

COMPLETION OF ARGUMENT

TRANSLATION OF

Itmaam-i-Hujjat

by: **Sayyid Saeed Akhtar Rizvi**

Handwritten text at the top of the page, possibly a title or header, including the word "Handwritten" and some illegible characters.

Small handwritten mark or character on the left margin.

Small handwritten mark or character in the middle of the page.

Small handwritten mark or character at the bottom of the page.

COMPLETION OF ARGUMENT

Translation of
Itmaam-i-Hujjat

By:

Late Maulana Sayyid Saeed Akhtar Rizvi (t.s.)

Translated by:

Sayyid Athar Husain S.H. Rizvi

Akhtar Rizvi, Saeed, .

Completion of Argument Translation of Itmaam-i-Hujjat/by Saeed Akhtar Rizvi; Translated by Athar Husain S.H. Rizvi.- Qum: Ansariyan, 2006.

336P.

ISBN: 964-438-795-3

1. Shiites – Apologetic works. 2. Shiites – Doctrines.
I. Rizvi, Athar Husain S.H., Tr. II. Title.
297.4172 BP212.5.A6C7

اتمام الحجّة ترجمه انگلیسی

COMPLETION OF ARGUMENT

Translation of Itmaam-i-Hujjat

Author: Late Maulana Sayyid Saeed Akhtar Rizvi (t.s.)

Translator: Sayyid Athar Husain S.H. Rizvi

Publisher: Ansariyan Publications – Qum

First Edition: 1385 – 1427 - 2006

Thamin Al-a'immah Press

No. Of Pages: 336 P.

Quantity: 2000

Size: 143 x 205 mm

ISBN: 964-438-795-3

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED AND RECORDED FOR THE PUBLISHER



ANSARIYAN PUBLICATIONS

P.O. Box 187

22 Shohada Str. Qum

Islamic Republic Of Iran

Tel: 00 98 251 7741744 Fax: 7742647

Email: ansarian@noornet.net

www.ansariyan.org & www.ansariyan.net

بِسْمِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ

**IN THE NAME OF ALLAH,
THE BENEFICENT, THE MERCIFUL**

Dedication

Dedicated To those who

Like the Truth,

Prefer the facts,

And

Love justice,

And

To those who

Rising above prejudice and narrow mindedness,

Wish to understand Shiaism

In the light of truth.

Table of Contents

Dedication.....	4
Translator's Foreword	11
Preface	13
Introduction	18
The Thorn and the flower.....	22
Who is the culprit of the belief in tampering of Quran?	32
Umar.....	33
The aunt of Abi Amamah bin Sahl.....	34
Ayesha.....	36
Abdullah bin Abbas	38
Hafasa	40
Ummul Momineen Umme Salamah.....	41
Ubayy bin Kaab	42
Abdullah bin Masud	44
Abdur Rahman bin Auf	46
Abu Musa Ashari	46
Musailimah bin Mukhallad Ansari.....	48

Abu Waqid Lilaithi	48
Jabir bin Abdullah Ansari.....	49
Buraidah.....	50
Akramah	50
Huzaifah Yamani.....	50
Imam Malik.....	52
Abdullah bin Masud	53
Abu Darda	53
Umar.....	55
Abdullah bin Umar	56
Abdullah bin Masud	58
Abdullah bin Abbas	59
Mujahid.....	60
Uthman believed there was a mistake in the Quran.....	61
Ayesha.....	61
Abdullah Ibne Abbas	63
Mus'haf of Fatima.....	74
Meaning of Bada.....	78
Some beliefs of the opponents of Islam	87
Conclusion.....	88
Islamic belief.....	88
Voluntary and Non-Voluntary Actions.....	89
Abrogation (Naskh)	90

Bada in Involuntary Matters.....	92
Reason for Naming	93
First incident.....	95
Second incident.....	97
Third incident.....	100
Is Taqiyyah hypocrisy?.....	111
First Preface.....	114
Second Preface.....	114
Third Preface.....	115
First verse.....	117
Second verse.....	117
Third verse.....	118
Fourth verse.....	119
Fifth verse.....	120
Sixth verse.....	121
Muawiyah and the Imam's martyrdom.....	134
Existence of the Master of the Age.....	163
Proof of existence of the Imam of Age.....	164
Allamah Abdul Wahhab Sherani	172
Maulana Ali Akbar Maududi.....	174
Mulla Jami	175
Khwaja Muhammad Parsa.....	176
Sibte Ibne Jawzi.....	178

Abu Abdillah Ganji Shafei.....	179
Shaykh Nuruddin bin As-Sabbagh Al-Maliki.....	179
Shah Waliullah Dehlavi	180
Shaykh Abdul Haq Dehlavi.....	181
Muhaddith Jamaluddin	183
Allamah Muhiuddin bin Arabi	184
Kamaluddin bin Talha Shafei.....	185
Excellence of the two Shaykhs	193
Were Shias the killers of Imam Husain?	207
Shias in the view of Imam Musa Kazim.....	211
Another miracle of comprehension - Taziyah of Shimr!.....	242
Mutah (Temporary Marriage)	245
Mutah was in vogue since the beginning of Islam	256
Allamah Baghavi writes in Tafsir Ma'alimut Tanzil:	261
The recitation of 'Ila ajalim musammaa'	265
First Question	277
Second and Third Questions	280
Fourth Question	284
Fifth and seventh Question	292
Sixth Question	294
Imam Abu Hanifah, Wrapping of silk and other issues	301
Imam Abu Hanifah and his prayer.....	313
1 st fundamental: Permission to pray in a dog skin	315

2 nd fundamental - prayers with one-fourth of dress impure.....	317
3 rd fundamental – Ablution with date wine	318
4 th fundamental – Non-obligation of intention in ablution.....	319
5 th fundamental –Sequence not obligatory in ablution.....	320
6 th fundamental - Takbiratul Ihram in any language.....	321
7 th fundamental - Sufficiency of reciting any verse in Prayer.....	323
8 th fundamental – Non-obligation of calmness in prayers	324
9 th fundamental – Passing flatulence is sufficient.....	325
Glossary of Islamic Terms	331

Translator's Foreword

Praise be to Allah, the Lord of the worlds, and benedictions upon the Messenger of Allah and his Purified Progeny (s). By the Grace of the Almighty, the English translation of *Itmaam-i-Hujjat* is completed on the 18th of Zilhajj (Eid-e-Ghadeer), 1426 A.H.

What could be a better occasion to refute the allegations of the enemies of the followers of Ahle Bayt (s)!

The author, late Allamah Sayyid Saeed Akhtar Rizvi (q.s.) was one of the most competent researchers in the field of religion and polemics. In this book he has applied his dexterity to reply to the baseless but horrifying objections against the Shia religion.

This book covers almost all the major objections that scholars of Ahle Sunnat and other opponents of Shias aim against Shia beliefs and customs:

Allamah Sayyid Saeed Akhtar Rizvi (q.s.) has refuted them in his typical style and quoted extensively from their own books to support his arguments.

I had to exercise great care in translating this book, as the Urdu language is well known for idiomatic subtleties and ironic style. This sometimes makes it almost impossible to render perfectly all the meanings in a different language, but I have tried my best not to stray way from the actual meaning and at the same time to make the book readable to the English reader.

Readers would have to get used to read the words "Rizwan Editor" again and again as the book is addressed to him and in reply to his objections.

Since the English equivalents of Islamic terminology do not convey the exact meaning, I have sometimes used the original Arabic terms with the English meaning in parentheses. However those who are not conversant with Arabic words may refer to the "Glossary of Islamic Terms" at the end of the book.

Lastly I thank my son, Sayed Maqsood for assisting in the translation of this book and typing of the manuscript. May the Almighty Allah reward him and make his love for languages to serve the cause of the True Religion.

Wassalaam

Sayyid Athar Husain S.H.Rizvi

Al-Qalam Translators & Writers Bureau, Vasai, (India)

January 19, 2006 - 18th Zilhajj 1426 (Eid-e-Ghadeer)

Email: sayedathar@hotmail.com

Preface

In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful.

In a time when the whole world is hell bent on hindering the spreading light of Islam and is trying different types of schemes to suppress this voice and every possible scheme is being carried out. Especially hectic efforts are made to create doubts among the Muslims regarding their faith and dissent is being sowed among them to foster disunity so that they remain involved in such controversies and get no opportunity to propagate Islam. It is the same method that was resorted to during the apparent caliphate of Ali (s) and so many external issues were raised that there was no limit to it. When all those plans failed, Imam Ali (s) was martyred.

Today, the world is moving fast in the direction of Islam like those dying of thirst rush towards water. At such time it is necessary to rise above internal differences and present the true picture of Islam before others and demonstrate such unity and accord like the Holy Quran, the traditions of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) and the Holy Imams advise.

Everyone knows that imperialist and Zionist powers never want to see the Muslims unite. If they had even a little soft corner for the Muslims; they would not have allowed the enemies of Muslims to bomb the Muslims anywhere they like.

There had never been greater need for unity among the Muslims. It is an established fact that when Islam is attacked,

the attacker does not discriminate between different sects, rather he attacks all the Muslims. In such circumstances, when Islam is being attacked from all directions, sometimes the Islamic laws are made butts of ridicule, at other times its principles are mocked at, it is also sometimes publicized that it is an insufficient system, it is labeled to be materialistic and also called as the legacy of the period of ignorance.

Under such circumstances, the need of the hour is to unite together according to the command of the Holy Quran and secure the well being of the society by countering the enemies with irrefutable proofs. Today the enemies of Islam are not inimical to a particular personality or a particular sect. They are enemies of Islam and they intend to eradicate Islam. At present whatever distinction we have is due to Islam alone. Whatever dignity and position we have among the people is only for the sake of Islam. People accord respect to us solely for the fact that we teach them about Allah and the Prophet. This status has made us honorable in the eyes of people. Therefore if we do anything that renders Islam blameworthy and emboldens the enemies, we can be sure that every kind of such action and behavior is detrimental to ourselves.

After the Islamic revolution of Iran an atmosphere of unity and integration has been created among the Muslims and the two great sects of Islam have begun to come near each other. The atmosphere of distrust, that the imperialist powers had created, is considerably reduced. The commands of Quran are:

*And hold fast by the covenant of Allah all together and be not disunited...*¹

*And be not like those who became divided and disagreed...*²

¹ Surah Aale Imran 3:103

² Surah Aale Imran 3:105

The verse between the above two verses is as follows:

*And from among you there should be a party who invite to good and enjoin what is right and forbid the wrong, and these it is that shall be successful.*¹

There is command of unity and agreement before this verse, and after it, prohibition of controversies and disunity; and consensus. That is in the Holy Quran the style of propagation is consensual and harmonious and not based on disunity and dissension.

It is a fact that what the Zionists and the imperialists fear most is the unity of Muslims, and they should really fear it. However, those who claim to be the sons of Quran and the sons of Monotheism should be pleased with the unity of Muslims.

But it is a tragedy that even the world-renowned and award-winning Mullahs are not happy with this atmosphere of unity. They do not, at all, like this unity, no one knows why. While they should be more pleased with this atmosphere on whose lips the verses of Quran remain all the time. If those who have received this style in legacy had raised their voices against this unity, it would not have been surprising. But today even those who used to assume silence in controversial matters are screaming at the top of their voices. Is it because they are connected to the imperialist and Zionist powers? Is it because they had been favored by the enemies of Islam and now they want their pound of flesh? It seems to be so. That the words in their mouths are not theirs and the ink in their pens is not theirs. It is the voice of imperialism in their mouths and the ink of imperialism in their pens. It is a matter of great pity that these people, even in their last moments, instead of repenting

¹ Surah Aale Imran 3:104

and seeking forgiveness are fulfilling the wishes of imperialism and remain puppets in the hands of Zionists.

Objections against the Shias are nothing new. In every age there were people who by raising objections had consoled their egos. But at a time when people are coming near to each other and arranging rows against the enemies of Islam, it is not a good thing and a rewarding deed to do anything that creates dissension in the ranks.

The objections showered on Shia beliefs do not contain anything new. The age-old objections are again recycled and repeated. These objections have been replied in all the ages. Justice requires that after making allegations one should also read the replies. And if there is any deficiency or weakness in the reply, it should be highlighted. But it seems that the objection makers, after making objections close their eyes and no more sight remains in their eyes to read the replies. When again their eyes open up they again pick up the pen and start writing. And when they become tired they close their eyes to sleep and when again they wake up they start writing in a state of stupor.

Approximately thirty years ago, Maulana Sayyid Mahmood Ahmad Rizvi had mentioned such objections under the article, "The thorn and the flower" in "The chief of the Martyrs" (Sayyidush Shohada, Imam Husain) special issue of the periodical, 'Rizwan' (Lahore). He wrote whatever came to his mind. When the readers see those objections they will find them to be stock objections and age-old allegations.

We would not have replied to these objections if it had not been further alleged that the Shias are unable to reply them.

The replies are presented here by way of "Completion of Argument". We hope that the justice-loving people would rise

above bigotry and read the objections and their replies and then form a correct opinion.

May Allah bestow us with the best of Tawfeeqs and may He always keep our hearts illuminated with the love of His best and selected servants.

Amen.

And there is no divine opportunity except from Allah and upon Him I rely and in Him I trust.

Executive Committee

Idarah Nurul Islam, Faizabad

Mohurrum al-Haraam 1406 AH

Introduction

In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful.

Praise be to Allah the Lord of the worlds and blessings and peace be upon the best of creations, Muhammad and his Purified Progeny.

So to say:

An Urdu weekly, "Rizwan", used to be published from Lahore, which publicized itself on its banner to be "The Religious Voice of the Ahle Sunnat wal Jamat". The editor of the weekly was Maulana Sayyid Mahmood Ahmad Rizvi. The Imam Husain special issue was published between 28th August to 14th September 1954 (Issues no 31 to 34, Vol. 6). On pages 11 to 16 the editorial contained various objections against the Shias under the title of "The thorn and the flower". Most of these objections had been the oft-repeated ones of the elders of editor of Rizwan and which have already been replied thousands of times. But, the Rizwan editor has presented them in such a way that his readers would feel they are his own creations. Other objections concocted by Maulana Sayyid Mahmood Ahmad Rizvi have exposed the level of his knowledge.

Replies to a majority of these objections were published in the Razakar newspaper of Lahore, till the authorities banned this publication. It was then that my respected friend, Sayyid Jamil Husain Rizvi wrote to me to expose the facts behind the objections. In compliance of his wishes, I wrote replies to two

objections at a time and had them published in Al-Jawwad Magazine of Varanasi, India (March 1955 to March 1958 issues). Maulana Zafar Hasan, editor of Noor Magazine, Karachi, published in article form, my discussion about 'Bada'¹ and stated that he had not seen anything better than that in Urdu language.

And as for the favor of your Lord, do announce (it).²

When I had written those articles I had no access to many books and sources that I required. In spite of that, thanks be to Allah, the replies proved very effective, quite sufficient and became a wealth of information for the preachers of India, Pakistan and Africa. During the compilation of these replies, there were two instances when it was impossible to write anything without looking up the original references and I did not have the concerning books, neither there existed any library from which I could obtain them. On both the occasions I sought the help of the Master of the Age (May Allah hasten his reappearance) and the Imam favored me and solved the problem in no time.

The first instance occurred when the Rizwan editor wrote on the authority of *Rijal Kishi* that Shias are composed of three parts: One part is sinful and evil and two parts foolish." Further on, under the same reference he wrote: His eminence, Imam Husain (s) said addressing the Shias:..."O Shias! You killed me and plundered all my belongings."

I did not have a copy of *Rijal Kishi* to check the reference. The article came to a stand still. In the evening I strolled to a relative's house. There I saw in a corner of the courtyard, some loose pages strewn about, that had been discarded as trash. I

¹ The belief that Allah could effect change in His decree

² Surah Zuha 93:11

collected those pages and brought them home. When I arranged the pages I found that it was the complete first volume of *Rijal Kishi* (Published from Calcutta). I thanked Allah for the favor of my Imam and got the volume bound. The veracity of references presented by the Rizwan editor can be seen in the coming pages.

The second instance was when the Rizwan editor had quoted the sentence of Majalisul Muttaqeen. The correct tradition should have been: O People! You have killed my Shias and martyred the people of my house! But the Rizwan editor has interpolated it as: O Shias! You have killed me and my Ahle Bayt also." It was very difficult to expose this fraud without access to the original Arabic text and I did not have any book containing this sentence of Imam Husain (s). I was forced to put away all the papers and sought the help of the Imam of the Last Age. When my respected mother (May Allah purify her grave) noticed that I had stopped writing the article she sent me on an errand to her parents' place five miles away. I complied immediately and conveyed her message. After that, by way of whiling away the time I picked up a book from the tomes of my departed maternal grandfather. It turned out to be the *Maqatal* of Abi Mikhnaf. I opened it and the first line that caught my eyes were the words of Imam Husain (s): O People! You killed my brother, my children and my Shias...I thanked the Almighty for this unseen help and borrowed the book and brought it home with me. The aim of recounting these experiences is that people like the Rizwan editor who are themselves deniers of His Eminence the Proof (Hujjat), should see how His Eminence favors even the lowliest of his slaves.

After the publication of my articles under the title *Kerbala Shinasi*, my friends in India, Pakistan and Africa insisted that the replies addressed to the Rizwan editor should also be similarly published in book form so that their usefulness may

be enhanced. A few months ago, my respected mentor, Mulla Asghar M.M. Jaffer of KSI Supreme council of Africa and former president of World Federation of KSI Muslim Communities (London) stressed the need for publishing this book. These articles are presented herewith in the book form according to his wishes. May Allah reward the gentleman and increase his Tawfeeqat.¹ Amen, then amen.

In the beginning of the book I have quoted verbatim the article of Rizwan so that readers may see all the objection at a glance.

And peace be upon those who follow the guidance.

Sincerely

Sayyid Saeed Akhtar Rizvi

Gopalpur, PO Baqarganj, Dist. Siwan, (Bihar) India.

12th Rabi II 1404 (February 15, 1984)

¹ Plural of Tawfeeq=Divine opportunity to perform a good deed

The Thorn and the flower

(Objections against Shia faith published in the 'Rizwan' Magazine, Lahore. Sayyadush Shohada¹ Special Issue 1374 A.H.)

Objection 1: Forged Quran

Again this year read about some interesting beliefs and laws of the Shia faith and gain lesson from them. Muslims all over the world believe that the Quran in our hands is the one revealed by Allah and that it is exactly as it was revealed upon the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.). However the Shia belief is exactly opposite; that the existing Quran is a fabricated one. It has been distorted while the real Quran is with the Hidden Imam who is hiding in a cave. He will come with the real Quran sometime before the Day of Judgment.

All right sir! So this is a forged Quran. But how sensible is this Hidden Imam that he has hidden the real Quran and does not guide the creatures of God!

It is narrated on page 271 of *Usul al-Kafi* that Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq (s) said, "The Quran that Jibraeel (s) brought to the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) had seventeen thousand verses."

On the same page of this book another tradition is narrated that Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq (s) brought out the Quran inscribed by

¹ Lit. Chief of the Martyrs, title of Imam Husain (a.s.)

Imam Ali (s) and said, "By Allah, after this day you will never see the Quran."

On page 146 of the same book another tradition says that Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq (s) remarked, "We have a 'Jame' (collection). It is seventy yards long."

It means that according to the Shia school of thought no one will see the real Quran till the reappearance of Imam Mahdi (a.t.f.s.). The real Quran is seventy yards long and has seventeen thousand verses. As if a ladder would be needed to read it.

Objection 2: Mus'haf-e-Fatima

The famous religious book of Shias, *Usul al-Kafi* has the following tradition on page 146: Imam (s) said, "We have Mus'haf-e-Fatima. And do you know what is Mus'haf-e-Fatima?" He said, "It is a Quran, and by Allah! It does not have even a single letter in common with your Quran."

Now, this is a third Quran. First a forged one, then a real one, which is with the Hidden Imam and a Mus'haf-e-Fatima also. But we don't know in which cave it is and who is hiding with Mus'haf-e-Fatima.

Objection 3: Bada (Change in Divine Will)

The principle of Bada in Shia ideology is also very strange: They say that Bada happens to God. It means that at times, God forbid, He performs an action due to His ignorance and then regrets it, and an interesting thing is that this belief is considered so important that no worship act is equal to it. Hence a whole chapter is devoted to Bada in *Usul al-Kafi*, the famous religious book of Shias.

A tradition is mentioned on page 84 of *Usul al-Kafi* that Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq (s) said, "If people come to know about the reward in the belief of Bada they would not neglect it."

Another tradition says: Zurarah says that Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq (s) said, "Allah does not give prophethood to anyone unless He makes him confess to five things: Bada, Mashiyat (Will of God), Prostration, Worship and Obedience."

It is quite strange that this issue is mentioned in the reliable book of Shias. It is surprising that these people believe in such a God Who regrets His own actions, and has to change His opinion. It is as if He is Fazlul Haq, the Governor of Bengal, who at first deposed against Pakistan and then regretted it.

Objection 4: Taqiyyah (Dissimulation)

"Taqiyyah is one of the best worship act for the Shias. The foundation of their religion stands on Taqiyyah itself. Taqiyyah means to lie.

It is narrated on page 488 of *Usul al-Kafi* that Imam Muhammad Baqir (s) said, "Taqiyyah is my religion, the religion of my forefathers, (God forbid), one who does not have Taqiyyah, has no faith."

It is narrated on page 483 of *Usul al-Kafi* that, "Taqiyyah is from the religion of God."

Shia gentlemen should tell us that if Taqiyyah had been actually religion or a part of religion why didn't Imam Husain resort to Taqiyyah and pay allegiance to Yazid? The Imam cut off the roots of Taqiyyah in the battle of Kerbala. He gave away his head but did not pay allegiance even for the sake of Taqiyyah. He made it clear from his behavior that 'a religion based on Taqiyyah is not mine'."

Objection 5: Concealing religion

Shias must also think over this narration that is present in their religious book. It is mentioned on page 485 of *Usul al-Kafi* that Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq (s) said, "O Sulaiman! You follow such a religion that God honors one who conceals it and disgraces one who reveals it."

It is narrated on page 482 of *Usul al-Kafi*: "Nine parts of religion are in Taqiyyah."

Shias must note that they are ordered, and that too by Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq (s), to conceal their religion. If you reveal it, you would be disgraced. Can a religion be called a religion where one gets honor in concealing it and disgrace in revealing it?

Objection 6: Who killed the Imam?

Shias blame Amir Muawiyah for the assassination of Imam (s). Some Shias even say that the Imam was assassinated only on the order of Muawiyah. However, Shia scholars have themselves concocted these allegations. Reliable Shia books prove that Amir Muawiyah had nothing to do in the Imam's murder. Mulla Baqir Majlisi writes in *Jalalul Uyun*¹ that Amir Muawiyah willed to Yazid at the time of his death:

- 1) "But as for Imam Husain (s)! You know his relation and nearness to the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.). He is a part of the Prophet. I know that the people of Iraq will call him and would not help him. If you get control over him, recognize his rights. Remember his rank of nearness to the Prophet. Do not make him recompense for his actions and do not break off the relations I have

¹ Page 421-422

strengthened with him during this time. Beware! Do not give him any kind of trouble.

- 2) It is narrated in *Nasikhut Tawarikh* that Muawiyah made the following will to Yazid: O son! Do not be greedy. Beware, when you come to Allah you should not have the blood of Husain bin Ali upon your neck. Otherwise, you will not be at ease and remain under chastisement forever.

This narration is also from the book of Shias. At least it proves that Muawiyah was not involved in the martyrdom of Husain (s). He had willed Yazid to respect and help the Imam. Then we do not understand why Amir Muawiyah is blamed for the martyrdom of the Imam?

Objection 7: Shias and Imam Mahdi

It is narrated in *Usul al-Kafi*: "If the number of Shias come to three hundred and thirteen, Imam Mahdi (a.t.f.s.) will reappear."¹

Did you understand anything? The book of Shias is opposing themselves. It says that if at anytime and anywhere the number of true Shias comes to three hundred and thirteen, Imam Mahdi will reappear. But the Imam is not ready to leave the cave. It proves that all these Shias seen everywhere in large numbers are not true believers but enemies of Ahle Bayt. If at anytime the number of Shias had come to three hundred and thirteen, the Imam would have surely reappeared. Since the Imam has not reappeared the conclusion is clear.

¹ Kitabul Hujjah, Pg. 35

Objection 8: Shias in the view of Musa Kazim (s)

Now let us see this narration on page 159 of *Usul al-Kafi*: Imam Musa Kazim (s) said: "Allah sent wrath upon the Shias."

"If I select my Shias, I will not find any but talkative ones and if I test them, I will not find them but apostates."¹

This verdict is not of Shias but of Imam Musa Kazim, which is present in their books. Now Shias should contemplate on what is the opinion of their Imam about them, because if we say anything they would complain.

Not only this, it is mentioned in the reliable book of Shias, *Ihtijaj* of Tabarsi:² "All the twelve sects of Shias would go to Hell."

It is mentioned in *Rijal Kishi* that the Shia community consists of three parts: First is sinful and unfortunate while the other two are foolish." Similarly, it is narrated in *Furu al-Kafi*³ that Imam Ali (s) said, "I pity the deeds of the Shias."

Objection 9: Killers of Husain were also Shias

It is mentioned in *Majalisul Muttaqin* (page 29) that: Imam Husain (s) holding his son, Ali Asghar in his arms said to the disbelievers, "O Shias! You killed me as well as the people of my house (Ahle Bayt)." It is mentioned in *Rijal Kishi* (page 13)

¹ *Furu al-Kafi*, Pg. 107

² Page 141

³ Vol. 3, Pg. 31

that Imam Husain addressed the Shias, "O Shias! You killed me and plundered all my belongings."

Books of Shias inform that the killers of Husain were Shias themselves.

Objection 10: Taziyah (replica of a sarcophagus)

You would be surprised to know that according to Shia faith there is no harm in taking out the Taziyah of Shimr (l.a.). It is mentioned in *Zakhiratul Ma'ad* (page 618) that taking out the Taziyah of Shimr (l.a.) is not wrong; rather it is a preferable act. Now the Shias please let us know that though they carry Taziyah of Imam Husain to express love towards him, how does taking out the Taziyah of Shimr (l.a.) become preferable and permissible?

Objection 11: Mutah (Temporary Marriage)

According to the Shias it is a very good deed to use women after giving them some pennies, without performing Nikah¹ with them. It is even that, God forbid, it is permissible even with Sayyid women after giving them some money. This is so because they believe that performing Mutah gives them the rank of Husain, Ali and even the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.). It is mentioned on page 50 of *Burhanul Mutah*: "One who performs Mutah once, gets the rank of Hasan. One who performs twice, gets the rank of Husain. One who performs thrice, gets the rank of Ali and one who performs Mutah four times, gets the rank of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.)."

¹ Islamic Marriage

Not only this, the Shia faith is so dirty that it is permissible to have sexual relations even with women in the prohibited degree (Mahram) provided one has wrapped his sexual organ in silk. Zainul Abideen Haeri Mazandarani, a Shia scholar, writes in *Zakhiratul Ma'ad* (page 95) that: 'Intercourse (with mother and sisters) is permissible after wrapping silk.'

Objection 12: Companions of the Prophet in the view of Ali (s)

"I have seen the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) and his companions but found none of you like them (i.e. they have a high status). In the morning they used to accumulate dust on their body in Jihad, fighting for the religion of Allah and at night they stood before God and engaged in prostrations. They used to rub their cheeks and forehead one after the other on the earth. They used to stand up due to the fear of the Day of Judgment like a restless man standing over embers. Marks of prolonged prostrations were prominent on their foreheads. Tears flowed from their eyes when Allah's name was mentioned before them and their shirt used to get wet in their tears. They trembled of the fear of God like a tree shakes in stormy wind. They were fearful of divine chastisement and in anticipation of divine reward."¹

The above narration is from Ali al-Murtada (r.a.). He has exposed the true picture of the companions without any reservation. The victorious Lion of Allah (Asadullah al-Ghalib) would not have praised them if the companions in general, and the first three caliphs in particular, were not worthy of it.

¹ Nahjul Balagha, Sermon 96

Shias should ponder upon it and decide that when Sayyidna Ali praises the companions why their orators continue to abuse them. Is it a sign of love for Ali?

Objection 13: Siddiq and Farooq

Ali al-Murtada, the lion of God, most proximate to the Merciful Lord, says in his sermon regarding the Siddiq Akbar (Abu Bakr) and Farooq Azam (Umar), "They both (Siddiq and Farooq) were just Imams (s). They were righteous and died righteous. May Allah's blessings be on them on the Day of Judgment."

I request the Shias to read this sermon of Ali (s) al-Murtada Karamullah Wajhul Karim properly. Ali (s) says that the caliphates of Siddiq and Farooq were lawful and they both trod the path of truth.

Not only this, but they even died on truth.

Not only this, but Allah would shower blessings upon them on the Day of Judgment.

Just think upon it!

Shia scholars say that Ali (s) paid allegiance to Siddiq and Farooq under Taqiyyah or due to some other reason. Firstly, it is against the honor of the Lion of God that he should feel afraid and approve the caliphate only out of fear. Even if we agree to this, the above sermon of Ali (s), which he delivered after the death of Hazrat Siddiq and Farooq, contradicts it. He said that Siddiq and Farooq were righteous and died righteous and Allah will send His blessings upon them on the Day of Judgment.

When Ali (r.a.) had power, what was the need to fear?

Allah had agreed upon the caliphate of the three caliphs.

“The right of choosing the caliph belongs to Immigrants and Helpers only. If these Immigrants and Helpers unite over the Imamate or caliphate of a person, and they appoint him as the Imam, it has the approval of Allah.”

Now Shias should decide that if the caliphates of the three caliphs were not valid, how could Haider-e-Karrar¹ (Imam Ali) state thus?

Does it not prove that the caliphates of the three caliphs were correct in the view of Ali (s)?

¹ An appellation of Ali bin Abi Talib (a.s.)

Who is the culprit of the belief in tampering of Quran?

(Published in 'Al-Jawwad', March 1955 A.D.)

Rizwan says: "Again this year, read about some interesting beliefs and laws of Shia faith and gain lesson from them. Muslims all over the world believe that the Quran in our hands is the one revealed by Allah and that it is exactly as it was revealed upon the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.). However the Shia belief is exactly opposite; that the existing Quran is a fabricated one."

The knowledge of Rizwan editor is apparent from the topic of this objection itself. Someone should ask him if the millions of copies of Quran seen worldwide were directly written and sent by Allah and delivered by Jibraeel, the trustworthy, to the houses of all Muslims? Or Muslims have themselves copied them from somewhere? If it is not so, and they have been copied from somewhere, why do you object to their being called 'copied'? At the most you will claim that these copies are exactly as the real one; but your caliphs and scholars will oppose you so strongly that you would be shocked!

When the poor editor of Rizwan himself is unaware of his religion and has not read his own books of exegesis and traditions, there was no need for him to object to Shias. And since even Ahle Sunnat caliphs have emphatically declared that the existing Quran is a collection of changes, additions and

deletions. Leave alone Rizwan, all the people of their religion together cannot prove this till the Day of Judgment. Below we present the names of well-known Ahle Sunnat personalities who believe in distortions in the Holy Quran:

Prominent Ahle Sunnat personalities who consider the existing Quran defective and incomplete

Umar

He was the first among Ahle Sunnat leaders, who considered this Quran defective. It is narrated in the old editions of *Sahih Bukhari* that Umar said, "Allah sent Muhammad (s.a.w.s.) with truth and revealed the Book on him. The verse of 'Rajm' (stoning to death) was among the verses revealed by Allah. Thus, we read it, understood and remembered it. The Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) also did 'Rajm' and we also did 'Rajm' after him. I fear that after sometime people will say that they do not find the verse of 'Rajm' in the book of God. So they will leave a religious obligation and become deviated. Thus the verse of 'Rajm' is the Quranic punishment for adultery."¹

Note: Editing and revision of source books started in Egypt, at the end of the nineteenth century. As a result this prime narration was omitted till "we also did 'Rajm' after him." from *Sahih Bukhari* 1311 A.H. edition, Published by Maktabul Jamhooriyyatul Arabiyyah, Cairo, Egypt, Refer Part VIII, page 208 of the above-mentioned edition.

In any case the actual wording of the Verse of Stoning is not present in this narration. Therefore let us see one more narration: "It is narrated that Umar said, 'If I had not feared

¹ Sahih Bukhari

that people would say that Umar has made an addition to the Book of Allah, I would have written this in the Quran, because a verse was revealed as follows: 'When old men and women commit adultery, surely you stone them to death. This is a punishment from God and God is a severe punisher.'

The second caliph, Umar also used to seek every opportunity to state that this verse has been excluded from Quran.

Apart from the above two references, narrations on this topic are also present in the following books:

- 1) *Itqan* by Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti
- 2) *Muwatta* by Imam Malik
- 3) *Musnad* of Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal (there are three narrations on this topic from Umar in this book)

It is apparent from the second narration quoted above that Umar did not dare to include this verse in the Holy Quran due to lack of witnesses.

The aunt of Abi Amamah bin Sahl

This lady companion also used to tell the Ahle Sunnat that the verse of stoning was present in the Holy Quran but it is now missing from the present version. Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti narrates in *Itqan*: "It is narrated from Abu Amamah bin Sahl that his maternal aunt said that the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) had taught them the verse of stoning: 'When old men and women commit adultery, surely you stone them to death...'

Two whole chapters are missing from this Quran according to Umar

It is narrated that Umar bin Khattab recited the Qunut after Ruku (genuflection) and then recited two passages beginning with 'In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful'.

"Ibne Juraih says that the reason of reciting Bismillah was that some companions (like Ubayy bin Kaab, Abu Musa Ashari and Ibne Abbas) say that these are two Surahs (chapters) of Quran. They say that the chapters are Surah Khala and Surah Hafad.¹

Umar bin Khattab believed in the deletion of yet another verse.

He said, "God sent Muhammad with truth and revealed the Book to him. The verse of stoning was among the verses, which were revealed. We did stoning after the Prophet (s.a.w.s.). We used to read this verse: 'Do not hate your ancestors because it is infidelity to hate your ancestors.'

Tayalisi, Abu Ubaid and Tibrani have narrated from Umar that he said, "We used to recite this verse during the time of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.): 'Do not dislike your ancestors because it is infidelity.' Then Umar asked Zaid bin Thabit, "O Zaid, is it not so?" Zaid replied in the affirmative.²

These traditions not only prove the belief of Umar, but also that of Zaid bin Thabit, the collector of Quran, that the above verse was a part of Quran.

¹ Itqan by Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti, Part One, Page 67, Egypt 1317 A.H.

² Tafsir Durre Manthur, Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti

Ayesha

Ummul Momineen Ayesha, daughter of the first caliph has taught the Ahle Sunnat that hundreds of verses are missing from this Quran. Thus consider these narrations:

"Abu Ubaid writes in the 'Book of Excellences' and Ibne Anbari and Ibne Marduyah narrate that Ayesha said that there were two hundred verses in Surah Ahzab during the time of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.). When Uthman wrote the Quran, more than this could not be found."¹

We should know that there are only seventy-three verses in Surah Ahzab. According to Ayesha's belief one hundred and twenty seven verses are missing from it. Apart from *Tafsir Durre Manthur*, narrations on this topic from Ayesha are also present in the following books:

- 1) *Itqan* by Allamah Suyuti
- 2) *Mahazerat* by Allamah Raghīb Isfahani

Apart from Ayesha, Akrama and Huzaifah also believed it and they used to explain the same to Ahle Sunnat. Ayesha says that many more verses were chewed up by her goat and could not be included in the written copy (Mus'haf). It is mentioned in the Sunni book, *Bunyanul Haqiq Sharh Kanzul Daqiq* about coming into the prohibited degree due to breastfeeding: "Shafei has said that one will not come into the prohibited degree unless a stomach-full breastfeeding is done at least five times. Because it is narrated from Ayesha that she said it was revealed in the Quran to breastfeed ten times. Then it was replaced by the order to do so five times. The Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) passed away and this verse was read in the Quran. This tradition is narrated by Imam Muslim."

¹ Tafsir Durre Manthur, Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti

Rejecting this saying he has written:

“Shafei even does not have the proof for breastfeeding five times because Ayesha said, “This is Quran and this verse was hidden under my pillow in a book. When the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) passed away we were busy in that grief while some goats entered my room and chewed up the paper on which the verse was written.”

Imam Raghīb Isfahani writes in *Fanoonul Mahaziraat*:

Ayesha said, “The verses of stoning and breastfeeding were revealed (in Quran). They were written on a paper and kept under my pillow. When we were busy with the Prophet’s last rites, a goat of the tribe came and chewed up the paper.”

Ayesha has taught the Ahle Sunnat that collectors of Quranic verses omitted many phrases from the verses. Imam Muslim writes in *Sahih Muslim*:

Abu Yunus, the slave of Ayesha said that Ayesha ordered him to transcribe a Quran for her and asked him to inform her when he reaches the verse, ‘Attend constantly to prayers and to the middle prayer.’¹ Abu Yunus says that when he reached this verse he informed her. She told him to write this verse as – ‘Attend constantly to prayers and to the middle prayer and the late afternoon (Asr) prayer and stand up truly obedient to Allah.’ And she said, “I have heard from the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) in this way.”

Note: The words ‘and the late afternoon (Asr) prayer’ are not present in Quran:

¹ Surah Baqarah 2:238

The following tradition scholars and compilers of narration collections have quoted this narration and other narrations on this topic in the following books:

- 1) Abd bin Hamid (*Jama' Baynus Sahihain*)
- 2) Abu Dawood (*Sunan Abi Dawood*)
- 3) Tirmidhi (*Sahih Tirmidhi*)
- 4) Nasai (*Sunan Nasai*)
- 5) Ibne Jurair
- 6) Ibne Abi Dawood
- 7) Ibne Anbari (In their *Masahif*)
- 8) Allamah Baihaqi (*Sunan Baihaqi*)
- 9) Allamah Suyuti (*Tafsir Durre Manthur*)
- 10) Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal (*Musnad Ahmad*)
- 11) Imam Malik (*Muwatta*)

Abdullah bin Abbas

He was a famous and reliable Ahle Sunnat exegetist and a scholar of Quranic sciences through the prayers of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.). He says:

Saeed bin Jubair said, "I said to Ibne Abbas 'Surah Tawbah'. He said that it was not 'Tawbah' (Repentance) but was 'Faziha' (Denouncement). It continued to be revealed about the companions and Muslims to the extent that we thought that none of us would remain to be mentioned in it."¹

Allamah Suyuti has quoted this narration from the books of the following writers:

¹ Tafsir Durre Manthur, Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti

- 1) Abu Ubaid
- 2) Imam Ibnul Mundhir
- 3) Abu Ishaq
- 4) Ibne Marduyah

Apart from this, one more narration on this topic is quoted from the second caliph, Umar, from three sources. We know that not a single companion is mentioned by name in the Surah Barat leave aside the discussion of many. Hence the testimony of Umar and Abdullah bin Abbas proves that all those names have been omitted. We will discuss this later also.

Allamah Suyuti quotes in his book *Itqan*, from *As Salat*, the book of the Imam of Ahle Sunnat, Muhammad bin Nasr Maroozi that Surah Hafad and Surah Khala were present in the copy of Abdullah bin Abbas. (As we have already discussed these chapters under the topic of Umar, here we have just mentioned the source before continuing our discourse.)

According to Abdullah bin Abbas, some verses are also omitted:

Ibne Abbas said that a man came to Umar to ask for something. Umar looked at him from head to toe to find a sign of poverty, then asked him, "How much property do you own?" He replied, "Forty camels." Ibne Abbas said, "God and His Prophet (s.a.w.s.) have said the truth, that even if man gets two valleys full of gold he will desire for a third and nothing except dust can fill the stomach of man. And God accepts the repentance of the one who repents." Umar asked, "What is this?" Ibne Abbas said, "Ubayy Ibne Kaab has taught me in the same way." Then Umar took us to Ubayy Ibne Kaab and asked, "What is Ibne Abbas saying?" Ubayy Ibne Kaab said, "I have learnt the same from the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.)." Umar asked,

"Should I include it in Quran?" Ubayy Ibne Kaab replied in the affirmative.¹

This narration is also mentioned by Allamah Suyuti in *Tafsir Durre Manthur* from Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal and quotes another narration on this topic from Ibne Zarees. The report of Ibne Zarees also shows that this verse is missing.

Ibne Zarees narrates from Ibne Abbas that they used to read this verse during the time of the Prophet – 'Do not hate your ancestors because it is infidelity to hate your ancestors.'²

A narration of this topic from the second caliph has also been discussed previously. Apart from this, Abdullah Ibne Abbas also believed in the omission of some phrases from these verses. Ahle Sunnat scholars have mentioned this in their books: Faryabi, Imam Hakim, Ibne Marduyah and Allamah Baihaqi have quoted from Ibne Abbas in their books that he used to read this verse as: 'The Prophet has a greater claim on the faithful than they have on themselves, and he is a father for them and his wives are (as) their mothers.'

Note: We know that the words, 'and he is a father for them' are not found anywhere in the Quran.

Hafasa

Hafasa, the second caliph's daughter, like Ummul Momineen Ayesha, also believed that the words 'and the late afternoon (Asr) prayer' were mentioned after the words, 'Attend constantly to prayers and to the middle prayer' and they were omitted from the Quran by the collectors. Ummul Momineen asked Abu Rafe, her slave, to write a Quran in which she asked him to include the words 'and the late afternoon (Asr) prayer'.

¹ Izalatul Khifa by Muhaddith Dehlavi

² Tafsir Durre Manthur, Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti

A similar narration has already been discussed under the topic of Ayesha. For the sake of brevity I would just mention the source and move ahead. Narrations on this topic are mentioned in *Tafsir Durre Manthur* through the following sources:

- 1) Abdur Razzaq
- 2) Imam Bukhari (In *Tarikh-e-Bukhari*)
- 3) Ibne Jurair Tabari
- 4) Ibne Abi Dawood (In their own Mus'haf). The testimony of Ubayy Ibne Kaab is also present in the narrations of these scholars.
- 5) Imam Malik (*Muwatta*)
- 6) Abu Ubaid
- 7) Abd bin Hamid, the teacher of Imam Bukhari, Muslim, Tirmidhi and others.
- 8) Abu Ya'la
- 9) Ibne Anbari (In *Masahif*)
- 10) Imam Baihaqi (In his *Sunan*)
- 11) Allamah Ibne Hajar Asqalani has also narrated this tradition from Imam Malik in *Fathul Bari Sharh Sahih Bukhari*. The chain of Imam Malik's narrators is as follows in *Muwatta*: Malik from Zaid bin Aslam from Amr bin Nafe.
- 12) Ibne Mundhir

Ummul Momineen Umme Salamah

Ibne Mundhir has narrated from Ummul Momineen Umme Salamah also that this part of sentence is missing. Allamah Ibne Hajar Asqalani has quoted this report.

Ubayy bin Kaab

The Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) commanded the Muslims to learn Quran from this famous companion and Quranic scholar, according to whom many verses that were previously part of Quran are now not included. We mention them in brief here:

Abu Ubaid narrates from Ibne Sireen that Ubayy Ibne Kaab wrote in his copy of Quran the Surah Fatiha, Surah Falaq and Surah Naas and he also wrote the 'Surah Khala' and 'Surah Hafad'.¹

Allamah Suyuti has quoted a narration on this topic from Imam Muhammad bin Nasr Maroozi's book, *As Salah* while narrations on this topic in *Durre Manthur* are taken from the following sources:

- 1) Ibne Zarees
- 2) Imam Muhammad bin Nasr Maroozi from the narration of Ahle Sunnat scholar, Shobi.

We have already discussed Ibne Abbas' report about the belief of Ubayy bin Kaab regarding the omission of the verse, 'even if man gets two valleys full of gold...' Following are some more examples:

- 1) *Itqan* by Allamah Suyuti
- 2) *Mustadrak* of Imam Hakim (The narration of *Mustadrak* also proves that this verse is of Surah Bayyinah).
- 3) Ibne Anbari from Abi Zar (from *Itqan*)
- 4) Ibne Atheer Jazari (*Jame' ul-Usool*)
- 5) Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal
- 6) Imam Tirmidhi

¹ Itqan, Vol. 1, Pg. 67, Egypt, Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti

7) Ibne Zarees (from *Tafsir Durre Manthur*)

Except for 3 and 7, all mention the omission of the following verse also:

“And the religion one near Allah is the upright one, not a Jew or Christian. And one who does good, then never denies.”

Ubayy bin Kaab believed one more sentence to be part of Quran, which is not present in the present version:

“Ubayy bin Kaab used to read this verse (Surah Fath 48:26) as:

When those who disbelieved harbored in their hearts (feelings of) disdain, the disdain of (the days of) ignorance, and if you disdain like they disdained in spoiling the sacred mosque, but Allah sent down His tranquility on His Apostle...”¹

Now the part “and if you disdain like they disdained in spoiling the sacred mosque,” is not present in the Quran. Imam Nasai and Allamah Suyuti have also quoted narrations on this topic.

We have already mentioned while discussing about Abdullah bin Abbas that according to him the words, ‘The Prophet has a greater claim on the faithful than they have on themselves’ are followed by, ‘and he is a father for them’. Ubayy bin Kaab also believed this.

“Abdur Razzaq, Saeed bin Mansur, Ishaq bin Rahuyah, Ibne Mundhir and Allamah Baihaqi have narrated from Bajalah that Umar bin Khattab passed by a boy who was reciting the Holy Quran: ‘The Prophet has a greater claim on the faithful than they have on themselves, and his wives are (as) their mothers and he is a father for them.’ Umar told the boy to omit the words ‘and he is a father for them’. The boy said to him that it was the Copy of Ubayy bin Kaab. Umar went to Ubayy bin

¹ Mustadrak, Imam Hakim

Kaab to inquire about it. Ubayy said, "I was always involved with the Quran while you were busy in the markets (hence I know it better than you)."¹

Under the discussion of mothers of believers, Ayesha, Hafasa and Umme Salma we have already seen that after the words, 'Attend constantly to prayers and to the middle prayer...' the words, 'and the late afternoon (Asr) prayer' were also present in the Quran. Abdur Razzaq, Bukhari, Ibne Jurair Tabari and Abi Dawood narrate that when Abu Rafe, Hafasa's slave included this phrase on her order, he went to Kaab. He says, "I went to Ubayy bin Kaab and asked, 'O Abu Mundhir! Hafasa claims thus.' Ubayy said, 'She is right. Don't you see that we are busiest at the time of Noon (Zuhr) prayers?'"²

Abdullah bin Masud

According to *Sahih Muslim* and *Istiab* the Prophet has commanded us to learn Quran from this famous companion. However he is also seen to be a believer in the omission of many verses. Allamah Ibne Marduyah has narrated from Ibne Masud that he said, "During the time of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) we used to read as: 'O Apostle! Deliver what has been revealed to you from your Lord; that Ali is the Master of the believers; and if you do it not, you have not delivered His message, and Allah will protect you from the people.'"³

Note: But we know that, 'Ali is the Master of the believers' is not present in the existing Quran.⁴

¹ Tafsir Durre Manthur, Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti

² Tafsir Durre Manthur, Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti

³ Reference to Surah Maidah 5:67

⁴ Tafsir Durre Manthur, Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti

Mirza Muhammad bin Mo'tamid Khan Badkhashaani, a famous Ahle Sunnat scholar has also included this narration in his book, *Miftahun Najah*.

It is mentioned in the famous book of Ahle Sunnat, *Ma'arijun Nubuwwah*, that Abdullah bin Masud read: "...and Allah sufficed the believers in fighting by Ali; and Allah is Strong, Mighty."¹

We know that the words, 'Ali is the Master of the believers' is not present in the verse of proclamation and the words 'by Ali' are absent from the verse, 'and Allah sufficed...' Hafiz Ibne Marduyah has also written about Ibne Masud that he used to read this verse as: "...and Allah sufficed the believers in fighting by Ali bin Abi Talib; and Allah is Strong, Mighty." The following scholars have also included this narration in their books:

- 1) Allamah Suyuti (*Tafsir Durre Manthur*)
- 2) Ibne Asakir writer of *Tarikh Damishq* (History of Damascus)
- 3) Mirza Muhammad bin Mo'tamid Khan Badakhshani (In *Miftahun Najah*)

It is mentioned in *Tafsir Thalabi* that Abu Dawood said, "I read in the Quran of Abdullah bin Masud: 'Surely Allah chose Adam and Nuh and the descendants of Ibrahim and the descendants of Imran and the descendants of Muhammad above the nations.'

Note: Though we know that the words, 'and the descendants of Muhammad' are not present in the Quran today.

¹ Reference to Surah Ahzab 33:25

Abdur Rahman bin Auf

He was a collector of Quran and brother-in-law of Uthman (husband of Uthman's sister). He was the king-maker for the caliphate of Uthman and he was a famous companion. He was also of the opinion that many things have been omitted from this Quran. Consider this narration: Abu Ubaid has narrated from Masoor bin Makhzamah that Umar asked Abdur Rahman bin Auf, "Don't you think that this verse is among the ones revealed: *If they fight like you have done Jihad*. Because we do not find this verse now." Abdur Rahman replied, "This verse is among the things excluded from the Quran."¹

Along with Abdur Rahman, we also get the testimony of Umar from his narration. This verse *and if you disdain like they disdained in spoiling the sacred mosque*, is nowhere in Quran. Abdur Rahman bin Auf's statement implies that they have not been omitted due to forgetfulness or mistake but it is done on purpose. God knows what was the reason behind it! The Ahle Sunnat know this better because this narration is found in their following books:

- 1) *Tafsir Durre Manthur*
- 2) *Jama'-ul-Jawame*
- 3) *Kanzul Ummal*

Abu Musa Ashari

He was a famous companion and the hero of arbitration after the Battle of Siffeen, who believed that two lengthy chapters have been omitted from the Holy Quran and that two verses of these chapters were still a part of Quran. He used to teach the Ahle Sunnat people not to consider this Quran complete.

¹ Itqan, Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti

Abu Harb narrates that Abu Musa Ashari called the reciters of the Holy Quran of Basra. Three hundred reciters of Quran reported to him. He said to them, "You are the chosen ones and the reciters of the Holy Quran of the people of Basra. Recite the Quran so that your hearts do not become hard like of the people before you. During the time of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.), we used to read a chapter, which was as long as Surah Barat. I forgot that chapter but remember only this verse from it: "Even if man has two valleys full of gold he will desire for a third and nothing except dust can fill the stomach of man." And we used to read another chapter like 'Misbahaat'.¹ I forgot it too and remember only this verse: "O' those who believe! What you say you don't practice. Then the testimony is written on your necks."²

Allamah Suyuti has recorded this narration in *Tafsir Durre Manthur* on the authority of the following sources:

- 1) Imam Muslim
- 2) Hafiz bin Marduyah (In *Hilyatul Awliya*)
- 3) Allamah Baihaqi (In *Dalail*)

And it is also quoted in *Itqan* on the authority of Ibne Abi Hatim.

From *Tafsir Durre Manthur*, we come to know, that Abu Musa Ashari considered Surah Khala: (O Allah indeed we seek Your help), as part of Quran and this chapter was present in his copy.

¹ Chapters of Quran that begin with the words 'Yusabbih' (declares the glory), like Surah Hashr and Surah Jumah etc.

² Mustadrak, Imam Hakim

It is also narrated thus from Ibne Zarees. (We have already discussed about this chapter above, hence in order to avoid making the discussion lengthy we refrain from quoting the actual words.)

Musailimah bin Mukhallad Ansari

He was a companion of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) and was appointed as the governor of Egypt by the caliph. He used to be displeased over two missing verses of the Holy Quran. Consider this narration: Abu Sufyan Khala'ee states that one day Musailimah bin Mukhallad Ansari asked the people, "Tell me about the two verses of Quran which are not included in the written copy compiled now." The people could offer no reply. Abul Kanood and Sa'ad bin Malik were among them. Then Musailimah said, "Those two verses are: 1) 'Surely those who believed and those who fled (their home) and strove hard in the way of Allah by their wealth and their selves, but give them the good news that they are successful.' 2) 'And those who denied and helped them and fought with them. Those are the people on whom Allah has become angry. They do not know what is concealed from their eyes. It is the recompense of what they had done.'¹

Abu Waqid Lilaithi

He was a companion of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) who had a great liking for the knowledge of Quran. He believed that a verse had been omitted from the existing Quran: Abu Waqid Lilaithi states that when some revelation used to descend on the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) we used to come to him and he used to tell us about the revelation. One day I came to the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.). He said, "Allah says – Indeed we revealed the wealth for establishment of prayer and for the payment of

¹ Itqan, Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti

Zakat. And if there had been, for the son of Adam, a valley full of gold he would like to have a second one and if he has the second one he would desire for a third. And nothing fills the belly of the son of Adam, except dust. And Allah accepts the repentance of one who repents.”¹

This narration is quoted in *Tafsir Durre Manthur* on the authority of the following scholars:

- 1) Abu Ubaid
- 2) Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal
- 3) Imam Tibrani (*Mojam-e-Ausat*)
- 4) Allamah Baihaqi (in *She’bul Eemaan*)

(4) Zaid bin Arqam

He was a famous companion at whose house the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) used to occasionally sit with the companions. He also believed in the omission of this same verse. For the sake of brevity I refrain from quoting the actual words. This narration is recorded in *Tafsir Durre Manthur* on the authority of the following scholars:

- 1) Abu Ubaid
- 2) Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal
- 3) Abu Ya’laa
- 4) Imam Tibrani

Jabir bin Abdullah Ansari

He was a famous companion of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) whose claim the first caliph did not consider as needful of a witness. (while the claim of Sayyida Fatima was considered

¹ Itqan, Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti

needful of testimony of a witness). He believed that the verse: "If man had a valley full of gold he would desire more wealth. And nothing satisfies the appetite of man except dust (death)," as part of Quran according to *Tafsir Durre Manthur*.

Buraidah

The famous companion, Buraidah, also considered this verse as part of Quran, as mentioned in *Tafsir Durre Manthur* on the authority of Hafiz Bazar and Ibne Zarees. We have omitted the real wordings to avoid making the discussion lengthy. Also this verse has already been discussed above.

Akramah

It is impossible to narrate all his 'excellences' here. About him it is said that:

"It is stated from Akramah that Surah Ahzab was equal to Surah Baqarah or even longer than that; and it had the 'Verse of Stoning' in it.¹

Now, while Ayesha says that Surah Ahzab had only two hundred verses this gentleman claims it was a little longer than Surah Baqarah. That is, it consisted of more than two hundred and eighty-six verses, but now only seventy-three remain.

Huzaiifah Yamani

This famous companion of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) has also taught the Ahle Sunnat that many verses have been omitted from Surah Ahzab. It is mentioned in *Tafsir Durre Manthur* on the authority of the history of Imam Bukhari:

"Imam Bukhari narrates from Huzaiifah in his history, 'I learnt Surah Ahzab from the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) but forgot

¹ *Tafsir Durre Manthur*, Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti

seventy-seven verses from it and now they are not found anywhere.”

Similarly he is also reported to have said that at least three-fourth of Surah Barat is missing.

In the words of Huzaifah, “Now you don't read even one-fourth of Surah Barat.”¹

This narration is mentioned in *Itqan* also. Today Surah Barat has a hundred and nine verses. According to Huzaifah at least three hundred and twenty-seven verses are omitted. Huzaifah also allegedly explains the reason for this omission:

Huzaifah said, “You call it Surah Tawbah. By Allah, it has not left anyone, but it denounced the defects of one and all. Ibne Abbas has referred to this chapter as Surah Faziha (that which denounces). He says, ‘It continued to be revealed for those people. Till we thought that it won't spare anyone.’”²

Umar's name has already been mentioned above in this connection. The actual narration is as follows:

Ibne Mundhir, Abul Shaykh and Ibne Marduyah have narrated from Ibne Abbas that someone mentioned Surah Tawbah in the presence of Umar. He said, “It is not Surah Tawbah but rather very close to chastisement. So close was it that it has not spared anyone.” Abu ash-Shaykh has narrated from Akramah that Umar said, “The revelation of Surah Barat did not end. Till we began to think that none of us shall be spared, but that a verse shall be revealed about him or her. And it is called Surah Faziha.”³

¹ Mustadrak, Imam Hakim

² Tafsir Kabir, Imam Fakhruddin Razi

³ Tafsir Durre Manthur, Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti

Imam Malik

The followers of this great scholar are called Maliki. Every sect of Ahle Sunnat believes that he possessed vast knowledge about the Islamic laws. He also used to say that Surah Barat was of the same length as Surah Baqarah.

Imam Malik said, "When the earlier part of Surah Barat was deleted, the 'Bismillah' (In the name of Allah) was also deleted along with it because it is proved that this chapter was of the same length as Surah Baqarah."¹

This narration is mentioned in *Itqan* on the authority of *Mustadrak*.

Thus we can conclude that according to the great Ahle Sunnat scholars who are considered the founders, architects and pillars of their religion, nearly nine hundred verses are missing from the Holy Quran. Since the first part (juz/para) of the Quran consists of about a hundred and fifty verses we can say that around six parts are missing. In other words, the Quran of Ahle Sunnat originally consisted of thirty-six parts (according to above narrations). Today, only thirty parts exist while six parts are concealed by their companions.

¹ Mustadrak, Imam Hakim

Ahle Sunnat scholars who believe that compilers of Quran made additions to it

Abdullah bin Masud

The first name among them is of Abdullah bin Masud. We have already discussed his merits and virtues earlier. He did not consider Surah Falaq and Surah Naas as part of Quran. Allamah Suyuti writes in *Itqan*:

"There were only a hundred and twelve chapters in the Copy (Mus'haf) of Ibne Masud (there are 114 in the existing Quran). He had not included Surah Falaq and Surah Naas while inscribing the Quran."¹

In other words he used to omit these chapters from the Quran.

A narration on this topic has been quoted by Abu Ubaidah from Ibne Sireen.

Abu Darda

The second name is that of Abu Darda, a famous companion. It is narrated as follows in *Sahih Muslim*:

Alqama says, "We went to Syria where Abu Darda came to us and asked, 'Does anyone of you recite Quran according to the recitation of Abdullah bin Masud?' I replied that I do. Abu Darda asked, 'How does Abdullah recite the verse: "I swear by the night when it draws a veil." I said that I heard him reciting in the following way: "I swear by the night when it draws a veil and the male and the female." Abu Darda said, "By Allah! I heard the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) reciting in the same way but these people want me to recite as: And the creating of the male and the female. But I am not going to listen to them."

¹ *Itqan*, Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti, Vol. 1 Pg. 81

Another narration on this topic is present in *Sahih Muslim*. Apart from this, there are three narrations on this topic in *Sahih Bukhari*. After the narration on this subject, it is mentioned in *Sahih Tirmidhi* that: This tradition is correct and the recitation of Abdullah bin Masud is like this only: "I swear by the night when it draws a veil. And the day when it shines in brightness. And the male and the female."

These narrations show that Abu Darda and Abdullah bin Masud believe that the words "And the creating of" (*Maa khalaqa*), in the third verse of Surah Lail,¹ were added later by the compilers of Quran.

Thus not only the Ahle Sunnat believe that the Quran is incomplete but they also think that some additions have been made into it by the people. But they are not even content with this much. They go further to claim that many words of the Quran have been changed.

¹ Holy Quran, Surah 92

Ahle Sunnat leaders who believe that words of Quran are changed

Umar

Here also the first name is that of Umar. The caliph used to read 'famzu iladh dhikrillaah' (then *walk towards* to the remembrance of Allah) instead of 'fas-oo iladh dhikrillaah' (then hasten to the remembrance of Allah)¹. It means that 'fas-oo' (hasten) was wrong according to him.

Imam Malik asked Ibne Shahab about the verse:² "O you who believe! When the call is made for prayer on Friday, then hasten to the remembrance of Allah and leave off trading." Ibne Shahab replied, "Umar bin Khattab used to recite this as: "O you who believe! When the call is made for prayer on Friday, then *walk towards* the remembrance of Allah and leave off trading."³

Narrations regarding this matter are present in *Tafsir Durre Manthur* on the authority of the following scholars:

- 1) Abu Ubaid (*Kitab al-Fazail*)
- 2) Saeed bin Mansur
- 3) Ibne Abi Shayba
- 4) Ibne Mundhir
- 5) Ibne Anbari
- 6) Abd bin Hamid

¹ Surah Jumah 62:9

² Surah Jumah 62:9

³ Muwatta, Imam Malik

- 7) Imam Shafei
- 8) Abdur Razzaq
- 9) Farabi
- 10) Ibne Jurair
- 11) Ibne Abi Hatim
- 12) Baihaqi (*Sunan*)

Out of them many have quoted the testimony of Abdullah bin Umar that the caliph used to say, 'famzu' till the time of his oath.

Abdullah bin Umar

The second name is that of Abdullah, son of Umar who used to recite 'famzu' instead of 'fas-oo' like his father as we have already discussed above. In addition to this Abdullah used to recite, 'fi qabla iddatihinna' (before their prescribed time) instead of 'li-iddatihinna' (for their prescribed time) in the verse:

"O Prophet! When you divorce women, divorce them for their prescribed time..."¹

Thus let us see this narration:

It is narrated about Ibne Umar that he divorced his wife while she was in her menses. When the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) came to know about this, he was annoyed. He ordered him to take her back till she is cleansed and her menses start again and when she is purified. Then if he still wanted to divorce her, he could do so when she was free of menses before having sexual intercourse with her. And it is the same period (iddah)² that

Surah Talaq 65:1

Waiting period before a woman could remarry

the Almighty Allah has commanded in the divorce of women: Then the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) recited the verse: "(O Prophet!) When you divorce women, divorce them *before* their prescribed time."

This narration is quoted in *Tafsir Durre Manthur* from the books of the following Ahle Sunnat scholars:

- 1) Imam Malik
- 2) Imam Shafei
- 3) Abdur Razzaq
- 4) Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal
- 5) Abd bin Hamid
- 6) Imam Bukhari
- 7) Imam Muslim
- 8) Abu Darda
- 9) Tirmidhi
- 10) Nasai
- 11) Ibne Majid
- 12) Ibne Jurair Tabari
- 13) Ibne Mundhir
- 14) Abu Ya'la
- 15) Ibne Marduyah
- 16) Allamah Baihaqi

The following narrators have recorded a similar narration:

- 1) Abdur Razzaq
- 2) Imam Hakim

- 3) Ibne Mundhir
- 4) Ibne Marduyah

Abdullah bin Masud

The third name is that of Abdullah bin Masud, whose excellence has already been discussed. He used to read 'famzu' instead of 'fas-oo' like Umar.

It is narrated that Ibne Masud used to read 'famzu iladh dhikrillah' (then *walk towards* to the remembrance of Allah). He says, "If it were 'fas-oo iladh dhikrillaah' (then hasten to the remembrance of Allah), I would have ran so fast that my robe would have fallen off."

This narration is quoted in *Tafsir Durre Manthur* through various channels on the authority of the following scholars:

- 1) Abdur Razzaq
- 2) Farabi
- 3) Abu Ubaid
- 4) Saced bin Mansur
- 5) Ibne Abi Shayba
- 6) Abd bin Hamid
- 7) Ibne Jurair Tabari
- 8) Ibne Mundhir
- 9) Ibne Anbari
- 10) Imam Tibrani

Also Abdullah bin Masud used to read: "Surely I am the Bestower of sustenance, the Lord of Power, the Strong," instead

of, "Surely Allah is the Bestower of sustenance, the Lord of Power, the Strong."¹

He used to say that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) had taught him in this way. He believed that the words, 'Allah is the...' were later additions by the compilers of Quran.

It is narrated from Abdullah bin Masud that he said, "The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) has taught as: "Surely I am the Bestower of sustenance, the Lord of Power, the Strong."²

Imam Tirmidhi has certified this narration to be good and authentic. Can there be greater authenticity than this? Moreover, this narration is also present in the *Musnad* of Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal.

Abdullah bin Abbas

The fourth name is that of Abdullah bin Abbas. We have already discussed his excellence in the previous chapter. Like Abdullah bin Umar, he also used to state that the verse of divorce (Surah Talaq 65:1) has been modified. He used to say that the original verse had the words, '*before* their prescribed time', which are now replaced by, 'for their prescribed time'.

Ibne Abbas used to recite: "*before* their prescribed time..."³

The Ahle Sunnat scholar, Jalaluddin Suyuti, has quoted this narration on the authority of the following scholars and narrators:

- 1) Abdur Razzaq
- 2) Abu Ubaid

¹ Surah Zariyat 51:58

² Sahih Tirmidhi

³ Tafsir Durre Manthur, Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti

- 3) Saeed bin Mansur
- 4) Abd bin Hamid
- 5) Ibne Marduyah
- 6) Allamah Baihaqi

Mujahid

The fifth name is that of Mujahid, a famous student of the companions of Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.). Like Ibne Abbas and Ibne Umar, he also believed that modifications have taken place in the verses of Quran.

Mujahid used to read: '*before their prescribed time*'.

Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti has narrated this on the authority of the following scholars:

- 1) Saeed bin Mansur
- 2) Ibne Mundhir
- 3) Abd bin Hamid
- 4) Ibne Marduyah
- 5) Allamah Baihaqi

However it is a pity that Ahle Sunnat do not rest content with even this much and not only they say that the Quran has additions, deletions and changes, they even claim that this Quran, which was revealed as an eloquent miracle for guidance, which the whole Arab world failed to equal, has mistakes in it. While the fact is that even if the literary works of normally educated people are not eloquent, they at least, do not contain silly mistakes.

It is surprising that the belief regarding mistakes in Quran is not expressed by an ordinary leader, rather it is by the third caliph, Uthman, the owner of two lights, (Zinnoorain), who is

supported by a jurist like Ummul Momineen Ayesha and a Quranic scholar like Ibne Abbas.

Uthman believed that there was a mistake in the existing Quran

Consider the following narration on this topic:

Uthman said that there is a mistake in the statement of God:

"These are most surely two magicians..."¹

Someone asked him to correct this mistake. Uthman replied, "Let it be as it is, because no unlawful deed becomes lawful or vice versa due to it."

In order to avoid making the discussion lengthy, I leave the original wordings and just give the sources. The following scholars and narrators of Ahle Sunnat have stated this saying of Uthman:

- 1) Ibne Abi Dawood
- 2) Akramah
- 3) Qatadah
- 4) Yahya bin Yamar
- 5) Faqih Abul Laith Samarqandi (In *Tafsir*)
- 6) Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti (In *Itqan* and *Durre Manthur*)

Ayesha

Similarly, mother of faithful, Ayesha also believed that there is a mistake in the existing Quran. Read the following explanation: Allamah Baghavi writes in *Tafsir Malimat Tanzeel* regarding the verse:

¹ Surah Taha 20:63

*"But the firm in knowledge among them and the believers believe in what has been revealed to you and what was revealed before you, and those who keep up prayers (Muqimeenas Salaat) and those who give the poor-rate and the believers in Allah and the last day, these it is whom We will give a mighty reward."*¹

He says: 'There is a difference of opinion in its being 'Muqimeenas Salaat'. It is narrated from Ayesha and Aban bin Uthman that this is a mistake of the calligraphist which should be corrected and, 'wal muqimoonas Salaat' be written in its place. Similarly, she says that there is a mistake in the words of God:

*"Surely those who believe and those who are Jews and the Sabians (saabi-oon) and the Christians, whoever believes in Allah and the last day and does good- they shall have no fear nor shall they grieve."*²

And:

*"These are most surely two magicians (in haadhaani..."*³

According to her these mistakes occurred due to the calligraphists and should be changed from 'saabi-oon' to 'sabi-een' and 'in haadhaani' to 'in haadhaini', respectively.

This shows that Ayesha and Aban bin Uthman, the third caliph's son, considered these verses incorrect. They felt that they should be corrected.

Abu Ubaid has quoted this narration in *Fazailul Quran*: A narrator asked Ayesha about these mistakes in Quran and she replied, "O nephew! These are the errors of the calligraphists when they inscribed the Quran." The chain of narrators of this

¹ Surah Nisa 4:162

² Surah Maidah 5:69

³ Surah Taha 20:63

report is correct according to the standards of Imam Bukhari and Imam Muslim. (On the authority of *Itqan* by Allamah Suyuti).

In addition to this, the following scholars have also mentioned the belief of Ayesha regarding mistakes in the above three verses:

- 1) Saeed bin Mansur
- 2) Ibne Abi Shayba
- 3) Ibne Abi Dawood
- 4) Ibne Jurair
- 5) Ibne Mundhir
- 6) Allamah Suyuti
- 7) Raghhib Isfahani
- 8) Abu Amr Dani

Since the discussion is becoming prolonged I refrain from writing about other verses that Ayesha considered incorrect. Also, out of the numerous verses, which Ibne Abbas allegedly considered wrong, I shall discuss only one and return to my original topic.

Abdullah Ibne Abbas

He also believed that the scribes have inscribed many words wrongly due to their sleepiness. Allamah Ibne Hajar Asqafani writes in *Fathul Bari Sharh Sahih Bukhari*:

Tabari and Abd bin Hamid have narrated through a correct chain of narrators (each of whose narrator was a narrator of Bukhari) that Ibne Abbas used to read the verse:

"Have not yet those who believe known (Afalam yayaşa) that if Allah please He would certainly guide all the people?"¹

as 'Afalam yattabin'. He used to say that the scribe made a mistake since he was feeling very sleepy.

This narration is also mentioned by Allamah Suyuti in *Durre Manthur*, Ibne Jurair Tabari and Ibne Anbari.

It is regretful that space does not permit me to dwell further on this topic and I have to restrain my pen, otherwise, there are hundreds of narrations that could be presented on this subject.

After this long preamble, I would only like to say that even if the people having same opinion as that of the Rizwan editor express aloofness from the belief of distortion of Quran out of the fear of Shias, they will in any case have to agree that their religious leaders were of the opinion that there are additions, omissions, changes, and mistakes due to the drowsiness of calligraphists in Quran. The commentators and narrators of Ahle Sunnat have quoted so many narrations on this topic (in which the most authentic book after the book of God, *Sahih Bukhari* is also included) that these people cannot succeed in calling them wrong, rare, weak or incorrect. Also there is no possibility to interpret them differently because their position and identification is mentioned clearly that all these verses are of Quran and nothing else.

Now read this sentence of the Rizwan editor once again: "Muslims all over the world believe that the Quran in our hands is the one revealed by Allah. It is exactly as it was revealed upon the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.)."

Consider this sentence of a famous Ahle Sunnat scholar, Qazi Ayaz, which he has mentioned in *Shifa*:

¹ Surah Ra'ad 13:31

Know that one who dishonors the Quran or any of its parts, or talks ill about Quran or its part or rejects the Quran or falsifies a command of Quran or makes something permissible that Quran has prohibited or make a permissible thing prohibited or doubts the Quran or its laws or its contents, then according to the scholars, he is a disbeliever (Kafir). Allah says,

*"Falsehood shall not come to it from before it nor from behind it; a revelation from the Wise, the Praised One."*¹

Now if the Rizwan editor has any Islamic modesty remaining he should boldly declare:

"Since it is the faith of the world Muslims that the Quran in our hands is the one revealed by Allah, and it is exactly as it was revealed upon the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.); and according to the clarification of Qazi Ayaz one who doubts a verse or even a single alphabet of Quran or one who falsifies or disgraces it, is a disbeliever, hence all the above leaders of Islam and all those who have a similar opinion are excluded from the limits of Islam and are disbelievers according to the unanimity of the scholars."

Now read these sentences of the Rizwan editor:

"However the Shia belief is exactly opposite; that the existing Quran is a fabricated one. It has been distorted while the real Quran is with the Hidden Imam who is hiding in a cave. He will come with the real Quran sometime before the Day of Judgment.

All right sir! So this is a forged Quran. But how sensible is this Hidden Imam that he has hidden the real Quran and does not guide the creatures of God?

¹ Surah Ha Mim 41:42

It is narrated on page 271 of *Usul al-Kafi* that Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq (s) said, "The Quran that Jibraeel (s) brought to the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) had seventeen thousand verses in it."

On the same page of this book another tradition is narrated that Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq (s) brought out the Quran inscribed by Imam Ali (s) and said, "By Allah, after this day you will never see the Quran."

In the above statements of Rizwan, some point are worthy of discussion:

Firstly, the existence of Imam Mahdi (a.t.f.s.) is mentioned in a taunting manner. I would have proved the belief in existence of my Master (s) in the words of the Rizwan editor's ancestors at this place itself but since some objections were made under the topic of 'Shia and Imam Mahdi (a.t.f.s.)', therefore I reserve my explanation for that section.

Secondly, Shias are blamed of such a belief, which they can never accept. The editor of Rizwan should, at first, learn to speak. Come, let me explain to him some manners of writing. Just now, I have quoted hundreds of narrations about the distortion of Quran through different sources from the books of Ahle Sunnat. If I were a sensible man like you, I would have immediately written: 'Hence it is proved that all Ahle Sunnat are believers of distortion (of Quran),'

Not doing so, I prove the belief in distortion of Quran of only those people about whom narrations are present and who have expressed this belief.

What did you do? You flew away with a narration of *Usul al-Kafi* (whose meaning was difficult for you to understand) and said that 'this is a belief of Shias'. Come; let me explain to you the belief of Shias.

Shaykh Abu Ja'far Saduq said, "Our belief is that Quran which was revealed by Allah upon the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) is one between the two covers (of the book) in the hands of people. It is not more than that. One who says that our belief is that Quran is more than this, is a liar."

If the Rizwan editor believes in the Holy Quran, he should remember that the "curse of Allah (be) on the liars."¹

Thirdly, the Rizwan editor has omitted the actual text of *Usul al-Kafi*, so let us first see the actual narration and then applaud his honesty.

"Saalim bin Salma states that a person recited some letters (words) of Quran in a way different from the usual recitation in the presence of Imam Ja'far Sadiq (s). Imam (s) said, "Refrain from such recitation and recite like the common people. When Imam of Age (a.t.f.s.) would reappear, he will recite the Quran to its limits. He will present the copy inscribed by Imam Ali (s)." Then Imam (s) said, "After completing the inscription of the Holy Quran, Imam Ali (s) presented it before the people and said, 'This book of God is in the same order as it was revealed upon Muhammad (s.a.w.s.) by Allah. I have compiled it from two tablets.' The people replied, 'We have a written copy in which Quran is compiled. Thus, we do not need (your) Quran.' Imam Ali (a.s) said, 'Beware, by Allah, you will never see this hereafter. It was incumbent upon me to compile and inform you so that you may recite it.'"

The editor of Rizwan writes this narration as: 'Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq (s) brought out the Quran inscribed by Imam Ali (s).' This is mentioned nowhere in the original narration. We do not know why the senses of the editor failed him while writing thus. Was it something pricking at his conscience due to his

¹ Surah Aale Imran 3:61

dishonesty? Because in the beginning of the tradition, Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq (s) has opposed the recitation of Quran in any way other than the usual one. Imam Ali (s) has also declared in between the narration that the Quran compiled by him was in sequence of revelation. (While it is a confirmed fact that the present Quran is not in sequence of revelation). Does the Quran of Ali (s) become different just due to a different method of compilation? Imam Ali (s) has also clarified at the end of narration that he was merely fulfilling his duty and was not trying to make it customary. Hence, the people would not see it thereafter.

In any case, Allamah Majlisi (a.r.) has clarified about this narration in *Sharh Usul al-Kafi* that this is a rare report,¹ and a rare narration can neither be presented in an argument nor is it acted upon.

The editor of Rizwan most probably does not know that Shias do not consider *Usul al-Kafi* as the most authentic book after the Holy Quran. Neither do they believe that there are no weak and incorrect narrations in it. They investigate the reliability of each narrator quite seriously and then check the tradition in view of the science of criticism. They accept a narration only if it passes all these tests. This method is not confined to *Usul al-Kafi* but to all the tradition compendiums. They do not like the Sunnis, believe that everything in *Sahih Bukhari* and *Sahih Muslim* is absolutely correct and there is no scope of asking 'how' and 'why', as Allamah Nawawi declares in the *Sharh of Muslim*:

As the nation has accepted both these books (*Sahih Muslim* and *Bukhari*), it is obligatory on them to follow the narrations mentioned in it and this is a unanimous decision. Because apart

¹ Refer Muntahaiul Kalam, Haider Ali, a great Ahle Sunnat scholar

from these two books, it is obligatory to follow the solitary tradition in other books only if the chain of its narrators is correct and that narration will be useful in conjecture. The same rule applies for 'the two Sahihs' also but the only difference is that the narrations in these two books are surely correct and there is no need for further observation of their chain of narrators, rather it is obligatory to follow them. On the contrary narrations of other books cannot be followed without investigation and without confirming their correctness.¹

In other words, the presence of a tradition in *Usul al-Kafi* is not a proof of its correctness and there is no obligation to follow it. However, a narration recorded in *Sahih Bukhari* and *Sahih Muslim* is absolutely correct according to Ahle Sunnat, and it is obligatory to follow it. Therefore you cannot disregard narrations about the belief in distortion of Quran that I have quoted from *Sahih Bukhari* and *Sahih Muslim*. It is obligatory for you to have faith in distortion of Quran.

Fourthly, even if we consider that this narration is not rare, it's meaning is not the same as understood by our critic. After the passage of Shaykh Saduq (a.r.) quoted by us above from *E'tiquadiyyah* he further writes:

"On the contrary we say that so much of revelation has come down, which is not embodied in the present Quran, that if it were to be collected, its extent would undoubtedly be 17000 verses. And this, for example, is like the saying of Jibraeel to the Prophet:

Allah says to thee, O Muhammad, act gently with My creatures, in the same manner as I do.

¹ Sharh Sahih Muslim, Allamah Nawawi

Or his (Jibraeel's) saying: Be careful of the bitter hatred of the people and their enmity.

Or his (Jibraeel's) saying: Live as you desire, for verily you shall die. Love what you will, for verily you shall be separated. Act how you will, for verily you shall be faced with it. The nobility of man is his prayer by night; his honor is refraining from injury to human beings.

Or like the saying of the Prophet: Jibraeel never ceased enjoining me (to use) the toothbrush (siwak) until I feared it would chafe (my gums) or make me toothless. And he (Jibraeel) never ceased enjoining me (to be good) to the neighbor until I thought he would make him my heir; and he never ceased enjoining me about the wife, to the extent that I thought it would be improper to divorce her; and he never ceased enjoining me about the slave, until I thought that he would fix a period within which he should be freed.

Or like the saying of Jibraeel, when the battle of the Moat (Khandaq) was over: O Muhammad, verily Allah, Exalted and Blessed is He above all, commands you not to say the Asr (afternoon) prayer, except with the Banu Qurayza.

Or like his saying (the Prophet's): My Lord commanded me to deal gently with the people, in the same manner as He asked me to perform the obligatory acts.

Or like his saying; verily we prophets were ordered not to speak to people except in accordance with their intelligence.

Or like his saying: Verily Jibraeel brought a command to me from my Lord, which cooled my eyes and brought joy to my breast. He (Jibraeel) said: Verily Allah the Mighty and Glorious says that Ali is the Prince of Believers, and the leader of the bright-faced ones.

Or like his saying: Jibraeel came to me and said: O Muhammad, verily Allah the Blessed and Exalted, has given Fatima in marriage to Ali in front of His Throne (Arsh), and made select angels bear witness to the marriage. So marry her to him in this world and make the select amongst your people bear witness to it. There are many such (traditions), all of which are revelations, but do not form part of the Quran; and if they did, they would surely have been included and not excluded from it.

[Dhahabi and others have offered the same kind of explanation regarding the saying of Umar: "The Quran has a million and a hundred and twenty-seven thousand letters," and stated that the present Quran does to reach the extent mentioned by Umar.]¹

Now the meaning of this narration (about sequence of revelation) must have become clear to you. For further explanation, let me also mention that the various laws the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) used to teach on different occasions, though not included in the Quran, you will agree that it was done at the behest of the Almighty. For example, the number of units and the method of prayer; selection of invocations, etc. All these were in accordance to the verse:

*"Nor does he (Muhammad) speak out of desire. It is naught but revelation that is revealed,"*²

However all the revelations were not Quran but only part of them constituted the Quran. The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) was commanded to convey many other revelations to us in the form of Hadith Qudsi and Hadith Nabawi. Imam (s) has elucidated the same point, that if all the revelations, consisting

¹ Refer Itqan, Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti, Part One, Pg. 72

² Surah Najm 53:3-4

of Quran and Hadith Qudsi etc. are compiled, it would be equal to seventeen thousand verses. What made you think that he is proclaiming that the existing Quran is incomplete from this point? Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq (s) himself says:

"Quran is one. It has been revealed upon the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) from One God. Whatever differences are there, they are due to the narrators."¹

Fifthly, Rizwan quotes the tradition:

"Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq (s) brought out the Quran inscribed by Imam Ali (s) and said, "By Allah, after this day you will never see the Quran."

Rizwan then tries to conclude from it that according to Shias the present Quran is not a Quran but his wonderful knowledge of Arabic has become obvious from this. So just pay attention to this:

You may probably not know that if a pronoun refers to a compound then the whole compound antecedent should be considered in translation (I have used simple terminology! Hope you don't find them difficult). I intend to say that the pronoun 'it' in the tradition refers to the Quran inscribed by Ali (s) you should have translated it as: 'By Allah! You will never see the Quran *written by Imam Ali (s)* after today.' While you have simply mentioned: 'You will never see the Quran.' As if the Quran, we see today, is not Quran.

Now when you have read the corrected translation of this narration report do you find anything objectionable? You may know it or not but it is a fact that after the passing away of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.), Imam Ali (s) swore that he would not put the robe on his shoulders till he compiles the Quran. At

¹ Itiqadiya, Shaykh Sadooq

last, he compiled the Quran in the sequence of revelation and brought it before the caliphate. The caliphs said that they were not in need of the Quran compiled by him. Imam Ali (s) returned saying, "You will never see this Quran after today." It was the same Quran, which Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq (s) showed to his Shias and said that they would not see it thereafter. But how does this prove that the Quran in our hands is not the discourse of Almighty?

The editor of Rizwan also writes:

On page 146 of the same book, another tradition says that Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq (s) remarked, "We have a 'Jame' (collection). It is seventy yards long."

It means that according to the Shia school of thought no one would see the real Quran till the reappearance of Imam Mahdi (a.t.f.s.). The real Quran is seventy yards long and has seventeen thousand verses. As if a ladder would be needed to read it.

Mus'haf of Fatima¹

The famous religious book of Shias, *Usul al-Kafi* has the following tradition on page 146:

Imam (s) said, "We have Mus'haf-e-Fatima. And do you know what Mus'haf-e-Fatima is?" He said, "It is a Quran, and By Allah! It does not have even a single letter in common with your Quran."

Now, this is a third Quran. First a forged one, then a real one, which is with the Hidden Imam and a Mus'haf-e-Fatima also. But we don't know in which cave it is and who is hiding with Mus'haf-e-Fatima.

The greatest calamity for a man is to be involved with a fool. In all of the above statements the ignorance of Rizwan about Arabic grammar has become clear. Hence it is necessary to explain some points here.

- 1) The Rizwan editor has translated the unit of measurement of the length of Quran as 'yard'. O respected scholar! My sincere advice to you is to get your translations checked by an elementary student of Arabic Grammar before publishing them. The Arabic word 'Dharaa-a' does not imply 'yard' but it means 'a hand-span'.

¹ Scroll of Fatima

- 2) You have messed the translation of what should be: 'Mus'haf-e-Fatima is three times your Quran and by Allah, it does not have a single letter of your Quran.' While you simply state: 'It is a Quran, and by Allah! It does not have even a single letter in common with your Quran.'
- 3) Also Rizwan says: 'and do YOU know what is Mus'haf-e-Fatima?' While pronoun is 'they' and the translation should be: 'and do THEY know what is Mus'haf-e-Fatima?' That is the Imam (s) wanted to say: 'What could the people who have left Ahle Bayt (s) out of the love of others know what Mus'haf-e-Fatima is!' Thus Ahle Sunnat scholars like the Rizwan editor are also unaware of it.

At first, I was surprised how the Rizwan editor, Maulana Syed Mahmud Ahmad Rizvi could make such silly mistakes. But after a thorough study of Rizwan I surmise that the writer is perhaps a follower of Abu Hanifah. My surprise disappeared after this guess because the Imam of the Rizwan editor was also unaware of the rules of Arabic language and science of traditions. Imam Ghazzali writes in *Mankhool*:

"As for Abu Hanifah, he was not even a jurist because he was ignorant of language (i.e. Arabic). It was due to this ignorance that he said, "Lau ramaahu bi Abu Qubais" (while even a student will say, "Bi Abil Qubais"). Also, he had no knowledge about the recognition of traditions. Hence he used to accept weak traditions and reject the correct ones. He was not a jurist and used to say anything anywhere from his mind, which used to be completely opposed to reality."¹

¹ Mankhool, source: Istiqsaaul Afham

By the grace of the Almighty, all these qualities of his leader are also manifested in the Rizwan editor.

Actually Mus'haf-e-Fatima is a book of Lady Sayyida Fatima (s.a.), which contains divine secrets and divine recognition. It is one of the trusts of God, which is three times the Quran. It is clear from the saying of Imam (s) that not a single letter of it is common with the Quran that it is neither a Quran nor its commentary. It is a storehouse of the knowledge of unseen and signs of prophethood, which is beyond the reach of the people other than an Imam, and it remains only with the Imam.

Similarly, 'Jame' (and Ja'fr) are the two books of Amirul Momineen (s) containing all the events that shall occur till the Day of Judgment written under a heading, which only an Imam can understand. The only thing Imam (s) said about it was that its length was seventy hands (which the Rizwan editor mentions as seventy yards). However since the Rizwan editor would not be satisfied with my justifications I quote Muhaqqiq Syed Sharif, a renowned Sunni scholar. He has written a gloss on *Muwaanaafiq* (which is a book of belief and theology of Ahle Sunnat.) Muhaqqiq Sharif writes in this gloss as follows:

"These two (Ja'fr and Jame) are books of Imam Ali (s). He has compiled in them all the events that shall happen till the Day of Judgment through his knowledge of letters. All the Imams of his progeny know these books very well and used to issue commands according to them. Imam Ali bin Musa Al-Reza (s) wrote in a document after accepting the heir-apparency of Mamun: 'You recognized those of our rights, which your ancestors failed to do. I accept your pledge but Ja'fr and Jame show that this pledge shall never be fulfilled.'"

The poor editor of Rizwan is found to be absolutely ignorant of the books of the household of Ahle Bayt (s). Hence whenever he heard a name of a book from an Imam he mistook it for

Quran. It is good that he has not heard of books like *Sahifa Alawiya* and *Sahifa Sajjadiya*, otherwise he would have considered them also Qurans and instead of three, he would have accused the Shias of believing in five Qurans.

I recall a humorous incident about this sort of wisdom. Swami Dayanand, the founder of Arya Samaj has raised some objections on Quran and Islam in the fourteenth chapter of his book *Satyarth Prakash*. He objects against the challenge of Quran that: "And if you are in doubt as to that which We have revealed to Our servant, produce a chapter like it and call on your witnesses besides Allah if you are truthful."¹ The Swami says: Well! Is it impossible to produce a chapter like unto it? Did not Maulavi Faizi in the time of King Akbar compile a Qoran without making use of any dotted letters in it?"²

Now what can be said about the double research of Rizwan editor who has concluded that the 'Jame', 'Jafr' and 'Mus'haf-e-Fatima' are three different Qurans?

¹ Surah Baqarah 2:21

² Actually Faizi had written a commentary of Quran with the condition that it shall not have any dotted letters. Swami Dayanand Saraswati has mistaken it for another Quran.

Meaning of Bada

(First published in Al-Jawwad, May-June 1955)

The editor of Rizwan has written the next objection after 'Forged Quran' as:

BADA (CHANGE IN DIVINE WILL)

The principle of Bada in Shia ideology is also very strange. They say that Bada happens to God. It means that at times, God forbid, He performs an action due to His ignorance and then regrets it, and an interesting thing is that this belief is considered so important that no worship act is equal to it. Hence a whole chapter is devoted to Bada in *Usul al-Kafi*, the famous religious book of Shias.

A tradition is mentioned on page 84 of *Usul al-Kafi* that Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq (s) said, "If people come to know about the reward in the belief of Bada they would not neglect it."

Another tradition says: Zurarah says that Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq (s) said, "Allah does not give prophethood to anyone unless He makes him confess to five things: Bada, Mashiyat (Will of God), Prostration, Worship and Obedience."

It is quite strange that this issue is mentioned in the reliable book of Shias. Then it is surprising that those people believe in such a God Who regrets over His own actions, and has to change His opinion. It is as if He is Fazlul Haq, the Governor of Bengal, who at first deposed against Pakistan and then regretted it.

Please ignore the literary aspects of these statements because meanings expressed therein are so funny themselves that there is no time to pay any attention to the words. After reading this objection I was not able to control my laughter at many places. Before clarifying the real objection, I feel it necessary to pen down my remarks for the entertainment of the readers.

Firstly the Rizwan editor says, "It means that at times, (God forbid), He performs an action due to His ignorance and lack of knowledge and then regrets it," I am surprised that the self-made explanation of Bada is same as the discussion of 'Mus'haf-e-Fatima' and 'Jame'.

The account regarding the two books is that after the passing away of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) Allah sent an angel to comfort Lady Sayyida Fatima in her grief who used to discuss the heavenly secrets and divine knowledge while Amirul Momineen (s) used to note down those words. The same writing is called 'Mus'haf-e-Fatima'. While 'Jame' was a book, which Amirul Momineen (s) had written through which the successor of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) can know all the events that shall occur till the Day of Judgment.

However the poor editor of Rizwan had to close his eyes from all these meanings in order to enter the group of 'Who whispers into the hearts of men,'¹ and to represent the one who says 'and I will certainly cause them all to deviate.'² By writing this he proved himself to be the representation of the verse:

"And certainly We have created for hell many of the jinn and the men; they have hearts with which they do not understand, and they have eyes with which they do not see, and they have

¹ Surah Naas 114:5

² Surah Hijr 15:39

ears with which they do not hear; they are as cattle, nay, they are in worse errors; these are the heedless ones."¹

He wrote with great grandeur: "Shias consider 'Mus'haf-e-Fatima' and 'Jame' as Quran."

Similarly, closing his eyes to the explanations relating to Bada present in Shia books and *Usul al-Kafi* itself he has understood it to be Allah's ignorance, foolishness and regret and associated this foolish belief to the Shias. While our Tawheed (Oneness of God) has reached such a peak whereas in the words of the Urdu poet Ghalib 'People who consider neo-Muslims at par with the father of Imams (Ali a.s.)' cannot reach. If Maulana Syed Mahmud Rizvi is interested to see the wonders of the foolish and regretful God he should refer to these golden beliefs, which are the emblems of distinction of Ahle Sunnat. The Rizwan editor, probably, does not know that Ahle Sunnat say, "When a human being is born, he is lacking in all knowledge, power, intention and speech etc. When these qualities are acquired by him later on he is called a scholar. If he later gets power he is called powerful. If he fails to gain these qualities, he shall remain ignorant and weak instead of being knowledgeable and powerful. Similarly, God Himself is neither knowledgeable, nor powerful or living, or Mureed², Samee³ or Baseer⁴, speaking nor truthful. Rather knowledge, power, life, decision, sense of hearing, speech and truth, all such qualities are separate and are present in the Divine Being from outside." The greatest proof of this belief is presented as follows:

¹ Surah Araaf 7:179

² The Restorer

³ The All-hearing

⁴ The All-seeing

"The dictionary and common sense testify that knowledgeable is one who has gained knowledge from external sources. Thus God, the Almighty must also be such a scholar that knowledge has come into his Holy Being from somewhere outside."

The famous Ahle Sunnat scholar, Fazl bin Ruzbahan writes regarding this proof:

"I am of the opinion that this proof is worthy of being trusted for the meaning (that qualities of God are separate from His nature and are different things). Otherwise, all logical proofs regarding this perception are unworthy of trust and objectionable."¹

How edifying are the evil consequences of comparing the Divine Being with human beings and laying the foundation of belief by turning the pages of dictionary, shall be discussed towards the end of this chapter.

In any case, now the Rizwan editor should tell us that if knowledge, power etc. all these qualities are separate from Divine nature then isn't their God Himself an ignorant, weak, not a speaker, not a truthful, not hearing and not alive? Is ignorance and foolishness expected from a God who is dependent on external sources or the God of Shias Whose qualities such as knowledge, power etc. are considered one with His Being?

Here is another amusing statement of Rizwan:

"Then it is surprising that those people believe in such a God Who regrets over His own actions, and has to change His opinion."

¹ Ibtalul Batil

I am amused over the fact that the poor man is surprised while he himself is an object of surprise. That is, he does not even know that the attack of this surprise cannot befall the Shias (because the God of Shias is the Knower of Unseen and never regrets). It attacks the Sunnis who not only consider God as one Who regrets but also narrate incidents regarding this fact. Like they say that Allah destroyed the community of Prophet Nuh (s) through the deluge and then shed tears on it Himself. Pay attention to the following belief:

A group of foolish companions have explained God's resemblance to the creatures. So much so that once God had sore eyes and angels visited to comfort Him. And He cried over the storm of Nuh (s) so much so that His eyes pained. The Arsh (throne) creaks under Him just like a new packsaddle on a camel. His body bulges out four inches from every side of the Arsh.¹

Now the Rizwan editor should say whether this storm was not caused by Allah Himself Who regretted about it later? If not, then, he should believe in two gods. Otherwise, he should read his sentence modified by us by only replacing the word of 'Shia' by 'Sunni' as follows:

"It is quite strange that this issue is mentioned in the reliable book of Sunnis. Then it is surprising that those people believe in such a God Who regrets over His own actions, and has to change His opinion."

The third sentence over which I laughed out of pity is:

"It is as if He is Fazlul Haq, the Governor of Bengal, who at first deposed against Pakistan and then regretted it."

¹ Al-Milal wan Nihal, Allamah Shahrastani in the margin of Kitabul Fazl fil Milal wal Nihal, Pg. 141

This statement does not befit the lips of people who hold God responsible for every deed of man. According to Ahle Sunnat, Fazlul Haq of Bengal opposing Pakistan and then regretting are both deeds of God only. Since this belief is already established among you, your ridicule about it is like looking at yourself in the mirror and making faces at yourself.

As for the regret of Fazlul Haq, he has learnt this act from the great leaders of Ahle Sunnat only. After taking allegiance from the people forcefully, Abu Bakr regretfully announced, "Please excuse me from this caliphate. In the presence of Ali I am not eligible for it. And otherwise too I am not better than you." Thus Allamah Sibte Ibne Jawzi writes in his book *Khawasul Ummah*:

Then after he had completed the noon (Zuhr) prayer Abu Bakr climbed the pulpit and said, "Excuse me from this allegiance because I am not better than you while Ali is present among you."

This regret remained with him till the time of his death. Thus at the time of his death he wished:

"If I had only asked the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) about this matter that for whom the caliphate was, so that I should not have opposed the one who was rightful for it. And if I had only asked whether there was any share of the Helpers (Ansar) in this matter (of caliphate) or not."¹

A statement of Abdur Rahman bin Auf is present in the same book that Abu Bakr regretted three of his deeds till the time of his death and wrung his hands in regret.

¹ *Kanzul Ummal*, Mulla Ali Muttaqi, source: Musnafah, Syed Zirak Husain

Abdur Rahman bin Auf says, "Abu Bakr Siddiq said at the time of his death, 'I am not sorry for anything but the three deeds which I have committed (that I wish I had not done).'"¹

Similarly, Umar, the founder of the religion of Ahle Sunnat, also regretted three deeds greatly. On Pg. 249 of *Tafsir Durre Manthur* (Egypt, 1314 A.H.), the famous book of Ahle Sunnat, it is mentioned in the exegesis of verse:

*"O people! Surely there has come to you manifest proof from your Lord and We have sent to you clear light."*²

"Abdur Razzaq Adzni, Ibne Mundhir and Hakim have narrated from Umar that he said, 'If I had inquired three things from the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) they would have been dearer to me than red camels. Firstly, regarding the caliph after the Prophet (s.a.w.s.), secondly, whether it was permissible to wage a war against a community, which says that they believe in paying Zakat but not to me. Thirdly, I should have asked about Kalalah (a childless person whose parents are also dead).'"

And Tayalisi, Abdur Razzaq Adni, Ibn Majah, Saaji, Ibne Jurair, Hakim and Baihaqi have narrated from Umar that he said, "If our Prophet (s.a.w.s.) had explained three things to us clearly it would have been dearer to me than this world and all of its bounties. Firstly, caliphate; secondly, Kalalah and thirdly, interest."

The Rizwan editor should know that the caliphate was also usurped, a war was also waged over those Muslims who refused to pay Zakat to Abu Bakr and their honor, women, lives and property were considered permissible to be looted. The Prophet's saying that, 'Imams after me will be only from

¹ Khulafa Pg. 21

² Surah Nisa 4:174

Quraish' has also been presented as a proof against the Ansar (helpers). All these incidents have already happened, then what for are these statements of embarrassment on their tongues? Which openly announce that they themselves considered the correctness of their caliphate doubtful. It was nothing but the innocent blood of people who refused to pay Zakat to them that was speaking aloft their heads.

I mean to say that the first brick of your religion was itself so crooked that every follower of it will have to be embarrassed at some time or the other over his deeds. If not today, tomorrow! If not in this world, in the Hereafter! However, since this regret of Fazlul Haq is in accordance with the nature of the two Shaykhs you should have valued this deed and given him the title of 'Caliph of Muslims' instead of censuring him and proving yourself ignorant of his status.

Let me now explain to you the meaning of Bada. Shaykh Mufeed (a.r.) writes in one of his famous books, *Awailul Maqalat*:

"Regarding the meaning of Bada I say the same which all Muslims say about abrogation and other such things like it. For example, to impoverish after giving wealth, or to make sick after keeping healthy, or death after life or (according to the belief of some people) reduction and increase in age and livelihood. As for the reason of application of Bada, its reason is that personalities who were envoys (i.e. the Holy Prophet and the Imams) between Allah and His creatures were heard saying this word. And if this word had not been used in such traditions, whose authenticity is absolute I would never have considered its use permissible. If the verses and traditions regarding this were not found that God gets angry, He gets pleased, He loves and is amazed then words such as 'anger', 'pleasure', 'love' and 'amazement' could not be used for Him. Since they are found in narrations, we have begun to use them.

However, we take such a meaning from them, which no intellect can deny. The fact is that there is no difference of opinion in the chapter of Bada between me and other Muslims. And those who oppose Shias in this matter are against the word of 'Bada' and not against the meaning of 'Bada'. I have exposed the wrong use of this word in such a way that there is no scope of further discussion in this matter and my religion is the religion of all the Shias."¹

Allamah Shaykh Fazlullah Zanjani has written the following gloss on it:

"There are two meanings of the word 'Bada'. First 'Zuhoor' (reappearance) and it is the literal meaning of this word according to the dictionary. Secondly it denotes 'changing one's decisions on the basis of getting new information or conjecture regarding something. The usage of the second meaning of Bada is absolutely impossible for God of the Universe because the outcome of it would be that we will have to believe that God gets knowledge of a thing which He was not having earlier. While absolute proofs are evidently opposed to it. Thus whenever we associate this word with God, it means that such a matter has come from God, which we never expected. Or God made such a thing possible, which people never thought of. And on this same basis we have to believe this meaning only. All the words of Bada used in Quran and the legitimacy of its usage (in the same meaning) is due to those verses of the Book of Allah in which the usage of this word is associated with God. For example, Allah says,

*"...and what they never thought of shall become plain to them from Allah."*²

¹ Awailul Maqalat, Pg. 53 Printed at Tabriz

² Surah Zumar 39:47

And there are other such verses."

Note: This verse shows the legitimacy of the usage of word 'Bada' while explaining its meaning.

Though these descriptions are absolutely clear, the understanding of the Rizwan editor is coercing me to present more explanations. Since these scholarly discussions won't be understood by him without pure Urdu language, I feel it necessary to explain two or three things before discussing the actual point.

Some beliefs of the opponents of Islam

- 1) Jews believe that God created the world and is now resting, free from all activities.
- 2) The Greek philosophers believed that God created the first intellect and the first intellect created the second intellect and the first heavens. The second intellect created the third intellect and the second heaven. This went on till the ninth intellect that created the tenth intellect and ninth heaven. Then the tenth intellect created the whole world. According to them, One God can perform only a single deed. Hence the work of God was completed after the creation of the first intellect. All the things created in this world after that and the existence of day and night are called wonders of these intellect. God does not have any relation with it.
- 3) A group of philosophers (who are called Kamoon wa Zuhoor) believed that God created all the things within a few moments in eternity. All the things from the beginning to the end were created at the same time. However, some appeared before the others. Hence all these delays and advancements are not creation but reappearance. Just like the whole page of newspaper is

printed at the same time but you read the first word and first alphabet first and then the next letter.

- 4) One of the beliefs of Mutazila sect's chief, Nazzam, is similar to the belief of these philosophers. That is, there exists a link between existence and non-existence called as 'proof'. God has 'proved' all the things at once in eternity i.e. He has created them. Now, delay and advancements are visible at the stage of world only. According to them, neither the world nor the souls of Abu Lahab and Abu Jahl were created after the Light of Muhammad (s.a.w.s.) but all were created at the same time.

Conclusion

All these four beliefs have deposed God of His Godliness. The Jews are clearly making their God sleep in a restful sleep as if the world has no relation with Him. The first group of the Greek philosophers does not permit God to even correct the mistakes of the first ten intellects. Since correction would also be another action which is not possible for Him. The companions of Kamoon and Zuhoor, Mutazila and Nazzam believe that whatever God wanted to do, He has already done in the beginning and He does not want to do anything now. As if God is now free.

Rejecting all these beliefs, the God of Universe has guided His creatures at various places in the Holy Quran the details of which shall be mentioned later.

Islamic belief

In any case, Islamic belief says that God alone is the Creator of all things. He is not suspended according to the belief of the Jews and philosophers. Nor is He such that He created everything in the beginning and everything that is going to

happen will reappear gradually while God does not have any power over anything as they have already been created, according to the belief of a group of Ahle Sunnat, Mutazila and Nazzam.

But a Quranic verse says:

*"Know that, His is the creation and the command."*¹

*"All those who are in the heavens and the earth ask of Him; every moment He is in a state (of glory)."*²

It means He always brings someone to non-existence, someone to existence, makes someone sick and someone healthy, causes the birth of someone and death of someone. The changes in the world are brought about by His command alone. He is neither suspended nor His hands are tied according to the belief of the Jews:

*"And the Jews say: The hand of Allah is tied up! Their hands shall be shackled and they shall be cursed for what they say. Nay, both His hands are spread out, He expends as He pleases."*³

In every moment of the order of creation the absolute and final judgments are issued. Without His command, nothing can appear on these creations of the world.

Voluntary and Non-Voluntary Actions

Every human being feels that our actions are of two types. We have a control over some actions and on the basis of them we are applauded or apprehended. Also we are rewarded or punished in the hereafter. For example, praying, going somewhere, talking or keeping quiet, murdering someone etc.

¹ Surah Araaf 7:54

² Surah Rahman 55:29

³ Surah Maidah 5:64

On the other hand, there are some actions over which we have no control. Hence we are neither praised nor punished because of them. For example, bearing children or not, having an elegant face or not etc.

We can differentiate the two by the fact that one cannot ask an ailing person 'Why don't you become healthy?' however; we can ask him 'Why don't you seek treatment?' Or 'Why don't you go to such and such doctor?' You can see what is the reason behind not asking a person to become healthy but asking him to do the treatment. It is clear that to become healthy is out of control of an ailing person. Hence we do not ask him about it. However, it is possible for him to do the treatment. Thus we can criticize him if he does not go for the treatment.

Matters under the control of man, are called 'Amr-e-Tashri-ee' or 'Shariat'.

Whatever is out of the control of man and are in control of God, are called 'Amr-e-Takveeni' or 'Khilqat'.

Abrogation (Naskh)

According to Islamic belief, God of Universe has full control over 'Amr-e-Takveeni' (which are related to creation and course of action of the world). He has always sent the rules of way of life for 'Amr-e-Tashri-ee' (which are related to the control of man) through the prophets from Prophet Adam to the Last Prophet (s.a.w.s.) so that man could attain Paradise and avoid hell. This modus operandi is called 'Shariat' or 'Religion'. The religion of Muhammad (s.a.w.s.) is the final one and has abrogated all the former religions.

The connotation of abrogation is that considering the mental and physical weaknesses of man, God makes changes in His laws so that His laws are in accordance with the growing needs

of the civilization. It should not happen that the human species go on advancing while his religion cannot cope up with them. The God of Universe explains the expedience of abrogation in the following manner:

*"Whatever communications We abrogate or cause to be forgotten, We bring one better than it or like it. Do you not know that Allah has power over all things?"*¹

The Jews and fatalists object to this 'abrogation'. They ask whether God had forgotten or made some mistakes in the prior Law that He has to send a new Law for rectification?

Islamic scholars reply in the negative. God had neither forgotten nor committed a mistake in the prior law. Rather those laws were in accordance with the conditions of that time but as time passed, situations and thoughts changed, abilities progressed, and intellects developed and finally it became necessary to change that law. For example, a dress made for a child can be used for a limited period only. Once the child grows up, it would be silly to ask him to wear that same dress. It would be necessary to make a new dress now and the tailor cannot be blamed that he had stitched the former dress wrongly or he had forgotten something in it that the child now needs another dress on being a grown up. In short, it proves the skill of the tailor and not his foolishness.

In this instance, the tailor knew even before styling the dress that after six months or a year this dress will be rendered useless for the child. Similarly, not only before sending the first Law but even before the creation of Prophet Adam (s), God knew that after some centuries a law would become inappropriate for the human species and a new law would be sent. This proves the knowledge of Allah instead of forgetfulness or a mistake.

¹ Surah Baqarah 2:106

The tailor was in the beginning itself aware when he had not even cut the dress for the child. At that time too He knew that after six months or a year it would not fit the child. In the same way the Almighty Allah, at the time of sending the first Shariat and even before that, even before the creation of Adam, was aware that after so many centuries this Shariat would become unfit for humanity and another Shariat would be sent to replace it. This proves the knowledge of God and not His ignorance or mistake.

Bada in Involuntary Matters

Just as God sent a law and modified it depending upon the circumstances, in the same way He makes changes in His actions, which are called 'Amr-e-Takveeni' as per the need of time. For instance, Zaid used to sit idle. God wrote poverty in his destiny but afterwards he began to work hard as much as possible. Thus, God wrote happiness and well being for him. Before sending the first law, God knew that it would be abrogated at so and so time. Similarly He knew before giving wealth to Zaid and even before the creation of this world that at such and such time Zaid would be given wealth. It does not prove the ignorance or foolishness of God but the fact that nothing can come into appearance without the consent of Allah in this world. He is that Knowing Lord of the worlds Who knows a thing before it comes into existence.

Now if the Rizwan editor does not have any palpitation let me tell him that just as bringing about changes in 'Amr-e-Tashri-ee' out of the need of consideration and time is called abrogation, in the same way bringing about changes in 'Amr-e-Takveeni' out of the need of consideration and time is called Bada. That is the aim of the statement of Shaykh Mufeed (a.r.) when he says:

"Regarding the meaning of Bada I say the same which all Muslims say about abrogation and other such things like it. For example, to impoverish after giving wealth, or to make sick after keeping healthy, or death after life or (according to the belief of some people) reduction and increase in age and livelihood. The fact is that there is no difference of opinion in the chapter of Bada between me and other Muslims." (and everyone believes it and hence, there is not at all any difference between common Muslims and Shias in this matter)."

Reason for Naming

Now the remaining issue is why this belief in God's power and control is termed as Bada? The reason is that in order to explain this connotation, only this word is used in the Quran and traditions. Hence, we also use it. You cannot ask as to why is this word used in the Quran and traditions. Actually, God has appointed angels for the organization of this world. He has given them the knowledge (gist and conditional) about them at first only. Similarly, He had given it to His special creatures also. For the sake of their benefit, He has given them knowledge long before the event. However, all these angels and special people always wait for His command. They cannot understand what His decision at a particular time will be. Even if they are having the conditional knowledge of the commands related to them then also they are unaware of the final decision. Consider the issue of life and death. God creates Zaid but does not inform the Angel of Death that his life is of forty or fifty or sixty years. It is said (or written) to him: 'His life is of fifty years owing to Divine wisdom. Now, if he misbehaves with his relatives or cuts off relations from them, his life would be reduced by ten years to forty years. If he maintains good relations with his relatives, his life would be increased by ten years to sixty years.' Now the Angel of Death cannot make out whether to take his soul away from the body after forty, fifty or

sixty years till the last moment. However, that All-Knowing God knew even before the creation of this world that Zaid will maintain good relations with his relatives and live to be sixty. He does not give this final and absolute knowledge even to His Angels and there are many reasons for that.

The knowledge of those angels and special ones of God is always conditional. It also is not necessary that they be given the information about every condition beforehand. If there is a consideration then the condition is revealed at first only otherwise it is revealed at the final moment (that information in which He Himself says that there are no conditions in a particular matter and it is an absolute one). The knowledge of the angels and special ones of God also changes according to the fulfillment of the condition but God always knows His final decision. There is no change in His knowledge. God says this as follows:

*"Allah makes to pass away and establishes what He pleases, and with Him is the basis of the Book."*¹

That is, the knowledge in which there are erasings and writings, it denotes the knowledge of angels and special ones of God, which is also called as 'Tablet of erasing and writing' (Lauh-e-Mahv-o-Ithbaat) because it changes continuously. While the 'Mother of Book' (Ummul Kitab) and 'real book' (Real Book) refers to the knowledge of God which does not change, and it is this which is called 'the secure tablet' (Lauhe Mahfooz).

*"Nay! it is a glorious Quran. In a guarded tablet."*²

'The guarded tablet' in this verse signifies the knowledge of Almighty, which never changes.

¹ Surah Ra'ad 13:39

² Surah Buruj 85:21-22

To conclude, whenever the command of God goes against the prior knowledge of angels and special ones of God, it is called Bada in the technical terminology of Shias. Since the meaning of Bada is reappearance and an order appears against the expectation of the people.

Tell me, do you see any possibility of objecting to this belief? Possibly the Rizwan editor has failed to understand this Divine issue even after such a prolonged explanation. Hence, I shall narrate some incidents from the Holy Quran for further elucidation. Hence consider the following:

First incident

The Lord promised Prophet Musa (s) that if after fasting for thirty days he goes to Mount Tur he would be given the Torah. Prophet Musa did as ordered. He went to Mount Tur on thirtieth day after brushing his teeth. He did not know that he had to abstain from brushing his teeth during these thirty days. Upon reaching there, he received an order, 'The mouth odor of a fasting person is dearer to Me than the smell of musk and ambergris. Hence you fast for ten more days and come without brushing your teeth and you will get the Torah'. Thus Prophet Musa (s) fasted for another ten days according to Divine command and received the Torah on the fortieth day. Here are the Quranic wordings of this incident:

"And We appointed with Musa a time of thirty nights and completed them with ten (more)..."¹

You can see that God promised Musa (s) for thirty nights in this verse and then extended it by ten more nights. This resulted in the change in knowledge of Prophet Musa (s) and not the knowledge of God because God always knew that Musa

¹ Surah Araaf 7:142

(s) would get the Torah only after 40 days. This is revealed as follows:

"So the appointed time of his Lord was complete forty nights."

¹

That is the reason why in another verse Prophet Musa's (s) knowledge was ignored and it was said:

*"And when We appointed a time of forty nights with Musa, then you took the calf (for a god) after him and you were unjust."*²

This verse also exposes the reason behind keeping Prophet Musa (s) unaware at first. The reason is that due to the ten-day delay of Prophet Musa (s) in returning to his community, the weak-faith people of Bani Israel and hypocrites fell prey to the deceit of Samri and started worshipping the 'golden calf'. In this way, the strength and weakness of the belief of all the people was tested. This incident is mentioned in Quran as follows:

"And what caused you to hasten from your people, O Musa?

He said: They are here on my track and I hastened on to Thee, my Lord, that Thou mightest be pleased.

He said: So surely We have tried your people after you, and the Samri has led them astray.

So Musa returned to his people wrathful, sorrowing. Said he: O my people! Did not your Lord promise you a goodly promise: did then the time seem long to you, or did you wish that displeasure from your Lord should be due to you, so that you broke (your) promise to me?

They said: We did not break (our) promise to you of our own accord, but we were made to bear the burdens of the ornaments

¹ Surah Araaf 7:142

² Surah Baqarah 2:52

of the people, then we made a casting of them, and thus did the Samri suggest.

So he brought forth for them a calf, a (mere) body, which had a mooing sound, so they said: This is your god and the god of Musa, but he forgot.

*What! Could they not see that it did not return to them a reply, and (that) it did not control any harm or benefit for them?*¹

It is clear that if Prophet Musa (s) had already been informed, "You will get the Torah in thirty or forty days" or "If you come without brushing your teeth on the thirtieth day then only you will get the Torah" or "If you come after fasting for forty days without brushing you teeth", how it would have been possible to test Bani Israel? The test was possible only by promising thirty days and concealing the condition for giving of the Torah. When Prophet Musa (s) did not fulfill this condition the period was extended by ten more days. This ten-day extension was against the expectations of Prophet Musa (s) and Bani Israel. Within this short period, Samri misguided Bani Israel by saying, "This calf is the God of Musa. Musa has gone to Tur by mistake. How would he get the Torah there?"

The majority supported him and Prophet Harun (s) was also over-powered while the firmness of people's belief became clear.

Second incident

The second incident is about the nation of Prophet Yunus (s). According to the Quran, Prophet Yunus (s) was sent as a messenger to a hundred thousand or more people. After preaching for a long time, only two people brought faith on him. One was a worshipper and other a scholar. When Prophet Yunus became disheartened after preaching for a long time, he

¹ Surah Taha 20:83-89

invoked divine curse on them. God informed him that on so and so day chastisement would be sent upon them. Prophet Yunus (s) warned all of them and left the area and the worshipper accompanied him.

After Prophet Yunus (s) went away, the scholar summoned all the people of the community and explained to them that Divine chastisement was about to befall them. If they still failed to repent and bring faith they would all be destroyed and their hereafter shall also be ruined.

On the fixed day, Divine chastisement appeared in the form of a black cloud. Under directions of the scholar, the community of Yunus (s) separated the children from their mothers. All the people – elderly and children came to an open ground repenting and crying and brought faith with a sincere heart. At last, the chastisement hovering on their heads receded and the people were saved. It is described in Quran as follows:

*"And wherefore was there not a town which should believe so that their belief should have profited them but the people of Yunus? When they believed, We removed from them the chastisement of disgrace in this world's life and We gave them provision till a time."*¹

The next day when Prophet Yunus (s) returned to see the condition of his community he found people in an unexpected condition and they were going about their normal lives. Without asking about anything, he returned thinking that the people would call him a liar. On the other hand, the people of his community were waiting for him eagerly so that they could confess their faith to him. In any case, he boarded a ship and when he reached the deep seas he saw a huge whale with its mouth wide open.

¹ Surah Yunus 10:98

The captain said, "Perhaps a slave has ran away from his master and he is the prey of this fish. If he does not go by himself the whale would destroy the whole ship." Prophet Yunus (s) said, "I have run away from my Master (i.e. God)," and he jumped into the sea. The whale swallowed him and he remained in the whale's belly for forty days, praising and glorifying Allah. As a result, God commanded the fish to eject him at the shore. His body had become very delicate and he had also become very weak. God grew a vegetable creeper so that he remains safe from the flies in its shade. At last when he regained some strength he returned to his community to a warm welcome and everyone became happy. God has related this incident in the following manner:

*"And Yunus was most surely of the apostles. When he ran away to a ship completely laden, So he shared (with them), but was of those who are cast off. So the fish swallowed him while he did that for which he blamed himself. But had it not been that he was of those who glorify (Us), He would certainly have tarried in its belly to the day when they are raised. Then We cast him on to the vacant surface of the earth while he was sick. And We caused to grow up for him a gourd plant. And We sent him to a hundred thousand, rather they exceeded. And they believed, so We gave them provision till a time."*¹

The reason behind keeping the real condition secret in this incident is obvious. If it had been revealed to Prophet Yunus (s) that the chastisement would go away from his people, forcefulness would not have remained in his propagation. As a result, there would not have been any impact on the community and chastisement would have become necessary for all of them. Hence, God declared that He would send chastisement but kept the condition secret that if they failed to

¹ Surah Saffat 37:139-148

bring faith, He would send the chastisement but the chastisement would go away if they became faithful. The best result of it was that the whole community became believers and all the people were saved from chastisement.

Third incident

Similarly, the third incident is regarding the sacrifice of Prophet Ismail (s) in which Allah commanded Prophet Ibrahim (s) in his dream to sacrifice Ismail (s). When he went to sacrifice Prophet Ismail (s), Allah saved him and made a ram his ransom. Were Ibrahim (s) to be informed about the actual scene beforehand that, as he is about to sacrifice Ismail (s) a ram is made his ransom, the purity of the hearts of Ibrahim (s) and Ismail (s), their steadfastness, their acceptance and compliance could not have been tested. Hence the real command was revealed but the result was kept secret so that their acceptance and compliance could be tested in full. That is why Allah granted him the following certificate:

"You have indeed shown the truth of the vision; surely thus do We reward the doers of good."¹

Evidently in this incident and the previous two incidents of Prophet Musa (s) and Prophet Yunus (s) the conditions of those commands were not revealed. As a result, the community of Musa (s) thought that he would return after thirty days. Prophet Yunus (s) thought that chastisement would indeed befall his community. Prophet Ibrahim (s) thought that Prophet Ismail (s) would surely be sacrificed. When the final outcome was contrary to their expectations, they realized that the command was actually dependent on some conditions. However, we cannot find anywhere in those incidents that God was unaware of the result. He is the Knower of the unseen and

¹ Surah Saffat 37:105

the seen. He knows the end of the world since before its inception while the creatures can never understand His expediencies. Hence, when they expect a thing from God and the contrary happens, they say that 'Bada' (appearance) has occurred. It means a thing or expedience of God has become apparent for us which we had not expected earlier.

I hope my explanation has clarified that 'Bada' is not related to 'Divine Knowledge' but to the knowledge of human beings. People think that a particular thing should happen in a particular way. When it happens in an opposite manner due to various hidden conditions, there occurs a change in the knowledge of man and not the divine knowledge. And the appearance of the things contrary to the expectations of man is called 'Bada'.

Also read this text on the margins of *Atwailul Maqalat* and the meaning shall become clear:

"There are two meanings of the word 'Bada'. First 'Zuhoor' (reappearance) and it is the literal meaning of this word according to the dictionary. Secondly it denotes 'changing one's decisions on the basis of getting new information or conjecture regarding something. The usage of the second meaning of Bada is absolutely impossible for God of the Universe because the outcome of it would be that we will have to believe that God gets knowledge of a thing which He was not having earlier. While absolute proofs are evidently opposed to it. Thus whenever we associate this word with God it means that such a matter has come from God, which we never expected. Or God did such a thing possible, which people never thought of."

Now if the Rizwan editor has a discerning mind he should ponder over this Islamic belief and see what is the connotation of Bada. And how it implies that Allah (God forbid) sometimes

due to his ignorance and lack of knowledge does a thing then regrets it.

Rather 'Bada' shows that man can never reach the depths of the knowledge of Allah.

'Bada' actually implies that Allah is the absolute omnipotent and has full control over all things.

The connotation of 'Bada' is that not even a single leaf could move without God's permission in the created world.

The connotation of 'Bada' is that God rewards the good deeds and punishes evil.

How many foundations of Islam are laid on the belief of 'Bada' can be proved by the assumption that whatever God wanted to do He has already done and now He has no power to change it. Then it would also be considered impossible to abrogate the old laws and send new ones. Because it also constitutes modification of a previous action. In the same if it is decided that whatever God wanted to do He has already created in the beginning then emphasis on worship and warnings to avoid sins would all be useless. Because whomsoever Allah wants to send to Paradise He would in any case do so and whomever He intends to send to hell will definitely bear its punishment. Rather it can be said in more clear words that He had already created the entry of Paradise and Hell, only its actualization remains. It means that the creation of Zaid's soul, his coming to this world, doing good or bad deeds, dying and going to Paradise or Hell are all created in the beginning. Now all these issues are appearing in a sequence. Delay and advancement is only in actualization. Therefore it is no use doing good or bad deeds in the expectation of Paradise or fear of hell. Paradise and Hell are already pre-determined for us.

In addition to this if we just believe that God has already created what He wanted to and it shall indeed come to pass, then all these countless supplications, emphasis on their recitation, hundreds of supplications within prayers and without, hundreds of supplications in Quran and the declaration of God:

"And your Lord says: Call upon Me, I will answer you..."¹

And this assertion of God:

"And when My servants ask you concerning Me, then surely I am very near; I answer the prayer of the suppliant when he calls on Me..."²

And other thousands of supplications like:

"Keep us on the right path."³

And:

"Our Lord! Grant us good in this world and good in the hereafter, and save us from the chastisement of the fire."⁴

All these would be useless. Because our supplications would not do anything as God would do whatever He has decreed.

Apart from this, emphasis is laid in many places that 'Charity (Sadaqah) keeps difficulties away', 'maintaining relations with relatives keeps difficulties away and increases life', 'so and so prayer fulfills one's desires', 'life decreases due to cutting off relations with one's relatives', 'recitation of Quran causes prosperity'. All these would (God forbid) become useless because God will not increase or decrease the lifespan. Then

¹ Surah Momin 40:60

² Surah Baqarah 2:186

³ Surah Fatiha 1:6

⁴ Surah Baqarah 2:201

what is the need of charity, maintaining or breaking off relations, prayer for desires, Quran and supplications?

However if it is true that the former 'Divine Laws' were abrogated, it is true that one goes to Paradise due to ones worship and to Hell due to lack of it, that supplications are effective and the promise of God is not false, it is correct that charity and maintaining good relations with relatives bring prosperity while miserliness and breaking off relations cause adversity, then one has to believe that God has made these occurrences conditional. God has full power to take a final decision in every matter. He knew in the beginning itself what final decision would be taken in such and such matter. It is possible that the decision and the result be contrary to the knowledge of the angels and special ones of God. The appearance of this final decision contrary to expectation, is called 'Bada'.

When such aspects depend on 'Bada' it is as if confession in God's power and discretion is not possible without 'Bada'. The abrogation of other religions by Shariat of Muhammad (s.a.w.s.), arrival of prophets and receiving Paradise or Hell as recompense to good or bad deeds respectively are dependent on 'Bada'. Then what is the ambiguity in the assertion of Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq (s): "Allah has not been honored more in anything save 'Bada'." Or his declaration: "If people know the reward of 'Bada' they would never tire of discussing it." Because the honor of God is dependent on 'Bada', which you have not understood till today due to your foolishness. But what is the fault of Shias in this?

"If in the daylight they cannot see with their eyes.

What is the fault of the Sun in it?"¹

The poor editor of Rizwan does not even know that Ahle Sunnat have a same belief as Shias, regarding 'Bada'. However they do not refer to it as 'Bada'. Hence it is just a different word and the change in name does not change the reality.

Chufran Maab (a.r.) writes in *Imadul Islam* in the 'Book of Al-Tawheed' on Pg. 112 regarding this belief:

"This shows that confession in 'Bada' is the belief in the command of God that He has full control over His actions. Many laws of Shariat are dependent on it. For example, abrogation of laws, manipulation of jurisprudence, sending of messengers, inducements of worship, prohibitions of unlawful acts, encouragement for supplication, charity and maintaining good relations with relatives, all these deeds are based on this very article of belief. All these matters are among the necessities of religion. If a person does not believe in this meaning of Bada he would have to deny all those matters also (that is, neither abrogation is possible nor modifications in laws. Neither there is a benefit in worship nor there is any harm in omission of evil deeds. There is no benefit from supplication, charity or maintaining relations). When a person denies all these things he would become a greater denier than the disbelievers and transgressors. God give us refuge from this! Had the Ahle Sunnat not believed in the real sense of 'Bada', we would have labeled them disbelievers because they would have denied a necessity of religion (However since they also believe in the meaning of 'Bada', we cannot call them disbelievers)."

The editor of Rizwan who stitches the patch of 'Hazrat Maulana' before his name with his own pen is himself unaware

¹ Persian Couplet

of his religion. How can he reach the heights of the Shia belief? If he was having the least knowledge he would have at least known that all the Ahle Sunnat people are believers in the connotation of 'Bada'. Whatever may be the name but the connotation is same. A famous Sunni scholar, Fakhruddin Razi writes in *Tafsir Kabir* in the commentary of the verse:

*"Allah makes to pass away and establishes what He pleases, and with Him is the basis of the Book."*¹

"There are two opinions about this verse. Firstly it is common to all the commandments according to the apparent meaning. God erases and increases sustenance. In the same way they believe that God confirms and erases death, luck, misfortune, faith and disbelief. This is the religion of Amr bin Masud, a companion of Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.). Jabir bin Abdullah Ansari has also narrated this from the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.).

Secondly, this obliteration and confirmation is only for some special things. Now there are many conditions in the selection of these special things. Firstly, abrogation of the command before obliteration or revelation and giving a new order in its place... Eighthly, the purpose behind it is the obliteration and revelation of sustenance, labor and difficulty are written by Allah in the book. But He erases them due to supplications and charity. In this way, man is motivated to have hopes on God... Tenthly, He can obliterate any of His orders without any information. Only He is the Master of His order and orders as He wishes. He is the Only Powerful One Who gives birth, mortality, life, death, wealth and poverty. Due to this rank of His, no creature can be informed about His secrets."

Now compare the beliefs of Ahle Sunnat explained by Imam Razi with the explanation of Shaykh Mufeed (a.r.) regarding

¹ Surah Ra'ad 13:39

'Bada' then it would become known that the 'untouchable belief' which you consider 'Bada' to be and get infuriated by it, it is also accepted by Ahle Sunnat. I repeat the explanation of Shaykh Mufeed (a.r.) once again:

"Regarding the meaning of Bada I say the same which all Muslims say about abrogation and other such things like it. For example, to impoverish after giving wealth, or to make sick after keeping healthy, or death after life or (according to the belief of some people) reduction and increase in age and livelihood."

Similarly, Allamah Zamakhshari writes regarding the following verse in *Tafsir Kashaf*:

*"...and no one whose life is lengthened has his life lengthened, nor is aught diminished of one's life, but it is all in a book; surely this is easy to Allah."*¹

"It means that: Suppose it is written in the tablet that the lifespan of so and so person is forty years if he does Hajj or Jihad and sixty years if he does both. If he performs both the deeds and completes sixty years of life he would have received the whole lifespan. If he could perform only one deed and did not live for more than forty years his lifespan is decreased from its maximum limit, that is 60 years. Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) has indicated this matter in his saying: 'Charity and good relations inhabits towns and increase life spans.'"

"It is narrated regarding Kaab that when Umar was injured by the stabbing of Abu Lulu, Kaab said, 'If Umar had supplicated, his death would have been delayed'. Someone said to Kaab, 'Didn't God say:

¹ Surah Fatir 35:11

*"...so when their doom will come they shall not be able to delay (it) an hour nor can they bring (it) on (before its time)."*¹

Kaab replied, 'God has also said:

*"...and no one whose life is lengthened has his life lengthened, nor is aught diminished of one's life, but it is all in a book; surely this is easy to Allah."*²

Moreover, Allah has made the following statements popular on the tongues of people: 'May God increase your lifespan...' and 'May Allah enhance your age...' etc. Muslims use such statements day and night, which shows that it is the belief of all Muslims that lifespan can increase and decrease."

Similarly, Qazi Baidhawi writes in *Tafsir Baidhawi* regarding the above-mentioned verse:

"And it is said that the lifespan of a person can be decreased and increased due to various reasons which God has written in a book. For instance, if Umar performs Hajj, his age would be sixty years. Otherwise, it would be forty years."

These writings prove that all Ahle Sunnat scholars believe that God obliterates and confirms in the affairs of creation. Time and again He issues commands appropriate to the occasion and requirement of the time. It is called 'Bada'.

The Poor editor of Rizwan objected to Shias over a self-made explanation of 'Bada' while even Ahle Sunnat were found to have similar opinions as the Shias. The poor 'Hazrat Maulana' shall be rejected by both the sides. Both Shias and Sunnis will think that he is making fun of their religions. They would tell him to go away. We pity the writer and hence advise him to

¹ Surah Nahl 16:61

² Surah Fatir 35:11

have a look at the books before writing on a particular subject in future.

In the words of Ghalib:

"If the heart itself is sorrowful and a butt of ridicule

May be the narrow mind would open due to more study."¹

Let me make a point clear due to which the poor Rizwan fell a prey to his compound ignorance. The fact is that Bada has two meanings. Firstly, 'appearance' and secondly, 'remaining unaware of a thing and then becoming aware later on and changing one's decisions'.

It is explained thus on the margins of *Awailul Maqalat*. It is not only present in Shia traditions but also in the Holy Quran. The abrogation of former divine laws, change in God's commands due to 'Divine Expedience' is called 'Bada' according to jurisprudence and technical terminology. And this technical meaning 'appearance' is related to the dictionary meaning that here also it implies actualization of a new command for humans and angels. It is this connotation that is implied in the traditions and Quranic verses.

The poor editor of Rizwan, after hearing the literal meaning of Bada as, 'Change in decision after getting new information' thought that the belief in it is also in the same sense. That is, 'God forbid, God does something in ignorance and foolishness and then regrets.' Fortunately, no one has told him that the literal meaning of 'Sawm' (fast) is abstinence. Otherwise from the next Ramadhan he would begin teaching his followers that the Arabic phrase, 'atimmus siyaama ilal lail' which means, 'then complete the fast till night' is actually, 'then observe abstinence till night'. So that the youth of today, who are

¹ Urdu Couplet

running away from religion would become very particular in 'fasting' and the splendor of Ramadan shall increase a thousand fold.

Not only this, if he knew that the dictionary meaning of 'Jihad' (Holy War) is 'hard work' he would have included every teacher in his list of 'Chief of warriors' and every student a 'warrior'. He would have started kissing their feet. At that time, the title 'caliph' would have suited the wrestlers.

Laws would become so easy that if one prays in the morning lying on his bed, "O God! Please give intelligence to the Rizwan editor" the Salat (prayer) is over. Since the dictionary meaning of 'Salat' is 'invocation'.

Decide to undertake a journey to Lahore's Mall Road for pleasure and you have become a Haji because the dictionary meaning of Hajj is to 'decide'.

You have already applied literal meanings to all Divine matters and proved that God has a face (wajh), hand (yad), side (janb), calf of leg (saq), eyes, ears, hair etc. according to the apparent meanings of Quran. Rather Mr. Allah is also ready to burn His foot in hell.¹

Now it is the turn of worship acts, which are waiting for your merciful attention: After that, neither Islam nor the people of Islam shall remain. Only the people like you shall survive. After seeing which one shall be compelled to say:

"Neither researchers nor scholars

Only a quadruped loaded with books,"²

¹ Refer Sahih Bukhari

² A Persian couplet of Sadi

Is Taqiyyah hypocrisy?

(First published in 'Al-Jawwad', July 1955)

After 'Bada', the Rizwan editor has raised some objections over Taqiyyah (dissimulation), which are as follows:

TAQIYYAH

Taqiyyah is one of the best worship acts for the Shias. The foundation of their religion stands on Taqiyyah itself. Taqiyyah means to lie.

It is narrated on page 488 of *Usul al-Kafi* that Imam Muhammad Baqir (s) said, "Taqiyyah is my religion, the religion of my forefathers, (God forbid), one who does not have Taqiyyah has no faith."

It is narrated on page 483 of *Usul al-Kafi* that, "Taqiyyah is from the religion of God."

Shia gentlemen should tell us that if Taqiyyah had been actually religion or a part of religion why didn't Imam Husain resort to Taqiyyah and pay allegiance to Yazid? The Imam cut off the roots of Taqiyyah in the battle of Kerbala. He gave away his head but did not pay allegiance even for the sake of Taqiyyah. He made it clear from his behavior that 'a religion based on Taqiyyah is not mine'."

The quintessence of this objection is concealed in this statement:

'Taqiyyah means to tell lies'.

I have mentioned in the discussion of 'Bada' that the religion of these gentlemen is based on dictionary but the editor of Rizwan could not even remain firm on this simple formula of his ancestors because at least some knowledge is required for referring to a dictionary too. The actual root of word much be known for finding the meaning of an Arabic word. One should know the difference between adjective and a conjunction in Persian. And in order to achieve this proficiency, precious time is wasted. Hence it is wiser to leave all this useless study for others and start a religious magazine and to publish in it whatever comes to the mind under the intoxication of lawful and clean drink of Nabidh¹ and consequently assure for oneself a life of luxury. Maulana Syed Mahmud Ahmad Rizvi has done exactly this.

In any case, a word can have two types of meanings, literal or terminological. For the literal meaning the spoken language of the people whose mother tongue it is, would be the final authority. While for the terminological connotation, the word shall be accepted of those who have coined this term. What would you call a person who defines a word in such a way that neither the people of the language nor the ones who have coined the term can understand? You yourself can suggest.

'If we say anything it would be considered objectionable.'²

Come, let me tell you the dictionary meaning of 'Taqiyyah'. It is mentioned in the Arabic dictionary, *Sirah*, that 'Taqiyyah' means 'caution'.

Thus a similar meaning is mentioned in other dictionaries also.

¹ Date wine, considered lawful by some caliphs and scholars of Ahle Sunnat

² A line of Urdu poetry

It is indeed astonishing that lexicon experts explain the meaning of 'Taqiyyah' as caution while the personal dictionary of the Rizwan editor says that it means 'to lie'.

Now if the Rizwan editor had remained firm on the decision of dictionary he would not have to take the trouble to make this whole objection. After all, these traditions are also saying that "Taqiyyah (i.e. caution) is the religion of God, the religion of my forefathers and my religion. And one who does not have Taqiyyah is not a believer." What is untrue in this statement?

Let us now explain the technical meaning of Taqiyyah.

Firstly, it is a Quranic and Shiite terminology and you neither trust Quran nor have any connection with the Shias, hence you had no right to just explain the meaning of this one word and create a heap of objections. The Holy Quran has clearly advised people like you:

*"So ask the followers of the Reminder if you do not know."*¹

However, in spite of your complete ignorance in this matter, without asking the Shias, you have simply mentioned that 'Taqiyyah means to lie'. Due to this one sentence you have become guilty of three sins:

- (1) You opposed the above-mentioned command of Quran by not asking the 'people who know'.
- (2) You insulted and denied the clear Quranic injunction of 'Taqiyyah' and according to the verdict of Qazi Ayaz: 'One who insults or denies a Quranic command is a disbeliever.'
- (3) By publishing this wrong objection you have tried to hinder the common people from a Quranic command.

¹ Surah Nahl 16:43

While misguiding the people is like following the devil and such a great sin that God never forgives.

But in any case, I shall try to guide you.

*"And nothing devolves on us but a clear deliverance (of the message)."*¹

I feel it necessary to mention some points by way of introduction.

First Preface

Faith and disbelief are related to one's conscience. Hence, God has referred to those newly converted Arabs Muslims who claimed to be believers but had not become sincere believers, in the following way:

*"The dwellers of the desert say: We believe. Say: You do not believe but say, We submit; and faith has not yet entered into your hearts..."*²

That is why people who only proclaim Islam verbally are externed from the circle of faith and they are said to be deserving the "lowest of the low" position in Hell and they are given the title of 'hypocrites' due to such belief of theirs.

Second Preface

The life of a Muslim is considered very valuable. So much so that it is prohibited to put one's own life in danger because it is not our property, rather a divine trust in our possession.

*"...and cast not yourselves to perdition with your own hands..."*³

¹ Surah Yasin 36:17

² Surah Hujurat 49:14

³ Surah Baqarah 2:195

Third Preface

If a situation arises where one is compelled to choose one of the two evils, one of them being greater than the other, any wise person will choose the lesser and which is less harmful. Numerous such examples are present in the Islamic law. For instance, a person is praying and he realizes that a child has fallen in a well. Now he has two options before him: either to continue praying while the child dies or discontinue his prayers, which is a greater sin. However since the death of the child is a greater evil than discontinuing prayers, Islamic Shariah orders that it is incumbent upon such a person to discontinue his prayers and save the life of the child. If the man does not act in this manner his prayers shall be void and he would be guilty of the death of the child. Hence the discontinuation of this prayer is not only permissible but rather it is a very good deed and also obligatory in some cases.

Keeping in mind all these points, just suppose that the Rizwan editor was present near the cave of Thaur on the eve of the Hijrah, knowing the secret that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) was concealed in the cave. And the disbelievers reach the entrance of cave tracing the footprints of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) where they are astonished to see the Rizwan editor and they ask him if he had any knowledge about the whereabouts of Muhammad (s.a.w.s.). Could the Rizwan editor, in his enthusiasm of truth be justified in informing the disbelievers about the Prophet? His writings show that he indeed would have informed the disbelievers that the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) was hiding in that cave. However, we cannot expect this from any other Muslim. He would have either said that he does not know or would have informed them about a place far away from there so that the disbelievers may go away from the cave of Thaur in his pursuit. This lie of his would not be considered a sin but rather deserving of a great reward.

because the harm of this lie is nothing in comparison to the important purpose it served, that is saving the life of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.).

Now in the same example just suppose an ordinary innocent Muslim instead of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) whom disbelievers are bent to kill only because he has become a Muslim. Suppose they ask the Rizwan editor about his whereabouts. Would he inform them? While the sin of a murder is a million times greater than lying!

Consider another example. Suppose one's own life is in danger. The disbelievers have surrounded a person and ask him to either give up his faith or die. It is a fact that as long as the heart is filled with the light of faith, there is no harm in apparent confession of disbelief. It causes no harm to the faith. On the other hand, if one does not openly declare disbelief, one loses his life as well as the enthusiasm of faith, which could have created beneficial results in life.

The conclusion is that there is security of both life and faith in apparent confession of disbelief. And in not confessing thus, neither the believer nor his faith would be secure.

Whatever be the decision of the Rizwan editor in this matter, but God prefers that one confess disbelief apparently and save ones life. If one remains alive one can benefit greatly from Islam and this is what is called Taqiyyah.

A similar thing happened to Ammar Yasir (r.a.). The disbelievers martyred his parents in a horrible way with utmost barbarity. Then they told him either to give up Islam or wash his hands off his life. Preferring the safety of his life, he confessed according to the order of the disbelievers and the disbelievers released him. After that he came to the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) weeping and narrated the whole episode to him. The Prophet (s.a.w.s.) said, "You did very well. If these disbelievers

again force you, do repeat those words again." The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) approved in this way while Allah revealed the following verse by way of the approval of his action:

First verse

*"He who disbelieves in Allah after his having believed, not he who is compelled while his heart is at rest on account of faith, but he who opens (his) breast to disbelief — on these is the wrath of Allah, and they shall have a grievous chastisement."*¹

Most Quranic commentaries narrate the above incident in the explanation of this verse. For more explanation, refer to the following commentaries. For the sake of brevity I have not quoted the whole episode:

- i) *Tafsir Kabir* of Imam Fakhruddin Razi
- ii) *Tafsir Kashaf* of Allamah Zamakhshari.
- iii) *Tafsir Fazil* Nishapuri etc.

Second verse

The following verse openly justifies and extols Taqiyyah:

*"Let not the believers take the unbelievers for friends rather than believers; and whoever does this, he shall have nothing of (the guardianship of) Allah, but you should guard yourselves against them, guarding carefully; and Allah makes you cautious of (retribution from) Himself; and to Allah is the eventual coming. Say: Whether you hide what is in your hearts or manifest it, Allah knows it, and He knows whatever is in the heavens and whatever is in the earth, and Allah has power over all things."*²

¹ Surah Nahl 16:106

² Surah Aale Imran 3:28-29

have already explained that according to the dictionary (*Sirah*) 'Taqaaah' and 'Taqiyyah' have the same meaning. They may be two different words but their sense is entirely the same .e. making a show of friendship to the disbelievers out of fear of ones life, and it is a permissible act.

Allamah Syed Razi (a.r.) has explained this in the briefest manner in *Haqaiqut Tawil*:

"Then God exempted Taqiyyah from this order (of prohibiting the friendship of disbelievers). So He said, 'Except that you fear the mischief of these disbelievers and you want to remain secure.' Here 'Taqaa' is also read as Taqiyyah in some recitations, but both of them mean the same. Thus, Allah has permitted the apparent confession of friendship with disbelievers only if it is just a verbal confession and one does not truly believes thus."

God has also justified it saying that faith is actually related to ones conscience. If faith exists in your heart you are free to keep it concealed or reveal it. Both are same in the view of God and He is always aware of your faith. It is enough for those who have brought faith for God's bliss that God is aware of their faith. On the other hand, those whose aim in accepting Islam was to accumulate war-booty or to get royal patronage should really fear Taqiyyah because they cannot fulfill their wicked aims without making a show off. That is why the Rizwan editor is worried of Taqiyyah.

Third verse

The verse, which in helpless circumstances permits eating an unlawful thing to save ones life also allows Taqiyyah (i.e. expressing agreement with disbelievers). The verse is as follows:

*"He has only forbidden you what dies of itself, and blood, and flesh of swine, and that over which any other (name) than (that of) Allah has been invoked; but whoever is driven to necessity, not desiring, nor exceeding the limit, no sin shall be upon him; surely Allah is Forgiving, Merciful."*¹

Two more verses on this topic are present in Surah Anam and one in Surah Naml.

Obviously, the life of a believer is very dear to God. One can commit such a prohibited act in order to save one's life, which is less harmful than the death of a believer.

Fourth verse

This verse is actually in praise of Taqiyyah:

*"And a believing man of Firon's people who hid his faith said..."*²

It is obvious from the way God has spoken of a believer from the community of Firon that He likes concealment of faith very much since there are many advantages of it. As in the case of Abu Talib (s), the infidels considered him also a disbeliever and refrained from causing serious harm to the Prophet (s.a.w.s.). Similarly, the believer of Firon saved Prophet Musa (s) from the mischief of Firon and was always concerned about his security and service. In this way the following statement of Allah is fully confirmed:

*"Surely We have sent to you (O people of Mecca!) an Apostle, a witness against you, as We sent an apostle to Firon."*³

That is, another similarity between the conditions of Prophet Musa (s) and the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) is that the Believer

¹ Surah Baqarah 2:173

² Surah Momin 40:28

³ Surah Muzzammil 73:15

from the community of Firon was the well-wisher of Prophet Musa (s) while concealing his own faith and here Abu Talib (s) concealed his faith in order to protect the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.).

Allah so much liked this faith of Taqiyyah that He gave the title of 'Siddiq' (the truthful one) to the believer of the people of Firon.

The Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) said, "The 'truthful ones' are three: (1) Habib Najjar (2) the believer of Firon's nation and (3) Ali Ibne Abi Talib (s). And Ali (s) is the most superior among them." For more explanation, refer to *Sawaiqul Mohreqa* and *Tafsir Kabir*, the famous books of Ahle Sunnat. I leave the actual text and instead concentrate on replying to the objections of the Rizwan editor.

Fifth verse

Some Ahle Sunnat scholars have proved the Taqiyyah of Prophet Musa (s) through this verse. I present this only for the palpitation of Rizwan's heart. The verse is that Firon told Prophet Musa (s), 'What has happened to you? You have started propagating the worship of One God while you used to live with us and followed my religion. You have also murdered a Copt.':

*"(Firon) said: Did we not bring you up as a child among us, and you tarried among us for (many) years of your life? And you did (that) deed of yours which you did, and you are one of the ungrateful."*¹

Qazi Baidhawi writes in the commentary of this verse that before the declaration of Prophethood, Prophet Musa was

¹ Surah Shuara 26:18-19

living with Firon in Taqiyyah. (Shias are not responsible for this view).

Sixth verse

This verse of Surah Fath proves that the ritual of Taqiyyah prevailed at the time of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.). Allah revealed the reasons of peace treaty of Hudaibiyah when Umar doubted the prophethood after this incident. Allah informed that Mecca shall be conquered without fighting a war and this peace treaty shall be the foundation of this victory. The reason of conquest without war is:

*"...and were it not for the believing men and the believing women, whom, not having known, you might have trodden down, and thus something hateful might have afflicted you on their account without knowledge — so that Allah may cause to enter into His mercy whomsoever He pleases; had they been widely separated one from another, We would surely have punished those who disbelieved from among them with a painful punishment."*¹

This verse proves that during the time of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) there were some believing men and women in Mecca about whom even Muslims were unaware. What to say of the disbelievers! Here Allah is using the terms of 'believing men' and 'believing women' only for those who had resorted to Taqiyyah. What a calamity! Allah refers to those who practice Taqiyyah as believers while the Rizwan editor is heaping objections on them! As if he is (God forbid!) correcting the mistake of God like the second caliph used to (God forbid!) correct the mistakes of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.).²

¹ Surah Fath 48:25

² Courtesy: Allamah Shibli

*"Do they not then reflect on the Quran? Nay, on the hearts there are locks."*¹

Apart from this, I have already mentioned about the Taqiyyah of Ammar Yasir in the beginning. Moreover it is well known that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) propagated Islam secretly for many years and a particular reference is not needed to prove it.

These numerous verses, traditions and incidents prove that it is allowed to confess disbelief falsely if the life of a believer is in danger since the life of a believer is more valuable than the harms of this lie. This is what Taqiyyah means. All essence of these verses is concealed in the following statements of Allamah Razi (a.r.):

"And thus we realize that Taqiyyah only applies to verbal confession (i.e. on the tongue) and not that it may dominate the conscience and the heart because one who forces a person to do something related to the heart (e.g. disbelief or faith) can never know what lies in his heart except that he would compel him to make a verbal confession and through this verbal confession gauge what lies in his heart."

Thus the best method during Taqiyyah is that one should express the friendship of the infidels in such a way that one should be opposed to them but at the same time assume apparent good behavior and pleasing manners with them. But one should continue to harbor the same former enmity towards them in a concealed way, and have firm belief in aloofness from them and their dislike. And in expressing friendship and confessing disbelief also one should try ones best to use words

¹ Surah Muhammad 47:24

having double meanings so that the disbelievers may take it in their sense while it implies something else.”¹

Such usage of words having dual meanings is called ‘Toriya’. The best example of this is also present in a statement of the believer of the community of Firon who was in fact a cousin and heir-apparent of Firon. A courtier informed Firon, that his cousin has developed contrary views. On getting this information Firon wanted to confirm the report while his court was in session and the hall was filled with courtiers. The believer asked all the courtiers, “Who is your Creator?”

“Firon,” they replied at once.

Once again he asked. “Who is your Lord?”

“Firon,” they again replied in unison.

Then he asked, “Who is your sustainer?”

“Firon,” replied everyone.

Then addressing Firon, the believer said, “I confess, before you all, that my Creator, Lord and Sustainer is the same as the Creator, Lord and Sustainer of these people.” Firon was satisfied although the aim of the believer is obvious.

I feel that since only this type of conversation is needed in Taqiyyah and it requires a degree of cleverness, that is why the Rizwan editor considers it unlawful for himself. Anyway, everyone is aware of his or her personal capability!

In other words you should know that caution, ‘Taqiyyah’, ‘Taqwa’ (piety) and ‘Taqaaah’ are words having similar connotations. The basis of piety is to sacrifice a less important thing to save the precious one. Hence when it comes to saving

¹ Haqaiqut Tawil, Part 5, Pg. 77

the life of a believer, which is really precious, it can be achieved with apparent confession of disbelief provided that this confession does not affect to an extent, which would be more harmful than the life of believer. Intelligence and faith is required to decide whether the confession would cause more harm or not. The editor of Rizwan is deprived of both, else he wouldn't have said:

"Shia gentlemen should tell us that if Taqiyyah had been actually religion or a part of religion why didn't Imam Husain resort to Taqiyyah and pay allegiance to Yazid? The Imam cut off the roots of Taqiyyah in the battle of Kerbala. He gave away his head but did not pay allegiance even for the sake of Taqiyyah. He made it clear from his behavior that 'a religion based on Taqiyyah is not mine'."

The writer has leveled the following objection at another place in the same journal. On page 4 he says:

Taqiyyah

This behavior of Imam Husain (s) has cut off the roots of Taqiyyah. What could have been a more appropriate time to resort to Taqiyyah? If the Imam had so desired, he could have made a show of giving allegiance and led a life of comfort and peace. But Allaho Akbar! (God is the Greatest) He was the son of the Lion of God¹. He did not even permit the thought of Taqiyyah. He made it clear from his behavior that Taqiyyah was unlawful and a religion based on Taqiyyah was not his."

The fact is that Taqiyyah is based on the principle that the more precious thing must be saved. Everyone from Prophet Adam to the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) has acted upon this principle.

¹ An appellation of Imam Ali (a.s.)

Prophet Ibrahim (s) did Taqiyyah, Prophet Musa (as said by Baidhawi) acted similarly while the believer of the community of Firon also practiced Taqiyyah. The Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) applauded Ammar Yasir (r.a.) for practicing it. Allah permitted Taqiyyah. However all these incidents show that Taqiyyah is allowed only so far as the apparent rejection of faith does not cause any harm to any Islamic aim. Because if for instance, the life of one who confesses falsely is saved but another person who considers emulating him as cause of salvation gets deviated, the question would arise whether the lives of one or more persons are more important or the faith and guidance of a whole group. Surely, we have to accept that the lives of one, fifty, hundred or a hundred thousand people are not as important as the faith of one, fifty, hundred or a hundred thousand persons. That is why in important and serious circumstances the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) was also permitted to wage a holy war (Jihad). Even though it put the lives of Muslims in danger, the benefit connected with the holy war was more important than lives of few people. Therefore Jihad had to be fought at that time. Although to decide what is more important at a particular time requires a very exalted and vast vision. Hence the decision of a holy war rests only with a messenger (s) or an Imam (s) because the Quran testifies to their infallibility.

Therefore if the personality of a 'True guide' is so honorable that due to his Taqiyyah a whole community would be misguided till the Day of Judgment, 'Caution and Abstinence' (or Taqiyyah) demands that he should not care for his life but save others from being deviated.

This principle does not depend only on the misguidance of others. Rather if due to Taqiyyah one has to murder an innocent soul even then Taqiyyah would not be permitted because the here the actual aim of Taqiyyah is being defeated.

That is, saving the life of a believer. In case the choice is between saving one own life and taking the life of another person. In such a situation it would be better to sacrifice ones own life and the permission of Taqiyyah shall stand withdrawn.

Even the Rizwan editor accepts that the personality of Imam Husain (s) was so influential that if he had paid allegiance to Yazid (l.a.) the transgression and sinfulness of the latter would have gained a stamp of approval. People would have got misguided and the name of Islam wiped out. Thus it is mentioned just before his remarks on Taqiyyah on page 4 itself:

"Though it is obvious that if Imam Husain (s) had paid allegiance to Yazid he would have honored the former. Rather the Imam (s) would have obtained many worldly benefits also. However, the system of religion would have been destroyed and the allegiance of Imam (s) would have become a stamp of approval for the evil deeds of Yazid. Therefore Imam (s) endangered his life, gave away his head but did not allow any harm to Islam."

Then immediately after this he writes under the subtopic of topic of Taqiyyah and states his objections to it. After that in the account of the letters of Kufis he says:

"If Imam (s) had not accepted their request, what excuse he would have before the Almighty to their appeal that, 'We paid allegiance to Yazid under the pressure of his hypocrisy and transgression. If Imam (s) had supported us, we were prepared to sacrifice our lives for him.' The same problem was encountered by the Imam whose solution was not but that he should harken to their call."

It is very surprising that after writing this, you also go on to say: 'What could have been a better time to practice Taqiyyah?' It is possible that in your view it may have been the best time.

For in this way the Islam brought by the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.), which prohibited wine, evil, dancing, singing, sinfulness and transgression etc. would have been destroyed. Only that Islam would have remained which permitted wine, incestual marriage and adultery, dance and music and in which a transgressor is considered worthy of Imamate and congregation leadership. Indeed, it was, from your point of view, the best time for Taqiyyah but from the point of view of Shias at that time there was no possibility of Taqiyyah. The expediencies for it are so many that there is no scope to describe them here.

As the saying goes: 'These disbelievers are destroying their houses with their own hands.' In the same way you have mentioned such points in the beginning which clearly prove that *it was definitely not a time to resort to Taqiyyah.*

After that you say:

"Shias should also think over this narration that is present in their religious book. It is mentioned on page 485 of *Usul al-Kafi* that Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq (s) said, "O Sulaiman! You follow such a religion that God honors one who conceals it and disgraces one who reveals it."

It is narrated on page 482 of *Usul al-Kafi*: "Nine parts of religion are in Taqiyyah."

Shias should note that they are ordered and that too by Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq (s) to conceal their religion. If you reveal it, you would be disgraced. Can a religion be called as a religion where one gets honor in concealing it and disgrace in revealing it?"

The religion of Islam is indeed very strange. God has asked His Prophet to remain quiet on numerous occasions and in the words of the Rizwan editor commanded him to conceal the

faith. What type of a religion it is that in one place it commands Jihad and sometimes it says:

*"(O unbelievers!) You shall have your religion and I shall have my religion."*¹

At times, it advises migration from the abode of unbelievers:

*"...they (angels) shall say: In what state were you? They shall say: We were weak in the earth. They shall say: Was not Allah's earth spacious, so that you should have migrated therein?"*²

It is said in the same place that God will forgive believers who cannot migrate due to their helplessness:

*"Except the weak from among the men and the children who have not in their power the means nor can they find a way (to escape); So these, it may be, Allah will pardon them, and Allah is Pardoning, Forgiving."*³

What type of a religion it is that instructs its followers to perform ablution or ritual bath for prayers but if they become ill or do not get water they may perform Tayammum?⁴ What type of a religion it is that commands to pray four units of prayers at hometown but allows two units while on a journey? What type of a Shariat it is that commands sacrificing an animal but if one cannot do so, he could fast for three days during Hajj and seven days on returning home?

An interesting joke comes to my mind regarding this issue. When the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) initiated the propagation of Islam it was in an absolutely secretive manner. Often Muslims used

¹ Surah Kafiroon 109:6

² Surah Nisa 4:97

³ Surah Nisa 4:98-99

⁴ Dry Ablution with mud and sand etc.

to gather at the house of Zaid bin Arqam. They even used to pray secretly.

Abu Bakr tried to rectify this mistake (God forbid) of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) and coaxed him to go near the Holy Ka'ba and pray openly. The Prophet (s.a.w.s.) tried to convince him but he did not budge. At last, the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) went to the Ka'ba along with his companions.

The disbelievers became furious on seeing this. They thrashed Abu Bakr so nicely that his face became swollen and his nose could not be distinguished. Read the following description of *Sirat Halabiyyah*.¹

When the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) entered the house of Arqam along with his companions (who were 38 in number) to pray secretly, Abu Bakr insisted that the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) go to Masjidul Haram² and make an open expression of Islam. The Prophet (s.a.w.s.) told him, "O Abu Bakr! We are less in number and hence an open display is inadvisable." However Abu Bakr continued insisting till the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) relented and he and his companions went to the mosque.³

After narrating the above incident Allamah Dayar Bakri says:

"And Abu Bakr stood up and started speaking while the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) remained seated. So the polytheists began to attack Abu Bakr and other Muslims, and gave them a severe beating within the boundaries of Masjidul Haram. Abu Bakr was crushed and received a terrible thrashing and the transgressor Utbah bin Rabi'ah came to him and started hammering him with his patched sandals. He used to rub each

¹ Vol. 1 Pg. 295

² The Sanctified mosque in Mecca

³ *Sirat-e-Halabiyyah*, Vol. 1, Pg. 295

side of his sandals on the face of Abu Bakr. This affected his face so much that his nose could not be distinguished."

Allamah Ibne Hisham in *Sirat Ibne Hisham*¹ and Shah Abdul Haq Dehlavi in *Merajan Nabuwwah*² have also quoted the same incident. I avoid the actual text for the sake of brevity.

Let us now consider this incident:

- 1) The first thing obvious from this episode is that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) used to propagate Islam secretly. He did not plan to make an open declaration till he had gathered enough power. It means, even the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) followed the principle of Taqiyyah. That is why Imam Muhammad Baqir (s) says: "Taqiyyah is my religion and the religion of my holy ancestors."
- 2) All the previous discussions prove that Prophet Ibrahim (s), Prophet Musa (s) (as said by Baidhawī), the believer from the community of Firon, the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.), Ammar Yasir, believing people of Mecca about whom even Muslims were unaware, followed Taqiyyah. Even after observing the style of all these personalities the Rizwan editor says: 'Imam Husain (s) declared that a religion with Taqiyyah is not his.' This only proves the intellectual level of the editor. Was the religion of Imam Husain (s) different from that of Prophet Ibrahim (s), the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) and believer from the community of Firon? Imam Husain (s) did Tayammum for prayers due to oppression of enemies, which did not allow him access to water. Will you say that Imam (s)

¹ Vol. 1 Pg. 153

² Vol. 2 Pg. 49

claimed that a religion in which there is ablution is not his?

- 3) Abu Bakr opposed Taqiyyah and he had no qualms in destroying the exigencies of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.). After seeing the Taqiyyah of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) and opposition of Abu Bakr, the objections of the Rizwan editor against Taqiyyah are not surprising because these people have always considered Abu Bakr superior to the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) and base their religion on the statements of caliphs and their followers rather than the traditions of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.). Hence I consider the Rizwan editor worthy of forgiveness not only in this, but in every matter.
- 4) Now the most important conclusion becomes apparent here that due to the disobedience of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) and proclaiming Islam at a wrong time, the disbelievers angrily attacked Muslims and poor Abu Bakr became a sacrificial goat. The disbelievers disgraced him in such a way that his nose could not be distinguished from his cheek. Leave aside the discussion why the disbelievers selected Abu Bakr to the exception of all others for this evil act and how it shows his dignity. Just ponder on the fact that Abu Bakr was disgraced because of untimely expression and! Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq (s) has also said, "O Sulaiman! You follow such a religion that God honors one who conceals it and disgraces one who reveals it."

Now tell me what type of a religion it is that one gets honor in concealing it and disgrace in revealing it?

Is there any need of further discussion?

In the end I want to ask the Rizwan editor that the believer from the community of Firon practiced Taqiyyah and protected

the religion of God so God gave him the title of 'Siddiq' (the truthful one) but on what basis have you people given the title of 'Siddiq' to Abu Bakr? While his mode of action was exactly opposite to that of the believer from the community of Firon. The former made the announcement of Islam at the wrong time and place. Also traditions of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) clearly say that only three people are 'the truthful ones' viz. (1) Habib Najjar (2) The Believer from the community of Firon and (3) Imam Ali Ibne Abi Talib (s). And Ali (s) is the most exalted among them. Other narrations also address Ali (s) as 'Siddiq-e-Akbar' (the greatest truthful one). So when there is no other 'truthful one' in this nation, from where has Abu Bakr arrived to take this title? What a daring that along with the caliphate, the titles were also usurped! Same is the case with the title of 'Farooq-e-Azam'.¹ The Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) addresses Ali (s) as the 'Farooq-e-Azam' while you apply this title to Umar. What a great way of following the Prophet's example!

It is possible that my honorable readers may be thinking why the Rizwan editor objects to a principle, which is in accordance with reason as well as the Quran and traditions. It is necessary to describe an important issue here. Faith is related to conscience and a belief inside the heart can only be destroyed by another belief, which is contrary to the former one. Iron is cut by iron only. Inner belief can neither be expressed nor destroyed by open declaration. If verbal expression had any effect on inner belief even hypocrites would have become believers, since they declare their belief in Islam verbally.

If a person is a sincere believer of Islam, verbal expression of disbelief could not affect his heart till he changes the beliefs of his heart. But if the Islam of a person is only verbal and there is

¹ The greatest discriminator of truth and falsehood

no effect of faith and Islam on his heart, then verbal 'expression of disbelief' is quite enough to deceive that 'verbal expression of Islam'. The editor of Rizwan falls in the second category whose Islam has not gone beyond their throats and it is limited to the tongue only. Hence he fears that if he has to express disbelief verbally in a forced circumstance their apparent veil of Islam shall also be destroyed. And that hidden hypocrisy will assume the form of clear disbelief, hence the best way to hide one's hypocrisy and lack of faith of their hearts, is to oppose Taqiyyah.

Apart from this, there is another reason, which is as follows:

There can be one of the four conditions while considering faith and disbelief together:

- (1) Believing from heart and its true expression. (It is obviously faith)
- (2) Opposing Islam from heart and its expression. (It is clearly disbelief)

These two conditions are exactly opposite to each other.

- (3) Opposing Islam from heart while expressing a belief in it. (It is hypocrisy or hidden disbelief)
- (4) Believing Islam from heart but expressing disbelief out of helplessness. (This is called Taqiyyah or hidden faith).

Obviously, both these conditions are also clearly opposite to each other and they cannot exist together. Now the people who practice hypocrisy, if they oppose Taqiyyah, which is opposed to hypocrisy, they are worthy of being excused and their opposition is the very proof of the legality of Taqiyyah.

Muawiyah and the responsibility of the Imam's martyrdom

(First printed 'Al-Jawwad', September-October 1955 A.D.)

After expressing views on 'Taqiyyah', the Rizwan editor felt proud of his knowledge of history and he paid tributes to his chief, Muawiyah in the following manner:

WHO KILLED THE IMAM?

Shias blame Amir Muawiyah for the assassination of Imam (s). Some Shias even say that the Imam was assassinated on the order of Muawiyah. However, Shia scholars have themselves concocted these allegations. Reliable Shia books prove that Amir Muawiyah had nothing to do in the Imam's murder. Mulla Baqir Majlisi writes in *Jalalul Uyun*¹ that Amir Muawiyah willed to Yazid at the time of his death:

- 1) But as for Imam Husain (s)! You know his relation and nearness to the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.). He is a part of the Prophet. I know that the people of Iraq will call him and would not help him. If you get control over him, recognize his rights. Remember his rank of nearness to the Prophet. Do not make him recompense for his actions and do not break off the relations I have strengthened with him during this time. Beware! Do not give him any kind of trouble.

¹ Page 421-422

- 2) It is narrated in *Nasikhut Tawarikh* that Muawiyah made the following will to Yazid: O son! Do not be greedy. Beware, when you come to Allah you should not have the blood of Husain bin Ali upon your neck. Otherwise, you will not be at ease and remain under chastisement forever.

This narration is also from the book of Shias. At least it proves that Muawiyah was not involved in the martyrdom of Husain (s). He had willed Yazid to respect and help the Imam. Then we do not understand why Amir Muawiyah is blamed for the martyrdom of the Imam?

After quoting this objection from the beginning to the end I don't know which statement should be replied first. By the grace of Allah, each word of this script is inviting an objection. However, I feel it appropriate to present an example of the historical knowledge of Rizwan editor and his associates before criticizing these wordings. This same issue of Rizwan contained an article, "Coronation of Yazid and Problems of 'is there more?'" by Maulana Abul Hasanat Sayed Muhammad Ahmad, the chief of the Federation of scholars of Pakistan, Lahore. Who can ask what this exalted personality means by this title. Why he says 'is there more' instead of 'is there from more'. Is it due to the age-old habit of making distortions? Anyway, the beauty of the title shows the significance of the subject matter. The chief of the Federation of the scholars of Pakistan does not even know that Imam Hasan (s) was martyred ten years before Yazid (l.a.) came to the throne. And that their Chief, Muawiyah had a significant role in this martyrdom. The poor man thinks that Imam Hasan (s) was also martyred in 61 A.H. I shall mention some selected sentences of this article in a sequence as follows:

"Sixtieth year of Hijrah and the month of Rajab...Unclean Yazid dirties the throne with his impure feet:: He attacks Imam

Hasan (r.a.) for the first time and poisons him a number of times. As a result, the liver of the beloved of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) came out in pieces."

After that is mentioned the martyrdom and bequest etc. of Imam Hasan (s). Then he continues...

"...in short, after Yazid satisfied his unlucky heart with the martyrdom of Imam Hasan (r.a.), his eyes fell upon the Prince of the two worlds, Imam Husain (s)...and so on."¹

Do you see the historical knowledge of the chief of the federation of scholars of Pakistan? Even an elementary student of Islamic history will not make such a blunder. But where the only aim is to acquire offerings from people after donning the turban, where is the time for the pursuit of knowledge?

The problem is that the Rizwan editor has tried to undertake a journey, which requires great historical consciousness. The condition of his knowledge is such that he does not even know the sequence of important events. So it is very difficult to explain to him, 'Who the assassin of the Imam (s) is?'

Let us consider his statements, one by one.

He says: "Shias blame Amir Muawiyah for the assassination of Imam (s)."

Whoever has provided you with this information has not conveyed it in full. Rather they consider it to be connected to much earlier incidents. Shias not only blame Muawiyah but also his predecessors for the martyrdom of Imam Husain (s). They say that the foundation of martyrdom of Imam Husain (s) was laid by your leaders in Saqifah itself. If the rights of the progeny of Muhammad (s.a.w.s.) had not been usurped on that

¹ Pg. 17 and 18

day, the tragedy of Kerbala would not have occurred. They would not have dared to oppress the progeny of Muhammad (s.a.w.s.). Hence we consider all, from those responsible for allegiance at Saqifah, to the lowest soldier of Yazid, responsible for the martyrdom of Imam Husain (s). We consider the root more important than the branches. The same thing is versified beautiful way by a poet thus:

"In what a nice way someone has said
That Husain was killed in Saqifah."¹

Also another poet has said about your second Caliph:

"The evil deed of Shimr was due to what he had done.
The blood of all the martyr is upon his neck."²

These are open secrets well understood by your Imam Ghazzali and other scholars. Hence he issued the verdict, "It is prohibited for a preacher and a non-preacher to speak about Imam Husain (s) and his companions because it instigates enmity of companions (of Prophet)." The question is if Imam Ghazzali was not aware that this event of martyrdom occurred by courtesy of your 'blessed companions' and that the foundation of this tragedy has been laid at the hands of the companions, why else would he say that it causes incitement of the enmity of companions? Also note that even during that period the common man was so conscious of history that he could estimate the causes of events. Otherwise how could the enmity of the companions develop just because a preacher is talking about Husain (s)? The reason is, when an event is viewed in a true light, the mind is led to the incidents prior to that event and one can reach a conclusion based on the

¹ Persian Couplet

² Persian Couplet

relationship between them. It could thus be understood that 'Husain was killed in Saqifah'. And in this way they would develop hatred to those companions. Thus even the common people understood these historical facts but who would explain them to the Rizwan editor?

"Who does not know this secret?

Though these are the secrets known to all."¹

What to say about others, Muawiyah himself has explained this fact. He says that he was the follower of the three caliphs especially the first caliph, in all these oppressive deeds. If Abu Bakr had not usurped the caliphate, he would never have opposed Ali (s). To be more precise, when Imam Ali (s) accepted the apparent caliphate, Muawiyah began to oppose him. Muhammad bin Abu Bakr, the son of the first caliph, wrote to Muawiyah describing the defects of Bani Umayyah and excellences of Amirul Momineen (s). He asked him to start obeying Amirul Momineen (s) or be prepared to face the chastisement of the Judgment Day. Muawiyah replied as follows:

"This is a letter from Muawiyah bin Sakhr to Muhammad bin Abu Bakr who accuses his own father. So to say: I received your letter in which you have described the power, highness and majesty of God, which He indeed is worthy of. You have also described the excellences due to which God chose the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.). You have also stated many things that show your weakness and denounce your father. You have also mentioned about the excellences of Ali bin Abi Talib, his peculiarities, nearness to the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) and the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) getting his help in times of need. Your arguments against me and finding my faults are due to the appreciation of

¹ Persian Couplet

someone else [i.e. Ali bin Abi Talib (s)]. It is not due to your own excellence. Hence, I thank God Who removed these excellences from you and gave them to someone else. The fact is that we (including your father, Abu Bakr) knew the excellences of Ali bin Abi Talib very well. We knew that it was incumbent upon us to restore his right. God liked this bounty for His Prophet (s.a.w.s.), which he had already chosen. God fulfilled His promise made to the Prophet (s.a.w.s.), made His invitation open and enlightened His proof. When God called him back, your father and Farooq were the first to usurp the right of Ali (s) and who opposed him regarding his caliphate. They both united over this issue and made it evident. Then they called Ali to pay allegiance to him. Ali refused to pay allegiance to them. They intended to harass Ali and made considerable attempts to do so...They neither associated Ali in any of their affairs nor revealed any secret to him till God gave them death. Then their third, Uthman stood up and followed their footsteps only. You and your companion started pointing out his faults. However, the foolish people far and wide were tempted by it. You both wished for hardships upon him and expressed your enmity. Finally you achieved your aims. Thus, O son of Abu Bakr! Beware, and compare your span with the inner area of your palm. You cannot compare yourself with the one (Muawiyah) whose empire is as large as the mountains. Pressure does not make his spear soft. Neither a speaker can understand his order. He has spread the throne of his rule and made his empire very strong.

Now the issue of caliphate that we are discussing; if it is correct, your father (Abu Bakr) alone had made the arrangements. We just followed his orders and became his partners. If your father had not behaved thus, we would also never have opposed Ali bin Abi Talib and on the contrary, accepted his caliphate. We only saw your father's behavior

with Ali and followed his footsteps. Now if you want accuse anyone, accuse your own father or refrain from this issue. And peace be on the one who had his desires fulfilled."¹

Even Yazid (whom Ahle Sunnat accepted as caliph after Muawiyah) declares that he dared to oppress Ahle Bayt (s) only because the two Shaykhs, Uthman etc. had opened the door of oppressing the Ahle Bayt and he had only followed them. Thus after the martyrdom of Imam Husain (s), Abdullah bin Umar (son of the second caliph) wrote a letter to Yazid. Both the letter and its reply are present in *History* of Balazari, which is a work of a great Ahle Sunnat scholar, Allamah Balazari. The actual text is as follows:

When Imam Husain (s) was martyred Abdullah bin Umar wrote a letter to Yazid bin Muawiyah: "After praise and salutations, you should know that this is a great catastrophe. A great tragedy has occurred in Islam. No day is equal to the day of the martyrdom of Husain (s)."

Yazid replied: "O fool! We acquired decorated houses, spread chessboards, and well-arranged cushions (i.e. a strong empire). So we fought a battle to safeguard our worldly life. If truth is against us (i.e. with Husain and his family) then your father is the first person who started usurping the rights."²

The eyes of Abdullah bin Umar opened on reading this reprimanding letter. He understood that if he has to maintain the prestige of his father he would have to support Yazid. Because of opposition of Yazid implies that the three caliphs be opposed. After all, they are links of the same chain, and

¹ Muruz az-Zahab on the margins of Tarikh Kamil, Vol. 3, Pg. 89, Printed at Egypt. Fazaile Bahira Fee Mahasin, Cairo, Egypt, and Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Ibne Abil Hadid, Part 3, Pg. 162, Iran.

² History, Balazari Pg. 462

opposing the three caliphs would eliminate one from the 'Sunni circle'. Apart from this, he did not have the courage to reveal his father's blunders and become a truthful one (like Muhammad bin Abi Bakr). Hence he started supporting Yazid to such an extent that when the people of Medina decided to break allegiance of Yazid it was this Abdullah bin Umar who supported Yazid and became aloof from the people of Medina along with his family members, as mentioned in the books of history. Confession of a criminal is more important than his defensive arguments, but there should be someone who can understand it.

Keeping in mind all these issues, we have to accept that Saqifah was the foundation of not only the martyrdom of Imam Husain (s), but also the martyrdom of every member from the progeny of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.).

Hence those orators who say that Muawiyah was the only one involved in the martyrdom of Imam Husain (s) along with Yazid, narrate only a part of truth or act with utmost forbearance.

The next sentence is:

"Some Shias even say that the Imam was assassinated only on the order of Muawiyah."

The editor of Rizwan wants to save his Amir from the accusation of the Imam's martyrdom. Even if the accusation of martyrdom is taken back it will not be possible to acquit him. Since the pieces of Imam Hasan's liver prove that he is the culprit, Hasan and Husain (s) are equal in the eyes of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.), Allah and we people. As you have not mentioned the name of Imam, let me explain to you how Muawiyah's hands are smeared with the blood of the Imam. Numerous Ahle Sunnat scholars accept it. Allamah Ibne Abdul

Barr, a famous Ahle Sunnat scholar, writes in his renowned work, *Al Istiab fi Marefat As-haab* as follows:

Qatadah and Abu Bakr bin Hafasa said, "Hasan bin Ali was poisoned. He was poisoned by his wife, Judah binte Ashath. A group of scholars believe that this poisoning was only the intrigue of Muawiyah. It was only as a result of what he paid to Judah."

Allamah Sibte Ibne Jawzi, a renowned Ahle Sunnat scholar writes in his famous book, *Tadhkirah Khwaasul Ummah* with more explanation:

"Imam Shabi says that Muawiyah made a secret pact with Judah and said, 'If you poison Hasan I would marry you off to Yazid and reward you a hundred thousand dirhams.' After the martyrdom of Imam Hasan (s), she asked Muawiyah to fulfill his promise. Muawiyah sent a hundred thousand dirhams to her along with a message, 'I love Yazid and want him to remain alive otherwise I would have surely married you to him.' Imam Shabi says that the proof of this statement is the assertion of Imam Hasan (s) at the time of his death, 'I know that the sip of Muawiyah has become pleasant and he has fulfilled his wish. By Allah, he would not fulfill his promises and neither is he true to his word.'"

And my grandfather (Allamah Ibne Jawzi) writes in the book, *As Safwah* that Yaqub bin Sufyan has mentioned in his history that only Judah poisoned Imam Hasan (s). A poet has said regarding this:

'You know that there are many ways of your consolation,
Thoughts that will take away your grief.

The demise of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.), martyrdom of Amirul Momineen (s),

Martyrdom of Husain (s) and the poisoning of Hasan (s).¹

Ibne Saad says that Muawiyah poisoned Imam Hasan (s) a number of times because Imam Hasan and Imam Husain (s) used to visit him in Syria (and he used to poison his guests there).²

All these points are mentioned by the following Ahle Sunnat scholars with explanation:

- 1) Allamah Zuhri in *Tahzibul Kamal fee Asmair Rijal*
- 2) Imam Zahabi in *Tahzibut Tahzib*
- 3) Shaykh Abu Abdillah Muhammad bin Umar Zainuddin Ibnul Waqidi in *Miratul Ajaib*
- 4) Allamah Zamakhshari in *Rabi-ul-Abraar*
- 5) Abul Hasanul Madayani in the *History of Madayan*
- 6) Allamah Ismail bin Ali bin Mahmud in *Al-Mukhtar fil Akhbaar Khairul Bashari*
- 7) Maulana Abdul Qadir bin Muhammad Tabari in *Husnus Sareerah* etc.

When Muawiyah got the news of the martyrdom of Imam Hasan (s) he exclaimed, 'Allaho Akbar!' (God is the Greatest) out of joy. When people asked the reason, they came to know that it is due to the martyrdom of the beloved of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) and they rebuked him. Muawiyah said that his heart was at peace because of his demise. Mirza Mutamid Khan has quoted this incident in his book *Miftahun Najah* and narrated a lengthy conversation between Muawiyah and Ibne Abbas. I narrate it here in spite of my concern for brevity:

¹ Arabic Couplet

² Tadhkirah-e-Khwaasul Ummah, Account of Imam Husain (a.s.)

"Allamah Dayar Bakri writes in *Tarikh Khamees* that when Muawiyah received the news of the martyrdom of Imam Hasan (s), he recited a Takbir (Allaho Akbar). The Syrians also repeated the slogan after him. Thus Fakhta binte Qarza asked Muawiyah, 'May God keep your eyes cool. What is the reason of this Takbir?' He replied, 'Hasan died.' Fakhta said, 'Do you shout the slogan of Takbir at the death of the son of Fatima (s.a.)?' He said, 'I have not recited Takbir because I am rejoicing at his distress but my heart is at peace.'"

Allamah Dayar Bakri says that this only constitutes 'rejoicing at someone's distress'. Without it a heart cannot be at peace at the death of someone else.

Zubair bin Bakar says that Ibne Abbas went to Muawiyah and Muawiyah had already received the news of the martyrdom of Imam Hasan (s). Thus Muawiyah performed a prostration of thanks and his face lit up in delight. Then he gave permission to the people to enter the court. He permitted Ibne Abbas last. He entered and Muawiyah made him sit beside himself. Muawiyah said, 'Do you know about the incident that occurred in your family?' Ibne Abbas replied in negative. Muawiyah said, 'Imam Hasan (s) has expired. May God reward you greatly in this calamity.' Ibne Abbas said, 'From Him we come and to Him shall we return. We seek the reward of calamity of the death of Imam Hasan (s) from God only. I have got the news of your prostration and I am sure it is prostration of thanks out of the joy of this death. By Allah, neither his body will close your grave nor his life will increase your life. We have already suffered the calamity of a greater personality (i.e. Amirul Momineen). Then God recompensed it (by Imam Hasan) (Hence you should not be happy at the demise of Hasan).' Muawiyah asked the age of Imam Hasan (s). Ibne Abbas replied, 'He was more honorable that I should be aware of the date of his birth!' Muawiyah said, 'I know that he has left

behind small kids.' Ibne Abbas said, 'We all were young (in his presence) but have become elderly now.' Muawiyah said, 'You have become the head of your family now.' Ibne Abbas replied, 'Did not God keep Abu Abdillah Husain (s) alive that I should be the chief?' He stood up saying so with tears flowing from his eyes. Muawiyah said, 'May God do good to Ibne Abbas. By Allah, we never remained with him but that we found him the leader.'"

Allamah Damiri has also quoted this incident in brief using some different words in his book, *Hayatul Haiwan*.

The description of Muawiyah's joy at the demise of Imam Hasan (s), his saying of Takbir, doing prostration of thanks etc. are found in the following books:

- 1) *Nazatul Abrar and Miftahun Najah* by Mirza Muhammad bin Mutamid Khan
- 2) *Tarikh Khamis* by Dayar Bakri
- 3) *Hayatul Haiwan* by Allamah Damiri
- 4) *Rabiul Abrar* by Allamah Zamakhshari

Now the Rizwan editor and his brother, Chief of the federation of scholars of Pakistan might have known that Amir Muawiyah could not be absolved of the responsibility of the Imam's martyrdom. It is not strange for Muawiyah to be happy over the martyrdom of Ahle Bayt (s). He had also expressed similar joy at the martyrdom of Amirul Momineen (s). A renowned Ahle Sunnat Imam, Raghīb Isfahani writes in one of his notable works, *Mahazirat*:

Hisham bin Hakam was asked whether Muawiyah was present in the battle of Badr. He replied, "Yes, from the side of the infidels." Muawiyah and his forbearance was discussed in the presence of Sharik bin Abdullah who remarked, 'Muawiyah

was nothing but a fool. He was reclining on a cushion when the news of the martyrdom of Amirul Momineen (s) arrived. He sat upright and said, "O slave-girl! Sing a song as today my eye has become cool" and the slave-girl started singing this song: "Please send this message to Muawiyah bin Harb. May God never cool the eyes of one who rejoices over other's distress. You involved us in the calamity of a personality who was the best among the people, in the month of Ramadan itself. You martyred a person who was better than all the riders and those who sit on the ship."

Muawiyah picked up baton lying before him and hit it hard on her head. As a result, the brain of that slave-girl broke into pieces. Where was his tolerance on that day?

This extempore poem of the slave-girl of Muawiyah that: 'You gave us calamity and sorrow' and 'You killed' point to Muawiyah. The common historians have not paid attention to this aspect. Before we provide the explanation let us see the account of the martyrdom of Amirul Momineen (s) in brief. Here are some details commonly found in history:

Abdur Rahman bin Muljim was a Khariji. He and two other Kharijis planned to kill Amirul Momineen (s), Muawiyah and Amr bin Aas at the same time so that Muslims remain safe from wars. They fixed the dawn of 19th Ramadan for this job. One of them went to Damascus where Muawiyah lived. The second one went to Egypt where Amr bin Aas resided and Ibne Muljim arrived in Kufa where Ali (s) ruled. The sword of Ibne Muljim was smeared with poison. Muawiyah did not go to lead morning prayers on the 19th of Ramadan and sent someone in his place and that person was killed. Amr bin Aas went to lead the prayers wearing a silk dress. Silk is prohibited for men but it is permissible in battles because sword strokes are deflected from it. The same thing happened. The Khariji hit him with the sword and it slipped and Amr Aas survived. Amirul Momineen

(s) was injured in Kufa and the poison with which the sword was smeared proved more fatal than the injury.

If a neutral person reflects over this incident he could not but be surprised how on that very day Amr Aas wore a silk dress, which is prohibited. Also why Muawiyah sent another person to the Mosque when he used to lead the prayers himself always? Why was the sword of only Ibne Muljim smeared with a lethal poison? Why Muawiyah celebrated that his eyes were cooled on hearing the news of martyrdom? Why did his slave-girl, on the spur of the moment tell him that he had martyred the Imam and caused sorrow to them? We will have to believe that Muawiyah and Amr Aas were behind the martyrdom of Amirul Momineen (s). They planned the attack in such a way that it should look like a Khariji conspiracy and they should remain safe from criticism and people should not think that they were involved in the martyrdom of Ali (s).

If the Rizwan editor or any of his supporter has any objection to this belief he go ahead and prove it.

Anyway, these issues were raked up because the Rizwan editor had tried to absolve Muawiyah completely from the martyrdom of the Imam. So I thought I should keep the mirror of reality in front of him in which he could see the face of his Amir and himself and know that the teeth of 'Khalul Momineen'¹ are smeared with the blood of more than one Imam.

As a matter of fact he has written the objection of Shias in a distorted manner so that it would be easy to discuss about them. In this too, instead of refuting the Shias he has quoted a will of his chief, Muawiyah. This style of argumentation is also an example of the intellectual perception of the Rizwan editor. The world over, it is a rule that the denial an accused does not

¹ A title of Muawiyah meaning, 'Uncle of the believers'

have any value. Although if the testimony of others is reliable it is given a hearing. On the other hand if the accused confesses his guilt, it has great importance. But the Rizwan editor considers the denial of the accused as the sole and complete evidence of his justification. The strength of his claim is clear from this.

We feel it necessary to narrate some historical events in brief to explain the true facts:

Bani Umayyah were always opposed to the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.). They supported the disbelievers in Badr, Uhad, Khandaq and other battles in order to destroy the aim and life of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.). After the conquest of Mecca, when Abu Sufyan and others realized that it was impossible to succeed against the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) they apparently accepted Islam. But they were always considered among those who had unstable belief. When the conspiracy of Saqifah took place after the passing away of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.), they came to Imam Ali (s) and said, "If you say, I can fill the streets of Medina with cavalry and infantry, and restore your rights."

His Eminence, Ali (s) knew it well that his actual aim was not to support him but to cause bloodshed of Muslims. He also knew that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) had always remained aloof of Bani Umayyah and continued to consider it un-Islamic that Bani Umayyah should be given an important role or a rank in Islam and hence, he rejected this proposal.

Being dejected, he went to the first caliph and said, "You acquired the caliphate but what have I gained?" The first caliph, after consulting the second caliph presented him with the governorship of Syria to earn his support. He in turn transferred the governorship to his son, Yazid bin Abu Sufyan and Yazid became the governor. When Yazid died, he

appointed his brother Muawiyah as his successor and Muawiyah succeeded him after his death. And the first caliph allowed Muawiyah to continue in the post due to the original reasons. In this way a common opponent (Bani Hashim) united Bani Umayyah and the seat of caliphate. During the reign of the first three caliphs, the duty Bani Hashim's destruction was performed by the caliphs themselves. But after them, when caliphate reached Amirul Momineen Imam Ali Ibne Abi Talib (s), it was the time for Muawiyah to get into action. He knew that time was ripe for him to rise. Thus he continued to engage Amirul Momineen (s) in battles as long as the latter lived. Till at last, he (s) was martyred at the hands of Ibne Muljim (I.a.).

The Late Riyaz Banarsi has mentioned the account of events in *Al-Karrar*. He opines that Muawiyah had a great role in the martyrdom of Amirul Momineen (s) also. I have already shed light on this matter.

Imam Hasan (s) ascended the seat of caliphate after Amirul Momineen (s). Muawiyah continued to play his wicked tricks. He bribed the chiefs of the Imam's army and won them to his side. Imam Hasan (s) had no option but to sign a peace treaty with Muawiyah. The conditions of treaty were such that Muawiyah would not appoint Yazid as his successor. Hence, his prime aim shall not be achieved. Thus, he poisoned Imam Hasan (s) through Judah binte Ashath and expressed joy when he got the news of his martyrdom. We have already mentioned the details in the foregone pages. Obviously, the aim of Imam Hasan's murder and use of abusive language for Amirul Momineen (s) was to pave way for the allegiance of Yazid. However, the personality of Imam Husain (s) was not like that of an ordinary person. His presence and opposition was enough to ruin all his plans. So at first, Muawiyah tried to call the Imam (s) towards him in a polite manner. But the Imam (s)

was well aware of his cunning and he openly refused to pay allegiance to Yazid.

Now I shall quote, in parts, as required, the account of the later events from the history, *Rauzatus Safa*¹:

Muawiyah traveled to Hijaz along with a thousand riders. When he reached near Medina he happened to meet Imam Husain (s) first of all.

Muawiyah said to the Imam (s), "May luck not favor you. You are like that animal of sacrifice whose blood is ready to gush out. God will surely make your blood flow."

He spoke in the same way to Abdur Rahman bin Abi Bakr and others also. Imam Husain (s) told him, "O Muawiyah! Keep quiet! Such talks do not befit us."

Muawiyah said, "Not only this but you are worthy of worse things. You wanted a matter (caliphate) while God was against it. The intention of God was finally realized. (This is a complete picture of the belief of compulsion, that whatever happens is destined by Allah.)

He did not permit the Imam (s) to meet him in Medina. Imam Husain (s), Abdullah bin Umar, Abdur Rahman bin Abi Bakr and Abdullah Ibne Zubair went to Mecca. Muawiyah climbed the pulpit of the Messenger (s.a.w.s.) and said, "If these four pay allegiance to Yazid it is all right; but if not, I will do what is needed to be done with them." He uttered many such statements and issued many threats. Later, he stopped using harsh words upon the counsel of Ayesha and Abdullah Ibne Abbas that this trick might work. He came to Mecca, summoned the Imam and began the discussion of Yazid's allegiance. He said, "If I had considered someone else worthy

¹ Vol. 3, Pg. 28-31

of caliphate I would have appointed him my heir apparent." Imam Husain (s) said, "Keep quiet! O Muawiyah! People still exist, who are more worthy and better than your son in terms of parentage."

Muawiyah said, "You imply yourself in this statement."

Imam (s) replied, "There is nothing wrong even if I have implied thus?"

Muawiyah said, "Your parents are indeed better than the parents of Yazid but he is better than you in the matter of caliphate and administration."

Imam (s) said, "How strange! That a drunkard and a transgressor could be better than me!"

Muawiyah said, "Keep quiet! Because if someone mentioned your name before Yazid he would not say anything about you except good."

Imam (s) replied, "I say whatever I know about him and he should also say what he knows about me."

Muawiyah said, "Get up and go back. Beware for your life and fear the people of Syria."

Then he summoned Abdur Rahman bin Abi Bakr, Abdullah bin Umar and Abdullah bin Zubair one by one and discussed about the caliphate of Yazid (l.a.). All of them, except Abdullah bin Umar opposed him.

He distributed gifts to the people of Mecca except Bani Hashim. Abdullah bin Abbas who had come to Mecca from Medina with Muawiyah, complained about it and he mentioned the same reason that, "I am disappointed with Husain for he did not accept the caliphate of my son. Hence I have deprived Bani Hashim from rewards and gifts."

Finally, after being persuaded by Ibne Abbas, he sent monies to all the people and the largest amount to Imam Husain (s) but he refused to accept it.

A day before leaving Mecca, he again called those four persons and raised the matter of Yazid's caliphate. Abdullah bin Zubair presented three options:

- 1) Do not appoint anyone as the caliph and leave the selection to Muslims
- 2) Or appoint a Quraish other than Bani Umayyah
- 3) Or appoint a selection committee

Muawiyah asked him if any other option remained.

"No," Ibne Zubair replied, "This was all I wanted to say."

Muawiyah sought the advice of others and they also opposed the caliphate of Yazid. Muawiyah said:

"All right! Before I leave, I want to go on the pulpit to advise and admonish the people and leave this exhortation for tomorrow. I fear the people of Syria regarding you."

The next day, that is the day of his departure, he summoned the chiefs of Quraish. These four personalities (including Imam Husain) arrived as promised the day before. Muawiyah climbed the pulpit and delivered a sermon as follows:

"Some baseless news is circulating in the public. Yesterday I heard some people say that Imam Husain (s), Abdur Rahman bin Abi Bakr, Abdullah bin Umar and Abdullah bin Zubair do not agree to the caliphate of Yazid and are not paying allegiance to him. I was surprised and called all these chiefs of Quraish and investigated the matter. They spoke kind and loving things and agreed to pay allegiance to Yazid. And I say this in their presence so that if there is any doubt, it should become clear."

Immediately the Syrians (who were important characters in this drama) unsheathed their swords and said that if the four do not pay allegiance to Yazid openly they would kill them and sought Muawiyah's permission to behead them.

When Muawiyah had fulfilled his aim, he persuaded them to overlook it, and the swords returned to the sheaths.

On the other hand, Imam Husain (s), Abdur Rahman bin Abi Bakr, Abdullah bin Umar and Abdullah bin Zubair were shocked. They began to wonder, "What the promise was and now what has happened? Now, if we refuse to pay allegiance the Syrian army would never leave us alive." Left with no option, they remained quiet in this gathering and others paid allegiance to Yazid.

Muawiyah came down from the pulpit and the crowd dispersed. The people began to blame them (Imam Husain and others) for opposing Yazid at first then paying allegiance to him. It was then they explained that they were completely unaware of the allegiance, and that Muawiyah had resorted to deceit and made false statements. They also said: "We remained quiet due to the fear of the sword."

These incidents clearly prove that Muawiyah was fully prepared to slay Imam Husain (s). He had created such an environment that if Imam Husain (s) was not having the Divine support, his martyrdom would occurred in Mecca instead of Kerbala and in 56 A.H. instead of 61 A.H. In this way, Muawiyah had created such an atmosphere that Imam Husain (s) was sure to be martyred. Yazid was taught that he should not refrain from shedding Husain's (s) blood even in Mecca in order to strengthen his rule. Yazid followed this lesson after coming to the throne and he immediately sent thirty mercenaries to Mecca disguised as pilgrims to assassinate Husain (s) during circumambulation.

Knowing that Husain (s) would never accept the caliphate of Yazid in his life, making Yazid a caliph and teaching him through practical acts that the martyrdom of Husain was not a big issue, were the two important foundations on which the tragedy of Kerbala came into being. Hence we have to believe that "Muawiyah indeed had a hand in the martyrdom of Husain". And also that he was in favor of this martyrdom. Otherwise why did he use threats time and again?

After reading the above incidents, any sensible person would be compelled to believe that Muawiyah himself wanted to martyr Imam Husain (s). However, his machinations were foiled by the foresight of the Imam and his discernment, and thus Muawiyah remained helpless. Yazid fulfilled this heartfelt wish of Muawiyah. As the poet says:

"What the father could not do, the son did."

We recite in the Aamal (rituals) of Ashura (10th of Mohurrum):

"Curse of Allah be on the community that killed you all. And curse of Allah be on those who created the atmosphere for your slaying."

Muawiyah died with the wish that he had himself murdered Husain (s) but nevertheless, he was indeed among those who harassed him, who was in favor of his slaying and those who created the atmosphere for his martyrdom. Such internal and external conditions are necessary in the background of such incidents, which are causes for this happening. If this is true it is correct to say that all the three caliphs, and Muawiyah and Yazid were equally responsible for the creation of such internal and external conditions for the event of Kerbala because this branch has sprouted from this same root.

Appointing Yazid as the heir-apparent against the terms of the treaty with Imam Hasan (s), threatening Imam Husain (s) time

and again about it, knowing that he will not accept Yazid's heir-apparency, to attribute falsehood to him in public, and surrounding him with naked swords; all these were practical lessons that Muawiyah imparted to Yazid, and Yazid acted on them. Therefore the responsibility of the deeds of Yazid rests on Muawiyah just as the responsibility of effect is on the cause.

In the same way Muawiyah was taught the lesson of usurping of the rights of Ahle Bayt (s) by the two Shaykhs as both Muawiyah and Yazid have confessed in writing. Thus this matter is seen to have a long connection and the causes of Kerbala carnage are visible in the happenings of Saqifah.

It is possible that someone may think why Imam Husain (s) did not sacrifice his life in Mecca itself and instead remained quiet? This mode of action of Imam is itself a slap on the face of the Rizwan editor who writes again and again that:

"He (Imam) made it clear from his behavior that 'a religion based on Taqiyyah is not mine'."

Those who say this should come and see that not only Imam Husain (s) but also three Ahle Sunnat saints and guides viz. Abdur Rahman bin Abi Bakr, Abdullah bin Zubair and Abdullah bin Umar are practicing Taqiyyah. They confess in clear words: "We remained quiet due to the fear of the sword." These three Ahle Sunnat leaders indeed committed an unlawful deed because the Ahle Sunnat object to Taqiyyah. However, the reasons of Imam Husain's (s) silence are as follows:

Firstly, Imam Husain (s) did not like that the honor of Mecca should be trampled, the proof of which is found in the time of Yazid also. When Yazid sent killers disguised as pilgrims to murder Imam (s) wherever they could find him, Imam (s) was compelled to change his intention of Hajj. He instead performed Umrah and left Mecca so these people do not

destroy the honor of Mecca in their pursuit of the Imam's murder.

Secondly, till that time the evil deeds of Yazid had not become so well known that people should openly abhor him. Neither his vicious actions had achieved fame. That is why at that time opposition to him could not obtain religious expedience, which came to be the case during his caliphate and after Yazid had become a famous libertine. People were assured that the grandson of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) was opposing Yazid only out of the love of religion. On the other hand, if he had opposed Muawiyah during the discussion of heir-apparency, people would have thought as justified by Muawiyah, that, 'he is opposing Yazid even though Yazid is better than him because he himself wants to become the caliph'. Muawiyah had explained this to Bakal Ayari during the discussion with Imam (s) so that people may derive the same conclusion. In other words it would have been given a political color at that time, and this, the Imam was not ready to accept.

Thirdly, a lone martyrdom in a crowd could not have created such a dreaded effect on the Islamic World from the East to the West and from the South to the North that the whole world should start hating Yazid. The land of Kerbala and all those calamities were required so that this effect of martyrdom comes into existence. Thousands of people are killed due to political oppositions and no one cares about them. Hence martyrdom in this gathering of Mecca was void of any benefit. Everyone is aware of the intrigues of Muawiyah and he would have completely suppressed this martyrdom. Or he would have presented it in such a light that no one would have understood who was killed and why he was killed. On the other hand, Imam (s) attained an immortal way of propagation through a defensive battle and through the sufferings of his family members, which was not possible in Mecca.

Apparently, Imam (s) remained quiet due to all these three reasons according to Divine Will and acted upon Taqiyyah and then fought the battle of Kerbala. Would the Rizwan editor still say that, "He (Imam) made it clear from his behavior that 'a religion based on Taqiyyah is not mine'."

However, all these discussions were incidental and our main aim was to make it clear that Shias are right in considering Muawiyah responsible for the martyrdom of Imam (s). Not only Muawiyah but also the three caliphs are connected to this martyrdom. Hence, Allamah Balazari, a renowned Ahle Sunnat scholar writes in *Tarikh Balazari* after the letter of Yazid, which he wrote to Abdullah bin Umar:

"Thus, it is said that Husain (s) was martyred on the day of Saqifah."

These were the facts. Even if we accept the two evidences of the Rizwan editor against this, then also it is nothing but a veil of deceit so that those who hear it fall prey to misunderstandings like the Rizwan editor. Let us now investigate the veracity of the points mentioned in this will. The first sentence of this will as quoted by the Rizwan editor is as follows:

"But as for Imam Husain (s)! You know his relation and nearness to the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.). He is a part of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.)."

The question is whether Muawiyah himself cared about the honor of the Prophet? And what devotion he had with him that he should have respected a part of his body and his relatives? How much respect he truly had of the Prophet is obvious from the following incident:

Matraf bin Mughaira bin Shayba narrates, "I went to Muawiyah along with my father. My father used to visit him often and upon returning speak about Muawiyah and his intelligence,

and he used to be astonished at him. So much so that when he returned one night he did not even eat his dinner and I found him depressed. I waited for a while thinking that this depression was only because of something related to us. At last, I asked him, 'Why do you look so aggrieved tonight?' he replied, 'Today I am coming from the worst infidel and the most vile person.' I asked, 'Who is that?' My father replied, 'Today, I told him in private: O Master of the faithful! You have reached an age when it would have been better if you had acted justly and nicely and looked at your brothers (i.e. Bani Hashim) with kindness and improved relations with them. By Allah! Today they have nothing, which you may fear and you shall always be praised due to this good deed and rewarded by Allah.' Muawiyah said, 'Alas! Alas! How can I hope for the endurance of remembrance? See, a man of the Teem tribe (i.e. Abu Bakr) became a ruler. He acted justly and did what he should have done, till he finally died, and with him his memory also perished; just his name, Abu Bakr remains. Then a man from Adi tribe (i.e. Umar) became the ruler. He struggled for many years till he finally died and his memory also ended, except that just his name is mentioned as Umar. But see how the name of Ibne Abi Kabsha¹ is called out five times a day: "I testify that Muhammad is the Messenger of God." Now after this which deed of mine and name shall endure? By Allah, there is none except Him, except that they shall be buried (destroyed)."²

The intrinsic condition of Muawiyah's heart is clear from this hatred and jealousy towards the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) and

¹ A derogatory title given by the Quraish infidels to the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.)

² Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Ibne Abil Hadid Mutazali, Part 5

the way he addresses him by the insulting title, which the infidels of Quraish had reserved for him.

When he had such opinions about the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) there is no question of honoring his relatives. That is the reason he continued to wage battles against the Commander of the faithful, Ali Ibne Abi Talib (s) and continued to have him cursed from the pulpits; so much so that even some Bani Umayyah were compelled to say, 'Now that Ali is dead, what is the use of cursing him? And you got the kingdom.' However, he did not accept it and for ninety long years, preachers continued to recite curses on Amirul Momineen (s) in all the Islamic towns, every Friday.

Some persons of Bani Umayyah told Muawiyah, "Your desire (of becoming a caliph) is fulfilled. Now it would be better that you stop cursing him (i.e. Ali)." He replied, "No, by Allah, I will not stop till children grow old and adults become aged with this habit, and none who glorifies Ali remains."¹

Muawiyah's son well knew how the elder brother of Imam Husain (s) was treated and martyred. Yazid was also aware about the treatment meted out to Imam Husain (s) outside Medina and in the Prophet's mosque. The advice of Muawiyah in such circumstances that, 'If you get control over him, recognize his rights. Remember his rank of nearness to the Prophet. Do not make him recompense for his actions', it is just a veil of deceit for the common people. While Yazid himself knew how much his father honored the rights of Ahle Bayt (s) and to what extent he remembered their rank of nearness to Prophet (s.a.w.s.) is obvious from the description of Matraf bin Mughaira about how Muawiyah looked upon Bani Hashim. His notoriety had increased so much that his own companion

¹ Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Ibne Abil Hadid Mutazali,

Matraf bin Mughaira bin Shayba had to say, "What is left with Bani Hashim to be feared? Treat them well so that you be remembered as a nice person." The effect of this advice on Muawiyah is obvious from his reply. The most interesting statement is: 'Do not break off the relations I have strengthened with him during this time. Beware! Do not give him any kind of trouble'.

The relations Muawiyah maintained with Imam Husain (s) are already mentioned above. If surrounding him with naked swords and saying, 'I am looking at an animal of sacrifice whose blood is flowing in his blood-vessels about to gush out', denotes strengthening relations, words like 'hatred' etc. would become meaningless.

Lastly, I would like to object against the statement that:

'I know that the people of Iraq would call him and would not help him.'

Can the Rizwan editor tell us whether Muawiyah had knowledge of the Unseen? How did he know that the people of Iraq would call him and would not help him? Does it not prove that Muawiyah had instructed his agents to call Imam Husain (s) to Iraq and betray him at the last moment and this is what they did. Some of those who led Yazid's forces in Kerbala were the same who sent letters to Imam (s) from Kufa. Who later became thirsty for the blood of that same Husain (s) whom they had invited through letters. As for the sincere believers who sent letters to Imam Husain (s), they either joined the Imam in Kerbala or were arrested by Ibne Ziyad (I.a.).

The intrigue of Muawiyah is clear from this discourse that how he had organized the martyrdom of Imam (s). Now what effect this apparent will could have on a son who very well knew the real intention of his black-hearted father? All these issues are just deceitful talks so that spectators remain unaware of the

real strategy while Yazid had full knowledge about it. Or else, we have to believe that Muawiyah's followers faked this will after Imam Husain's martyrdom. And gradually it became a part of history.

The condition of the will of *Nasikhut Tawarikh* is similar. Then how could the Rizwan editor say: 'At least it proves that Muawiyah was not involved in the martyrdom of Husain (s)'?

No. At least it proves that Amir Muawiyah and the people who made him governor were surely involved in the martyrdom of Imam Husain (s) and other members of the Prophet's (s.a.w.s.) progeny.

Now you must have understood why Amir Muawiyah is held responsible for the martyrdom of the Imam?

I am surprised that the Rizwan editor claims to be a Sayyid, yet he supports and defends Muawiyah, who was the worst enemy of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) and the murderer of his progeny.

That is why the poet Anwari has beautifully composed the following verses:

"They are devoted to the son of Hind (Muawiyah) but they don't know how much harm came from him and those three guys.

His father broke the teeth of the Prophet and his mother chewed the liver of the uncle of the Prophet.

He usurped the rights of the son-in-law of the Prophet and his son beheaded the son of the Prophet.

Shouldn't one curse and hate such people? Curse of Allah be on Yazid and the Progeny of Yazid."

In his book, *Muwaizul Muttaqeen* Maulana Syed Muhammad Mahdi quotes from *Lulu al-Bahrain* an amusing incident of

Allamah Hilli (a.r.). It is would not be unfit to present its translation here. He writes:

Allamah Hilli (a.r.) held a dialogue with the Ahle Sunnat scholars in the court of King Muhammad Khuda Banda. When the debate was over and the rightfulness of the religion of twelve Imams became as clear as daylight, Allamah delivered an eloquent sermon containing praise of God and salutations on the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) and the infallible Imams (s). When Syed Mosuli (a Sunni scholar who had suffered defeat in the debate) heard this, he asked, "What is the proof in support of sending salutations on persons other than the prophets?" Without disturbing his sermon, Allamah replied by reciting the verse:

*"Who, when a misfortune befalls them, say: Surely we are Allah's and to Him we shall surely return. Those are they on whom are blessings and mercy from their Lord..."*¹

Allamah wanted to convey that as innumerable calamities befell Ahle Bayt (s) and they remained patient only for the sake of God, that is why they are worthy of salutations. On hearing this, Syed Mosuli said obstinately, "Which calamity befell the progeny of the Prophet in which they remained patient and became worthy of salutation?" Allamah (who was a Shaykh) gave an apt reply, "What can be a greater calamity that in their generations is born a person like you who prefers accursed hypocrites and ignorant ones to his venerable ancestors." The audience burst into laughter at this and all became very surprised and pleased to hear this reply.

Thus the saying has become famous that: 'A Syed can never be a Sunni'.²

¹ Surah Baqarah 2:156-157

² Persian Couplet

Existence of the Master of the Age (s)

(First printed in 'Al-Jawwad', January 1956 A.D. issue)

Shias and Imam Mahdi

I was so occupied after Mohurram that I could not continue the series on this subject. However, this article has manifested itself at its place of appearance after an occultation of three months. Perhaps, the topic of discussion necessitated that there should be a practical example of occultation before the discussion of the one who is in occultation. Also the number of these months, that is 'three', is not less amusing. We have to pass three nights in the reign of darkness before the appearance of the new moon...Even the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) had to pass three years in Sheb-e-Abi Talib, in occultation. Also three Prophets viz. Khizr (s), Ilyas (s), and Isa (s) are in occultation and the fourth person to be in occultation is the Qaem of the Progeny of Muhammad (s.a.w.s.). Thousands of proofs of his existence are present but some eyes yet deny the brightness of this sun and the Rizwan editor is one of them. After discharging his obligations towards Muawiyah, he has denied the existence of the 'Imam of the Time' in the following words:

SHIAS AND IMAM MAHDI

It is narrated in *Usul al-Kafi*: "If the number of Shias come to three hundred and thirteen, Imam Mahdi (a.t.f.s.) will reappear."¹

Did you understand anything? The book of Shias is opposing themselves. It says that if at anytime and anywhere the number of true Shias comes to three hundred and thirteen, Imam Mahdi will reappear. But the Imam is not ready to leave the cave. It proves that all these Shias seen everywhere in large numbers are not true believers but enemies of Ahle Bayt. If at anytime the number of Shias had come to three hundred and thirteen, the Imam would have surely reappeared. Since the Imam has not reappeared the conclusion is clear.

There can be only two possibilities, which though not mentioned by the Rizwan editor are as follows:

- A) Imam Mahdi (a.t.f.s.) is not present that he would reappear.
- B) Or the Shias are in fact, not real Shias.

Proof of existence of the Imam of Age

FIRST TRADITION

The first tradition of this discussion is widely related one, both with regard to its text as well as subject. It is believed to be correct by both the sects of Islam. Apart from other Imams, Imam Muslim has also quoted it in *Sahih Muslim*. It proves the necessity of the existence of the Master of the Age (a.t.f.s.) by the rule of logic. The tradition is that the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) said,

"Whosoever dies without recognizing the Imam of his time, dies the death of ignorance (i.e. he dies an infidel)."

¹ Kitabul Hujjah, Pg. 35

The importance of this tradition shall become clearer when you come to know that when the second caliph's son, Abdullah bin Umar learnt in Medina at night that Abdul Malik has become the caliph, he immediately got up and went to the door of his tyrant governor, Hajjaj and sought his permission to enter. When Hajjaj asked the reason, he conveyed to him that he had come to pay allegiance for Abdul Malik.

Hajjaj sent the message that he was not free and told him to come the next day. Abdullah bin Umar became much perturbed and said, "If I die tonight, I would die without paying allegiance to the Imam of the time. And according to the saying of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.), one who dies without recognizing the Imam of his time dies the death of ignorance. Hence you anyhow take allegiance from me now." Hajjaj called him inside and said, "I am very busy and my hands are not free. You can pay allegiance at my feet." Thus, the poor man had to pay allegiance of Abdul Malik at the feet of Hajjaj, after which he returned happily.¹

It is surprising that the same Abdullah bin Umar did not pay allegiance to Amirul Momineen Ali (s) during his apparent caliphate. He sat comfortably at his house and remained without an Imam for full four and a half years. Did he not fear dying the death of ignorance then?

In any case, this tradition, which is a complete guideline for the matter of caliphate, clearly proves that the existence of an Imam is necessary in every age, whose recognition is incumbent upon all the creatures.

However, those, whose caliphs were appointed by followers and whose caliphate was annihilated by a single stroke of the pen of Mustafa Kamal Pasha should not only see their own

¹ Sharh Nahjul Balagha, Ibne Abil Hadid Vol. 3, Pg. 362, Egypt

consequences in the light of this tradition, but also know that a caliphate, which could be destroyed before the Day of Judgment, cannot be a Divine caliphate. The destruction of a system of caliphate is itself a complete proof that both the leader and followers of this system were astray from the beginning till the end, they were in misguidance and deviated from the right path.

*"...that is a manifest loss."*¹

Now justifications are offered to erase their shame and it is said that 'the Imam of the time' implies the Holy Quran. Don't these 'interpreters' think that the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) did not merely use the word 'Imam' but said 'Imam of the time'? It means, one should recognize the 'Imam of his time', which clearly implies an Imam who changes with different times, an Imam succeeded by another. Did the Quran change or would change with the changing times? Or one Quran shall succeed another?

SECOND TRADITION

A tradition, accepted as authentic by all sects of Islam and found in *Sahih Bukhari* and other books of traditions through various chains is as follows:

"There will be twelve Imams after me who all would be from Quraish."

Complete chapters are devoted in books of traditions for traditions on this topic. This tradition is also a complete code of law which we could apply to every system of caliphate to judge its correctness or invalidity. The clear aim of this tradition is that any series of caliphate which is not from Quraish (e.g. Turkish empire) or which is within Quraish but has less than twelve Imams is not a Divine series. Since it is

¹ Surah Hajj 22:11

impossible that Allah wrongly declared the number of Prophet's caliphs as twelve while they are less than that, or that He later changed His decision, or the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) predicted it without getting a divine revelation. If none of these possibilities exist why the number of caliphs declared by the Prophet seems to be incorrect? Indeed we have to agree that a caliphate founded on Ijma (consensus), Istikhlaf (nomination), Shura (consultative committee), and force after the passing away of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.), none of whose series had twelve caliphs, cannot be a cherished and chosen system of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.).

I challenge the majority of Muslims to prove any of their caliphates ('Rightly Guided'¹ caliphate, Bani Abbas caliphate, Spanish caliphate, Turkish caliphate and Egyptian empire etc.) valid and in accordance with the above tradition of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) but fulfilling the condition that all the twelve caliphs should be in a continuous serial order and they should be in power from the time of the passing away of the Prophet till the Day of Judgment without any break, so that no period should be without an Imam as mentioned in the captioned tradition.

"But if you do (it) not and never shall you do (it), then be on your guard against the fire of which men and stones are the fuel..."²

However, Shias can proudly present their series of caliphs (Imams) according to the criteria of this tradition that their number be exactly twelve. As the time of eleven caliphs has passed, the twelfth one is naturally present on the earth. It is not that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) has stated only the

¹ Arabic = Khilafatur Raashideen

² Surah Baqarah 2:24

number of caliphs and left their names and other details unknown. If the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) had been silent on the issue there would surely have been a possibility of suppositions. Nevertheless, he declared their number, tribe, names, as well as other family information. By this he meant to imply that this prediction was not accidental and that rather it was a detailed declaration of pre-planned Divine caliphate in which any kind of fraud will not succeed. Please study the following tradition for further details:

THIRD TRADITION

Allamah Syed Jamaluddin Muhaddith, a renowned Ahle Sunnat scholar has quoted a tradition from Jabir bin Abdullah Ansari in one his famous works, *Rauzatul Ahibab* that when Allah revealed this verse on His Prophet (s.a.w.s.):

*"O you who believe! Obey Allah and obey the Apostle and those in authority from among you; then if you quarrel about anything, refer it to Allah and the Apostle, if you believe in Allah and the last day; this is better and very good in the end."*¹

I asked the Prophet (s.a.w.s.), "O Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.)! We know Allah and His Messenger but who are 'those in authority' whose obedience is joined with your obedience by Allah?" The Prophet (s.a.w.s.) replied, "They are the caliphs after me. First of them is Ali Ibne Abi Talib (s) followed by Hasan, then Husain then Ali bin Husain then Muhammad bin Ali (s), who is referred by the title of Baqir in the Torah². O Jabir! Very soon you will reach his tenure and (when you do) convey my salutations to him. He shall be succeeded, by Ja'far as-Sadiq, Musa bin Ja'far, Ali bin Musa, Muhammad bin Ali, Ali bin Muhammad, Hasan bin Ali and Muhammad bin Hasan

¹ Surah Nisa 4:59

² Old Testament

bin Ali (s), who shall be the Proof of Allah on the earth and a remnant of Allah among men. Allah would grant him victory of the east and west. He shall be hidden from his Shias and friends such that none would remain faithful to his Imamate except the ones whose hearts Allah has already tested for faith."

Jabir asked, "O Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.)! How would his partisans (Shias) benefit from him while he is in occultation?"

The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) replied, "Yes! By Allah, Who has sent me as a Prophet, Shias would be enlightened by his light during his occultation as people benefit from the sun even if it is behind the clouds."

This blessed tradition narrated by a great Ahle Sunnat scholar from Jabir bin Abdullah Ansari, a great companion of the Prophet, has elucidated the two previous traditions. It has clarified who exactly those twelve caliphs are, that the earth can never remain devoid of and whose recognition is obligatory on every Muslim. It has also declared that the twelfth among them shall be hidden from the people. His occultation will be prolonged to the extent that except the ones whose hearts Allah has tested for belief; none would have faith on him. (So it is not surprising for the Rizwan editor to ridicule this belief.) Believers shall benefit by his presence as we profit by a sun hidden behind clouds.

The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) has not only informed about the occultation but also about the reappearance. I would like to present some correct traditions from authoritative tradition compendiums of Ahle Sunnat for the kind attention the Rizwan editor in which the Prophet gave glad tidings of the existence and reappearance of the Imam of the time (a.t.f.s.). Actually, all such traditions are among the widely related ones (mutawatir) hence there is no need to present more proof about them

because Shias and Sunnis, are unanimous that Imam Mahdi (a.t.f.s.) is from the progeny of Fatima (s.a.) and he would reappear some time before the Day of Judgment. But the poor editor of Rizwan is unaware of his religion and makes such silly objections that expose the level of his religious knowledge.

FOURTH TRADITION

Imam Abu Dawood in his *Sunan* and Imam Tirmidhi in *Sahih Tirmidhi* have narrated from Abu Saeed Khudri:

The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) said, "Mahdi (s) is from me. He shall have a bright forehead and a high nose. He shall fill the earth with justice as it would have been filled with oppression and injustice and he would rule for seven years."

FIFTH TRADITION

Imam Abu Dawood has narrated from Imam Ali (s) in his *Sunan*:

The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) said, "Even if a single day remains before the end of the world, Allah would send a person from my Ahle Bayt who would fill the earth with justice as it would be filled with injustice and oppression."

SIXTH TRADITION

Imam Abu Dawood has narrated this tradition from the mother of faithful, Umme Salma that:

The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) said, "The Mahdi would be from my progeny i.e. from the lineage of Fatima (s.a.)."

SEVENTH TRADITION

Imam Bukhari in *Sahih Bukhari*, Imam Muslim in *Sahih Muslim* and Qazi Ibne Masud Baghavi in his *Sharhus Sunnah* have narrated from Abu Huraira that:

The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) said, "What would be your condition when Isa bin Maryam (s) descends among you and your Imam shall be from among you?"

EIGHTH TRADITION

Imam Tirmidhi in *Sahih Tirmidhi* and Imam Abu Dawood in *Sunan* have narrated from Abdullah Ibne Masud that:

The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) said, "The world shall not end till a person from my Ahle Bayt becomes the ruler of Arabs, whose name shall be same as mine."

NINTH TRADITION

These same two Ahle Sunnat Imams have quoted this tradition in their authentic compendiums (Sahihs):

The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) said, "A person from my Ahle Bayt will be the ruler whose name would be same as mine."

TENTH TRADITION

Imam Abu Ishaq Thalabi has narrated this tradition from Anas bin Malik in his commentary that:

The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) said, "We, the sons of Abdul Muttalib are Chiefs of Paradise which include me, Hamzah, Ja'far, Ali, Hasan, Husain and Mahdi (s)."

Thus ten are completed.

These proofs have clarified that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) has explained the matter of caliphate after him explicitly. In this explanation he has especially emphasized on the prolonged occultation of the Twelfth Imam and his reappearance. If the Rizwan editor does not care about the saying of Prophet (s.a.w.s.), I can present some testimonies of scholars of his religion, so that it becomes evident that the Twelfth Imam is alive and hidden from the view of creatures and would reappear some time before the Day of Judgment.

This fact is not only associated with some Shias but many scholars and writers of Ahle Sunnat also have faith in it. For example:

Allamah Abdul Wahhab Sherani

He was a great Ahle Sunnat scholar, whom Shah Waliullaah Dehlavi, an excellent scholar has included among the heirs of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.). He writes in one of his works, *Lawaqihul Anwar fee Tabaqaatil Akhbar*:

Shaykh Hasan Iraqi is among them. His age was about a hundred and thirty years. Once I visited him along with Abul Abbas Harshi. He said, "I will narrate such an incident that you would learn about my condition from my youth till this time." We requested him to tell us about it.

He said, "At that time, I was a youth with a clean-shaven face. I used to weave cloaks in Syria and was extravagant over my self (i.e. I did not refrain from sins). Once I entered the Jame Masjid of Bani Umayyah and saw a preacher speaking about Imam Mahdi (a.t.f.s.) and his reappearance. The love of Imam Mahdi (a.t.f.s.) developed in my heart. I began to implore Allah that He makes me to meet him. I prayed like this for about a year.

One day I was in Jame Masjid after the Evening Prayer (Maghrib) when a stately gentleman wearing his turban in a non-Arab manner and wearing a camel-fur robe approached me. He tapped my shoulders and asked,

'Why do you want to meet me?'

'Who are you?' I inquired.

'I am Mahdi,' he replied.

I kissed his hands and requested him to come with me to my house and he accepted my offer. He lived with me for seven days and taught me various supplications. He advised me to

fast alternate days and pray five hundred units of prayers every night. He asked me not to lie down for sleep unless it completely overpowers me. He was about to leave and said, 'O Hasan! Do not go to anyone after me. Whatever you have got from me is enough for you. People have less than this. Hence do not unnecessarily take other people's favors.' I promised him to do as commanded and tried to come out of the house to bid farewell to him. He stopped me at the door and said, "Go back from here." I remained steadfast on what he had taught me...¹

I inquired from him (Imam Mahdi) about his age and he replied, 'My son! At present, I am six hundred years old'."

Shaykh Hasan Iraqi says that this incident occurred a hundred years ago (i.e. now it is seven hundred and twenty years). Allamah Abdul Wahhab Sherani says that when he discussed this issue with Ali al-Khawas, the latter agreed with Shaykh Hasan Iraqi regarding the age of Imam Mahdi (a.t.f.s.).

This incident not only proves the belief of Allamah Abdul Wahhab Sherani but also of Shaykh Hasan Iraqi and Ali al-Khawas regarding Imam Mahdi (a.t.f.s.) one of whom had the honor of hosting the Imam of the Age (a.t.f.s.) and gaining knowledge from him for a week. Allamah Abdul Wahhab Sherani has mentioned about the signs of nearness of the Day of Judgment in one of his famous works, *Al-Yuwaaqeeetu wal Jawaahir in Al-Mub-hathul Khamis wa Sutoon*. He says that the first of those signs is reappearance of the Imam of the time (a.t.f.s.). After discussing about other signs when religion shall gain supremacy he writes:

¹ There are some more incidents which we have ignored as they are not relevant to the discussion. (Author)

At that very time, one should await the reappearance of Imam Mahdi (a.t.f.s.). That Imam is the son of Imam Hasan Askari (s). He was born on the 15th of Shaban 255 A.H. He is alive to be united with Isa bin Maryam. His age is seven hundred six years as it is 958 A.H. now.¹

Maulana Ali Akbar Maududi

He was one of the great Ahle Sunnat scholars and he has written marginal notes titled *Mukashifat* on the above book of *Naftaat*. In this book, under the account of Ali bin Sahl Isfahani he says:

"They have said that avoiding mistakes in religious laws is only restricted to the prophets but the Shaykh have differed with them in this matter due to the tradition regarding Imam Mahdi (a.t.f.s.)...Then it is mentioned in the forty-fifth chapter that Shaykh Abul Hasan Shazli has said that there are fifteen signs of a Qutb². For example, it is supported by infallibility, mercy, caliphate and deputation and the bearers of Divine Throne are his helpers. The truth of the Divine nature and qualities are disclosed to him etc." Due to this saying (that there is infallibility in the Qutb), their religion is proved correct that they believe that some people other than prophets can be infallible...Because to accept the presence of Imam Mahdi implies that he is a Qutb after his holy father, Imam Hasan Askari (s) till the series reach back to Imam Ali Ibne Abi Talib. This shows that the dependence of this rank on their holy personalities is correct (Imam Ali (s) being a Qutb till the Promised Mahdi. Not before Ali (s)). Thus, whosoever is a

¹ The scribe has erroneously written 706 while it should be 703 and the work of Sherani is seventy years older than this book. Readers please note this. (Author)

² Sufi term for the chief leader

Qutb today will be manifested on this rank of deputation of Mahdi because Imam Mahdi (a.t.f.s.) will be hidden from common and special ones. Although he is not hidden from very special ones...Hence it became necessary that all those twelve Imams be infallible. Understand this meaning."

This excerpt clarifies that Maulana Ali Akbar considered Imam Mahdi a Qutb of the time after Imam Hasan Askari and believed in his infallibility and also used to say that he is hidden from the common and special people. However, very special personalities can meet him.

Mulla Jami

He is that renowned Ahle Sunnat scholar to introduce whom is like showing a lamp to the sun. He is regarded as an authority on physical and metaphysical sciences. He has written in one of his famous works, *Shawahidun Nubuwwah* that Imam Mahdi (s) is the 12th Imam and presented a detailed chapter about him. In it he has mentioned all the miraculous and strange incidents connected with him. His concealed birth, his going into prostration soon after birth and his reciting the verses:

*"In the name of Allah, the Beneficent, the Merciful. And We desired to bestow a favor upon those who were deemed weak in the land, and to make them the Imams, and to make them the heirs..."*¹

Also his being born circumcised and with the umbilical cord detached. As were the words on him:

*"And say: The truth has come and the falsehood has vanished; surely falsehood is a vanishing (thing)."*²

¹ Surah Qasas 28:5

² Surah Bani Israel 17:81

When he sneezed, he immediately said: Praise be to Allah, the Lord of the worlds. The author has mentioned all these incidents in detail. After that he writes:

The narrator says that he came to Imam Hasan Askari (s) and said: O son of Allah's Messenger (s.a.w.s.), who is the Imam and Caliph after you? The Imam went inside and brought a young boy aloft his shoulders. The boy was handsome and bright-faced like a full moon and his age was around three years. The Imam said: O so and so, if you were not having an elevated status in the view of Allah, I would never have shown you this child. His name is same as that of the Messenger's and his patronymic is same as that of the Messenger's. He the one who would fill the earth with justice and equity just as it would be fraught with injustice and oppression.

In the same book is the report of another narrator who says that the Imam showed his son saying: This is your master. After that the Imam of the Last Age came down from the blessed lap of Imam Hasan Askari (s).

Imam Hasan Askari (s) told him: O Son, be concealed for a stipulated period. Thus he went inside the house as I watched him. After that Imam Hasan Askari (s) told me: Arise, go in and see who is there. So I entered the house but did not find anyone there.

Can there be a clearer explanation about the belief in the occultation of the Imam of the Age?

Khwaja Muhammad Parsa

An opportunity to have audience with him was considered a matter of great honor by the Sadat, the Shaykhs and scholars, as mentioned in the book *Nafhaatul Uns*. He writes in *Faslul Khitab*:

When Abu Abdullah Ja'far, the son of Imam Ali Naqi (s), thinking that his brother Imam Hasan Askari (s) was not survived by a son he claimed that his brother had granted the Imamate to him. Thus he became famous by the nickname of 'Liar' (Kadhdhab)...The son of Imam Hasan Askari (s) Muhammad (s) and some special companions were and are aware of this fact.

After that he has narrated the arrival of Lady Hakima in the house of Imam Hasan Askari (s) on the eve of 15th Shaban, 255 A.H., Imam (s) asking her to stay the night and the birth of Imam Mahdi (a.t.f.s.) near dawn. Then he says:

Lady Hakima narrates, "When I came to Imam Hasan Askari (s) I saw a newborn child in saffron clothes before him. His face had such brightness and glow that his love developed in my heart. So I asked Imam Hasan Askari (s), 'O my master! If you have any information regarding this blessed child, tell me about it also.' Imam (s) replied, 'Yes, O aunt! He is the same Awaited Imam whose glad tidings were given to us.'" Lady Hakima narrates, "Thus I bowed down in prostration of Allah to thank for him. Then I used to visit Imam Hasan Askari (s) regularly. One day I did not see the boy there and I asked Imam Hasan Askari (s), 'O Master! What did you do to our Master and the Awaited one?' Imam replied, 'We have entrusted him to the protection of Whom Prophet Musa (s) was given by his mother.'"

This passage has clarified that even Khwaja Muhammad Parsa believed in the existence of the Imam of the time (a.t.f.s.). He believed in his occultation and supported the opinion that the occultation shall end when the Almighty desires, for the fulfillment of the glad tidings of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) he would reappear just as Prophet Musa (s) was again returned to his mother.

Khwaja Muhammad Parsa writes in the margin of this book about the signs of the reappearance of Imam Mahdi (a.t.f.s.):

“There are so many traditions regarding it that we cannot enumerate them. Imam Mahdi, Master of the Age (r.a.) (Who is hidden and present in every age) has many merits. Traditions regarding his reappearance and rising of his light support each other. He would revive the Law of Muhammad (s.a.w.s.) and fight the Holy war in the way of Allah as it should be fought. He would cleanse the earth of God from one end to the other from impurities and evils. His time will be the time of pious and his companions will be free of doubts and purified of sins. They would follow his guidance and path. They will receive the recognition of the Imam of the time from Allah. Caliphate and Imamate shall end on him and he is the Imam from the time of the passing away of his father till the Day of Judgment.”

Sibte Ibne Jawzi

He was one of the great Ahle Sunnat Imams. He writes in one of his famous works, *Tadhkirat Khwaasul Ummatu fee marefatil Aimmah* regarding the Master of the Age (s) that:

“He is Muhammad, son of Imam Hasan Askari (s). His patronymics are Abu Abdillah and Abul Qasim. He is the same Khalaful Hujjah¹, Master of the Age, Qaem², Awaited One, Remaining one and Imam of last age.”

Can there be more explanation for the Imam of the time being alive and present?

¹ The succeeding divine proof

² One who shall rise up

Abu Abdillah Muhammad bin Yusuf bin Muhammad Ganji Shafei

Kifayatul Talib is one of his famous works. He has written another book *Al-Bayan* devoted to the subject of the Master of the Age (s). He has explained the Imamate, existence, long life of Imam (s) in the following way:

“One of the proofs of Imam (s) being alive due to occultation is that it is not impossible for him to remain alive. After all, friends of God, like Isa bin Maryam, Khizr and Ilyas are alive and enemies of God such as the one-eyed Dajjal and Iblis are alive. Quran proves their being alive and traditions too, hence what is the problem if Allah keeps Imam Mahdi (s) alive?”

Shaykh Nuruddin bin As-Sabbagh Al-Maliki

This famous Ahle Sunnat scholar has devoted a section of his book *Al-Fusoolul Muhimma* for the account of the Master of the Age whose title is as follows:

The twelfth section of this book describes Abul Qasim Muhammad, the son of Imam Hasan Askari (s), the Divine Proof, the Remaining Divine Proof and the Twelfth Imam. It provides information regarding his date of birth, proofs of his Imamate, accounts of occultation, period of his rule, his lineage, agnomen, title etc.

Some selected sentences of this section are quoted below:

“The son of Imam Hasan Askari, Abul Qasim Muhammad Hujjat was born in Samarra on the eve of the 15th of Shaban, 255 A.H....This is a brief description from those texts, which prove the Twelfth Imam and are narrated from trustworthy Imams. There are many narrations regarding this and traditions are very famous. We have omitted them all to keep the discussion brief. Narrators have collected and quoted all these traditions in their books and have paid special attention

towards their compilation...Some tradition scholars have said that Mahdi is the same Qaem and Awaited one and narrations about his reappearance support each other. Traditions regarding the brightness of his light are unanimous. Very soon the darkness of the night and day will disappear with his reappearance. Darkneses will be illuminated with his view in the same way as night is illuminated on the arrival of morning. Very soon he will come out of the veil of occultation. He will make the hearts overjoyed."

Shah Waliullah Dehlavi

Ahle Sunnat people call him "the last of the gnostics", "chief of the tradition scholars", "the basis of scholastic theologians" and "proof of Allah on the worlds." He has supported the existence and Imamate of the Imam of the time (s) in his work *Fazl Mubeen*, knowingly or unknowingly. Thus narrating a tradition he writes as follows:

"I say that Ibne Aqlah has permitted me face to face to relate all those things whose narration was lawful for him. I have seen a continuous tradition in his series of traditions each of whose narrators has lofty qualities. The tradition is that Ibne Aqlah said: Fareed-e-Zamana, Shaykh Hasan bin Ali Ajeemi informed me that he was informed by Hafiz Asr, Jamaluddin Babuli by Mustand-e-Waqt, Muhammad Hijazi Waiz by Sufi Dauran, Shaykh Abdul Wahhab Sherani by Mujtahid Asr, Jalal Suyuti by Zahid-e-Asr, Imam Jamaluddin bin Muhammad bin Muhammad Al-Jamal by Imam Muhammad bin Masud who was a narrator of Fars of his time by Aalim-e-Dahar, Shaykh Ismail bin Muzaffar Shirazi by Muhaddith Dauran, Abdus Salaam bin Abdur Rabi Hanafi by Shaykh Waqt, Abu Bakr Abdullah bin Muhammad Shaboor Qalansi by Imam-e-Waqt, Abdul Aziz bin Muhammad Aumi by Nadirah-e-Asr, Sulaiman

bin Ibrahim bin Muhammad bin Sulaiman that Ahmad bin Hashim Balazari who was a Hafiz¹ of his time said: The Imam of the time, Muhammad bin Al-Hasan bin Ali (who is hidden) told me that he was informed by his father who was informed by his father who was informed by Imam Muhammad Taqi by Imam Ali bin Musa Al-Reza by Imam Musa Kazim by Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq by Imam Muhammad Baqir by Imam Zainul Abideen Ali bin Husain Sajjad by Imam Husain Sayyadush Shohada by his father Sayyidul Awliya Ali bin Abi Talib by Chief of the Prophets Muhammad bin Abdullah (s.a.w.s.) by Chief of Angels Jibraeel by Allah, the Almighty: I am Allah. There is no God except Me. One who testifies My Oneness has entered my fort. One who enters My fort is secure from My chastisement.”

This chain of narrators proves that not only Shah Waliullah Dehlavi but sixteen other Ahle Sunnat scholars also possessed a unique lofty quality. They all believed in Imam Mahdi (s), his lineage, occultation and his being the Imam of the time. Otherwise they would not have quoted a tradition in which they had doubted the date of birth and life of one of its narrators.

Shaykh Abdul Haq Dehlavi

The majesty of his personality is proof itself in the Sunni world. He writes in his journal, *Manaqib Ahwaaal-e-Aimmaah-e-Athaar*:

“Muhammad is the son of Abu Muhammad Hasan Askari; the reliable people of his family and his special companions know it. It is narrated that Hakima Khatun, the daughter of Imam Muhammad Taqi (s) and paternal aunt of Imam Hasan Askari (s) desired it and used to supplicate and pray that a son be

¹ One who has memorized the Quran

born to Imam Hasan Askari (s) and that she could see him with her own eyes. Imam Hasan Askari (s) had selected a slave-girl named Narjis Khatun for himself. Hakima Khatun visited Imam Hasan Askari (s) on the eve of the 15th of Shaban, 255 A.H. and blessed him. Imam Hasan Askari (s) requested, "O aunt! Please stay at our place tonight there is an important work at hand." She stayed the night upon the Imam's request. Narjis Khatun began to feel uneasy as morning approached. Lady Hakima came near Narjis Khatun and saw that a blessed newborn infant who was already circumcised and bathed ritually etc. She brought the child to Imam Hasan Askari (s). He took the child and passed his hand of affection on his back and eyes and put his tongue in his mouth. He recited *Azan*¹ in the right and *Iqamah*² in the left ear and said, "O aunt! Now take him to his mother." So Lady Hakima handed over the child to his mother. Lady Hakima Khatun says, "After that when I came to Imam Hasan Askari (s) I saw the child with him dressed in saffron clothes. There was such a light and honor on his face that my heart was filled with his love. I said, 'O my master! Do you have any information regarding this fortunate newborn child that you can narrate to me?' Imam Hasan Askari (s) said, 'O aunt! This newborn one is our 'Awaited one' whose glad tidings were given to us.' I bowed down for prostration of thanks to Allah for the child. Then I used to visit Imam Hasan Askari (s) frequently. One day I came to him but did not find the child. I asked, 'O master! What happened to our chief and Awaited one? He replied, 'We have handed him over to One Whom Musa was handed over by his mother.'"

¹ The call for Prayer

² Shorter call for Prayer

It is narrated from Imam Reza (s) that he was asked, "What shall be the name of your Qaem?" He replied, "We are commanded not to mention his name before his birth."

What can be a more emphatic acceptance of the existence of His Eminence, Hujjat (s)?

...while they do not perceive...¹

Muhaddith Jamaluddin

He is included among the pillars of tradition science. His books are regarded with great respect. He expresses his belief in one of his renowned works, *Rauzatul Ahabab* as follows:

In the discussion of the Twelfth Imam Muhammad bin Hasan: The birth of this Gem of guardianship (Wilayat) and treasure of the mine of guidance, according to most narrators is on 15th Shaban, 255 A.H. in Samarra. While others say that his birth took place on 23rd Ramadan, 258 A.H. The mother of this exalted pearl was a slave-girl named Saqeel, Susan or Narjis. She was also named Hakima. That honorable Imam has the name and agnomen of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.). His titles are 'Mahdi, the Awaited one', 'Khalaf-e-Salih' and 'Master of the Age'. According to the first narration (which is almost authentic), he was five years old during the lifetime of his holy father. He was two years old according to another narration. Allah granted wisdom to this bud of the garden of prophethood in his childhood as He had done to Yahya and Zakaria (s). He made him reach the great heights of Imamate in his young age. The Master of the Age i.e. Mahdi disappeared from the eyes of the people in a cellar in Samarra during the reign of Caliph Mutamid in 265 A.H. or 266 A.H. (due to difference of narrations).

¹ Surah Anam 6:26

Apart from this, the Muhaddith has quoted very long passages about awaiting for the reappearance. He has also quoted some poetic verses regarding nostalgia for his reappearance, which prove the excellence of his belief. I ignore these writings to keep the discussion brief.

Allamah Muhiuddin bin Arabi

Now I am going to present the testimony of that Ahle Sunnat scholar whose saying, 'Husain was killed with the sword of his grandfather because Yazid was already given allegiance and Husain rebelled against the 'True Imam', is famous even today. It is obvious that when such a scholar emphasizes so strongly that Imam Mahdi (s) is already born, he is away from the sight of people, will reappear shortly before the Day of Judgment, he is an infallible and has excellent qualities; what can be better proof that 'the truth is exalted and it is not made exalted'.

Accordingly, the Allamah has described all these qualities of the Imam of the time (a.t.f.s.) in one of his popular works *Al-Futuhāt Makīyyah*.¹ He has used many pages for it. I ignore all those issues, which include accounts of his reappearance, the benefits of his justly guided reign, his victories, his personal excellences, his reinforcements through revelation, renaissance of religion, his infallibility etc. Some selected sentences about his name, lineage, birth and occultation are mentioned below, as it is the actual topic of our discussion:

Know that the advent of Mahdi is necessary but he will not reappear till the world is not filled with injustice and oppression. Then he shall reappear and fill the earth with justice. Even if a single day of this world remains, God will prolong it so much that this caliph becomes the ruler. He is from the progeny of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) and the

¹ Chapter 366

descendants of Fatima (r.a.). Imam Husain bin Ali bin Abi Talib (s) is his grandfather and his holy father is Imam Hasan Askari Ibne Imam Ali Naqi (s)...

After that he mentions his lineage, which reaches upto Amirul Momineen (s).

His name is same as that of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.)...And know that all Muslims (whether Shia or Sunni) will be happy at the reappearance of Imam Mahdi...His time has already come and it is casting a shadow on you. He had appeared in the fourth age, which was after three ages (i.e. time of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) and his companions, second age of the followers of the companions and third one of the followers of the followers). There was a little gap after these three ages and some new incidents happened, some new thoughts and desires began to spread, there was despotism and bloodshed. Thus, he disappeared till the appointed time of his reappearance does not arrive.

Kamaluddin bin Talha Shafei

He was one of the leading lights among the Ahle Sunnat scholars. His statement in every field of jurisprudence, traditions and laws is considered authentic. One of his works *Matalibus Suool fi Manaqib aale Rasool* is very famous. He has reserved its twelfth chapter for the account of the Imam of the time (s). He has explained all the issues very explicitly and nullified the objections of the rivals in such a way that if the Rizwan editor had the ability to understand, I would have advised him to read that chapter but the problem is that the book is in Arabic. I quote some sentences of this book about the name, lineage, birth, occultation etc. of Imam Hujjat according to the need:

"Twelfth chapter: About Abul Qasim Muhammad Hujjat bin Hasan Khalis (Askari) bin Ali Mutawakkil bin Muhammad (Taqi) Qane' bin Ali Al-Reza (s)...

...he was born on 23rd Ramadan 258 A.H.

His lineage from his father and mother (is mentioned). His holy father is Imam Hasan Askari (s) (Whose series of lineage reaches to Amirul Momineen). We have already discussed it in detail. His mother was a slave-girl, Saqeel, while she was also called Hakima. Some other names are also found but his name is only Muhammad, agnomen Abul Qasim and titles are Hujjat, Khalaf-e-Salih and Muntazar.

Then he has narrated the traditions of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) regarding Imam Hujjat and replied to the doubts of opponents. He has proved that when all the qualities mentioned in the traditions of the Prophet are present in him, it is obligatory to believe that only he is the Promised Mahdi and only he would reappear when God commands. He has spent many pages for this discussion and writes further:

But as for his age, he was in the state of fear during the time of Caliph Mutamid Alallaah and disappeared...God's power is very vast and His wisdom and favors over men are exalted and common. Even great scholars will not find a way to understand the secrets of His powers. Their researching eyes would return tired and fruitless. The wary tongues would have to recite the verse: 'And you are not given knowledge except a little'. It is not strange that God grants a long life to some of his pious servants or increases the life span to a fixed time. God has increased the life span of a large community in His creation – of His righteous friends as well as enemies. His righteous ones include Isa (s), Khizr (s) and other prophets whose life-span was increased so much that their ages became nearly a thousand years. For example, Prophet Nuh (s) etc. His enemies

include Iblis and Dajjal. Also the community of Aad, which had people, aged a thousand years. We also have the example of Luqman.

The purpose of all these examples is to describe the vastness of the power of God. He can grant a long-life to His creatures. What can be a hindrance if the life of Imam Khalaf-e-Salih (s) is prolonged till now? He will reappear and act according to the orders of God. When the discussions has reached here and the pen has moved till this place, I praise Allah, the Lord of the Worlds and end this book here. Since it is the only sentence, which is regarded as the last supplication of the people of Paradise and which has the Divine pleasure.

Now when I have quoted the last lines of *Matalibus Suool* I think that it is a good coincidence that the number of testimonies has also reached twelve. It seems suitable for the proofs of existence of occultation of the Twelfth Imam that we do not go beyond this number. Hence I end the discussion here.

I advise the Rizwan editor that even if he does not respect the traditions of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) he should at least have a look at the testimonies of the scholars of his religion, which include high profile narrators, holy scholars, and learned mystics. They include Allamah Abdul Wahhab Sherani, Shaykh Hasan Iraqi, Ali Al-Khawas, Maulana Ali Akbar Maududi, Mulla Jami, Khwaja Muhammad Parsa, Sibte Ibne Jawzi, Abu Abdillah Muhammad bin Yusuf Shafei, Shaykh Nuruddin bin Sabbagh Maliki, Shah Waliullaah Dehlavi, Ibne Uqala, Muhaddith Shaykh Hasan bin Ali Ajeemi, Hafiz bin Jamaluddin Babuli, Muhammad Hijazi Waiz, Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti, Hafiz Abu Naeem Aaqbi, Allamah Shams Ibne Jazari, Imam Jamaluddin Muhammad bin Muhammad Jamal, Imam Muhaddith bin Masud, Shaykh Ismail bin Muzzafar Shirazi, Muhaddith Abdus Salaam bin Abir Rabi Hanafi, Shaykh Abu Bakr Abdullah bin Muhammad, Imam

Abdul Aziz, Nadirah Misr Sulaiman bin Ibrahim, Allamah Hafiz Ahmad bin Balazari, Shaykh Abdul Haq Dehlavi, Muhaddith Jamaluddin, Allamah Muhiuddin bin Arabi and Allamah Kamaluddin bin Talha Shafei.

He should also, like the above scholars, accept the belief in existence and occultation of the Imam of the time (a.t.f.s.) and keep away from the wrong belief and save himself from the death of ignorance. However, if he also wants to live in doubts like some of his leaders and close the eyes from all these testimonies I will keep quiet after saying:

*"And nothing devolves on us but a clear deliverance (of the message)."*¹

The astonishing fact is that Mr. Editor has faith in the existence of Shaitan and Dajjal but shies away from believing in the Promised Mahdi.

"If in the daylight they cannot see with their eyes.

What is the fault of the Sun in it?"²

Now I end the discussion on this couplet:

"The papers are exhausted but the writing is not complete
Even a hundred notebooks would not suffice for us."³

¹ Surah Yasin 36:17

² Persian Couplet

³ Persian Couplet

B. Three hundred and thirteen Shias

Now that it is proved that the Promised Mahdi really exists, surely the Rizwan editor would immediately say:

“It proves that all these Shias seen everywhere in large numbers are not true believers but enemies of Ahle Bayt. If at anytime the number of Shias had come to three hundred and thirteen, the Imam would have surely reappeared.”

Regarding this, it is sufficient to mention just two or three points:

Firstly, this is not a saying of an Imam but an opinion of Shareh, which you tried to show that it is a saying of the infallible. Obviously this responsibility can come on us only when it is so (that there should be 313 Shias) then we should present this saying of Imam or Prophet (s.a.w.s.): ‘If it is not so, there is nothing’.

Secondly, the sense of this saying proved much more elevated for your understanding. How did you take the meaning of this saying that when the number of Shias will *increase* to three hundred and thirteen, the Imam will reappear? Let me explain it to you, hopefully you may understand.

- a) It is admitted that the Imam of the time will reappear only when the world shall be full of injustice and oppression. This fact is as clear as daylight from the viewpoint of traditions. Also, we have discussed the above sayings of your scholars that Imam (a.t.f.s.) will not reappear till the world becomes full of injustice and oppression and is fraught with sins.
- b) It is also known that the community of the Shias of Ali (s) is treading the Right Path (Siratul Mustaqeem). They consider God as Just and Divine justice a principle of

faith. Hence Shias (and Mutazilas) are called 'Adliyah' in the technical sense. There is a rival sect of Ahle Sunnat, Ashaira, which denies that God is Just. Today all Ahle Sunnat strongly support this belief (It is a whole issue of scholastic theology - Ilm-e-Kalam - of Ahle Sunnat, which Rizwan editor might have never heard of. However, he should study his religious books). Shias of Ali (s) consider God as Just and have a complete belief on the verse: "God is never unjust to His servants". Obviously, they too live with justice and keep aloof from sins. That is the reason they expect their prayer-leader also to be just. Nevertheless, when Ahle Sunnat do not expect even God to be Just, what would the 'Scholars of Mosque' be worth considering that there be a condition of justice for them? Hence they have adopted the concocted tradition: "Pray behind every good and evil person". As a result, the strategies of people like the Rizwan editor who is 'half a scholar, and a danger to religion' are working well, among the Ahle Sunnat. Their bare sustenance reaches them through this, while there is no such possibility among the Shias.

- c) After understanding these two issues just ponder over this fact that as the community of justice-loving people will grow, injustice in the world will be proportionately reduced. On the other hand, as this community goes on shrinking, injustice will go on increasing in this world. In other words, greater the number of Shias in the world, the more the earth will lack in being filled with injustice. As the number of Shias reduce, sins and injustice of this world will increase because the followers of the Right Path will decrease and followers of polytheism, injustice, oppression and tyranny will

increase. Till the time that the number of Shias reduce till it becomes three hundred and thirteen, at that time the Lord of the Worlds would command the Imam of the time, "Now, this world has become full of injustice. The number of people taking My name have become very meager. Hence you should reappear." So, he would reappear and fill the earth with justice as it would have been filled with injustice. O Allah! Hasten his reappearance and ease his advent.

The editor of Rizwan and his companions have tried to revive the period of Bani Umayyah and Bani Abbas in Pakistan and other so-called Islamic nations. If they succeed in their efforts and if the life spans of Shias living there is reduced and the practice of Farooq¹ gains hold, it is not unlikely that this condition of 'Excess of injustice' gets fulfilled and Imam reappears. At that time these poor Ahle Sunnat who follow the practice of Imam Abu Hanifah, Imam Shafei, Imam Malik and Imam Hanbal and regard their conjectures and analogy a source of salvation, would be involved in calamities the most because their own Allamah Arabi has clarified that:

"So nothing shall remain in his time except the pure religion, which would be pure of conjectures and analogy. Most of his commands shall be against the religion of the scholars. So the scholars would be unhappy with him because of their belief that God will not create any jurist after their Imams."²

Obviously people who consider their Imams better than the Imam of the time (a.t.f.s.) are happy in the misunderstanding that the door of jurisprudence is closed after their four Imams and there is none except Hanafis, Shafeis, Malikis and

¹ Umar

² Futuhat-e-Makkiyyah

Hanbalis. This has also become clear that analogies and conjectures of those religions are opposed to the 'Pure religion', that is why the Pure religion shall be manifested. Naturally, scholars of those schools would be unhappy at the manifestation of the 'Pure religion'. *Futuh-at-e-Makkiyyah* also explains the condition of those people (which include a Hanafi scholar like the Rizwan editor) after the manifestation of 'Pure religion' that they would become liable for execution.

That is why, probably, the Rizwan editor could not bear to hear that Imam Mahdi (a.t.f.s.) is present. He wants to keep this thought away from his mind as much as possible so that the fear of death does not put him into vexation.

However, I sincerely advise the editor to repent his vexatious belief even now. He should adopt the right belief and await the Imam of the Age with a peaceful heart so that Allah bestows him happiness in this world as well as the hereafter.

Excellence of the two Shaykhs

(Published in 'Al-Jawwad', February 1956 A.D. issue)

After objecting to the existence of the Master of the Age (a.t.f.s.), Rizwan editor says: Shias in the view of Musa Kazim (s): "Now let us see this narration on page 159 of *Usul al-Kafi*: Imam Musa Kazim (s) said: 'Allah sent wrath upon the Shias.' If I select my Shias, I will not find any but talkative ones and if I test them, I will not find them but apostates."¹

This verdict is not of the Shias but of Imam Musa Kazim, which is present in their books. Now Shias should contemplate on what is the opinion of their Imam about them, because if we say anything they would complain. Not only this, but it is mentioned in the reliable book of Shias, *Ihtijaj* of Tabarsi:² "All the twelve sects of Shias would go to Hell."

It is mentioned in *Rijal Kishi* that the Shia community consists of three parts: First is sinful and unfortunate while the other two are foolish." Similarly, it is narrated in *Furu al-Kafi*³ that Imam Ali (s) said, "I pity the deeds of the Shias."

¹ *Furu al-Kafi*, Pg. 107

² Page 141

³ Vol. 3, Pg. 31

KILLERS OF HUSAIN WERE ALSO SHIAS!

“It is mentioned in *Majalisul Muttaqin* (page 29) that: Imam Husain (s) holding his son Ali Asghar in his arms said to the disbelievers, ‘O Shias! You killed me as well as the people of my house (Ahle Bayt).’ It is mentioned in *Rijal Kishi* (page 13) that Imam Husain addressed the Shias, ‘O Shias! You killed me and plundered all my belongings.’

Shia books say that the killers of Husain were Shias themselves.”

I am amused that along with his slyness, deception, fraud, distorting nature and malice, the gems of the knowledge of the Rizwan editor are also exposed. It has become evident that the foundation of his religion cannot be laid without deceit. Some of the wordings of the above passage are blatant lies, some intentional distortions and some miracles of misunderstanding. I write these three aspects separately so that it is easy to answer them.

A. Blatant Lies

“The editor of Rizwan has mentioned on the authority of *Rijal Kishi* Pg. 13: Imam Husain addressed the Shias, ‘O Shias! You killed me and plundered all my belongings.’ Hence it is proved from Shia books that Shias were only the killers of Husain.”

I never before felt to say that the editor of Rizwan never got an opportunity to himself read all the books he has mentioned and quoted. Its proof is that he has not quoted the correct page number of a single reference. As a result, I had to read whole books to find the reference. If at all I found it, it was in such a way that the objection of the Rizwan editor was not applicable to it. It is clear that his editorship is wholly dependant on gossips.

However, this passage and reference has crossed all limits of deceit. I challenge that if the Rizwan editor or anyone of his religion shows me this saying of Imam Husain (s) not only from page 13 but from the 'B' of 'Bismillah'¹ to the end, I would reward him a thousand rupees.

The editor of Rizwan has also resorted to a similar deception in a later topic. Though restriction of maintaining a serial order had restrained me from discussing it, I feel that I would have to write all these things once again next month. The editor of Rizwan would not be ashamed of being exposed again and again but I am very conscious about my time, so I shall discuss that also here itself. He writes as follows:

Siddiq and Farooq

"Ali al-Murtada, the lion of God, most proximate to the Merciful Lord, says in his sermon regarding the Siddiq Akbar (Abu Bakr) and Farooq Azam (Umar), "They both (Siddiq and Farooq) were just Imams (s). They were righteous and died righteous. May Allah's blessings be on them on the Day of Judgment."

I request the Shias to read this sermon of Ali (s) al-Murtada Karamullah Wajhul Karim properly. Ali (s) says that the caliphates of Siddiq and Farooq were lawful and they both trod the path of truth.

Not only this, they even died on truth.

Not only this, but Allah would shower blessings upon them on the Day of Judgment.

Just think upon it!

¹ That is from the first word

Shia scholars say that Ali (s) paid allegiance to Siddiq and Farooq under Taqiyyah or due to some other reason. Firstly, it is against the honor of the Lion of God that he should feel afraid and approve the caliphate only out of fear. Even if we agree to this, the above sermon of Ali (s), which he delivered after the death of Hazrat Siddiq and Farooq, contradicts it. He said that Siddiq and Farooq were righteous and died righteous and Allah will send His blessings upon them on the Day of Judgment.

When Ali (r.a.) had power, what was the need to fear?

Allah had agreed upon the caliphate of the three caliphs.

“The right of choosing the caliph belongs to Immigrants and Helpers only. If these Immigrants and Helpers unite over the Imamate or caliphate of a person, and they appoint him as the Imam, it has the approval of Allah.”

Now Shias should decide that if the caliphates of the three caliphs were not valid, how could Haider-e-Karrar (Imam Ali) state thus?

Does it not prove that the caliphates of the three caliphs were correct in the view of Ali (s)?”

According to some narrations Shaitan told Lady Hawwa (Eve), “The nearness of that tree which God had prohibited is over and there is no harm in eating the fruits of that tree.” When Lady Hawwa hesitated, the Shaitan immediately swore by Allah. Lady Hawwa thought how someone could swear by Allah falsely (because this was the first swearing which proved false) and she believed the saying of Shaitan to be true.

Poor semi-literate subscribers of Rizwan were deceived by these hypothetical sources and sermons in a similar manner. They would have thought how someone could print a wrong account in a journal. Hence, whatever the Rizwan editor quotes

must be present in Shia books and is a saying of Imam Ali (s). Today there is no dearth of such people in villages who pick up pages of novels and fictions lying on the ground and keep them safely thinking that since it is a printed-paper, there would surely be a thing worthy of respect and a true subject in it. How could they know that it contains useless matters?

In order to strengthen the belief of the readers, Mr. Editor has challenged in later issues that whosoever proves a single reference wrong, would be awarded a thousand rupees.

Those readers who have read my earlier issues might have clearly understood the fact that none of the references were free of deception. He has resorted to distortion and deception everywhere but I did not repeat this challenge on purpose. For instance, he has said that 'Mus'haf-e-Fatima' and 'Jame' are both Qurans. While the complete account of these two books are present in the same narrations whose parts he has quoted. If I had quoted the whole narration and asked him, "Since you have given a wrong description that these two books are also Quran, now give me a thousand rupees," he would have humbly said, "The narration was in Arabic and hence I could not understand it clearly. I had just quoted what I understood, so the Shias should forgive me." Thus the matter would have ended.

However, there is no excuse of such ignorance in the narration of *Rijal Kishi'* and sermon of Amirul Momineen (s) because both of them are not even found anywhere. Hence, the Rizwan editor should either show the saying of Imam Husain (s) in *Rijal Kishi'* or cough up a thousand rupees. Further, he should either show that saying of Amirul Momineen (s) in a Shia book which is acceptable (not the one quoted by Ahle Sunnat) or present a thousand rupees more.

Anyone among the believers of Pakistan can file a lawsuit against the Rizwan editor over the bet of reward and recover two thousand rupees along with legal expenses. Half of the money should be donated to the Association of Scholarships of Sayyids and believers (Pakistan) for scholarships in jurisprudence. While half of it should be donated to the Association of Scholarships of Sayyids and believers (India). So that students of religious schools may be given scholarships through this.

After proving the fact that there is no existence of such a saying of Amirul Momineen (s), no need remains to object to the blessed wordings of the Rizwan editor. Still, let us ignore this fact for a moment and for the sake of completion of argument, let us glance at this concocted saying and interpretation of the Rizwan editor so that he reaches home.

Firstly, all the words of this saying have multiple meanings and do not make any clear sense:

- 1) *Imamah*: According to the Holy Quran, there are two types of Imams – ‘Guiding Imams’ and ‘Imams of hell’. Refer to the following verses:

“And We made of them Imams to guide by Our command...”¹

“And We made them Imams who call to the fire...”²

How can we judge whether the Imam here does not imply Imams leading to hell?

- 2) *Adilan* or *Adil*: Adl (Justice) and Udool (to deviate). Both are active nouns (Ism-e-Faail) and the meaning can be both ‘justice’ and ‘to deviate’. What is the proof that here it does not imply ‘deviation from truth’?

¹ Surah Sajdah 32:24

² Surah Qasas 28:41

- 3) *Qasitan* or *Qasit*: It means both, just and equitable, and unjust and sinner. Jabir (r.a.) narrates that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) said regarding the circumstance of revelation of the verse of: *But if We should take you away, still We shall inflict retribution on them...*¹ "This verse was revealed in the honor of Imam Ali (s) because after me he would fight with the oath breakers (Nakiseen), the unjust (Qasiteen) and apostates (Mariqeen)."² Now, how can we say that 'Qasitaan' does not mean unjust and sinners here?
- 4) *Kaana Alal Haq* (The two were upon the truth): 'Ala' (upon) is used in various meanings. One of them is 'upon', according to which, the sentence would mean, 'they both were rightful'. However, second meaning is 'opposite'. It is said that if 'Shahida lahu' (gave witness in accordance with it) is said 'Shahida alaiha' then it would mean 'gave a testimony against it'. What is the reason that the second sense is not implied here, that 'they both were *against* the truth'.
- 5) *Wa maa taa alaihe* (And the two died upon it): There would be two meanings of this sentence also due to 'Alaa' viz. 'they both died rightful' and 'they both died when they were against the truth'.
- 6) *Fa alaihimaa rahmatullaahi yaumal Qiyamah* (May mercy of Allah be on them on the Day of Judgment): 'Ala' is present here also. Hence both interpretations are possible: viz. 'May God's mercy be upon them on the Day of Judgment' and 'May God's mercy be *against* them on the Day of Judgment.'

¹ Surah Zukhruf 43:41

² Arjahul Matalib Pg. 38-39

The editor of Rizwan should tell us how he could force a person to believe only in the former meaning and not the latter one?

That is: "They both were leaders taking others to hell. They were deviated from the 'Right path' and were unjust. They were against truth and died against truth. Thus, may God's mercy be against both of them."

Secondly, context is required to find the meaning of similar words. The editor of Rizwan does not have any historical or literary proof for his translation other than his belief. I have the context and proof of my translation that Amirul Momineen (s) really considered the Shaykhs unjust and deviated from the Sunnah of Prophet (s.a.w.s.). The books of Ahle Sunnat are replete with such discussions. Allamah Qutaybah writes in *Al-Imamah Was-siyaasah* about the battle of Naharwan: Amirul Momineen (s) asked a Khatha'mi man to pay allegiance. He said that he would pay allegiance to him on the command of Quran, Sunnah of Prophet (s.a.w.s.) and method of Shaykhs. Amirul Momineen (s) asked, "Why do you mix the method of Abu Bakr and Umar with the Book of God and Sunnah of Prophet (s.a.w.s.)? The two were tyrannical and unjust rulers."

In the same way the following tradition of Amirul Momineen (s) is quoted on Pg. 154 of *Tanqeed-e-Akhbar* on the authority of *Kanzul Ummal*, *Kitabul Iktifa* and *Tabaqat* of Ibne Saad:

Amirul Momineen Ali (s) said, "So I came to know, that by Allah, Umar would surely not act on justice according to the Sunnah of Prophet (s.a.w.s.)."

That is why Amirul Momineen (s) never considered the two Shaykhs just and rightful. So he did not accept the condition of the Shaykhs' practice at the time of consultation (Shura) and spurned the apparent caliphate. These thoughts of Ali were not such that they be hidden and only revealed after the death of

the Shaykhs but they were obvious in their lifetime also. Even caliph Umar was aware of it. Thus, according to one of the narrations of *Sahih Muslim* (belief on whose traditions is one of the necessities of religion of Ahle Sunnat), Umar himself complained inter alia a long discussion with Amirul Momineen (s) and Abbas bin Abdul Muttalib and said, "You both considered me a liar, sinner, disloyal and treacherous."

Obviously, when other proven sayings of Amirul Momineen (s) show that he considered Abu Bakr and Umar unjust, deviated from the way of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.), liar, sinner, disloyal and treacherous, hence if a saying of Amirul Momineen were presented whose meaning is somewhat similar to this we would surely have to believe in that meaning only but it would be necessary to reject the meaning, which is opposite to these sayings.

Thirdly, the Rizwan editor has not given any reference for this saying in any issue after the 'Sayyadush Shohada Number'. Instead he has given the proof that Allamah Hairi has interpreted this saying and given selfish meanings. It is concluded from his interpretation that if he had not considered it a saying of Amirul Momineen (s) why he had interpreted it?

The interpretation of Allamah Hairi is not present with me but I am sure that the explanation would not be dissimilar to that of mine because the aspects of these similar words are very lucid. However, my explanation does not prove that I really believe that this is a saying of Imam (s). Similarly, Allamah Hairi (May Allah exalt his status) might have given an amusing explanation of this saying. So how the Rizwan editor got involved in a pleasant thought that the Allamah also believes that it was a saying of Imam? O gentleman! It is the favor of Allah, the Almighty, upon we Shias from eternity that not only Sunnis but all other opponents are caught guilty by us through their own testimonies and writings and struck dumb with such

amazement that they can't even find a way to escape to even Mount Uhad.¹

Hence, it had been our ever-lasting method that when opponents cook up and narrate hypothetical issues, we accept them for a time being and then refute them using their own sources. It is about our Shia religion that Allah has promised: *"that He might cause it to prevail over all religions..."*² We are proud to give such a series of blows to the opposite sects from every angle that they become satisfied. Hence, you can see the result of your concocted saying. Allah put such a seal on the mind of its forger that he wrote every such sentence, which would be used against him only. For the kind information of the Rizwan editor, let me tell him that this is neither a sermon of Amirul Momineen (s) nor a saying of an Imam but an invention of an over-smart Ahle Sunnat gentleman. Its mention can neither be found in Shia books nor in traditions of Ahle Sunnat. Hence you could not write even a reference heard by you for this hypothetical saying. Just estimate your worth from this.

Fourthly, if the Rizwan editor was not aware of the references presented by me, before raising the objection, he should have at least thought that if Amirul Momineen (s) considered those leaders so just, rightful and worthy of Divine Mercy why he would have said the Book of God and recommendations of Prophet (s.a.w.s.) are all right but he would not follow the Shaykhs when Abdur Rahman bin Auf placed forth this condition at the time of consultation (Shura) that they would pay allegiance to Amirul Momineen (s) if he followed the Book of God, Sunnah of Prophet (s.a.w.s.) and Sunnah of the

¹ A reference to the flight of some prominent companions of the Prophet (s) from the battle of Uhad

² Surah Tawbah 9:33

Shaykhs. These incidents are so famous and in safe custody of history that there is no need for a special reference for them. Any Islamic history containing incidents of Shura committee can be referred on this issue.

Did Amirul Momineen not want to (God forbid) perform the duties of caliphate with justice? Or did he not want to live and die rightfully? Or did he want to (God forbid) remain aloof from Divine Mercy? After all, Amirul Momineen (s) wanted to live such a life. Hence, if he considered Shaykhs just, why he remained so wary of them?

Let me mention one more point at the end of the discussion that Abu Bakr and Umar are mentioned as 'Siddiq-e-Akbar' and 'Farooq-e-Azam' in the preface of an account after associating it to Amirul Momineen (s). This injustice is also worthy of attention because the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) himself says that only Ali (s) is 'Siddiq-e-Akbar' and 'Farooq-e-Azam'. Refer to the following narration:

Salman al-Farsi (r.a.) narrates that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) used to say regarding Imam Ali (s), "He was the first to bring faith on me, he would be the first to meet me on the Day of Judgment, and he is 'Siddiq-e-Akbar' and 'Farooq-e-Azam' and the Master of the faithful ones while wealth is the master of believers."¹

One should not think that maybe Ali (s) is 'Siddiq-e-Akbar' and 'Farooq-e-Azam' but the Shaykhs are also given this title. Because the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) has already negated it saying there is no 'Siddiq' save Ali (s) in this community. Refer to the following tradition:

¹ Arjahul Matalib, Maulana Ubaidullah Amritsari

Ibne Abbas and Abu Laila narrate that the Messenger of Allāh (s.a.w.s.) said, "There are three 'Siddiqs' (truthful ones). (1) Habib Najjar, believer of the Al-Yaa Seen, (2) Hizqil, believer from the community of Firon and (3) Ali Ibne Abi Talib; and Ali is most exalted of them." Imam Bukhari has narrated this from Ibne Abbas and Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal from Abu Laila.¹

This shows that Abu Bakr being called 'Siddiq' is not in accordance with any lawful proof or divine decree. Now refer to this saying of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) regarding 'Farooq':

Abu Laila narrates that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) said, "Shortly after me, sedition will raise its head. If such a condition arises remain attached to Ali (s) because he is the only 'Farooq' (distinguisher between right and wrong)."

Khwarizmi, Dailami and Allamah Ibne Abdul Bar narrate this tradition in *Istiab*.²

It clearly proves that the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) did not regard anyone except Ali (a.s) as 'Farooq'. He commanded them to remain attached to Ali (s) in the rising sedition i.e. of the issue of caliphate after him. What is the right to call Umar 'Farooq' or 'Farooq-e-Azam'?

The great Ahle Sunnat scholar, Maulana Ubaidullah Amritsari has quoted eleven traditions from Pg. 22 to 25 in his book, *Arjahul Matalib* on the authority of the following narrators that Imam Ali (s) is 'Siddiq-e-Akbar' and 'Farooq-e-Azam':

- 1) Allamah Muhib Tabari (in *Riyazun Nazara fi Fazaelul Ashara*)

¹ Arjahul Matalib, Maulana Ubaidullah Amritsari Pg. 22

² Arjahul Matalib, Maulana Ubaidullah Amritsari Pg. 25

- 2) Imam Tibrani (in *Mojam*)
- 3) Dailami
- 4) Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal (in *Musnad*)
- 5) Imam Nasai (in *Khasais*)
- 6) Imam Hakim (in *Mustadrak*)
- 7) Hafiz Abu Zaid Uthman bin Abi Shayba (in *Sunan*)
- 8) Ibne Asim (in *Sunnat*)
- 9) Hafiz Abu Naeem (in *Hilyatul Awliya*)
- 10) Abu Ja'far Aqeeli
- 11) Ibne Qutaybah (in *Maa'rif*)
- 12) Imam Bukhari (in *Sahih Bukhari*)
- 13) Ibnul Hijam (in *Tafsir*)
- 14) Allamah Ibne Abdul Basr (in *Istiah*)

The following companions narrate these traditions:

- 1) Salman Al-Farsi
- 2) Abu Zar Ghiffari
- 3) Ibad bin Abdullah
- 4) Muaazat Aduyah
- 5) Ibne Abbas
- 6) Abu Laila
- 7) Amirul Momineen Imam Ali Ibne Abi Talib (s) himself.

Hence, Amirul Momineen (s) declared from the pulpit, "If anyone other than me claims to be 'Siddiq-e-Akbar' he is a liar."

Imam Ali (s) said, "I am the servant of God and brother of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.). I am 'Siddiq-e-Akbar'. None other than me can say this except a liar. I prayed for seven years before anyone did."¹

This tradition is narrated in *Arjahul Matalib* of Amritsari, *Manaqib* of Imam Ahmad bin Hanbal, *Khasais* of Imam Nasai, *Mustadrak* of Imam Hakim, *Sunan* of Hafiz Abu Zaid, *Sunnat* of Ibne Asim and *Hilayatul Awliya* of Hafiz Abu Naeem.

¹ *Arjahul Matalib*, Maulana Ubaidullah Amritsari Pg. 23

Were Shias the killers of Imam Husain (s)?

(Published in 'Al-Jawwad', February 1956 A.D. issue)

Intentional distortion

A reference of Rizwan editor has been discussed above under the heading of 'Blatant Lies' in which he has accused Shias for killing Imam Husain (s). He has purposely distorted the translation of the text of *Majalisul Muttaqin* on this topic though comprehension also plays a major role in this translation. The wordings of *Majalisul Muttaqin* are taken from the *Maqatal* of Abi Mikhnaf. First let us see how this incident is narrated in the *Maqatal* of Abi Mikhnaf:

Imam Husain (s) told Umme Kulthum, "Bring Ali Asghar to me." He took the child near the army and said, "O People! You killed my brother, son, helper and friends. Now, none except this child is left, in whose liver flames are leaping due to thirst. Give him a sip of water."¹

Shahid-e-Rabe' has described this matter in the text which is presented by the Rizwan editor. Its correct translation is as follows:

¹ *Maqatal*, Abu Mikhnaf, Pg. 39, Printed Bombay, 1311 AH

"O People! You killed my Shias (friends) and martyred my family members."

However, note the capability of the Rizwan editor who translates as, "O Shias! You killed me too..."

The Lord of the worlds has condemned Jews and Christians in numerous places in Quran that they distorted Divine scriptures and "*they altered the words from their places and they neglected a portion of what they were reminded of...*"¹ In this way, they wanted to live a happy life. For example, refer to the following verse of Quran:

*"Most surely there is a party amongst those who distort the Book with their tongue that you may consider it to be (a part) of the Book, and they say, It is from Allah, while it is not from Allah, and they tell a lie against Allah whilst they know."*²

Did you see how the Rizwan editor made a successful attempt to become a connotation of this verse by twisting the tongue and changing the wordings? He also proved the following saying of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) practically:

"Whatever has happened among the past nations will happen among this nation also. To such an extent that even if they had entered a burrow of an animal, you too would enter it."

Umar was greatly interested in the Jews and hence, he had to face the displeasure of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) one day. Surely, that habit has reached the Rizwan editor through inheritance. Like Jews, he also, "*altered the words from their places and...neglected a portion...*" Thus in this unequivocal statement he changes simple term of 'My Shias' into pieces made 'Me' a separate word. He made 'Shias' a predicate of

¹ Surah Maidah 5:31

² Surah Aale Imran 3:78

'people', which was actually the suffix of 'My' and created a new compound 'Shia people' and immediately translated it as, "O Shias! You killed me and my Ahle Bayt also."

*"(They) distort the Book with their tongue that you may consider it to be (a part) of the Book, and they say, it is from Allah, while it is not from Allah."*¹

God be praised!

This adornment of new ways has made you rightful that you roam telling your disciples:

"What is accomplished by me, could not be accomplished by even Rustom."

But, my lord! If you did not have the capability to understand Arabic and Persian you should at least have thought how it could be correct to say 'You killed me' taking Ali Asghar (s) on his hands? Was Imam Husain already martyred at that time? But how could the Rizwan editor understand these points of common sense? Because,

*"Allah has set a seal upon their hearts and upon their hearing and there is a covering over their eyes."*²

This is the result of your distortion and dishonesty in quoting a statement of *Rijal Kishi* that 'Killers of Husain were Shias'.

If you really want to know who the killers of Husain were and who their followers are today, read my article 'Killers of Husain (s)' from beginning to end. It is printed in 'Arbaeen special issue 1374 A.H. of Razakar'. It is such a clear mirror that you would be able to see your features very clearly. If you have any shame you would refrain from making such statements in future.

¹ Surah Aale Imran 3:78

² Surah Baqarah 2:7

What a scandal, that people who consider the accursed Yazid, the accursed Marwan as their caliphs, who accept narrations of Umar Saad (L.a.) and accursed Shimr, who consider the enmity of Ahle Bayt and obedience of killers of Husain a part of their belief, are taunting the slaves of holy Ahle Bayt (s) that 'Killer of Husain were Shias'.

Shias in the view of Imam Musa Kazim (s)

(‘Al-Jawwad’, March 1956 A.D and April 1956 A.D)

Miracles of Comprehension

Five parts are included in this topic, which come under ‘Shias in the view of Imam Musa Kazim (s)’. As the Rizwan editor has failed to understand the meaning of those traditions, I would first explain each of them and then write some of my remarks.

I take the last part first. Rizwan editor writes:

1

Similarly, it is narrated in *Furu al-Kafi*¹ that Imam Ali (s) said, “I pity the deeds of the Shias.”

This is an intermediate sentence of a long tradition. Instead of raising an objection over it, I feel it sufficient to narrate the whole tradition. Imam Amirul Momineen (s) said:

“And then, the Almighty God did not end the mighty ones of age but after giving them time and giving them respite. While the pious would get happiness only after further calamities. O people! The incidents occurring in front of you or after you are

¹ Vol. 3, Pg. 31

worth taking a lesson from but every person having a heart need not be intelligent. Every person having ear need not be hearing and neither every possessor of eyes be a looker.

O servants of God! Think about the deeds, which will benefit you in the hereafter. Look at the deserters of those people whose knowledge is bestowed by Allah. They followed the ways of the community of Firon who had orchards, springs, agriculture and excellent palaces. Then, also see why God ended them after this freshness, happiness and sending orders and prohibitions. The patient ones among you will forever be in Paradise in the hereafter. Only God has the return of all the affairs.

It's a surprise over the errors of those sects, regarding difference of evidences in the religion and why should not it be? They neither follow the footsteps of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) nor follow the acts of the successor of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) or believe in Ghaib (Unseen) or forgive the mistake of anyone. Only one whom they like is pious in their view. According to them, a good is that which they consider good and a wrong deed is that, which they consider wrong. Each of them is his own Imam. They have prepared strong proofs regarding their likes, according to their wishes. They will always remain on injustice and only their mistakes shall increase. They would never be near to God, rather become more distant. They have love for each other only because of their hatred of the news that the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) has conveyed from Allah. They are involved in doubts, sin, deviation and suspicion. They are such that Allah has left them to their desires and opinions. So only one who does not know them, considers them reliable and blameless. How similar they are to those cattle whose shepherds are separated from them (because they have left the Imam)."

After narrating the account of the well wishers of Bani Umayyah, he says:

"I pity the deeds of my Shias, that in spite of love and nearness, they should try to dishonor each other after me and kill each other. Tomorrow they would be separate from the root and take support on the branch. They would desire for victory without any effort. All the groups among them (after being separated from root) will catch a branch each. They would also bend wherever that branch does.

But Allah (only He is worthy of Praise) will shortly unite my Shias for the day, which would be the worst day for Bani Umayyah. Just like farmers gather to harvest the autumn crops. God will form their organization through mutual love. Then He would unite them like specks of light. Then He would open the doors for them and they would start spreading everywhere just like the flood of Iram when God sent a mouse (which made a hole in the dam and water began to flow breaking the dam). Thus no secure and safe place shall remain.

He would make them flow on the earth like springs. He would procure the rights of a community from another through them. He would involve an unjust community in chastisement for an oppressed community so that the organization of Bani Umayyah becomes completely dispersed and they do not have any control over what they have usurped. (After some special guidelines, he says) I swear by Him Who split the seed and created living beings, surely these incidents would happen, as if I am hearing the sounds of their cavalry and infantry.

By Allah, whatever mighty empire and control they (Bani Umayyah) have in their hands would melt as fat of ram melts in fire. Among them, whoever dies, will die astray and God only will decide the fate of the dying ones. Whoever repents (in life), God will accept his repentance.

I hope that God unites my Shias after differences and dispersion for the day, which would be the worst day for them (Bani Umayyah). No one has any control over God while He has control over all things."

Read this whole text. It is obvious that Amirul Momineen is narrating incidents that are to occur after him. For instance, the rising up and formation of kingdoms of enemies of Ahle Bayt and those having a similar outlook, unison of Shias by the command of God after that, their covering the world like a flood and snatching of power from the enemies of Ahle Bayt is described by him. He has expressed his grief over mutual differences among Shias during early days. However, it does not prove the conclusion drawn by the Rizwan editor. Since this prediction does not prove the fault of our religion or the people of our religion.

It, at the most, censures those who caused sectarian differences among Shias. Because those who created one hypocrisy after another and created rifts between Shias since the time of Imam Zainul Abideen (s) to Imam Reza (s) are blameworthy in our view also. We do not make hypocrites our leaders like the Sunnis do, so that we should need to veil their hypocrisy.

We can summarize this as follows:

- 1) Some people considered Muhammad Hanafiyyah as their Imam after Imam Husain (s) instead of Imam Zainul Abideen (s). This sect, known as Kaisaniyyah, became extinct during the lifetime of Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq (s) itself.
- 2) Zaid, the martyr, confronted Bani Umayyah some time after Imam Zainul Abideen (s). A group of people began to consider him as Imam and this sect was called Zaidiyyah.

- 3) During the time of Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq (s), Muhammad bin Miqlas bin Abil Khattab who was popularly known as Abul Khattab invented a belief that even Imams (s) are prophets. He began to spread many deviating claims. His followers were called Khattabiyyah. Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq (s) has cursed Abul Khattab on every occasion. These people were extremists (Ghulat) and there were such extremists before them also during the time of other Imams.
- 4) After the passing away of Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq (s), some people began to consider his late son, Ismail as their Imam. They are called Ismailis and are present even today as Bohras and Aga Khanis.
- 5) After the passing away of Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq (s), his another son, Abdullah, claimed to be an Imam. There was a defect in his body and hence, he was called 'Aftah' (flat-footed in both feet). According to Shias, an Imam should be free of any physical or spiritual defects. Apart from this, he also was ignorant of the solutions of even common problems. Hence, his Imamate ended very soon. His followers are called Fatheeyah (some of their account will be discussed later on).
- 6) After Imam Musa Kazim (s), some of his representatives, who had huge funds of the Imam in their possession, spread this belief wrongly that Imamate has ended, so that they do not have to return those monies to Imam Ali Reza (s). However, the saying of Prophet (s.a.w.s.) that 'Imams after me are twelve' is enough to reject this claim. Hence that group ended when the veil of their intention was removed and the excellences of the Imamate of Imam Ali Reza (s) began to be revealed. These people were called Waqfiyyah.

In short, these enemies of Ahle Bayt used to call themselves lovers of Ahle Bayt and create beliefs contradicting actual Shia beliefs. Zaidiyyah and Ismailis have even inflicted a number of atrocities on other groups. (Once the community of Ismailis was famous as Batniyyah). Thus, if Amirul Momineen (s) expresses his unhappiness over the deeds of such people, blaming the Shia Ithna Asharis for it is nothing but a miracle of comprehension of the Rizwan editor.

2

Also the Rizwan editor says:

Now let us see this narration on page 159 of *Usul al-Kafi*: Imam Musa Kazim (s) said: "Allah sent wrath upon the Shias."

The error in translation will be explained later on. First let me say that both the Shia belief and the Shias themselves were in grave danger during the final days of Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq (s) and initial period of the Imamate of Imam Musa Kazim (s). The dangers to Shia belief are clear from the origin of Khatabiyyah, Ismailis and Fatihis. They were internal enemies. While the danger to the life, property and honor of Shias were external enemies i.e. those from the side of the caliphs of the Rizwan editor.

Mansur al-Dawaniqi, the rightful caliph according to the Rizwan editor buried the Sayyids alive in walls and made cement mixtures in their blood. He martyred them through various atrocities. The spies were present everywhere. If they found anyone following the Shia faith, they beheaded him immediately. Mansur martyred Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq (s) through poison. Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq (s) regularly advised his Shias to do Taqiyyah in such a dangerous environment and he said: "You follow such a religion that God honors one who conceals it and disgraces one who reveals it."

"One who does not have Taqiyyah has no faith."

"Taqiyyah is my religion, the religion of my father and grandfather."

The Rizwan editor has made fun of these traditions (refer the discussion of Taqiyyah) but if one-tenth of these atrocities, had befallen the Rizwan editor or his leaders they would definitely have taken their hands off their apparent claim of Islam also, and become apostates. The seriousness of the situation can be estimated from the fact that Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq (s) could not even announce the name of his real successor clearly. He added the names of four more persons along with Imam Musa Kazim (s) regarding whom Shias could easily make out that they could not be Imams. Their inclusion however saved the life of Imam Musa Kazim (s). The four are as follows:

- (1) Mansur Dawanigi, the ruler of the time and killer of Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq (s)
- (2) Mansur's governor in Medina
- (3) Abdullah Aftah
- (4) Hamida Khatun

Thus when this will of Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq (s) reached reliable companions, they said, "Thanks be to Allah! The truth has become clear." When asked for explanation, they said that Mansur and his governor couldn't be Imams as they were involved in the martyrdom of Imam (s) and were thus obvious oppressors. Hamida Khatun is a woman and hence she could not be an Imam. Abdullah Aftah has a physical defect. So even he is not worthy of Imamate. Thus only Imam Musa Kazim (s) is stationed on the rank of Imamate and he is a true Imam appointed by Allah."

The benefit of including these people in successorship was that when Mansur wrote to his governor that he search for the person whom Imam Ja'far as-Sadiq (s) has appointed as his successor, arrest him and send his head to him, the Governor replied, "He has made you and me also his successors."

Mansur said that these people could not be killed!

In this way, the life of Imam Musa Kazim (s) was saved at that time.

I shall mention another incident of *Rijal Kishi* from which the Rizwan editor is very fond to give references. It would bring forth the clear picture of the conditions of that time.

A tradition is narrated from Ja'far bin Muhammad about Hisham bin Salim Jawaliqi in which Hisham discussed about going to Abdullah Aftah along with a believer to ask the solution of some problems to him. When Abdullah gave wrong answers, they both sat in a street of Medina and began to wail, "What should we do now? What will be our consequence?" They were saying, "Should we go to Murjiyyah or to Qadariyah or to Zaidiyyah or Mutazila or to Khwarij?" i.e. which religion should they follow?

Hisham says, "We were in this same state when I saw an elderly person whom I did not recognize, gesturing towards me. I feared that he was a spy of Mansur because there were a number of spies of Mansur in Medina who used to find out the Shias of Imam Ja'far Sadiq (s) and have them executed. I was afraid that he was also one of them. I asked Momin Taq to leave me and move away as I was sensing danger for both of us. I said, 'This person wants me and not you. Hence, you go away and save your life and do not assist your own destruction.' He went a little away from me and I began to walk behind that old man according to his direction for I knew that it was difficult to escape his clutches."

Nevertheless, that elderly person took him to the door of Imam Musa Kazim (s) and the servant permitted them to enter. They went in to find Imam Musa Kazim (s) there. Imam (s) said, "Do not go to Murjiyyah nor to Qadariyah nor to Zaidiyyah nor to Mutazila nor to Khwarij but come to me, come to me, come to me."

His heart was relieved on seeing this miracle but as a precaution, he required the proof that one who was present was an Imam. He asked for permission to present some questions and said, "May I be sacrificed for you. Could I ask those questions which were posed to your venerable father?" Imam (s) said, "You may ask and you will be informed but do not disclose them else you would be slaughtered."

Hisham states that when he questioned the Imam (s), he found him an unfathomed ocean. Then he said, "May I be sacrificed for you. Your and your father's Shias are involved in confusion and deviation today. If you permit, I may tell them about these things and call them towards you because you have commanded confidentiality." Imam (s) gave the permission and said, "Inform only those on whom you have complete faith and take oath from them to keep it confidential. If they disclose it, slaughter is imminent." The Imam gestured at his neck while saying this.¹

After that, Hisham informed the reliable persons and they came in large numbers and reposed faith in the Imamate of Imam Musa Kazim (s). The market of Abdullah Aftah turned cold. When he came to know that Hisham was the first person to visit Imam Musa Kazim (s), he appointed many agents in Medina to assassinate him but they did not succeed in this.

¹ Rijal Kishi Pg. 182, 183, Printed at Egypt

Our purpose of narrating this incident was to inform you of the dangerous circumstances of that time and how Shias were afraid of spies every moment. Imam Musa Kazim (s) himself had to live a life full of risks that a little leak of secret would have become the cause of the Imam's murder.

However, when numbers increase it is possible that a person considers another worthy of trust and reveals secrets to him but that person instead of being a believer is a hypocrite. Something like this happened and that which Imam Musa Kazim (s) wanted to conceal was revealed. Although after a period of time, but the caliph of the Rizwan editor, at last came to know correctly who the Imam of Shias was. Imam (s) was arrested and imprisoned for life. It is about this Imam Musa Kazim (s) has said:

"The Lord of the worlds became angry with the Shias. So He gave me the choice to either save myself or save them. By Allah! I put myself in calamities to save the Shias."

Two conclusions can be drawn from this narration.

Firstly, the secret that Imam Musa Kazim (s) was Imam was revealed due to the carelessness of those Shias and they did not reveal this secret out of enmity towards Imam, but they unknowingly revealed this secret to a person who they thought was trustworthy while he was in fact an accomplice of the caliph of the Rizwan editor. If this exposure had been intentional, God would not have commanded Imam Musa Kazim (s) to either save himself or the Shias. He would have indeed sent down His anger on the wrong-doers (just like the Rizwan editor intentionally translated these statements wrongly).

Secondly, Imam Musa Kazim (s) loved those Shias so much and showed such kindness to them that he agreed to bear all calamities in order to save the Shias. This kindness and love of

Imam (s) themselves prove that although those Shias had indeed committed a deed of carelessness, yet there was no inherent defect in their faith and love of Ahle Bayt (s). Otherwise neither the Imam would have borne difficulties to save them nor Allah would have liked it.

The fact is that, those Shias did not know how to recognize the infidelity of the heart. In addition to this it is also a fact that they were not infallibles. If they, in their ignorance revealed the secret to an unreliable person at the most, those few people would be considered guilty. How can the basis of religion or other followers could be reproached for it? Although if we had considered those people Imams or leaders, like the Rizwan editor considers 'chastised' and 'misguided' ones as his caliphs and leaders, it would have been an opportunity to ridicule us.

Let me also tell you that the chain of narrators of this narration is as follows:

"Ali bin Ibrahim has narrated from Muhammad bin Isa and he, from another person that Imam Musa Kazim (s) said...and so forth"

The experts of tradition science very well know the value of a narration one of whose narrators is unknown. No one trusts such a narration but I did not intentionally give this reply to the Rizwan editor that this narration is unreliable or weak. I accepted its authenticity supposedly for the time being and clarified the truth behind it that this narration does not put any blame on the Shias or their ideology. The bad intention of Shias indicated in this narration is also not evident from this while the thing explicit from it, is kindness of the Imam (may my soul be sacrificed on him).

I remember an incident of early Islam on this occasion, which I have narrated in the topic of Taqiyah on the authority of *Tarikh Khamis* etc. Muslims had to face difficulties due to

opposing the command of Taqiyyah when Abu Bakr incessantly desired to make an open display of Islam against the orders of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) and finally he (the Prophet) relented helplessly to complete the argument, as a result of which, infidels attacked the Muslims and beat Abu Bakr with an old shoe in such a way that no difference remained between his nose and cheeks. The Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) did not adopt a style for Abu Bakr as Imam Musa Kazim (s) did and himself faced difficulties to save the Shias. The Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) left him at the mercy of the infidels. It seems that the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) did not even consider Abu Bakr an ordinary Muslim, otherwise, he would have surely tried to save him.

3) The editor of Rizwan writes:

Not only this, but it is mentioned in the reliable book of Shias, *Ihtijaj* of Tabarsi:¹

“All the twelve sects of Shias would go to Hell.”

Let us first read the whole narration, then there would not be any need for objection:

It is narrated from Amirul Momineen (s) that once he asked a Jew scholar, “How many sects have developed among you Jews?” He replied that so and so number of sects are formed. Imam Ali (s) said that he was wrong. Then he addressed the people, “By Allah, if I am made to dispense justice I would judge the Jews with the Torah, the Christians with the Injeel, the people of Psalms with Psalms and the followers of Quran with Quran. The Jews are divided into seventy-one sects. Seventy of them shall go to hell and only one is worthy of salvation. It is the same sect, which followed Yusha bin Noon, the successor of Prophet Musa (s). Christians are divided into

¹ Page 141

seventy-two sects. Of which, seventy-one shall go to hell and one is worthy of salvation that followed Shamoon bin Safa, the successor of Prophet Isa. This nation (i.e. the Muslims) will be divided into seventy-three sects. Seventy-two of them would go to hell and only one shall go to Paradise. It is the same sect which follows the successor of Muhammad (s.a.w.s.)." He tapped his chest, saying so. (That we are those successors. Only the sect that follows us, shall go to Paradise).

He further said, "Thirteen out of these seventy-three sects would be such that each shall claim my love and devotion. Of them only one (the moderate sect) would receive salvation and the remaining twelve would go to hell."¹

Now, who will ask the Rizwan editor how he translated it as, "All the twelve sects of Shias would go to hell?" Apparently, it seems that there are twelve sects of Shias and all of them would go to hell. However, according to the above narration, the real followers of Imam Ali (s) are we Shias. Except we Shia Ithna Asharis, all Muslim sects who claim to be the devotees of Ali (s) would go to hell. Only this sect will get salvation. It seems that the writer heard the word 'Shia Ithna Ashari' and began to think that there are twelve sects among Shias. The poor man does not even know that Shias are called 'Ithna Ashari' because they are the only ones among the sects of Islam who believe in the twelve Imams about whom the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) had prophesied.

After all, these are also miracles of comprehension.

After reading this tradition, no need remains but I would like to also explain as to which sect is to receive salvation and what are those sects who claim to love Ali (s) so that readers may find it easy to understand the right path.

¹ Ihtijaj, Tabarsi, Pg. 135

Firstly, reflect over the point that Imam Ali (s) has called this 'worthy-of-salvation-sect' as 'Al-Namatul Awsat' i.e. 'a moderate group'. It means that this group would neither increase nor decrease the rank of Imam Ali (s). This is the same intermediate way, which is called 'Siratul Mustaqeem'. (the right path) Thus, even Ahle Sunnat commentators write in the commentary of, 'Keep us on the right path.'¹ (Siratul Mustaqeem) as follows:

Muslim bin Hayyan states that he heard Abu Buraidah (r.a.) saying that the 'right path' implies the way of the life of Muhammad (s.a.w.s.) and his progeny. Imam Thalabi has quoted this narration in his *Tafsir* and Allamah Baghavi in his book, *Malimut Tanzeel*²

And praise be to Allah, people who tread the 'right path' are only the Shias whom the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) himself has praised and glorified on innumerable occasions. I quote only five traditions (equal to the number of the Holy Five)³ from the books of Ahle Sunnat.

FIRST TRADITION

It is narrated from Jabir bin Abdullah Ansari that they were in the presence of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) when Imam Ali (s) arrived. On seeing him, the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) said, "I swear by Him under Whose control is my life, that surely he (Ali) and his Shias would be successful on the Day of Judgment." At that moment a verse was revealed that:

*"(As for) those who believe and do good, surely they are the best of men."*⁴

¹ Surah Fatiha 1:6

² Arjahul Matalib, Maulana Ubaidullah Amritsari Pg. 97 and 38

³ Muhammad, Ali, Fatima, Hasan and Husain (a.s.)

⁴ Surah Bayyinah 98:7

Thus Khwarizmi, Ibne Asakir and Allamah Suyuti have also quoted this prophetic statement,¹

Apart from this, Allamah Ibne Marduyah, Hafiz Abu Naeem in *Hilyatul Awliya*, Dailami in *Firdausul Akhbar*, Khwarizmi in *Manaqib* and Allamah Suyuti in *Tafsir Durre Manthur* have narrated two similar traditions from Ibne Abbas and Amirul Momineen (s).

SECOND TRADITION

It is narrated from Ibne Abbas that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) said, "Seventy thousand people from my followers will go to Paradise without being accounted for their deeds."

Then he addressed Imam Ali (s), "They will be your Shias and you are their Imam."²

This narration is quoted in *Arjahul Matalib* from the book, *Darus Simtain* of Hafiz Muhammad bin Yusuf bin Hasan Razandi Al-Ansari.

THIRD TRADITION

It is narrated from Jabir bin Abdullah Ansari (r.a.) that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) said, "O Ali! You will be nearest to me tomorrow on the Day of Judgment. You will be my caliph on the cistern of Kauthar. Your Shias will be around me on the pulpits of light (Noor) in such a way that their faces would be luminous. I would intercede for them and they shall be my neighbors in Paradise."³

This tradition is narrated in *Arjahul Matalib* from *Al-Manaqib* of Ibne Maghazali, Khwarizmi, *Waseelatul Mutabideen* of Mulla, *Kifayatut Talib* of Allamah Muhammad bin Yusuf Kanji Shafei,

¹ *Arjahul Matalib*, Maulana Ubaidullah Amritsari Pg. 159

² *Arjahul Matalib*, Maulana Ubaidullah Amritsari Pg. 160

³ *Arjahul Matalib*, Maulana Ubaidullah Amritsari Pg. 161

Al-Shifa of Al-Usboo' Andulisi, *Al-Ikitfaa* of Ibrahim bin Abdullah Yamani Shafei, Abu Saeed and *Sharhun Nubuwwah* of Abdul Malik bin Muhammad Ibrahim.

FOURTH TRADITION

It is narrated from Abu Rafe that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) told Imam Ali (s), "You and your Shias will be found well-watered at the cistern of Kauthar. Their faces will be illuminated and your enemies would be thirsty and disgraced."¹

FIFTH TRADITION

It is narrated from Umme Salma that once Lady Fatima Zahra (s.a.) visited the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) along with Imam Ali (s). The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) raised his head towards Fatima and said, "Good news for you, O Ali! You and your Shias would go to Paradise."²

This narration is quoted by Fakhru'l Islam Najmuddin Abu Bakr bin Muhammad bin Husain in *Manaqib Sahaba*.

Maulana Ubaidullah Amritsari, an Ahle Sunnat scholar, has quoted five more narrations about the Shias being worthy of salvation in his book *Arjahul Matalib*. The Ahle Sunnat scholars are restless since long on learning about these traditions and are trying hard to apply them to themselves. Allamah Ibne Hajar Makki writes in *Sawaiqul Mohreqa*:

"The Shia of Ahle Bayt implies Ahle Sunnat wal Jamat."

Shah Abdul Aziz Muhaddith Dehlavi has mentioned such things on numerous occasions in the preface of his *Tohfa Ithna Ashariyah* that:

¹ Arjahul Matalib, Maulana Ubaidullah Amritsari Pg. 161

² Arjahul Matalib, Maulana Ubaidullah Amritsari Pg. 163

"The Ahle Sunnat say, 'We are the first Shias and traditions recorded in praise of Shias are applicable to us and not the Rawafiz'.¹"

Please refer to pages 4, 6, 11 and 18 of *Tohfa Ithna Ashariyah*.² An amazing discovery is reported in one more place on Pg. 11 of the same book as follows:

"It should be known that the first Shias, i.e. Sunnis and Tafzilis, were previously were called as Shias in the past. When the extremist Rafizis, Zaidiyyah and Ismaili sects started calling themselves Shia and when they became sources of ideological and practical evils, Sunnis and Tafzilis did not like this appellation for themselves out of the fear that truth should becomes similar to falsehood. Hence they assumed the name of 'Ahle Sunnat wal Jamat'."

Maulavi Waheeduz Zaman, a great Ahle Sunnat scholar has mentioned in *Anwaarul Lughah*³ regarding the tradition of Prophet (s.a.w.s.) that; 'O Ali! You and your Shias are satisfied with Divine Mercy and the favorites of God' as follows:

"This tradition is narrated in books of both Shias and Ahle Sunnat and it clearly explains that only the Shias of Ali (s) are worthy of salvation and accepted ones in front of the Almighty. While the enemies of Ali are accursed in view of the Almighty and they would be destroyed...This tradition also shows that the Shias of Ali is an ancient sect as mentioned by the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) himself...The true Ahle Sunnat⁴

¹ A derogatory term coined by Ahle Sunnah for the Shias

² Naval Kishor Press, Lucknow

³ Pg. 21, Pg. 144

⁴ Practice of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.)

and Ahle Hadith¹ are the Shias of Ali al-Murtada (s) and not the Shias of Muawiyah."

If all the points are discussed it would prolong the debate and also it is not my main topic of discussion here. Therefore I would just quote the remarks of Maulana Ubaidullah Amritsari about the view of Shah Abdul Aziz, which would prove the veracity of his claims. It should however be remembered that Maulana Ubaidullah Amritsari is not the friend of we 'Rafizis' (Shias). However, he writes:

"But to say that Ahle Sunnat were famous as Shias in the beginning is a mere claim for which no proof is found. If Ahle Sunnat were really called as Shias in the beginning, someone or the other who lived before the formation of Zaidiyyah sect should have become famous as a Shia. But only those who believed in the superiority of Ali (s) were called Shias. Apart from this, if Ahle Sunnat were in fact originally called Shias, Zaidiyyah and Ismailis would never have called themselves 'Shias' out of their enmity. They would have assumed some other name."²

Also, according to Maulana Waheeduz Zaman, Shias have come into existence from the time of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) as discussed above. The 'Ahle Sunnat wal Jamat' came into being in 41 A.H. during the time of Muawiyah as mentioned by Nawab Siddiq Hasan Khan Bhopali in his famous work *Munhijul Wusool*,³ and also *Tarikh Khulafa*,⁴ *Tarikh Tabari*,⁵

¹ Lit. Followers of the traditions

² *Arjahul Matalib*, Maulana Ubaidullah Amritsari Pg. 164

³ Pg. 164

⁴ Pg. 132

⁵ Vol. 6

Hayatul Haiwan,¹ *Fathul Bari Sharh Sahih Bukhari*,² *Istiaab* on the margins of *Isabah*.³ It is mentioned in all those books with difference in wordings that the majority of the Muslims united on the caliphate of Muawiyah in 41 A.H. Hence this year was called as 'Sinnatul Jamat' (i.e. year of cooperation).

It is also a known fact that followers of Muawiyah also came to be known as 'Ahle Sinnatul Jamat' (people of the year of cooperation) in this year only. Afterwards they made a slight change and modified it to 'Ahle Sunnat wal Jamat', which was construed as 'People of the Sunnah of Prophet (s.a.w.s.) and organization of Islam'. However, they were never called as 'Shias'. Then how can traditions in praise of Shias be applied to them?

Conclusively, it is obvious from these traditions and the feigning style of Ahle Sunnat that Shia is the only sect, which deserves salvation and will go to Paradise according to the saying of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.).

Two sects would compete with the Shias. One would commit excess in love and the other would fall deficient or harbor enmity. This excess and deficiency are the causes of going astray and reaching hell. Please refer to the following narration also:

It is narrated from Imam Ali (s) that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) said, "O Ali (s)! Your example is like that of Prophet Isa (s). One group loved him so much that they were ruined and the other was destroyed due to his enmity."

¹ Vol. 1, Pg. 52

² Vol. 2 Pg. 552

³ Vol. 1, Pg. 372 and Pg. 373 and Vol. 3, Pg. 398 and 433

This narration is quoted in *Arjahul Matalib*¹ on the authority of Abu Ya'la, Imam Hakim and Naziri etc.

Let us see which are those twelve sects of Islam, that are involved in excess or deficiency.

A) The sects that fell deficient are those who lowered the rank of Amirul Momineen or his successors or reduced their number. Since the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.), by the command of Allah, had already declared them to be twelve. Syed Ali Hamdani in *Mawaddatul Qurba* and Akhtab Khwarizmi in *Manaqib* have narrated from Salman al-Farsi:

"I came to the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) and saw that Imam Husain (s) was sitting on his holy lap and the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) was kissing his eyes and mouth and saying, 'You are the chief, the son of the chief. You are Imam, the son of Imam and Proof son of Proof and you are the father of nine proofs, the ninth among you shall be the Qaem of Aale Muhammad (s.a.w.s.).'"

On the basis of this criterion, the 'deficient sects' who were deprived of salvation, in spite of their claim of love of Ali (s) are as follows:

- (1) Hanafi
- (2) Shafei
- (3) Hanbalis
- (4) Maliki
- (5) Ahle Hadith or Wahabi
- (6) Ahle Quran

¹ Pg. 96

All these sects reduce the rank of Amirul Momineen (s) and bring it down to the fourth level instead of considering him the first caliph immediately after the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.).

- (7) Kaisaniyah
- (8) Zaidiyyah
- (9) Ismailis
- (10) Iftiyah
- (11) Waqifayah

None of these above sects believed in *all* the successors of Amirul Momineen. Some left the series after three Imams while some took another route after four or six Imams and some stopped after seven Imams.

- B) The extremist sect is only one, which was so 'obsessed' by the love of Ali (s) that they gave him the rank of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) or God. This sect is called Ghali, Nusairi or Khattabiyah.

Thus these are the twelve sects who are involved in either exalting or reducing the actual rank of Ali (s). According to the saying of Imam Ali (s), all of them shall go to hell. Now read once again the translation done by the Rizwan editor: "All the twelve sects of Shias would go to hell", and ponder over his power of comprehension.

- 4) The editor of Rizwan writes:

It is written in *Rijal Kishi* that the Shia community consists of three parts: First is sinful and unfortunate while the other two are foolish."

There is no such wording in whole of *Rijal Kishi* whose meaning matches what the Rizwan editor has mentioned. However,

there is a narration, which I am quoting here. Maybe the Rizwan editor has misunderstood its meaning:

"Aslam (Slave of Muhammad bin Hanafiyyah) said to us that he and Imam Muhammad Baqir (s) were sitting reclining their backs on Zam Zam. Muhammad bin Abdullah bin Hasan (s) (Nafs Zakiyyah) passed by us and he was performing the circumambulation of the holy Ka'ba. Imam Muhammad Baqir (s) asked, "O Aslam! Do you recognize this youth?" He replied, "Yes, this is Muhammad bin Abdullah bin Hasan (s)." Imam (s) said, "Shortly, he would initiate an uprising and be killed in a horrible manner." Then he said, "O Aslam! Do not inform anyone about this tradition. It is my trust with you." Aslam says that he narrated this tradition to Maroof bin Kharbooz and took an oath of secrecy from him as Imam (s) had taken the oath from him. Aslam states that once we four people of Mecca were sitting with the Imam. Maroof requested the Imam, "Please narrate the tradition that you narrated to Aslam because I would love to hear it from you directly." On hearing this, the Imam looked at Aslam and said, "Aslam?" (He meant to ask why did he not obey his command). Aslam said, "May I be sacrificed on you. I have asked him also to keep this secret as you did to me." It was then the Imam said, "If all the people would have become our Shias, three-fourth of them would have doubted us and one-fourth would have been foolish."

- A) I think that in this tradition, by the Arabic term 'Thalathata Arba' (three-fourths) the Rizwan editor has taken the meaning of one-third and the term 'Arba Aakher' (one-fourth) as 'two parts'. Also he read 'Shakak' (one who doubts) as 'Shaaq', which means miserable or unfortunate one. Maybe he does not even have the proficiency of recognizing the alphabets that he could differentiate between the Arabic letters K (Kaaf) and Q (Qaaf). If this is the condition he would

start pronouncing 'Abu Bakr' as 'Abu Baqar' and like some of his leaders, consider 'Istihkak' (picking quarrels) as 'Istihqaq' (merit).

- B) Nevertheless, it was an aspect of comprehension. Now consider another aspect. He did not even think that this statement is conditional. The stated thing cannot come into existence unless the condition is fulfilled. For instance if it is said, "There would be sunlight, if the sun rises," it would mean that there would be no sunlight until the sun rises. Similarly, when a condition is applied here that: "If all the people were claimants of being our Shias, three-fourth of them would have been involved in doubt and one-fourth of them would have been foolish," so unless the condition is fulfilled i.e. unless all people claim to be Shias, this statement cannot be applied to the Shias. That is, neither all the people of world claim they are Shias nor is there anyone among we Shias, who doubts or is foolish.

Obviously if all the people of the world claim to be Shias, Ahle Sunnat would also be included among them. Since their main patron saint, Umar, was also involved in doubts regarding the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) all his life, that's why these people would always also be involved in doubts regarding the Ahle Bayt (s).

For example, Umar had such a doubt in the prophethood of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) at the time of the Peace treaty of Hudaibiyah as he never had such a doubt before. In addition to many other books, the following saying of Umar himself is quoted in *Tafsir Durre Manthur*¹ by Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti through many chains of narrators. We should know that this

¹ Vol. 6, Pg. 77

event took place in 7 A.H. and the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) departed from this world three years after this. As if Umar continued to be in doubts in the final days of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.).

It is evident that since the caliph himself was 'Shakkak' (one who doubts much), his followers would obviously also be 'Shakkak'. And the Imam has made this statement keeping only these people in mind i.e. "If all the people would have become our Shias, three-fourth of them would have doubted us and one-fourth would have been foolish."

Anyhow, till our sect is not adulterated by such doubters and we are small in number as the Quran says: 'very few from My servants are thankful', this statement cannot be applied to us. Although when other sects try to merge with us, as the attempt of Ahle Sunnat to become 'Shia' is discussed above, the majority of doubters would be from them only. Only they would become the actualization of this statement.

C) Now examine the third aspect of comprehension.

The conditional article used for this sentence is the Arabic 'lau' (if). It is especially used regarding impossible things. That is why experts of Arabic consider a sentence having this article to mean just the opposite. Only then the actual meaning is understood. For example, consider the couplet of Imrul Qays, which the editor of Rizwan would translate as:

"If I strive for a simple life and livelihood it would be sufficient for me; and I never desired small wealth."

But he would not be able to explain the relation between 'adequacy of simple earning' and 'not desiring small wealth' because this translation itself is wrong. The correct meaning of this, according to those who know Arabic is:

"Neither I tried for a simple life and earning nor was it sufficient for me; and neither did I desire small wealth."

Now the meaning of this couplet is clear and what the characteristic of the article 'lau' (if) is.

Another characteristic of the article 'lau' (if) is that whether it be followed by a verb of the present/future tense or the verb of the past tense its meaning would be considered in past tense only. Readers should keep these two characteristics in mind, as they would be needed in the future.

Another such example of this is the following verse of the Holy Quran:

*"If there had been in them any gods except Allah, they would both have certainly been in a state of disorder..."*¹

However, its actual meaning is that neither was there another God except Allah in the heavens and earth nor were they destroyed.

After these examples, look at the actual sense of this statement of the narration. We shall find it to be: "Neither all the people were our Shias nor three-fourths of our Shias were involved in doubts nor one-fourth was foolish."

As the Arabic knowledge of the Rizwan editor is already clear for us, I have no complain against this interpretation. If the poor editor does not know the difference between the conditional articles like the Arabic 'an', (that), 'ammaa' (but) and 'lau' (if), then it is worth pity and not criticism.

- 5) The editor of Rizwan writes a part of a tradition of Imam Musa Kazim (s) as follows:

¹ Surah Anbiya 21:22

"If I select my Shias, I will not find any but talkative ones and if I test them, I will not find them but apostates."¹

This verdict is not of Shias but of Imam Musa Kazim, which is present in their books. Now Shias should contemplate on what is the opinion of their Imam about them, because if we say anything they would complain.

First read the whole narration:

That is, the narrator says that Imam Musa Kazim (s) said to me, "If I select my Shias, I will not find any but talkative ones and if I test them, I will not find them but apostates. If I choose among them not even one in a thousand would reach the desired criterion. And if I eliminate (such characters from them) none shall remain except those who are my selected ones. Their condition is such that they sit reclining on the sofa and say that they are Shias of Ali (a.s). Ali's Shia is only one whose actions match his speech."

Some of the wonders of comprehension presented by the Rizwan editor in this are as follows:

- (1) Firstly, anyone looking at this tradition with a cursory glance also would realize that this narration is by way of a 'good exhortation'. It shows that the sign of a true Shia of Ali (s) is similarity between the claim and deed. If one claims to be a follower of Ali (s) he should follow him in all matters. Otherwise his claim would be bereft of proof. As if a high standard of Shiaism is set in which the excellence of the Shia religion and obedience of Divine commandments are emphasized and not that it denounces the Shias. An advice consists of both encouragement as well as warning and it is the method

¹ Furu al-Kafi, Pg. 107

of every reformer and guide. If we consider the intimidating statements of an advisor to be due to his hatred or weariness towards the listeners it is such an exalted rank of comprehension that only the Rizwan editor could achieve.

- (2) Apart from this, some other warning sentences in the beginning are not unconditional and absolute. Rather they are all conditional. And the same article 'lau' (if) is repeatedly used for the condition that is mostly used to denote impossibility. The actual meaning of the tradition would be: "Neither are these Shias talkative nor are they apostates or lower than the desired standard." Although, the Imam stated in his manner in order to clarify their ideal standard to the people as the Lord of the worlds has said about the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.): "O Messenger (s.a.w.s.)! If you become a polytheist your deeds would be wasted." The article 'lau' (if) is present here also, which means that 'neither can you become a polytheist nor will your deeds be wasted' but others should understand from this warning how much they have to refrain from polytheism and what a serious evil, polytheism is. Similarly, Imam (s) fixed a standard of guidance for all the people with his saying to Shias as to what the real meaning of being a Shia is. How much emphasis is laid on the co-ordination of speech and action in this religion. How much particular one has to be in religion so that people like Ibne Hajar Makki, Shah Abdul Aziz Dehlavi and Maulavi Waheeduz Zaman Khan who began to consider other people better than Ali (s), out of their love and yet call themselves 'Shias of Ali (s)' should understand that there is no worth of mere verbal claim here. Heart and actions should support it. As a

result, Imam (s) has made it clear in the last condition that only those people can fulfill these conditions that are the followers of Imam Musa Kazim (s) ("None shall remain except those who are my selected ones). Those who follow others, instead of reaching this standard, are 'apostates, talkative and impure'. They claim to be lovers of Ali (s) and call themselves Shias of Ali (s) only after hearing traditions about the excellence of Shias.

Lastly, I would like to state that since these traditions are narrated conditionally, it clearly proves that they are by way of exhortation. God forbid! It does not aim at any definite and certain evil. Apart from this, we do not consider those persons, with whom these traditions are associated, as our leaders or Imams that we should be in any way affected by their evil deeds.

On the other hand, whatever is mentioned about the faith of Abu Bakr and Umar by the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) or what they themselves confessed is neither conditional nor indefinite. Much more than this, they are preceded by oath-taking emphasis, and thus have to be believed. If the Rizwan editor is unaware of such traditions he may sample a few of them mentioned below:

The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) has said, "Polytheism is hidden in you better than the movement of the ant." So Abu Bakr said, "Is there Polytheism except that one claims there is a god other than Allah?" The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) repeated, "Polytheism is hidden in you better than the movements of the ant." Hafiz Abu Ya'la, Imam Ahmad Hanbal and Imam Baghavi have narrated this tradition.

This narration is present in the following books of Ahle Sunnat:

- 1) *Tafsir* of Ibne Kathir printed on the margins of *Fathul Bayan*¹
- 2) *Tafsir Durre Manthur* by Allamah Suyuti²
- 3) *Kanzul Ummal*³

It is described more explicitly (having the mention of Abu Bakr's name) in *Kanzul Ummal*:⁴

"O Aba Bakr! Polytheism is hidden in you better than the movements of the ant."

Hakim Tirmidhi, Ibne Rahuyah, Imam Bukhari in *Adab-e-Mufrad* and Allamah Damiri in *Hayatul Haiwan*⁵ have narrated this tradition on the authority of Ma'qal bin Yasar. Muhaddith Dehlavi has also narrated it from Ibne Jurair in *Izalatul Khifa*.⁶ As if the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) has given a certificate of polytheism to Abu Bakr.

Not only this, it is mentioned in *Durre Manthur*⁷ and *Izalatul Khifa*⁸ to such an extent that the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) swore before saying this. He said, "By the One in Whose control is my life, polytheism is hidden in you better than the movements of the ant."

¹ Egypt, Vol. 5, Pg. 229

² Vol. 4, Pg. 54

³ Vol. 2, Pg. 97

⁴ Vol. 2, Pg. 98

⁵ Vol. 2, Pg. 320

⁶ Vol. 1, Pg. 199

⁷ Vol. 4, Pg. 54

⁸ Vol. 2, Pg. 24

This was a saying of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.). Now sample the blessed sayings of the great leader of the editor of Rizwan, Abu Hanifah, regarding the faith of Abu Bakr:

"The faith of Abu Bakr and the faith of Satan is one."¹

This was a glimpse of the faith of Abu Bakr. Now turn your attention to Umar. You have already read about his living the whole life in doubts. Now read his declaration of hypocrisy. He used to very often ask Huzaifah Yamani, with whom the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) had confided the names of hypocrites, "Did the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) mention my name among the hypocrites?"²

This query of Umar is mentioned in the following books also:

- 1) *Tafsir of Ibne Kathir*³
- 2) *Ihya Al-Uloom* by Imam Ghazzali⁴
- 3) *Tafsirul Taiful Bayan*, Translation of *Fathul Bayan*⁵

Firstly, the question itself makes the faith of Umar doubtful. Then finally he himself swore that he was a hypocrite!

It is quoted in *Mizanul Etidal*,⁶ by Allamah Dhahabi:

Umar said, "O Huzaifah! By Allah, I am from the hypocrites."

Is any explanation required after this sworn confession? The editor of Rizwan should consider what is the condition of their

¹ Tarikh, Khatib Baghdadi

² Maarijun Nubuwwah, Vol. 4, Pg. 292

³ Vol. 5, Pg. 61

⁴ Printed at Nawal Kishor Press, Lucknow, Vol. 1, Pg. 75

⁵ Pg. 443

⁶ Vol. 1, Pg. 365, Egypt

caliphs as mentioned by the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.), Imam Abu Hanifah and Umar himself.

Because if we say anything, they would complain.¹

The editor of Rizwan should once more note that the narrations presented by him are conditional and their meaning is exactly opposite to what is understood by him. The narrations presented by me are unconditional and definite. Their meaning is same as I have mentioned.

Secondly, his narrations are about such persons that even if these narrations, God forbid, prove their infidelity we would not be affected at all because it does not have any relation with the principles of religion. On the other hand, narrations presented by us are regarding the founders and stalwarts of their faith. The sand castle of 'Sunnism' would be demolished due to declaration of hypocrisy and 'satanism' of those caliphs.

Hence if possible, the Rizwan editor should try to save it.

¹ A line of Urdu poetry

Another miracle of comprehension - Taziyah of Shimr (l.a.)

(Published in 'Al-Jawwad', April 1956 A.D.)

After writing on the topic of 'Killers of Husain were Shias' (whose reply is already discussed in the previous pages), the editor of Rizwan has made another show of misinterpretation. He writes:

*Taziyah*¹

"You would be surprised to know that according to Shia faith there is no harm in taking out the Taziyah of Shimr (l.a.). It is written in *Zakhiratul Ma'ad* (page 618) that taking out the Taziyah of Shimr (l.a.) is not wrong; rather it is a preferable act.

Now the Shias please let us know that though they carry Taziyah of Imam Husain to express love towards him, how does taking out the Taziyah of Shimr (l.a.) become preferable and permissible?"

Let us first read the complete text of *Zakhiratul Maad*.

Question: What is the verdict regarding dramatizing of the Kerbala tragedy for the purpose of Azadari² of Imam Husain

¹ 'Replica', usually in connection with the mourning ceremonies of the Kerbala Tragedy

² Mourning for the tragedy of Kerbala

(s) i.e. a person disguises as Shimr and another as Zainab, although one disguised as Zainab is (also) a male?

Answer: There is no harm in it, rather it is praiseworthy¹ provided that it does not have any other prohibited thing like singing etc.²

The query and its reply is more than sufficient to answer the objection of the Rizwan editor. I do not want to argue further. The word 'Taziyah' is nowhere found in this question and answer. The Arabic knowledge of the Rizwan editor was already exposed by the narration of *Majalisul Muttaqin* and now this one has portrayed his knowledge of Persian also:

Maybe due to this apprehension the Rizwan editor has not quoted the whole paragraph because if among his readers there happens to be an expert of Persian, this secret would be revealed and the editor would be badly disgraced. He took an easy step to avoid it and gave the reference (page number) of the book and invented a fiction by writing a part of the tradition from *Zakhiratul Maad*: 'There is no harm in it, rather it is recommended'. Who cares to verify in the original book? He would think that taking out the Taziyah of Shimr is really praiseworthy (and 'preferable', in the words of the Rizwan editor).

The Rizwan editor has translated the Persian word 'mamduh' as 'preferable', while it actually means 'praiseworthy'. What expertise in languages!

Possibly, 'intentional deceit' is more involved here than 'miscomprehension' because the meaning of 'Taking out a Taziyah' is mentioned clearly on the margin as 'to mimic

¹ The editor of Rizwan has written 'recommended' as 'beloved'.

² *Zakhiratul Maad*

someone'. I am unable to understand that if the respected Maulana Syed Mahmud Ahmad Rizvi, the Rizwan editor, had himself seen *Zakhiratul Maad*, why he did not see this marginal note to find the meaning of it before writing this argument? Hence it not wrong for me to assume that the habit of deception has a greater role in this objection than ignorance.

Now in addition to the previous two thousand rupees, a thousand more rupees have become due from the Rizwan editor since he cannot, in his whole life, show the mention of 'Taziyah of Shimr' in *Zakhiratul Maad* or in any other book of Shias.

Let me invite your attention to one more issue before moving ahead. The editor of Rizwan has called Shimr as 'the accursed one' in about three places in this paragraph. The readers should note that from today onwards, respected Maulana Syed Mahmud Ahmad Rizvi has accorded the permission to curse those who are worthy of it. May Allah give him more Tawfeeq and also bestow him the ability to judge people correctly.¹

¹ Divine opportunity

Mutah (Temporary Marriage)

(Published in 'Al-Jawwad', March 1957 A.D., April 1957 A.D.,
February 1958 A.D.)

Regarding Mutah, the editor of Rizwan writes:

Mutah

According to the Shias it is a very good deed to use women after giving them some pennies, without performing Nikah with them. It is even that, God forbid, it is permissible even with Sayyid women after giving them some money. This is so because they believe that performing Mutah gives them the rank of Husain, Ali and even the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.). It is mentioned on page 50 of *Burhanul Mutah*: "One who performs Mutah once gets the rank of Hasan. One who performs twice gets the rank of Husain. One who performs thrice gets the rank of Ali and one who performs Mutah four times gets the rank of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.)."

I have estimated from a later writing that either the Rizwan editor is unaware of the meaning of Mutah or he intentionally wants to deceive the common people. Since he has tried to answer the questions of 'Razakar' regarding Mutah in December 1954 A.D. issue and has used about three pages for it. I present his statements that tell us about his knowledge regarding Mutah.

- 1) "The method of performing Mutah is to catch a woman and say, "I want you for one night or a definite period for five rupees." If the woman agrees, everything is permissible. If Mutah is correct, what is the difference between this and going to a brothel?"¹
- 2) "However, they should know that there is a vast difference between Mutah and Nikah. This is the reason why we find two different chapters in the books as Kitabul Mutah and Kitab Al-Nikah. In brief, Mutah is a temporary contract, which is a way of passing ones time just like a temporary contract with a prostitute. And just a little amount is fixed for it, it is done similarly in Mutah."²
- 3) "As an amount is fixed with a prostitute and a deal is made for one or two nights, similarly it is done in Mutah. As if the wine is same and the label has changed."³

In such a condition, first I would like to describe the rules and regulations and the actual nature of Mutah so that there would not be any possibility of misunderstanding.

It appears from the writings of the Rizwan editor that maybe Mutah is another name for adultery and there is no difference between the two. Hence, first of all, I would like to ask what is the difference between a permanent Nikah and adultery?

The natural urges are fulfilled in Nikah as well as adultery. Hence if an atheist says, "The method of Nikah is to catch a woman and say that one wants her in exchange of a definite

¹ Rizwan, Pg. 14

² Rizwan, Pg. 15

³ Rizwan, Pg. 15

amount. If the woman agrees, everything is permissible. Nikah is correct. Then what is the difference between this and going to a brothel?" What reply would the Rizwan editor give?

Perhaps, he would say that there is a 'proposal' and 'consent' therein, but this purpose is present in adultery also.

Probably, he would suggest 'dower', but then people going to brothels also fix an amount and pay it.

Maybe he would mention the open declaration of Nikah but then many a times lustful rich people keep prostitutes after open declaration of 'proposal and consents' (in their own words) and giving them money.

Possibly he would present the issue that after Nikah a woman is confined to a single man only. However, there are many such prostitutes who are confined to a rich man after signing a contract with him.

Maybe he would say that both spouses inherit each other in Nikah. Nevertheless, this rule is not general and absolute because if the wife kills her husband she does not inherit. Similarly, if she is from among the People of the Book¹ she cannot inherit. Thus, if all these wives cannot inherit, what is the problem in keeping a prostitute who would not inherit? What is the difference?

Actually, the difference between Nikah and adultery is that Nikah is under the command of God while adultery is against it. No other strong reason of excellence can be presented. As it would be discussed later, both permanent and temporary marriages performed on the command of God are equal. Thus, although many acts are similar to fornication, yet they are appreciable in permanent marriage because they are carried out

¹ Jew or Christian

according to Divine commands. Similarly, Mutah is also appreciable because it is in accordance to Divine commands.

Let us now make a comparison between permanent and temporary marriage.

We should first know that Islamic jurisprudence and Quran have fixed two types of Nikahs. First, the permanent Nikah, in which no time limit is fixed, while proposal and consent are required. Naturally, this contract lasts for an unlimited period of time. Once a person is bound by this contract he would have to take a particular step in order to terminate it, which is called 'divorce'. If divorce were not given this contract would last life long.

The second type is called 'limited Nikah' (also called as Mutah) whose matrimonial proposal and consent also has a time limit. Naturally, such a contract automatically ends after the stipulated period of time.

Now let us compare the rules and regulations of the two.

- (1) It is an important condition in both types of Nikah that the wife should not be from the prohibited degree (Mahrams). That is, she must not be among the women whom the Holy Quran has prohibited to marry. She must not be already married to someone or in the waiting period (Iddah) of some other man. In brief, temporary marriage is prohibited with those women who are prohibited for permanent marriage also because both are kinds of Nikah only. And as it is permissible but detestable to marry a prostitute in every Islamic sect, it is also detestable to do Mutah with her.
- (2) Dower (Mehr), matrimonial proposal and consent are obligatory in permanent marriage; they are obligatory

in Mutah also. As the amount of Dower is fixed through mutual agreement between man and woman in the first kind, it is done in the second kind also.

- (3) As it is necessary for a woman to observe Iddah¹ after divorce is given to her i.e. she could not marry for a fixed period of time, similarly it is obligatory on a woman to observe Iddah for a fixed period of time after the period of Mutah is over i.e. she cannot marry another man for a fixed period.
- (4) Similarly, a woman has to observe 'Iddah of death' for a fixed period of time after the death of her husband in both the cases. It may be permanent or temporary marriage (Mutah).
- (5) As the man and woman become husband and wife of each other after permanent marriage and the woman cannot even think of anyone else, they become husband and wife of each other after temporary marriage also and the woman cannot even think of anyone else.
- (6) As the permanent marriage is not an evil deed due to it being in accordance with divine command, Mutah is also not an evil deed due to its performance in accordance with divine command.
- (7) As the offspring of a permanent wife is a lawful inheritor of its father, it is a lawful inheritor in Mutah also and there is no difference between them.

These were laws, which are obligatory and marriage cannot even be imagined without them. And you might have seen that Nikah and Mutah are almost same in these obligatory conditions and specialties.

¹ Waiting period before a woman can marry again

Once again I emphasize that obligatory conditions and specialties of Nikah are only those, which are discussed above. They are same for permanent marriage and Mutah (temporary marriage).

There are some more laws, which change according to circumstances. It does not mean that a woman is not the wife if any of these conditions are not fulfilled.

For instance,

- If a person (Sunni) performs permanent marriage with a Jew or Christian woman, then also, the wife cannot inherit her Muslim husband. Similarly, if a wife kills her husband, she cannot inherit him. Nevertheless, not becoming an inheritor does not end her wifeness, while fulfillment of other obligatory conditions like Iddah are obligatory and she would be considered wife in all conditions.

Similarly, if according to some Shia scholars, if the woman taken in Mutah marriage cannot inherit her husband, how can it be proved that 'since she cannot inherit, how can she be a wife'?

I have purposely used the phrase 'some Shia scholars' because a group of Shia scholars are of the opinion that a wife inherits the husband in Mutah also. Alamul Huda Syed Murtada (a.r.) writes in *Kitabul Intesar*:¹

"Not receiving inheritance is not a proof that a woman is not a wife of a man because 'dhimmiyah wife'², 'slave wife' and husband's murderer-wife are neither his inheritors nor is the husband their inheritor. However, they

¹ Pg. 63, 64; Iran

² Jew or Christians living in Muslim territories

are wives without any doubt. Apart from this, according to our religion, inheritance is given in Mutah also provided that there is no condition of non-inheritance among the special conditions decided at the time of marriage."

- If a wife is disobedient to her husband, her maintenance is not obligatory on the husband even though she may be a permanent wife. This is a uniform verdict among all the Muslims. However, non-obligation of maintenance does not affect her wifehood because inheritance and maintenance, both are not the essential elements of marriage. Similarly, if the maintenance of wife in Mutah is not necessary on the husband what effect does it have on her wifehood?
- There is no divorce in 'limited marriage' i.e. Mutah. The reason for this is already discussed above. As this marriage is dissolved automatically after a stipulated period, there is no need to quote some formula again to end it. While permanent marriage is for the whole life. Hence it is necessary to quote the formula of divorce in order to end it (if it needs be ended before death).

Except divorce, all issues applicable for the permanent wife like 'Zihar'¹, 'Liaan'² Eelaa'³ etc. are also applicable to the Mutah wife. There is no difference between them.

If the readers permit I would quote some paragraphs of our scholars, which would shed light on the terms and conditions described by me and those who are really involved in a misunderstanding about Mutah would be reassured. As for

¹ Pre-Islamic form of divorce, consisting in the words of repudiation: You are to me like my mother's back. (anti a'layyah ka-zahri ummi).

² Sworn allegation of adultery committed by either husband or wife

³ Willful oath that one would not to go to ones wife

people like the Rizwan editor who purposely remain ignorant, their solution was not with even the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.).

- The Mutah of woman is that a woman marries one provided that there is no prohibited act in marriage according to the religion of Islam. That is, she must not be among the prohibited degree of relational prohibition as well as causal. She must not be in prohibited degree due to breast-feeding. She must not be already having a husband and not be in the Iddah of previous one and other religious prohibitions should not be present. For instance, she must not be the ex-wife of ones father or sister of a present wife etc. She must marry one in such a state for a fixed dower and period through recitation of marriage formula, which is based on Islamic law. After mutual agreement she must recite the formula of Mutah like in Nikah. Then mention the fixed dower and time (e.g. a day, a month, a year or some years etc.). One should immediately reply: 'Qabiltu' (I accept). It is permissible to have a representative (to pronounce the formula of Mutah) like it is done in other marriages. After this, the woman is one's wife and he her husband till the stipulated period of time comes to an end.¹
- A woman with whom Mutah is performed is also a lawful wife and a legal marriage is performed with her. As for sustenance, inheritance and distribution of nights, in which she does not have a share, all these are based on particular factors due to which a wife in Mutah is exempted from these general rules.²

¹ Fusulul Muhimma, Pg. 54, 1347 A.H. Edition

² Kitab-e-Madhkur, Pg. 60

- All the signs of wifehood are applied to a woman with whom Mutah is performed. All the rules are valid on her except some of those orders, which with definite evidences do not include a Mutah wife.¹
- When the mutually fixed time ends, it is permissible for the husband to immediately tie a knot with her once again, and not wait for completion of Iddah (as it is permitted in permanent marriage to return during the Iddah of revocable divorce). However, no other man except her husband can marry her till the period of Iddah ends.²
- If conjugal relations were established, the woman would have to observe Iddah for two menstrual cycles after the Mutah ends. According to a narration, it could be observed for only one menstrual cycle, but it is not a reliable report. If a woman does not have menses and she has not reached menopause she must observe Iddah for 45 days. If the husband dies during the period of Mutah she would have to observe Iddah of death for four months and ten days even if conjugal relations were not established and she is not pregnant. If she is pregnant she has to observe Iddah till the childbirth or four months and ten days, whichever is longer.
- It is narrated from Ibne Bazigh that a person asked Imam Reza (s), "If a person performs Mutah with a woman and puts forth a condition that if a boy is born it would not be his. What if a male child is born to her after this?" Imam (s) strictly opposed this denial and

¹ Aslush Shia wa Usulaha, Pg. 94

² Sarair, Ibne Idris

considered the rejection of the father a great sin, he said, "What? Would he reject that boy?"¹

- Zihar is valid occurs with Mutah wife also (due to more correct saying) because the verse of Zihar is general and the Mutah wife is also a wife and there is no restriction of a permanent wife in the verse.²
- Shaykh al-Mufeed and Syed Murtada (a.r.) have said that 'Liaan' is applicable with the Mutah wife because she is a wife and hence, she is also included in the generality of the verse.³
- Scholars have a difference of opinion about the right to inheritance in Mutah. There are a number of opinions in this. The first is that both husband and wife become mutual inheritors of each other through this marriage as in the case of permanent marriage. This is a saying of Ibne Barraaj and he gives the evidence that the verse of inheritance in marriage is general. The Mutah wife is also a wife and she also inherits like other wives.

The second opinion is exactly opposed to the first. None of the spouses inherit each other. Its proof is that inheritance is a religious command and its right is based on some religious proofs. And merely being a wife is not a proof enough of being rightful to inheritance because there are many wives who inherit and many who cannot. Thus, how can inheritance be given on the basis of just wifeness, without any other legal commandment?⁴

¹ Furu al-Kafi, Vol. 2, Pg. 196, Tahzib, Man Laa Yahzaruhul Faqih

² Sharh Lumah, Vol. 2

³ Masalikul Afham, Vol. 1

⁴ Hadaifun Nadhrah, Vol. 7, Pg. 165

This is *Mutah*, whose dreadful picture is drawn by the Rizwan editor. You have seen that there is no difference between *Mutah* and *Nikah* except that there is no period fixed in permanent marriage while a period is fixed in *Mutah*.

All the supposed evils of *Mutah* can also be found in permanent marriage after which, divorce may be given. Rather the evils become ten-fold due to divorce after permanent marriage. An example of this is, suppose you want to travel somewhere and you hire a vehicle for this purpose and start your journey. On the way, you reach a deserted area where there is no place to stay at night or hire some other vehicle and the vehicle owner leaves stranded there and returns. What hell would befall you? Just imagine!

On the contrary, if the vehicle owner tells you beforehand that he would drop you at so and so place and not go ahead, you would have the option to travel with him and plan your future course of action or find some other way if you do not like his terms and conditions.

Which is the better option between the two? Indeed, every sensible person would denounce the vehicle owner in the first case. However, no accusation can be laid on him in the second case because he had already stated the terms beforehand.

The same corollary is found in 'divorce after *Nikah*' and '*Mutah*'. A man performing *Mutah* tells the woman beforehand that he would keep her as a wife, say for five years. After that, she is free, after completing the *Iddah* period. If a woman considers this condition acceptable, she can perform *Mutah* or the discussion would end; but in any case there would no deceit.

On the contrary, if the man does not reveal any of his such plans and a permanent marriage is performed, then if he divorces the wife after two, four or ten days, you can imagine

the condition of the poor woman due to the shipwreck of her life, in the middle of the high seas.

It is clear from this example that those hypothetical defects (none of which has happened till date) described about Mutah are ten-fold in divorce after Nikah. Keeping in mind this example, is the Rizwan editor still prepared to ridicule divorce and permanent marriage also?

In any case, it has become as clear as daylight from the above discourse that there is no difference between the importance and conditions of the elements, conditions and nature of Mutah and permanent marriage from the point of view of reason and jurisprudence. Now a possible question is whether Mutah is permissible and in accordance with the command of God or not? Hence I consider it important to describe the history of Mutah and some related issues so that its historical background is revealed.

Mutah was in vogue since the beginning of Islam

No sect doubts that Mutah was permissible from the beginning of Islam. It was not only permissible but also in vogue. Imam Razi writes in the commentary of the verse of Mutah:

"Everybody is unanimous that Mutah was permissible in the beginning of Islam."¹

These wordings are found in *Tafsir Charaibul Quran*.² Imam Fakhruddin Razi writes in *Tafsir Al-Kabir*:³

"Muslims are unanimous that Mutah was permissible in Islam and no one has a difference of opinion in it."

¹ Tafsir Kabir, Vol. 3, Pg. 195, Egypt

² Vol. 1, Pg. 421

³ Vol. 3, Pg. 196

Similarly, Allamah Khazin Baghdadi, a Sunni scholar writes:

“Nikah of Mutah is to perform Nikah with a woman for a fixed period and Dower. When the stipulated period ends, the marriage ends automatically without divorce. The woman should observe Iddah and husband and wife would not inherit each other. This type of marriage was present in the beginning of Islam.”¹

Where is the space to quote the testimonies of all the Ahle Sunnat scholars? I can just state the references here so that if Rizwan editor desires he can ask someone to read those books and easily understand that Mutah was permissible in the beginning of Islam:

- (1) *Tafsir Malimut Tanzil* by Allamah Baghavi²
- (2) *Sharh Sahih Muslim* by Muhiuddin Abu Zakaria Noori³
- (3) *Neelul Maram min Tafsir Ayatul Ahkam* by Nawab Siddiq Hasan Khan of Bhopal⁴
- (4) *Ifadatush Shuyukh Bamiqdarul Nasikh wal mansookh* by Nawab Siddiq Hasan Khan Bhopal⁵
- (5) *Tafsir Quran* by Sir Syed Ahmad Khan⁶
- (6) *Zaadul Maad* by Allamah Shamsuddin Ibne Qayyim Jawzi Hanbali⁷

¹ *Tafsir Labaabut Tawil fi Maaniyut Tanzil*, Egypt, Vol. 1, Pg. 423

² Egypt, on the margin of *Labaabut Tawil*, Vol. 1, Pg. 423

³ Delhi, Vol. 1, Pg. 450

⁴ Lucknow, Pg. 75

⁵ Kanpur, Pg. 37

⁶ Aligarh, Vol. 2, Pg. 316

⁷ Egypt, Vol. 1, Pg. 401

Permission of Mutah in Quran

The issue that Mutah was in vogue in the beginning of Islam is clearly mentioned in the above references. But it should not be thought that it is an invention of the time of ignorance, which continued till the time of Islam because the existence of Mutah is not found in any history, tradition or narration. It clearly proves that it was a new law promulgated by Islam and its method is also the invention of Islam. The custom of Mutah remained from the beginning of Islam till the last days of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) without any hindrance. Till the time Mecca was conquered and the battle of Autaas or Hunain was also won. Read the later events from the book of Hafiz Jalaluddin Suyuti, *Qaule Khuda wal Muhsanaat*:

"Muslim, Abu Dawood, Tirmidhi and Nasai have narrated from Abu Saeed Khudri; 'We Muslims arrested some married women in Autaas. We considered it abominable to be intimate with married women. Thus, we asked about it from the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) and this verse was revealed at that time:

"And all married women except those whom your right hands possess (this is) Allah's ordinance to you..."¹

That is the women one gets as war-booty are permissible for him. Thus, we considered them lawful."

Tibrani has narrated from Ibne Abbas that after the victory of the battle of Hunain, Muslims got some women of People of the Book as war-booty who were already married. When a person tried to go near a woman, she would talk of her marital status. At last, the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) was asked regarding

¹ Surah Nisa 4:24

this. This verse was revealed at that time that married women are prohibited except those who become your slave-girls...¹

Now read the whole verse and consider it in the light of the above-mentioned circumstances of revelation. Enumerating the prohibited women, it is said at last:

"...And all married women except those whom your right hands possess (this is) Allah's ordinance to you, and lawful for you are (all women) besides those, provided that you seek (them) with your property, taking (them) in marriage not committing fornication. Then as to those whom you profit by, give them their dowries as appointed; and there is no blame on you about what you mutually agree after what is appointed."²

The method of description in this verse clearly shows that the order of permission of Mutah is not given here for the first time but the actual purpose of command is that so and so are prohibited women and married women are included in it. However, those married women who become one's slave-girls are lawful. Incidentally a special order is given regarding Mutah that when one performs Mutah with permitted women, he should immediately give the dower to her. It is possible to give dower later on if the wife agrees in permanent marriage. It is called 'Mehr-e-Mojal' (delayed dower). However, there is no such option in Mutah. Later on, however it is commanded that if both agree, the dower and period of Mutah can be increased or decreased.

By the way, this verse verifies the command of Mutah and all scholars and commentators, Shia or Sunni, and all followers of companions consider this verse to be related to Mutah. The

¹ Lubabun Nuqool fi Asbaabun Nuzul, Egypt, on the margin of Tanwirul Miqyas Pg. 77

² Surah Nisa 4:24

following excerpts from the books of Ahle Sunnat support my claim:

(1) Nawab Siddiq Hasan Khan says:

Scholars have a difference of opinion regarding the meaning of this verse. Hasan and Mujahid have said that it means one should pay the dower to women with whom one has fulfilled his physical desires after Nikah. People (majority of them) say that this verse only implies Mutah.¹

After this, he writes in the commentary of:

*"There is no blame on you if you divorce women when you have not touched them or appointed for them a portion..."*²

"According to the majority of scholars who believe this verse to be related to Mutah, it means that if a husband and wife agree there is no harm in increase or decrease in the period of Mutah or dower."³

(2) He also writes in one of his other works about the same topic:

According to a majority, this verse implies Mutah.⁴

(3) Qazi Thanauallah Panipati writes in the commentary of this verse:

A group believes that 'Itimnaa' in this verse means Mutah.⁵

(4) The writer of *Tafsir Khazin* says:

¹ Neelul Maraam min Tafsir Ayaatil Ahkam, Pg. 75

² Surah Baqarah 2:236

³ Pg. 76

⁴ Ifadatush Shuyookh, Pg. 37

⁵ Tafsir Mazhari, Pg. 572

A community has said that the command of Mutah is stated in this verse.¹

*Allamah Baghavi writes in Tafsir Malimut Tanzil:*²

Scholars have a difference of opinion about the meaning of this verse. Hasan and Mujahid say that it means that one should pay the dower to women with whom one has fulfilled his physical desires after Nikah, as their compensation. Other scholars believe that it implies Mutah.³

Incidentally, make a note that in all writings of Ahle Sunnat scholars, Mutah is called as 'Nikah of Mutah' or 'marriage of Mutah' and compare it to the statement of the Rizwan editor that 'Mutah means to use women after giving some money without Nikah', and recite a Fatiha (say farewell) to his knowledge and wisdom.

(5) Sir Syed Ahmad Khan writes in his commentary about this verse:

This verse is also among verses in whose commentary I have a difference of opinion with other scholars and commentators. All commentators call this as the verse of Mutah i.e. the permission of Mutah is given in this verse.

(6) Imam Fakhruddin Razi has given considerable explanation in the commentary of this verse. He writes:

"Those who consider Mutah permissible argue through this verse in many ways. First evidence is this verse itself:

¹ Tafsir Khazin, Vol. 1, Pg. 423

² Vol. 1

³ Tafsir Malimut Tanzil, on the margins of Tafsir Khazin, Egypt. Pg. 423

"...provided that you seek (them) with your property, taking (them) in marriage not committing fornication. Then as to those whom you profit by, give them their dowries..."¹

There are two ways of argument through this verse:

First, we can say that both permanent Nikah and Mutah are included in this verse because it is a saying of God, 'Seek women through your wealth.' Both the aspects are included in it. One can either keep the woman for an unlimited period of time or for a limited period. If both these aspects are included in it, the saying of God that, 'All women are permissible for you except those in the prohibited degree that you seek them through your wealth', is a proof of lawfulness of both kinds (permanent Nikah and Mutah) i.e. Mutah is also lawful like permanent marriage.

Second, we can say that this verse is revealed for Mutah only and it has no relation with permanent marriage. There are a number of reasons for it as follows:

The first reason is the narration that Ubayy Ibne Kaab (who was the chief of the reciters of Quran and an elite scribe) used to add 'Ila ajalim musammah' (for a stipulated period) to this verse i.e. 'Pay the dower of the woman immediately, with whom you have performed Mutah for a fixed period of time'. Abdullah Ibne Abbas also used to read this verse similarly and the people of Islam did not consider their recitation wrong. As if they were united over the correctness of this recitation. When the correctness of this recitation is proved through unanimity the permission of Mutah is also evident."

This is an open support of the belief of distortion of Quran by Allamah Fakhruddin Razi. The editor of Rizwan should be

¹ Surah Nisa 4:24

ashamed of his own misdeeds and keep aloof from accusing the Shias of distortion.

The second reason is that it is only mentioned in the verse that, 'It is permissible for you that you seek them through your wealth'. And after that God has commanded to pay their dower. This shows that seeking them just through wealth makes the relationship lawful. Such a condition is found in Mutah only. Thus, Nikah of Mutah is permissible.

After these arguments, let me present the reply of those who do not consider it permissible:

"The reply to the first argument is that Allah has discussed about those women with whom Nikah is prohibited that, 'Your mothers are unlawful of you...(and so forth)' and it is said in the end, 'Except them all women are permissible for you'. The same act is permitted here, which was prohibited with those women in the prohibited degree. As only Nikah with mahrams was prohibited, only Nikah is permitted with other women (and not Mutah).

Secondly, God has commanded it along with piety and piety is found in the proper Nikah only.

Thirdly, God has commanded it without evil deeds. God has called 'adultery' as 'Safah' because it implies 'Safh-e-Maa' (wasting of semen) in it while other aims of Nikah are not fulfilled. As there is no other purpose than satisfying one's desires in Mutah, it is also a 'Safah' (an evil deed)."

Abu Bakr Razi has made these statements as arguments against the supporters of Mutah.¹

¹ Tafsir Madhkoor, Pg. 197

However, these three answers are unacceptable to Imam Fakhruddin Razi himself. Thus, he writes after that:

"But the first point presented by Abu Bakr Razi is that at first, God has discussed about those women with whom not only permanent marriage but also intimate relations are prohibited. Then it is said that except those, other women are permissible. That is, one can maintain intimate relations with other women (be it through permanent marriage, Nikah of Mutah or by keeping as a slave-girl etc.). Then defect is there in this explanation of the supporter of Mutah?

The second point stated by Abu Bakr Razi is that piety is not found without a correct Nikah (that is permanent marriage). He has not presented any proof of this fact.

Thirdly, he says that fornication is called 'safah' because it implies just 'Safh-e-maa' (fulfilling the desire). Actually, it is not so in Mutah because the desire is fulfilled in Mutah in such a way that it is within the circle of Islamic law and there is permission from God. Thus, how can it be called adultery? How can a person considering Mutah prohibited be in the circle of Islamic law? We would say that the real debate is that whether Mutah is prohibited or not. Hence, how did you, in the beginning itself, say that Mutah is prohibited (it is as if one presents just his claim as proof)? Hence, it is proved that the opinion of Abu Bakr Razi is weak and unacceptable."

After these answers, Imam Razi has written his last decision based on comparative study as follows:

"And, the only thing to be relied upon in this debate is that we say that we do not deny that Mutah was legal. We can only say that it was abrogated. On this basis, if a proof of lawfulness of

Mutah is found in this verse, it does not affect our aim in any way."¹

It is clear that the proof of Mutah through this verse is such an established fact that Imam Razi had to believe in it at last. As for its abrogation, I will shed light on it later on.

The recitation of 'Ila ajalim musammaa' (for a stated period)

We have discussed above that scholars of 'recitation and commentary' like Ubayy bin Kaab and Abdullah bin Abbas used to read the verse of Mutah along with 'Ila ajalim musammaa' (i.e. pay the dower immediately to one with whom you perform Mutah for a stated period'). Maybe, this saying will put the Rizwan editor in palpitation. Hence, let me inform that this sentence 'Ila ajalim musammaa' was not present in the Quran according to Shias. At the most, we can consider it as a 'marginal commentary' written by those companions as an explanatory note. However, according to Imam Razi, Ahle Sunnat were not deniers of this recitation nor are they now. I have presented innumerable proofs of their belief in distortion of Quran in a previous chapter. According to Razi, they are unanimous over this. Hence, they consider those sentences to be part of Quran. Hafiz Ibne Jurair Tabari has calculated the list of those narrators, in detail, who considered the words, 'Ila ajalim musammaa' part of Quran in his book, *Jameul Bayan*. After congratulating the Rizwan editor for the belief in distortion of Quran, I mention the names of those narrators in brief as follows:

- 1) Imam Suda read this verse as: 'Then as to those whom you profit by *for a prescribed time*'. Then he mentions all the laws of Mutah. This tradition is narrated from Hafiz

¹ Tafsir Madhkur, Pg. 197

Tabarsi from Muhammad bin Al-Husain from Ahmad bin Mufazzal from Ibaat from al-Suda.

- 2) Mujahid (whom some people mistakenly consider a denier of Mutah) after reading this verse, said that this verse implies the Nikah of Mutah. This is narrated from Muhammad bin Umar from Abi Asim from Isa from Ibne Ubayy Bakheeh from Mujahid.
- 3) Abdullah bin Abbas (who is called as the rabbi of the Islamic nation, Jurist of Quran and the Divine Scholar) used to read this verse along with 'Ila ajalim musammaa' (for a stipulated period) and he supported the lawfulness of Mutah strongly.

Narrators who narrate differing traditions of Ibne Abbas on this topic are: Abu Kuraib, Yahya bin Isa, Naseer bin Abil Ashath, Habib bin Abi Thabit, Abu Thabit, Hamid bin Musa'dah, Bushr bin Mufazzal, Dawood, Abu Nazarah, Ibne Muthanna, Abdul A'ala, Muhammad bin Ja'far, Shayba, Abu Salmah, Abu Dawood, Abu Ishaq bin Umar, Ibne Abil Adi, Khilad bin Aslam and Nazr.

Hafiz Suyuti has given the reference of following writers in *Tafsir Itqan* in addition to those mentioned above:

Abd bin Hamid, Ibne Ambaari and Imam Hakim in *Mustadrak*. They have agreed that those narrations of Ibne Abbas are true.

In many of these narrations there is an emphasizing arrangement and declaration: i.e. he said thrice, "By Allah! He has revealed this verse in this way only."

- 4) Both Qatadah and Abdullah bin Abbas say that they have seen this verse along with the words 'Ila ajalim musammaa' (till a stated term) in the copy of a famous reciter companion like Ubayy bin Kaab. The narrators of

Ibne Abbas are already mentioned while following narrators have narrated this tradition from Qatadah:

- 5) Ibne Bashir, Abdul A'ala and Saeed. It is also narrated by Abd bin Hamid. Refer *Tafsir Jameul Bayan* of Imam Jurair Tabari¹ and *Tafsir Gharaibul Quran*.² Saeed bin Jubair, a famous follower of companion himself also used to read this verse along with 'Ila ajalim musammaa' (till a stated term). The chain of this narration is: Hafiz Tabari, Muthanna, Abu Naeem, Isa bin Imrul Qaariyul Asadee, Amr bin Marah, Saeed bin Jubair. All these references and narrations are taken from *Jameul Bayan*.³
- 6) Shaykhul Islam Shaukani writes in *Neel Al-Antaar*⁴ about Abdullah bin Masud that his recitation included 'Ila ajalim musammaa' (till a stated term). Imam Nawawi writes in *Sharh Muslim* that he recited with 'Ila ajalim musammaa' (till a stated term). It should be clear that a saying of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) regarding Ubayy bin Kaab and Ibne Masud is present in *Tafsir Itqan* that: "Learn the Quran from four people viz. Abdullah bin Masud, Saalim, Maaz and Ubayy bin Kaab."

I emphasize that the recitation of 'Ila ajalim musammaa' (till a stated term) is not rare, rather the Ahle Sunnat themselves are unanimous on it, according to Razi. Many obedient companions, reciters of Quran and narrators of traditions used to read the verse in the same way. It seems from the narration

¹ Vol. 5, Pg. 9

² Vol. 1, Pg. 22

³ Egypt, Vol. 5, Pg. 9

⁴ Vol. 6, Pg. 48

of Tibrani and Baihaqi from Ibne Abbas that this verse was commonly read in the same way during the time of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.). It was said, "People used to read this verse with a limited period of time and 'Ila ajalim musammaa' (till a stated term) was also read."

If Ahle Sunnat obey the commandments of rare recitations it is obligatory for them to obey this famous and unanimous recitation. A note on obeying rare recitation is present in *Tafsir Itqan*:

"Qazi Abu 'Tayyab, Qazi Husain, Allamah Roobani and Allamah Rafai have said that rare recitation will be given the rank of solitary report and acted upon. Allamah Ibne Sabaki has regarded this saying correct in *Jameul Jawama* and *Sharh Mukhtasar*. The companions protested the cutting off of the hands of thief through this recitation of Ibne Masud and Imam Abu Hanifah also believes the same."

If a rare recitation of Ibne Masud was followed, why is it not obligatory to obey this when apart from Ibne Masud, loyal companions like Ubayy bin Kaab, Abdullah bin Abbas, Qatadah, Saeed bin Jubair and Suda and according to Ibne Abbas, all the companions of Prophet (s.a.w.s.) and according to Imam Razi whole community is unanimous on this recitation ('Ila ajalim musammaa')? Why is it considered prohibited? The Rizwan editor should provide the answer keeping the narrations, commentaries and principles of jurisprudence in his mind.

Now we come to the point.

I was describing the history of Mutah. The discussion of the revelation of the verse of Mutah started and the debate of its recitation began. Anyway, Mutah was in vogue peacefully during the time of Prophet (s.a.w.s.) and the holy companions used to act on it during the time of the first caliph. Remarkably,

the daughter of the caliph, mother of faithfuls, Ayesha's elder sister, Asma binte Abi Bakr had established Mutah with Zubair at a simple dower of two Yemeni chadors.¹

Even during the period of Umar considerable time passed while Mutah was commonly practiced. Suddenly an incident occurred as a result of which the second caliph developed a dislike of Mutah in his heart. The incident is as follows:

- 1) Abdur Razzaq has narrated the incident of Amr bin Hareeth from Jubair in his book. Jubair states that the companion, Amr bin Hareeth went to Kufa and performed Mutah with a slave-girl and she became pregnant. When caliph Umar asked Amr bin Hareeth regarding this, the latter confessed and the former prohibited Mutah immediately.²
- 2) Abdur Razzaq has narrated from Ibne Abbas through a correct chain that nothing except Umme Arakah made the caliph Umar hostile to Mutah. She became pregnant and when Umar asked, "From where did this come?" She said, "Salmah bin Umayyah performed Mutah with me". According to the narration of Abu Al-Zubair, it was Mabad bin Umayyah instead of Salmah bin Umayyah in this incident.³
- 3) Umar bin Shabah states that Salmah bin Umayyah performed Mutah with the slave-girl of Hakim bin Umayyah bin Auqas, Aslama. A child was born to her but Salmah rejected him. After saying this, Ibne Kabi

¹ Covering sheets

² Fathul Bari Sharh Sahih Bukhari, Vol. 9, Pg. 138

³ Fathul Bari Sharh Sahih Bukhari, Vol. 9, Pg. 138

has also said that when caliph Umar came to know about this incident, he prohibited Mutah.¹

- 4) It is narrated from Urwah bin Zubair that Khawla binte Hakim came to caliph Umar and said that Rabia bin Umayyah performed Mutah with a minor girl and she became pregnant. Caliph Umar became surly and came out pulling at his cloak and saying, "Is this Mutah? If I would have prohibited it before I could have stoned them now."²

The compiler of *Tafsirul Ayaat* has baselessly derived from the above narration of *Muwatta* in his book *Madhkur*,³ that Rabia bin Umayyah had performed Mutah with a lady from the family of the second caliph and hence, the caliph was infuriated. According to me, this conclusion is not justified. It is already discussed above that the daughter of the first caliph had performed Mutah with Zubair out of which, Abdullah bin Zubair was born. This shows that women of reputed families used to perform Mutah freely during those times. There are no apparent conditions, which prove that caliph Abu Bakr disliked this act of his daughter. Then why should caliph Umar, who is regarded subordinate in rank to him, hate this permissible act for the ladies of his house?

Anyway, I do not want to argue as to which of the above incidents is true. The fact is that caliph Umar got angry over a displeasing incident and he stopped the practice of Mutah after half the period of his caliphate had passed. Allamah Qaushiji, an Ahle Sunnat scholar writes in *Sharh Tajwid*:

¹ Isabah fi Marefatul Sahaba, Vol. 2, Pg. 63, Egypt

² Muwatta Imam Malik Vol. 2, Pg. 30, Egypt

³ Pg. 298

Caliph Umar ascended the pulpit and said:

"O people! Three things were in vogue during the time of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) but I abolish them and consider them unlawful. I would punish one who commits them. They are performing Mutah with women, Mutah of Hajj and saying 'Hayya alaa khairil amal'¹ in the prayer-call (Azaan)."

Imam Razi writes: It is narrated from caliph Umar that he said in a sermon that Mutah of Hajj and Mutah with women was in vogue during the time of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) but he was prohibiting them and would punish anyone who performs them.²

The books of Ahle Sunnat are full of innumerable narrations of such incidents on this topic. Here are some more references:

(1) *Kanzul Ummal*³

The narrations in this book are taken from the following sources:

- a) Abu Salih scribe of Laith Samarqandi
- b) Tahawi
- c) Ibne Jurair Tabari
- d) Ibne Asakir
- e) *Zaad Al-Maad* by Allamah Ibne Qayyim⁴

These are historical events, which cannot be denied by any Islamic sect. I have presented them in a chronological order. It

¹ Hasten to the best of the deeds

² Tafsir Kabir, Vol. 3, Pg. 195, Egypt

³ Vol. 3

⁴ Vol. 1, Pg. 243

is as clear as daylight that there was no proof of prohibition of Mutah till the first half of the period of caliphate of the second caliph. The prohibition of Mutah was same as other new laws declared by him from the pulpit. When objected, he used to say, "Everybody including women behind veil are more aware of Islamic laws than Umar."

There were people who knew that acts permitted by Muhammad are permitted till the Day of Judgment and those prohibited by Muhammad are prohibited till the Day of Judgment. They knew that no one, be it a common man or a caliph, has any right to amend the Islamic laws. They were not ready to respect this declaration of caliph Umar. Even Abdullah bin Umar, his own son, did not consider this saying worthy of attention: "I prohibit Mutah with women and Mutah of Hajj." Read this narration of *Sahih Tirmidhi* which is certified 'correct' by Hafiz Tirmidhi:

Salim bin Abdullah said to Ibne Shahab, "I heard that a Syrian asked Abdullah bin Umar about Mutah of Hajj. Abdullah bin Umar said that it was permissible. The Syrian said that the latter's father had prohibited it. Abdullah bin Umar said, 'My father prohibited it but the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) used to practice it. Then, should one obey my father or the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.)? What is your opinion?' The Syrian said that one should obey the command of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.)." Imam Tirmidhi says that this tradition is 'good' and 'correct'.¹

Similarly, Urwah bin Zubair objected to Abdullah bin Abbas regarding Mutah of Hajj that the latter considered it permissible while Abu Bakr and Umar did not. The

¹ Sahih Tirmidhi, Pg. 106, Nawal Kishor Press, Zaad Al-Maad, Allamah Ibne Qayyim, Vol. 1, Pg. 215

conversation of that time is quoted in *Kanzul Ummal*,¹ in brief. However, Allamah Ibne Qayyim has quoted it in detail in *Zaadul Maad*² and also expressed some of his views:

"Urwah said, 'But Abu Bakr and Umar did not permit it.' Ibne Abbas said, 'By Allah, you will not stop from waywardness till Allah sends chastisement on you. I am informing you about the command of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) and you are talking about Abu Bakr and Umar!' Urwah said, 'Abu Bakr and Umar knew the Sunnah (practice) of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) better than you and they were more obedient.'"

After quoting this conversation, the Allamah writes:

"And we can tell Urwah that Ibne Abbas knew the Sunnah of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) more than him and was better than him. Ibne Abbas was better than him in the matter of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.), Abu Bakr and Umar and no Muslim can doubt it."

It is quoted on Pg. 215 of the book, *Mudhkur* after this conversation, 'This is the opinion of scholars'. Then, he further argues and writes:

"After all, why did Ibne Abbas and Abdullah bin Umar not say that Abu Bakr and Umar knew the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) better than they did (so that it is necessary to follow them)? Actually, no obedient companion can agree to oppose the Nass (explicit order) of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) through this answer. They knew the commands of Allah and His Prophet (s.a.w.s.) better. They feared Allah and hence, did not subordinate the saying of an infallible (Prophet) to the sayings of non-infallibles."

¹ Vol. 8, Pg. 293

² Vol. 1, Pg. 219

This was the reason that companions like Imam Ali (s), Abdullah bin Abbas, Imran bin Hasin, Ubayy Ibne Kaab, Abdullah bin Masud, Jabir bin Abdullah Ansari, Abu Saeed Khudri, Amir Muawiyah, Abu Saeed, Salmah Ibne Umayyah bin Khalaf, Mabad bin Umayyah bin Khalaf, Amr bin Hareeth, Asma binte Abi Bakr and followers of companions like Tawus, Saeed bin Jubair, Ataa, all the jurists of Mecca, people of Yemen and Ibne Juraih considered Mutah lawful in spite of the prohibition of caliph Umar. They did not respect the saying of caliph Umar against the Divine command and order of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.). Please read the following:

- A) Allamah Ibne Jazm states that the following companions considered Mutah permissible even after the passing away of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.):

Ibne Masud, Muawiyah, Abu Saeed, Ibne Abbas, Salmah bin Umayyah, Jabir bin Abdullah, Amr bin Hareeth. It is narrated from Jabir that during the whole life of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) and Abu Bakr and in half the period of the caliphate of Umar, all companions practiced Mutah.¹

- B) Ibne Jazm has narrated from companions other than Ibne Abbas in *Muhli* and said that after the Prophet (s.a.w.s.), a large group of senior companions was formed over the lawfulness of Mutah. They include and the following companions:

Asma binte Abi Bakr, Jabir bin Abdullah, Ibne Masud, Ibne Abbas, Muawiyah, Amr bin Hareeth, Abu Saeed, Salmah bin Umayyah bin Khalaf, Mabad bin Umayyah bin Khalaf. Jabir

¹ Fathul Bari Sharh Sahih Bukhari, Vol. 9, Pg. 138

states that all the companions considered Mutah lawful during the time of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.).¹

- C) Imam Ali (s) said, "If Umar had not prevented people from Mutah, except an unfortunate evil one, none would have committed fornication."²
- D) Companion Imran bin Hasin says that the verse of Mutah was revealed in the Book of Allah. No such verse was revealed after that which could have abrogated it. The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) permitted us and we performed Mutah accordingly. The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) passed away but did not prohibit us from it. After that, a person (i.e. Caliph Umar) said whatever he pleased.³
- E) Jabir bin Abdullah says that during the time of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) and the first caliph they used to perform Mutah for as many days as they wanted by giving a handful of dates or flour. Later on, caliph Umar prohibited Mutah due to the incident of Amr bin Hareeth.⁴
- F) Companion Abu Saeed says that anyone among them could perform Mutah by giving a cup of parched barley meal (sattu).

¹ Neelul Autaar, Vol. 6, Pg. 44

² Tafsir Jameul Bayan, by Hafiz Ibne Jurair Tabari Vol. 5, Pg. 9

³ Tafsir Kabir, Vol. 3, Pg. 95 and Tafsir Gharaibul Quran, Allamah Nishapuri

⁴ Sahih Muslim, Vol. 1, Pg. 45, Delhi

Abu Saeed also says, "We used to perform Mutah by giving a piece of cloth during the time of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.)."¹

- G) Allamah Ibnul Barr says, "People of Mecca and Yemen are having a similar ideology as that of Ibne Abbas regarding the lawfulness of Mutah." Ibne Jazm has also said that followers (Tabi'in) like Tawus, Saeed bin Jubair, Ataa and all the jurists of Mecca considered Mutah lawful.²
- H) Followers of companions like Tawus, Ataa, Saeed bin Jubair and all the jurists of Mecca considered Mutah lawful. Ibne Juraih, a jurist of Mecca was among those famous persons who considered Mutah lawful.³

This was the condition of scholars who had the knowledge of truth and the secrets of Islamic law. They were masters in jurisprudence, traditions, commentary and recitation. But even such people are not rare who went all the way to justify the acts of their leaders

A large group tried their best to find a way out of the prohibition of Mutah by the second caliph. While the caliph himself had given this explanation at the time of his declaration:

"Two Mutas (Mutah of Hajj and Mutah with women) were in vogue during the time of Prophet (s.a.w.s.). I prohibit them and would punish one who commits them."⁴

¹ Kanzul Ummal, Vol. 7, Pg. 295

² Fathul Bari Sharh Sahih Bukhari, Vol. 9, Pg. 138

³ Neelul Autaar, by Allamah Shaukani Vol. 6, Pg. 44

⁴ Tafsir Kabir, Vol. 3, Pg. 195

However, some scholars and excellent personalities say that Mubah was abrogated during the time of Prophet (s.a.w.s.) himself and caliph Umar declared it openly. Before abrogating a command of Quran, following questions naturally come to one's mind:

- (1) Was this order abrogated through a verse or a tradition?
- (2) Was the abrogating verse revealed before or after its revelation?
- (3) Whether the abrogating verse is really contradicting the command or not?
- (4) Can a tradition abrogate the command of a Quranic verse?
- (5) Was the abrogating tradition revealed before that command or after it?
- (6) Is the abrogating tradition really opposed to the command of that Quranic verse or not?
- (7) If the tradition is contradicting the command, does it have enough authenticity that the command of a verse be considered abrogated?

Come let us hear the replies to these questions from people who support the abrogation of the command of Mubah.

First Question

That is, what is the abrogator of this verse? There is a vast difference of opinion in it.

Many people say that this verse was abrogated by a saying of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) (the sayings will be discussed later). While Imam Shafei and others believe that this order was abrogated only by another verse. However there is a difference of opinion in the selection of this verse.

1) Imam Shafei says:

"The abrogator of the verse of Mutah is this verse of Surah Momin: 'And who guard their private parts, Except before their mates or those whom their right hands possess, for they surely are not blamable.'¹ because a woman with whom Mutah is performed is neither a wife nor a slave-girl.

2) It is narrated from Ataa Khorasani that: The verse of Mutah was abrogated by this saying: "O Prophet! When you divorce women, divorce them with Iddah." (i.e. they should observe Iddah).

3) Caliph Umar said: "Mutah was abrogated by Nikah, divorce, Iddah and inheritance."

All three sayings are quoted in *Tafsir Lubaabut Tawil*² by Allamah Khazin Baghdadi. The fourth saying is of Allamah Ibne Jazm, which he has quoted in his book, *Marefatun Nasikh wal Mansookh*:

"The abrogators of Mutah are those verses in which a wife is entitled to an eighth or fourth part of inheritance because the Mutah wife is not entitled to inheritance."

It would be better to describe the conditions of abrogation before writing my opinions on these sayings.

Allamah Ibne Qayyim Jawzi says: The abrogation of a command depends on four conditions and those who consider that Mutah of Hajj is abrogated cannot fulfill even a single condition. Firstly, a Nass (text) or explicit order should be present for abrogation. Secondly, that another Nass or explicit order should be contradictory to the former command. Thirdly,

¹ Surah Mominoon 23:5-6

² Vol. 1, Pg. 423

that Nass should be strong enough to stand against the proofs of the first command. Fourthly, that contradictory order should have been issued after the first one.¹

He further explains:

“When we see the companions of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) that they have a difference of opinion regarding an issue about which it is proved that the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) himself did it or ordered it and some companions say that it was abrogated later on or it was not general but a restricted one while other companions say that the order is not abrogated but still present; then a saying of one who supports or considers it restricted will not be accepted if it is against Islamic law and without a proof. At the most, both the sayings will contradict each other and the decision of their dispute would rest on ‘proof’.

When a dispute arises, it is obligatory to turn towards Allah and His Messenger (s.a.w.s.) according to the command of Quran (and it should be taken according to the saying and practice of Messenger only and not due to trust others’ sayings. Thus, if Abu Zar or Uthman say that Mutah of Hajj is abrogated or it is restricted while Abu Musa and Abdullah bin Abbas say that it is permissible and its command is general, the responsibility of presenting a proof falls on one who claims it to be abrogated.”²

It shows that it is the responsibility of Ahle Sunnat to present a proof, since it is they who believe in the abrogation of Mutah. Also that proof should fulfill all the conditions. We Shias know that it was in vogue in the time of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) and is present even today. The purpose is that the liability of

¹ Zaadul Maad, Vol. 1, Pg. 212

² Zaadul Maad, Vol. 1, Pg. 213

proving the prohibition of Mutah is on Ahle Sunnat. None of the verses presented by them as proofs of abrogation fulfill the required conditions as would become clear later on.

Second and Third Questions

It is necessary to discuss both these questions together in order to maintain sequence. The first verse, which is alleged to be the verse of abrogation of Mutah is:

*"And who guard their private parts, except before their mates or those whom their right hands possess, for they surely are not blamable"*¹

Firstly, this verse was revealed long before the verse of Mutah. As Surah Mominoon was revealed in Mecca while verse of Mutah was revealed approximately eight years after Hijrat. How can a verse revealed in Mecca be an abrogator of a verse revealed a number of years later?

Secondly, according to all those who support the lawfulness of Mutah, the Mutah wife is a spouse. Then how can the argument of Shafei and Allamah Ibne Jawzi: "As a woman of Mutah is neither a wife nor a slave-girl while relations with only wife and slave-girl are permitted in this verse. Hence, relations with a woman of Mutah are prohibited" be considered correct? Everybody can understand it because we consider the woman of Mutah, a wife. A detailed debate is already over in the forgone pages. According to the partisans of Mutah, a woman of Mutah is a wife just as is she is in a permanent marriage.

Thus, it is proved that neither this verse (which is called abrogator) was revealed after the verse of Mutah nor does it oppose the order of Mutah. Due to this, it is impossible to call

¹ 23:5-6

it abrogator. Hence, Allamah Zamakhshari of Ahle Sunnat has quoted in the exegesis of this verse in his *Tafsir Kashaf*:

“If you ask me whether there is any proof of prohibition of Mutah in this verse or not, I would reply in the negative. Since a woman who has performed the Nikah of Mutah (if Mutah is permissible), is also included in marriage.”¹

The second verse is:

*“O Prophet! When you divorce women, divorce them for their prescribed time...”*²

That is, the women should observe Iddah.

Firstly, the Ahle Sunnat do not present an evidence that this verse was revealed after the command of Mutah even though its responsibility rests on them alone while it is known that the practice of divorce was in vogue from the beginning of Islam. It did not start after the battle of Hunain that somebody could say that this verse was revealed after the order of Mutah.

Secondly, implying prohibition of Mutah through this verse is just like shooting ‘arrows’ in the dark. It is neither commanded in this verse that divorce is compulsory for all marriages so that one can present a proof that as there is no divorce in Mutah, it is not lawful nor anyone says that Iddah is not necessary after the completion of the period of Mutah so that it could be claimed that since there is no Iddah in Mutah, it is unlawful.

The only command in this verse is: “It is obligatory for a woman to observe Iddah after divorce.” Where is the explanation in this verse that to which women and when, a

¹ Tafsir Kashaf, Vol. 2, Pg. 287

² Surah Talaq 65:1

divorce be given? Hence a pair of questions arises against the Ahle Sunnat in this verse also.

Similarly, according to the fourth saying, the verse of inheritance is an abrogator of the command of Mutah because there is no inheritance in Mutah. Firstly, thinking that the verses of inheritance were revealed after the verse of Mutah is the best example of ignorance of Islamic History. Since the verses of inheritance were revealed during the early times of Hijrat¹ while the command of Mutah was issued after the battle of Hunain or Autaas.

Secondly, there is a difference of opinion about the inheritance of a Mutah wife. Scholars who grant the right to inheritance to a Mutah wife would consider this proof of Allamah Ibne Hazm absolutely invalid.

Also, even those who do not support the inheritance of the Mutah wife do not say that she is not a spouse, and hence, she would not receive inheritance but they say that the verse of inheritance is only about a permanent wife.

Since their proofs show that the verse of inheritance indicates the order of a special category just as the verse of divorce is revealed for a permanent wife only and has no connection with the Mutah wife. So, can anyone raise an objection to it? This objection can surely be raised only when a category of permanent wives is deprived of the right to inheritance. For example, a killer of husband is deprived of the right to inheritance. However, Ahle Sunnat scholars do not object at that time and peacefully accept it. Since it is definitely proved from traditions that even though a killer wife is considered a spouse, she is not entitled to inheritance.

¹ The Prophet's migration to Medina

To conclude, when every wife, in spite of being a spouse does not get inheritance how can this argument be correct that since a Mutah wife does not inherit, she is not a spouse at all?

Thus, both questions regarding this verse fall against the sense taken by Ahle Sunnat. As for the saying of caliph Umar that Nikah, divorce, Iddah and inheritance together abrogate Mutah, firstly, I have a doubt in this matter. How can a person who says, "I prohibit these acts even though they both were in vogue during the time of Prophet (s.a.w.s.)," say that this command is abrogated by so and so verses? Since belief in both these things would imply that verses of prohibition of Mutah were revealed continuously but, God forbid, the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) did not pay any attention to them and a sin remained in vogue.

Secondly, a long discussion is already over regarding the abrogation by the verse of divorce, verse of Iddah and verse of inheritance. While the thought of abrogation of the command of Mutah through the verse of Nikah is very amusing because just as Nikah includes the permanent marriage, it also includes Mutah, as Allamah Zamakhshari has said. With a word that imagines the prohibition of permanent and temporary marriage, it shows the knowledge of the narrator.

In addition to this, the revelation of the verse of Nikah before battle of Hunain or Autaas is established because the issue of Nikah was clarified in the beginning of Islam itself. That is why Sir Syed Ahmad Khan says:

"Majority of Muslims say that there is permission for Mutah in this verse without a doubt, but this command was abrogated.

However, the objection is weak according to me because of the verses selected for the abrogation of this order."¹

Since it was not possible to prove the abrogation of the command of Mutah through Quranic verses, the Ahle Sunnat tried to abrogate it through traditions. Nevertheless, the condition is same here too. No two people agree over a saying. The wonder of this divine saying is evident:

*"Do they not then meditate on the Quran? And if it were from any other than Allah, they would have found in it many a discrepancy."*²

Fourth Question

Before presenting these narrations, one should know that according to the majority of Ahle Sunnat scholars, the abrogation of the verses of Quran is not possible through traditions. The sect of Imam Shafei says:

*"According to Shafei religion, Sunnah (traditions) cannot abrogate verses of Quran."*³

Thus, after it is proved that the verse of Mutah is not abrogated by any other verse, we can at least consider the followers of Imam Shafei believers in lawfulness of Mutah. As for Hanafi and other such people, who believe that a tradition can abrogate the Quran, our discussion would be aimed them only. The decision of remaining three questions associated with traditions will be easily finalized by the discoveries of Ahle Sunnat only.

¹ Tafsir Quran, Sir Syed Ahmad Khan, Vol. 2, Pg. 216

² Surah Nisa 4:82

³ Tafsir Lubaabut Tawil, Allamah Khazin Baghdadi Vol. 1, Pg. 423

The discussion would become very lengthy if all the traditions are presented separately. Hence, I present their summary in the form of discussions of Ahle Sunnat scholars.

- (1) Allamah Nawawi has quoted the following paragraphs of Qazi Ayaz in *Sharh Sahih Muslim*:

“Imam Muslim has narrated from Salmah bin Akoo that Mutah was legalized in the battle of Autaas. It is narrated from Sabrah that it was legalized on the day of the Meccan conquest. Autaas and conquest of Mecca have the same meaning. Then it was made unlawful on the same day. According to a tradition from Imam Ali (s), Mutah was made unlawful in the battle of Khyber and this battle was fought before the conquest of Mecca.

Apart from Imam Muslim, others have narrated from Imam Ali (s) that the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) prohibited Mutah in the battle of Tabuk. The chain of this narration is: Ishaq bin Rashid, Zuhri, Abdullah bin Muhammad Hanafiyyah, Muhammad Hanafiyyah, Imam Ali (s). However, no one has obeyed this narration and Ishaq bin Rashid has made a mistake in it. Since this same narration is quoted by Imam Malik in *Muwatta* from the chain of Zuhri. It is also quoted by Sufyan bin Uyinnah, Amri, Yunus etc. There is a mention of Khyber in it. Even Imam Muslim has quoted this narration from the chain of Imam Zuhri about the prohibition in Khyber only and it is true.

Abu Dawood has narrated from Sabrah Jehni that Mutah was prohibited in the Farewell Hajj¹. According to Abu Dawood, it is the most correct saying among all the narrations. It is also narrated from Sabrah that Mutah was legalized at the time of the Farewell Hajj. Then the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) immediately prohibited it till the Day of Judgment.

¹ Arabic = Hajjatul Wada'

Fifth saying: And it is narrated from Hasan Basri that Mutah was never legalized except at the time of Umratul Qaza¹. It is worthy of discussion that this narration is also from Sabrah only. However, Imam Muslim has not discussed the limitation of time in any narration of Sabrah except in the narration of Muhammad bin Saeed, Ishaq bin Ibrahim, Yahya bin Yahya in which, he has mentioned that prohibition of Mutah was done at the time of the conquest of Mecca.

According to the saying of the scholars of traditions, a narration, which says that Mutah was legalized at the time of the Farewell Hajj is a mistake of the narrator because there was no need to make it lawful on that day nor were the companions alone and away from women. Most of the companions had come to Hajj along with their spouses hence what was the need to legalize Mutah? The fact is that only prohibition was made at the time of the Farewell Hajj as found in many narrations. The revival of prohibition was because the people had gathered in large numbers and the religion was reaching completion. Islamic law was becoming perfect (so that those present there may inform the absentees about these laws). Apart from the prohibition of Mutah, he had once again explained the permissible and prohibited acts on that day. He made the absolute prohibition on Mutah evident by saying, "Now this order is prohibited till the Day of Judgment."

However Qazi Ayaz said, that "the mention of different venues in different traditions, like the battle of Khyber, 'Umrah Qaza', conquest of Mecca or Autaas, shows the possibility that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) prohibited Mutah on all these occasions because the report of prohibition of Mutah at the time of the battle of Khyber is correct and there is no scope of

¹ Lapsed Umrah pilgrimage, in the year Treaty of Hudaibiyah was signed.

doubt in it, rather that tradition is from reliable and trustworthy narrators.

But according to a narration from Sufyan: "The Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) prohibited Mutah and donkey meat on the day of Khyber." Some people say regarding this narration that there are two separate parts in it. It means that the narrator said, "The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) prohibited Mutah" (and did not specify a time of prohibition of Mutah). Then he said, "and donkey meat on the day of Khyber". If it is read like this then the specification of time as the day of Khyber will be for prohibition of donkey meat only. The time of prohibition of Mutah will not be understood. The need of reading it like this is so that the meaning of various narrations will become harmonious and concordant.

I think that the only credible possibility is that Mutah was prohibited at the time of the conquest of Mecca. As for donkey meat, it was doubtlessly banned at the time of Khyber only."

Qazi Ayaz says that the best saying is what we have stated previously that the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) prohibited Mutah on a number of occasions. Then also, those narrations, which say that Mutah was legalized at the time of Umratul Qaza, conquest of Mecca and battle of Autaas. It seems that even after prohibition, the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) might have permitted it according to the need of that time. In such a condition, one has to believe that Mutah was prohibited forever in the battle of Khyber and Umratul Qaza, but at the time of the conquest of Mecca it was legalized for the time being due to the need, and then again it was prohibited forever.

As for the narration, which considers it to be legalized at the time of the Farewell Hajj, it will be annulled because it is narrated from Sabrah Jehni and reliable narrators have also narrated from Sabrah Jehni that Mutah was legalized at the

time of conquest of Mecca and banned at the time of the Farewell Hajj. Thus, the narration of Sabrah over which most companions are unanimous, will be accepted. That is, the narration that Mutah was prohibited at the time of the conquest of Mecca and the repetition of its prohibition at the time of the Farewell Hajj was to emphasize the former order.

As for the saying of Hasan, Mutah was permitted only at the time of Umratul Qaza and not before or after that, it is rejected by those traditions, which say that Mutah was prohibited in the battle of Khyber (because the incident of Khyber occurred before Umratul Qaza). Those narrations reject it which say that Mutah was legalized at the time of the 'conquest of Mecca' or battle of Autaas. Apart from this, the narration on which the saying of Hasan is based is also narrated from Sabrah Jehni. The narrations of permission and prohibition on other times are also narrated from him only and those narrations are more correct. Hence this narration, which is against the correct narration, will be rejected.

Some scholars believe that Mutah was legalized many times and banned twice and abrogated. Allah knows best."¹

After this, Imam Nawawi writes about his sect as follows:

"It is a correct belief that (Mutah) was prohibited and permitted twice viz. it was permissible before the battle of Khyber but prohibited after it and again it was permitted on the day of conquest of Mecca and it is also the day of Autaas because both are same. Then it was again prohibited in that period only after three days till the Day of Judgment and this prohibition would remain till then. It is not permissible to say that legalization of Mutah was confined to the period of

¹ Sharh Sahih Muslim, Imam Nawawi Vol. 1, Pg. 450, Mujtabai Press, Delhi

Khyber and the prohibition on the Day of Khyber is forever. The order on the day of conquest of Mecca was just an emphasis on prohibition. The command of permission was not prior to the conquest of Mecca (hence, the order of prohibition was given once again) as understood by Mazri and Qazi. Thus, those narrations which Muslim has mentioned about legalization of Muthah on the day of Khyber are clear. Hence it is unlawful to annul them and there is no hindrance in prohibition of this legalization twice."

Even Imam Shafei and Imam Muslim believe that Muthah was legalized and prohibited a number of times. Imam Muslim has titled the chapter of Muthah as follows:

"Chapter of Muthah and discussion that Muthah was legalized then abrogated, again legalized and again abrogated and that its abrogation will continue till the Day of Judgment."

Imam Shafei says:

"I do not know any act in Islam which was legalized and then prohibited, again it was permitted and again prohibited except Muthah. Some even say that Muthah was abrogated thrice and even more than that."¹

The wordings discussed above are taken from *Sharh Sahih Muslim*. Now let us take a stroll through *Sahih Bukhari* to understand how diligent a search those poor scholars had to make due to various types of narrations and how much they are struggling. They are trapped in the whirlpool of narrations in such a way that there is no way of salvation. Hafiz Ibne Hajar Asqalani writes:

"Sohaili says that there is a difference of opinion about the time of prohibition of Muthah. The poorest narration is that in

¹ Tafsir Mazhari, Qazi Thanauallah Panipati Pg. 72

which it is said that it (was prohibited) in the battle of Tabuk. It is narrated from Hasan that the prohibition was issued at the time of Umratul Qaza. While it is famous that the prohibition was issued at the time of the conquest of Mecca, as narrated by Muslim from Rabi bin Sabrah. According to a narration of Abu Dawood from Rabi, it was prohibited at the time of the Farewell Hajj. Narrators who say that it was prohibited in the battle of Autaas are like those who say that it was done in 'Aamul Fath'.¹

Considering all these, six occasions are found, viz. Khyber, Umratul Qaza, conquest of Mecca, Autaas, Tabuk and the farewell Hajj. The addition of Hunain is imminent because it is also present in a narration, which I had stated earlier thus either Sohaili was unaware or he purposely left it because its narrators were unreliable. Or because the battles of Autaas and Hunain are same. As for the narration of Tabuk, it is recorded by Ishaq bin Rahuyah and Ibne Habaan by their own chains from the tradition of Abu Huraira. As for the narration of Hasan Basri, it is recorded in their own way by Abdullah and he adds 'Maa kaanat qablaha wa laa baadiha' (There was nothing before it and after it). This addition is a favorite deed of its narrator, Amr bin Ubaid and he is 'The eliminator of tradition'. Saced Ibne Mansur has recorded from Hasan (Basri) in a correct way without any addition. The proof of the conquest of Mecca is found in *Sahih Muslim* as said by Sohaili. Even Autaas is proved in *Sahih Muslim* through the tradition of Salmah bin Akoo. The farewell Hajj is also proved by Abu Dawood from the narration of Rabi. When this is made clear, (keep it in mind) that except the conquest of Mecca, no other narration is correct without a cause even if the channel of the tradition of the battle of Khyber is correct but the descriptions

¹ Year of conquest

of scholars have already been discussed. The news of Umratul Qaza is not correct because it is among those narrations of Hasan in which a link in chain of narrators is missing and it becomes weak. Since he used to narrate traditions from everyone. Even if we consider it correct, it is possible that he meant the day of Khyber by Umratul Qaza because both occurred in the same year itself just as the conquest of Mecca and Autaas are same. However, the incident of Tabuk does not explain it in the tradition of Abu Huraira that Muslims did Mubah with women in that condition only. It seems that Mubah might have occurred long before and releasing might have been done to those women. Or prohibition was done long before but some Muslims were unaware and they continued to act on the former permission and hence, the prohibition was related to anger as the ban was imposed earlier. Also the tradition of Abu Huraira is in the situation of the statement. Since it is a narration of Mumul bin Ismail from Akramah bin Ammar Yasir and there is scope for discussion regarding both. However, the tradition of Jabir from the channel of Ibad bin Kathir is incorrect and forsaken. This difference of opinion about the Farewell Hajj is due to Rabi bin Sabrah while his narration of the conquest of Mecca is correct and famous...Among all those events the most correct one is conquest of Mecca."¹

The conclusion of the discussion so far is that if the Ahle Sunnat say that the verse of Mubah was abrogated by traditions, a question arises naturally, 'Can a verse be abrogated by a tradition?' We have discussed the saying of Imam Shafei, that "a tradition cannot abrogate Quran." The arguments of Imam Nawawi, commentator of *Sahih Muslim* and Hafiz Ibne Hajar Asqalani, commentator of *Sahih Bukhari* are presented for people who believe in the abrogation of Quran by traditions. It

¹ Fathul Bari Sharh Sahih Bukhari, Vol. 9, Pg. 133, Egypt, 1325 A.H.

is proved from them that seven different occasions of prohibition are present in the traditions. They are: battle of Khyber, Umratul Qaza, conquest of Mecca, battle of Autaas, battle of Tabuk, the Farewell Hajj and battle of Hunain.

Fifth and seventh Question

Now I am going to discuss about the questions that: Did the abrogating tradition arrive before or after the revelation of the verse? And if that tradition is contradicting, does it have enough credibility to abrogate the command of Quran?

The weight of those traditions can be understood by their being a practical exegesis of:

*"Do they not then meditate on the Quran? And if it were from any other than Allah, they would have found in it many a discrepancy."*¹

There is such a severe difference of opinion in them that poor the Ahle Sunnat scholars are not able to decide at all whether Mutah was really prohibited and when was it prohibited?

It is not surprising that every sycophant expert wrote each tradition according to his or her keen intelligence. This problem befell on scholars who came later on to darn those mistakes and prove them right. Thus, Imam Muslim and Imam Shafei had to say that Mutah was legalized and banned twice. Imam Shafei had the feeling while saying so that the Islamic law is not a child's game that it is made and broken again and again, but to prove the prohibition of Mutah it was necessary to accept all these traditions and he accepted them after saying:

"I do not know any act in Islam which was legalized and then prohibited, again it was permitted and again prohibited, except Mutah."

¹ Surah Nisa 4:82

However, all seven traditions can be true due to the saying of permission and prohibition twice. Hence, some people believe that it was permitted and prohibited thrice. Some have said even more than that. The meaning of accepting the sayings of the Ahle Sunnat is as if their God is very weak in taking decisions. At times, He makes Mutah lawful and then becomes aware of its defects and prohibits it. Then again He finds good qualities in Mutah and he makes it lawful. Once more He comes to know such faults, which were hidden from Him till now, and He bans it. This cycle goes on for as many as seven times.

By the way, the ideology adopted by Imam Nawawi after cross-examination of all these narrations is discussed above. He believes that all other narrations are wrong and only the narrations of prohibition at the time of Khyber and conquest of Mecca are correct. As he says, "The correct view is that Mutah was prohibited and legalized twice, viz. it was permissible before the battle of Khyber and banned in the battle and it was legalized on the day of the conquest of Mecca and the narration of the day of Autaas also implies conquest of Mecca because both the events are closely related. It was prohibited three days after that."

Thus according to the saying of Imam Nawawi, Mutah was absolutely prohibited at the time of the conquest of Mecca.

Allamah Hafiz Ibne Hajar Asqalani writes in *Fathul Bari Sahih Bukhari* after analyzing all the narrations: "(Among the occasions of prohibition of Mutah) the most explicit one, as said by me, is conquest of Mecca."

That is, even Allamah says that Mutah was prohibited forever on the occasion of the conquest of Mecca and all other narrations are wrong and doubtful.

After the final decision of both these Imams and Allamahs, recollect the time of the revelation of the verse of Mutah from past discussions. Consider this saying of Allamah Jalaluddin Suyuti:

"All four writers of *Sihah* books, i.e. Imam Muslim, Imam Abu Dawood, Tirmidhi and Nasai have narrated from Abu Saeed Khudri that the verse of Mutah was revealed after the battle of Hunain. Allamah Tibrani has also narrated from Ibne Abbas that this verse was revealed after the battle of Hunain."¹

All know that the battle of Hunain was fought after the conquest of Mecca. Where have those narrations gone that Mutah was banned at the time of the conquest of Mecca forever? Here, the verse of Quran says that Mutah was legalized in the battle of Hunain after the conquest of Mecca. While Imam Nawawi and Allamah Asqalani, according to their correct narrations, give a verdict of prohibition of Mutah till the Day of Judgment on the occasion of conquest of Mecca.

Even if we disregard the numerous differences of opinions and accept the saying of Ahle Sunnat that Mutah was prohibited through a tradition of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) on the day of the conquest of Mecca then also we would have to believe that this tradition was abrogated by a verse of Quran during the battle of Hunain through its revelation and now Mutah will remain lawful till the Day of Judgment.

So, these two points also prove to be against the Ahle Sunnat.

Sixth Question

Are the abrogating traditions really against the command of this verse or not?

¹ Lubaabun Nuqool fi Asbaabun Nuzul, on the margin of Tanwirul Qiyas, Pg. 77, Egypt

There is no need for writing much in this matter because even if all those narrations really prove the prohibition of Mutah then also their weakness and occurrence before the verse of Mutah are discussed above. But there is a condition after the acceptance of which, the stain of lie and treachery to the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) is removed from the skirts of those narrators (whom the Rizwan editor considers 'all of them are just') and those narrations do not remain contrary to the Divine verses. The command of the verse also remains in its place.

If the Rizwan editor shows thankfulness, I can tell him about a remote possibility about "the compilers of traditions and Quran", that the words of those narrations are not contradictory when you consider the possibility that the companions of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) who were traveling with him and had performed Mutah due to necessity at Khyber, Umratul Qaza or the Farewell Hajj and various other places. When it was time to return the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) came to know that some companions have performed Mutah, so he advised them to leave those women in a proper manner. That is, to free them by forgiving the remaining time because they were returning home and the necessity of these Mutah wives was getting over. The Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) was a Prophet and a guide of the people. He was more affectionate to the Muslims than their own parents. He was watchful of their affairs and had the power of discretion on them. Hence, there is no need to be surprised if he guided them in their private matters. These advices were given to different people at different occasions by the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.), which the narrators, due to their low understanding or unfair nature, considered that he had prohibited Mutah.

I have presented this possibility only for comfort of the Rizwan editor because a severe stroke was being inflicted on his belief of infallibility of companions when the narrations were proved

wrong. It is proved from these compilers of narrations and Quran that even if all these narrations would be true then also each one could have been applied to this condition. None of them could have clearly opposed the order of the lawfulness of the verse of Mutah. Hence, even this Question is against the ideology of Ahle Sunnat.

In brief, none of the points presented by the Ahle Sunnat for the abrogation of the verse of Mutah are correct nor they have such a capacity to confront a Quranic verse. Thus, praise be to Allah, it is found through intense explanation that the verse of Mutah was never abrogated.

After that, recollect the saying of Umar, "Two Mutahs were in vogue during the time of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.)."

Once again read this confession of Imam Razi:

"We do not deny that Mutah was lawful. We only say that it was abrogated."

The state of abrogation is clear (that it was not abrogated); its lawfulness is stable in its place.

Thus far we have discussed the statement of the Rizwan editor that, "According to Shias it is a very good deed to use women after giving them some money without performing Nikah with them."

The next sentence is:

"God forbid, it is permissible even with Sayyid women after giving them some money."

Like Mutah, the literal meaning of Nikah is physical relationship between a man and woman. If there would have been Nikah' in place of 'Mutah' then also its literal translation would have been the same as done by the Rizwan editor. It is possible that the editor, of Rizwan start labeling Nikah also as

voluptuousness. Thus, let me say that he distorted this correct translation also according to his habit that he included the wordings "after giving them some money" which is not mentioned anywhere in the actual text. Maybe the editor who makes fun of the amount of dower by saying "after giving them some money" does not know that the companions used to perform Nikah and Mutah after giving a handful of dates or flour. When the daughter of caliph Abu Bakr, Asma, performed Mutah with Zubair, her dower was only two Yemeni chadors. It can be said in the respectful language of the Rizwan editor as follows:

"Zubair did a great deed by using the daughter of caliph Abu Bakr without performing Nikah after giving two Yemeni chadors. As a result of which Abdullah bin Zubair was born."

Actually, the Rizwan editor is himself unaware of the affairs of his religion. Otherwise, he would not have made an unsuccessful attempt to find out the point of 'using women after giving some money without performing Nikah'. Though his great Imam, Abu Hanifah has given a verdict: "There is no harm in establishing physical relations with a woman after giving her compensation because it is given to her for the same purpose. Imam Ghazzali writes in his book, *Mankhool* about this great Imam:

"And, as far as unlawful sex is concerned, Imam Abu Hanifah has opened such venues that the penalty is eliminated. For instance, coition on contract basis and performing Nikah with mothers and establishing sexual relations with them. He thinks that all those acts invalidate the penalty. A person who wants to do the evil act with a believing woman, what difficulty would he have in hiring her for this work? Who can explain the justification of this issue?"

And Imam Malik goes a step ahead and says that if a man were paid remuneration it would be permissible to even perform the act of the community of Prophet Lut (s) with him. His verdict is as follows:

"Sodomy is permissible with one's slave or employee."

Even the Hanafites believe it. Their Allamah Chilpi has remarked on the margin of *Sharh Waqaayah* that:

"A person who penetrates the anus of a stranger man or woman. We have kept the condition of 'stranger man and woman' because there is a consensus that if someone does this with his slave, wife or a slave-girl there is no penalty and Qazi Khan has clarified this."¹

My sincere advice to the Rizwan editor is that if he wants to find a stamp of approval for such good deeds he should not waste his time in searching it among the Shias. All such products are available in his own house. The only condition is sincere search.

Then the Rizwan editor writes:

"This is so because they believe that performing Mutah gives them the rank of Husain, Ali and even the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.). It is written on page 50 of *Burhanul Mutah*: "One who performs Mutah once gets the rank of Hasan. One who performs twice gets the rank of Husain. One who performs thrice gets the rank of Ali and one who performs Mutah four times gets the rank of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.). There is no power and strength except from Allah!"

The Rizwan editor has done a great distortion while copying this narration also according to his old habit. *Burhanul Mutah* is

¹ Margin of *Sharh Waqaayah*, Kitabul Hudood Pg. 212

not present with me but I present the detailed explanation of this narration from *Tafsir Minhajus Sadiqeen*. The narration found, is:

"A believer who performs Mutah once, gets the rank of martyrdom. The leader of martyrs is Imam Husain (s). A person, who performs the Nikah of Mutah twice, gets a place among the rank of virtuous. The leader of virtuous is Imam Hasan (s). A person who performs Mutah thrice will get the rank of 'truthfuls'. The leader of truthfuls is Amirul Momineen (s). A person who performs Mutah four times will be included among the rank of prophets. The leader of prophets is Prophet Muhammad Mustafa (s.a.w.s.)."

Note this honesty! The intention of this narration is that if a person performs Mutah he will get the honor of living under the flag of the leadership of Imam Husain (s), Imam Hasan (s), Amirul Momineen (s) and the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.). While the Rizwan editor says that he will get the rank of these Holy personalities.

Moreover, this narration is based on the verse:

"And whoever obeys Allah and the Apostle, these are with those upon whom Allah has bestowed favors from among the prophets and the truthful and the martyrs and the good, and a goodly company are they!"¹

Obviously, when such is the rank of common obedience, what ranks can be received in a worship act, in which there is an utmost fear of taunts and punishment from the Ahle Sunnat caliphs? The Ahle Sunnat forgot their lustful deeds against Shariah and raised objections to an act which was in accordance with it. Hence, those who perform them are worthy of receiving those ranks.

¹ Surah Nisa 4:69

On the contrary, the Ahle Sunnat bestow those high ranks to every honest trader. However, we do not find any spiritual exertion, hurt, taunt or punishment in any trade, instead there is profit.

Allamah Hafiz Zahabi has quoted this narration from Ibne Umar in *Mizanul Itidal*:

"A truthful, trustworthy Muslim trader would be with the prophets, truthfults and martyrs on the Day of Judgment. This tradition is correct according to its meaning and excellent according to its chain. It is not necessary that he would be of their rank also while accompanying them. This saying is for only those "who obey Allah and Prophet (s.a.w.s.)...till the end of the verse."

After this explanation by Allamah Dhahabi who can object to the narration of *Minhajus Sadiqeen*?

Imam Abu Hanifah, Wrapping of silk and other issues

(Published in 'Al-Jawwad', February 1958 A.D.)

After that, the Rizwan editor writes out of the wonders of shamefulfulness as follows: "Not only this, the Shia faith is so dirty that it is permissible to have sexual relations even with women in the prohibited degree (Mahram) provided one has wrapped his private part with silk. Zainul Abideen Haeri Mazandarani, a Shia scholar, writes in *Zakhiratul Ma'ad* (page 95) that: 'Intercourse (with mother and sisters) is permissible after wrapping silk.'"

The editor of Rizwan has written about Shaykh Zainul Abideen Mazandarani in a very disrespectful way. Thus, after this he and all the scholars of his religion do not have any right to be addressed respectfully. However, I would like to follow the way of Ahle Bayt (s) and remain within the limits of civility.

The reality shall be exposed when you read the question and answer of *Zakhiratul Maad* in entirety:

"Question: If a person wraps a silk handkerchief or something like it over his sexual organ so that during intercourse or otherwise it does not come in contact with the woman's body, is ritual bath (Ghusl) obligatory on him?

Answer: The obligation of ritual bath is not bereft of strength. And it is narrated from Abu Hanifah that it is permissible to

penetrate the mahrams (mothers, sister, daughter etc.) after wrapping silk.”

This question and answer prove that the questioner has tried to obtain a verdict of his Shia religion about that issue of Ahle Sunnat. Shaykh Mazandarani says that the ritual bath would be obligatory in any case. However, it is the ideology of Abu Hanifah that leave aside the obligation of ritual bath, it is even permitted to fulfill one's lust in this way through women in the prohibited degree.

Hence, this is the verdict of the Hanafis and has no connection with the Shias. The editor of Rizwan omitted the words 'it is narrated from Abu Hanifah' and tried to grant the Shias that we fulfill our lust through mahrams after wrapping silk. He has repeated this in the journal of the Safar month also that 'these wordings are present on Pg. 95 of *Zakhiratul Maad* and one who proves it wrong would be rewarded a thousand rupees.'

I do not want to argue much in this matter but I want to show that if narrations are presented in this way after omitting some words and any religion is criticized with it the Rizwan editor will not get protection in the corner of the grave also. Here are some examples:

- A) Today any Christian can say, "It is present in the fourteenth ruku¹ of the sixth part of Quran that: 'surely God is third among the three'. This proves that the belief of Trinity is sanctioned by Quran. One who proves this reference wrong would be rewarded a hundred thousand rupees."

¹ Subdivision of (Juz/para) parts of Quran

- B) Then, another Christian can say, "Isa was the son of God, and it is quoted in the eleventh ruku of the tenth part of the Quran that 'Isa is the son of God'."
- C) Not only this but he himself is God as mentioned in the seventh and fourteenth ruku of sixth part that 'surely God is Messiah bin Maryam'. One who proves these references wrong would be rewarded a hundred thousand rupees.

Under such circumstances, the Rizwan editor would become a Christian due to his own rule.

- D) At that time, a Jew could say, "Why did you become a Christian? Our religion is even more ancient and true, and supported by Quran, as 'Uzair is the son of God'. This is also present in the tenth part's eleventh ruku.
- E) Not only this, according to our belief, the Quran considers God as helpless. It is mentioned in the thirteenth ruku of the same part that 'the hands of God are tied'. One who disproves these references shall be rewarded ten million rupees."

At that time, the Rizwan editor would prefer to become a Jew.

- F) But the problem is that the idol-worshippers would not allow him to be at peace and say, "The command is present in Surah Nuh of Quran that, 'By no means leave your Gods, nor leave Wadd nor Suwa nor Yaghuth and Ya'uq and Nasr.' One who proves this reference wrong would be awarded a billion rupees." Then, the poor editor of Rizwan, Maulana Syed Mahmud Ahmad Rizvi, would start prostrating before the idols.
- G) Alls well till here, but he would also have to become a Shia with which he has deep hatred. I challenge that the leader of Sunnis, Shah Abdul Aziz Dehlavi has written

all those defects, which were found in the three caliphs, Ayesha and Muawiyah in his book *Tohfa Ithna Ashariya*. All those facts are present even today in the same book. If a person proves this reference wrong he would be awarded ten billion rupees.

H) Well, *Tohfa Ithna Ashariya* is the work of someone else. I present the sentences penned by the Rizwan editor himself. The editor of Rizwan has written them in the issue of December 1954 from Pg. 6 to 10. They are not the sentences of anyone else. The Rizwan editor has himself written them as headings in bold letters:

- (1) The Righteous Caliphate and Yazid in the same pan
- (2) Companions of the Prophet sacrificed Islam
- (3) Abu Bakr was not farsighted
- (4) Umar accepted insult to religion
- (5) Talha and Zubair were liars
- (6) Ayesha was a revolter
- (7) Ayesha, Siddiq and Uthman were wealth-hoarders
- (8) All companions and followers of companions liked luxury and power
- (9) Amir Muawiyah, Iblis and Ahriman (Zoroastrian God of Darkness)
- (10) The Prophet's daughters married infidels
- (11) The father-in-law of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) was an infidel

The Rizwan editor has himself written all these statements. If someone proves this reference wrong he would be rewarded a hundred billion rupees. When the Rizwan editor has already accepted all these issues what stops him from being a Shia? It is better to either prove these references wrong and win the prize or become a Shia and improve his hereafter.

When the distrust of the Rizwan editor was unveiled in 'Razakar' that he has removed the words: 'It is narrated from Abu Hanifah' and committed great dishonesty, he became so blatant that he tried to prove that the Mujtahid Mazandarani had quoted Abu Hanifah to ridicule him. However, it was neither an occasion of ridicule nor any word of the writing proves that it is a taunt. Mujtahid has written these statements as proof. It is obvious that to quote someone in reply and not rejecting it, proves that the one whose saying is quoted by Mujtahid, he is his religious leader and guide. This proves that Abu Hanifah must also be an Imam of Shias. Now if the editor of *Razakar* says that there is no Abu Hanifah among Shias he should ask this only from Mujtahid. If not, he should visit his grave and do 'Chilla' (forty day seclusion for mystic communism) and say, "Sir, you died after writing this and left us in trouble. What have you written?" Some reply might come from his grave.¹

Maybe the Rizwan editor would purposely fail to recognize this Abu Hanifah. But he cannot succeed in befooling the people.

Come, Mr. Rizwan Editor, let me tell you who this Abu Hanifah is. He is your Imam and a leader of the Hanafis. Among the four Sunni schools of Islamic law, Numan bin Thabit Kufi is the head of the Hanafi school. He is also called

¹ Rizwan, Lahore Pg. 12 14/7, December 1954

'Abu Hanifah (r.a.)'. Hammad was his teacher and his students include Imam Abu Yusuf and Imam Muhammad bin Hasan. Both his students are credited with propagating his religion. His biography titled *Seeratun Numaan* is written and published by Allamah Shibli.

Do you recognize him now?

What can now be the reply for the blatant allegation that Abu Hanifah is called our Imam? Whereas our twelve Imams are those before whom the world bows. Venerating whose shrines is a cause of honor for the rulers of the time.

Also note another misinterpretation, that after stating the obligation of the ritual bath, Mazandarani quotes the saying of Abu Hanifah that 'Intercourse with Mahrams after wrapping silk', you construe it to be an approval and proof of obligation of ritual bath. It is the height of misunderstanding.

Actually, the Rizwan editor is infuriated that Mazandarani relied on writings of others and increased the condition of 'wrapping silk' in the verdict of Imam Abu Hanifah. While the verdict given by their Imam did not have even that much restriction that one should wrap silk. There was complete freedom that any Hanafi could perform Nikah with his mother, sister, daughter, paternal aunt, maternal aunt, niece, mother-in-law, daughter-in-law and all Mahrams and fulfill his lust through them and increase his progeny. It is written in the famous book of Hanafite teachings, *Hidayah*.¹

"If a person marries a woman with whom Nikah is prohibited and then, even if he goes to bed with her, according to Abu Hanifah the legal penalty would not be applicable on him."²

¹ Published at Matba Shaykh Yahya, Pg. 381

² Hidayah, Pg. 381

And the 'Great Imam' has proved it as follows:

"And, according to Abu Hanifah, this marriage is correct according to the circumstance because it is capable of fulfilling the need. Women are daughters of Adam and capable of bearing children and this is the aim of marriage."¹

Fakhruddin Razi, a famous Sunni Imam, has described this verdict of Imam Abu Hanifah in his renowned *Tafsir Kabir*² in the exegesis of the verse:

"Forbidden to you are your mothers..."³

"The third point mentioned by Shafei (r.a.) is that if a man marries his mother and even commits incest, the penalty is applicable to him while Abu Hanifah (r.a.) has said that the penalty is not applicable."

Obviously, if an Imam gives such freedom and a scholar of another religion interprets it in an incomplete way and restricts them to the use of a silk handkerchief, the Hanafi scholars and especially the Rizwan editor would be annoyed. However, Mazandarani has not used the words 'wrapping silk' without any reason because Imam Abu Hanifah did not want to trouble his followers by making it incumbent on them to all the time perform Nikah with mother, sisters etc. hence, he has prescribed this method for them. A verdict is present in *Bahrur Raqaiq Sharh Kanzud Daqaiq* (Book of Marriage) that fulfilling lust by Mahrams after wrapping silk etc. is permissible. If it is done with mahram women after a cloth is wrapped on one's organ, its prohibition is not proved.

¹ Hidayah, Pg. 381

² Vol. 3, Jamaliya, Egypt, First edition Pg. 182

³ Surah Nisa 4:23

Similar advice is given to those who do not want to care about Islamic law during fasting days that they should wrap silk and fulfill their desires so that they remain safe of the obligation of atonement (Kaffarah) etc.

Not only this, but even the ritual bath would not become obligatory. This narration is present in *Jameur Rumooz*.

Hence, Aqa Mazandarani has replied that the ritual bath would be obligatory among we Shias in such a state also. However, according to Abu Hanifah, a great Imam of Ahle Sunnat, if one copulates after wrapping silk, the ritual bath would not be obligatory on him. Not only this, but according to him, even mahrams can become objects of lust after wrapping silk.

This is the true sense of Aqa Mazandarani. God knows what the Rizwan editor understood from it due to his good sense or evil intention?

Now, the Rizwan editor would have recognized Abu Hanifah as to what the temperament of his great leader was and the secret of the popularity of Hanafi faith is also understood. Such liberal laws attract everyone. God be praised! If you want to see more wonders of your Imam, read the following statements of Imam Ghazzali. You will come across some more interesting laws:

"Abu Hanifah has almost destroyed the Islamic law. He made its ways dubious and changed its system...The disorder in details of Prayer in his religion is not a hidden issue. The discussion would become lengthy if I delve deeper. The fruit of his foolishness is obvious even in the shortest Prayer. Even if he presents his shortest prayer to a foolish ignorant, he would also flatly refuse to follow him (such is the picture of that Prayer). If a person dives into a pond of wine, wears a tanned skin of dog, says 'Takbiratul Ihraam' (Allaho Akbar) in Hindi or Turkish languages without performing 'intention', and

instead of reciting Quranic chapters recites the translation of 'Madhaa Mataan', (Two green leaflets), pecks two prostrations without bowing so fast that he does not even perform 'Quood' (short sitting in prayers) in between, and at the end he intentionally releases flatulence without reciting Tashahud, it would be considered a salutation and (then the prayer is complete). If one passes gas in the middle of prayer he should perform ablution (at that time) and after the prayer, he should pass it deliberately, since he did not intend to complete the prayer in his former effort. (Here) every sensible person should be certain that Allah did not appoint any Prophet with such prayer and the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) himself never invited towards such a prayer. Moreover, prayer is a pillar of Islam. Nevertheless, Abu Hanifah considered the above-mentioned prayer as the shortest obligatory prayer. He believes that messengers were sent only with such a prayer and all other acts in prayer are for etiquette and are recommended. As far as fasting is concerned, he has uprooted its pillars and left it half-dead, because he made it compulsory to give precedence to intention of fasting.

For Zakat he issued a verdict that it is permissible to delay its payment even if it is badly needed and the eyes of beggars remain open waiting for it. He also gave a verdict that if a person dies before paying Zakat, its obligation would be taken away from him. Did not Abu Hanifah destroy the Islamic law in this way?

For Hajj, he gave an exactly opposite order. That it is obligatory to perform the Hajj immediately. However, needs of other Muslims are not related with Hajj (as in Zakat).

These were some of his wonders in worship acts. Now, as for penalties, he annulled their purpose also and ruined all the basics and commands. The purpose of Islamic law is protection of life, dignity and wealth. Abu Hanifah demolished the rule of

capital punishment in cases when a killer kills with a stone. He made strangling of neck, drowning in water and killing through various heavy things a way to avoid capital punishment. He moved so ahead that he rejected sense and extemporization and said that killing with such objects cannot be called murder and it is doubtful. Which sensible person can believe in such emulation? Except when there is an effect of excessive stupidity. As far as copulation is concerned, Imam Abu Hanifah has established ways through which penalties are annulled. For example, paid sex and establishing sexual relations with mothers after performing Nikah with them. He believed that all these acts invalidate penalties. A person who wants to commit an evil act with a believing woman, what difficulty would he have in hiring her? Can anyone justify this?" Then he said that if four just witnesses testify against him for fornication and he himself confesses once, the penalty shall be cancelled.

He gave a verdict about wealth and property that making minor changes in a usurped thing deprives the owner of its ownership. For instance, making flour out of usurped wheat...At last, he made such a rule, which almost demolished the Shariah of Muhammad (s.a.w.s.). When false testimonies are presented about the Nikah of a wife with someone else and if the judge wrongly gives decision in its favor the woman becomes lawful for him even though this second man is fully aware of the truth and the woman would in future be prohibited on her former husband."

After this the cup of Imam Ghazzali's patience began to overflow and he says:

"And if the hearts would not have united over the emulation (Taqlaed) of such foolishness even one whose feelings were a little perfect would not have followed one who explains the Islamic law like this. Thus the former Imams denounced Abu

Hanifah with great severity. The scholars have accused him of destroying their Islamic law. Even Qazi Abu Bakr said after seeing the law of retaliation of Abu Hanifah that it is insane to assume that the killer did not intend to murder with those heavy objects. On the other hand, if he has a contrary belief and issues this order he has made a good plan to destroy religion."¹

If some more details of the 'great Imam' are needed refer to the following writings in the fourth part of this same book *Kitab Mankhool*:

"Abu Hanifah was not a jurist (Mujtahid) because he was unaware of the (rules of) language. His saying, "Lau Ramaahu bi Abu Qubais" 'If he shoots an arrow towards Mt. Abu Qubais' proves his ignorance (in spite of the presence of the article 'bi' he says 'Abu' instead of 'Abi'). That is, it should be, 'If he shoots an arrow towards Mt. Abi Qubais'. Also, he was unaware of traditions. Hence, he was attracted towards weak traditions and rejected the correct ones. He was not even a 'Faqih' (expert jurisprudent) and used to resort to conjecture for no reason at all even though it was often contrary to reality."

The same Qazi Abu Bakr whose saying is quoted by Imam Ghazzali says regarding Abu Hanifah after much argumentation that:

"There is no need to worry while opposing Abu Hanifah because I am sure he has committed mistakes in ninety percent of his verdicts in which he differs with the other Imams and in the remaining ten percent he is an equal partner in this. It is even possible that his opponents may have precedence in this also."

¹ Kitab Mankhool, Imam Ghazzali with reference to Istiqsaaul Afham, Vol. 2, Pg. 199-201

The editor of Rizwan would have known as to who that Abu Hanifah is, who permits fulfillment of lust even from mahrams. He might have also learnt of his other feats. How much favor he has bestowed on the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) that he did not let anything from prayer to penalties of murder untempered. According to the saying of Imam Ghazzali, 'he devastated it completely'.

If leaders are such what the followers would be? Praise be to Allah.

Followers all over the world try to emulate their leaders. If the Rizwan editor too tries to emulate Imam Abu Hanifah what can one say? He would get a license to all types of lustful deeds, in spite of the claim of Islam.

In 1957 A.D., some Pakistanis performed prayers of Eid al-Azha in Urdu. There was a great hue and cry on this from Pakistan to India, that it was an innovation, an insult to Islam and disgrace of Divine commands etc. etc.

God knows what all they said. While those followers had just stepped on the way shown by this great Imam. Had they moved a little forward, God knows what these spectators would have done. However, I am surprised over only one thing that the followers had to bear these atrocities, but the holy personality who opened the door to this innovation and dishonor of Divine religion is called the 'Great Imam (r.a.)'.

Imam Abu Hanifah and his prayer

(Published in 'Al-Jawwad', March 1958 A.D.)

If you really want to see the drama that how the brief prayer of the great Imam is as mentioned by Imam Ghazzali read the following incident: A renowned Sunni scholar, Allamah Abul Aali Abdul Malik bin Abdullah Al-Jawzi who is famous by the title of 'Imam Al-Haramain' (Imam of the two sanctuaries), has completely exposed the Great Imam in his famous journal, *Mugheethul khalqa fi Ikhtiyaarul Haq*. After writing the passage about Prayer quoted in *Mankhool* by Imam Ghazzali, he writes the following incident:

"It is reported that King Mahmud Subuktagin was a follower of Hanafi religion. He was very fond of the science of traditions and all his companions used to listen to traditions from teachers and he himself also listened. Whenever he used to question about traditions, mostly he used to find them in accordance with Shafei religion. (Hence) he became inclined to the Shafei religion. He gathered Shafei and Hanafi jurists in Merv to debate and prove which of the two religions was better. Finally, it was decided that both the parties perform two units of prayers each according to their religion so that the King observes their prayer and decides which was a better faith. Qifaal Maroozi stood up from Shafeis and after absolute purification and fulfilling the conditions of dress and everything, prayed with all acts, recommendations, etiquettes

and obligations. This was such a prayer that Shafeis would not have approved anything lesser.

Then a two-unit prayer approved by Abu Hanifah was performed. A tanned skin of dog was worn and one-fourth of its part was made even more impure. Ablution was performed by the date wine. Since this was done in an open and hot region, flies started swarming and ablution was also performed in the reverse order. Then he faced the Qibla and recited 'Takbiratul Ihram' (Allaho Akbar) in Persian without performing any intention. Then a Persian translation of a verse was recited i.e. 'Du Barge Sabz' (two green leaves). After that, two prostrations were pecked (on the earth) like a cock without genuflection (Ruku). There was no time gap between the two prostrations. After reciting Tashahud, he released flatulence at the end of prayer without reciting salutations and said, "O King! This is the prayer of Abu Hanifah." The king said, "If this prayer is not (proved to be) of Abu Hanifah I would kill you because no religious person can approve such a prayer."

(But) Hanafis denied that it was prescribed thus by Abu Hanifah. Then the books of Iraqis (Hanafis) were procured. The King ordered a Christian Persian teacher to read the acts of both religions. The prayer performed by Qifal was found according to the religion of Abu Hanifah. Hence the King left the religion of Abu Hanifah and became a Shafei. And if this prayer be presented before even an ignorant person, he would not be ready to accept it."¹

¹ Kitab Mugheethul Khalq, Imamul Haramain with reference to Istitisqaaul Afham, Vol. 2, Pg. 179

This incident is also quoted on the authority of Mughisul Khalq in *Ikhtisarul Afham* and also *Wafiyyatul Ayan Tarikh Ibne Khalikan*.¹

This Qifal Maroozi is the great Imam, Abdullah bin Ahmad bin Abdullah Al-Maroozi, who was a mystic Shaykh of Khorasan. Ibne Jamata in *Tabqaat Fuqaha* and Imam Yafai in his history have written about him:

“Neither was there a greater jurist in his time nor would there be any after him. We used to say that it is an angel in a human form.”

Imam Yafai has also mentioned the year of this incident in his history that: “This incident took place in 410 A.H.”

Possibly the Rizwan editor would also say like the courtiers of King Mahmud Ghaznavi, “All these are accusations on the great Imam (r.a.) and he never approved such prayer.” Therefore, I present the sources of these strange rules of prayer as follows:

First fundamental - Permission to pray in a dog skin

The following law is present in the book of Hanafi jurisprudence, *Hidaya*.²

“Every tanned skin is pure: It is permissible to pray in it and ablution with a vessel made of it is correct provided that it is not the skin of a pig or a human being.”

It clearly proves that one can perform prayers wearing any skin except that of human or pig and water stored in a water-bag made out of it can be used for ablution. It may be skin of dog, monkey or a bear.

¹ Vol. 2, Pg. 86, Egypt

² Vol. 1, Pg. 11

Not only this, one can also make a prayer mat out of dog skin. The following wordings are present in *Fatawa Qazi Khan*.¹

"Natiqi has given the verdict of Muhammad bin Hasan, a student of Imam Abu Hanifah that if someone prays on a skin of a slaughtered dog or wolf, his prayer is correct."

This was a favor bestowed by a student and successor of the great Imam. Now read a saying of another student, Imam Abu Yusuf that there is no need of tanning the dog skin, it is enough to just slaughter it. Also the skin of pig would become pure even though 'the great Imam' says that it is impure:

"But impure things are filth like excreta, urine, wine, excreta of dog, flesh of pig, all of its parts, flesh of prohibited animals provided that they are not slaughtered after reciting Bismillah (In the name of Allah). However if they are slaughtered after saying Bismillah, it is permissible to pray in their flesh and untanned skin. Except the skin of pig that (even) if it is slaughtered after saying Bismillah, it is impure. And if its skin is tanned, according to the narrations of our companions, it would not be pure. The common elders also believe this (but) it is narrated from Abu Yusuf that it would become pure and its trade will also be permitted."² It is a fact that dog is not impure according to the great Imam. It is written in brief in Bombay edition on Pg. 28 as follows:

"It should be known that dog was not an 'absolute impurity' according to 'the great Imam' Thus it could be sold and its guarantee is also there. A prayer mat and vessels can be made out of its skin. If it is taken out of a well alive, neither the well would become impure nor clothes due to its spraying of water provided that its mouth has not touched the water; nor its bite,

¹ Vol. 1, Pg. 10, Nawal Kishor Press, Lucknow

² Niyyatul Musalla, Pg. 46, 47, Printed at Meerut

unless its saliva is visible. Prayer carrying a dog (in one's arms) is not void, however big the dog may be."

In brief, there is no harm in performing prayers on a prayer-mat of dog skin, wearing dog skin, performing ablution with water from a dog skin water-bag, while carrying a dog in one's arms or having it on one's shoulders. God be praised!

Second fundamental - Performing prayers after making one-fourth of the dress impure

This law is found in every book of Hanafi jurisprudence. Read the following sources:

- 1) And if there is a slight impurity, like urine of animals whose meat is lawful, prayer is permissible even if that impurity covers one-fourth of the dress. This (command) is narrated from Abu Hanifah.¹
- 2) The impurity of less than one-fourth dress and body can be ignored.²

That is, along with clothes even if one-fourth body remains impure then also there is no harm.

- 3) Second type is of slight impurity. If it covers less than one-fourth of dress it can be ignored. As mentioned in the text of many books of jurisprudence.³

¹ Hidayat, Vol. 1, Pg. 28

² Durre Mukhtar, Pg. 44

³ Fatawa Aalamgiri, Nawal Kishor Press, Lucknow, Vol. 1, Pg. 44

Third fundamental – Ablution with date wine

Read the following sources for this:

- 1) "If a person has nothing except date wine for performing ablution, according to Abu Hanifah, he could use it."¹
- 2) "According to Abu Hanifah, if date wine is available, one should perform ablution it and not choose to perform Tayammum (ablution with mud, sand or stone etc)."²
- 3) "Even if he gets dirty and detestable water he should perform ablution with date wine. If doubtful water, date wine and mud are available then according to Abu Hanifah, one should perform ablution with date wine."³

As if the command: 'if you do not find water do Tayammum over mud' needed some correction and date wine is purer than doubtful water and mud. The cause of such laws was that according to the great Imam, Abu Hanifah, date wine is not only pure, but also lawful; may it produce excitement or it becomes more intoxicating. This law is present on Pg. 16 of *Hidaya*.

- 4) If (grape juice) is boiled, according to Abu Hanifah, ablution can be done with it because according to him, it is lawful to drink it.

This proof implies that not only date wine, but also every thing, which is lawful to drink, can be used for performing ablution.

¹ Niyatul Musalla, Meerut Pg. 20

² Hidaya, Pg. 16

³ Fatawa Aalamgiri, Vol.1, Nawal Kishor Press, Lucknow, Pg. 21

- 5) And the following wordings are present in the book *Zafarul Mubeen* that:¹

The 'great Imam' says that Nabidh (date wine), even if it is boiled and becomes intoxicating, is not prohibited. This law of his is contrary to all scholars. Imam Nawawi writes in *Sharh Sahih Muslim*:

"Scholars have a difference of opinion about one who drinks any other intoxicating drink except grape wine. Imam Shafei, Malik, Ahmad and majority of scholars say that it is unlawful. He would be lashed for it as lashing is given for one who drinks grape wine. A person, who drinks grape wine, be he believes in its permission or its prohibition. And Abu Hanifah has said that it is not unlawful and a person who drinks it, should not be penalized."²

The above-mentioned text of *Sharh Sahih Muslim* is quoted from *Sahih Muslim* printed at Matba Ansari.³ Now, the Rizwan editor can easily forget the worldly sorrows through date wine and thank God after performing ablution with it while being completely intoxicated. He can thank God for the numerous bounties created by Him in this world.

Fourth fundamental – Non-obligation of intention in ablution etc.

Read the following narrations for this:

- 1) "The intention of purification is recommended for a person performing ablution...According to us, it is

¹ Part 2, Muhammadi, Lahore Pg. 6

² Zafar Al-Mubeen, part 2, Pg. 6

³ Vol. 2, Pg. 71

recommended to perform intention in ablution and it is obligatory according to Shafeis."¹

- 2) "It is recommended for one who gets up from sleep to wash his hands upto wrists before putting them in the vessel. He should say Bismillah (In the name of Allah) in the beginning, brush the teeth, rinse the mouth, rinsing nose with water, performing intention (of ablution) and performing all these in order, as stated in Holy Quran. All this is recommended."²
- 3) A proof of non-obligation of intention of ablution is written by the writer of *Sharh Waqaayah* also as follows:

"As in other purifications, for example, purification of clothes and place because there is no condition of intention in it."³

In short, intention is not obligatory. Similarly, the Imam Abu Hanifah does not consider intention obligatory in fasting and prayers also, as described by Imam Ghazzali above.

Fifth fundamental – Sequence not obligatory in ablution

- 1) We have just now discussed the wordings of *Sharh Waqaayah* that the order of ablution mentioned in Holy Quran is only recommended.
- 2) It is mentioned in *Hidaya* as follows:

"According to us, sequence is recommended in ablution and it is obligatory according to Shafeis."⁴

¹ Hidaya, Pg. 4

² Sharh Waqaayah, Pg. 6

³ Sharh Waqaayah, Pg. 7

⁴ Hidaya, Pg. 4

- 3) The recommendations of ablution are mentioned in *Niyyatul Musalli*¹ as, 'Intention and sequence' of ablution are also recommended. Following wordings are written on its margin:

"The sequence mentioned in the verse of ablution is recommended and not obligatory because 'and' is used as a conjunction here. There is no argument in it for sequence."²

Therefore, Qifal Maroozi had performed the ablution in the reverse order because sequence was not obligatory. Thus leaving it would not have any effect on ablution. It is only recommended. Hence, the Rizwan editor should wash his feet first, then wipe the head and neck, after that, wash hands and then his face or do as he likes.

Sixth fundamental - Reciting Takbiratul Ihram (Allaho Akbar) and Praying in any language other than Arabic

Read the following sources for this:

- 1) "If someone starts (i.e. says Takbiratul Ihram) in Persian or recites Quranic chapters in Persian (translation) or says 'Bismillah' in Persian at the time of slaughtering, even if he can say in Arabic perfectly, then also it is sufficient."³
- 2) "If a person recites Quranic chapters in Persian or from Torah or Bible his prayer is not void; if he recites only stories (from Torah or Bible) it would be void. But if there is a mention of Allah, prayer is not void."⁴

¹ Pg. 5

² Margin of *Niyyatul Musalla*, Pg. 5

³ *Hidaya*, Vol. 1, Pg. 39

⁴ *Durre Mukhtar*, Pg. 65

Well, the recitation of abrogated books has also been permitted while the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) used to restrain his companions reading them otherwise also.

Although, only Persian language is mentioned in the above statements, it is just by way of example, otherwise one can pray in any language.

- 3) The following wordings are mentioned on Pg. 64 of *Durre Mukhtar*:

"Only Burooi has confined it to Persian, otherwise all other scholars consider prayer lawful in any language."

- 4) The following description is found in *Fatawa Alamgiri*:¹

"It is permissible to recite the Takbir (Allaho Akbar) in Persian as mentioned in books of jurisprudence, even if one can say it perfectly in Arabic. However, if one can correctly say it in Arabic it is detestable (Makruh) to say it in Persian. According to the saying of Abu Yusuf and Muhammad, if one can recite in Arabic it is unlawful to recite in Persian. It is quoted in *Muheet* in a similar manner. There is same difference of opinion about all recitations of Prayer including Tashahud, Qunut Dua, Tasbeehaat, Ruku and Sujud (i.e. difference of opinion is not restricted to only 'Takbiratul Ihraam'²) and (this permission is not only for Persian language but) permissibility exists for all non-Arabic languages like Turkish, Hamite, Jashi and Nabatean. It is mentioned in the same way in *Fatawa Qazi Khan*."

¹ Vol. 1, Pg. 67, Nawal Kishor Press, Lucknow, India

² The first recitation of 'Allaho Akbar' (Allah is the Greatest) at the beginning of ritual prayer

Now, what is the fault of the poor Ataturk that he started prayer in Turkish? Or why are thorough followers of Hanafi law of Pakistan criticized if they prayed in Urdu?

Seventh fundamental - Sufficiency of reciting a small verse in Prayer

Now read its sources:

- 1) "Abu Hanifah and a small group have said that Surah Fatiha is not obligatory but (only) a Quranic verse is obligatory."¹
- 2) "Recitation is one of the obligations of prayer and this obligation can be fulfilled by a single brief verse according to Abu Hanifah. It is quoted in *Muheet* and *Khulasah* in the same way and it is correct as mentioned in *Tatarkhaniya*."²

Hence, Qifal Maroozi sufficed with the Persian translation of 'Mudhaa Mataan' and fulfilled the obligation by saying 'Du barge sabz' (two green leaves). However, there was no need to waste time in a single verse also. According to Abu Hanifah, a single word 'Thumma' (then) or its translation is enough.

- 3) "However, according to Abu Hanifah, the obligatory volume of recitation is a verse even if it is a small one like the saying of Allah, 'Thumma'.

¹ Sharh Sahih Muslim, Imam Nawawi Vol. 1, Ansari Press, Delhi Pg. 170

² Fatawa Alamgiri, Vol. 1, Pg. 68

Eighth fundamental – Non-obligation of calmness while bowing and prostrating and pecking like a crow in prostration

Read the sources on it:

- 1) "As for standing upright, it is not obligatory and similarly for sitting between two prostrations (is not obligatory) and calmness is (not obligatory) between bowing and prostration. (This) verdict is of Abu Hanifah and Muhammad."¹

Obviously, if calmness is not obligatory in bowing and standing upright after bowing is also not obligatory then a person can go for prostration on the way to bowing. Thus, there was no gap between bowing and prostration as done by Qifaal Maroozi.

Similarly, if it is not obligatory to sit between two prostrations nor there is a need of calmness in prostrations, what is left other than pecking twice like a crow. Qifaal did the same.

- 2) Also read one more source:

"People are unanimous that according to Abu Hanifah and Muhammad, it is not obligatory to stand upright after bowing. Similarly it is not obligatory to be calm while sitting."²

Also know it that it is enough to prostrate on one's nose instead of forehead.

"According to Abu Hanifah, it is enough to prostrate on one's nose without any reason also."³

¹ Hidayah, Vol. 1, Pg. 44

² Fatawa Alamgiri, Vol. 1, Pg. 70

³ Sharh Waqaya, Pg. 44

Not only this, but one can also prostrate on the back of another person who is praying.

"It is permissible to prostrate on the back of a person who is himself involved in prayers."¹

God be praised! What a beautiful scene it would be if for prostration a person mounts the back of another person who is praying. However, imagination is necessary for this.

Ninth fundamental – Passing flatulence is sufficient instead of salutations

This virtuous deed is permitted by the 'great Imam' because his leader, 'Prince of believers', Amir Muawiyah had fulfilled this virtuous obligation openly after sitting on the pulpit of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.). But anyway, read some of its sources:

"If a person does 'Hadath'² (passes flatulence etc.) purposely after Tashahud and does an act contrary to Prayer, his prayer shall be complete."³

That is, it is not necessary to only pass flatulence in order to complete the prayer after Tashahud but he can even urinate or excrete, jump and do all those acts, which are contrary to prayer, provided that all these are done intentionally. If they occur unintentionally, there is a risk of the prayer being void.

Anyway, the 'great Imam' of Sunnis has completed the prayers even though it became an ill treatment of Islam. Possibly, our reader would be surprised over such statements said by the latter Imam. Hence it is enough to say that the great Imam was a follower of 'Murjiyyah' religion. The Murjiyyah belief is that

¹ Fatawa Alamgiri, Pg. 69

² Any act that makes the ablution void

³ Sharh Waqaayah, Pg. 52

one can commit as many sins as possible after reciting the Kalimah (formula of faith). There would not be any punishment of even a single second. As if uttering the two testimonies (Kalimah Shahadatain) is a license to sin. Therefore the Great Imam allowed incest with even the women in the prohibited degree.

And hence, the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) has said: "There would be two groups among my followers; not even one of them would be in accordance with Islam. One is Murjiyyah and other Qadriyyah."

By the way, read the proofs of the great Imam being a Murjiyyah:

- 1) Abdul Qadir Jilani writes in one of his famous works, *Ghaneeyatut Taalibeen* after narrating this tradition of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) that: "There would be seventy-three sects among my followers. Of which, only one would get salvation and others would go to hell.

Ten sects are the bases of these seventy-three sects viz. Ahle Sunnat, Khawarij, Shia, Mutazila, Murjiyyah, Mushbiha, Jehmiyyah, Zimaaryah, Najariyyah, Kilabiyah...But Murjiyyah has twelve branches...so...so...so...(among them) is Hanafiyyah... Hanafiyyah are the followers of Abu Hanifah Numan bin Thabit who claims that faith is divine recognition and accepting what the Prophet has brought, as mentioned by Barhooqi in *Al-Shajarah*.¹

- 2) Similarly, Allamah Ibne Qutaybah Dinawari has included not only Abu Hanifah but also his teachers and students in the list of Murjiyyah in his famous work, *Maarif* as follows:

¹ Ghaneeyatut Taalibeen

"Here are the names of some Murjiyyahs: Ibrahim Lateemi...Hammad bin Abi Sulaiman (teacher of Abu Hanifah), Abu Hanifah...Abu Yusuf Sahibur Raai and Muhammad bin Hasan (students of Abu Hanifah)."

Now, you would like to find out the belief of Murjiyyah. Hence, read on the following passage which Allamah Ibne Jawzi, a famous Ahle Sunnat scholar has quoted in his renowned work, *Talbees-e-Iblees* as follows:

- 3) "The Murjiyyah believe that if a person testifies the two principles of faith (Shahadatain) and commits all sorts of sins then also he would not enter hell. They have opposed those correct traditions, which have the mention of removal of monotheists from hell. Ibne Aqil said that the founder of the Murjiyyah, which is absolutely an apostate sect was a real hypocrite because the betterment of world is due to the warning, frightening and belief in recompense. As it was not possible for Murjiyyah to deny God openly, as people would have started hating them, they washed away the benefits of the existence of God i.e. they demolished self accounting and observation of deeds and diplomacies of Islamic law. This is the worst group against Islam."

As the belief of Murjiyyah is an offspring of atheism, there is no importance of traditions and the personality of the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) in the heart of the Great Imam, neither he cared for the symbols of Islam.

- 4) "Khatib has narrated from the chains of Abu Ishaq that he used to say, 'I used to go to Abu Hanifah and question him. I asked a question and he replied. I said that it was narrated from the Prophet (s.a.w.s.) in that way (i.e. contrary to his reply). He replied: Forgive me about that narration. Then I asked another question. When he replied, I said that it was narrated from the

Prophet (s.a.w.s.) in another way. He said: (God forbid!) Erase this narration by the tail of a pig."¹

Now read another narration:

- 5) "Abu Hanifah was asked about a person who says that he testifies that Ka'ba is true but doesn't know that it is the same which is in Mecca or any other one. Abu Hanifah said that he would be a believer without any doubt. Similarly, he was asked about one who says that he testifies that Muhammad bin Abdullah (s.a.w.s.) is a Prophet but does not know whether he is the same whose tomb is in Medina or someone else. Abu Hanifah replied that such a person is a believer without any doubt. Hamidi says that a person who says so is an infidel."²

Not only this but Abu Hanifah even considered the worship of his shoes a cause for salvation:

"It is narrated from a chain of narrators that Abu Hanifah said that if a person worships that shoe for nearness of God, I do not find any harm in it. It is narrated from Saeed that such a thing is infidelity."³

Therefore, Allamah Khatib Baghdadi says:

- 6) "No child born in Islam was more damaging than Abu Hanifah."⁴

And Khatib Baghdadi has mentioned such a belief of the 'great Imam' that one should not be surprised if even the Rizwan editor leaves him. He has quoted a saying of the 'great Imam' in the same book, *Tarikh Baghdad* whose abridged version is

¹ Mukhtarul Mukhtasar Tarikh-e-Baghdad, Ibne Khatib

² Mukhtar Mukhtasar Tarikh Baghdad

³ Mukhtar Mukhtasar Tarikh Baghdad

⁴ Mukhtar Mukhtasar Tarikh Baghdad

famous by the title of *Mukhtar-e-Mukhtasar Tarikh Baghdad* as follows:

7) "Indeed the faith of Abu Bakr Siddiq and Iblis is one."

Thus is the real condition of the great leader of the Rizwan editor, Numan bin Thabit Abu Hanifah (r.a.) and Pakistan is full of his followers. The editor of Rizwan feigned ignorance on being informed about one of his laws of 'Wrapping of silk' and said, "What do we know who this Abu Hanifah is?" Hatred of one's leaders on the exposure of their real conditions is a preface to the scene of the Day of Judgment, which is mentioned in Quran as follows:

*"When those who were followed shall renounce those who followed (them), and they see the chastisement and their ties are cut asunder."*¹

Hoping that the Rizwan editor might be satisfied at last, I conclude the discussion.

The End

¹ Surah Baqarah 2:166

Glossary of Islamic Terms

a.s.	:An abbreviation of 'alaihis salaam', that is "Peace be on him".
a.t.f.s.	:An abbreviation of 'ajjil allaahu ta'ala farajahu shareef', that is "May Allah hasten his reappearance".
Aale Muhammad	:Progeny of Muhammad
Aamal	: Rituals
Ahle Sunnat wal Jamat	: Majority Muslims who believe Abu Bakr to be the first caliph
Ahlul Bayt	:People of the house. They are The Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.), Janabe Fatima Zahra (s.a.), Ali (s) and his eleven successors.
Allamahs	:Plural of Allamah, a learned scholar
Amirul Momineen	:Leader of the believers. Title of Imam Ali bin Abi Talib (s)
Amr-e-Takveeni	:Things beyond the control of man. Natural factors etc.
Amr-e-Tashri	:Things under the control of man. Voluntary deeds etc.
Arsh	:Throne or heavens
Ashura	:10 th of Mohurram, day of the martyrdom of Imam Husain (s) and the tragedy of Kerbala
Asr	:Afternoon (prayer)
Ayat	:Verse of the Holy Quran
Azan	:Call for prayer
Bada	:Change in divine will
Baseer	:All-seeing
Bismillah	:In the Name of Allah

Dirham	:Unit of currency
Dua	:Invocation
Fajr	:Morning
Faqih	:Jurisprudent
Firon	:Pharaoh
Ghusl	:Ritual bath
Hadith-e-Nabawi	:A statement of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) or a Masoom (s)
Hadith-e-Qudsi	:A saying of Allah apart from the verses of Quran
Hafiz	:One who knows the Quran by heart
Hajj	:Annual pilgrimage to Mecca during the month of Zilqad
Halaal	:Permissible, legal
Haraam	:Prohibited, illegal
Hasanah	:Unit of heavenly rewards
Hijrat/Hijrah	:Flight of the Holy Prophet (s.a.w.s.) from Mecca to Medina. Beginning of the Islamic calendar
Hourul Eein	:Black eyed Houries of Paradise
Hujjat	:Proof
Iblis	:Satan
Iddah	:Waiting period for women before they could remarry
Ijma	:Consensus
Insha-Allah	:If Allah wills
Iqamah	:Shorter call for Prayer
Isha	:Late evening
Janabat	:A state of ritual impurity that can be removed by performing Ghusl (Bath)
Juz	:Arabic word for part. 30 th part of Quran
Ka'ba	:The Holy House of Allah, the directions that Muslims face during prayers.
Kaffarah	:Fine, penalty
Khariji	:A group which arose against Ali bin Abi Talib (s) after the battle of Siffeen. A heretic sect
Khilqat	:Creation

Liaan:	: Sworn allegation of adultery committed by either husband or wife
Maghrebain	:The two prayers of Maghrib (early evening) and Isha (late evening)
Maghrib	:Evening prayer, time of sunset
Mahram(pl. Mahrams)	:Relatives between whom marriage is prohibited
Makrooh	:Detestable, in the Islamic terminology it denotes an action performing which does not incur sin but refraining from which earns divine rewards
Makruh	:variant spelling of above term
Maliki	:Followers of the Sunnite Imam Malik
Maraja' Taqleed	:The Mujtahid whom people follow in matters of practical law
Masjidul Haram	:The sacred mosque in Mecca
Masoomeen	:(Singular- Masoom): Infallible
Mehr	:Dower
Mithqal	:A measure of weight of about 4.6 gms.
Momin	:Believer
Mubah	:Permitted. It denotes an action performing of which earns no rewards and refraining from it is not punishable
Mullahs	:Muslim scholars/leaders
Mureed	: The Restorer
Mus'haf	:Scroll
Mustahab	:Recommended. It is an action performing which earns rewards and refraining from it is not punishable
Mutawatir	:A tradition related through so many narrators that it is considered absolutely authentic
Najis	:Unclean
Nawafil	:Recommended prayers
Para	:30 th part of Quran

q.s.	:An abbreviation of 'Quddasa Sirruhu', which literally means: "May his resting place remain pure."
Qaem	:One would rise. A title of Imam Mahdi (s)
Qibla	:Prayer direction
Qunut	:Supplication recited in ritual prayers, usually in the second unit (rakat)
Quraish	:the tribe of the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.)
Rajm	:Stoning, punishment for adultery
Rakat	:A unit of ritual prayer
Ruku	:Bowing down or genuflection in the ritual prayers
s.a.	:An abbreviation of 'sallallaahu alaihi wa sallam', that is "Blessings be on him and peace".
s.a.w.s.	:An abbreviation of 'sallallaahu alaihi wa aalihi wa sallam', that is "Blessings be on him and his Progeny and peace".
Sadaqah	:Voluntary charity, alm
Safar	:Second month of the Islamic calendar
Salaam	:Salute, Islamic greeting
Salaat	:Ritual prayers
Salawat	:Allaahumma S'alle a'laa Muha'ammadinw wa aali Muh'ammad
Samee	:All-hearing
Saqifah	:The place where Abu Bakr took caliphate
Sayyid	:Lit. chief. A term for descendants of Lady Fatima through Imam Husain (s)
Sayyidush Shohada	:Chief of the Martyrs, a title of Imam Husain (s)
Shabaan	:The eighth month of the Muslim (Lunar) calendar

Shab-e-Qadr	:The Night of Power or 19th, 21st and 23rd nights of the month of Ramadan
Shahadatain	:the two testimonies of Islamic faith.
Shariat/ Shariah	:Islamic law
Shaykh	:Lit. elder. A genealogical division among Muslims
Sheb-e-Abi Talib	:Valley in Mecca where the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) and the early Muslims took refuge for some time
Shura	:Consultation committee formed by Umar for selecting Uthman as the next caliph
Siraat	:Path
Sujud	:Plural of Sajdah, prostration
Sunnah	:Practice (esp. of the Messenger of Allah)
Surahs	:Chapter of Quran
t.s.	:Abbreviation of Taaba Saraa. See the meaning of 'q.s.'
Tabi'in	:Followers of the companions of the Prophet
Takbir	:Allaho Akbar, God is the Greatest
Takbiratul Ihram	:Saying Allaho Akbar at the beginning of the ritual prayer
Taqiyyah	:Dissimulation
Taqleed	:Emulation of a scholar in Islamic practical law
Taqwa	:Piety
Tasbeehaat	:Plural of Tasbih, glorification of Allah (esp. in bowing and prostrations in the ritual prayers)
Tasbih	:Rosary
Tashahud	:Recitation in the sitting position in the second and the last unit of the ritual prayer
Tawfeeq (pl. Tawfeeqaat)	:Divine inspiration
Tawheed	:Belief in the absolute Oneness of Allah

Tayammum	:Substitute of ablution/ritual bath when use of water is not possible or advisable
Taziyah	:A replica of the tomb of Imam Husain (s)
Thawaab	:Divine rewards
Thawr, cave of	:The cave where the Messenger of Allah (s.a.w.s.) hid on way to Medina
Torah	:The Old Testament
Two Shaykhs	:Abu Bakr and Umar
Umrah	:Optional pilgrimage to Mecca
Umratul Qaza	:Lapsed Umrah
Wajib	:Obligatory
Wilayat	:Guardianship, belief in the guardianship of Ahle Bayt (s) and love towards them
Wudhu	:Ritual ablution
Zakat	:Obligatory Islamic wealth tax
Ziarat	:Visitation/ or recitation of salutation while facing the tomb of religious personalities
Zihar	: Pre-Islamic form of divorce, consisting in the words of repudiation: You are to me like my mother's back. (anti a'layyah kazahri ummi).
Zinnoorain	:Master of two lights. Uthman, the third caliph
Zuhoor	:Reappearance (of Imam Mahdi [a.t.f.s.]).
Zuhr	: Noon prayers
Zuhrain	:The two ritual prayers of Zuhr (noon) and Asr (afternoon)

إتمام الحجة والبرهان

باللغة الانجليزية



Ansariyan Publications

P.O. Box 187

22 Shohada St. Qum

Islamic Republic of Iran

Tel: 0098 251 7749744 Fax: 7742647

E-mail: ansariyan@noorinet.net

www.ansariyan.net & www.ansariyan.org