: “(There are) three matters that I wish that I had asked the Messenger of Allah ﷺ concerning. I wish that I had asked him about to whom this matter (of leadership) belongs, so that none would dispute it with its rightful people. And I wish that I had asked him whether the Ansar have any share in this matter (of leadership). And I wish that I had asked him about the inheritance of the paternal aunt and daughter of the sister”. He (Ad-Daraqutniy) said: It is a Hadith related by a Sheikh of the people of Egypt, called ‘Ulwan bin Dawud and he has been differed upon in respect to: Sa’id bin ‘Ufair related it from him, from Humaid bin Abdur Rahman bin Humaid bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf, from Salih bin Kaisan, from Humaid bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf, from his father, from Abu Bakr. Al-Laith bin Sa’d stated contrary to it as he related it from ‘Ulwan, from Salih bin Kaisan with this Isnad (chain), except he did not mention Humaid bin Abdur Rahman between ‘Ulwan and Salih. It is like Sa’id bin ‘Ufair rendered it from ‘Ulwan because he added in it (i.e. the chain) a man, whilst Sa’id bin ‘Ufair was from the reliable Huffaazh (scholars of Hadith).

- **I say**: The matter is not like that, but is rather a discrepancy from ‘Ulwan bin Dawud (or a lie from him), as there are from among the Thiqaat (reliable and trustworthy transmitters) those who added in it other than Humaid bin Abdur Rahman bin Humaid bin Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf:

1) **Al-Maajishoon**: This (name) has been attributed to a number of men. From among them are two from the generation (Tabaqah) of the Shuyukh of ‘Ulwan. They are: The Imam Al-Faqeeh Abdul ‘Aziz bin Abdullah bin Abi Salamah Al-Maajishoon Al-Madaniy, Abu Abdullah and is known as Abu Al-Asbagh. He is from the major Atbaa’ (followers) of the Taabi’een who died in the year 164 AH in Baghdad. The other is: Yusuf bin Ya’qub bin Abi Salamah Al-Maajishoon, Abu Salamah Al-Madaniy, the Mawla of Aali Al-Munkadir At-Taimiyeen (and he is the nephew of Abdul ‘Aziz bin Abdullah). He died in the year 185 AH or prior to that.

2) **Abu Muhammad Al-Madaniy**: It is not known who he is from the creation of Allah and it may be that half of the population of Al-Madinah carry the Kunya of Abu Muhammad! If we were to narrow it down to those involved in instruction from the generation of the major Atbaa’ (followers), we will find more than ten with this Kunya. They include: Aflah bin Sa’id Al-Ansari, their Mawla, Abu Muhammad Al-Madaniy Al-Quba’iy, from the major Atbaa’ (followers) of the Taabi’een, who died in the year 156 AH in Al-Madinah; Al-Hasan bin Zaid bin Al-Hasan bin ‘Ali bin Abi Talib Al-Qurashi Al-Hashimi, Abu Muhammad Al-Madaniy (who went to Baghdad), from the major Atbaa’ (followers) of the Taabi’een, born in the year 83 and passed away in the year 168 AH; Abdullah bin Zaid bin Aslam Al-Qurashi Al-‘Adawiy, Abu Muhammad Al-Madaniy, the Mawla of Aali ‘Umar (the brother of Abdur Rahman bin Zaid Aslam), from the major Atbaa’ (followers) of the Taabi’een, who died in the year 164 AH in Al-Madinah; Abdur Rahman bin Abi Az-Zinad: Abdullah bin Dhakwan Al-Qurashi, their Mawla, Abu Muhammad Al-Madaniy (The brother of Abu Al-Qasim), from the major Atbaa’ (followers) of the Taabi’een, who died in the year 174 AH in Baghdad; Abdur Rahman bin Sa’d bin ‘Ammar bin Sa’d Al-Qarazh, the Mu’adh’dhin, Al-Madaniy, Abu Muhammad, from the major Atbaa’ (followers) of the Taabi’een, and he is from the Du’afaa’ (weak narrators); Musa bin Muhammad bin Ibrahim bin Al-Harith Al-Qurashi At-Taimi, Abu Muhammad Al-Madaniy, from the earlier Atbaa’ (followers) of the Taabi’een, who lived during the time of the young Taabi’en, died in the year 151 AH, and he is Da’if Munkar Al-Hadith (i.e. his Hadith are rejected); Al-Walid bin Kathir Al-Qurashi Al-Makhzumiy, their Mawla, Abu Muhammad Al-Madaniy, then Al-Kufi, from the same Tabaqah (generation) as the previous one and similar time of death: From the earlier Atbaa’ (followers) of the Taabi’een, who lived during the time of the young Taabi’en, died in the year 151 AH, however he is Thiqah (reliable and trustworthy) and Sadooq (truthful). And so which Abu Muhammad Al-Madaniy is it that ‘Ulwan means?!

It is preponderant (or most likely) in my view that this Abu Muhammad Al-Madaniy merely represents a Tadlees (manipulation) from the forms of manipulation involving the names of the Shuyukh, and that he is only in fact: ‘Eisaa bin Yazid bin Bakr bin Da’b Al-Laithi Al-Bakriy Al-Kanani, Abu Al-Walid: (Who was a) Khatib, poet, scholar of genealogy and narrator, from the people of Al-Madinah. Ibrahim bin ‘Arafah said: [He was the most refined of the people of the Hijaz and sweetest in words. He was in the good favour of Al-Mahdi and he attained the favour of Al-Hadi unlike anyone else (in the case where he gave him 30,000 Dinar on one occasion)]. Ibn Qutaibah said: [He has consequence in Basrah. His father was Yazid, also a scholar of the news of the Arabs and their poetry, and the majority was concerning the news of Aali Da’b]. He was from the middle generations of the followers of the Taabi’een, who died in the year 171 AH. He relates from Hisham bin ‘Urwah, Ibn Abi Dhi’b and Salih bin Kaisan, whilst Shababah, Muhammad bin Salam Al-Jumahiy, Hawtharah bin Ashras and others related from him. Al-Khateeb said: [He used to relate about the Arabs, was well refined, a scholar of genealogy, knowledgeable of the days of the people (i.e. history) and the Seerah]. Abu Ubaid Al-Ujariy said about Abu Dawud: [I heard Abu Hatim saying: I heard Al-Asma’iy saying: Khalaf Al-Ahmar said to me: (Concerning the narration) “Arising between the East and the West”: Ibn Da’b fabricated the Hadith in Al-Madinah and Ibn Sawl fabricated the Hadith by the Sanad (chain of transmission)]. Abdul Wahid bin ‘Ali said in relation to the grades (Maraatib) of the scholars of Arabic grammar (Nahw): [He used to fabricate the poetry and Ahadeeth of As-Samar as speech which he attributed to the Arabs. As such, his name (or knowledge/repute) sunk and his narrations were avoided. He was a poet and his knowledge of the Akhbar (news) was greater]. Al-Bukhari and others said: [The man is therefore a liar, who was good at poetry and the formulation of speech].

There is also another man, from the same Tabaqah (generation), who was also called Ibn Da’b, from the sons of the unclehood. He was Muhammad bin Da’b and was also a liar. However, ‘Eisaa bin Yazid bin Bakr bin Da’b is our person here which is apparent from the good workmanship in respect to the speech attributed to Abu Bakr, reflected in: The exhortative introduction resembling the speech of the ascetics and Sufis of the Abbasid period, followed by the diversity and literary workmanship, in respect to the mention of: Three, three and three.

Upon this basis, I seek what is best from Allah and say: ‘Ulwan bin Dawud Al-Bajaliy Al-Qarqasaniy (and he is ‘Ulwan bin Sulaiman Al-Qarqasaniy according to Ibn Abi Hatim, attributing him in lineage to his grandfather), is Munkar Al-Hadith (i.e. his Hadith are rejected): Just as Al-Bukhari stated in addition to Sa’id bin Yunus who is the most knowledgeable concerning the Egyptians. He manipulates (by alteration and deception) the names of the Shuyukh and lies. His truth of his situation was hidden from Abu Bakr bin Sadaqah and Ibn Hibban was deceived by him, as he mentioned him among the Thiqaat (trustworthy and reliable relators). And Allah is Most Knowledgeable and Most Wise.

The Khabar (narrated report) is falsified and fabricated. It was never said by Abu Bakr and Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf did not relate it, just as his son Humaid bin Abdur Rahman did not hear it from him, nor did touch the mind of Salih bin Kaisan, neither in a moment of sleep or wakefulness.

Consequently, there was no storming of the house of Fatimah, the daughter of Muhammad, peace and blessings of Allah be upon them, in origin, and neither ‘Umar or anyone else dared to address here or threaten her directly. The furthest anything could have gone in respect to the severity and sternness of ‘Umar against ‘Ali, Az-Zubair and their companions, is what the Mother of the Believers, ‘Aa’ishah, mentioned in the reliable Sahih Hadith narrated from her. That was that he perhaps raised his voice whenever he passed by the house of Fatimah, when he was entering the Masjid. Concerning ‘Umar who was blunt and coarse, and well-known for harsh speech, then perhaps it is possible that something like the following came from him: “Do not a people who have separated from the Jama’ah (collective) and held back from giving the Bai’ah to the Khalifah of the Messenger of Allah fear that their houses will be burnt down over them?” or something similar to that. That is in contrast with Abu Bakr who use to play with Al-Hasan and Al-Hussein and perhaps carried Al-Hasan upon his shoulders.

I do not believe that the honourable reader is in any further need of this rottenness and putridness that leads to attributing the most repugnant attributes and actions to the first forerunners from the Muhajirin, Ansar and participants in the battle of Badr, who have definitely been promised Jannah (the gardens of paradise) by the text of the Qur’an and the Mutawatir Sunnah. At the head of whom is the Imam of guidance, the proven hero, conqueror of Khaibar, the tenacious warrior, the triumphant Lion of Allah, the Imam of the East and the West, ‘Ali bin Abi Talib, may the pleasure and peace of Allah be upon him and them. There is therefore no place to flee for the one who believes this from concluding the matter by categorising the final Prophet of Allah, may Allah forbid, as the chief of a group of criminal sinners of highway robbers, the most senior of whom wrestle against each other over the position of leadership following his death. Thus, there would be no Prophethood and no divine revelation! There is no wonder that the orientalists, the disbelieving and malicious enemies of Allah, would rejoice in this and exult!

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

**- Supplemental section: The belief of ‘Ali, may the blessings of Allah be upon him, that he was the most entitles of the people for the Khilafah (Succession of leadership):**

- The following came recorded in “Ansaab Al-Ashraaf” of Al-Baladhuri (2/177/202) with a Sahih chain of transmission:

[Rawh bin Abdul Mu’min related to me from Abu ‘Awanah, from Khalid Al-Hadh’dhaa’, from Abdur Rahman bin Abi Bakrah: That ‘Ali came to us returning and said: None from this Ummah have experienced what I have experienced. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ passed away whilst **I am the most entitled of the people for this matter (of leadership)**. The people gave the Bai’ah to Abu Bakr, then he chose ‘Umar as his successor and I gave the Bai’ah, accepted and submitted. Then the people gave the Bai’ah to Uthman and (again) I gave the Bai’ah, submitted and accepted. Now, they are deciding (in terms of preference) between me and Mu’awiyah]. Rawh bin Abdul Mu’min, Abu Al-Hasan Al-Muqri’ Al-Basriy, the Mawla of Hudhail, is Thiqah (trustworthy and reliable) by consensus. He is from the Shuyukh of Al-Bukhari in his Sahih and Abdullah bin Ahmad bin Hanbal related from him in “Zawaa’id Al-Musnad”.

- The following came recorded in “As-Sunnah” of Abdullah bin Ahmad (2/563/1315) with a Sahih Isnad (chain):

[My father related to me from Ubaidullah bin ‘Umar Al-Qawaareeriy, and this is the Lafzh 9wording) of my father: They said: Yahya bin Hammad Abu Bakr related to us, from Abu ‘Awanah, from Khalid Al-Hadh’dhaa’, from Abdur Rahman bin Abi Bakrah: That ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, came to them returning and ‘Ammar was with him. **He then mentioned something** and ‘Ammar said: “O Ameer ul-Mu’minin (Leader of the Believers). He then said: “**Be quiet, for by Allah, I will surely be with Allah upon who (or what) was**”. He then said: “None from this Ummah have experienced what I have experienced. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ passed away … **then he mentioned something** … Then the people gave Abu Bakr, may Allah be pleased with him, the Bai’ah and I gave the Bai’ah, submitted and accepted. Then Abu Bakr passed away … **and he mentioned a word (statement)** … Then he chose as his successor ‘Umar, may Allah be pleased with him, so, I gave him the Bai’ah, submitted and accepted. Then ‘Umar passed away and he assigned the matter to that group of six and the people consequently gave the Bai’ah to ‘Uthman, may Allah be pleased with him, so, I gave him the Bai’ah, submitted and accepted. Now, today, they are deciding (in terms of preference) between me and Mu’awiyah]. Observe here the manipulation (Tadlees) in respect to the omission of the statement “**I am the most entitled of the people for this matter (of leadership)**” and replacing it with empty meaningless speech: “**Then he mentioned something**”. I believe that this repugnant manipulation is from Ahmad bin Hanbal and he has what is similar to this and indeed even more repugnant, so take care with him that he does not fall from the grade of the Imamah!

- The following also came recorded in “As-Sunnah” of Abdullah bin Ahmad (2/563/1316) with a Sahih Isnad (chain):

[Ibrahim bin Al-Hajjaj An-Najiy related to me in Basrah, from Abu ‘Awanah, from Khalid Al-Hadh’dhaa’, from Abdur Rahman bin Abi Bakrah, who said: “He came to me” and he said again: “‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, came to us returning and ‘Ammar was with him. He mentioned something and ‘Ali then said: “By Allah, I will surely be with Allah upon who (or what) was. None from this Ummah have experienced what I have experienced. The Messenger of Allah ﷺ passed away … **then he mentioned something** … Then the people gave Abu Bakr the Bai’ah and I gave the Bai’ah and accepted (that). Then Abu Bakr passed away … **and then he mentioned something** … Then he chose as his successor ‘Umar, so, I gave him the Bai’ah and accepted. Then ‘Umar passed away and he (i.e. ‘Umar) made it a Shura (consultation) and the people consequently gave the Bai’ah to ‘Uthman, so, I gave him the Bai’ah and accepted. Then now, they are deciding (in terms of preference) between me and Mu’awiyah].

- The following came stated in “Lisan Al-Mizan” (4/484/1534):

[Kathir bin Yahya bin Kathir Sahib Al-Basriy, was Shi’iy. ‘Abbas Al-‘Anbariy forbade taking (narrations) from him and Al-Azdiy said that he has many rejectable narrations (Manakir). He then presented in relation to him (the narration): From ‘Awanah, from Khalid Al-Hadh’dhaa’, from Abdur Rahman bin Abi Bakrah, from his father: I heard ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with him saying: “Abu Bakr, may Allah be pleased with him, assumed the leadership **whilst** **I am the most entitled of the people for the Khilafah**”. I say: This is a fabrication upon Abu ‘Awanah and I am not aware of who narrated it from Kathir [end]. And Abdullah bin Ahmad, Abu Zur’ah and others related from him. Abu Hatim said: [**His status is Sidq (truthfulness) and he was Shi’ah**]. Abu Zur’ah said: [**Sadooq (truthful)]**. Ibn Hibban mentioned him among the Thiqaat (trustworthy and reliable narrators) and so perhaps the damage was from those that came after him].

**I say**: Abu Malik Kathir bin Yahya bin Kathir Sahib Al-Basriy was Thiqah Sadooq (Trustworthy, reliable and truthful) and we should completely discard the forbiddance of Al-‘Abbas Al-‘Anbariy and the speech of Al-Azdiy (here), following the high level accreditation from the great scholars of critiquing who knew him, heard from him and related from him, despite what some of them had, like Abu Hatim Ar-Raziy, in terms of partisan (anti ‘Ali) Umayyad inclinations, who stated in his “Al-Jarh Wa-t-Ta’dil” (7/158/885): [Kathir bin Yahya bin Kathir Abu Malik Al-Basriy related from Abu ‘Awanah, Matar bin Abdur Rahman Al-A’naq, Wahib bin Sawwar and Sa’id bin Abdul Karim bin Saleet. I heard my father saying that. Abu Muhammad said: “**His status is Sidq (truthfulness)** and he was Shi’ah”. Abdur Rahman related to us, he said: Abu Zur’ah was asked about Kathir bin Yahya and he said: “(He is) **Sadooq**”]. That is in addition to those who came after like Ibn Hibban (who testified to his trustworthiness and reliability).

There is no damage (i.e. to his integrity) in origin except for in the imagination of the two Imams Adh-Dhahabi and Ibn Hajar, may Allah overlook this from them, as is evident from the Isnad of Al-Baladhuri and other paths, even if some of the narrators, may Allah deal with them by their intentions, effaced the dreaded statement: “**I am the most entitled of the people for the Khilafah**” and replaced it with “**Then, he mentioned something**”. So, ponder and wonder at this underhanded manipulation which is close to lying and treachery. We ask Allah for protection and well-being in the Dunyaa and ‘Aakhirah.

In contrast, the editor or publisher of the book “Ansaab Al-Ashraaf”, by Al-Baladhuri, let their emotions run wild, whilst it is apparent that he is Shi’iy. That is as he said in the margins of “Ansaab Al-Ashraaf”, of Al-Baladhuri (2/177): [Abdur Rahman bin Abi Bakrah was from the governors of his paternal uncle who was proud of **Abu Sufyan’s adultery with his mother**. He was affiliated to other than his patrons and assisted Mu’awiyah in his injustice and hostility. He exaggerated in respect to the Ameer ul-Mu’mineen with complete exaggeration. He killed the upright from his Shi’ah (grouping) with every lie and falsehood and he killed them under every stone and clay. His Hadith are therefore given no consideration unless there are external indicators (Qaraa’in) indicating to their truthfulness and that it conforms to the reality. What he related here concerning him and that he said: “**I accepted**” is a pure lie and it is sufficient to revise his arguments, peace be upon him, and what took place between him on the day of the Bai’ah and after it!!!].

**I say**: The objection is upon the affirmation of the wording “I accepted” could have angles to support it, however, we are in origin concerned about discussing that. Rather, (for us) the important matter is his statement: “I heard and I obeyed” as was stated here and in other than the path of Abdur Rahman bin Abi Bakrah (and it will be presented shortly from the path of Yahya bin ‘Urwah Al-Muradiy and perhaps other than him). The requirement is hearing and obeying towards the one to whom the Bai’ah has been contracted correctly by the majority, where the Bai’ah becomes binding upon the necks of all and nobody separates from it except the one who has gone out against the Ummah, split the staff (or unity) of the Jama’ah (collective) and been content with the status of Jahiliyah: “And if he dies upon this, his death is of Jahiliyah (pre-Islamic period)”. We know, by necessity of the senses and mind, that there would be from the minority those who are not content. That is because the coming together of all the people, and every individual from them, upon contentment (or choice) is an impossible matter. It is something that did not occur and will never occur in the world at all (and not even in relation to the Prophets). However, there is no escaping from order and hearing and obedience. As for the contentment then it refers to the contentment (or choice) of the majority. Otherwise, the Bai’ah would be one of coercion and force and it would absolutely not be contracted. It would be invalid like that which is absent and did not exist in origin.

As for myself, then in contrast to these two sides that have been overtaken by unbridled partisanship to the Madh’hab and sectarian or factional straying, then I supplicate with the supplication of ‘Ammar bin Yasir which he took from the seal of the Prophets of Allah ﷺ:

اللَّهُمَّ بِعِلْمِكَ الْغَيْبَ وَقُدْرَتِكَ عَلَى الْخَلْقِ أَحْيِنِي مَا عَلِمْتَ الْحَيَاةَ خَيْرًا لِي وَتَوَفَّنِي إِذَا عَلِمْتَ الْوَفَاةَ خَيْرًا لِي اللَّهُمَّ وَأَسْأَلُكَ خَشْيَتَكَ فِي الْغَيْبِ وَالشَّهَادَةِ وَأَسْأَلُكَ كَلِمَةَ الْحَقِّ فِي الرِّضَا وَالْغَضَبِ وَأَسْأَلُكَ الْقَصْدَ فِي الْفَقْرِ وَالْغِنَى وَأَسْأَلُكَ نَعِيمًا لاَ يَنْفَدُ وَأَسْأَلُكَ قُرَّةَ عَيْنٍ لاَ تَنْقَطِعُ وَأَسْأَلُكَ الرِّضَاءَ بَعْدَ الْقَضَاءِ وَأَسْأَلُكَ بَرْدَ الْعَيْشِ بَعْدَ الْمَوْتِ وَأَسْأَلُكَ لَذَّةَ النَّظَرِ إِلَى وَجْهِكَ وَالشَّوْقَ إِلَى لِقَائِكَ فِي غَيْرِ ضَرَّاءَ مُضِرَّةٍ وَلاَ فِتْنَةٍ مُضِلَّةٍ **اللَّهُمَّ زَيِّنَّا بِزِينَةِ الإِيمَانِ وَاجْعَلْنَا هُدَاةً مُهْتَدِينَ**

O Allah, by Your knowledge of the unseen and Your power over creation, keep me alive so long as You know that living is good for me and cause me to die when You know that death is better for me. O Allah, cause me to fear You in secret and in public. I ask You to make me true in speech in times of contentment and anger. I ask You to make me moderate in times of wealth and poverty. And I ask You for everlasting delight and joy that will never cease and the soothing of the eye that is uninterrupted. I ask You for contentment following the decree and for comfort after death. I ask You for the delight of looking upon Your face and a longing to meet You in a manner that does not entail a calamity that will bring about harm or a trial that will cause deviation. **O Allah, beautify us with the adornment of Iman (belief) and make us among those who guide and are rightly guided**.

Other narrations have come supporting our view and are perhaps better than this in terms of Isnad (chain of transmission). We will present them without going into length in respect to their chains:

- The following came recorded in “Tareekh Dimashq” of Ibn ‘Asaakir (42/439):

[Abu l-Qasim Zahir bin Tahir informed us from Abu Sa’d Muhammad bin Abdur Rahman, from Al-Hakim Abu Ahmad Al-Hafizh, from Al-Husain bin Muhammad bin Salih As-Saimariy, from Ibrahim bin Yusuf (meaning As-Sairafiy), from Umay As-Sairafiy (he is Umayy bin Rabee’ah Al-Muradiy As-Sairafiy Abu Abdur Rahman whose biography is in Tahdheeb Al-Kamaal 2/312), from Yahya bin ‘Urwah Al-Muradiy: He said: I heard ‘Ali bin Abi Talib. He said: The Messenger of Allah ﷺ passed away and **I viewed that I was the most entitled of the people for this matter (leadership)**. Then the people gathered to Abu Bakr, **so, I heard and obeyed**. Then Abu Bakr approached his demise and I viewed that the matter would not be averted from me. Then ‘Umar assumed the leadership, **so, I heard and obeyed**. Then when ‘Umar was afflicted, I believed that he would not avert it from me, but then placed the matter among six from whom I was one, and then ‘Uthman assumed the leadership, **so, I heard and obeyed**. Then ‘Uthman was killed and they came to me and gave me the Bai’ah voluntarily and not out of compulsion: Then by Allah, I have not found (after that) except the sword or disbelief in that which was revealed upon Muhammad ﷺ].

- The following also came stated in “Tareekh Dimashq” of Ibn ‘Asaakir (42/439):

[Abu Ghalib Ahmad bin Al-Hasan informed us from Abu Muhammad Al-Hasan bin ‘Ali, from Abu Al-Husain Muhammad bin Al-Muzhaffar, from Abu Bakr Muhammad bin Muhammad bin Sulaiman from the origin of his book, from Abdullah bin Khalid bin Yazid Al-Lu’lu’iy, from Al-Hasan bin ‘Amr, from Shu’bah and Al-Hafariy, from Al-Jurairiy, from Abu Nadrah, who said: On the day of As-Siffin a man came to ‘Ali and said: “O Ameer ul-Mu’mineen, inform me about your Makhraj (origin) of this covenant (‘Ahd), which the Messenger of Allah ﷺ entrusted to you, or to an opinion that you yourself have viewed”. He replied: “Indeed, the Messenger of Allah ﷺ did not die suddenly or break in death. Indeed, the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, when death approached him, I viewed that he would choose me as his successor due to my closeness to him and due to my favour (or good performance). Then Abu Bakr assumed the succession (i.e. leadership), **so I heard and obeyed**. I used to take when he gave me, go out to fight when he sent me to go out to fight and establish (or implement) the Hudood (prescribed punishments) before him. Then when death approached him, I viewed that he would select me as successor (to the Khilafah) due to my closeness to the Messenger of Allah ﷺ and my good performance (or favour). Then ‘Umar assumed the leadership, **so I heard and obeyed**. I used to take when he gave me, go out to fight when he sent me to go out to fight and establish (or implement) the Hudood (prescribed punishments) before him. Then when death approached ‘Umar, **‘Umar viewed that if he appointed a Khalifah (successor), the Khalifah following him would do that in disobedience to Allah, that would reach him (i.e. as a consequence of his action). As such, he made it a Shura (matter of consultation) between six whom the Messenger of Allah ﷺ was pleased with when he passed away**: ‘Uthman, Talhah, Az-Zubair, Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf and Sa’d. When we debated each man from us wanted it for himself. When Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf saw that he said: “O people, appoint me (to preside) and I will take myself out of it (i.e. contention)”. He (Ali) said: So we did that and he took from us covenants and agreements. Then ‘Uthman assumed the leadership, **so I heard and obeyed.** Then when ‘Uthman was killed, may Allah’s mercy be upon him, I did not see anyone more entitled to it than me due to my closeness to the Messenger of Allah ﷺ].

I say: If the mention of “As-Siffeen” was memorised, then this (chain) is Munqati’ (interrupted): Abu Nadra (Al-Mundhir bin Malik bin Quta’ah Al-‘Awaqiy Al-‘Abdiy) did not attend As-Siffeen, and Allah knows best concerning the reliability of the one who informed him.

However, despite that, I am almost certain that the mention of Siffeen was an error made by some of the narrators and that it was actually the calamitous day of the Camel (Yawm ul-Jamal). It must be because the speech virtually conforms to many statements found in the Hadith of Abdullah bin Al-Kawwaa and Qais bin ‘Abbaad, which will be presented shortly, by Allah’s will. And Abu Nadrah was a longstanding Basriy. Talhah bin Ubaidullah Ibaan saw his arrival to Basrah during that calamitous event (Battle of the Camel). He therefore lived through the events and was an eyewitness to them. In addition, there is nothing within the text of the narration that is rejectable in origin and each part has many supportive evidences. The Isnad is therefore Hasan Qawwiy (strong) and the Khabar is **Sahih of the upmost level of authenticity** with its corroborations and supportive evidence.

- The Khabar (reported tradition) of Abdullah bin Al-Kawwaa and Qais bin ‘Abbaad was also recorded in “Tareekh Dimashq” by Ibn ‘Asaakir (42/449):

[Abu Al-Fat’h Ahmad bin Muhammad Ahmad bin Al-Haddad informed us, from Abu Al-Ma’aaliy Abdullah bin Ahmad Al-Marwaziy, from Abu ‘Ali Ahmad bin Muhammad bin Ibrahim, from Abu Muhammad Abdullah bin Ja’far bin Ahmad, from Ahmad bin Yunus bin Al-Musayyib, from Ya’la bin ‘Ubaid At-Tanaafasiy, from Salim Al-An’amiy, from Al-Hasan, who said: When ‘Ali came to Al-Basrah on the tracks of Talhah and Az-Zubair, intending to fight them, Abdullah bin Al-Kawwaa and Qais bin ‘Abbaad approached him and said: “O Ameer ul-Mu’mineen, tell us about this path of yours, is it an instruction that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ passed on to you, or a covenant that he entrusted you with, or is it your own opinion that you have determined when the Ummah (Islamic nation) became divided and its word became differed upon”. He (‘Ali) said: “O Allah, no. If the Messenger of Allah ﷺ entrusted (or charged) me with anything, I have undertaken it. And the Messenger of Allah ﷺ did not die a sudden death nor was he killed. He remained in his sickness during all of which the Mu’adh’dhin (caller to prayer) would come to him and make the call to prayer, and during all of that he commanded Abu Bakr to lead the people in prayer until one of his wives objected and said: “Abu Bakr is a delicate man and is unable to stand in your place. If you were to command ‘Umar to lead the people in the prayer?” He said: “You (wives) are like the female companions of Yusuf”. Then when the Messenger of Allah ﷺ passed away, the Muslims examined their affairs. They found that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ had appointed Abu Bakr over the affairs of their Deen and so they appointed him over the affairs of their Dunyaa (worldly life). They gave him the Bai’ah (pledge of allegiance) and I gave him the Bai’ah alongside them. I used to take when he gave me and go out to battle when he sent me to go to fight. If the matter was one of favouritism at the time of the approach of his death, he would have given it (i.e. the leadership) to his son. But (instead), he chose and did not … He said: So, he pointed towards ‘Umar and more than one (i.e. many) shared that opinion. They then gave him the Bai’ah (pledge) and I gave the pledge alongside them. I used to take when he gave me and go out to battle when he sent me to go to fight. If the matter was one of favouritism at the time of the approach of his death, he would have given it (i.e. the leadership) to his son. But (instead), he chose six from Quraish and I was from among them, for us to choose from among us a man for the Ummah. **That was because ‘Umar disliked selecting a man from the Quraish himself and appoint him over the affairs of the Ummah, where that man may do something bad after his (‘Umar’s) passing that would catch up to ‘Umar in his grave**. When we met, Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf leapt forward and granted to us his share upon the condition that we provide him with our covenants that we would give the Bai’ah to the one he gave the Bai’ah to from the five. So, we gave him our covenants and he took the hand of ‘Uthman and then gave him the Bai’ah. I objected to that within myself, examined the matter, but found that my covenant had precedence over my Bai’ah. **So, I gave the Bai’ah and submitted**. Then, when he was killed, I examined my affair and found that the noose upon my neck to Abu Bakr and ‘Umar had untied and the covenant to ‘Uthman had been fulfilled faithfully. I found myself to be a man from the Muslims with no one before me having a demand or entitlement. Then those who did not have his close relation like mine, no precedence like mine, and no knowledge like mine, pounced upon it (i.e. to acquire the leadership)” (meaning by that Mu’awiyah). They said: “You have spoken the truth, tell us why you have fought these two men (meaning Talhah and Az-Zubair), whilst they are your companions from the Hijrah, in the Bai’at ur-Ridwaan (Pledge under the tree at Hudaibiyah) and in the consultation”. He said: “They gave me Bai’ah in Al-Madinah and then disowned me in Al-Basrah. Had there been a man who had given the Bai’ah to Abu Bakr and then disowned him, we would have fought him. And had there been a man who had given the Bai’ah to ‘Umar and then disowned him, we would have fought him].

This report appears to be Mursal. Al-hasan only entered Al-Basrah during the nights of As-Siffeen after the tragedy of the (Battle of the) Camel by many months. The Mursal narrations of Al-Hasan are not of high quality (Jayyid) as he believes everyone who relates to him and takes from anyone (without scrutiny). He is lenient in the narration in respect to the meaning and choice of wordings. Despite that, it appears that he took this from Qais bin ‘Ubaad and/or Abu Nadrah, and/or others from among the Thiqaat (reliable and trustworthy narrators).

- The following also came recorded in “Tareekh Dimashq” bin Ibn ‘Asaakir (42/441):

[Abu l-Hasan Kaafoor bin Abdullah Al-Katabiy informed us from Malik bin Ahmad Al-Baanyaasiy, from Al-Husain bin Bushraan by dictation, from Abu ‘Ali Ahmad bin Al-Fadl, from ‘Abbas bin Khuzaimah, from Abdullah bin Rawh, from (…), from Abu Bakr Al-Hudhaliy, from Al-Hasan, who said: When ‘Ali came to Al-Basrah, Ibn Al-Kawwaa and Qais bin ‘Abbaad approached him and said to him: “Will you not tell us about your path that you have proceeded upon. You are entrusted with the Ummah, some of which is striking the other. Is it due to a covenant from the Messenger of Allah ﷺ that he entrusted to you? That is because you are reliable and trustworthy in respect to what you have heard”. He answered: “As for having a covenant from the Prophet ﷺ in respect to that (i.e. leadership). Then, no, by Allah, if I was the first to believe in him, I will not be the first to lie against him: [**And had there been a covenant from the Prophet ﷺ in respect to that: I would not have left the brother of Taim bin Murrah (i.e. Abu Bakr) and ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab to both stand upon his Minbar and I would have fought them by my hands and even if I had nothing apart from this garment (I am wearing)**]. However, the Messenger of Allah ﷺ was not killed and he did not die suddenly. He remained in his sickness for days and nights, where the Mu’adh’dhin would come to him and make the call to prayer, then he would command Abu Bakr to lead the people in prayer, whilst he saw my place. Then the Mu’adh’dhin would come to him and make the call to prayer, then he would command Abu Bakr to lead the people in prayer, whilst he saw my place. And a wife from his wives wanted to change his mind about Abu Bakr (i.e. leading the prayer) but he refused and was angered. He said: “You (i.e. wives) are like the female companions of Yusuf: Command Abu Bakr to lead the people in prayer!” Then when Allah took his Prophet (in death), we examined our affairs and then we chose for our Dunyaa (worldly affairs) whom the Prophet ﷺ chose for our Deen. That is because the prayer was the foundation of Islam and the pillar of the Deen, whilst he was the Ameen (trustworthy one) of the Deen. So, we gave the Bai’ah to Abu Bakr and he worthy for that. No two from among us disagreed in respect to him, none argued with the other and we did not sever the legal obligation from him. So, I gave Abu Bakr his right, I obeyed him and fought with him among his soldiers. I used to take when he gave me, go out to fight when he sent me to fight and I implemented the Hudood (prescribed punishments) in front of him with my whip. Then when he was taken (in death), may Allah be pleased with him, ‘Umar assumed it (i.e. leadership). He took it by the Sunnah (path and manner) of his companion and what he knew in terms of his affair. So, we gave the Bai’ah (pledge) to ‘Umar and no two of us disagreed, none argued with the other and we did not sever the legal obligation from him. I then gave ‘Umar his right, my obedience and fought with him in his armies. I used to take when he gave me, go out to fight when he sent me to fight and I implemented the Hudood (prescribed punishments) in front of him with my whip. Then when he was taken (in death), I remembered in myself my closeness, precedence and virtue. And I thought that none were equal to me. **However, he feared that the Khalifah after him would not cause blood except that it would reach him in his grave (note: i.e. if he selected the next ruler himself). So, he removed himself and his son from the matter and had there been favouritism from him, he would have made his son inherited it**. He discharged it to a group of six from the Quraish, and I was one of them. When the group met, I remembered in myself my closeness and precedence and thought that they were not equal to me. Abdur Rahman then took our agreement that we would hear and obey the one to whom Allah appointed our affair. Then he took the hand of ‘Uthman and struck his hand upon his hand. I then examined my affair and found that my obedience had preceded my Bai’ah and my agreement had been taken for other than me. So, we gave the Bai’ah to ‘Uthman. I then gave him his right, obedience and fought with him among his armies. I used to take when he gave me, go out to fight when he sent me to fight and I implemented the Hudood (prescribed punishments) in front of him with my whip. Then when he was killed, I examined my affair and found that the two Khalifahs who had taken it (the leadership) by the covenant of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, by the Salaah (prayer), had passed away and found that the one who had taken my covenant for it had been killed. So, give me the Bai’ah O people of the Haramaini (Two sacred Mosques) and O people of these two regions”].

**I say**: This also is from the Mursal narrations of Al-Hasan and we have previously spoken about it. However, the situation here is different because Al-Hasan bin Abi Al-Hasan Yasaar only arrived in Al-Basrah during the nights of As-Siffeen, when he was close to the age of maturity, coming from Wadi Al-Qura in Al-Hijaz. It is therefore certain that he did not witness the event of the Camel. Despite that, he lived in Al-Basrah throughout his life, with the exception of about ten years during which he was fighting in the East (he was present at the second conquest of Kabul in the year 44 AH and was then a transcriber for some of the rulers until approximately the year 52 AH). It is therefore very unlikely that he missed receiving (narrations) from Abu Nadrah and/or from Abu Abdullah Qais bin ‘Ubaad Al-Qaisiy Ad-Dab’iy Al-Basriy. He was Thiqah (reliable and trustworthy), an ‘Aabid (pious worshipper), honourable man, Mukhdaram (lived through the earliest generations), from the senior Taabi’een, who passed away in the year 80 AH. If only to assure from him the authenticity of this significant reported tradition, which, without doubt, had been circulated upon the tongues of the people, we say, whilst seeking assistance from Allah, that: This report is Muttasal (connected) Sahih (authentic) and indeed, in essence, it returns to the Tawatur (definite concurrent reports), and evidential proof is established by it.

- The following came stated in “Al-I’tiqaad” by Al-Baihaqiy (p: 371):

[Al-Imam Abu Tayyib Sahl bin Muhammad bin Sulaiman related to us, by dictation, from Abu Muhammad Abdullah bin Muhammad bin ‘Ali Ad-Daqqaq, from Abdullah bin Muhammad bin Abdur Rahman Al-Madeeniy, from Ishaq bin Ibrahim Al-Hanzhaliy, in his Musnad, from ‘Abdah bin Sulaiman, from Salim Al-Muraadiy Abu Al-‘Alaa’, who said: I heard Al-Hasan saying: When ‘Ali arrived in Al-Basrah on the tracks of Talhah and his companions, Abdullah bin Al-Kawwaa and Ibn ‘Abbaad approached him and said to him: “O Ameer ul-Mu’mineen, inform us about this path of yours. Is it an instruction that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ passed to you, or a covenant that was given to you, or an opinion that you viewed when the Ummah became divided and its word was differed upon?” He said: “I will not be first to lie against him. By Allah, the Messenger of Allah ﷺ did not die a sudden death and he was not killed. He remained in his sickness during all of which the Mu’adh’dhin (caller to prayer) would come to him and call the prayer. He would then say: “Command Abu Bakr to lead the people in the prayer”, and he left me whilst he saw my place. **And had he charged me with anything (of responsibility), I would have undertaken it. That was until one of his wives objected and said: “Abu Bakr is a delicate man. If he was to stand in your place (i.e. leading the prayer), he will not make the sound reach the people. If you were to command ‘Umar to lead the people in prayer …” He replied to her: Verily you are like the female companions of Yusuf”**. Then when the Messenger of Allah ﷺ was taken (in death), the Muslims examined their affair and found that the Messenger of Allah ﷺ had appointed Abu Bakr over the affair of their Deen, so they appointed him over the affair of their Dunya (worldly life). So, the Muslims gave him the Bai’ah (pledge over leadership) and I have the Bai’ah along with them. I used to go out to fight when he sent me to fight, I would take when he gave me and I was the whip before him in respect to the implementation of the Hudood (prescribed punishments). Had the matter been one of favouritism at the time of the approach of his death, he would have given it (i.e. leadership) to his son, but instead he **pointed towards ‘Umar** without hesitation. So, the Muslims gave him the Bai’ah (pledge over leadership) and I have the Bai’ah along with them. I used to go out to fight when he sent me to fight, I would take when he gave me and I was the whip before him in respect to the implementation of the Hudood (prescribed punishments). Had the matter been one of favouritism at the time of the approach of his death, he would have given it (i.e. leadership) to his son. He hated to appoint a man from among us, the Quraish, where he would appoint him to the affair of the Ummah and then there would be no bad act of the one who followed him, except that it would catch up with ‘Umar in his grave. So, instead, he chose six from us, from whom I was one, **to choose from them a man for the Ummah**. The, when we met, Abdur Rahman rushed and granted to us his share from it (the matter of leadership) upon the condition that we gave him our covenants that he would choose a man from the five and appoint him to the affair of the Ummah. So, we gave him our covenants and he then took the hand of ‘Uthman and gave him the Bai’ah. I found some objection within myself at that, then when I examined my affair, I found that my covenant had precedence over my Bai’ah, so I gave the Bai’ah and submitted. I used to go out to fight when he sent me to fight and I would take when he gave me. Then when ‘Uthman was killed, I examined my affair and found that the noose that was on my neck to Abu Bakr and ‘Umar had become undone and that I had faithfully fulfilled the covenant to ‘Uthman. I found that I was a man from among the Muslims, with nobody having a case against me or demand. Then someone, not equal to me, rushed to it (i.e. the leadership) (meaning Mu’awiyah), whose close relation was not like mine, his knowledge not like my knowledge, no precedence like mine, and I was more entitled to it than him”. They (Abdullah bin Al-Kawwaa and Ibn ‘Abbaad) said: “You have spoken the truth, so inform us about your reason for fighting these two men (meaning Talhah and Az-Zubair), your companions in the Hijrah, the Bai’ah of pleasure (i.e. under the tree at Hudaibiyah) and in the Shuraa”. He said: “**They gave me the Bai’ah in Al-Madinah and violated in Al-Basrah. Had a man from among those who had given the Bai’ah to Abu Bakr relinquished it, we would have fought against him, and had a man from among those who had given the Bai’ah to ‘Umar relinquished it, we would have fought against him**”].

- It was also reported in “Tareekh Dimashq” by Ibn ‘Asaakir (443/42) as follows: [Abu Abdullah Al-Faqeeh related to us from Abu Bakr Al-Baihaqiy … in its full length].

This is also apparently from the Mursal narrations of Al-Hasan and they are not Jayyid (of high quality), however it is Muttasal Sahih in this specific case and the definite evidential proof (Al-Hujjah Al-Qaati’ah) is established by it, as we have previously mentioned.

- Then Al-Baihaqiy said: [I heard the Sheikh Al-Imam Abu At-Tayyib Sahl bin Muhammad As-Su’lookiy and he was mentioning what this Hadith summarized in terms of the virtues of ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, his special and good qualities, the indications of his truthfulness, the strength of his Deen and the validity of his Bai’ah. he said: “From the most significant of these, is that he did not fail to mention what he felt inside from what Abdur Rahman did towards him, even if it was only a small mention, when he said: “I found some objection within myself at that”. And from that it is clear that had he felt any objection in respect to the matter of Abu Bakr and ‘Umar and differed with it in himself secretly or openly, he would have explicitly stated that or brought attention to it, just as he did in respect to what he had felt in relation to the action of Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf”].

- The Sheikh (Al-Baihaqiy himself) said: [**The reason for Talhah and Az-Zubair fighting ‘Ali is that some of the people perceived that ‘Ali was content with the killing of ‘Uthman. So, they went to ‘Aa’ishah, the Mother of the Believers, and encouraged her to go out to seeking the blood (i.e. justice) for ‘Uthman and to make peace between the people, due to ‘Ali’s inaction amongst them and those who had come to Al-Madinah in relation to the killing of ‘Uthman. Then Shaytan did his work among the two parties until they fought against each other**. Most of them then regretted what they had done and repented. ‘Aa’ishah was saying: “I wish that I had bereaved ten like the son of Al-Harith bin Hisham and that I had not undertaken the march that I did”. It has been related that she did not recall her march at all except that she cried until who veil was drenched and would say: “If only I had been completely forgotten”. It has been related that ‘Ali sent for Talhah on the day of the Camel. He came to him and (‘Ali) said: “I urge you for the sake of Allah, have you heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ saying: “**Whoever I am his Mawla (friend and supporter) then ‘Ali is also his Mawla. O Allah, take as friends those who take him as a friend, and take as enemies those who take him as an enemy**”. He replied: “Yes”. He said: “Then why do you fight against me?” He said: “I don’t remember”. He said: “Then depart from here Talhah”. It was then related that when he was speared, he gave the Bai’ah to a man from the followers of ‘Ali and then died. ‘Ali was informed of that and said: “Allahu Akbar, Allah and His Messenger speak the truth. Allah refused for him to enter Jannah (paradise) except and the Bai’ah to me was upon his neck”. It was also related that the news of the return of Az-Zubair bin Al-‘Awwam reached ‘Ali and that he said: “By Allah, he did not return due to cowardice but rather he returned sincerely repenting”. And when Jarmouz the killer of Az-Zubair came, he said: “May the killer of the son of Safiyah enter the fire. I heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ saying: Every Prophet has a Hawaariy (disciple) and my Hawaariy is Az-Zubair”].

**I say**: This speech is good as a whole, with the exception of his statement: [**The reason for Talhah and Az-Zubair fighting ‘Ali is that some of the people perceived that ‘Ali was content with the killing of ‘Uthman. So, they went to ‘Aa’ishah, the Mother of the Believers, and encouraged her to go out to seeking the blood (i.e. justice) for ‘Uthman and to make peace between the people, due to ‘Ali’s inaction amongst them and those who had come to Al-Madinah in relation to the killing of ‘Uthman. Then Shaytan did his work among the two parties until they fought against each other**]. This is speech with no basis, does not do justice to the historical realities, guesswork and reliance upon intentions which none but Allah know. However, this is not the place to critique it. Despite that, why was it deemed necessary to include these secondary historical issues into the books of Aqeedah. It is through this and what is similar that, by Allah, the easy and magnanimous Hanafi Aqeedah was distorted and harm was brought to the Ummah.

**In conclusion I say: It has been affirmed to me without the least of doubt:**

1) That ‘Ali, may the blessings of Allah be upon him, believed that he was the most entitled of the people for the Khilafah and remained upon that position until he was martyred. That is due to considerations which he mentioned in many places and his denial of the existence of any text or covenant (i.e. concerning the person of leadership) from the final Prophet of Allah ﷺ , whilst affirming that had there been (such a covenant or text), he would have fought to implement it: [**And had there been a covenant from the Prophet ﷺ in respect to that: I would not have left the brother of Taim bin Murrah (i.e. Abu Bakr) and ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab to both stand upon his Minbar and I would have fought them by my hands and even if I had nothing apart from this garment (I am wearing)**].

2) Consequently, he affirmed the legal legitimacy of the Khilafah of Abu Bakr, ‘Umar and ‘Uthman, and the obligation to fight the one who violates the Bai’ah or renounce it from any of them. His Madh’hab (Shar’iy view) is therefore the validity of the Imamah (leadership) of the one who is not preferred, whilst the preferred is present. Therefore, there is no meaning to the defective study, which has no benefit, concerning the validity of the belief of ‘Ali, may the blessings of Allah be upon him, in respect to his priority to the Khilafah over other than him.

3) That Talhah, Az-Zubair and those who followed them from the people of the “Camel”, were violators of the Bai’ah, acting criminally and deserving to be fought against, whilst this act of theirs was **a heinous betrayal**. However, Talhah and Az-Zubair repented, due to what had preceded for them from Allah, in terms of paradise and forgiveness granted to the participants of (the battle of) Badr and the forerunners from the Muhajirin and Ansar, a promise that is not broken. In addition, they were killed in a treacherously in a manner that expiates the sins. Az-Zubair was killed by Ibn Jarmouz whilst he was performing the prayer following his departure by some miles from the field of battle in a state of repentance. And Talhah was killed whilst he was leaving the field of battle by Marwan bin Al-Hakam bin Al-‘Aas, may the curse of Allah be upon them both.

4) That the statement of the Prophet ﷺ:

مَنْ كُنْتُ مَوْلَاهُ فَعَلِيٌّ مَوْلَاهُ اللَّهُمَّ وَالِ مَنْ وَالَاهُ وَعَادِ مَنْ عَادَاهُ

“**Whoever I am his Mawla (friend and supporter) then ‘Ali is also his Mawla. O Allah, take as friends those who take him as a friend, and take as enemies those who take him as an enemy**”, which was heard by thousands and related by hundreds, to the point that it was transmitted to us by way of Tawatur (definite concurrent reports), establishing definiteness and certainty, has absolutely no relationship to the matter of the Khilafah, Imaarah, Sultan or position of head of state, contrary to the view of the dim witted Saba’iyah Rawaafid, foreigners of the language and heart. It rather relates to support and affection, hatred and animosity, war and peace. This is what the majority (if not all) of those who heard it understood and they were Arabs of pure tongue. In addition, the Prophet of Allah ﷺ, who was from the purest of Arabs in tongue, was not incapable of saying: “And he is the Khalifah after me”. That is whilst Allah تعالى inspired His Prophet after that and after the descent of the Qur’an, by more than two months, of the Aayah related to the “Perfection of the Deen and completion of the blessing” (Al-Ma’idah: 3), to command Abu Bakr to lead the people in prayer and to insist upon that decision despite the objection of some of his wives to that, whilst saying: “**Allah and the believers refuse other than Abu Bakr**” and expressing his anger towards them, saying to them in the form of a reprimand “**You are like the female companions of Yusuf: Command Abu Bakr to lead the people in prayer!**”. Consequently, any Shubhah (doubt) or misunderstanding is falsified in respect to his statement ﷺ:

مَنْ كُنْتُ مَوْلَاهُ فَعَلِيٌّ مَوْلَاهُ اللَّهُمَّ وَالِ مَنْ وَالَاهُ وَعَادِ مَنْ عَادَاهُ

**Whoever I am his Mawla (friend and supporter) then ‘Ali is also his Mawla. O Allah, take as friends those who take him as a friend, and take as enemies those who take him as an enemy.**

That is because had this been a text establishing the Khilafah for ‘Ali, may Allah’s pleasure and blessings be upon him, none except him would have been permitted to lead the people in the prayer. The Imaamah (leadership) of the prayer in the Prophetic Masjid, in which none except the Prophet ﷺ led the people in prayer, in his quality as the head of state and ruler of Al-Madinah, or the one whom the Prophet ﷺ appointed over Al-Madinah with that description of being a ruler, is an Imaamah (leadership) of the Salah by a specific description, like that which has been indicated to in the Hadith:

لاَ يَؤُمُّ الرَّجُلُ فِي سُلْطَانِهِ إِلَّا بِإِذْنِهِ

A man should not lead another man in prayer in his **Sultan (authority/domain)**, except with his permission.

It was not because Abu Bakr was the most versed of them in the Book of Allah as that status belonged to Ubayy bin Ka’b, ‘Ali bin Abi Talib, a small group from the Ansar and perhaps Abdullah bin Mas’ud, may the pleasure and peace of Allah be upon them all, without contest.

In addition, it has not been reported from ‘Ali, may the blessings of Allah be upon him, that he presented this as an argument **except in the situation of confronting those who were hostile and warring against him**. That was like his presentation of an evidential argument to Talhah bin Ubaidullah in this situation here as presented above: “I urge you for the sake of Allah, have you heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ saying: “**Whoever I am his Mawla (friend and supporter) then ‘Ali is also his Mawla. O Allah, take as friends those who take him as a friend, and take as enemies those who take him as an enemy**”. He replied: “Yes”. He said: “Then why do you fight against me?” He said: “I don’t remember”. He said: “Then depart from here Talhah”. It was then related that when he was speared, he gave the Bai’ah to a man from the followers of ‘Ali and then died. ‘Ali was informed of that and said: “Allahu Akbar, Allah and His Messenger speak the truth. Allah refused for him to enter Jannah (paradise) except and the Bai’ah to me was upon his neck”. It is also like his famous adjuration at “Ar-Rahbah” when exposing the true reality of the underhanded Munafiq (hypocrite) Mu’awiyah bin Abi Sufyan and the rest of the hypocrites from the leaders of the rebellious faction, that they were accursed criminals and enemies of Allah and His Messenger. That they were not people of an Ijtihad (legitimate differing opinion) nor did they have any excuse in respect to interpretation. Rather, it was a belief-based hypocrisy, hatred and war against Islam and its adherents, in general and against ‘Ali bin Abi Talib and his household (family), in particular.

5) That the mention of ‘Ali bin Abi Talib, may the pleasure and peace of Allah be upon him, whilst upon the Minbar of Kufa, of the covenant of the Prophet ﷺ to him, that “**The Ummah will betray him**” is a truth and truthfulness, which is applicable to the “**people of the Camel**” (the treachery of which has been previously mentioned) and to the “**people of Ash-Shaam (Greater Syria)**” due to their casting off of the Bai’ah which had been obligatory upon them and which had been contracted upon their necks due to the Bai’ah of the majority of the Muslims (apart from those of Ash-Shaam), especially the Bai’ah of the leaders of the Muslims from those who had attended Badr and the forerunners of the Muhajirin and the Ansar in Al-Madinah An-Nabawiyah Ash-Shareefah, the capital of the Khilafah. They then added to the betrayal by rebellion and engagement in fighting and it also applies to the arbitrating renegade Khawarij who stabbed in the back, declared him to be a disbeliever and fought against him. They preoccupied him from fighting the rebelling faction, and to a limited extent, it applies to “**most of his soldiers**” who let him down and fell short in respect to supporting him, to the point that he came to wish for death. There has not been related from him (‘Ali) at all, not in a Sahih, Da’if (weak) or fabricated report, that he mentioned that during the days of the Saqeefah in Al-Madinah. We do not find anything of that even within the fabricated and invented narrations of the Saba’iyah Rawafid. That is whilst it reflects Riddah (apostacy) from Islam, according to their claim. We will present a collection of these narrations which came related to that; that “**The Ummah will betray him**” in the forthcoming supplemental section, by Allah’s permission.

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

**- Supplemental section**: **“Verily the Ummah will betray you after me”:**

- The following came in “Al-Mustadrak ‘Ala s-Sahihaini”, by Al-Hakim (3/153/4686) and “Al-Mustadrak ‘Ala s-Sahihaini with the commentary of Adh-Dhahabiy” (4/241/4686, in the Electronic Shamela Library):

[From **Hayyaan Al-Asadiy**: I heard ‘Ali saying: The Messenger of Allah ﷺ said to me: “**Verily, the Ummah will betray you after me**, whilst you are living upon my Millah (Deen) and fight upon my Sunnah those who loved you and loved me and those who hate you and hate me. And verily this will become tinged (or green) from this, meaning his beard from his head”. Al-Hakim said: [(The narration) is Sahih], like this, without mentioning the Isnad and the commentator of the Mustadrak only related it from the copy (transcript) of the “Talkhees” of Adh-Dhahabiy, who was of the same opinion as Al-Hakim, stating: [(The narration) is Sahih].

Al-Albaniy, driven by the loathsome Wahabiy Nasibiy mentality, doubted its very existence in the Mustadrak of Al-Hakim, and evaded authenticating the Hadith due to the absence of an Isnad that can be studied. **However, Allah left him in the lurch**:

- That is because the following came recorded in “It’haaf ul-Maharah” by Ibn Hajar (11/296/540):

[“From the Musnad of the Ameer ul-Mu’mineen (Leader of the Believers) Abu Al-Hasan ‘Ali bin Abi Talib Al-Haashimiy and from his Aathaar (narrated reports)” – Abaan Al-Asadiy, from ‘Ali.

14043 – Hadith “**Kam**”: “**Verily, the Ummah will betray you after me**” … to the end of the Hadith.

**Just as it came (mentioned) in “Al-Manaaqib”**: Abu ‘Ali Al-Hafizh related to us from Al-Haitham bin Khalaf, from Muhammad bin ‘Umar bin Hayyaaj, from Yahya bin Abdur Rahman, from Yunus bin Abi Ya’qour, from his father, from him (meaning Abaan Al-Asadiy), from ‘Ali (who related it)].

**I say**: Here is the **Sahih** Isnad in full, from the official (or relied upon) heard transcript of Al-Mustadrak which was in the possession of Al-Hafizh (Ibn Hajar). There was a slip of the pen with (the name of) Hayyaan, which (incorrectly) became Abaan. This is corroborated by the fact that there was no Abaan Al-Asadiy at all who related from ‘Ali or was present amongst that generation.

As for Hayyaan Al-Asadiy, then he is: Hayyaan bin Husain, Abu Al-Hayyaaj Al-Asadiy Al-Kufi, the father of Mansur bin Hayyaan and Jareer bin Hayyaan. He is a well-known **Thiqah** (trustworthy and reliable narrator). He was appointed over the law enforcement of ‘Ali bin Abi Talib, may the pleasure and peace of Allah be upon him, from the Wustaa (middle) of the Taabi’een (Third generation following that of the Sahabah and senior (or first) Taabi’een). He heard (i.e. received narrations) from: ‘Ali and ‘Ammar, whilst Abu Wa’il, ‘Aamir Ash-Sha’biy and his son Jareer related from him. From the six the following Imams related from him: Muslim, An-Nasa’iy and Abu Dawud, among others.

Consequently, the Isnad is upright (sound and solid) and the Matn (textual content) is upright in conformity with numerous transmitted reports. The Hadith is therefore **Sahih** in full. It is from the amazing signs of the Prophethood and from the evident virtues of the Imam of guidance ‘Ali bin Abi Talib.

- A second Hadith from Abu Idrees Al-Awdiy came recorded in “Al-Mustadrak ‘Ala s-Sahihaini” with the commentary of Adh-Dhahabi in “At-Talkhees” (4/237/4676, in the Electronic Shamela Library) and in “Al-Mustadrak” (5/194):

[Abu Hafs ‘Umar bin Ahmad Al-Jumahiy related to us in Makkah, from ‘Ali bin Abdul ‘Aziz, from ‘Amr bin ‘Awn, from Hushaim, from Isma’eel bin Salim, from Abu Idrees Al-Awdiy, from ‘Ali bin Abi Talib, may Allah be pleased with him, who said: From that which the Prophet ﷺ promised me, was **that the Ummah will betray me after him**]. Then Imam Abu Abdullah Al-Hakim said: [This Hadith is Sahih but they (the two Sheikhs) did not record it]. Adh-Dhahabiy said in “At-Takhlees”: [(It is) Sahih)]. I said: It is Sahih, as they have said, and we will elaborate upon that with detail and proof soon, by Allah’s permission.

- It also came reported in the Musnad of Al-Harith: “Bughyat ul-Baahith ‘An Zawaa’id Musnad Al-Harith” (2/905/984) and “Musnad Al-Harith” (4/57/971), in the Electronic Shamela Library):

[Abdur Rahman bin Ziyad, the Mawla of Bani Hashim, related to us from Hushaim, from Isma’eel bin Salim, from Abu Idrees Al-Awdiy, from ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, who said: The Messenger of Allah ﷺ said: “Verily, this Ummah will betray you after me”].

- It also came mentioned in “Dalaa’il An-Nubuwah” by Al-Baihaqiy (verified version) (6/440):

[Abu ‘Ali Ar-Roudhbaariy informed us of it from Abu Muhammad bin Shawdhab Al-Waasitiy: Shu’aib bin Ayyub related to us from ‘Amr bin ‘Awn, from Hushaim, from Isma’eel bin Salim, from Abu Idrees Al-Azdiy, from ‘Ali, who said: “From that which the Messenger of Allah ﷺ promised me, was that the Ummah will betray you after me]. **I say**: Al-Azdiy is most likely a mistake in transcription which is also found in many other places. The correct view is only that it is Al-Awdiy.

- It came mentioned in “Al-Mataalib Al-‘Aaliyah Bi-Zawaa’id Al-Masaaneed Ath-Thamaaniyah” (4/102/3920):

[Al-Harith said: Abdur Rahman bin Ziyad Mawla Bani Hashim related to us from Hushaim, from Isma’eel bin Salim, from Abu Idrees Al-Awdiy, from ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, who said: The Messenger of Allah ﷺ said: “Verily, this Ummah will betray you after me”, as related by Al-Bazzaar and Ibn Maajah]. **I say**: It is not present in the transcript of Ibn Maajah that is available to us.

- It came recorded in “It’haaf ul-Maharah” by Ibn Hajar (11/666/148836):

[Hadith “Kam”: The Prophet ﷺ promised me that the Ummah will betray me after him.

Just as it came in Al-Manaaqib: ‘Umar bin Ahmad Al-Jumahiy related to us in Makkah, from ‘Ali bin Abdul ‘Aziz, from ‘Amr bin ‘Awn, from Hushaim, from Isma’eel bin Salim, from him: With this (Hadith)].

- It came as well in “Al-Kunaa Wa l-Asmaa’”, by Ad-Dawlabiy (1/318/563) and (2/442/441 in the Electronic Shamela library) as follows:

[Yahya bin Ghailan related to us from Abu ‘Awaanah, from Isma’eel bin Salim … (And) Fahid bin ‘Awf related it to us from Abu ‘Awaanah, from Isma’eel bin Salim, from Abu Idrees Ibrahim bin Abi Hadid Al-Awdiy: That ‘Ali bin Abi Talib said: The Prophet ﷺ promised me that the Ummah will betray me after him].

**I say**: It is **Sahih** as they both said and there is no fear from the Tadlees (manipulation) by Imam Hushaim bin Bushair as the explicit statement of Hushaim in respect to hearing from Isma’eel bin Salim came in “At-Tareekh Al-Kabir” by Al-Bukhari, just as the report has been related by other than him from among the Thiqaat (reliable and trustworthy narrators) like Abu ‘Awaanah, as has just been presented.

As for Abu Idrees Al-Awdiy (in the case where some miswrote Al-Azdiy), then the most correct view here is that he is: Ibrahim bin Abi Hadid (and perhaps it has been said: Ibrahim bin Hadid or Ibrahim bin Abi Hadidah”. That he is Kufi (from Al-Kufa), from the companions of ‘Ali bin Abi Talib, may the pleasure and peace of Allah be upon him, from the generation of the Kibaar or Awsaat of the Taabi’een (i.e. first or second generation). He is not Abu Idrees Yazid bin Abdur Rahman Al-Awdiy, the grandfather of Al-Hafizh Al-Hujjah Abdullah bin Idrees, who is from the same generation, albeit slightly later, and it is likely that he is Madaniy who moved to Al-Kufa. The similarity of the Kunya (name) and generation has led to the mixing of the speech from the two men by most of the collectors of Hadith:

- The following came stated in “Al-Kunaa Wa l-Asmaa’”, by Ad-Dawlabiy (2/44/17681 in the Electronic Shamela library):

[Abu ‘Aamir Musa bin ‘Aamir related to us from Al-Walid bin Muslim, from Ibn Jabir, from Abu Idrees Abdur Rahman bin ‘Iraak, who said: “If a man finds himself in an uninhabited (or uncultivated) land and is afflicted by a famine, and then says: “O Allah, give me my Rizq (sustenance) that you have decreed for me”, then Allah will bring to him his Rizq (sustenance)”. Al-‘Abbas bin Muhammad related to us. He said: I heard Yahya bin Ma’een saying: Abu Idrees Ibrahim bin Abi Hadid, so I asked him: “Is he the one whom Isma’eel bin Salim related from?” He said: “Yes”. In another place he said: I heard Yahya saying: “Abu Idrees Al-Awdiy Ibrahim bin Abi Hadid”].

- The following came mentioned in “Su’aalaat Al-Aajiriy (1/213/212):

[I asked Abu Dawud about Abu Idrees Al-Awdiy, if he was from the companions of ‘Ali. He said: His name is: Ibrahim bin Abi Hadid].

- And the following came mentioned in “Al-Kuna Wa l-Asmaa’”, by Muslim (24/10/3150):

[Abu Al-Mundhir Asad bin ‘Amr Al-Bujaliy, Sahib Ra’y (the one possessing the opinion), heard from Ibrahim bin Hadid].

- The following came recorded in “At-Tareekh Al-Kabir”, of Al-Bukhari (with the commentary of Mahmud Khalil (1/282/908)):

[Ibrahim bin Hadid, Abu Idrees Al-Awdiy. Hamid bin ‘Umar related it to me from Abu ‘Awaanah, from Isma’eel bin Salim. He is considered to people from the people of AL-Kufa. He conveyed it from ‘Ali. And it is said (i.e. concerning his name): Ibrahim bin Abi Hadid. Ibn Zuraarah said to me: Hushaim informed us, he said: Isma’eel bin Salim **related to us** from Abu Idrees: I looked towards ‘Ali]. **I say**: Al-Bukhari shortened the Hadith, sufficing himself with its beginning. It may well have been: “I looked towards ‘Ali whilst he was upon the Minbar and was saying: The Prophet ﷺ promised me that the Ummah will betray me after him” or something like that.

- However, the following came stated in “Lisan Al-Mizan” (1/46/98): [Ibrahim bin Hadidah and it has been said Bin Abi Hadid. Al-Bukhari said, he had the Kunya of Abu Idrees and was considered to be from the people of Al-Kufa. Abu Hatim said he is Majhool (unknown). This is what the compiler mentioned in Al-Mughniy although I have not seen it within the book of Ibn Abi Hatim itself. He may have mentioned it in another place. And it is like it was from another transcript as I have seen it by the transcription of someone I trust from Al-Muntaqaa from the book of Ibn Abi Hatim by the transcription of Ibn Al-Jawziy. It may be that he meant that his status (or condition) was unknown as he has been mentioned in relation to the transmitters who related from him Al-Hasan bin Ubaidullah, Isma’eel bin Salim and other than them. Ibn Hibban also mentioned him among the Thiqaat (trustworthy and reliable narrators)].

**I say**: Yes, indeed he is in the book of Ibn Abu Hatim and he had speculated, as is his custom, with the claim of it being Mursal from ‘Ali and (thereby) said: Majhool (unknown), meaning in terms of status (or condition). Both of these matters are speculation that are not to be relied upon. That is because those who knew him, (including) Al-Bukhari, Yahya bin Ma’een, Muslim and Abu Dawud, did not speak about him with criticism or in terms of classifying him as weak (Da’if). In addition, Isma’eel bin Salim related from him and he is Thiqah Thabat (Trustworthy and reliable), just as Al-Hasan bin Ubaidullah bin ‘Urwah An-Nakha’iy, who was a virtuous Thiqah Faqeeh related from him, and perhaps other than them. His status is therefore clearly good and Ibn Hibban, rightfully, mentioned him in the book of trustworthy and reliable transmitters (Thiqaat). Consequently, the Isnad (chain of transmission) is Sahih without doubt and there is no evidential proof for the one who declares it to be weak. Rather, it is only the result of Wahabi Nasabiy desires and factional Madh’hab malice.

Therefore, Al-Hakim and Adh-Dhahabi, were correct when they authenticated this Hadith to be Sahih, due to the authenticity of its Isnad and integrity of its Matn (textual content). Perhaps, some of the people objected believing that the two Imams only authenticated the Hadith due to their belief that the mentioned Abu Idrees here was Yazid bin Abdur Rahman Al-Awdiy. I say: This does not change anything as our person here Abu Idrees Ibrahim bin Abi Hadid Al-Awdiy is not of a lower status to Abu Idrees Yazid bin Abdur Rahman Al-Awdiy, indeed he may even be higher than him.

- A third Hadith came in the verified (Muhaqqaq) version of “Dalaa’il An-Nubuwah” of Al-Baihaqiy (6/440), the extracted (Makhraj) version (6/440) and “Dalaa’il An-Nubuwah” of Al-Baihaqiy (7/312/2759, the Electronic Shamela Library) as related by Tha’labah bin Yazid As-Sa’diy Al-Himmaaniy:

[Abu Bakr Ahmad bin Al-Hasan Al-Qaadiy informed us from Abu Ja’far bin Duhaim, from Ahmad bin Hazim bin Abi Gharazah, from Ubaidullah, Abu Nu’aim and Thabit bin Muhammad, from Fitr bin Khalifah. He said: And Ahmad bin Hazim related to us, from Ubaidullah, from Abdul ‘Aziz bin Siyaah, both of whom said: From Habib bin Abi Thabit, from Tha’labah Al-Himmaaniy, who said: I heard ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, upon the Minbar and he was saying: “By Allah, it is a promise of the Prophet ﷺ to me, that the Ummah will betray you after his death]. Then Al-Baihaqiy said: [The Lafzh (wording) is the Hadith of Fitr. Al-Bukhari said: Tha’labah bin Yazid Al-Himmaaniy is open to examination and there is no corroboration in respect to this Hadith of his. I say: This is what Al-Bukhari said. And it has been related to us by another Isnad from ‘Ali, if it was preserved: [Abu ‘Ali Ar-Roudhbaariy informed us of it from Abu Muhammad bin Shawdhab Al-Waasitiy: Shu’aib bin Ayyub related to us from ‘Amr bin ‘Awn, from Hushaim, from Isma’eel bin Salim, from Abu Idrees Al-Awdiy, from ‘Ali, who said: “Verily, from that which the Messenger of Allah ﷺ promised me, was that the Ummah will betray you after me”]. If this is Sahih (authentic), then the intended meaning of it, and Allah is most knowledgeable, relates to the rebellion of those who rebelled against him in respect to his leadership and then in relation to his killing].

**I say**: The great esteem Imam Al-Baihaqiy had for Al-Bukhari prevented him from pointing out the error of Al-Bukhari here, as we will shortly see, by Allah’s permission.

- It is found in the Hadith of Ibn Mulaa’ib (Ahmad bin Mulaa’ib Abu Al-Fadl Al-Baghdadiy Al-Mukharrimiy) who passed away in the year 275 AH. It was published in the free “Jawaami’ Al-Kalim” program of the Islamweb site (p: 0/4):

[Ahmad related to us from Thabit, from Fitr bin Khalifah, from Habib bin Abi Thabit, from Tha’labah bin Yazid Al-Himmaaniy, who said: I heard ‘Ali saying: The promise of the Prophet ﷺ to me was sufficient “That the Ummah will betray you after me”].

- And it is found in “Al-Mu’jam” of Abdul Khaliq bin Asad Al-Hanafiy (p: 387/409):

[Al-Mubarak bin Hibbatullah informed us from ‘Ali bin Muhammad Al-Khatib, from Abu ‘Umar bin Mahdiy: Muhammad bin ‘Amr related to us from Ahmad bin Mulaa’ib, from Thabit, from Fitr bin Khalifah, from Habib bin Abi Thabit, from Tha’labah bin Yazid Al-Himmaaniy: I heard ‘Ali saying: “There is in the covenant (or promise) of the Nabi Al-Ummiy (in respect to me) that the Ummah will betray you after me”].

- It came mentioned in “Al-Mataalib Al-‘Aaliyah Bi-Zawaa’id Al-Masaaneed Ath-Thamaaniyah” (4/102/3919):

[(Abu Bakr said): Al-Fadl, he is Abu Nu’aim, related to us from Fitr bin Khalifah: Habib bin Abi Thabit informed me, he said: **I heard** Tha’labah bin Yazid, he said: I heard ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, saying: “By Allah, it is a covenant (or promise) of the Nabi Al-Ummiy ﷺ: They will betray you after me”].

- And it came as follows in “Al-Amaaliy” of Sheikh At-Tousiy (1/493):

[A Jamaa’ah (group) informed us from Abu Al-Mufaddal, who said: Musaddad bin Ya’qub bin Ishaq bin Yazid Al-Qalousiy Al-Basriy, the Qaadi of Tinees related to us, from Ishaq bin Sayyaar An-Naseebiy, who said: Abu Nu’aim Al-Fadl bin Dukain, who said: Fitr bin Khalifah related to us, he said: Habib bin Abi Thabit informed us, he said: I heard Tha’labah bin Yazid Al-Himmaaniy, he said: I heard ‘Ali, may the blessings of Allah be upon him, he said: “By Allah, it is an ‘Ahd (covenant/promise) that the Nabi Al-Ummiy made to me, that the Ummah will betray you after me”].

**I say**: There is therefore no fear in terms of the Tadlees (manipulation) of Habib bin Abi Thabit as he expressed explicitly that he heard from Tha’labah bin Yazid, whilst there is no doubt in respect to Tha’labah having heard from ‘Ali.

- And it came stated in the Musnad of Al-Bazzar (Fully from 1-14 indexed (9/137/14783)):

[Harun bin Sufyan related to us from ‘Ali bin Qaadim, from Shareek, from Ajlaha, from Habib bin Abi Thabit, from Tha’labah bin Yazid, from his father … He said it like this, whilst I believe it was only him from ‘Ali. He said: I heard ‘Ali saying upon the Minbar (pulpit): “By Allah, it was the ‘Ahd (covenant or promise) of the Nabi Al-Ummiy to me, that the Ummah will betray me”]. Then Al-Bazzar said: [This Hadith has been related by more than one, from Habib, from Tha’labah, from ‘Ali: Fitr bin Khalifah, and other than him].

- It also came in “Majma’ Az-Zawaa’id and Man’ba’ Al-Fawaa’id” (9/137/14783):

[From Tha’labah: That he (i.e. ‘Ali) said upon the Minbar: “By Allah, it was the ‘Ahd (covenant or promise) of the Nabi Al-Ummiy ﷺ to me, that the Ummah will betray me”]. Then Al-Haithani said: [Al-Bazzar related it and it contains ‘Ali bin Qaadim who has been declared (both) reliable and Da’if (weak)].

**I say:**

**Firstly**: ‘Ali bin Qaadim Al-Khuzaa’iy Al-kufi, is Thiqah (reliable and trustworthy) who was affiliated to Shi’ism. The speech of Ibn Sa’d in “At-Tabaqaat Al-Kubraa” (Dar Sadir Edition 6/404): [‘Ali bin Qaadim, whose Kunya is Abu Al-Hasan, passed away in Al-Kufa in the year 213 AH during the Khilafah of Al-Ma’mun. He was Mumtani’ (interdicted or elusive), Munkar Al-Hadith (i.e. they were rejected) and intense in his affiliation to Shi’ism] was only due to the affiliation to Shi’ism. And what has been said in respect to Abu Zakariya Yahya bin Ma’een classifying him as being Da’if (weak), then that is not affirmed because it is from that which Ad-Doulabiy (Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Hayyaan) was alone in stating, whilst he has been accused of lying and fabricating against the Shi’ah and the followers of Ar-Ra’y; the followers of Abu Hanifah.

**And secondly**: This is a corroboration of the highest level of quality from Al-Ajlaha bin Abdullah, Abu Hujjiyah Al-Kindi Al-Kufi, to Fitr bin Khalifah. Al-Ajlaha is a well-known Thiqah (reliable and trustworthy narrator). He is not a lower status than Fitr, indeed, he may be above him (in status).

- However, the following came stated in “Ad-Du’afaa’ Al-Kabir” by Al-Uqailiy (1/178/224):

[(Tha’labah bin Yazid Al-Himmaaniy): Aadam related to me, he said: I heard Al-Bukhari, he said: Tha’labah bin Yazid Al-Himmaaniy (related) from ‘Ali. Al-Bukhari said: “He is not corroborated, there are question marks (i.e. require examination) concerning his Hadith”. And the Hadith which Muhammad bin Isma’eel related to us, he said: Qabeedah related to us from Kamil Abu Al-‘Alaa’, from Habib bin Abi Thabit, from Tha’labah bin Yazid Al-Himmaaniy, from ‘Ali: “The Prophet ﷺ gave me an ‘Ahd (covenant or promise): That this Ummah will betray me”].

**I say**:

**Firstly**: Concerning the statement of Al-Bukhari “There are question marks **concerning his Hadith** (i.e. require examination)” is based upon the absence of corroboration in respect to the Hadith which is the subject of examination, in accordance with the knowledge of Al-Bukhari, or due to doubt concerning his hearing it (directly) from ‘Ali, or due to both of these factors. All of that however is invalid: That is as we have already presented the corroborations of Hayyaan bin Husain Al-Asadiy and Abu Idrees Ibrahim Abi Hadid Al-Awdiy, just as the explicit statement of Tha’labah has come in relation to his hearing it (directly) from ‘Ali. All of that was missed by Al-Bukhari and Glorified be the One who has encompassed all knowledge.

Abu Ahmad bin ‘Adiy understood the speech of Al-Bukhari to be related to the issue of hearing directly only, in the case where he said in “Al-Kaamil Fee Ad-Du’afaa” (2/109/325):

[(Concerning Tha’labah bin Yazid Al-Himmaaniy): I heard Ibn Hammad saying: Al-Bukhari said: “Tha’labah bin Yazid Al-Himmaaniy heard from ‘Ali. Habib bin Abi Thabit related from him. There are question marks in relation to it (i.e. requires examination)” and his Hadith is not corroborated”. Ahmad bin Al-Husain bin Abdus Samad related to us from Sa’id Al-Ashajj, from Al-Ajlaha, from Al-A’amash, from Habib bin Abi Thabit, from Tha’labah bin Yazid Al-Himmaaniy, from ‘Ali, from the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, that he said: “Whosoever lies about me deliberately, then let him take his seat from the hellfire”. The Sheikh said: And Tha’labah has (also) related other than this from ‘Ali and **I have not seen from him a Munkar (rejectable) Hadith in relation to what he has narrated**. And as for his hearing (directly) from ‘Ali, then this has question marks (i.e. require examination) as stated by Al-Bukhari].

It may be that Abu Hatim Ar-Raaziy was alert to what Al-Bukhari missed as he stated in his “Al-Jarh Wa t-Ta’deel” (10/464/1877):

[Tha’labah bin Yazid Al-Himmaaniy related from ‘Ali bin Abi Talib, may Allah be pleased with him. Habib bin Abi Thabit and Salamah bin Kuhail related from him. I heard my father saying that]. He did not mention that it was Mursal nor the absence of hearing (directly), despite his well-known excessive rashness in respect to passing judgement upon the lack of (direct) hearing. This is what we find reinforced in “At-Tabaqaat Al-Kubraa” of Ibn Sa’d (5/119):

[Tha’labah bin Yazid Al-Himmaaniy, from Bani Tamim, related from ‘Ali bin Abi Talib and did not relate many Hadith]. He did not say anything beyond that.

**Secondly**: The path of Al-‘Uqailiy has provided us with a good second corroboration from Kamil Abi Al-‘Alaa’ to Fitr bin Khalifah.

As for Tha’labah bin Yazid Al-Himmaaniy, then he is **Thiqah** (trustworthy and reliable). Therefore, the speech of Al-Bukhari here is not relied upon as has been demonstrated, just as the speech of Adh-Dhahabiy is not relied upon:

- That is as the following came in “Mizan Al-I’tidaal” of Adh-Dhahabi (1/306/1391):

[Tha’labah bin Yazid Al-Himmaaniy was a law enforcer of ‘Ali’s, an excessive Shi’ah. Al-Bukhari said: There are question marks concerning his Hadith (i.e. require examination)”. He related: The Prophet ﷺ said: “The Ummah will betray you”. Habib bin Abi Thabit related from him. He is not corroborated. An-Nasa’iy said: “Thiqah” (trustworthy and reliable). Ibn ‘Adiy said: “I have not seen from him a Munkar (rejectable) Hadith”].

**I say**: The speech of Al-Bukhari has already been established to be false. As for the corroborations, then Adh-Dhahabiy himself verified two of them in the Mustadrak of Al-Hakim. It may be that he forgot. Otherwise, it is a heinous treachery. I don’t know from where Adh-Dhahabi came up with “an **excessive** Shi’ah?!” That is because I have not found in all of his narrations that which alludes to Shi’ism, let alone excessiveness. It may be that he relied upon what Ibn Al-Jawziy mentioned from Ibn Hibban, when he said: [And he was responsible for the law enforcement of ‘Ali and was most likely connected to Shi’ism. His narrated reports are not used as evidential proof if he is alone in reporting them from ‘Ali].

- The following came stated in “Al-Majrooheen” of Ibn Hibban (1/207/170):

[Tha’labah bin Yazid Al-Himmaaniy is from the people of Al-Kufa. He related from ‘Ali and Habib bin Abi Thabit related form him. He was excessive in Shi’ism. His narrated reports which he is alone in reporting from ‘Ali are not used as evidential proof]. It does not contain anything about him being responsible for the law enforcement of ‘Ali. As such, it may be that Ibn Al-Jawziy took it from another source. Had he actually been that, then his hearing from ‘Ali would be more confirmed and reliable!

In any case, Ibn Hibban realised his error and revised his view of him in his “Thiqaat” (3/27/1995):

[Tha’labah bin Yazid Al-Kufi related from ‘Ali. Habib bin Abi Thabit related from him]. That is whilst it is known that he compiled “Al-Majrroheen” first, then compiled his “Thiqaat” and crowned his biographical works with “Mashaaheer ‘Ulamaa’ Al-Amsaar”.

Al-Hafizh (Ibn Hajar) was initially indecisive in his “Tahdheeb At-Tahdheeb” (1/17/42):

[Concerning the Musnad of ‘Ali): Tha’labah bin Yazid Al-Himmaaniy Al-Kufi related from ‘Ali and Habib bin Abi Thabit, Salamah bin Kuhail and Al-Hakam bin ‘Utaibah related from him. It has been said from Al-Hakam from Tha’labah bin Yazid bin Tha’labah or Yazeed with doubt. Al-Bukhari said: “His Hadith have question marks (i.e. require examination) and he has no corroboration in his Hadith”. An-Nasa’i said: “Thiqah” (trustworthy and reliable). I said: Ibn ‘Adiy said: “I have not seen a Munkar (rejectable) Hadith in accordance with what he has related”. Ibn Hibban said: “He was responsible over the law enforcement of ‘Ali and was most likely connected to Shi’ism. His narrated reports are not used as evidential proof if he is alone in reporting them from ‘Ali]. This is what has been related from Ibn Al-Jawziy and he mentioned him among the Thiqaat (trusted and reliable narrators) in his narration from ‘Ali and the narration of Habib bin Abi Thabit from him: **And so, the matter is to be examined!**].

Al-Hafizh, may Allah have mercy upon him, then examined the issue and arrived, with the Tawfiq of Allah, to the final conclusion, when he stated in “At-Taqreeb”; “Taqreeb At-Tahdheeb” by Ibn Hajar Al-Asqalaniy (1/147/849):

[Tha’labah bin Yazid Al-Himmaaniy, (with a Kasrah of the first letter and a Shaddah on the Meem), is Kufi **Sadooq** (truthful), a Shi’ah from the third generation].

However, Doctor ‘Awwaad Ma’ruf and Sheikh Shu’aib Al-Arna’ut rejected that and stated in “Tahreer Taqreeb At-Tahdheeb” (1/200/847):

[(Concerning Ibn Hajr’s statement) “Tha’labah bin Yazid Al-Himmaaniy, (with a Kasrah of the first letter and a Shaddah on the Meem), is Kufi Sadooq (truthful), a Shi’ah from the third generation”.

Rather, he is Da’if (weak. That is as Al-Bukhari said: “His Hadith are to be examined (probed) and he is not corroborated in his Hadith”. And Ibn Hibban said in his “Al-Majrooheen”: “He was excessive in Shi’ism. His narrated reports which he is alone in reporting from ‘Ali are not used as evidential proof”. An-Nasa’i declared him to be Thiqah (trusted and reliable) however, the Hadith that An-Nasa’i recorded of his in “Al-Khasaa’is”: “Verily, the Ummah will betray you” is not Sahih (authentic). And Ibn ‘Adiy said in “Al-Kaamil”: “His hearing (directly) from ‘Ali is to be probed (i.e. suspicious)]!!

All of this has already been discussed and refuted above. Just as the knowledge and examination of Al-Hafizh (Ibn Hajar) has preceded. It may have been better had Doctor ‘Awwaad Ma’ruf and Sheikh Shu’aib Al-Arna’ut, with all due respect, dedicated their time to that which they excel in in terms of verifying manuscripts and restricted themselves to following the opinions of Al-Hafizh and the early scholars in respect to the classification of the narrators. As for the “Tahreer (verification) of At-Taqreeb” or criticism of the narrators, then that requires those whom Allah has bestowed upon a critical mind which has been freed from dependency and imitation, and from the factional and partisan Madh’hab desires, like the ‘Alaamah (great scholar) Abdullah bin Yusuf Al-Jadee’, and a small number from the contemporary scholars.

Other narrations have also come which are less authentic and strong than what has preceded, and consequently we will not go to length in critiquing them. They include:

- A **fourth** report came recorded in “Tareekh Dimashq” of Ibn ‘Asaakir (42/446) from ‘Alqamah:

[Abu Al-Qasim bin As-Samarqandiy and Abu Al-Barakaat Abdul Baaqiy bin Ahmad bin Ibrahim reported to us. Thye said: Abdullah bin Al-Hasan bin Muhammad bin Al-Hasan reported to us from Abu Muhammad Al-Hasan bin Al-Husain bin ‘Ali An-Nawbakhtiy: ‘Ali bin Abdullah Mubash’shar related to us from Muhammad bin Harb, from ‘Ali bin Yazid, from Fitr bin Khalifah, from Hakim bin Jubair, from Ibrahim, from ‘Alqamah, that he said: ‘Ali said: “The Prophet ﷺ promised me that the Ummah will betray you after me”].

- It came as follows in “Tadhkirat ul-Huffaazh” (3/232):

[Ibrahim bin ‘Ali Al-Faqeeh Ajazah reported to us from Dawud bin Mulaa’ib, from Muhammad bin ‘Umar Al-Qaadiy, from Abdus Samad bin ‘Ali from ‘Ali bin ‘Umar Al-Hafizh: ‘Ali bin Abdullah bin Mubash’shar related to us from Muhammad bin Harb An-Nashaa’iy, from ‘Ali bin Yazid As-Sadaa’iy, from Fitr, from Hakim bin Jubair, from Ibrahim, from ‘Alqamah, who said: ‘Ali said: “The Prophet ﷺ promised me that the Ummah will betray you after me”. Ad-Daraqutniy said about it: It is Ghareeb from the Hadith of Abu ‘Imran from Abu Shibl, from ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with him. Hakim was alone in relating it, Fitr bin Khalifah was alone in relating it from him and ‘Ali As-Sadaa’iy was alone in relating it from Fitr. We do not know other than Muhammad bin Harb who related it and we have not written it down except from our Sheikh and he was Thiqah (trustworthy and reliable)].

**I say**: There is no one in the Isnad who requires examination apart from Hakim bin Jubair Al-Asadiy Al-Kufi. Al-Hafizh (Ibn Hajar) said: He is Da’if, deep into Shi’ism. Al-Barqaniy said: I asked Ad-Daraqutniy about Hakim bin Jubair and he said: He is Kufi (from Al-Kufa) and is discarded (Matrook i.e. not related from). It was he who related: “Sadaqah is not Halal (permissible) for the one who possesses 50 Dirham”. Ash-Shu’bah discarded him due to this single Hadith and wronged him by that as he was not alone in relating it. That is as Ath-Thawriy heard it from Zubaid Al-Yaamiy. Hidden behind Shu’bah’s discarding of him was the majority of those who spoke about him and they only targeted him due to his affiliation to the Shi’ah. As for An-Nasaa’i, who was from those who were stubborn, then accommodated him and said: “He is not strong (Qawwiy)” and was therefore close to what is correct. And perhaps we will raise the wrong done against this man on another occasion by Allah’s permission.

- A fifth report came stated in “Sharh Nahj ul-Balaaghah” by Ibn Al-Hadid (19/141) related from Abdullah bin Al-Ghanawiy:

[Uthman bin Sa’id related from Abdullah bin Al-Ghanawiy, that ‘Ali, peace be upon him, gave a speech at Ar-Rahbah, and said: “O people, you have refused except that I say it! By the Rabb (Lord) of the heavens and earth, verily from that which the Nabi Al-Ummiy (Unlettered Prophet) promised to me was: “That the Ummah will betray you after me””. And Hushaim bin Bashir related from Isma’eel bin Salim the like of it and most of the people of the Hadith related this Khabar (reported narration) with this wording or close to it].

**I say**: I have not found a mention of Abdullah bin Al-Ghanawiy with the exception of a vague story concerning the killing of Abu Bakr bin Al-Husain bin ‘Ali bin Abi Talib, may the pleasure and peace of Allah be upon them, whilst he was a child, that at the time of his killing, he was struck by an arrow whilst sitting in his father’s quarters at Karbala; verily to Allah we belong and to Him shall we return. And concerning ‘Uthman bin Sa’id, then if he is not Ad-Daaramiy, the compiler of Al-Musnad Al-Kabir and other works, then I don’t know who it may be, so that could possibly be examined further to ascertain!

Consequently, those four Thiqaat and Saadiqoon (reliable and truthful narrators): Hayyaan bin Husain Al-Asadiy, Abu Idrees Al-Awdiy, Tha’labah bin Yazid Al-Himmaaniy At-Tameemiy and ‘Alqamah bin Qais An-Nakha’iy, have related this. And perhaps there is a fifth narrator alongside them: Abdullah bin Al-Ghanawiy. This mandates definiteness in respect to its authenticity and the obligation to adhere to it. As such, it is from the great indications of the Prophethood and the evident outstanding qualities of the Imam of guidance ‘Ali bin Abi Talib.

Despite that, there are a people from among the donkeys of the Saba’iyah Rawaafid Akhbaariyoon or from the Zanaadiqah, those who wipe themselves with Shi’ism, indeed with excess and Rafd (rejection), whilst concealing pure disbelief, who find it difficult to accept the truth. They do not refuse everything apart from lies and the fabrication of fables:

- For example, the following came stated in “Mustadrak Safeenat ul-Bihaar” (9/22): [The pretext: From Ishaq bin Musa bin Ja’far, from his father, from his fathers (may peace be upon them), who said: The Ameer ul-Mu’mineen (Leader of the Believers) gave a speech in Al-Kufa. Then at the end of his speech he said: “I am the most entitled of the people with the people and **I have continued to be wronged since the time of the death of the Messenger of Allah** ﷺ”. Al-Ash’ath bin Qais then stood and said: “O Ameer ul-Mu’mineen (Leader of the Believers), you have not given a speech since you arrived in Iraq except that you have said: “I am the most entitled of the people with the people and I have continued to be wronged since the time of the death of the Messenger of Allah”, however when Taim and ‘Adiy were appointed (over the matter), you withheld your sword in the face of the injustice?” The Ameer ul-Mu’mineen (peace be upon him) said: “O son of a wineshop, I have said something so listen: By Allah I was not prevented by cowardice or the fear of death. Nothing prevented me except the ‘Ahd (promise or covenant) of my Messenger of Allah. He informed me and said: “O Abu Al-Hasan, verily the Ummah will betray you and violate my covenant. You are from me like the status of Harun to Musa”. So, I said: “O Messenger of Allah, what do you charge me with when that happens?” He said: “If you find supporters, then set out against them and make Jihad against them. But if you do not find supporters, then hold back your hand and preserve your blood until you meet with me as one who was wronged””].

**I say**:

**Firstly**: The great liar who fabricated this did not dare to attribute the narration to Imam ‘Ali Ar-Ridaa bin Al-Imam Musa Al-Kaazhim, may the pleasure and peace of Allah be upon them both and their fathers, nor to his brothers, the noble leaders, who are well-known to relate from their father: Ibrahim, Isma’eel and Husain, the sons of Imam Musa Al-Kaazhim, nor to his uncles, the noble leaders, who are well-known to relate from their brother: ‘Ali bin Ja’far bin Muhammad, Muhammad bin Ja’far bin Muhammad, may the pleasure and peace of Allah be upon them. Had he done that, he would have been exposed immediately and forever. Instead, he made the Isnad from: Ishaq bin Musa bin Ja’far, who is unknown, concerning whom no biography is known and via him Munkarah (rejectable) narrations have been related. As such, if his name has not come among some of the lineages of some of the well-known people of the Aali Bait (people of the house), it existence in the world in origin must be doubted.

**Secondly**: Had this not been a lie against Allah and His Messenger, it would have been obliged to take it as a joke that would make the grieving person laugh. However, the lie against Allah and His Messenger is tantamount to ruin:

وَيَوْمَ الْقِيَامَةِ تَرَى الَّذِينَ كَذَبُوا عَلَى اللَّهِ وُجُوهُهُم مُّسْوَدَّةٌ ۚ أَلَيْسَ فِي جَهَنَّمَ مَثْوًى لِّلْمُتَكَبِّرِينَ \* وَيُنَجِّي اللَّهُ الَّذِينَ اتَّقَوْا بِمَفَازَتِهِمْ لَا يَمَسُّهُمُ السُّوءُ وَلَا هُمْ يَحْزَنُونَ

**And on the Day of Resurrection you will see those who lied against Allah (i.e. attributed to Him sons, partners, etc.) their faces will be black. Is there not in Hell an abode for the arrogant ones? \* And Allah will deliver those who are the Muttaqun (pious) to their places of success (Paradise). Evil shall touch them not, nor shall they grieve** (Az-Zumar: 60-61).

As for the believers, then this will be their day:

قَالَ اللَّهُ هَٰذَا يَوْمُ يَنفَعُ الصَّادِقِينَ صِدْقُهُمْ ۚ لَهُمْ جَنَّاتٌ تَجْرِي مِن تَحْتِهَا الْأَنْهَارُ خَالِدِينَ فِيهَا أَبَدًا ۚ رَّضِيَ اللَّهُ عَنْهُمْ وَرَضُوا عَنْهُ ۚ ذَٰلِكَ الْفَوْزُ الْعَظِيمُ \* لِلَّهِ مُلْكُ السَّمَاوَاتِ وَالْأَرْضِ وَمَا فِيهِنَّ ۚ وَهُوَ عَلَىٰ كُلِّ شَيْءٍ قَدِيرٌ

**Allah will say: "This is the Day on which the truthful will profit from their truthfulness: theirs are Gardens under which rivers flow (in Paradise) - they shall abide therein forever. Allah is pleased with them and they with Him. That is the great success (Paradise). (119) To Allah belongs the dominion of the heavens and the earth and all that is therein, and He is Able to do all things** (Al-Ma’idah: 119-120).

\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*\*

- **Supplemental Section: The marriage of Umm Kulthum, the daughter of ‘Ali bin Abi Talib, may the blessings of Allah upon them, to ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab, may the pleasure and peace of Allah be upon him**:

We have previously mentioned the apology of Abu Bakr to ‘Ali, may the pleasure and peace of Allah be upon them, on the day of the general Bai’ah, following the death of Fatimah, the daughter of Muhammad, may the peace and blessings of Allah be upon them and upon their family. That is like what was presented by Imam Muhammad bin Ishaq in his “Maghaazi”:

[And he said in relation to the apology of Abu Bakr to ‘Ali and others from those who delayed giving the Bai’ah: By Allah, we were not driven to conclude that in the absence of those who were not in attendance except due to the fear of Fitnah (discord) and the escalation of the situation, even if I disliked that. Had it not been for that, then no one would have been more beloved to me to have been in attendance than you, apart from those who are like your status”. He then turned to the people and said: “**O People, this is ‘Ali bin Abi Talib and there is no Bai’ah to me upon his neck whilst he has a choice in his affair. Indeed, and all of you have a choice in respect to your Bai’ah to me. If you view that it should be given to other than me, then I will be the first to give him the Bai’ah**”. **Then when ‘Ali heard that, what had felt inside him dissipated, and he said**: “There is no dissolution. We do not view anyone for it other than you”. He then extended his hand and gave him the Bai’ah alongside the group of people with him and **all of the people** were said similar to that. So, they returned the matter to Abu Bakr and he was the Khalifah (successor) of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. And that was because he selected him to lead the Salah (prayer) after him. **They used to call him the Khalifah (successor) of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ until he died**].

It came like this word for word in “Al-I’tiqaad” of Al-Baihaqi. Indeed, it was related that Abu Bakr repeated his offer to resign three times, day after day. Then ‘Ali stood at the forefront of the people, and said: “By Allah, we will never discharge you or ask to resign. The Messenger of Allah put you forward to lead the people in the prayer, so who then will take you back (from that)”.

Imam Abdullah bin Ahmad bin Hanbal also recorded it in his “Fadaa’il As-Sahabah” (1/133/102) as follows: [My father related to me: Taleed bin Sulaiman related to us, he said: Abu Al-Jahhaaff related to us]. And he said in “Fadaa’il As-Sahabah” (1/151/133): [Ahmad bin Abdul Jabbaar related to us, he said: Muhammad bin Abbaad Sandoulaa related to us, he said: Taleed bin Sulaiman related to us from Abu Al-Jahhaaf Dawud bin Abi ‘Awf], and also in “Fadaa’il As-Sahabah” (1/132/101): [Abdullah bin ‘Umar Abu Abdur Rahman Al-Qurashiy, he said: ‘Ali bin Hashim bin Al-Bareed related form his father, from Abu Al-Jahhaaf, he said: When Abu Bakr was given the Bai’ah, then ‘Ali and his companions (or followers) gave him the Bai’ah, he (Abu Bakr) stood up three times requesting the people to release him (for the position of leadership), saying: “O people: I have released you from my Bai’ah, is there an objector?” He (the narrator) said: ‘Ali then stood at the forefront of the people to state it (i.e. the objection)].

There is no question that all of that took place in the attendance of ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab and his witnessing. We also do not doubt for a moment that he regretted the harshness and severity that he had exhibited against ‘Ali and his companions, and so he hastened to apologise, like the apology of Abu Bakr, or greater than that. All reported narrations of history affirm that the friendship of the two men was warm and increased in strength and solidity, to the point that one of the contemporary researchers, who was from the Shi’ah, exaggerated and stated that ‘Umar was from the “**Shi’ah (group) of ‘Ali**”, and perhaps the most prominent manifestations of this close companionship was ‘Ali marrying his daughter Umm Kulthum to ‘Umar.

- The following came recorded in “Al-Mustadrak ‘Ala s-Sahihaini” (3/153/4684) and with the commentary of Adh-Dhahabiy in “At-Talkhees” (4/241/4684 in the Electronic Shamela Program):

[Al-Hasan bin Ya’qub and Ibrahim bin ‘Ismah AL-‘Adlaan related, they said: As-Sarriy bin Khuzaimah related to us from Mu’allaa bin Asad, from Wuhaib bin Khalid, from Ja’far bin Muhammad, from his father, from ‘Ali bin Al-Husain: That ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab, may Allah be pleased with him, proposed to ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, to marry Umm Kulthum. He said: “May I marry her?” ‘Ali then said: “I was preparing her for my nephew Abdullah bin Jaf’ar”. ‘Umar said (again): “May I marry her, as by Allah there is no one from among the people that will provide for her affair what I will”. And so ‘Ali agreed to marry him (i.e. to his daughter). ‘Umar then came to the Muhajirin and said: “Will you not congratulate me?” They asked: “Whom will you marry O Ameer ul-Mu’mineen?” He said: “Umm Kulthum, the daughter of ‘Ali and Fatimah; the daughter of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. I heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ saying: “Every Nasab (lineage) and Sabab (relation) will be discontinued on the Day of Judgement apart from my Sabab and my Nasab” and so I loved for there to be between myself and the Messenger of Allah ﷺ a Nasab and Sabab (i.e. relations”]. Imam Al-Hakim said: [This Hadith is Sahih in its Isnad, but they (i.e. Al-Bukhari and Muslim) did not record it].

- And it came as follows in “Ash-Sharee’ah Al-Aajurriy (5/2231/1713):

[Abu Bakr bin Abi Dawud reported to us, he said: My uncle related to us from Al-Mu’alla, from Wuhaib, from Ja’far bin Muhammad, from his father: That ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab proposed to ‘Ali to marry Umm Kulthum. He said: “May I marry her?” ‘Ali then said: “I was preparing her for my nephew Abdullah bin Jaf’ar”. ‘Umar said (again): “May I marry her, as by Allah there is no one from among the people that will provide, from her father, what I will”. And so ‘Ali agreed to marry him (i.e. to his daughter). ‘Umar then came to the Muhajirin and said: “Congratulate me” They asked: “Whom will you marry O Ameer ul-Mu’mineen?” He said: “Umm Kulthum, the daughter of ‘Ali and Fatimah; the daughter of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. I heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ saying: “Every Sabab (relation) and Nasab (lineage) will be discontinued on the Day of Judgement apart from what was from my Nasab and my Sabab” and so I loved for there to be between myself and the Messenger of Allah ﷺ a Nasab (relations)”].

- It was recorded as follows in the “Fadaa’il As-Sahabah” of Ahmad bin Hanbal (2/625/1069, related from Baqir:

[Muhammad bin Yunus related to us from Al-Mu’allaa bin Asad, from Wuhaib bin Khalid, from Ja’far bin Muhammad, from his father: That ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab, may Allah be pleased with him, proposed to ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, to marry Umm Kulthum. He said: “May I marry her?” ‘Ali then said: “I was preparing her for my nephew Abdullah bin Jaf’ar”. ‘Umar said (again): “May I marry her, as by Allah there is no one from among the people that will provide for her affair what I will”. And so ‘Ali agreed to marry him (i.e. to his daughter). ‘Umar then came to the Muhajirin and said: “Will you not congratulate me?” They asked: “Whom will you marry O Ameer ul-Mu’mineen?” He said: “Umm Kulthum, the daughter of ‘Ali and Fatimah; the daughter of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. I heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ saying: “Every Sabab (relation) and Nasab (lineage) will be discontinued on the Day of Judgement apart from what was from my Nasab and my Sabab” and so I loved for there to be between myself and the Messenger of Allah ﷺ a Sabab and Nasab (i.e. relations)”]. Some of the foolish people from among the imitators of the innovator Al-Albani, spoke about this Isnad, due to some talk about Muhammad bin Yunus Al-Kudaimiy. However, they have no Hujjah (evidential argument) as he was corroborated as has been presented above. In addition, the reported tradition of Al-Mu’allaa bin Asad is too well known for anyone to play around with; neither by Al-Kudaimiy or other than him.

**I say**: As for the statement of Adh-Dhahabi: [(That it is) Munqati’ (interrupted)], then that is exaggerated. Yes, it appears to be interrupted as Zain Al-‘Abideen ‘Ali bin Al-Husain bin ‘Ali bin Abi Talib was only born in the year 38 AH and was not present at nor heard what was said. However, he, in his quality as the best, most trusted and most reliable Qurashiy of his era, definitely would not have asked about the matter of the marriage of his paternal aunt, or any other matter from the specific matters of his family household, from any odd person from the traders of the market of Al-Madinah. It is therefore without doubt from his father and his paternal uncle, from his grandfather, may the pleasure and blessings of Allah be upon them all.

It is probable that the intention of Adh-Dhahabi was that the mention of Zain Al-‘Abideen ‘Ali bin Al-Husain in this Isnad was an error, as most of the paths stop with him at Al-Baqir. Even if that was the case then this does not harm it. That is because if it was Zain Al-‘Abideen, it is from Jabir bin Abdullah Al-Ansari, as is apparent from other paths, and that is Muttasalah (connected) without doubt. It is not lower than that in terms of authenticity, indeed it may even surpass it.

**I also say**: Zain Al-‘Abideen, may the peace of Allah be upon him, did not delve into the details of what took place between his grandfather, Ameer ul-Mu’mineen, ‘Ali bin Abi Talib, and Ameer ul-Mu’mineen, ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab, may the pleasure and peace of Allah be upon them. We will shortly present some nice details related to this, despite it not being essential, in order to shed some light upon these two genius personalities: ‘Ali and ‘Umar, may the peace of Allah be upon them both.

- The following came from another angle, via a second path from Baqir, in “At-Tabaqaat Al-Kubra” (8/463):

[Anas bin ‘Iyaad Al-Laithi informed us from Ja’far bin Muhammad, from his father: That ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab proposed to ‘Ali to marry his daughter Umm Kulthum. So, ‘Ali said: “I have held my daughters back for the sons of Ja’far”. Them ‘Umar said: “Let me marry her O ‘Ali, for by Allah, there is no man upon the face of the earth who can provide her good treatment as I can”. So, ‘Ali said: “I have agreed”. ‘Umar then came to the gathering of the Muhajirin between the graveyard and the Minbar whilst they were sitting. And there was ‘Ali, Uthman, Az-Zubair, Talhah and Abdur Rahman bin ‘Awf came. That is in the case where if some news came to ‘Umar from the horizons (or regions), he would go to them, inform them of that, and seek their counsel in that matter. So, ‘Umar came and said: “Congratulate me (in relation to marriage)” and so they congratulated him. They asked: “To whom O Ameer ul-Mu’mineen (i.e. is the marriage)?” He said: “The daughter of ‘Ali bin Abi Talib”. He then began to inform them, saying: “Verily, the Prophet ﷺ said: “Every and Nasab (lineage) and Sabab (relation) will be discontinued on the Day of Judgement apart from my Nasab and my Sabab (i.e. relation)” and I was a companion of his and loved to attain that (i.e. the relation) as well”]. However, Anas bin ‘Iyaad stopped his Isnaad at Abu Ja’far Muhammad Al-Baqir. It is apparent that Al-Baqir used to sometimes connect the Sanad and sometimes use the Mursal form. It is highly probable that this thread was related from Jabir bin Abdullah Al-Ansari.

- Its main part came summarised in the Seerah of Ibn Ishaq, “As-Siyar Wa-l-Maghaaziy” (p: 249):

[Ahmad related to us from Yunus, from Ibn Ishaq, he said: Abu Jaf’ar related to me from his father ‘Ali bin Al-Husain, who said: When ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab married Umm Kulthum, the daughter of ‘Ali, he came to a gathering of the Muhajirun in the Masjid of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, between the Qabr (graveyard) and the Minbar, where none except them used to sit. They supplicated for him with blessings, and then he said: “By Allah, nothing motivated me to marry her except that I heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ saying: “Every Sabab and Nasab (relation) will be discontinued on the Day of Judgement apart from that which was from my Nasab and my Sabab (relation)””].

- It came recorded in “As-Sunan Al-Kubra” of Al-Baihaqiy, in its commentary “Al-Jawhar An-Naqiy” (7/63/13776) and in “As-Sunan Al-Kubra” (7/63/13171), via two paths from Zain Al-‘Abideen:

[Abu Abdullah Al-Hafizh related to us from Al-Hasan bin Ya’qub and Ibrahim bin ‘Ismah, who (both) said: As-Sarriy bin Khuzaimah related to us from Mu’allaa bin Asad, from Wuhaib bin Khalid, from Ja’far bin Muhammad, from his father, from ‘Ali bin Al-Husain … And (second path) Abu Abdullah Al-Hafizh related to us from Abu Al-‘Abbas: Muhammad bin Ya’qub related to us from Ahmad bin Abdul Jabbar, from Yunus bin Bukair, from Ibn Ishaq (who said): Abu Ja’far related to me from his father ‘Ali bin Al-Husain, who said: When ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab, may Allah be pleased with him, married Umm Kulthum, the daughter of ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with them, he came to a gathering of the Muhajirun in the Masjid of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, between the Qabr (graveyard) and the Minbar, where none except them used to sit. They supplicated for him with blessings, and then he said: “By Allah, nothing motivated me to marry her except that I heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ saying: “Every Sabab and Nasab (relation) will be discontinued on the Day of Judgement apart from that which was from my Sabab and my Nasab (relation)””]. Then Imam Al-Baihaqiy said: [It is the Lafzh (wording) of the Hadith of Ibn Ishaq and it is Mursal Hasan. It has also been related from other paths which are Mawsool (connected) and Mursal (i.e. missing the name of the final link)].

**I say**: Rather, in truth it is Muttasal (connected) and of the highest level of authenticity, as we have mentioned a short while ago in our comment upon the Hadith of Al-Hakim. And this path, the path of Ibn Ishaq, from Zain Al-‘Abideen represents the **Asl (origin) and the Hujjah (evidential proof)**, which is necessary to be relied upon.

- Some of it came in “Fadaa’il As-Sahabah” of Ahmad bin Hanbal (2/626/1070) from Abu Al-Maithaa’ Al-Mustazhill bin Al-Husain Al-Baariqiy Al-Azdiy:

[Muhammad related to us from Bishr bin Mihran, from Shareek, fromShabeeb bin Ghardaqah, from AL-Mustazhill: That ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab proposed to ‘Ali bin Abi Talib to marry Umm Kulthum. And so he argued against it based upon her young age. Then he (‘Umar) said: “**I am not desiring beauty**, however I heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ saying: “Every Sabab and Nasab (relation) will be discontinued on the Day of Judgement, apart from my Sabab and Nasab (relation). Every child of a father, their paternal relations are to their fathers, apart from the child of Fatimah, as I am their father and their paternal relation””].

- It came recorded in “Ma’rifat us-Sahabah” of Abu Nu’aim (1/56/215) as follows: [Ahmad bin Ja’far related to us from Muhammad bin Yunus, from Bishr bin Mihran, from Shareek, from Shabeeb bin Ghardaqah, from Al-Mustazhill bin Husain: That ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab proposed to ‘Ali bin Abi Talib, may Allah be pleased with them both, to marry his daughter Umm Kulthum. And so he argued against it based upon her young age. Then he (‘Umar) said: “I am not desiring beauty, however I heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ saying: “**Every Sabab and Nasab (relation) will be discontinued on the Day of Judgement, apart from my Sabab and Nasab (relation). Every child of a father, their paternal relations are to their fathers, apart from the child of Fatimah, as I am their father and their paternal relation**””].

**I say**: The Muhammad (here) is Muhammad bin Yunus Al-Kudaimiy and he was not alone in relating it, but was rather corroborated:

- As was recorded in “Al-Ahadeeth Al-Mukhtaarah” [Extracted from the Ahadeeth Al-Mukhtarah from that which was not recorded by Al-Bukhari and Muslim in their two Sahih collections as revised by Ustadh Doctor Abdul Malik bin Abdullah bin Duhaish (1/398/281)]:

[Abdul Baaqiy bin Abdul Jabbar As-Soufiy informed us that Abu Shujaa’ Al-Bastaamiy informed them in what was read to him: Ahmad bin Muhammad bin Muhammad related to us from ‘Ali bin Ahmad, from Al-Haitham bin Kulaib, from Abu Qilaabah Abdul Malik bin Muhammad Ar-Raqaashiy: ‘Umar bin ‘Aamir and Bishr bin Mahran related to me, they said: Shareek related to us (one of them said he related to us is Makkah whilst the other did not mention that), from Shabeeb bin Ghardaqah, from Al-Mustazhill bin Husain:

That ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab proposed to ‘Ali to marry his daughter. So he argued against it based upon her young age and he said: “I have prepared her for the son of my brother Ja’far”. ‘Umar said: “I have not desired her due to beauty. Rather, I heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ saying: “Every Sabab and Nasab (i.e. relation) will be severed on the Day of Judgement, except for my Sabab and Nasab (relation)””]. Ibn Duhaish then said: [Its Isnad is Hasan] and it is as he has said.

- The following, which may be a more complete wording, came recorded in “Tareekh Baghdad” [Bashaar Edition (7/126/3190)] connected from ‘Uqbah bin ‘Aamir Al-Juhaniy:

[Ibrahim bin Mahran bin Rustam, Abu Ishaq Al-Marwaziy, the son of the sister of Rawwad bin Al-Jarrah Al-‘Asqalaniy. He came to Baghdad and related it: From Al-Laith bin Sa’d, Abdullah bin Luhai’ah, who were both from Egypt and Shareek bin Abdullah, the Kufi. The following related from him: ‘Umar bin Hafs As-Sadusiy, Abdullah bin Ahmad bin Hanbal, Musa bin Harun and Ahmad bin Al-Husain bin Ishaq As-Soufiy.

(2003) – [6:126] Al-Hasan bin Abi Bakr informed us. He said: Abdullah bin Ishaq bin Ibrahim Al-Baghawiy informed us. He said: Musa bin Harun related to us, from Abu Ishaq Ibrahim bin Mihran, the neighbour of Al-Haitham bin Kharijah. He said: Al-Laith bin Sa’d informed us … (A second path) Muhammad bin ‘Umar bin Al-Qasim An-Narsiy (and the wording is from him) informed us. He said: Muhammad bin Abdullag bin Ibrahim Ash-Shafi’iy informed us. He said: Ahmad bin Al-Husain As-Soufiy related to us from Ibrahim bin Mihran bin Rustam Al-Marwaziy, from Al-Laith bin Sa’d Al-Qaisiy, the Mawla of Bani Rifaa’ah, in the year 171, in Egypt, from Musa bin ‘Ali bin Rabaah Al-Lakhmiy, from his father, from ‘Uqbah bin ‘Aamir Al-Juhaniy, who said: ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab proposed to ‘Ali bin Abi Talib to marry his daughter from Fatimah and he repeated his request frequently. He (‘Umar) said: “O Abu l-Hasan, nothing has motivated me to repeatedly ask you apart from a Hadith that I heard from the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, when he said: “Every Sabab (relation) and Sihr (relation through marriage) is discontinued on the Day of Judgement apart from my Sabab and Nasab (relation)”. So, I loved for there to be from you the Ahl ul-Bait (people of the Prophet’s household) a Sabab and Sihr”. ‘Ali then stood and instructed his daughter from Fatimah and she was prepared in adornment. He then sent her to the Ameer ul-Mu’mineen (Leader of the Believers) ‘Umar. Then when he saw her, he stood towards her and took her side and said: “Tell your father that I have accepted, I have accepted, I have accepted”. Then when the girl came to her father, he asked her: “What did the Ameer ul-Mu’mineen say to you?” She said: “He summoned me and kissed me. When I stood, he took my side and said: “Tell your father that I have accepted” And so he married her to him and she gave birth for him to Zaid bin ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab. He lived until he reached the age of manhood and then died].

**I say**:

**Firstly**: (Concerning) the sentence “He summoned me and kissed me” was rightfully rejected by the majority and it appears to have ben from the transcription mistakes of the narrators. Its origin is likely to have been “He summoned me and accepted what I had been sent for”, as is evident from the other narrations, which will be presented.

**Secondly**: Ibrahim bin Mihran bin Rustam, Abu Ishaq, is a Sheikh who is not well-known, has related few Hadith, and Al-Khateeb did not mention him with praise or dispraise. It is apparent that Abu Ahmad bin ‘Adiy did not know him as well as he should have and consequently called him “Ibrahim bin Rustam bin Mihran bin Rustam”, whilst he did not know from him except two Hadith; one of which was this one and the other was one which was **Munkar Al-Matn** (rejected by its textual content) related to the Tafsir of the meaning of “Laa Hawla Wa Laa Quwwata Illa Billah” with that which resembles the latter speech of the Sufis. It is therefore possible that the affliction (in the Isnad) is only from Ahmad bin Al-Husain As-Soufiy (As-Saghir/the younger) as most of the Muhadditheen viewed that Ahmad bin Al-Husain As-Soufiy should be discarded and classified as being Da’if (weak).

He is not Abu Bakr Ibrahim bin Rustam Al-Marwaziy (An-Naisabouriy), the Hanafi jurist as he is well-known and related from Hammad bin Salamah, Qais bin Rabee’, Abu ‘Ismah Nuh bin Maryam, Ya’qub Al-Qummiy, Al-Fudail bin ‘Iyaad and others. He died in the year 211 AH.

- It was recorded as follows in “Al-Mu’jam Al-Kabir” of At-Tabarani (3/44/2633):

[Ja’far bin Muhammad bin Sulaiman An-Nawfaliy Al-Madeeniy, from Ibrahim bin Hamzah Az-Zubairiy, from Abdul ‘Aziz bin Muhammad Ad-Daraawardiy, from Zaid bin Aslam, from his father, who said: ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab, may Allah be pleased with him, invited ‘Ali bin Abi Talib and confided in him. He then arose, went to As-Suffah and found Al-‘Abbas, ‘Aqeel and Al-Husain. He then consulted them in respect to ‘Umar marrying Umm Kulthum. ‘Aqeel became angry and said: “O ‘Ali, the days, months and years have not increased you except in blindness in respect to your affair. By Allah, if you were to do that, there will certainly be and there will certainly be for things their numbers (or consequences)”, and he continued to pull his garment (i.e. to persist). ‘Ali then said to Al-‘Abbas: “By Allah, that was not advice from him, but rather the whip of ‘Umar brought him to be what you see. However, by Allah, that is not due to desiring in you O ‘Aqeel, but rather as ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab, may Allah be pleased with him, informed me that he heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ saying: “Every Sabab and Nasab (relation) is discontinued on the Day of Judgement apart from my Sabab and my Nasab (relation)””. ‘Umar laughed at that and said: “Woe to ‘Aqeel. A foolish imbecile”. Al-Haithami said in “Majma’ Az-Zawaa’id Wa Manba’ Al-Fawaa’id” (Verified edition: 4/314): [At-Tabarani related it and its narrators (Rijaal) are Sahih narrators].

- The following came recorded in the Seerah of Ibn Ishaq “As-Siyar Wa l-Maghaazi” (p:248):

[Yunus related to us from Khalid bin Salih, from Waqid bin Muhammad bin Abdullah bin ‘Umar, from some of his family, he said: ‘Umar bin AL-Khattab proposed to ‘Ali bin Abi Talib to marry his daughter Umm Kulthum, whose mother was Fatimah, the daughter of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. ‘Ali then said to him: “There are those whom I must seek their permission in relation to her”. He then went to the son of Fatimah and he mentioned that (matter) to them. They said: “His wife?” He called Umm Kulthum and she was a girl at the time and said to her: “Go to the Ameer ul-Mu’mineen and say: My father passes to you Salam (greetings of peace) and says to you: I have fulfilled the matter that you have requested. So ‘Umar took her, held her to him and said: “I proposed to her father to marry her, so marry her to me”. It was said: “O Ameer ul-Mu’mineen, why do you wish her whilst she is still a young girl?” He said: “Verily, I heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ saying: “Every Sabab (relation) is discontinued on the Day of Judgement apart from my Sabab (relation), and so I wished that there would be between me and the Messenger of Allah ﷺ the relation through marriage”].

- It came recorded as follows in “Adh-Dhurriyah At-Taahirah” by Ad-Doulaabiy (p: 255/210 in the Electronic Shamela Library):

[Ahmad bin Abdul Jabbar related to us from Yunus bin Bukair, from Khalid bin Salih, from Waqid bin Muhammad bin Abdullah bin ‘Umar, from some of his family members: He stated it in full word for word].

**I say**: Waqid Bin Muhammad bin Abdullah bin ‘Umar is Waqid bin Muhammad bin Zaid bin Abdullah bin ‘Umar. He is Thiqah (trusted and reliable narrator) however many of the family line of ‘Umar were not well-known for preservation (or memorisation) and investigation in respect to the Riwayah (narration). In addition, I do not know who Khalid bin Salih is, unless he is: Khalid bin Yazid bin Salih bin Subaih, Abu Hashim Al-Murriy Al-Muqriy Ad-Dimashqiy, the Qaadiy (judge) of Al-Balqaa, whose lineage is attributed to his grandfather. That is like what Al-Hafizh did in “Lisan Al-Mizan” (7/107/2839): [Khalid bin Salih bin Subaih Abu Hashim Al-Murriy Al-Muqriy]. There is no issue with this man although he is not known for relating a lot from the people of Al-Madinah and it is not known that Yunus bin Bulair related from him. Something (of doubt) lingers in the self only in relation to ‘Ali’s seeking permission of Al-Hasan and Al-Husain, may the peace of Allah be upon them all. As for the remainder of the story then it is in conformity and harmony with that is well-known.

**Emendation**: The following came in “Mu’jam Rijaal Al-Hadith” (27/26/4202):

[Khalid bin Salih: He related from Thabit bin Shuraih and Ahmad bin Al-Husain Al-Qazzar Al-Basriy related from him. This is what came stated in the Fihrisat (biographical catalogue) in relation to the biography of Thabit (140). However, the correct view is (that he is): Salih bin Khalid and the path itself is mentioned in the biography of Ziyad bin Abi Ghiyath]. It is therefore probable that the name has been reversed like what came in the “Fihrisat” of Sheikh At-Tousiy (1/144): [Salih bin Khalid Al-Muhamiliy, Abu Shu’aib Al-Kanasiy. The Sheikh entitled him in his Rijaal (transmitter list): 347, number: 5180 and An-Najashiy did so in his Rijaal, number: 535. He was also mentioned in the chapter of agnomens (Kunya) by the title: Shu’aib Al-Muhamily]. He was not mentioned with praise or dispraise. It is probable that this is him as he is Kufi (from Al-Kufa), the land of Yunus bin Bukair. And Allah is most knowledgeable.

- Some of it came recorded in the Musannaf (compilation) of Abdur Razzaq As-San’aniy (6/163/10354): [ Abdur Razzaq related from Ma’mar, from Ayyub, from ‘Ikrimah, who said: ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab married Umm Kulthum, the daughter of ‘Ali bin Abi Talib, whilst she was a girl who played with (other) girls. He then went to his companions and they supplicated blessings for him. He then said: “I did not marry due to an urge within me, but rather it was because I heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ saying: “Verily, every Sabab and Nasab (relation) will be discontinued (or severed) on the Day of Judgement apart from my Sabab and my Nasab (relation)”, and I loved that there would be between myself and the Prophet of Allah ﷺ a Sabab and Nasab (relation”]. Abdur Razzaq then said: [Umm Kulthum was the daughter of Fatimah the daughter of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ and ‘Umar consummated the marriage with her and she gave birth to a boy from him called Zaid. It reached me that Abdul Malik bin Marwan poisoned them, that they died as a result and Abdullah bin ‘Umar prayed the funeral prayer over them. That was because it was said to Abdul Malik: This is the son of ‘Ali and the son of ‘Umar, so he feared over his authority and poisoned them both].

**I say**:

**Firstly**: ‘Ikrimah did not mention from whom he took it from and it may be from a number of sources, like: Ibn ‘Abbas, ‘Ali Zain Al-‘Abideen and Jabir bin Abdullah. It is evident that that range (or scope) was well known and Mutawatir among the people.

**Secondly**: What reached Abdur Razzaq concerning the atheist in the Haram Abdul Malik bin Marwan, may the curse of Allah, his angels and all people be upon him, poisoning Zaid bin ‘Umar, was false news which had no basis at all for it. That is because the death of Zaid bin ‘Umar and his mother Umm Kulthum the daughter of ‘Ali, may the pleasure and peace of Allah be upon them, occurred in the year 50 AH or around that time as will be established shortly by Allah’s permission. That is whilst Abdul Malik bin Marwan was not at that time of any significance. Yes, it is true, that had that been mentioned about the sanctuary of the hypocrites, chief of the confederates, and commander of the rebellious faction leading them to the fire of hell, Mu’awiyah bin Abi Sufyan, that would have been possible. That is because he was an expert in poisoning, just as he did with Abdur Rahman bin Khalid bin Al-Walid and with Al-Hasan bin ‘Ali as has been said. However, even this (i.e. poisoning) has not ben established in respect to Zaid bin ‘Umar, and has no basis to it.

- The following came recorded in the Seerah of Ibn Ishaq “As-Siyar Wa l-Maghaazi” (p:248):

[(Concerning ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab marrying Umm Kulthum the daughter of ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with them): Ahmad related to us, from Yunus, from Ibn Ishaq, who said: Umm Kuthum, the daughter of ‘Ali from Fatimah, the daughter of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, married ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab. She thereafter gave birth for him to Zaid bin ‘Umar and a woman with him. ‘Umar then died whilst she was still living.

Ahmad related to us from Yunus, from Ibn Ishaq, who said: ‘Asim bin ‘Umar bin Qatadah related to me, he said: ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab proposed to ‘Ali to marry his daughter Umm Kulthum, who was from Fatimah, the daughter of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. ‘Ali made an excuse to him and said: “She is young”. ‘Umar replied: “No, by Allah, that is not your issue, rather you wanted to prevent me. If she is as you say, then send her to me”. ‘Ali returned and summoned her. He then gave her a Hullah (garment) and said: “Go to the Ameer ul-Mu’mineen (Leader of the Believers) and say (to him): My father says to you, what is your opinion of this Hullah (garment)?” So, she went to him with it and asked him that. He then took hold of it and she pulled it away from him and said: “Let go”. So, he let go and said: “It is a noble horse. Go to your father and say to him: How perfect and beautiful it is. By Allah, it is not like how you said it was”. So, he (‘Ali) married her to him].

- The following came recorded in the Musannaf of Abdur Razzaq As-San’aniy (6/162/10352):

[Abdur Razzaq related from Ibn ‘Uyainah, from ‘Amr bin Dinar, from Abu Ja;far, who said: ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab proposed to ‘Ali to marry his daughter, and so he (‘Ali) said: “She is young”. It was then said to ‘Umar: “He only wishes to prevent you by that” he said: “Speak to him”. ‘Ali said: “I will send her to you, then if you are content, she will be your wife”. He (the narrator) said: So, he sent her to him. He said: Then ‘Umar went and uncovered her leg (or side) and she said: “Let go, if you were not the Ameer ul-Mu’mineen I would have struck your neck”] It appears that “your neck” is a mistake in transcription and that the correct word is “your eyes”.

- It came recorded in “Ghawamid Al-Asmaa Al-Mubhimah” (2/787) as follows:

[It was read to Abu Muhammad bin ‘Attaab whilst I was listening. He said: I read (received) from Hatim bin Muhammad, he said: Ahmad bin Firas informed, he said: Abdur Rahman bin Abdullah bin Muhammad bin Yazid Al-Muqriy related to us, he said: My grandfather related to us from Sufyan bin ‘Uyainah, from ‘Amr, from Muhammad bin ‘Ali, who said: ‘Umar proposed to ‘Ali to marry his daughter and so he mentioned her young age. They told ‘Umar that he is only attempting to repel you, so return to him. So he (’Ali) said): “I will send her to you, then if you are content she will be your wife”. Then when she came to him, he uncovered her leg (or side) and she said: “Let go, if you were not the Ameer ul-Mu’mineen I would have slapped your eyes”].

- The following also came recorded in the Musannaf of Abdur Razzaq As-San’aniy (6/163/10353):

[Abdur Razzaq related from Ibn Juraij, who said: I heard Al-A’amash saying: ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab proposed to ‘Ali to marry his daughter and he said: “What’s wrong, except that you want to prevent her”. He (‘Ali) said: “I will send her, then if you are content, she is your wife and I have married her to you”. He adorned her and sent her to him. Then he (‘Umar) said: “I am content and so, he took her leg (or side), and he said: By Allah, if you were not the Ameer ul-Mu’mineen, I would have struck your eyes”].

- The following came in “Ansaab ul-Ashraaf” of Al-Baladhuri (2/190/236):

[Al-Husain bin ‘Ali bin Al-Aswad related to us from ‘Ubaidullah bin Musa, from Isra’eel, from ‘Uthman bin Muhammad bin ‘Ali, who said: ‘Umar went out to the people and said: “Congratulate me for my marriage to the daughter of the Messenger of Allah, as I heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ saying: “Every Sabab and Nasab (relation) is discontinued (or severed) on the Day of Judgement apart from my Sabab and my Nasab (relation)””]

- The following also came in “Ansaab ul-Ashraaf” of Al-Baladhuri (2/190/237):

[Muhammad bin Sa’d related to me from Malik bin Isma’eel An-Nahdiy, from Saif bin Harun, from Fudail bin Kathir, from ‘Ikrimah, from Ibn ‘Abbas, who said: When ‘Umar consummated with Umm Kulthum, he came to the seniors of the Muhajirun and his treat for them was that he yellowed their beards with Malaab (perfumed Saffron)].

- It came mentioned in “Tahdheeb Al-Aathaar” [The lost part/volume (p: 466/834)]:

[Isma’eel bin Musa As-Suddiy related to me, he said: Saif informed us from Fudail bin Kathir, from ‘Ikrimah, from Ibn ‘Abbas: When ‘Umar consummated with Umm Kulthum, the seniors of the Muhajirun came to him and his treat for them was that he yellowed their beards with Malaab (perfumed Saffron)].

- It came recorded in “Musnad of Al-Faruq” of Ibn Kathir (1/392) as follows:

[Abu Abdullah Muhammad bin ‘Isa bin Al-Hasan bin Ishaq At-Tameemiy Al-Baghdadiy, who is well known as Ibn Al-‘Allaaf, said: ‘Ali, meaning Ibn Tabbaan Al-Muqriy, who is well known as Al-Baqilaniy, related to us from Sa’id bin Sulaiman Al-Waasitiy, from Saif bin Harun, from Fudail bin Kathir, from ‘Ikrimah, from Ibn ‘Abbas, who said: When ‘Umar consummated with Umm Kulthum, the seniors of the Muhajirun came to him and his treat for them was that he yellowed their beards with Malaab (perfumed Saffron)].

- However, the following came stated in “Al-Mu’jam Al-Awsat” of At-Tabarani (6/357/6609):

[Muhammad bin Ja’far, the son of the Imam, related to us from Sufyan bin Wakee’, from Rawh bin ‘Ubadah, from Ibn Juraij, from Ibn Abi Mulaikah: Al-Hasan bin Al-Hasan bin ‘Ali related to me: That ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab proposed to ‘Ali to marry Umm Kulthum. He (‘Ali) then said: “She is young for that”. ‘Umar then said: “I heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ saying: “Every Sabab and Nasab is discontinued (or severed) on the Day of Judgement apart from my Sabab and Nasab (relation)” so I loved that there would be for me a Sabab and Nasab (relation) to the Messenger of Allah ﷺ”. ‘Ali then said to Al-Hasan and Al-Husain: “Undertake the marriage of your uncle”. They replied: “She is a woman from among the women who chooses for herself”. ‘Ali arose angrily and so Al-Hasan took hold of his clothing and said: “No patience over your migration O father”]. Then At-Tabarani said: “No one related this Hadith from Ibn Juraij apart from Rawh; Sufyan bin Wakee’ was alone in relating it].

- It also came recorded in the “Sunan of Al-Baihaqiy” of Abu Bakr Al-Baihaqiy (2/415/14031):

[Abu Al-Husain bin Bishraan informed us from Da’laj bin Ahmad: Musa bin Harun related to us from Sufyan bin Wakee’ bin Al-Jarrah, from Rawh bin ‘Ubadah, from Ibn Juraij: Ibn Abi Mulaikah informed me from Hasan bin Hasan, from his father: ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab proposed to ‘Ali to marry Umm Kulthum. He (‘Ali) then said: “She is young for that”. ‘Umar, may Allah be pleased with him, then said: “I heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ saying: “Every Sabab and Nasab is discontinued (or severed) on the Day of Judgement apart from my Sabab and Nasab (relation)” so I loved that there would be for me a Sabab and Nasab (relation) to the Messenger of Allah ﷺ”. ‘Ali then said to Al-Hasan and Al-Husain: “Undertake the marriage of your uncle”. They replied: “She is a woman from among the women who chooses for herself”. ‘Ali arose angrily and so Al-Hasan took hold of his clothing and said: “No patience over your migration O father”. So they undertook his marriage]. Al-Baihaqiy then commented saying: [Ash-Shafi’iy, may Allah’s mercy be upon him, said: “And Az-Zubair, may Allah be pleased with him, married his daughter whilst she was a girl and more than one of the companions of the Prophet ﷺ married their daughter whilst she was of a young age. And if the Nikah (marriage) was not permissible for the virgin except by her command, it would not have been permissible for her to marry until she had a command in respect to herself].

**I say**:

**Firstly**: This Hadith with this form is Batil (false/invalid). Two different stories have been mixed in the mind of one of the narrators. It is most likely Sufyan bin Wakee’ because he is Da’if (weak). Al-Hafizh Ibn Hajar said: [He was Sadooq (honest), except that he was afflicted with his papers and consequently that which was not from his Hadith was inserted into it. He was advised but did not accept the advice. As such his Hadith were discarded]. In this way this Munkar (rejectable) textual content (Matn) was put together. The correct view is that Al-Hasan and Al-Husain did not have a role in the marriage of Umm Kulthum to ‘Umar, with the exception of consultation as has been mentioned previously. There was also not the slightest objection or refusal, if the consultation was established to have occurred in origin. Rather, that was another story (or incident) related to the marriage of Umm Kulthum to ‘Awn bin Ja’far bin Abi Talib, which will be presented shortly by Allah’s permission.

**Secondly**: Concerning the statement of Ash-Shafi’iy: [And if the Nikah (marriage) was not permissible for the virgin except by her command, it would not have been permissible for her to marry until she had a command in respect to herself], it represents a correct Hujjah (evidential argument) which is dictated by the necessity of the mind. However, his deduction that some of the Sahabah marrying their daughters whilst they were young indicates the validity of marrying the Bikr (virgin) without her command, is a false (Batil) deduction) and contrary to the Qur’an and the Sunnah. However, the place for establishing that is found in our independent study entitled “Wilayat un-Nikaah”.

- The following came recorded in “Tareekh Dimashq” of Ibn ‘Asaakir (19/486/4556):

[Abu l-Qasim Hibbatullah bin Muhammad informed us from Abu Talib Muhammad bin Muhammad bin Ghailan, from Abu Bakr Ash-Shafi’iy: Ja’far bin Muhammad bin Kazzal related to us from Ishaq bin Al-Mundhir, from Muhammad bin Abdul Malik Al-Ansari, from Muhammad bin Al-Munkadir, from Jabir bin Abdullah Al-Ansari, who said: ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab married Umm Kulthum, the daughter of Fatimah, the daughter of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ, upon a dowry of 40,000 Dirham].

- The following came recorded in “As-Sunan Al-Kubra” of Al-Baihaqiy in its commentary “Al-Jawhar An-Naqiy” (7/233/14730):

[Abu Sa’d Al-Maaleeniy informed us from Abu Ahmad bin ‘Adiy Al-Hafizh: Muhammad bin Dawud bin Dinar related to us from Qutaibah bin Sa’id, from Abdullah bin Zaid bin Aslam, the Mawla of ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab, from his father Zaid bin Aslam, from his father: That ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab, may Allah be pleased with him, fixed the dowry of Umm Kulthum, the daughter of ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with him, at 40,000 Dirham].

- It came as follows in “Adh-Dhurriyah At-Taahirah” by Ad-Doulabiy (p: 257/210 in the Electronic Shamela Library):

[Abdul ‘Aziz bin Muneeb Abu Ad-Dardaa’ Al-Marwaziy related to me: Khalid bin Khaddash related to us … (And): Ishaq bin Ibrahim bin Muhammad bin Sulaiman bin Bilal bin Abi Ad-Daraa’ Al-Ansari Abu Ya’qub related to me: Abu Al-Jamahir Muhammad bin Uthman related to us … They both said: Abdullah bin Zaid bin Aslama related to us from his father, from his grandfather: That ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab married Umm Kulthum, the daughter of ‘Ali bin Abi Talib upon a dowry of 40,000 Dirham].

**I say**: The sons of Zaid bin Aslam are not of the same strength (in terms of narration) as their father. The strongest of them is Abdullah but he is not that solid. His Hadith are Hasan Mutawasat (middling). Then comes Usamah whilst the weakest is Abdur Rahman.

- The following came recorded in the Seerah of Ibn Ishaq “As-Siyar Wa l-Maghaazi” (p:249):

[Yunus informed us from Hisham bin Sa’d Al-Qurashiy, from ‘Ataa’ Al-Khurasaniy, from ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab, that he said: Do not be excessive in respect to the dowries of the women. Had it been from the Taqwaa (fear and piety) to Allah and a noble act in the Dunyaa, your Prophet is the most entitled of you in that respect. He did not set a Mahr for any of his wives and did not set the Mahr for his daughters for more than 12 Awqiyah 480 Dirham. Then after that ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab proposed to marry Umm Kulthum, the daughter of ‘Ali bin Abi Talib, and gave her 40,000 (Dirham).

Ahmad related to us from Yunus, from Ibn Ishaq, who said: When ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab died leaving behind Umm Kulthum, the daughter of ‘Ali, she married ‘Awn bin Ja’far. ‘Awn died before her and she did not give birth to a child from him].

- It came in “At-Tabaqaat Al-Kubra” [Dar Sadir Edition: (8/463)] as follows:

[Wakee’ bin Jarrah informed us from Hisham bin Sa’d, from ‘Ataa’ Al-Khurasaniy: That ‘Umar gave Umm Kulthum, the daughter of ‘Ali, a Mahr of 40,000].

- And in “Tareekh Dimashq” (19/486):

[I read at the hands of Abu Ghalib from Abu Muhammad Al-Jawhariy: Abu ‘Umar bin Hayawiyah informed us from Ahmad bin Ma’ruf: Al-Husain bin Al-Fahm related to us from Muhammad bin Sa’d: Wakee’ bin Al-Jarrah informed us from Hisham bin Sa’d, from ‘Ataa’ Al-Khurasaniy: That ‘Umar gave Umm Kulthum, the daughter of ‘Ali, a Mahr of 40,000].

- And it came in “Ansaab Al-Ashraaf” of Al-Baladhuri (2/189/235) with a nice summarisation via Al-Kalbiy:

[‘Abbas bin Hisham Al-Kalbiy related to me from his father, from his grandfather, who said: ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab proposed to Umm Kulthum (from ‘Ali), may Allah the Most High be pleased with them all, so he (‘Ali) said: “She is young”. He (‘Umar) replied: “O Abu Hasanain (i.e. Hasan and Husain): My concern for her is only because I heard the Messenger of Allah ﷺ saying: “There is no Sabab (relation) and no Sihr (relation through marriage) except that it is discontinued (or severed) on the Day of Judgement, apart from my Sabab and my Sihr””. ‘Ali then said: “I will send her to you, so that you can see her”. Then when she came to him, he (‘Umar) said to her: “Say to your father: I am pleased (content) with the Hullah”. She delivered the message and then ‘Ali married her to him and ‘Umar gave 40,000 (Dirham) for the Dowry].

- It came mentioned as follows in the Seerah of Ibn Ishaq, “As-Siyar Wa-l-Maghaaziy” (p: 250):

[(**Concerning the marrying of Umm Kulthum to ‘Awn bin Ja’far bin Abi Talib**): Ahmad related to us from Yunus, from Ibn Ishaq, who said: My father Ishaq bin Yasar related me from Hasan bin Hasan, from ‘Ali bin Abi Talib, that he said: When Umm Kulthum was widowed from ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab, her two brothers Hasan and Husain went to her and said to her: You have known the Sayyidah (chief) of the Muslim women and you are the daughter of their Sayyidah. And you, by Allah, if you were to allow ‘Ali to dictate your affair, he would marry you to one of his orphans. And if you wish to gain for yourself great quantities of wealth you would be able to attain it”. By Allah, they had only just stood up when ‘Ali appeared leaning upon his staff. He then sat and praised Allah and extolled Him. He then mentioned their standing in relation to the Messenger of Allah ﷺ and said: “You have known your station O children of Fatimah and your preference over the remainder of my children due to your standing in relation to the Messenger of Allah ﷺ and your close relations to him”. They said: “You have spoken the truth; may Allah’s mercy be upon you and may He reward you with goodness for us”. He (‘Ali) said: “O daughter, verily Allah has placed your affair into your hands and I would like that you place it in my hands”. She said: “O father, by Allah I am a woman that wishes for that which women wish for and I would like to attain what the women attain from the Dunya. I would like to look into the matter myself”. He said: “No, by Allah O daughter, this is not your own opinion. It is only an opinion from these two”. He then stood and said: “By Allah, I will not speak to a man from them both or you will do so”. They then took hold of his garment and said: “Sit O father, for by Allah you have not patience upon your migration. (Addressing their sister) Entrust your affair to him”. She said: “I have done so”. He said: “Then I will marry you to ‘Awn bin Ja’far. He is a young man”. He then returned to his house, sent 4000 to her, sent for his nephew and brought him to her. Hasan said: “By Allah, I have not heard of the like of the love from her to him since Allah created you”. Then ‘Awn did not remain long before passing away. ‘Ali then returned to his daughter and said: “Entrust your affair to me” and so she did. He then married her to Muhammad bin Ja’far. He went out and sent 4000 Dirham to her and then he (Muhammad bin Ja’far) went to her.

Ahmad related to us from Yunus, from Ibn Ishaq, who said: Then ‘Awn bin Ja’far died widowing Umm Kulthum, the daughter of ‘Ali behind. So, he (‘Ali) married her to Muhammad bin Ja’far bin Abi Talib. He then died widowing her and did not have children from her].

- It came as follows in “Adh-Dhurriyah At-Taahirah” by Ad-Doulabiy (p: 89 and p: 262/217 in the Electronic Shamela Library):

[Ahmad bin Abdul Jabbar related to us from Yunus bin Bukair: Ibn Ishaq said: My father Ishaq bin Yasar related to me from Hasan bin Hasan bin ‘Ali bin Abi Talib: He said it (i.e. the narration) in full, word for word, until Hasan stated: “By Allah, I have not heard of the like of the love from her to him since Allah created you”].

**I say**: Here, the father of Al-Hasanaini (Hasan and Husain), may the pleasure and peace of Allah be upon him, employed fatherly intimidation with them. Consequently, Umm Kulthum lost the opportunity to acquire great wealth and to compete with who peers from the women, however, she attained a husband whom she deeply loved, which may have been better for her.

- The date of this blessed marriage came mentioned in “Ath-Thiqaat” of Ibn Hibban (2/89): [Then ‘Umar married Umm Kulthum, the daughter of ‘Ali bin Abi Talib, from Fatimah. He joined with her in the month of Dhu l-Qa’dah. He then made Hajj and left Zaid bin Thabit in charge over Al-Madinah. Then when the 18th year (AH) came, the people were afflicted by a severe famine and so he performed the prayer for rain …].

**I say**: Therefore, the marriage was contracted at the end of the 17th year (AH) whilst Umm Kulthum was 12 years of age. That is because she was born after Al-Husain bin ‘Ali, which cannot be conceived to have occurred except at the end of the 5th year after Hijrah or the beginning of the sixth year. It is apparent from all that has preceded that she was matured early, of complete mind, strong in personality and suitable to enter into marriage. That is apparent from when ‘Umar took hold of her side and perhaps uncovered her leg, and she said with rigor and firmness: “Let go” and perhaps said: “If you had not been the Ameer ul-Munineen, I would have struck your eyes”. There is therefore no surprise that ‘Umar said: “It is a noble horse. Go to your father and say to him: How perfect and beautiful it is. By Allah, it is not like how you said it was”. By this he meant that she is not too young to be suitable for marriage and she was not skinny legged, as some of the reported narrations claimed.

- A good summary of the essence of what preceded with a nice addition came mentioned in “At-Tabaqaat Al-Kubra” [Dar Sadir Edition: (8/463-464)] as follows:

[Umm Kulthum is the daughter of ‘Ali bin Abi Talib bin Abdul Muttalib bin Hashim bin ‘Abd Manaf bin Qusayy. Her mother was Fatimah the daughter of the Messenger of Allah and her (Fatimah’s) mother was Khadijah bint Khuwailid bin Asad bin ‘Abd Al-‘Uzzaa bin Qusayy. ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab married her whilst she was a girl (Jaariyah) yet to reach the age of maturity (or puberty). She remained with him until he was killed and she gave birth to Zaid bin ‘Umar and Ruqayyah bint ‘Umar from him. After ‘Umar ‘Awn bin Ja’far bin Abi Talib bin Abdul Muttalib married Umm Kulthum. He then died widowing her and his brother Muhammad bin Ja’far bin Abi Talib bin Abdul Muttalib then married her. He then passed away and his brother Abdullah bin Ja’far bin Abi Talib bin Abdul Muttalib married her following her sister Zainab bint ‘Ali bin Abi Talib. So, Umm Kulthum said: “I am shy of Asmaa’ bint ‘Umaish as her two sons died whilst they were with me and I now fear for this third”. She then died before him and she did not have children at all from any of them.

Muhammad bin ‘Umar said (And other than him): When ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab proposed to ‘Ali to marry his daughter Umm Kulthum, he (‘Ali) said to him): “O Ameer ul-Mu’mineen, she is a girl”. He replied: “By Allah, that is not your issue, however we are aware of your issue”. Then ‘Ali commanded her to come and she did. He then commanded that a garment (or cloak) be brought and he wrapped it. He said: “Go with this to the Ameer ul-Mu’mineen and say: My father sent me to give you Salam (greetings) and he says: If you are content with this garment, then hold on to it and if it displeases you, return it”. Then when she came to ‘Umar, he said: “May Allah bless you and your father. We are contented”. He (the narrator) said: Then she returned to her father and said: “He did not lay the garment (or cloak) out (i.e. to examine it) and he did not look except at me”. And so he (‘Ali) married her to him and she gave birth to a boy from him called Zaid].

**I say**: Indeed, Allah honoured Umm Kulthum, the daughter of Fatimah, the daughter of Muhammad, may the peace and blessings of all be upon them and their household, that He made her to pass away before Abdullah bin Ja’far and making that a “**Shahadah” (martyrdom)**, as will be presented shortly by Allah’s permission.

- The details of the martyrdom of Umm Kulthum bint ‘Ali and Zaid bin ‘Umar, may the pleasure of Allah be upon them, came stated in “Tareekh Dimashq” of Ibn ‘Asaakir (19/486):

[Abu Al-Husain bin Al-Faraa’, Abu Ghalib and Abu Abdullah, the sons of Al-Banaa infomed us: They said: Abu Ja’far bin Al-Maslamah informed us from Abu Tahir Al-Mukhlis: Ahmad bin Sulaim related to us from Az-Zubair bin Bakkar, who said: ‘Umar bin Abi Bakr Al-Mu’ammaliy related to me from Sa’id bin Abdul Kabir, from Abdul Hamid bin Abdur Rahman bin Zaid bin Al-Khattab whose mother was Umm Kulthum bint ‘Ali bin Abi Talib: The reason for that was that a war had broken out between ‘Adiy bin Ka’b. So Abdullah bin Mutee’ went out to discover the cause of that. The news of that reached Abdullah and Sulaiman the sons of Abu Jahm. So, they went out to lie in wait for him to return him. The news of their two brothers reached them. So, they went out to them and the two groups challenged each other whilst Abdullah bin Mutee’ departed in the evening. They met at Al-Baqee’ and fought against each other. Ibn Mutee’ took a staff and it reached the end of the saddle, so he broke it. Zaid bin ‘Umar came to act as a barrier between them and no keep them away from each other. So, he went into their midst and then a man from them struck him in the dark without being aware of him. It was a blow to the head. His head was split and he was brought down to the ground from his riding animal. The people then began to call out “Zaid … Zaid” and they separated from each other and he fell into their hands. Abdullah bin Mutee’ approached and when he saw that he (i.e. Zaid) had been brought down, he descended and bent over him, the called out twice or thrice: “O Zaid, may my father and mother be ransomed for you”. He then replied to him and Ibn Mutee’ made Takbir (Allahu Akbar) and took him. He carried him upon his mule until he delivered him to his home. He treated Zaid’s head wound until he came around and it was said that he had recovered. He used to ask about who had struck him but ne did not name him. Then the head wound deteriorated and remained sick from it. He was consequently **afflicted in his stomach (internally)** and died; may Allah’s mercy be upon him. Abdul Hamid bin Abdur Rahman bin Zaid bin Al-Khattab said, just as some of the people of knowledge mentioned, **that he and his mother Umm Kulthum bint ‘Ali bin Abi Talib both became ill at the same time, it became overbearing and fell upon them**. And that men would walk amongst them to see which of them would pas away first so that one would inherit from the other, but both passed away at the same hour, where it was not known which of the two passed away before the other. In relation to that Abdullah bin ‘Amir bin Rabee’ah the ally of Bani Al-Khattab said (in prose):

**Verily ‘Adiy on the night of Al-Baqee’ \* Separated from a man who had been felled**

**A fighter of high regard \* He was met by the Ill fortune of Bani Mutee’**

Concerning that ‘Asim bin ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab also said some prose (note: Refer to original Arabic text for this).

And Muhammad Bin Iyaas bin Abi Al-Bakr, the ally of ‘Adiy bin Ka’b, also stated some prose on this matter (note: Refer to original Arabic text for this).

**I say**: It is therefore clear that Zaid was killed by his stomach and similarly his mother Umm Kulthum was afflicted by infection. Consequently, they both died from stomach illnesses and the death by stomach illness is martyrdom as was affirmed by the seal of Allah’s Prophets ﷺ.

- Thew following also came recorded in “Tareekh Dimashq” by Ibn ‘Asaakir (19/488):

[He said (the narrator is Ahmad bin Sulaim like the previous Sanad (chain of transmission)): Az-Zubair related to us: Muhammad bin Al-Hasan Al-Makhzumiy related to me: He said: When he was overwhelmed with (the situation) of Zaid bin ‘Umar, Al-Husain bin ‘Ali began to ask him: “O Zaid, who struck you?” Then ‘Abdullah bin ‘Umar” would say to him: “O Zaid, fear Allah were in a situation of confusion and do not know who struck you in it”. He (the narrator) said: There were two Sunnahs in respect to Zaid and his mother. They died at the same hour. It was not known which of the two died before the other. Neither inherited from the other and they were placed together at the place of the funeral prayers. His mother was placed behind and he was placed in front next to the Imam. As such, the Sunnah in respect to the man and woman took place in that manner after that and Al-Husain bin ‘Ali said to ‘Abdullah bin ‘Umar: “Move forward and pray over your mother and brother” and so he moved forward and prayed over them].

- The following also came reported in “Tareekh Dimashq” of Ibn ‘Asaakir (19/489):

[Abu Ghalib and Abu Abdullah, the sons of Al-Banaa, informed us: They said: Abu Ja’far bin Al-Maslamah informed us from Abu Tahir Al-Mukhlis: Ahmad bin Sulaiman related to us from Az-Zubair bin Al-Bakkar: He said: ‘Ali bin Salih informed me from my grandfather Abdullah bin Mus’ab: That Khalid bin Aslam, the Mawla of ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab, was the one who afflicted Zaid on that night with a shot without knowing who it was. He said: And Az-Zubair related to us: He said: And more than one informed me, including Muhammad bin Hasan. He said: Al-Husain bin ‘Ali used to say to his nephew: “Name the one who struck you”. Then ‘Abdullah bin ‘Umar would say to him: “O brother, fear Allah and do not make claims against anyone. You were struck in a situation of confusion amongst the people at night”. Then when Zaid and his mother passed away at the same time they were placed at the place of the funerals. Zaid was brought forward next to the Imam and Husain said to Abdullah bin ‘Umar: “Go forward and pray over your mother and brother”. So, he moved forward and prayed over them. Two Sunnahs took place in respect to them: That the one concerning whom his death is not known whether it occurred before his companion does not inherit and that the men are advanced (in the funeral prayer) adjacent to the Imam].

- The following came in the Sunan of Imam Sa’id bin Mansur (p: 36/240):

[Sa’id said: Abdul ‘Aziz bin Muhammad related to us from Ja’far bin Muhammad, from his father: That Umm Kulthum bint ‘Ali passed away, her and her son Zaid bin ‘Umar. The two cries (i.e. announcing death) came together on the road and it was not known which of them died before the other. Consequently, she did not inherit from him and he did not inherit from her and that the people of the lines did not inherit and that the people of the Harrah (locality) did not inherit].

- The following was recorded in “Tareekh Dimashq” of Ibn ‘Asaakir (19/489):

[Abu AL-Fadl Muhammad bin Isma’eel, Abu Al-Mahaasin As’ad bin ‘Ali, Abu Bakr Ahmad bin Yahya bin Al-Hasan and Abu Al-Waqt Abdul Awwal bin ‘Isa informed us: They said: Abdur Rahman bin Muhammad bin Al-Muzh’zhafar informed us from Abdullah bin Ahmad bin Hamawaih, from ‘Isa bin ‘Umar bin Al-‘Abbas, from Abdullah bin Abdur Rahman bin Bahram, from Nu’aim bin Hammad, from Abdul ‘Aziz bin Muhammad: Ja’far related to us from his father: That Umm Kulthum and her son Zaid passed away on the same day. So, the two cries (i.e. announcing death) came together on the road and each one of them did not inherit from the other].

- Some of the incident was recorded in “Tareekh Dimashq” of Ibn ‘Asaakir (19/493) as follows:

[Abu Muhammad As-Salmiy informed us: Abu Bakr Al-Khatib related to us and Abu l-Qasim bin As-Samarqandiy informed us from Abu Bakr bin At-Tabariy, who both said: Abu Al-Husain bin Al-Fadl informed us from Abdullah bin Jaf’far: Ya’qub related to us from Ibrahim bin Al-Mundir: Abdullah bin Maymun related to me from Ja’far bin Muhammad, from his father: That Husain bin ‘Ali said to Abdullah bin ‘Umar: Pray (i.e. lead the funeral prayer) over Umm Kulthum bint ‘Ali for verily she is your mother and over your brother Zaid”. They were placed down at the same hour (or time)].

- The following was recorded in “Tahdheeb Al-Ahkam” of Ash-Sheikh At-Tousiy (20/137/ (1295) 15):

- Muhammad bin Ahmad bin Yahya related from Ja’far bin Muhammad Al-Qummiy, from Al-Qaddah, from Ja’far bin Abihi (the son of his father), peace be upon him, that he said: Umm Kulthum bint (the daughter of) ‘Ali (peace be upon him) and her son Zaid bin ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab died in one single hour. It was not known which of the two died first. So, neither inherited from the other and they were prayed upon (in the funeral prayer) together]. The (ruling of ) non-inheriting is also like that in the Ja’fariy Fiqh and as such it resembles an Ijmaa’ (consensus) from the majority of the Sunnah and the Shi’ah.

**I say**: Zain Al-‘Abideen ‘Ali bin Al-Husain bin ‘Ali bin Abi Talib was in his twelfth year at the time of the incident and was consequently discerning and aware at that age. There should therefore be nothing that causes doubt in respect to him having lived through those painful events and his attendance at the funeral prayer of his paternal aunt Umm Kulthum and his cousin Zaid bin ‘Umar.

- The following came recorded in “At-Tareekh As-Sagheer” (Al-Awsat) (1/49/420):

[Mahmud related to me from ‘Ubaid, from Isra’eel, from As-Suddiy, from Abdullah Al-Bahiy, who said: I witnessed Ibn ‘Umar praying over Umm Kulthum and Zaid bin ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab and Al-Hasan and Al-Husain witnessed that].

- It was recorded in “Tareekh Dimashq” of Ibn ‘Asaakir (19/493) as follows:

[I read (or received from) Abu Ghalib from Abu Muhammad Al-Jawhariy: Abu ‘Umar informed us: Ahmad bin Ma’ruf related to us from Al-Husain bin Al-Fahm, from Muhammad bin Sa’d, from Ubaidullah bin Musa: Isra’eel informed us from As-Suddiy, from Abdullah Al-Bahiy, who said: I witnessed Ibn ‘Umar praying over Umm Kulthum and Zaid bin ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab. Zaid was placed adjacent to the Imam and Hasan and Husain were in attendance].

- The following came recorded in the Musannaf of Ibn Abi Shaibah (235) (3/315/11695):

[Ibn Mus’hir related to us from Ash-Shaibaniy, from Ash-Sha’biy, who said: Abdullah bin ‘Umar prayed over Umm Kulthum bint ‘Ali and her son Zaid. He said: The young man was placed adjacent to him and the woman was adjacent to the Ka’bah].

- And in “At-Tareekh As-Sagheer” (Al-Awsat) (1/49/421):

[Abu Nu’man related to us from Abdul Wahid, from Ash-Shaibaniy and he said: Ash-Sha’biy related to us, he said: Umm Kulthum bint ‘Ali and a son of hers from ‘Umar. So, Ibn ‘Umar performed the funeral prayer over them].

- And in “Al-Aathaar” of Muhammad bin Al-Hasan (p: 318/244 in the Electronic Shamela Library)

[Muhammad (i.e. Bin Al-Hasan Ash-Shaibaniy) said: Abu Hanifah informed us from Sulaiman Ash-Shaibaniy, from ‘Aamir Ash-Sha’biy, who said: Ibn ‘Umar, may Allah be pleased with him, prayed (the funeral prayer) over Umm Kulthum the daughter of ‘Ali, may Allah be pleased with them both, and Zaid bin ‘Umar, may Allah be pleased with him, her son. They placed Umm Kulthum in front of (or opposite) the Ka’bah and Zaid adjacent to the Imam. Muhammad said: We take our opinion in accordance with that and it was the view of Abu Hanifah, may Allah be pleased with him].

- And in “At-Tareekh As-Saghir” (Al-Awsat) (1/49/419):

[Muhammad bin As-Sabah related to us from Isma’eel bin Zakariya, from Razeen Al-Bazzar: Ash-Sha’biy related to me, he said: Zaid bin ‘Umar and Umm Kulthum both died and so Abdullah bin ‘Umar came forward with Al-Hasan, Al-Husain, Muhammad bin Al-Hanfiyah and Abdullah bin Ja’far behind him].

- And in “As-Sunan As-Saghir” of Al-Baihaqiy (3/13/863 in the Electronic Shamela Library):

[ Abu Al-Husain bin Al-Fadl Al-Qattan informed us from Abdulah bin Ja’far: Ya’qub bin Sufyan related to us from Abu Nu’aim, from Razeen Bayyaa’ Ar-Rumman, from Ash-Sha’biy, he said: Ibn ‘Umar prayed (the funeral prayer) over Zaid bin ‘Umar and his mother Umm Kulthum the daughter of ‘Ali. The man was placed adjacent to the Imam and the woman was placed behind him. He made four Takbirs and behind him stood Ibn Al-Hanafiyah, Al-Husain bin ‘Ali and Ibn ‘Abbas].

- And in “Tareekh Dimashq” of Ibn ‘Asaakir (19/492):

[Abu Muhammad As-Salmiy informed us: Abu Bakr Ahmad bin ‘Ali related to us: Abu l-Qasim Isma’eel bin Ahmad informed us from Muhammad Hibbatullah: They said: Muhammad bin Al-Husain related to us: Abdullah bin Ja’far informed us: Ya’qub related to us from Abu Nu’aim, from Razeen Bayyaa’ Ar-Rumman, from Ash-Sha’biy, who said: Ibn ‘Umar prayed over Zaid bin ‘Umar and his mother Umm Kulthum bint ‘Ali. The man was placed adjacent to the Imam and the woman was placed behind him. He prayed for over them and behind him stood Ibn Al-Hanafiyah, Al-Husain and Ibn ‘Abbas. He said: And Ya’qub related to us from Ubaidullah, from Razeen Bayyaa’ Ar-Rumman, from Ash-Sha’biy, who said: Ibn ‘Umar prayed over Zaid bin ‘Umar and his mother Umm Kulthum bint ‘Ali and then (i.e. behind him), Husain bin ‘Ali, Muhammad bin Al-Hanafiyah, Ibn ‘Abbas and Abdullah bin Ja’far].

- Razeen bin Habib Al-Juhaniy and it is said Al-Bakriy, Al-Kufiy Ar-Rummaniy, and it is said At-Tammar (date seller) and Al-Bazzaz (Clothes merchant). He alternated between many trades. He was from the seventh generation, from the major followers (Atbaa’) of the Taabi’een and Thiqah (trustworthy and reliable).

- And in “At-Tabaqaat Al-Kubra” of Ibn Sa’d (Dar Sadir publishers: 8/465):

[Abdullah bin Numair informed us: Isma’eel bin Abi Khalid related to us from ‘Aamir, he said: Ibn ‘Umar prayed over his brother Zaid and Umm Kulthum bint ‘Ali, and there placing was equal (or in line) and the man was adjacent to the Imam].

- And in “Tareekh Dimashq” of Ibn ‘Asaakir (19/491): [Abu Bakr Muhammad bin Abdul Baaqiy informed us from Al-Hasan bin ‘Ali, from Abu Al-Husain bin Al-Muzh’zhafar, from Muhammad bin Muhammad, from Shaiban bin Farroukh: Abdul ‘Aziz bin Muslim related to us from Isma’eel bin Abi Khalid, he said: Abdullah bin ‘Umar led us in prayer in Al-Madinah upon Zaid and his mother Umm Kulthum bint ‘Ali. We levelled them both together and placed the man adjacent to the Imam and the woman was brought forward]. Ibn ‘Asaakir said: [This is what was said however Isma’eel did not meet Ibn ‘Umar but rather only related it from Ash-Sha’biy]. This means that a narrator was omitted in the chain whilst its correct Isnad should be: [ … Isma’eel bin Abi Khalid from Ash-Sha’biy, who said: **Abdullah bin ‘Umar led us in prayer** in Al-Madinah upon Zaid and his mother Umm Kulthum bint ‘Ali. We levelled them both together and placed the man adjacent to the Imam and the woman was brought forward].

- And in “Adh-Dhurriyah At-Taahirah” by Ad-Doulabliy (p: 267/222 in the Electronic Shamela Library):

[Ibrahim bin Ya’qub related to us from Yazid bin Harun: Isma’eel bin Abi Khalid informed us, he said: We were talking about the funeral prayers of men and women at ‘Aamir’s (house) and ‘Aamir said: “I came and Abdullah bin ‘Umar had led the prayer over his brother Zaid bin ‘Umar and his mother Umm Kulthum bint (the daughter of) ‘Ali bin Abi Talib, may Allah be pleased with them both”].

- And in “Tareekh Dimashq” of Ibn ‘Asaakir (19/492):

[Abu l-Qasim bin As-Samarqandiy and Abu Ja’far Muhammad bin ‘Ali bin Muhammad bin Ahmad bin As-Simnaniy informed us of it: They said: Abu Muhammad As-Sarifeeniy from Abu l-Qasim bin Hababah: Abdullah bin Muhammad related to us from ‘Ali bin Al-Ja’d: Shu’bah informed us from Isma’eel and Abu Husain from Ash-Sha’biy, from Ibn ‘Umar: That he led the prayer over his brother and his mother Umm Kulthum bint ‘Ali. They placed the young man adjacent to the Imam and the woman above that] **And this is from the most authentic Asanid (chains of transmission) of the Dunyaa (this world)**.

- And also in “Tareekh Dimashq” of Ibn ‘Asaakir (19/492):

[Abu Ghalib bin Al-Banaa informed us in respect to what I read upon him from Abu Muhammad Al-Jawhariy: Abu ‘Umar bin Hayawiyah informed us from Ahmad bin Ma’ruf: Al-Husain bin Al-Fahm related to us from Muhammad bin Sa’d: Ubaidullah bin Musa informed us from Isra’eel, from Abu Husain, from ‘Aamir, from Ibn ‘Umar: That he prayed over Umm Kulthum bint ‘Ali and her son Zaid. He placed him adjacent to himself and made four Takbeers over them both. He said: And Ubaidullah bin Musa informed us from Isra’eel, from Jabir, from ‘Aamir, from Abdullah bin ‘Umar: That he made four Takbeers over Zaid bin ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab and behind him (stood) Al-Hasan and Al-Husain. And if he knew that goodness would increase him, he would have increased it].

**I say**: This therefore represents a Tawatur transmission from Ash-Sha’biy which is affirmed by the authentic transmissions of both Zain Al-‘Abideen and Abdullah Al-Bahiy, each of whom were also eye witnesses who attended the funeral prayer and saw that Abdullah bin ‘Umar was the one who came forward to pray over Zaid and his mother, and that Al-Husain was the one who put him forward. In addition, the Ameer of Al-Madinah at that time was Sa’id bin Al-‘Aas bin Sa’id bin Al-‘Aas, may Allah be pleased with him, who gave up the Imamah (leadership) of that Salah (prayer) to show respect to the ‘Aali l-Bait (Family of the house), whilst Al-Husain put Abdullah bin ‘Umar forward due to his virtue, age and his close relation to Zaid, his brother, and Umm Kulthum, who was like a mother to him. Even though Abdullah bin ‘Umar was older than her, he used to greatly respect her and would not depart from Al-Madinah except after giving her Salam in farewell and seeking her permission, may Allah’s pleasure and peace be upon them all.

- As for what came recorded in “Al-‘Ilal Wa Ma’riaft ur-Rijaal” of Ahmad bin Hanbal (3/3/25):

[My father related to me, he said: Hushaim related to us, he said: Yunus bin ‘Ubaid informed us from ‘Ammaar, the Mawla of Bani Hashim, who said: I witnessed the passing of Umm Kulthum bint ‘Ali and Zaid bin ‘Umar. He said: Then Sa’id bin Al-‘Aas prayed over them both and Umm Kulthum was brought forward in front of Zaid bin ‘Umar].

- And in “Al-Kunaa Wa l-Asmaa’” of Ad-Doulabiy (5/21/1055 in the Electronic Shamela Library):

[Muhammad bin Bash’shar related to us from Abu Al-Musaawir, he said: ‘Awf related to us, he said: ‘Ammar Abu Abdullah, the Mawla of Bani Hashim, related to me, he said: I was in Al-Madinah at the time when Umm Kulthum bint ‘Ali and her son Zaid passed away. They died at the same time and so their Janazah (funeral prayer) was done together. The man was placed adjacent to the Imam and the woman was placed in front of that].

- And in “Adh-Dhurriyah At-Taahirah” by Ad-Doulabiy (p: 266/221 in the Electronic Shamela Library):

[Abu Ishaq Ibrahim bin Ya’qub bin Ishaq Al-Jawazjaniy related to us from Yazid bin Harun: Hammad bin Salamah informed us from ‘Ammar bin Abi ‘Ammar: That Umm Kulthum bin ‘Ali and Zaid bin ‘Umar died and Sa’id bin Al-‘Aas prayed over them whilst Al-Hasan, Al-Husain and Abu Hurairah stood behind him].

- And in “Tareekh Dimashq” by Ibn ‘Asaakir (19/490):

[I read (received) from Abu Ghalib bin Al-Banaa from Abu Muhammad Al-Jawhariy: Abu ‘Umar bin Hayawiyah informed us from Ahmad bin Ma’ruf: Al-Husain bin Al-Fahm related to us from Muhammad bin Sa’d: Wakee’ bin Al-Jarrah informed us from Hammad bin Salamah from ‘Ammar bin Abi ‘Ammar, the Mawla of Bani Hashim, who said: I witnessed them on that day and Sa’id bin Al-‘Aas prayed over them and he was the Ameer (leader) of the people at that time, whilst eighty of the companions of the Muhammad ﷺ stood behind him].

- And in “Tareekh Dimashq” by Ibn ‘Asaakir (19/490):

[Abu Muhammad Hibbatullah bin Ahmad bin Tawus and Abu Al-Majd Mu’aliy bin Hibbatullah bin Al-Hasan bin ‘Ali bin Al-Hububiy informed us, they said: Sahl bin Bishr related: Abu Al-Hasan ‘Ali bin Al-Munir Al-Khallal informed us from Al-Hasan bin Ar-Rasheeq, from Abu Ja’far Ahmad bin Hammad bin Muslim Raghbah: Sa’id bin Al-Hakam bin Abi Maryam related to us: Yahya bin Ayyub informed us from Ibn Juraij: He related it from ‘Umaarah. The Mawla of Al-Harith bin Nawfal: He said: I witnessed the prayer over Umm Kulthum the wife of ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab and her son called Zaid bin ‘Umar. They were placed in the Musallaa (place of prayer) and the Imam that day was Sa’id bin Al-‘Aas, whilst among the people present were Ibn ‘Abbas, Abu Hurairah, Abu Sa;id Al-Khudriy and Abu Qatadah. The boy (or young man) was placed adjacent to the Imam. He said: So, I openly disapproved of that and I looked to that group and they said that it is the Sunnah]. Ibn ‘Asaakir said: [This is what ‘Umaarah said but he is really ‘Ammar as has been stated previously). **I say**: He was also the Mawla (slave or freed slave) of Bani Hashim and not the Mawla of Al-Harith bin Nawfal.

- Also, in “Tareekh Dimashq” of Ibn ‘Asaakir (19/489):

[Abu Muhammad As-Salamiy informed us: Abu Bakr Al-Khateeb related to us: Abu l-Qasim bin As-Samarqandiy informed us from Abu Bakr bin At-Tabariy, from Abu l-Husain bin Al-Fadl, from Abdullah bin Ja’far: Ya’qub related to us from Sa’id (meaning Ibn Mansur): Isma’eel bin Ibrahim informed us: Yunus bin Ubaidullah related to us: He said: ‘Ammar the Mawla of Bani Hashim was asked about the funeral prayers of the men and the women when they are done together. Then Al-Hasan (meaning Al-Basriy) said: “The man is before the woman in life and death!” ‘Ammar then said: “This is not what I am asking you about. I was among those frequently visiting between Umm Kulthum bint ‘Ali and her son Zaid bin ‘Umar (Yunus said: In relation to the inheritance). Then their funerals were brought out and the Ameer (leader) of AL-Madinah prayed over them both. He placed the woman before the man. And the companions of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ on that day (i.e. in attendance) were numerous in addition to Al-Hasan and Al-Husain.

He said: And Ya’qub related to us from Al-Hajjaj (meaning Ibn Al-Minhal), from Hammad: ‘Ammar bin Abi ‘Ammar informed us: That Zaid bin ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab and his mother Umm Kulthum bint ‘Ali were on their death bed. I was frequently visiting between them. Then both died. They were washed, shrouded and brought (for the prayer). Sa’id bin Al-‘Aas came forward and prayed over them. He said: And amongst the people (present) were Al-Hasan, Al-Husain, Abu Hurairah, Ibn ‘Umar and around 80 of the companions of Muhammad ﷺ].

**I say**: This only indicates that ‘Ammar bin Abi ‘Ammar, the Mawla of Bani Hashim, did not catch the prayer in the first lines, especially as he had been busy carrying the two bodies to the funeral and placing them. Consequently, he had thought that the Ameer of Al-Madinah Sa’id bin Al-‘Aas was the one who had led them in the prayer according to the usually followed custom. Similarly, the narration of Naafi’, the Mawla of Abdullah bin ‘Umar, appears from its context to not have been taken from Abdullah bin ‘Umar and it may be that some of it had been taken from ‘Ammar bin Abi ‘Ammar. That is because Naafi’ definitely did not witness the event:

- This is how it came reported in “Al-Mujtaba Min As-Sunan” of An-Nasa’iy (4/35/1978) and in “As-Sunan Al-Kubra” of An-Nasa’iy (1/459/2105):

[Muhammad bin Raafi’ informed us, he said: Abdur Razzaq related to us, he said: Ibn Juraij related to us, he said: I heard Naafi’ claim that Ibn ‘Umar led the prayer over nine funerals in one go. He placed the men in line with the Imam and the women in line with the Qiblah where their row was one row. And the funeral (i.e. her shrouded body) was placed of Umm Kulthum bint ‘Ali, the wife of ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab, and her son who was called Zaid. They were placed together (i.e. to be prayed over in one prayer) and the Imam on that day was Sa’id bin Al-‘Aas, whilst among the people (attending) were Ibn ‘Umar, Abu Hurairah, Abu Sa’id and Abu Qatadah. The boy (or young man) was placed adjacent to the Imam. Then a man said: “**I openly disapproved of that**, then I looked towards Ibn ‘Abbas, Abu Hurairah, Abu Sa’id and Abu Qatadah, and said: “What is this?” and they said: “It is the Sunnah”.

- And in “Al-Muntaqaa Min As-Sunan Al-Musnadah” of Ibn Al-Jaarud (p: 142/545):

[Ahmad bin Yusuf related to us from Abdur Razzaq, he said: Ibn Juraij informed us, he said: I heard Naafi claim that Ibn ‘Umar, may Allah be pleased with them both, led the prayer over nine funerals in one go. He placed the men in line with the Imam and the women in line with the Qiblah where their row was one row. And the funeral (i.e. her shrouded body) was placed of Umm Kulthum bint ‘Ali bin Abi Talib, the wife of ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab, and her son who was called Zaid, may Allah be pleased with them. They were put in a row together (i.e. to be prayed over in one prayer) and the Imam on that day was Sa’id bin Al-‘Aas, whilst among the people (attending) were Ibn ‘Abbas, Abu Hurairah, Abu Sa’id and Abu Qatadah, may Allah be pleased with them. The boy (or young man) was placed adjacent to the Imam. Then a man said: “I openly disapproved of that, then I looked towards Ibn ‘Abbas, Abu Hurairah, Abu Sa’id and Abu Qatadah, may Allah be pleased with them, and said: “What is this?” and they said: “It is the Sunnah”].

- And in “As-Sunan Al-Kubra” of Al-Baihaqiy (4/33/7169):

[Abu Zakariya bin Abi Ishaq informed us from Abu Abdullah Ash-Shiabaniy: Muhammad bin Abdul Wahhab related to us: Ja’far informed us … And Abu Abdullah Al-Hafizh: Abu l-‘Abbas related to us: Muhammad bin Ya’qub related to us from Ahmad bin Hazim bin Abi Gharazah Al-Ghifariy, from Ja’far (meaning Ibn ‘Awn), from Ibn Juraij, from Naafi’, from Ibn ‘Umar: That he led the prayer over nine funeral prayers of men and women (together). He placed the men adjacent to the Imam and the women in line with the Qiblah and he aligned them in one row. He said: And he placed the Janazah (i.e. shrouded body) of Umm Kulthum bin ‘Ali, the wife of ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab, may Allah be pleased with them, and that of her son called Zaid bin ‘Umar. And the Imam on that day was Sa’id bin Al-‘Aas and among the people (attending) that day were Ibn ‘Abbas, Abu Hurairah, Abu Sa’id and Abu Qatadah. He said: The boy (or young man) was then placed adjacent to the Imam and a man said: I openly disapproved of that and so I looked towards Ibn ‘Abbas, Abu Hurairah, Abu Sa’id and Abu Qatadah, may Allah be pleased with them, and said: “What is this?” They said: “The Sunnah”. The wording of the Hadith is that of Abu Abdullah and in the Riwayah (narrated report) of Abu Zakariya (it was stated): That Ibn ‘Umar led the prayer over nine funeral prayers together and he said in relation to Umm Kulthum and her son, that they were placed together and the remainder were equal].

- And in the Sunan of Ad-Daraqutniy (Version with Tashkeel: 2/137/1874):

[Al-Qasim bin Isma’eel related to us from Khallad bin Asalam, from Ja’far bin ‘Awn, from Ibn Juraij, from Nafi’: That Ibn ‘Umar prayed over nine funerals of men and women. He placed the men adjacent to him and the women in line with the Qiblah and he aligned them in one row. He said: And he placed the Janazah of Umm Kulthum bint ‘Ali, the wife of ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab, and her son, called Zaid bin ‘Umar. And the Imam on that day was Sa’id bin Al-‘Aas and among the people (attending) that day were Ibn ‘Abbas, Abu Hurairah, Abu Sa’id and Abu Qatadah. He said: The boy (or young man) was then placed adjacent to the Imam and a man said: I openly disapproved of that and so I looked towards Ibn ‘Abbas, Abu Hurairah, Abu Sa’id and Abu Qatadah. So, I said: “What is this?” and they said: “The Sunnah”].

**I say**: The paths are very numerous in both the books of the Sunnah and the Shi’ah, and it is hoped that what has ben presented is sufficient. So the marrying of Umm Kulthum bint (the daughter of) ‘Ali to ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab, in the most beautiful and excellent form, and what was granted to them from Allah in terms of children: Zaid bin ‘Umar and Ruqayyah bint ‘Umar, is a historical fact that is established by way of Mutawatir transmission and no one would deny it apart from the one who has lost his reason and joined the insane.

In addition, the sum of what has been presented above decisively dictates the invalidity of what came stated in “Al-Istee’aab Fee Ma’rifatil As’haab” of Al-Qurtubiy (p: 386):

[(Concerning) [‘Awn bin Ja’far bin Abi Talib]: He was born at the time of the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. His mother and the mother of his brothers: Abdullah and Muhammad the sons of Ja’far bin Abi Talib, was Asmaa’ bint ‘Umaish Al-Khath’amiyah. ‘Awn bin Ja’far and his brother Muhammad bin Ja’far were martyred (at the battle) of Tustur and he had no offspring]. This is false as Tustur only took place during the day’s of ‘Umar (i.e. his leadership) and ‘Awn remained living after ‘Umar and married Umm Kulthum after his death. As for Muhammad bin Ja’far, then it is well-known that he was martyred at Siffeen with ‘Ali. He battled against the forsaken rebel Ubaidullah bin ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab who had sided with Mu’awiyah, and so each of them killed his companion: Verily, to Allah we belong and to Him shall we return.

Some of the parts of the story have been relied upon (or officially adopted) within the Ja’fariy Fiqh, as has been stated previously, and similarly, for the purpose of providing an example whilst not being limited to this, it has come mentioned in the following:

- What came stated in “Kitab Zawaaj ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab Min Umm Kulthum bint ‘Ali bin Abi Talib” (Book: The marriage of ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab to Umm Kulthum bint ‘Ali bin Abi Talib) (p: 42/1):

[Related from Humaid bin Ziyad from Ibn Sama’ah, from Muhammad bin Ziyad, from Abdullah bin Sinan and Mu’awiyah bin ‘Ammar, from Abu Abdullah (peace be upon him), who said: I asked about the woman whose husband passed away, whether she does the ‘Iddah (waiting period) in her house or wherever she wishes? He said: Indeed, wherever she wishes. Indeed, when ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab passed away, ‘Ali (peace be upon him) went to Umm Kulthum and took her to his people].

- And (also) in “Kitab Zawaaj ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab Min Umm Kulthum bint ‘Ali bin Abi Talib” (Book: The marriage of ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab to Umm Kulthum bint ‘Ali bin Abi Talib) (p: 43/1):

[Muhammad bin Yahya and other than him related from Ahmad bin Muhammad bin ‘Isa, from Al-Husain bin Sa’id, from An-Nadr bin Suwaid, from Hisham bin Salim, from Sulaiman bin Khalid, he said: I asked Abu Abdullah (peace be upon him) where the woman whose husband passes away undertakes her ‘Iddah (waiting period)? Whether she performs the ‘Iddah in the house of her (late) husband or wherever she wishes? He said: Indeed, wherever she wishes. He then said: Indeed, when ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab passed away, ‘Ali (peace be upon him) went to Umm Kulthum, took her by her hand and went to his house].

There is therefore no surprise that the claimants of Shi’ism from the Rafidah As-Saba’iyah have a fit choking upon this and then flee towards false claims of coercion and compulsion, to hypocrisy which they call “**Taqiyah**”, and then to the world of fables and legends:

- The following came mentioned in “Kitab Al-Kaafiy” of Al-Kulainiy (1/105/237):

[(Chapter: The marrying of Umm Kulthum): ‘Ali bin Ibrahim related from his father, from Ibn Abi ‘Umair, from Hisham bin Salim and Hammad, from Zuraraah, from Abu Abdullah (peace be upon him) in relation to the marrying of Umm Kulthum, he said: **Verily, that was a Farj (i.e. woman’s source of fertility) that we were robbed of**].

- Also, in “Kitab Al-Kaafiy” of Al-Kulainiy (1/106/237):

[(Chapter: The marrying of Umm Kulthum: Muhammad bin Abi ‘Umair from Hisham bin Salim, from Abu Abdullah (peace be upon him), he said: When he proposed to him, the Ameer ul-Mu’mineen (i.e. ‘Ali) said to him: “She is a girl (i.e. of young age)” he said: Then he (i.e. ‘Umar) met Al-‘Abbas and said to him: “What is wrong with me?! Is there a problem with me?!” He said: “I proposed to the son of your brother and he rebuffed me. By Allah, I will deprive the Zamzam and I will not leave for you a noble deed except that I will demolish it and I will establish against him two witnesses that he stole and I will cut his right hand”. Then Al-‘Abbas came to him, informed him and asked him to let him take care of the matter and so he did so].

**I say**: In this way, humiliation and submissiveness was attributed to ‘Ali bin Abi Talib, Allah forbid, in the case where is daughter was (meant to have been) taken against her will and then he slipped away from the responsibility by passing it to his uncle Al-‘Abbas! There is therefore no surprise that the Abbasids considered themselves to have greater right to the Khilafah than the Alawis whilst their condition was like this!!

This horrendous “Taqiyah” (deception) and repulsive “coercion” became burdensome upon the people, whilst it is in truth a matter that cannot be endured, and so they attempted to get rid of the calamity of the “**Usurpation of the Farj (private part fo the woman)**”.

- The following came mentioned in “Al-Anwaar Al-‘Alawiyah” [Sheikh Ja’far An-Naqdiy (2/145)] directly after (The lie of the deprivation of Zamzam and the cutting of the hand):

[It was related: That when he went to her, he looked at her person from a distance, then when he got closer to her, a Hijab (barrier) was placed between her and him, and so he sufficed with that in respect to the relationship by marriage. And it came in “Al-Munaaqib” from An-Nawbakhtiy: ‘Umar passed away widowing Umm Kulthum before consummating the marriage with her, and ‘Awn bin Ja’far bin Abi Talib married her after him, then Muhammad bin Ja’far and then Abdullah bin Ja’far].

**I say**: No problem, at least we have escaped from the “**Usurpation of the Farj (private part fo the woman)**” and even if only barely. However, what should we do here in respect to Zaid bin ‘Umar?! Did he descend from the sky or was he picked up from one of the alleys of Al-Madinah?!

- Another attempt came in “Madinat ul-Mu’aajiz” of Hashim Al-Bahraniy (6/374):

[The five hundred and forty fifth: the Jinniyah that he (peace be upon him) showed to ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab when he married Umm Kulthum) – 828 – Ar-Raawandiy: From Abu Baseer, from Jud’aan bin Nasr, (He said): Abd Abdullah Muhammad bin Mis’adah related to me from Muhammad bin Hamawaih Ibn Isma’eel (Al-Arbanou’iy), from Abu Abdullah Az-Zabeeniy, from ‘Umar bin Udhainah, who said: It was said to Abu Abdullah (peace be upon him): “People bring the argument against us and are saying that the Maeer ul-Mu’mineen (i.e. ‘Ali), peace be upon him, married his daughter to so and so”. He was leaning and so he sat down and said: “And do you (all) accept that ‘Ali (peace be upon him) married his daughter to so and so!? People claim that who are not guided to the correct path or guidance”. He then clapped his hand and said: Subhaanallah (Glorified be Allah)! Was the Ameer ul-Mu’mineen, peace be upon him, not capable of coming between him and his daughter and to then save her?! They lied, what they said did not happen. (Rather) So and so proposed to ‘Ali to marry his daughter Umm Kulthum but ‘Ali, peace be upon him, rejected. Then he (i.e. ‘Umar) said to Al-‘Abbas: “By Allah, if he does not marry me (i.e. to his daughter), I will certainly removed from you the honour of feeding the pilgrims water and that related to Zamzam”. So, Al-‘Abbas went to ‘Ali and spoke to him and he refused him. Al-‘Abbas then persisted in asking him and then when the Ameer ul-Mu’mineen (‘Ali), peace be upon him, hardship and the speech of the man against Al-‘Abbas and that he ‘Umar) would do in respect to the honour of feeding water to the pilgrims what he said he would, the Ameer ul-Mu’mineen, peace be upon him, sent to a Jewsish Jinniyah from the people of Najran, who was called **Suhaiqah bint Haririyah**. He gave the command for her to impersonate Umm Kulthum whilst he kept Umm Kulthum from the sight of the people. He sent her to the man (i.e. ‘Umar) and she remained with him until one day he saw something in her to give him doubt. He then said: “There are no household on earth more sorcerous than Bani Hashim” he then wanted to expose that to the people but was killed. She then took the inheritance and went to Najran. Then the Ameer ul-Mu’mineen, peace be upon him, revealed Umm Kulthum].

- And the following came mentioned in “Kitab Zawaaj ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab Min Umm Kulthum bint ‘Ali bin Abi Talib” (Book: The marriage of ‘Umar bin Al-Khattab to Umm Kulthum bint ‘Ali bin Abi Talib) (p: 21):

[As for the second and that is the specific angle, then it was related by As-Sayyid ‘Aalim Bahaa ud-Deen ‘Ali bin Abdul Hamid Al-Husainiy An-Najafiy in the first volume of his book called “Al-Anwaar Al-Mudee’ah”. He said: From what I have been permitted to relate from Sheikh As-Sa’id Muhammad bin Muhammad bin An-Nu’man Al-Mufid, may Allah be pleased with him, which he raised (in the chain of transmission) to ‘Umar bin Udhainah, who said: I said to Abu Abdullah (peace be upon him), that the people bring the argument against us … etc … almost exactly like the previous report, word for word]. The compiler (Musannif) then commentated saying: [And I say: Based upon this the Hadith: “**The first Farj (i.e. woman’s source of fertility) that we were robbed or usurped of**” is understood to fall under: **At-Taqiyah (deception or concealment of the truth) and as a protection for the general masses of the Shi’ah**, as is evident].

- This text was mentioned by a number of the ‘Ulamaa’ of the Shi’ah in respect to the explanation of this marriage. They include: Bahaa’ ud-Deen ‘Ali bin Abdul Hamid Al-Husainiy An-Najafiy in “Al-Anwaar Al-Mudee’ah” and Sheikh Muhammad bin Muhammad bin An-Nu’man, who was known by the title of Al-Mufeed.

**I say**:

**Firstly**: In accordance with the colloquial proverb of the people of Makkah: “If the speaker is insane, then the hearer is sane”. Consequently, there is no need for any comment after such insanity, which failed, in spite of its terrible mythical nature, with absolute failure to solve the problematic issue regarding Zaid bin ‘Umar.

**Secondly**: I am unable, due to what is between myself and Allah, except to provide one single observation, and that is that “**At-Taqiyah**” (deception/concealing the truth) is not considered to be a “**Deen**” that is only utilised with the disbelievers, hypocrites, Nawaasib and general masses, but rather, **At-Taqiyah and (pretext of the) protection for the general masses of the Shi’ah**, has come to be a required and recommended matter. There is no surprise, as through that the Scholars and points of reference (Clergy) were able to maintain their control over the masses of the god fearing and good natured Shi’ah, whilst continuing to corruptly devour their wealth (through the fifths system), just as the Rabbis and priests of the previous nations use to do. That is in the case where Allah تعالى said in a warning and lesson:

يَا أَيُّهَا الَّذِينَ آمَنُوا إِنَّ كَثِيرًا مِّنَ الْأَحْبَارِ وَالرُّهْبَانِ لَيَأْكُلُونَ أَمْوَالَ النَّاسِ بِالْبَاطِلِ وَيَصُدُّونَ عَن سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ ۗ وَالَّذِينَ يَكْنِزُونَ الذَّهَبَ وَالْفِضَّةَ وَلَا يُنفِقُونَهَا فِي سَبِيلِ اللَّهِ فَبَشِّرْهُم بِعَذَابٍ أَلِيمٍ ‎﴿٣٤﴾‏ يَوْمَ يُحْمَىٰ عَلَيْهَا فِي نَارِ جَهَنَّمَ فَتُكْوَىٰ بِهَا جِبَاهُهُمْ وَجُنُوبُهُمْ وَظُهُورُهُمْ ۖ هَٰذَا مَا كَنَزْتُمْ لِأَنفُسِكُمْ فَذُوقُوا مَا كُنتُمْ تَكْنِزُونَ

**O you who believe! Verily, there are many of the (Jewish) rabbis and the (Christian) monks who devour the wealth of mankind in falsehood, and hinder (them) from the way of Allah. And those who hoard up gold and silver [Al-Kanz: the money, the Zakat of which has not been paid], and spend it not in the Way of Allah, announce unto them a painful torment. \* On the Day when that Al-Kanz (money, gold and silver, etc., the Zakat of which has not been paid) will be heated in the Fire of Hell and with it will be branded their foreheads, their flanks, and their backs, (and it will be said unto them): “This is the treasure which you hoarded for yourselves. Now taste of what you used to hoard”** (At-Tawbah: 34-35).

And perhaps the best way to conclude, following the peace and blessings upon the Seal of Prophets, his purified and good family and his sincere companions who strove in Allah’s way, is with the Du’aa (supplication) of ‘Ammar bin Yasir which he attained from the seal of the Prophets of Allah ﷺ:

اللَّهُمَّ بِعِلْمِكَ الْغَيْبَ وَقُدْرَتِكَ عَلَى الْخَلْقِ أَحْيِنِي مَا عَلِمْتَ الْحَيَاةَ خَيْرًا لِي وَتَوَفَّنِي إِذَا عَلِمْتَ الْوَفَاةَ خَيْرًا لِي اللَّهُمَّ وَأَسْأَلُكَ خَشْيَتَكَ فِي الْغَيْبِ وَالشَّهَادَةِ وَأَسْأَلُكَ كَلِمَةَ الْحَقِّ فِي الرِّضَا وَالْغَضَبِ وَأَسْأَلُكَ الْقَصْدَ فِي الْفَقْرِ وَالْغِنَى وَأَسْأَلُكَ نَعِيمًا لاَ يَنْفَدُ وَأَسْأَلُكَ قُرَّةَ عَيْنٍ لاَ تَنْقَطِعُ وَأَسْأَلُكَ الرِّضَاءَ بَعْدَ الْقَضَاءِ وَأَسْأَلُكَ بَرْدَ الْعَيْشِ بَعْدَ الْمَوْتِ وَأَسْأَلُكَ لَذَّةَ النَّظَرِ إِلَى وَجْهِكَ وَالشَّوْقَ إِلَى لِقَائِكَ فِي غَيْرِ ضَرَّاءَ مُضِرَّةٍ وَلاَ فِتْنَةٍ مُضِلَّةٍ **اللَّهُمَّ زَيِّنَّا بِزِينَةِ الإِيمَانِ وَاجْعَلْنَا هُدَاةً مُهْتَدِينَ**

O Allah, by Your knowledge of the unseen and Your power over creation, keep me alive so long as You know that living is good for me and cause me to die when You know that death is better for me. O Allah, cause me to fear You in secret and in public. I ask You to make me true in speech in times of contentment and anger. I ask You to make me moderate in times of wealth and poverty. And I ask You for everlasting delight and joy that will never cease and the soothing of the eye that is uninterrupted. I ask You for contentment following the decree and for comfort after death. I ask You for the delight of looking upon Your face and a longing to meet You in a manner that does not entail a calamity that will bring about harm or a trial that will cause deviation. **O Allah, beautify us with the adornment of Iman (belief) and make us among those who guide and are rightly guided**.

And Al-Hamdu Lillahi Rabb il-‘Aalameen.

(All Praise belongs to Allah, the Lord of the Worlds).
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